
From: Christine Hereward [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2019 19:00
To: NoraAndreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk; Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea;
nora.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk
Cc: Masterson, Helen
Subject: RE: 2018/5699/P - Flat 6, 135 Haverstock Hill

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Ms Constantinescu,

I have now received detailed comments on the Applicant's acoustic report from Spectrum Acoustic Consultants -

1. MANUFACTURER'S NOISE DATA

The manufacturer quoted sound pressure level has been used as the starting point for calculations of noise propagation.

However, the manufacturer's measurements were (according to their data sheet) carried out in an 'anechoic chamber', which is equivalent to 'free field' conditions.

As the proposed location of the condenser is on a balcony, close to a corner between two walls and with another balcony above, the calculation is not valid.

The proximity to these nearby surfaces means that reflections will increase the actual sound pressure level at 1m from the condenser in-situ, likely by 6-9 dB above the manufacturer's quoted value.

Even when separated from the other potential issues discussed below, this issue is significant enough to produce noise levels greater than the Local Authority criteria of 5 dB below background.

2. SCREENING CORRECTION

Information is lacking about the proposed attenuation provided by acoustic screening

between the source and the receiver locations. In Appendix D of the report, a correction of at least 10 dB is applied for screening between the source and receptor for each assessment location, and in some cases 15 dB is used.

This appears inappropriate. For example -

- from street-view photography available online it appears as though there may be direct line of sight between the proposed condenser location and the window at receptor D, and if so a barrier correction of between 0 and 5 dB would apply.
- a correction of 15 dB has been applied for calculation at receptor B, which is atypically high for a screening correction.

3. BACKGROUND SOUND LEVELS

In Appendix C, the measured night-time noise levels are quoted in 15-minute periods. The lowest measured 15-minute period between 23:00 and 01:30 is quoted and separately the lowest between 01:30 and 04:00 is quoted. However, the reference background sound level does not match either value.

4. CONDENSER 'NIGHT-MODE'

Is the 'night-mode' referred to an automatic feature of the product?

The combination of the issues raised in Section 1 and/or 2 alone could result in a significant change in predicted noise level.

At some receptors, it may be that the predicted level could increase by as much as 20 dB, which could have significant implications for the acceptability of the proposals and the potential requirement for mitigation measures.

It is not clear from Camden's website whether you have already received a Consultation response from Environmental Health, please confirm. We would ask that Environmental Health review the Applicant's acoustic report in light of the above comments.

I would be grateful to hear back from you on the above. Would you also please confirm the Councils Target date for determination of this application.

Regards,

Christine Hereward
ch@hereward-solicitors.com
Tel: 07900 424640

Hereward & Co, solicitors
Planning Matters

www.hereward-solicitors.com

Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority, SRA Number 644442

From: Christine Hereward

Sent: 29 January 2019 22:08

To: 'NoraAndreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk' <NoraAndreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>; 'Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk' <Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>; 'nora.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk' <nora.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>

Cc: 'helen.masterson@camden.gov.uk' <helen.masterson@camden.gov.uk>

Subject: 2018/5699/P - Flat 6, 135 Haverstock Hill

Dear Ms Constantinescu,

I act for the Freeholder of this block and write to object to the current planning application.

We have reviewed the Applicants' Acoustics Report, by Auracle Acoustics, and taken specialist advice.

We submit that the Applicants Acoustics Report includes some fundamental errors/omissions. Therefore, its conclusions cannot be relied upon.

In particular: -

1. A calculation error has arisen from the way the manufacturer's noise data for the equipment has been used, and there is uncertainty over assumptions about acoustic screening.
2. Other elements require further explanation, such as the method used to determine the background sound level and the operating mode of the plant.

I appreciate that as the 21 days period is still running you may not yet have received the comments of Environmental Health. It may be useful if we could speak once there has been a review of the Applicants' Acoustics Report.

Regards,

Christine Hereward
ch@hereward-solicitors.com
Tel: 07900 424640

Hereward & Co, solicitors
Planning Matters

www.hereward-solicitors.com

Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority, SRA Number 644442