

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3377/P	Patricia Carvel	Leavesden Branch Hill NW3 7LY	13/08/2015 11:09:35	OBJ	<p>1. The white structure will stand out like a sore thumb. The whole estate was originally planned as white, but they were made to change by Camden as being wrong for the area. (I was here!)</p> <p>2. Noise, dirt, traffic chaos - and possibly DEATH. Why? The ground water readings were taken at the wrong end of the site. There used to be a pond outside our houses (painted by Constable) which drained in a culvert beneath the road (but visible on the Heath side) by No. 13 and down beneath No. 17. It is the Westbourne, which fills the Serpentine, carried in a huge pipe over Sloane Square Station to the Thames. It is no mean river! No. 13 has an observation platform in the garden with a monitor in the house to see the level of water, because the previous owners came home one evening and were met by a barrage of water at garden level. They moved!</p> <p>3. In 1975, a man was drowned in his cellar in Sumatra Road, West Hampstead by the Westbourne rising suddenly. (See Lost Rivers of London, by Nicholas Barton.)</p>
2015/3377/P	S Gough	Leavesden Cottage Branch Hill	18/08/2015 11:30:58	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The design and materials to be used are out of keeping with the surrounding buildings (which are all of a brick construction) and therefore detrimental to a conservation area.</p> <p>2. The increase in size of the property is a massive overdevelopment of the site and will be detrimental to the area and on neighbouring properties' privacy and sunlight. For example, the proposed change to a living area on the south aspect on the first floor will directly impact on and look into both my livingroom and kitchen (this is currently configured as bedrooms and so not an issue). The location of the outdoor pool will also directly adversely affect noise levels and view.</p> <p>3. The proposed piling and swimming pool may impact on soil stability. This is not adequately addressed in the reports. For example the fact that an underground river (the Westbourne) is located nearby is not dealt with.</p> <p>4. The siting of condensers will adversely affect neighbours' peace and tranquility in an otherwise quiet area.</p> <p>5. The traffic issues caused by such a development are inadequately dealt with. Contrary to the report, Branch Hill is extremely busy at certain times of the day and the narrow road and turn off from West Heath Road is a traffic issue. Furthermore planning permission has been granted for demolition of 7 Branch Hill so we are faced with 2 major projects and traffic chaos within 200 metres of each other.</p> <p>6. The 91 week building programme and consequent noise and dust is unacceptable. The existing property is a relatively newly built property and the environmental impact of the current proposal does not justify it being accepted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3377/P	Ghassan Majed	Holme Vale House Branch Hill Hampstead	18/08/2015 13:35:20	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Peres Da Costa 17 Branch Hill London NW3 7LS (ref. no. 2015/3377/P), withdrawn from (ref. no. 2015/0457/P)</p> <p>We are the owners of Holme Vale House, Branch Hill. The proposed scheme is at the rear of our garden and is abutting our residential annexe building, where our nanny lives full-time. We still strongly OBJECT to the scheme despite the applicant withdrawing their earlier submission (ref. no. 2015/0457/P) and re-submitting their new application, following comments made by Camden Council; a stance shared with many of our neighbours. This is not a view we have formed lightly, and in reaching our decision to object, we have discussed the scheme at length with a planning lawyer, and a heritage consultant. We believe a 91week construction timeframe is inordinately long and will material affect the quality of life of many residents in our neighbourhood.</p> <p>We strongly object to the opportunistic timing of this submission towards the end of July, and covering the August period for comment, whilst many families are away for the summer holiday. We think this tactic is highly unneighbourly and unfair to the families directly affected who are either unaware or are abroad, and thus unable to comment. We would kindly ask the Planning Team to extend the comment period by another month to give these affected families a fair and decent chance to comment.</p> <p>We OBJECT to the current Planning Application for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) Unneighbourly development</p> <p>The eastern elevation of the existing house runs along approximately half of the rear boundary of our house. As you will see from your site visit, we have clear views through the other half. We can see trees, benefit from natural light and enjoy spending time in the open character of our garden. The re-submitted replacement house still obliterates all of the above (Design & Access Statement p.12). The majority of our family time is spent in the lower ground floor kitchen, lower ground living area and garden, and our nanny in her residential annexe at the end of the garden. The new elevation at the rear of our garden will run along the entire length of our rear garden; the fact that the some foliage on a 'stepped' arrangement (Proposed – East Elevation) has been added to pass the eco-credentials just obfuscates the permanent loss of amenity and space, whilst increasing the sense of overbearing that my family will endure. The new structure completely envelops and encloses our garden. My garden, house and residential annexe would be dominated by the new extension, which would be hugely overbearing.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10 of the Council's Design Guidance makes it clear: "rear extensions should be designed to not cause loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure." The principles of paragraph 4.10 apply equally to a new build as they do an extension. Whilst some of these assessments might be partly quantitative (eg sunlight), the qualitative judgments on matters such as privacy, overlooking, overshadowing and sense of enclosure are subjective planning judgments. In our view, those judgments should be made having regard to the overarching objective of the guidance, which is to prevent development that causes a loss to amenity.</p> <p>In order to help the LPA, we have enclosed photographs of our current eastern elevation and rendered 3-Dimensional visualisations, provided to us during the pre-application phase, by the applicant's architect to demonstrate the difference between flat and curved roof structures. In our opinion, it is highly significant that the applicant did not include 3-Dimensional visualisations or rendering of this</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

