

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0989/P	Jack Woodhouse	23/04/2024 16:43:48	OBJ	<p>We would like to objection to this application - the installation of air condenser units at 19 Cannon Place.</p> <p>We own and regularly use the rear garden of our property. It is a peaceful space, surrounded by many buildings and trees that limit almost all noise from our surroundings, including the occasionally busy, East Heath Road. We are strongly opposed to any proposals that threaten this wonderful environment.</p> <p>The application documentation refers to a distance attenuation line, calculated as the distance from the rear windows of the property to the proposed units. This is not an appropriate distance, it should be the distance from our garden seating area, which is located at the rear of the garden. We estimate this distance to be 2 metres. Therefore the noise assessment study is inaccurate and should be considered void.</p> <p>Even if the study is deemed appropriate, the distance attenuation table states that the volume of bass frequencies (63 - 250Hz) will be 75 - 80db when close to the units. The attenuation capability of the enclosure is negligible for these frequencies: 67 - 73db. In my experience as a mechanical engineer, the lower frequencies of condensers are generated by the movement of the higher inertia components (essentially "whirring", "tapping" and "banging"). This type of noise is extremely noticeable to the human ear and very different from any natural, ambient noise. Therefore, this proves that the noise will be extremely noticeable when we are using our garden seating area, in contradiction to the conclusion of the study.</p> <p>Furthermore, the application states that the purpose of the air condensers is to "keep the property at a comfortable temperature level for family living during the summer months". This implies that the noise will be greatest on warm days when we are most likely to be using our garden seating area.</p> <p>Finally, this application risks setting a precedence that every property is able to install air condensers in their gardens, creating a cumulative increase to unnatural background noise. We note that the council appears to agree with this view given that the (almost identical) applications 2021/3236/P and 2022/2476/P were both refused.</p> <p>We deliberately moved to Hampstead because it is a peaceful and tranquil neighbourhood and it should remain so.</p>
2024/0989/P	Israel Goldman	22/04/2024 14:05:47	COMMNT	<p>I wish to object to the installation of air condenser units at 19 Cannon Place. As a next door neighbour to this property, I am concerned about the noise levels that will be emitted from the condenser on summer days/evenings when windows are open and we enjoy the tranquillity of the neighbourhood that we live in.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0989/P	Stuart Perry	22/04/2024 13:33:19	OBJ	<p>I'm writing to object to the installation of air condenser units at 19 Cannon Place.</p> <p>The garden-side area of the houses on this side of Cannon Place is surrounded by tall buildings that shield the gardens from any traffic noise from Cannon Place itself, as well as almost all the noise from East Heath Road, emergency services vehicles being the only exception. For the vast majority of the time one can sit in the garden and hear nothing but birds tweeting and the occasional short-term use of garden-maintenance equipment, which is one of the main reasons I imagine why many people choose to live in this neighbourhood.</p> <p>There is one unfortunate exception, which I believe possibly voids the Plant Noise Assessment undertaken, and that is the installation (without planning permission) of a similar bi-directional (heating & cooling) air condenser unit at Langtree House 19f, East Heath Road, NW3 1AJ, which backs on to the rear garden of 15 Cannon Place. I'm probably 25 metres from the device, and for the periods during the year when that property is occupied and the unit is running the noise is horrendous, there's a loud whirring fan-noise and bass hum that travels long distances and through even modern double glazing such as my own, and ruins the tranquility of the space and disturbs my sleep. Camden Planning for some reason powerless to order its removal or even mitigation.</p> <p>So I would question the stated background noise figures in the report, as I do not believe it's fair to have a 'reference level' that's potentially polluted by what is essentially an illegal noise source. Similarly I would object to the possible precedent-setting, a world in which every Cannon Place garden has these units, particularly with the aforementioned surrounding tall buildings 'trapping' any noise, is not one I wish to contemplate.</p> <p>I would also question the Distance Attenuation figures in the report; there is a theoretical 'distance attenuation' line in the table that's based on the distance to the windows at 17 Cannon Place. However my garden dining table is less than one-third of that distance away, positioned similarly in my garden to the proposed installation location at No. 19. The table itself shows that bass frequencies in the 63-250Hz band are going to be circa 75-80 decibels when directly adjacent to the units, barely attenuated at all to 67-73db by the enclosure. On a summer's evening my enjoyment and amenity would be vastly reduced by any such nearby sporadic industrial/machinery sounds.</p> <p>Finally I note from some of the correspondence already posted on this application that there is uncertainty as to the purpose of these units; however the Design and Access statement opens with the sentence "The proposed alterations are motivated by the need to keep the property at a comfortable temperature level for family living during the summer months", which implies a bias towards cooling rather than heating. Given all heat pumps offer the facility to both cool & heat, I don't know how a heating-only policy would be practicable to enforce. With a bias towards cooling this application would appear to be similar to 2021/3236/P and 2022/2476/P, both refused.</p>
