

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4426/P	Kate Jacobs	10/11/2024 15:42:24	OBJ	I am an owner and resident of a unit in Regent House, 1-6 Pratt Mews. I urge the council to reject the planning application for the roof extension and air-conditioning units at 10 Pratt Mews. The proposed changes stand to negatively impact Regent House through noise pollution and natural-light reduction. Specific objections follow.

NOISE POLLUTION

The proposed installation of 3 air-conditioning units poses a serious noise concern, and the impact on Pratt Mews has not been adequately assessed:

1. The Noise Survey and Impact Assessment was conducted from the rear of 86 Camden High Street. The noise-impact measure is relative to baseline noise levels at the assessment location. 86 Camden High Street likely has much higher baseline levels than Pratt Mews due to its proximity to the high street. This means that the true impact of the noise increase from the Mews could be more severe than suggested by this report.
2. The microphone for the assessment was placed 2m above ground floor level, far below the level of the second-floor flats of Regent House, which would be much closer to the AC units.
3. Furthermore, the units failed the noise assessment! The applicant claims enclosures will sufficiently dampen the noise, but the only evidence provided here is the claims of the manufacturer of the enclosures, not an independent party.

The report gives no confidence that it can predict the impact these units would have on noise levels or on residents' quality of life. We all know how loud commercial air-conditioning units are. The quiet Mews is a respite from the loud and busy high street, and that is now in jeopardy.

Also: the Camden Local Plan discourages air conditioning, stating that it will only be permitted where thermal modelling demonstrates a clear need for it after all preferred measures are incorporated. Has such a need been demonstrated here?

LIGHT OBSTRUCTION

The application states that there is "no daylight sunlight related reason why Planning Permission should not be granted", but this is contradicted by the Daylight and Sunlight Report, which found that windows 61 and 62 at Regent House do not pass the daylight-distribution test. The report suggests that this failing should be overlooked, but it provides only flawed arguments in support of this:

- Point 4.2.3 says that window 62 serves a bedroom, and thus is less important in terms of light obstruction. This assumes without evidence how the room in question is used.
- Point 4.2.4 states that light obstruction "may be unavoidable if the room is lit from one side only and is greater than 5m deep", and therefore obstruction to window 61 is acceptable. One could argue that rooms lit from only one side and thus have limited daylight already should be given greater consideration when it comes to reduction of daylight, not less, as is suggested here.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>- Point 4.2.6 states that when approving the development of Regent House, the local authority should have considered that its windows “would potentially be impacted by any future proposal to develop [10 Pratt Mews]”. This turns logic on its head, suggesting the approval of Regent House should have pre-emptively considered hypothetical future developments nearby. Any new development should be required to demonstrate compatibility with existing structures, not the other way around. The report draws the conclusion that applying the sunlight/daylight rules rigidly would be an “unfair burden” on 10 Pratt Mews – but surely adhering to guidelines is exactly what should be required. here If anything, it is unfair and illogical to prioritise the future desires of 10 Pratt Mews over the rights of the existing residents of Regent House.</p> <p>- Point 4.2.7 states that the BRE guidelines are "intended to be used flexibly" and assumes that the design is "likely to be acceptable". Without more concrete justification for why the guidelines should be relaxed in this case, this argument is meaningless. The guidelines exist to protect residents' right to natural light and cannot be simply disregarded.</p> <p>Thank you for your taking our comments into consideration.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4426/P	Bruce Hazan	08/11/2024 19:01:37	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Regents House on Pratt Mews, and I am writing to object to specific aspects of the proposed roof extension at 10 Pratt Mews (Application #2024/4426/P), particularly the addition of air-conditioning units, solar panels, and associated enclosures. The proposed rooftop installations only compound the impact of the current plans to add a third story to this building, directly impacting the residents of Pratt Mews, and bringing additional concerns regarding noise, light interference, and cumulative development effects that threaten the quiet residential character of the mews.</p> <p>The Noise Impact Assessment indicates that the anticipated noise levels from the 3 air-conditioning units exceed Camden Council's acceptable limits. This is particularly concerning as the assessment only includes measurements from the rear of 86 Camden High Street, where the AC units will be installed on the far side of the building. No noise assessment was conducted from the Pratt Mews side, where the residential impact would be most pronounced. Pratt Mews is a quiet, residential area, and noise from these units could be highly disruptive. Although acoustic enclosures are recommended, there is no guarantee of ongoing maintenance or enforcement to ensure noise remains at acceptable levels over time, raising concerns about sustained noise disruption for nearby residents.</p> <p>The Daylight and Sunlight Report includes a daylight distribution analysis but states that the proposed build is non-compliant with respect to certain windows at Regents House, directly impacting residences across from the development. Access to natural daylight and sunlight is essential for physical and mental wellbeing, particularly for those who work from home or have family members who are especially sensitive to reduced light levels. Additionally, the increase in height and mass from the rooftop AC units and enclosures could lead to overshadowing that further diminishes light access for residents of Pratt Mews. The report's conclusion that the development is "acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight" does not accurately reflect these significant impacts. Residents should not have their right to adequate daylight and sunlight curtailed for the purpose of a commercial extension.</p> <p>The proposed combination of a roof extension with solar panels, AC units, and new rooflights represents a significant increase in the building's height, visual mass, and commercial footprint. This cumulative impact risks overburdening Pratt Mews, a small residential street, with increased noise, visual disruption, and potential light interference, which collectively could degrade the quality of life for residents and alter the character of this otherwise quiet neighborhood.</p> <p>Given these concerns, I respectfully ask Camden Council to review the potential cumulative impact of the entire extension, including the rooftop installations, and, if approved, to enforce conditions that would mitigate the adverse effects on neighboring properties.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these critical issues, which are essential to preserving the residential quality and character of Pratt Mews.</p>