

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 September 2020 18:39  
**To:** Meynell, Charlotte; Planning  
**Subject:** 2020/2666/P - 8 Pilgrims Lane

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Charlotte,

1. HCAAC Objects on principle to proposals for AC units.
2. This mainly due to their noise generation as nuisance to neighbour and need for regular maintenance against otherwise increasing noise levels, but also because they are, by now at least, environmentally undesirable or at least questionable compared with other technologies.
3. Embodied carbon is a consideration in all schemes as an essential study in any environmental design.
4. There seems to be a current fashion to site such units at the end of the garden away from the building served. That and acoustic enclosure is an admission of otherwise unacceptable noise levels merely ameliorated by the enclosure. Units so located threaten nuisance to the neighbour's enjoyment of their garden., in this case nos. 3 and 4 Downshire Hill. Siting a unit against a neighbouring building is likely, by reflection and because of its lack of shielding in that direction, to compromise the acoustic control offered by the enclosure. No details given of mechanical isolation from the ground – presumed concrete slab not detailed – against vibration transmission.
5. We in any case look for the possibility of enclosing such a unit within the building served or at least carefully attached thereto also in an enclosure.. Garden take up, even of such an apparently less maintained area is unwelcome and the buildings of nos. 2,3 and 4 Downshire Hill represent a fairly enclosed area.
6. The noise sensor appears sheltered from the ac unit's source.
7. The applicant's D&AS states an aim for energy efficiency in their oversight of the building, There is no statement of the by now number of recommended proven sustainable alternatives to AC units, as in the use of heat pump and MVHR technology. (Interesting to see contractor's vans in the neighbourhood and elsewhere having signage not of boiler or AC unit installation/maintenance - but of Heat Pump installations).
8. Applicant's statement - *"Windows are openable however during the hottest summer period it is not felt that this is sufficient to create a comfortable temperature* 5. *Mechanical ventilation. It is not felt that mechanical ventilation would be of benefit and would not be an energy efficient strategy. 6.Active Cooling. It is intended that Air conditioning will be used during the increasing periods of very warm weather which was experience last summer 2019 and its incorporation now rather than in the future will reduce further works and upgrades in the future."*
9. As the applicant is thinking of future-proofing, such plant as gas boilers and AC units should be assessed against the alternatives of hest pumps and MVHR. "It is felt/not felt..." requires a more analysed basis equal to that given to the AC unit. (Two units are discussed but only one shown in drawings ?)
10. Holistic assessment of the building is required to include windows and doors, internal insulation to future standards better than Thermaboard proposed, actual comfort levels desired and available tachnologies with minimising of carbon embodied or produced.
11. For all of the above, HCAAC requests refusal of the scheme in its present form with more rigorous examination of sustainable design and alternatives. Such effort would be repaid with a truly sustainable scheme.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10