

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3148/P	Dan Clague	13/09/2024 15:18:16	COMMNT	<p>1. Notwithstanding Clement Acoustics' ('CA') report and the suggestion that commercial extractors and other equipment found in industrial areas in Camden should represent an appropriate noise benchmark, DEFRA's latest guidance to Councils in relation to permitted noise levels in residential areas is as follows:</p> <p>" The permitted noise level using A-weighted decibels (the unit environmental noise is usually measured in) is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 34 dBA (decibels adjusted) if the underlying level of noise is no more than 24 dBA</li><li>• 10 dBA above the underlying level of noise if this is more than 24 dBA"</li></ul> <p>It seems clear that the proposed equipment will exceed these levels</p> <p>2. In setting the benchmark noise levels for the street CA ran a test which seems fundamentally defective in that:</p> <p>(i) the time period selected was during a period of intense construction activity at No 1 and No 3 Rothwell Street</p> <p>(ii) The microphone for the test was set up on the flat roof at the rear of the property. Why not request installation of the microphone inside the relevant rooms in 4 and 12 Rothwell Street which are the locations most likely to suffer adverse consequences? Indeed this is the test that would be run if there is a prima facie breach of policy on noise following installation.</p> <p>3. Why, apparently, has no consideration been given to installing the equipment on the rear wall of the property where it would be further away from the properties most likely to be affected? Air source heat pumps are often installed between a wall and a quiet screen to dampen noise transmission. A format like this with the machine on the rear wall might well produce less noise</p> <p>4. None of the houses in Rothwell Street have air-conditioning and so it is not appropriate to assume that residents will benefit from noise attenuation due to partly open windows. The fact is that windows, including bedroom windows at the front of the properties, are left wide open at night - especially during the summer.</p> <p>5. What if CA has made some mistakes in its report and analysis? What if, following installation, the machinery does not perform to the standard advertised and the noise is unacceptable? Can there be a planning condition introduced that an independent noise test be carried out post installation?</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3148/P	catherine charles	15/09/2024 15:45:03	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to this application on several counts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are a lot of technical references in the report which are not comprehensible to a lay person.</li> <li>2. The report is addressed to Dominic Howard. So if it turns out to be wrong in some respect and we suffer some adverse effect or consequences because we relied on the report, we will have no recourse against Clement Acoustics for their errors.</li> <li>3. The heat source unit which Mr Howard proposes to install on his roof will inevitably impact the immediate neighbours. Everyone in Rothwell St sleeps in the top floors of their houses making the positioning of this unit totally unsuitable. Inevitably in the dead of night there will be low level noise disturbance and vibrations from it. Although the report references tests carried out, these tests were for noise only and not vibration and there is rarely one without the other. Additionally, these tests were carried out during day time hours when there has been interference from the two major refurbishments at numbers 1 and 3. It will be a whole other thing in a residential neighbourhood in the dead of night.</li> <li>4. No testing was done at our house which adjoins number 3. Also our bedroom is on the front and top (2nd floor) of the house and closest to Mr Howard's roof and the unit. Mr Howards own main bedroom conveniently is on the 1st floor. It makes no sense that the report is saying that the "sensitive receptors" (i.e. properties which may be affected) are Nos 4 and 12 and we who are next door are apparently unaffected. It is unclear how these tests were actually carried out as neither houses number 4 or 12 were approached to provide access for testing.</li> <li>5. The report's noise impact assessment is primarily by reference to Camden's noise transmission criteria but concedes that those criteria are by reference to industrial and commercial premises rather than residential. Of course what may be acceptable and tolerable in commercial and industrial premises is likely to very different from what may be acceptable in residential premises. (For example, people tend not to sleep in commercial / industrial premises so would not have their sleep disturbed by noise from heat source pumps).</li> <li>6. The report does not say that "sensitive receptors" / adjoining premises will not experience any noise. As I read it, it states that provided the unit is installed in accordance with certain criteria any noise will be within the transmission criteria. I want to know whether there will be noise and the level of that noise explained to me, particularly as we all have different tolerances to noise levels. The noise levels are stated in decibels in the report but I have no idea what in the real world this means.</li> <li>7. in the context of residential premises it is unreasonable to expect a homeowner to be required to live with new (and preventable) noise of whatever level (particularly at night in bedrooms) because an adjoining owner, for his own convenience and comfort, wishes to instal a heat source pump.</li> <li>8. if this application were to proceed and we find ourselves affected by noise or vibration from the unit this would constuite a Nuisance in law (even if the unit had planning permission).</li> <li>9. There is also concern that a precedent will be set in the neighbourhood if Mr Howard is granted permission to instal this heat pump.</li> </ol>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

10. I have a particularly high sensitivity to noise myself and am very concerned about how my sleep might be impacted going forward.

---