

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 August 2015 00:57  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Jody & Robert  
**Subject:** Comment on Planning application 2015/3377/P

Good evening,

I would like to register an objection to the following planning application:

***Planning reference number: 2015/3377/P***

***Planning Officer: David Peres Da Costa***

***Site address: 17 Branch Hill London NW3 7NA***

***Comments open until: 20.08.15***

I am a local resident living at 4 Firecrest Drive, NW3 7ND, very close to the proposed site. Below is an outline of some areas I believe the planning team should scrutinise closely:

***Lack of justification for the development:*** The rationale for the re-build, that 'the building is too small for the applicant's family' is highly questionable. This house is already a 3-storey 4-5 bedroom property with indoor swimming pool and extensive indoor and outdoor living space. The planning/ development team should consider whether the benefits of mildly expanded space (relative to current size) outweighs the larger impact on local area.

***Overdevelopment of the site:*** This is contrary to Conservation Area status principles. The house is already the newest build in the area.

***Lack of consultation with neighbours:*** Savoy Court, St Regis Heights, Firecrest Drive and others requested input and consultation without response. None of the professional advice contained within the planning documents has considered the impact to neighbours in a balanced way. Unfortunately we do not have the resources to tailor a professional noise assessment, structural assessment etc to the actual Savoy Court, St Regis Heights, Firecrest Drive experience.

**Concerns raised by residents between this application and the previous application (2015/0457/P) have not been addressed:** We note that some design features have been altered. However, 95% of the residents' concerns have not been addressed. The development team should consider the size/ nature of responses to application 2015/0457/P. Unfortunately many neighbours are currently away and unable to respond as they did last time.

**Transport impact during construction period has not been addressed - Misrepresentation of Branch Hill's local use:** Branch Hill is in fact a vital local thoroughfare. For example it provides vital access local schools (e.g. UCS Junior/ Senior Schools, Hampstead Parochial). - **Safety of pedestrians during construction:** The blind spot and narrowness of Branch Hill on its approach will cause danger to children. It should be expected that the construction vehicles would mount the pavement on approach – **Knock-on traffic effect on West Heath Road:** without fully appreciating the nature of Branch Hill, the stress on West Heath Road (already highly traffic-laden) could be huge.

**Neighbours' privacy/ amenable living has not been appropriately considered in the construction plan:** beyond traffic concerns during the construction period, (and planning misrepresentations), the construction plan is huge. 91 weeks, including Saturday works is an unacceptable imposition on privacy, amenable living and local noise. Dust production is expected to be particularly high, and meetings will be arranged with neighbours (however, see point 'lack of consultation'). The spread of occupants affected includes families, elderly and sick. These unpleasant circumstances will not be felt by the current occupants, who will be relocating.

**Neighbour's living spaces are misrepresented:** This occurs throughout the proposal. One of many examples: on the third paragraph on page 13 of the '17 Branch Hill Design & Access Statement' they refer to our windows as "circulation area windows" (Figure 6.2 on the same page). However, these are in fact our central living spaces – living rooms, bedrooms.

**Surer safeguards than those mentioned in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment are needed:** The site has a history of illicit tree works and tree felling. Trees are at high risk and, based on past experience, safeguards based on assumptions of good handling are not adequate.

**A fuller assessment on basement excavation is needed:** There are no predictions on expected ground movement and impact on surrounding houses and trees. It is noted that some of the assumptions of safeguarding required in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment are based on maintaining steady soil levels!

**Wider risks present for neighbouring structures, if land slippage occurs:** The effect of potential damaged roots, which secure the foundations of Savoy Court, St Regis Heights and Firecrest Drive, has not been assessed and could be catastrophic. A fuller assessment is needed.

**The effect on local animals could be unacceptable:** The Conservation Area is home to diverse wildlife, which would be affected. A fuller assessment is needed.

***The increased air pollution is contrary to Conservation Area status principles***

***The differences between the Acoustic Assessment for this application, and the previous application (2015/0457/P) are highly questionable:*** For example, while the 'baseline situation' has not changed, we noticed that condensers have been moved around to disguise the full effect of the noise. Certain accuracy measures have also changed to disguise the effect of new condensers. For example, 'Noise Impact A' no longer includes the +6 decibel correction, even though the reverberant sound remains. If it did, it would be over the limit.

***The Acoustic Assessment background noise measurement is (still) inaccurate:*** The reading has been taken next to the Branch Hill side of the house, rather than the quieter Firecrest Drive side of the house. The lowest background noise measurement would have been much lower, if it represented an accurate assessment on the impact on Firecrest Drive. The limit should therefore be lower.

***It does not appear that the Noise Impact point calculations account for 'noise bleed' from other systems:*** We question why the acoustic assessment only includes calculations of the effect of *specific* systems for each noise impact point. While some systems will be more relevant to certain impact points, noise impact will include noise from *all* systems at *all* impact points.

***The Acoustic Assessment for Noise Impact C is at the limit of legality, but does not account for the condenser's main use:*** On page 12 of the Acoustic Assessment, it says that the reading has been taken based on 'comfort cooling'. However, in the proposal, it notes that the condensers will in fact be used for heating the house. Were the noise readings taken from the condensers for their most common use - heating purposes, instead of cooling purposes, Noise Impact C would certainly be above the legal limit.

Best regards,

Adam Coe