eastern elevation in the new application documents, instead choosing to include rendered perspectives of the north and south elevations (Design & Access Statement p.14). Whether a curved or flat roof is used is immaterial – the loss of amenity and overbearing is stark.

As you'll see, the comparison between the existing house and the new scheme (Proposed – East Elevation) is stark. The former allows us to enjoy our garden as it respects our space and amenity. In contrast, the proposed scheme creates a massive bulk covering the entire width of our rear boundary. If ever a new house created a sense of enclosure for a neighbouring property, this must be it!

Furthermore, we must highlight seriously misleading inaccuracies in the applicant's Design & Access Statement – Comparative Study Current Scheme (p.12) 'the neighbours concerns of garden sunlight', and particularly with the Withdrawn Scheme (2015/0457/P) (p.11), 'early engagement with the neighbours No.1 and 2. Branch Hill raised potential concerns of loss of afternoon sunlight into their garden.'

We met with Mr. Kaye and his architect in December 2014 and we highlighted our concerns. We also emailed them to him on 15th January 2015 (attached), prior to his application being submitted formally. Our concerns were not taken into account and the application was formally submitted. As you can clearly see in the email, our major concerns covered: character of the conservation area; materials used within a conservation area; the bulk, scale and mass of the extension with reference to character and harmony of the conservation area and, finally, the large roof would be unacceptably prominent in long views, far beyond my own garden, and would have a significant adverse impact on the skyline. We had never made any objections relating to loss of sunlight during our discussion phase with Mr. Kaye and his architect in December 2014, as we knew the garden sunlight concerns would be a very subjective point. Furthermore, and to corroborate our point, Mr James Hart, of SHH Architects, emailed us previously on 23rd December 2014 with a light study that was undertaken of our property during the discussion phase. If you read in Mr Hart's email: 'Shadow Summary': 'Overall the curve in the new scheme's roof allows more sunlight into your yard over the course of the afternoon. The trade-off is the difference between the existing and new scheme which occurs between 4pm and 5pm where approximately 2 metres of sunlight is lost in the northern corner of the backyard.' Even though we would lose 2metres of afternoon in our garden, we did not raise this as an objectionable point in our email of 15th January 2015. We would argue that to maintain the charade of neighbours' sunlight concerns and, thereby, making minor amendments to the roof design in the current Design & Access Statement to the Camden Council Planning Team is in fact a pretext to detract from our loss of amenity and space - due to the new eastern elevation running along the entire length of our rear garden. We have checked with the previous owner of The Chestnuts (No.1 Branch Hill), Mr Eric Nobileau, whose previous objection covered the pre-application and Withdrawn application period. Mr Nobileau confirms that he never discussed sunlight access concerns with any party related to the development (documentary proof available). We, thus, strongly urge the Planning Team to reject the entire application on the grounds of these misleading inaccuracies alone.

Moreover, just to underscore our points, we draw your attention to the Construction Management Plan, Section 5.1 Community Consultation which states "a series of consultative meetings have been held with Mr Gus Majed, the occupier of Nr1 branch Hill, the property closest to the site". This is a very misleading entry and we object to it strongly as it gives the impression that there is some tacit approval on our part or that we were part of the process, which is most certainly not the case. There is no mention of our pre-application concerns whatsoever. We identified this very point in our previous

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

objection letter, yet the applicant maintained this point in the newly submitted Community Consultation section. For a point of exactness, in the Design & Access Statement – Executive Summary (p.3 & p.5) – our house, Holme Vale House, is referred to as No.2 Branch Hill– so even in the applicant’s own documentation, references to the actual property in question is incorrect.

We have also read that in pre-application discussions with the LPA, the applicant was advised of the need to make the proposal subservient to our house, and our neighbour. It is self-evident that this still has not been done in the newly re-submitted application. Instead, the applicant states (Design & Access Statement – Comparative Study – Current Scheme (p.12.)) that a curved roof has been abandoned and replaced by a flat roof. This is self-evident nonsense. A flat roof of the size being proposed is just as dominant as a curved roof, as has been introduced in the newly re-submitted Current Scheme.

