

From: Gus Majed [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 January 2016 11:21
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Application No. 2015/3377/P - 17 Branch Hill, London, NW3 7NA

Dear Mr Peres Da Costa and Planning Team,

With reference to this application, I note that whilst neighbours were given a one-month window last summer to make comments, the applicant has been afforded every opportunity to revise, amend and supersede documents over the past six months. How can this be construed as fair and impartial? The process so far gives me the impression that the Council is making every accommodative effort to the applicant at the expense of the residents time constraint. This application must go to Committee and be decided upon, there are over 50 families who have objected and it is unjust to have us wait whilst the Council allows the applicant to amend their application, taking in all objections and seeking continuous advice in the process.

Furthermore, I note that there remains several unanswered questions, namely:

- 1) Why have no noise impact studies been conducted on our side of party wall – we are the closest and most affected property to the proposed development?
- 2) Why have no noise impact studies been conducted regarding the condenser units – many neighbours have raised this issue and I note that this question has still not been addressed in any of the Reports?
- 3) The proposed site is directly opposite Hampstead Heath, why has no Heritage Study still not been commissioned? As you are very aware, I took the personal expense of commissioning one and the conclusions by Kevin Murphy were quite damning. I insist that a Heritage Study is commissioned, we are living in a Conservation Area and the Council has a duty of care.
- 4) I draw your attention to the recent BIA Audit, dated 11th January 2016, regarding the surcharging of the retaining wall. I find this report somewhat misleading, was this commissioned by the applicant? Whilst the engineers conclude that , “*on (sic) order to avoid a potential surcharge on this wall all construction vehicles should be kept **at least 2.0m back from the face of the existing wall**”*, there are no exact measurements as to the width of the driveway and distance from the retaining wall. Furthermore, there is no reference to the dimension or, crucially, width of the plant and vehicles (<http://www.hanson.co.uk/en/technical-information/truck-information>) reversing down the driveway, which as can be seen in the photograph narrows as you approach the property. An average cement truck (6m3/8m3) is 2.55m wide and with the required retaining wall safety margin of at least 2.00m, the width of the driveway must be over 4.55m minimum at all times. As such, and give the fact that my family spend a considerable amount of time in the lower-ground basement and garden, I request the full schematics and width measurement for the driveway are made and reported to everyone. Again, another example here of misleading reporting.
- 5) I note from the CGL Ground Movement Assessment, dated January 2016, (all 261 pages of it) that the engineers *conclude* that :
 - “*The demolition of the existing building at 17 Branch Hill, excavation and the construction of the basement will generate ground movements ..”*

- *"It is recommended that an appropriate monitoring regime is adopted to manage risk and potential damage to the neighbouring properties and infrastructure"*
- *"The ground modelling assessment assumes high quality of workmanship and construction control, both in installation of piles and provision of temporary propping."*

It strikes me as remarkable that with these conclusions, which indicate a potential to property damage, that there has not been any site visits to our premises, where our residential garden annexe building sits adjacent to the proposed site. The engineers of this report conclude that there will be ground movement and, as such, how can any assessment be made into the structural stability of our annexe without a site visit to determine dimensions or proportion, take documentary photographs and evidence, to assess stresses and potential deformation to the party-wall and the annexe?

- 6) Also, I note on from CGL Ground Movement Assessment, dated January 2016, on p.8 the inaccuracy, *'There are therefore no residential properties within 10m of the existing building although there is a brick shed associated with the 'The Chestnuts' located approximately 1m to the south of No. 17.'* – as has been demonstrated, this annexe is not a shed and our nanny lives in it. Note p. 151 reference, *'Note that site is largely bounded by gardens so the adjacent structures are limited to retaining walls and a lean-to garden building.'*
- 7) Also, from the CGL Ground Movement Assessment, dated January 2016, regarding the conclusions from the engineers: reference to *'ground modelling assessment'* – can you please confirm whether the engineers actually were on-site and conducted their own detailed soil mechanics assessments, with core samples and pressure testing? To me, this appears to be another desk-top study and given their conclusions of definitive potential damage to our property, I would have expected an actual and detailed site visit – please confirm?
- 8) Furthermore, I do not see any proposal in the CGL Ground Movement Assessment document that satisfies the conclusions for an *'appropriate monitoring regime'* to *'manage risk and potential damage to the neighbours properties and infrastructures'*. Please may I see the detailed monitoring regime to manage potential property damage.

Again, as I have seen throughout this application, seemingly lots of data and very little substance when analysed in greater detail. This application is detrimental to the neighbourhood, the Conservation Area, is overbearing and unneighbourly, with many many factually misleading entries, whilst being marketed to be sold presently via an estate agent. I do not see how this application adds to our Conservation area and our community. I call for this application to be rejected in its entirety and a decision made immediately.

Regards,

Gus Majed

Gus Majed
 Founding Partner & CIO
 Beca Capital LLP
 83 Baker Street,
 London, W1U 6AG
 United Kingdom



Beca Capital LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA).
Beca Capital LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales under LLP Number OC386606, with registered office c/o Hillier Hopkins LLP, Dukes Court, 32 Duke Street, St James's, London, SW1Y 6DF, United Kingdom. VAT Registration Number 203981613.

This e-mail message is strictly confidential and intended solely for the persons to whom it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail, do not duplicate or redistribute it by any means. Please delete it and any attachments and notify the sender that you have received it in error.