

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2019/1035/P

Case Officer:

David Peres Da Costa

Application Address:

17 Branch Hill
London
NW3 7NA

Proposal(s)

Erection of a replacement carport including the relocation of plant extract ducts to roof of carport.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	1
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

I am writing this objection as, whilst this may appear to be a minor change, I think there comes a point where the disruption caused to those in the surrounding area outweighs the needs of one individual.

The rebuilding of what was already a very large house built less than 20 years ago, into an even larger one has meant nothing but disruption, dirt, dust, inconvenience and upset to the many neighbours surrounding this house. My own home is a fair distance along from 17 Branch Hill (next to Firecrest Drive) but we are constantly disturbed by the noise and dusty works that takes place 6 days a week.

Parking bays are regularly suspended (this past week we lost 4 parking spaces for further works from utilities into the property, works which overran by 2 days beyond the bay suspension notification). That in itself, whilst a

massive inconvenience for those of us who park there, at least is communicated in advance. However what is not communicated are the constant lorries making deliveries from 8am throughout the entire day, all of which double park on the road in front of the narrow entrance to the property and block access and sight lines to the whole of Branch Hill. Although Branch Hill appears to be a quiet Heath-side road with a handful of houses, it is in constant use throughout the day and suffers from gridlocked traffic from 07:30-09:30 and 16:30-19:30 on weekdays, as well as constant use throughout the weekend for visitors to the Heath. For its size and capacity, it is an extremely busy road and the ongoing works have results in increased pollution from all the idling cars, vans and lorries either delivering to the property, or held back by lorries and traffic marshals delivering to the property. The residents of Branch Hill, Firecrest Drive and Mansion Gardens then have to listen to the constant car horns beeping as all traffic is blocked. I myself have had occasions when I can't move my car out of the parking bay as there is a lorry parked alongside me unloading heavy bags of cement and other building materials. Whenever I or others ask them to move we are met with verbal abuse and told to wait.

Similarly I have concerns about the CCTV which appears to be trained directly onto the road outside the entrance to the property and therefore beyond the boundary of the household. This is a public highway and having the CCTV aimed onto the street is a breach of GDPR, as according to the legislation identifiable imagery is considered as personal data and as such requires the same considerations. Every time anyone parks outside the entrance to the property (which the workmen 'reserve' for their own vehicles therefore circumventing the need to suspend the bays more regularly), someone will run out and stand and intimidate whilst you park. CCTV cameras, under GDPR, require the processing of personal data to be lawful, fair and transparent and I would argue that it is none of these. Data subjects (the public) have the right to be informed - signage should be clear in which areas are being surveilled and what this data is used for, and how long it is kept. It should also detail instructions of how to access this information (as is the public's right in this instance).

I know there was a great deal of opposition to the planning applications with the whole saga even making local press (<https://www.hamhigh.co.uk/news/zizzi-boss-angers-hampstead-neighbours-with-plan-to-demolish-new-9m-home-1-4307160>) as well as national news (<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3317407/Boss-restaurant-chain-Zizzi-angers-neighbours-plans-demolish-new-9million-home-rebuild-scratch.html>), but the application was nonetheless approved by Camden and now all surrounding neighbours have had to suffer for years, just for the excessive requirements of one family. Indeed anyone walking past The

Chestnuts and Holme Vale can see through the windows the excessive and disruptive work taking place in their back gardens right up to their border, and my sympathy goes out to both those homes for what they are having to put up with for the past few years with no sign of abatement.

I therefore ask you to REJECT this application, and to investigate the ongoing disruption around traffic management, illegal parking, deliveries, and CCTV.

Officer response

- 1. None of the issues raised relate to the current application which only concerns the replacement of a carport and the relocation of plant extract ducts to the roof of the carport. The original application secured a construction management plan as a planning obligation in the legal agreement. CCTV was not part of the original proposal, however it is noted that CCTV is permitted development by virtue of Class F of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 subject to certain limits and conditions.*

Recommendation:- Grant planning permission