The use of a ‘living garden’ merely acts as some gimmickry decoy purporting to fly the ecological flag, albeit half-heartedly, to gain planning consent. Why had none of the previous pre-application and withdrawn schemes ever incorporated a ‘living garden’ roof before? There are no technical designs or specifications for the ‘living garden’ or details as to how it would be irrigated, maintained or accessed. From the perspective of being in our garden, it doesn't matter if we are looking at a flat roof, or a curved roof or a triangular one, with or without a garden (living or synthetic)! Its mass is overbearing, dominating and creates a huge sense of enclosure.

(ii) Character of the conservation area

We believe that the application is so dominant, overbearing and unneighbourly, that those are all sufficient reasons in themselves for it to be recommended for refusal. However, there is also another aspect, which is the impact on the character of the conservation area.

In the Design and Access Statement, there are several references to the site as being a "backland", "off-street location" etc. In effect, the applicant is saying that the proposed scheme will preserve the character of the conservation area as it won't be readily visible from many locations.

There are two points to note here. Firstly, and most obviously, it can be seen from numerous locations: numerous residents in Savoy Court, St. Regis Heights, our house, our neighbour's house at The Chestnuts, everyone living in Leavesden and Leavesden Cottage. The applicant does not live in splendid isolation, and no amount of screening and landscaping will hide it from public view.

The second point is a legal one. Our lawyer has confirmed that screening a house, eg with landscaping, cannot be used as justification for saying that the house doesn't have a negative impact on the character of the area. He's referred us to a case called Great Trippets Estate Ltd [2011], which confirmed this as legally correct.

As that is the legal position, the scheme cannot be justified by the applicant saying it has no practical effect on the character of the conservation area. Instead, the proper approach is that as new development in conservation areas must either preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area, the LPA must decide on the impact that the house has on the conservation area.

It is significant to note that the application documents did not include any heritage statements, apart from a few references in the Design and Access Statement.

We would respectfully request that a decision on the application is delayed until a full and independent heritage report has been submitted. If you recall that we commissioned our own heritage study (attached), by Mr Kevin Murphy, who found the Withdrawn Application (ref. no. 2015/0457/P) to be woefully inappropriate and failed to acknowledge and reflect the characteristics of the conservation

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>area, therefore detracting from its character and appearance.</p> <p>He asserted that the development, due to its proximity, scale and inappropriate appearance, would have a negative impact on the immediately adjacent properties that have been identified as positively contributing to the conservation area.</p> <p>Further, Kevin Murphy emphasised that irrespective of tree cover, a new development should be "subservient and respectful to the older context that provides the conservation area with its character and appearance". He considered that the significant height and inappropriately contrasting design would harm that context. Despite the minor changes made in the re-submitted application, we strongly feel the proposed development will not preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.</p> <p>We note in the Design & Access Statement – Proposal – Design (p.14) that ‘ the predominant materials will be a white cement render for the ground and lower ground floors’ and use of ‘warm laminate hardwood will be used as shutters and to accentuate the ‘split’ in the 2 wings’. Given the fact that every single building in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development is constructed out of brick, including the applicant’s own existing building; how can a ‘white cement render’ and ‘laminate hardwood’ be construed as subservient and respectful to the older context that provides the conservation area? We believe this makes a clear negative impact on the conservation area and supports the need for an independent heritage report.</p> <p>As, a matter of law, we understand that a negative impact must be given "considerable importance and weight" (a case called Forge Field Society [2014]). We understand this means that a negative impact on the conservation area is not just a material consideration for the LPA to take into account. Instead, the strong presumption is that planning permission should be refused, and only even stronger material considerations can outweigh that presumption.</p> <p>(iii) Insufficient technical information</p> <p>We note from the Design & Access Statement – Executive Summary (p.3) that the existing building will be replaced with a ‘single family dwelling on a re-arranged slightly larger footprint’. We note the lack of clear presentation of total area (sq. m.) or volume (m3) in the proposed development in the Design & Access Statement. Obviously, these critical metrics have been left out intentionally to make it harder to raise concerns regarding the exact increase in area and volume, thereby triggering detailed objections and discussions pertaining to over-development and excessive construction area. We calculate that the increase in square metres is considerably higher in area and, particularly, by volume. We would ask the applicant to furnish the Planning Team with the exact area and volume of the proposed and withdrawn designs before any planning decision is made. These designs require technical expertise and have clearly left out critical metrics to essentially baffle the untrained objecting eye with structural engineering science.</p> <p>(iv) Justification</p> <p>The proposed development argues in the Design & Access Statement – Existing Site (p.6) ‘ the existing 3-storey building was constructed in the early 2000’s..’ and ‘the current users of the existing building experience high on-going living and maintenance costs due to insufficient choice of materials during the construction’. It is self-evident that the existing structure was constructed with Camden Council Planning Team’s approval, passing all current and best practice buildings regulations, materials and codes in the early 2000’s. Within the context of building history, the existing building is modern when compared to their considerably older neighbours, particularly The Chestnuts, Holme Vale House and</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

the Leavesden section of properties.

