

OBJECTIONS TO THE APPLICATION FOR PLANNING APPLICATION AT 17
BRANCH HILL, HAMPSTEAD, LONDON NW3 7NA (Ref No 2015/3377/P)

1. The river Westbourne – this river runs under where the proposed inside – outside swimming pool will be situated, which is on the Leavesden side of the site. There has been no in depth report, as to the effects of pile driving and excavation to install the extension of the swimming pool, on the Westbourne. As I mentioned previously Leavesden Cottage has already had serious flooding from the Westbourne. The only report, which was not an in depth report on excavation and pile driving on the Leavesden side, but a flim flam commentary based on a report done on the Firecrest side of the site. It was noted that none of the submitted reports did any analysis on this crucial side of the site. It would seem that this was in order not to divulge the reality of what might happen to the river Westbourne during this development. This is causing great anxiety to those who live in Leavesden.
2. After reading the application it would seem that there is to be very deep pile driving. This not only creates a great deal of dust but also the noise of deep pile driving is immense. During the development of the Firecrest Estate the surrounding houses suffered severe vibrational shaking, with floors shaking, in fact the whole building shook, with a cracking away of an outdoor step. Seismic readings were done which lead to an injunction and work totally stopping on site. Also, especially for some of the more elderly residents. the prospect of 5 and a half days a week of deep pile driving will have a deleterious effect on their health and wellbeing, As they will not have the opportunity to be at work during the day time. This is most unneighbourly, especially as the Kaye family will not be in residence to suffer this them.
3. Traffic Report - Branch Hill is not at all quiet during the morning and afternoon rush hours. It is in fact a very busy road as it leads to the Finchley Road, the Hendon Way, the North Circular and the

M1 just to mention a few of the cut through roads. The road is a bit quieter during school holidays as this is also a cut through to Hampstead for the many private schools in the area.

4. It also states that one parking bay will be closed to residents. However, it does not say how long for. We are at the very end of our CAH residents parking zone and we have nowhere else to park. There are only two bays on Branch Hill and at times they are already both totally full. We do pay over £100 per year to park on Branch Hill and it seems unreasonable that site workers will be able to bring their cars to Branch Hill leaving even less parking for the residents. Also it would appear that there will be between 2 and 7 HGV deliveries a day which will take place during the course of the development. This will not only cause congestion on West Heath Road, but also on Frognal as well as Branch Hill. I would point out that both Branch Hill and Frognal are very narrow roads and not suitable for lots of HGV using them.
5. The design materials of the house are not in keeping with all of the surrounding buildings. This is supposed to be a conservation area and the proposed house is an ultra-modern building with a white finish and laminated hard wood finish. The house that would be demolished is only 10 to 12 years old and was built according to Camden Council Planning Team's approval and passed all best practice building regulation materials and codes, and it is red brick as are all of the other buildings in the area of Branch Hill and Firecrest.
6. It is my belief that there will be several (4 or 5) outside condensers fitted to the outside of the building. These will create extra noise when they are in use and destroy our peaceful garden, yet another unneighbourly act.
7. The so called living roof I feel is purely a gimmick to gain planning permission there is no technical design or specifications or details as to how it will be maintained or watered or even accessed. It really is a joke.
8. The argument from the Kaye's is the house to be demolished is costly to maintain and they are thus proposing to replace it with

an even 'larger house' with a considerably larger footprint. This cannot be a good or neighbourly thing and Camden Planners are putting themselves in a rather difficult and dangerous position of setting a precedent for anyone who has the means and fancies a larger house on the same site regardless of the environmental and social effects they may create.

9. Finally, I would question why this application was put in at a time that I the Kaye family must have been aware that many families with children are away as soon as the children finish school and would therefore not be able to put their objections to the Planning Department.