

Your Ref: 2018/2004/P
By email to: planning@camden.gov.uk

FAO Matthias Gentet
Planning Solutions Team
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
WC1H 8ND

11 August 2018

Dear Mr Gentet

Re: Planning Application 2018/2004/P - Public House 4 Conway Street, W1T 6BB
Restated Objection to the Application as proposed.

In the light of the further documentation which has been uploaded to the Council's Planning website this letter supersedes our letter dated 6 August 2018 with regard to our objection to the above Application.

The Council Planning portal identifies this Application proposal in relation to the public house at 4 Conway Street as the "Installation of 3no air condenser units, a new fridge/freezer condenser and associated acoustic fence on the rear flat roof at third floor level and 2no extra ducts onto rear roof slope to Public House (Class A4)."

We are the owners of a flat on the fourth floor of County House and are therefore immediate neighbours to the proposed development. We face South-West, towards the public house and are just 7 metres from it. Our flat is located slightly above the 3rd floor of the public house - the level at which the Applicant proposes to locate new plant on the 3rd floor terrace. We also note that the rear window of Nr. 6 Conway Street is about 6 metres away from the proposed plant location.

To assist you, we append photos taken from our bedrooms towards the public house 3rd floor terrace as follows:

- Photo A - public house 3rd floor terrace
- Photo B - view from our 1st bedroom
- Photo C - view from our 2nd bedroom
- Photo E – view of nearest window at rear No. 6 Conway Street.
and Photo D – view from Conway Mews.

Objection to the Application

We object to the Application as it is not compliant with the Camden Local Plan criteria and is likely to severely impact the amenity of residential neighbours. We set out our reasons below.

1. With regard to the Noise Impact Assessment report P18-171-R01v1 dated July 2018 (registered on 7 August 2018) we would comment as follows:
 - 1.1. The revised report refers (Paragraph 1.3) to the "most affected noise-sensitive premises" being the flats in County House. The initial version of the report referred to these being located in Maple Street and assumed 16 metres in the distance attenuation calculations. Unfortunately, this has not been corrected in the revised report which leads to incorrect calculations, as noted at 1.6 and 1.9 below.
 - 1.2. Paragraph 1.6 refers to the assessment being based on drawing 3175/35 Revision C. Has this revision been provided by the Applicant? The revisions available to view on the Council's Planning website are B, D, E and F.

1.3. Paragraph 4.1 refers to the following new plant:

- 3 Nr. condensers
- 1 Nr. cooler condenser (existing)
- Kitchen air extract
- Kitchen air supply

However, Drawing 3175/35F shows a "New replacement condenser for walk-in fridge/freezer". What is the specification for this unit? How does the noise data for the new unit compare with the noise data for the existing unit which has been included in the calculations?

- 1.4. Has the Applicant provided manufacturer's data for the proposed condensers? Drawing 3175/35F refers to a Daikin RZQSG100L9U1. This model does not appear to exist. Should this read Daikin RZQSG100L9V1 ? If so, why is the unit shown on the drawing as a tall twin-fan model when both the 100 and 125 versions have a single fan with height 990mm? This is important as the proposed acoustic screen would provide less protection from a taller unit.
- 1.5. The stated number of condensers (4 Nr.) does not align with the 5 Nr. condensers referred to in the 'Plant Specification (13/06/2018)' which shows 2 condensers serving the Ground floor, 1 condenser serving the 1st floor and 2 condensers serving the 2nd floor. Why is this?
- 1.6. Paragraph 4.3 Table 3 shows the predicted noise levels at the nearest residential window without mitigation. The results presented are discredited as the assessment does not take into account the nearest residential window. The nearest residential window appears to be No.6 Conway Street which is about 6 metres from the proposed plant location. The appended Photo E shows this elevation. The noise calculations in Appendix III reduce the projected noise intensity by a distance attenuation of 16 metres which is clearly incorrect.
- 1.7. Paragraph 4.5 recommends that duct attenuators be installed to the kitchen supply and extract. Appendix III Noise Calculations includes the Table 4 mitigation values to reduce the calculated emission level. Any consent should be conditional upon the duct attenuators being installed and achieving the mitigation targets.
- 1.8. Paragraph 4.6 recommends installing a 1.5 metre high proprietary solid timber acoustic screen minimum 10kg/m2 to attenuate noise from the condensers. Appendix III Noise Calculations includes mitigation values to reduce the calculated emission level. Any consent should be conditional upon the Applicant providing manufacturer's certification that these values will be achieved. Furthermore, the Applicant's proposal (Drawing 3175/35F) is to install this screen to the height of the existing handrail, which is no more than 1.4 metres above the deck? We are also concerned that noise breakout may be enhanced by the external wall behind the 3rd floor terrace and that a lower screen height will also increase diffracted noise.
- 1.9. Paragraph 4.7 Table 5 shows the predicted day-time noise levels at the nearest residential window with the recommended mitigation. However, these results do not take into account the nearest residential window. The noise calculations in Appendix III incorrectly use a distance attenuation of 16 metres to obtain a distance attenuation of -32dB(A). We suggest that the distance attenuation should be calculated at 6 metres, giving -24dB(A). The total emission level at 6 metres distance is therefore 46dB and not 38dB as shown in the table. Therefore, with mitigation, the levels are lower than day-time background noise by just 2dB, as shown in the table below. This is not compliant with the Camden Local Plan criteria.