To argue that a modern building is now costly to maintain and justifies a knock-down would be a very dangerous precedent to set within the Borough of Camden, as anyone fancying a newer, larger and more contemporary design can use this line of argument in future. Furthermore, the existing building's choice of materials was approved by Camden Council Planning Team, as per best practice industry and national codes of the time. To now argue that the inefficient choice of materials during construction is to argue that the Planning approval decision was sub-optimal and below national standards, which is clearly not the case. Imagine the precedent if every Camden home owner cited the need to knock-down their property to re-build, so as to save on costs, due to advancement in building materials technology? This would be setting a very dangerous precedent.

To be crystal clear, the applicant is arguing that because the original choice of materials used were inefficient and now too costly to maintain the property justifies the expense, running into millions of pounds, of demolition, re-designing and re-building a new one now. Obviously, this takes no account of the implicit cost to our environment, our ecology, and the increase in carbon impact from the development nor the 91 week disruption to our neighbourhood. We think this is utterly perverse logic and nonsense. We strongly urge the Planning Team to reject the application only on this point alone as it would set a very dangerous precedent.

(v) Structural Report and Analysis

We draw the Planning Team's attention to the Structural Engineer's Report:

2.0 Site Information: 'There are boundary retaining walls to most of the site. The Chestnuts has a single storey lean-to structure on the north east boundary.'

We take it that the Report is referring to Holme Value House and not The Chestnuts, another minor factual error in a formal report. We draw the Planning Team's attention to this 'lean-to structure' which is in fact a residential annexe, where our nanny lives full-time. The annexe is heated, contains a shower and toilet, kitchenette, living room and bedroom. Within the context of the structural analysis and stability of the project, we have major concerns regarding the extent of analysis and reporting. At no stage have we seen stress test results or soil mechanics seepage reports pertaining to the piling abutting the party walls and adjacent annexe. Furthermore, no detailed structural reports covering stress analysis of retaining wall, party walls or subterranean excavations have been submitted.

Since our kitchen, lower ground living area and garden are roughly over 2.5 metres below the entrance to the main driveway of 17 Branch Hill, a retaining wall (photo attached) provides the necessary reinforcement to buttress the soil and water pressures arising from the ground above us. We have not seen any soil mechanics, retaining wall fluid seepage reports or pressure analysis. Furthermore, as given the increased duration of the development to 91 weeks, the volume of HGV movements (Construction Management Report – 3.8) and the location of the material storage depot (Construction Management Report – Traffic Management Regime – Superstructure phase) – the pressure on our retaining wall will increase significantly. Our family and friends use the garden daily and we have our nanny living full-time in the annexe, we are very concerned for our family's health and safety, given no detailed pressure analysis or soil mechanics reports on any of the party walls have not been provided.

This point is further underscored in the Structural Engineer's Report: 9.0 Conclusion

'...the proposed scheme has been undertaken although detailed calculation checks, investigations and full design will need to be completed' and ' Note that site is largely bounded by gardens so the adjacent structures are limited to retaining walls and a lean-to garden building'

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

How can planning permission be granted on a development when the detailed calculation checks, investigations and full design have not even been completed? Also, the consistent demotion of the residential nanny's annexe to a lean-to is erroneous and must be re-considered.

At no point does this report refer to the retaining wall between 17 Branch Hill and Firecrest Drive. This is extremely important as this is a 5m high wall and if damaged could cause substantial damage to Firecrest and their residents.

We note in the 'Structural Report – 3.3.2' that "As the new lower ground floor to the rear is deeper than the existing floor level", further highlights the need to determine the true volume and area increases. The proposed development is running deeper than the existing structure and we note that in the Proposed Application the subterranean section along Section AA has been further extended to the Withdrawn Application design.

We would urge the Planning Team to request further and more detailed analysis regarding the structural stability of the now increased piling, increased stresses on retaining walls and on party walls.

Moreover, we urge detailed analysis of how the proposed development affects the soil and fluid mechanics of the nearby Westbourne River from The Chestnuts and Leavesden side of the project, where the river runs closest. We note that none of the submitted reports did any analysis on this most crucial side, clearly in order to submit more favourable readings. Again, this further highlights the very important need for all parties affected by this proposed development to see the exact metrics.

Furthermore, we note that these 'Iceberg' developments have created significant backlash throughout London and given rise to legal disputes amongst neighbours within many boroughs due to noise, ground water issues, structural instability and settlement problems. We urge the Planning Team to consider these points.

