
From: Kathy Doyle [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 January 2024 14:32
To: Planning
Subject: 2023/3777/P - Retrospective Planning Application to Install an Air-conditioning unit in a lightwell

Dear Sirs,

I wish to register my strong **objection** to this application.

The applicants have shown their lack of regard for the planning process by installing this equipment without first obtaining planning permission because they considered that the planning process was 'too slow' and would delay the target opening day for their shared workspace offices.

The proposal will have a seriously detrimental effect upon the amenity of our dwellings. All the bedrooms of the 36 flats in Russell Chambers look out onto the lightwell. The buildings are designed in this way so that the bedrooms are quiet compared to the living rooms which overlook Bury Place. Despite our central London setting our bedrooms are extremely quiet and tranquil. There are children living in our building, together with night-workers and also many individuals who work from home, all of whom require peace and quiet.

The lightwell produces a very intense magnifying effect for any noise created within the space, because the noise reverberates throughout the entire six-storey length of the lightwell. I know from past experience that the sound of people talking in normal tones or cleaners going about their duties early in the morning or late at night can produce intolerable levels of noise. Only recently when work was being carried out on the offices in question the levels of noise were unbearably high and this encompassed not only the sound of machinery but the sound of conversations between the foreman and the workers, every word of which could be heard within my flat. It is therefore completely incorrect to claim that the wall provides us with protection from the noise generated on the applicant's premises.

It would be completely unjustified to grant planning permission for the applicant to site his air-conditioning unit in our lightwell because it will adversely affect the lives of 36 families, compared with the marginal benefit it will provide for the applicant. Had the equipment been sited on the roof of his building, away from the lightwell, the interference is likely to have been much reduced. From our point of view, in Russell Chambers, the applicant has chosen the worst possible location for the air-conditioning equipment. In balancing the interests of the applicant with those of the residents I would urge the planning officer to remember that for the families in question these flats are our homes and we are subject to whatever noise levels are permitted for 24 hours a day without respite.

Any assurances provided by the applicant that they will adhere to fixed hours of operation should be viewed with caution because for the last few months they have shown that it was beyond their capabilities even to comply with a simple request to switch off the lights in their building overnight. As a consequence our bedrooms have been bathed in bright light 24/7.

Yours faithfully,

Kathy Doyle
18 Russell Chambers
Bury Place
London WC1A 2JU