Total Predicted Noise Levels at Nearest Residential Window With Mitigation DAY-TIME	Window at 16 metres as Table 5	Window at 6 metres as Actual
Description	dB(A)	dB(A)
Resultant condensers emission level at nearest residence window (dB LAeq)	25	33
Resultant new kitchen ventilation emission level at nearest residence window (dB LAeq)	38	46
Total emission level at nearest residence window (dB LAeq)	38	46
Lowest background noise level, 10.00 to 22.00 (dB LA90,15min)	48	48
Comparison (dB LAeq - dB LA90)	-10	-2

- 1.10. Table 6 assesses a night-time period with only the condensers operating and does not tabulate the predicted noise levels against background noise with all plant running at night-time. The report suggests (Paragraph 4.3) that the kitchen extract fans will not operate in the night-time period. We can see no reasonable case for taking this approach. In fact it is not consistent with the permitted opening hours for this public house. We note that the Premises Licence (089244) permits business opening between 10:00 and 00:30 hrs. How can the Council possibly be expected to control the hours during which this plant will be operated? In our view the night-time predicted total emission with mitigation is 46dB (as 1.9 above) which is 2dB above the background noise level, as shown in the table below, and is therefore not compliant with the Camden Local Plan criteria.

Predicted Noise Levels at Nearest Residential Window With Mitigation NIGHT-TIME	Window at 16 metres as Table 6	Window at 6 metres as Actual
Description	dB(A)	dB(A)
Resultant condensers emission level at nearest residence window (dB LAeq)	25	33
Resultant new kitchen ventilation emission level at nearest residence window (dB LAeq)	0	46
Total emission level at nearest residence window (dB LAeq)	25	46
Lowest night-time background noise level (dB LA90,15min)	44	44
Comparison (dB LAeq - dB LA90)	-19	2

- 1.11. The report appears to take no account of the prevailing South-Westerly wind direction which will drive noise and fumes into our windows.
- 1.12. Paragraph 4.10 recommends that all mechanical equipment is mounted on vibration isolation mounts. Any consent should be conditional upon compliance with this recommendation.
- 1.13. The Appendix III noise calculations only take into account the new fans in the roof void for kitchen extract and supply. No account is taken of noise from the existing kitchen extract which is to be retained, as shown on Drawing 3175/35F proposed elevations. Why is this?

Alternative mechanical plant locations

2. There would appear to be suitable alternative locations at a lower level where existing plant is located:
 - 2.1. The 'as existing'/'proposed' drawings indicate the removal of 1 Nr. condenser above the Ground floor level roof and the removal of 2 Nr. condensers on a small roof between 1st and 2nd floor levels. These locations appear to remain suitable for the siting of the new condensers. The locations are at the level of the neighbouring commercial premises which are less likely to be impacted by plant noise.
 - 2.2. 2 Nr. heat dump radiators are retained on the low-level roof above Ground floor, as shown on Drawing 3175/35F. We would suggest that this area be considered as a suitable location for the proposed condensers.

2.3. There appears to be no reason why the kitchen air handling plant cannot remain at the existing location.

In conclusion, the proposed location of mechanical plant so close to residential windows is not appropriate and will adversely affect amenity. The noise intensity levels exceed the Camden Local Plan criteria. We would ask that grant of the Application be refused.

Yours sincerely

David Hart

Enc: Photos A, B, C, D and E









Public house 3rd floor terrace



County House 4th floor



