To: Residents of Flats 101 – 141 as per Planning Application Consultation

**Boiler Replacement – Planning Application 2016/4401/P**

***Response to Planning Concerns – No 2 - 13th October 2016 v2.0***

1. **Introduction**

This note is produced in response to the comments received from residents via the Camden planning application website or by direct emails to Cholmley Gardens management. It has taken on board information provided by the following people

Mark Auty Design Consultant of 30 years’ experience, MCIBSE, IEng

Paul Stokes Boiler and Flue sales manager of 15 years’ experience

Craig Phillips Flue specialist design engineer of 30 years’ experience.

Paul Forbes dMFK architects handling the planning application

It has been authored by Tony Penfold, Board member acting as overall Project Manager on behalf of Cholmley Gardens Ltd.

1. **Siting of the Flue**

The starting point was that we needed a new flue because the existing ones failed to meet the current regulations.

Having accepted that a new flue was needed the current regulations dictated the height relative to the immediate buildings.

This gave us three options to consider:

* 1. a new flue rising from the boiler house roof
	2. a new flue up the side of block 134-141
	3. a new flue up the front of block 110-117

Dealing firstly with option a.

This would have needed the flue to rise to a height almost 2m above the height of the nearest roof. It is arguable this could be block 134-141, but you could also argue that the school building was deemed to be the closest building. The flue is not free standing and would have required a large and unsightly infrastructure to support the weight and give it stability in severe wind conditions. There would be a large visual impact for all in Cholmley, particularly those around the boiler house, and for residents and others outside Cholmley in Mill Lane. If the height were based upon the school building the exit from the flue would be below the level of some of the surrounding flats. The strong opinion of those involved, including those listed above, was that this would not get planning permission, particularly as we had other options.

That left options b and c

Routing, temperature and costs

The flue exits the boiler room from close to the corner near the Mill Lane gate. Hence the horizontal distance from the flue exit from the boiler roof to the output above the block roof is about 30% greater with option c.

Since the roof of block 110-117 is higher than that of block 134-141 the vertical distance from the flue exit from the boiler roof to the output above the block roof is greater with option c.

The routing is slightly more convoluted with option c and the accessibility means that significantly more complex scaffolding would be required.

These three facts give rise to a greater difficulty in keeping the flue gas temperature high as well as higher costs and lengthier schedule for option c.

Visuals

For option b the rising part of the flue will be partly hidden from view behind the existing rising water pipe box for the residents of block 134-141. In contrast, for option c it will be directly outside the windows of some of the flats in block 110-117 and clearly visible to many of the flats in block 118-126.

In both options the flue will be powder coated black to match the existing pipework boxings.

In summary, for option c the visual impact is significantly worse, both in impact and with respect to the number of residents affected.

Noise

We were, and are still of the opinion that noise, vibration and heat transfer would not be an issue in either case, hence these are not a differentiator between the two options. Further information is provided in section 3 below

Conclusion

It is for all the reasons above that option b was chosen as the preferred solution. It has the least visual impact for residents of the estate, lower cost and less nuisance to the residents.

Consequently, this solution was submitted in the planning application.

1. **Revised Noise Report**

This revised noise report enhances the earlier one, recommends what acoustic treatment needs to be carried out and calculates the effect it will have. It is now on the planning website but Sections 5 and 6 are attached for convenience. The website also includes updated flue drawings. These have been revised as a result of a change requested by Camden Planning

The key table is the one in section 6.0 which should be read in conjunction with the following graphic.

This is to illustrate how the sound level in decibels relates to everyday sounds.

Extracted from the Emtec noise report the key levels to look for are:

* 80 to 85 – the typical high levels recorded on the boiler house roof over 24 hours last July with 1 hot water and no central heating boilers running
* 35.5 – the level recorded in the early hours of the morning which is treated as the ambient noise
* 25.5 – the related target (10dB less than ambient) set by the current planning regulations for the sound at 1m from the nearest window (eg flat 137) whilst running with the new hot water and heating boilers
* 23 – the level we are aiming to achieve at the same position with the new system and associated acoustic treatments

We have fully adopted the recommendations for both the plantroom sound attenuation and the flue attenuation and vibration into the design.

The end effect is to more than meet the noise standards required.

Please digest the above and if there are still concerns regarding noise or vibration please contact me

tonypenfold@blueyonder.co.uk

1. **Emissions**

I can’t add anything further to what was stated regarding emissions in the previous note addressing planning concerns. We will be fully compliant with the Clean Air Act, gas and water regulations. For more details on the Clean Air Act the Government DEFRA website is a useful information resource.

A helpful Google search is for

2010 to 2015 government policy: environmental quality

I do wish to reiterate that the white pluming that may be seen in certain conditions is water vapour, not smoke as some may believe.