

Application No: 2016/0552/P
Consultees Name: Kate Széll and Redmond Széll
Consultees Addr: 38A Gayton Road London NW3 1UB
Received: 10/04/2016 20:46:30
Comment: OBJLETTE R
Response:

Dear Mr Yeung,
 Planning Application no. 2016/0552/P – 23 Gayton Crescent NW3 1UA

We are writing to object to this application. We object as we are concerned about the noise that will be made by the external condensing unit. We are the owners and residents of the neighbouring house, no 38A Gayton Road.

The planning application is filed together with a noise impact report. The report concludes that the anticipated noise of the external condensing unit just comes within the levels allowed by the LPA (London Borough of Camden) Local Development Framework 2010-2015 Section DP28 Noise and Vibration (as reproduced in paragraph 5.1 of the report). The noise impact report concludes that the maximum noise from the unit will be 22 dBA at the nearest noise sensitive façade and that 22dBA is the highest level permitted.

However, the noise impact report contains a number of errors. When these errors are taken into account, it is clear that the noise will be well over the 22dBA limit.

The errors in the report include the following.

1. The report estimates the distance to the nearest noise sensitive façade to be 16m. This is said to have been determined from “scaled drawings” which are not included in the application. Our own measurements (measuring along the length of the pavement and height of relevant walls) leads to an estimate of this distance of no more than 10m.

2. The report uses the wrong noise data for the proposed unit. Appendix A gives diagrams of noise impact for the proposed unit. On the diagram for the proposed unit, there are two lines. One is labelled “cooling” and the other “heating”. Table 3 at paragraph 6.6 of the report purports to take figures for “cooling” when it has erroneously taken those for “heating”. The figures for heating and cooling from Appendix A, together with the figures used in Table 3, are:

Frequency (Hz)	63	125	250	500	1k	2k	4k	8k	Max										
Cooling figures (from Table 3) (dBA)						48	50	49	50	44	40	36	28	50					
Cooling figures (from manufacturer’s graph at Appendix A) (dBA)												49	55	46	45	44	38	40	28
																			55
Heating figures (from manufacturer’s graph at Appendix A) (dBA)												48	50	49	50	44	40	36	28
																			50

As can be seen, the figures for “cooling” put the maximum noise (at 125 Hz) at 55 dBA and not the 50 dBA used in the noise impact report.

3. When calibrating the sound on the basis of distance to the nearest noise sensitive façade, no account is taken of the fact that the distance is meant to be to 1m from the noise sensitive façade, not all the way to the noise sensitive façade.

4. The width of the wall on which the unit is to be placed is not stated in the application. Looking at it from the pavement, we estimate it to be only a little over 1m. As it has a drainage pipe running down it towards the right hand edge (when looked at face on), and as the unit is stated to be 90cm wide, it is

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

likely that the left hand edge of the unit will be less than 25cm from the left hand edge of the wall. According to paragraph 6.5, that means that the “Building edge diffraction” figure given in Table 3 should be -5, not -10.

5. As can be seen from the photographs submitted with the noise impact report, the unit will be situated on a wall facing onto a small, enclosed garden. The garden mainly consists of hard surfaces, surrounded by a high brick wall. Such an enclosure will amplify sound. No account has been taken of this.

6. No account has been taken of the fact that air conditioning units grow noisier with usage.

We are unaware of any other air conditioning units within this residential area. It is, as pointed out in the noise impact report, an area with a “particularly low” ambient noise climate (paragraph 4.2). The unit will create unnecessary noise over the limits allowed by the borough. It will also create a precedent which could lead to installation of other such units and a consequent decline in the nature and environment of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area.

Yours sincerely,

Redmond and Kate Széll
