

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0141/P		22/03/2020 18:41:40	OBJ	<p>We live at Doughty Street, which is one of the properties that backs on to the applicant's property. We commented on the applicant's previous application 2019/4150/P, and many of the objections raised in respect of that application are also applicable to the current application.</p> <p>We have had the benefit of seeing the comments from my neighbours at 41, 43 and 44 Doughty Street and I agree with and endorse all of the objections that they have raised, so will not repeat them here.</p> <p>Our fundamental objection to this application is that the applicant wants to install ugly and unnecessary external air conditioning equipment in a position that will cause a nuisance to residents, both aesthetically and by way of noise disturbance. The proposals are contrary to many of the principles and policies of various Camden Development Policies, which (amongst other things) discourage air conditioning (CPG Energy Efficiency and Adaption), seek to protect visual outlooks from insensitive designs (CPG Amenity) and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The applicant proposal falls short on all of these.</p> <p>As demonstrated by the revisions to application 2019/4150/P, the applicant can upgrade its existing internal plant room and install the air conditioning equipment internally. Whilst clearly not ideal from an environmental/energy efficiency perspective, this solution would be more consistent with the Camden Development Policies and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.</p> <p>This would also be more equitable. The applicant would then have to assess whether the loss of floor space to house the air conditioning is worth the benefits it perceives from having air-conditioning. To permit external air conditioning equipment as proposed would put all of the burden and nuisance on the neighbouring residents, for no public benefit at all.</p> <p>We would also note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The same noise survey has been included in this application as for 2019/4150/P. That noise survey was deficient in respect of that application because of the amount of construction occurring at the time of the survey. The proposed location of the external plant in this application has moved to the other end of the building to that proposed in the previous application. As a result the nearest property is a different distance away (possibly closer) than in the survey. As such, the survey is a completely unreliable basis upon which to assess the noise impact on neighbouring residents. The draft approval for the revised plans for 2019/4150/P did not contain any conditions requiring long-term maintenance contracts for the equipment and ongoing noise monitoring, or (more fundamentally) any limit to the operating time and days of the air conditioning units. We presume that this was because the revised plans were for internal air conditioning units. Nevertheless in view of the proximity of the applicant's property to neighbouring residential accommodation, we would strongly encourage the Council to make any approval of any application for air-conditioning (internal or external) subject to such conditions.