(vi) Noise Assessment by Acoustics Plus

1. Item 3.3 states that the Acoustic test was taken at the start of the Driveway of 17 Branch Hill. The report has stated that there are concerns about the noise impact on Savoy Court (Flat 4) and 1 Firecrest Drive, noise impact A and C, then an acoustic test should be provided for both these areas, as this is a rural areas with less traffic and pedestrian through way. The current results are not a true reflection of the noise level in the surrounding area.

2. At no time were noise tests conducted near our garden or near our residential annexe at the rear of our garden, where our nanny lives full-time. Of all the properties, this residential annexe is closest to the proposed development.

3. Item 6.5 and 6.24 the specialist has advised that it is assumed that the plant rooms will be lined with acoustic lining however this is not guaranteed and has not be confirmed that it will be installed. Therefore their results are inadequate as they are based on insulation that may not be installed.

4. Item d and e in section 7.2 states that acoustic lining should be installed and does not specify it has to be installed to comply with noise regulations. Their findings are based on this insulation, which are relatively near to the noise limit and therefore the acoustic lining must be installed in these plant rooms and an acoustic test done in these separate locations.

(vii) Construction Management Plan

1. States in item 3.2 that there is a low traffic density – this is not the case this is a short cut for

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

vehicles wanting to get to Hampstead from West Heath Road. This road is constantly being used, particularly during school term time.

2. States in item 3.3 that one parking bay will be suspended for a period of time - it does not mention how long the bay will be suspended for during the 91 week programme. Parking for residents of Branch Hill is limited and thus having a bay suspended for a long period of time may mean that non-residents will park outside, further reducing resident parking spaces. Furthermore as section 4.9 it states that workers will be allowed to bring vehicles to site, which will once again reduce the number of parking spaces for residents.

3. Table 2 – HGV Movements indicates that over a period of 28 weeks from the start of the project that there will be an average of 2 deliveries a day. This is a significant volume of traffic on a narrow road.

4. Item 3.8 states average of one a day – this is incorrect based on the above point 1.c.

5. Table 2 – HGV movements – during the first 9 weeks of the project (04/01/15- 04/03/15) there is an average of 4 deliveries a day and during some weeks. Also during the demolition to ground floor work there is to be 7 deliveries a day. This will cause traffic congestion along Branch Hill, as well as Frognaal and West Heath Road.

6. The Report states in section 4.1 that the dust generated will be medium during the demolition, excavation and construction. Therefore for the first 28 weeks (January through to August) of the work during the demolition work St Regis Heights, Savoy Court and Firecrest Drive will suffer from dust and this is due to continue throughout the whole 91 week project. There has been no dust assessment made covering our residential garden annexe, where our nanny lives, nor from our garden and lower ground floor, where we spend a significant amount of time.

7. Section 4.1.2 states that meetings should be held with residents that are within 500m of the site boundary. Apart from our initial pre-application discussions with Mr. Kaye and his architect, there has been no discussion and therefore we are concerned with regard to the amount of dust that will be circulated in the air for all parties concerned. Clearly, the only party not affected by this dust will be the applicant – who will clearly be living elsewhere whilst the 91 week construction is underway. 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.

8. We have received no correspondence in relation to access to our property 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.

(viii) Report on Ground investigation – Site Analytical Services

1. In section 5.6 it states that this report has to be reviewed with the Stage 1 report that was submitted with the previous application. This is unacceptable. The planning application must submit all relevant documents with the current application and not refer to applications that have been withdrawn.

2. Consideration has not been made with regard to the underground river (West Bourne). We believe this is critical to understanding the potential soil stability risk on the section of the proposed development closest to The Chestnuts and the Leavesden properties.

3. The points that were raised in the previously as below have still not been addressed;

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

- i. As per 2.5 of the report that they have concerns about the ground stability and recommend sheet piling but further investigation is required. We are aware that they are proposing a sheet piling system but we would request further information on this as this could affect the roots of neighbouring trees and impact the retaining walls of neighbouring properties
- ii. AS per 5.5 there is significant potential that the basement will incur movements through the ground and that there should be a proper design and the Party Wall Act should be taken into consideration at the design stage. At no point have we received any correspondence in relation to this.

In summary, our strong view is that the scheme has a negative impact on the character of the conservation area. On that basis, as a matter of law, there is a strong presumption against granting planning permission. We cannot see any material considerations that would outweigh that presumption. Indeed, we can see several other material considerations that would only add weight to the refusal of the application, including dominance, overbearing, sense of enclosure, impact on the amenity of our garden, factual errors, lack of detailed technical analysis, lack of reasonable justification and

We would request that you refuse the application.

