

5 Savoy Court
West Heath Road
London NW3 7NF

15th August 2015

Planning ref: No 2015/3377/P
Planning Officer: David Perez Da Costa

Dear Sir

I object in the strongest terms to
the above planning application. I
enclose my reasons herewith.

Yours faithfully,

S. Byr (Mrs)

- 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 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)
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 been 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 side 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 –
- 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.
- b. The design is not in keeping with the current surroundings
6. Report on Ground Investigation – Site Analytical Services
- 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.
- b. Consideration has not been made with regard to the underground river (West Bourne)
- c. The points that were raised in the previously as below have still not been addressed:
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
 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.
 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.
 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.
 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.

6. Report on Ground Investigation – Site Analytical Services

- 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.
- b. Consideration has not been made with regard to the underground river (West Bourne)
- c. The points that were raised in the previously as below have still not been addressed;
 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
 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.
 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.
 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.
 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