10th March 2015

Regeneration and Planning Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

Dear Sirs

Application Ref: 2015/0457/P – 17 Branch Hill London NW3 7LS

With regard to Planning Application 215/04574/P, for 17 Branch Hill NW3, we would like to **OBJECT** to the current Planning Application on the following reasons:

1. Tree report from Landmark Trees dated 15th July 2014.

   (a) It shows that 3 sycamore trees T9 and G8 would be effected by the new basement.
   (b) The report advised that trees G8 would have to be reduced to facilitate the development. These trees were only recently reduced.
   (c) There is insufficient information about what impact the pathway in the garden would have on the above mentioned trees.
   (d) The is insufficient information about whether the driveway is to be resurfaced and if so if there is to be a new sub-base. If there is a new sub-base to be installed then the report highlights that this will affect trees 13-15 (cedars) in the garden of Savoy Court.

2. Site Analytical services – Basement Impact Report

   a) The report highlights that that the new development needs sheet piling. We require further information as to what impact this will have on the trees in Savoy Court and 1 Firecrest Drive.
   b) This states that Party Wall Act's need to be entered into and our managing agents has not received any correspondence in relation to this.
   c) The report states that the Planning Application 214/2288/T received no objections with removing the Cedars along the driveway. This is totally incorrect as several residents on the Estate and the Managing Agent filed objections.
   d) Also there has been no report on the pathway, the condensing units, the extractor on the plant room. All are within a few meters of Savoy Court and Firecrest Drive. We are concerned about what impact these will have on noise and vibrations.
   e) The plans also show that there is a soak away in the lower part of the garden. We are concerned about this as the drainage of the soak away may lead to movement of the retaining wall and thus cause considerable damage to our Estate.

3. Construction Report:

   a. Section 3.2 states that the traffic along Branch Hill is light. This is certainly not the case. During peak times, from 8am to 10am and 3pm to 6pm, there is

heavy traffic along this route due to it providing a short cut from West Heath Road to Frognall/Hampstead Village.

b. Report advises that lorries will reverse onto the current site. This is not appropriate as it will cause congestion. Further to this, whilst the demolition to the ground floor is being undertaken, it states that lorries will be on site at least 7 times a day. This needs to be restricted and traffic control introduced. There is heavy congestion in this area and therefore lorries would have to be restricted between the hours of 10am and 3pm.
c. The Report states that the dust generated will be high and stipulates that meetings should be held with residents that are within 500m of the site boundary. There has been no discussion with our managing agents on the Firecrest Estate and therefore we are concerned with regard to the amount of dust that will be circulated in the air, not only for Savoy Court and Firecrest residents, but also St Regis and Birchwood Drive.
d. Further to this report, it stipulates that the site contractor will have to carry out daily inspections of neighbouring properties and vehicles within a 100m boundary of the site. Once again, our agents has not received correspondence in relation to access or with regards to the inspection. We believe that this property, as stated, will cause a significant amount of dust and we need to know what procedures are going to be in place to compensate the residents in relation to the dusty atmosphere within the development.
e. This document also states that they have delivered consultation letters to adjoining properties. This has not been carried out. We also have not received letters from Camden Council about this planning application and therefore feel that there is a lack of communication.
f. After the first set of works and the installation of the superstructure, the welfare facilities and office are to be placed next to the boundary fence of Savoy Court. We believe that this would be impractical, as this will be within close proximity of the flats of Savoy Court and therefore they will be disturbed by the smell and noise.
g. The engineer's report does not mention anything about the retaining wall on Firecrest Drive, Savoy or 1 Firecrest Drive. This is extremely important as this is a 5m high wall and if damaged could cause substantial damage to Firecrest and residents.

Acoustic Report:

a. 2.4 of the report shows a mechanical plant room which is going to be located near to the boundary wall of Savoy Court. There will be an external condenser also in the rear garden store. There are no details about the rear garden condensers in the entire documentation and therefore we object to this installation.
b. 2.6 of the report states areas A and C are the anticipated nearest noise sensitive areas which is Savoy Court – Flat 4 and 1 Firecrest Drive. However no acoustic test was carried out in these areas.
c. As per 3.4 of the report, it stipulates that the acoustic test was taken at the start of the driveway of 17 Branch Hill. We would like to advise that if the report stipulates that there are grave concerns about the noise impact on locations A and C, then the acoustic test should have been provided for both of these areas, as this is rural area with less traffic and pedestrian through way.

Based on all of the above, we **OBJECT** to the planning application until all aspects, as mentioned above, have been addressed.

Yours Faithfully,

[redacted]

PTO