Yours sincerely

Gus and Catherine Majed
Holme Vale House,
Branch Hill, Hampstead
London, NW3 7NA

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3377/P	Malcolm Segal	17 St Regis Heights Firecrest Drive Hampstead NW3 7NE	16/08/2015 21:48:55	OBJ	<p>1. Construction Management Plan</p> <p>a. States in item 3.2 that there is a low traffic density – this is not the case this is a short cut for vehicles wanting to get to Hampstead from West Heath Road. It is constantly being used.</p> <p>b. States in item 3.3 that one parking bay will be suspended for a period of time - it does not mention how long the bay will be suspended for during the 91 week programme. Parking for residents of Branch Hill is limited and thus having a bay suspended for a long period of time may mean that non-residents of Mansion Gardens and the Firecrest Estate will park outside Savoy Court. Furthermore as section 4.9 it states that workers will be allowed to bring vehicles to site, which will once again reduce the number or parking spaces for residents.</p> <p>c. Table 2 – HGV Movements indicates that over a period of 28 weeks from the start of the project that there will be an average of 2 deliveries a day.</p> <p>d. Item 3.8 states average of one a day – this is incorrect based on the above point 1.c.</p> <p>e. Table 2 – HGV movements – during the first 9 weeks of the project (04/01/15- 04/03/15) there is an average of 4 deliveries a day and during some weeks. Also during the demolition to ground floor work there is to be 7 deliveries a day. This will cause traffic congestion along Branch Hill, as well as Froggnal and West Heath Road.</p> <p>f. The Report states in section 4.1 that the dust generated will be medium during the demolition, excavation and construction. Therefore for the first 28 weeks (January through to August) of the work during the demolition work St Regis Heights, Savoy Court and Firecrest Drive will suffer from dust and this is due to continue throughout the whole 91 week project.</p> <p>g. Section 4.1.2 states that meetings should be held with residents that are within 500m of the site boundary. There has been no discussion with our clients 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. 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, we have received no correspondence in relation to access to my client's property 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.</p> <p>h. Section 5.1 Community Consultation – none of the residents have received any details about the scheme and neither have we as the Managing Agents</p> <p>i. After the first set of demolition works, the welfare facilities and office are to be placed next to the boundary fence of Savoy Court from 24/04/16 until 29/09/17. 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</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

disturbed by the smell and noise. (Appendix D)

2. Noise Assessment by Acoustic Plus

a. Item 3.3 states that the Acoustic test was taken at the start of the Driveway of 17 Branch Hill. The report has stated that there are concerns about the noise impact on Savoy Court (Flat 4) and 1 Firecrest Drive, noise impact A and C, then an acoustic test should be provided for both these areas, as this is a rural areas with less traffic and pedestrian through way. The current results is not a true reflection of the noise level in the surrounding area.

b. Item 6.5 and 6.24 the specialist has advised that it is assumed that the plant rooms will be lined with acoustic lining however this is not guaranteed and has not be confirmed that it will be installed. Therefore their results are inadequate as they are based on insulation that may not be installed.

c. Item d and e in section 7.2 states that acoustic lining should be installed and does not specify it has to be installed to comply with noise regulations. Their findings are based on this insulation, which are relatively near to the noise limit and therefore the acoustic lining must be installed in these plant rooms and an acoustic test done in these separate locations.

3. Structural Engineers Statement

a. At no point does this report refer to the retaining wall between 17 Branch Hill and Firecrest Drive. This is extremely important as this is a 5m high wall and if damaged could cause substantial damage to Firecrest and their residents.

b. No Consideration has been made with regard to the underground river (Westbourne) nor the problems with drainage.

4. Arboriculture impact Assessment

a. As per the report the basement is to be built some 1.3m away from this tree. Tim Moya Associates carried out a tree report on the trees in Savoy Court in 2013 and this Sycamore is a early Mature tree which is fair in physiological and Structural condition

b. Section 1.3 states that the basement will be some 3 meters below the stem of the tree. This means that the roots on one site of the tree will be cut and could make the tree unstable as the root system of a sycamore can extend as far as the spread of the canopy, which in mature trees is typically 50 to 70 feet across. We would therefore disagree with this assessment.

c. Once again no consideration has been made to trees T13-T15 if the roadway is resurfaced.

