| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------|--------------|--|
| 2018/1200/P | Mr & Mrs D Hawkins | 25 Downside Crescent London NW3 2AN | 04/05/2018 01:19:59 | OBJEMAI L | As the owner occupiers of one of the two "nearest noise sensitive properties" identified by the applicant we strongly object to the proposal for a noisy air conditioning unit to be installed in the adjoining garden a few metres from our home. It would have a serious adverse impact upon the amenity provided by our garden and would also make it difficult to sleep at night in the bedrooms which overlook the garden. The plant would be in use 24/7 to service the enormous basement under the house and garden of the applicant so the adverse impacts would be felt by us at all times. |
| | | | | | We have found out about the application only on 3 May when it was drawn to our attention. Nether the applicant nor the Council notified us although we have now seen a notice on a lamp post further down the street where it may have been obscured by the numerous parking suspension notices arising from the development proposals at the application site. We were astonished to see on the Council"s web site that the first site notice was on 12 April, that consultation expired on 27 April and that the first consultation was dated 6 April. |
| | | | | | The acoustic report on behalf of the applicant is unintelligible and gives vague assurances that the data provided by the maker of one possible type of unit should meet the Council's requirements. We do not know if the Council has available the necessary expertise to examine critically the submitted report. Familiarity over many years with evidence at planning inquiries has demonstrated that expert reports are often impossible for non experts to question so that the decision maker should ensure that the report should be the subject of critical examination. |
| | | | | | In view of the inevitable adverse consequences for us alternatives should be considered. The applicant applied to the Council for the first time in March 2012 and the current application is the seventh. As six years have gone by without an air conditioning unit and acoustic enclosure being considered necessary why is the application only now being made? Surely any plant required for the enormous basement would have been designed into the scheme long ago. It should have been incorporated into the new basement or perhaps buried below ground in the garden. Is the latest proposal put forward as a cheaper solution which in effect "exports" the inevitable noise so as to harm the neighbours, rather than confining its effects to the applicant who benefits from it? In circumstances such as these the Council must investigate less environmentally harmful options. |
| | | | | | It should also bear in mind that whatever data has been provided to support the application the scheme could be implemented using a different unit, and also the noise levels are likely to increase considerably as time passes and the plant deteriorates through age. We doubt if the Council would have the resources to respond to requests to monitor the noise levels at intervals. |
| | | | | | These comments are sent as a matter of urgency as we have only just found out about the application so further comments may be submitted. |

Printed on: 04/05/2018

09:10:04