5. Plans –

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>a. The property has been extended so that it is nearer to St Regis Heights and Firecrest Drive. This means that residents in St Regis and Firecrest Drive will be overlooked by 17 Branch Hill and vice versa.</p> <p>b. The design is not in keeping with the current surroundings</p> <p>6. Report on Ground investigation – Site Analytical Services</p> <p>a. In section 5.6 it states that this report has to be reviewed with the Stage 1 report that was submitted with the previous application. This is unacceptable. The planning application must submit all relevant documents with the current application and not refer to applications that have been withdrawn.</p> <p>b. Consideration has not been made with regard to the underground river (West Bourne)</p> <p>c. The points that were raised in the previously as below have still not been addressed;</p> <p>1. As per 2.5 of the report that they have concerns about the ground stability and recommend sheet piling but further investigation is required. We are aware that they are proposing a sheet piling system but we would request further information on this as this could affect the roots of neighbouring trees and impact the retaining walls of neighbouring properties</p> <p>2. AS per 5.5 there is significant potential that the basement will incur movements through the ground and that there should be a proper design and the Party Wall Act should be taken into consideration at the design stage. At no point has Spedan Tower MCL, Firecrest Management Co Ltd, or 1 Firecrest Drive received any correspondence in relation to this.</p> <p>3. The report also stipulates that the Planning Application 214/2288/T received no objections with removing the Cedars along the driveway. This is totally incorrect as per the attached email sent to Camden Council. Furthermore, the removal of these trees was carried out prior to the application completion date. Our complaint was not taken into account nor my clients views about noise and aesthetics'. If the planning application is granted then the removal of these trees will now increase the dust and noise that Savoy Court Residents will endure.</p> <p>4. 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 my clients land if not a meter so we are concerned about what impact these will have on noise and vibrations.</p> <p>5. The plans also show that there is a soak away in the lower part of the garden. We are concerned about this as we believe the drainage of the soak away will lead to movement of the retaining wall and thus cause considerable damage to my clients Estate.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3377/P	Claire Newbrook	4th Floor High Holborn House 52-54 High Holborn London WC1V 6RL	17/08/2015 09:08:45	OBJ	<p>17 Branch Hill – Planning Application</p> <p>We, Faraday Property Management Ltd, are the managing agents for Firecrest Management Co Ltd who are the Freeholders of 1-9 Savoy Court, 1-21 St Regis Heights, 1-6 Firecrest Drive and 1-12 Birchwood Drive, NW3. We are also the Managing Agents for Spedan Tower Management Company (1-9 Savoy Court) and St Regis Heights Management Company Limited (1-21 ST Regis Heights).</p> <p>With regard to Planning Application 2015/3377/P, for 17 Branch Hill NW3, we would like to OBJECT to the current Planning Application on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction Management Plan <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. States in item 3.2 that there is a low traffic density – this is not the case this is a short cut for vehicles wanting to get to Hampstead from West Heath Road. It is constantly being used. b. States in item 3.3 that one parking bay will be suspended for a period of time - it does not mention how long the bay will be suspended for during the 91 week programme. Parking for residents of Branch Hill is limited and thus having a bay suspended for a long period of time may mean that non-residents of Mansion Gardens and the Firecrest Estate will park outside Savoy Court. Furthermore as section 4.9 it states that workers will be allowed to bring vehicles to site, which will once again reduce the number or parking spaces for residents. c. Table 2 – HGV Movements indicates that over a period of 28 weeks from the start of the project that there will be an average of 2 deliveries a day. d. Item 3.8 states average of one a day – this is incorrect based on the above point 1.c. e. Table 2 – HGV movements – during the first 9 weeks of the project (04/01/15- 04/03/15) there is an average of 4 deliveries a day and during some weeks. Also during the demolition to ground floor work there is to be 7 deliveries a day. This will cause traffic congestion along Branch Hill, as well as Froggnal and West Heath Road. f. The Report states in section 4.1 that the dust generated will be medium during the demolition, excavation and construction. Therefore for the first 28 weeks (January through to August) of the work during the demolition work St Regis Heights, Savoy Court and Firecrest Drive will suffer from dust and this is due to continue throughout the whole 91 week project. g. Section 4.1.2 states that meetings should be held with residents that are within 500m of the site boundary. There has been no discussion with our clients 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. 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, we have received no correspondence in relation to access to my client’s property 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. h. Section 5.1 Community Consultation – none of the residents have received any details about the scheme and neither have we as the Managing Agents i. After the first set of demolition works, the welfare facilities and office are to be placed next to the boundary fence of Savoy Court from 24/04/16 until 29/09/17. We believe that this would be

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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. (Appendix D)</p> <p>2. Noise Assessment by Acoustic Plus</p> <p>a. Item 3.3 states that the Acoustic test was taken at the start of the Driveway of 17 Branch Hill. The report has stated that there are concerns about the noise impact on Savoy Court (Flat 4) and 1 Firecrest Drive, noise impact A and C, then an acoustic test should be provided for both these areas, as this is a rural areas with less traffic and pedestrian through way. The current results is not a true reflection of the noise level in the surrounding area.</p> <p>b. Item 6.5 and 6.24 the specialist has advised that it is assumed that the plant rooms will be lined with acoustic lining however this is not guaranteed and has not be confirmed that it will be installed. Therefore their results are inadequate as they are based on insulation that may not be installed.</p> <p>c. Item d and e in section 7.2 states that acoustic lining should be installed and does not specify it has to be installed to comply with noise regulations. Their findings are based on this insulation, which are relatively near to the noise limit and therefore the acoustic lining must be installed in these plant rooms and an acoustic test done in these separate locations.</p> <p>3. Structural Engineers Statement</p> <p>a. At no point does this report refer to the retaining wall between 17 Branch Hill and Firecrest Drive. This is extremely important as this is a 5m high wall and if damaged could cause substantial damage to Firecrest and their residents.</p> <p>b. No Consideration has been made with regard to the underground river (Westbourne) nor the problems with drainage.</p> <p>4. Arboriculture impact Assessment</p> <p>a. As per the report the basement is to be built some 1.3m away from this tree. Tim Moya Associates carried out a tree report on the trees in Savoy Court in 2013 and this Sycamore is a early Mature tree which is fair in physiological and Structural condition</p> <p>b. Section 1.3 states that the basement will be some 3 meters below the stem of the tree. This means that the roots on one site of the tree will be cut and could make the tree unstable as the root system of a sycamore can extend as far as the spread of the canopy, which in mature trees is typically 50 to 70 feet across. We would therefore disagree with this assessment.</p> <p>c. Once again no consideration has been made to trees T13-T15 if the roadway is resurfaced.</p> <p>5. Plans –</p> <p>a. The property has been extended so that it is nearer to St Regis Heights and Firecrest Drive. This means that residents in St Regis and Firecrest Drive will be overlooked by 17 Branch Hill and vice versa.</p> <p>b. The design is not in keeping with the current surroundings</p> <p>6. Report on Ground investigation – Site Analytical Services</p> <p>a. In section 5.6 it states that this report has to be reviewed with the Stage 1 report that was submitted with the previous application. This is unacceptable. The planning application must submit all relevant documents with the current application and not refer to applications that have been withdrawn.</p> <p>b. Consideration has not been made with regard to the underground river (West Bourne)</p> <p>c. The points that were raised in the previously as below have still not been addressed;</p> <p>1. As per 2.5 of the report that they have concerns about the ground stability and recommend sheet piling but further investigation is required. We are aware that they are proposing a sheet piling system</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>but we would request further information on this as this could affect the roots of neighbouring trees and impact the retaining walls of neighbouring properties</p> <p>2. AS per 5.5 there is significant potential that the basement will incur movements through the ground and that there should be a proper design and the Party Wall Act should be taken into consideration at the design stage. At no point has Spedan Tower MCL, Firecrest Management Co Ltd, or 1 Firecrest Drive received any correspondence in relation to this.</p> <p>3. The report also stipulates that the Planning Application 214/2288/T received no objections with removing the Cedars along the driveway. This is totally incorrect as per the attached email sent to Camden Council. Furthermore, the removal of these trees was carried out prior to the application completion date. Our complaint was not taken into account nor my clients views about noise and aesthetics'. If the planning application is granted then the removal of these trees will now increase the dust and noise that Savoy Court Residents will endure.</p> <p>4. 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 my clients land if not a meter so we are concerned about what impact these will have on noise and vibrations.</p> <p>5. The plans also show that there is a soak away in the lower part of the garden. We are concerned about this as we believe the drainage of the soak away will lead to movement of the retaining wall and thus cause considerable damage to my clients Estate.</p> <p>As our original queries have still not been addressed my clients OBJECT to this application until their interests and concerns have been reviewed and responded to in full.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3377/P	Jan Levy	4 Savoy Court Firecrest Drive Hampstead London NW3 7 NFou	15/08/2015 11:42:32	INT	<p>The managing agents of the Firecrest Estate have submitted a detailed analysis of our objections to the redevelopment of 17 Branch Hill. I would like to put forward a more personal objection as our home faces onto 17 Branch Hill .</p> <p>We have lived in Savoy Court for seventeen years and so were residents when the house was built approximately ten years ago...it was not an easy time but the house was built and we have had no problems with our neighbours.</p> <p>Now we are faced with two years of building and noise... My husband is 82 years old and suffers from Parkinson's and heart problems, he spends a great deal of time at home... The quite enjoyment of his life will be shattered by the overdevelopment of a house which is more than big enough for a family of five.</p> <p>I would also urge the planning committee to visit the site and see the scale of the proximity of the two building (Savoy and Branch Hill) the submitted plans suggest that five swimming pool condensers will be installed... No noise impact assessment has been done in the Savoy Court garden and that is totally unfair as that is where residents will suffer most , not the Branch Hill side of the house.</p> <p>I would also like to mention that this application has been submitted at a time when many residents are on holiday ... I am sure this has been done to lessen the number of objections but the Firecrest Estate is as determined as Ever to oppose this overdevelopment of a secluded Corner of Hampstead.</p> <p>I hope that our objections are listened to, they are not petty but rather heart felt as this proposal would seriously cause so many people to have the quality of their home life disrupted for far longer than years.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jan Levy</p>
