

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3624/P	Susan Oldroyd	29/09/2020 18:44:34	OBJ	<p>I wish to register an objection to the installation of Air Source Heat Pumps and Photo Voltaic panels as proposed for the roof of 66 Fitzjohn's Avenue.</p> <p>I have looked carefully at the drawings and acoustic reports submitted to Camden with this application to vary conditions of agreed planning approval.</p> <p>The shoehorning of this large new build into a tiny back land site in very close proximity to its immediate neighbours is unusual and the history of this particular project has been unorthodox and problematic from the start.</p> <p>There have been many revisions and "minor amendments," not least of which was the developer's attempt to secure approval for a third storey to the building as a minor amendment to the roof. Fortunately, Camden Planning, led by John Diver's eloquent and persuasive arguments successfully challenged this at Appeal.</p> <p>The current proposal to install Air Source Heat Pumps and Photo Voltaic panels on the roof is equally problematic and in my view, unacceptable. It adds to the rather overbearing nature of the building in relation to the Victorian villas to which it should be subordinate.</p> <p>My concerns are two fold.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>Firstly, the site is clearly visible from the public highway; Fitzjohn's Avenue to the front and Akenside road to the rear.</p> <p>The proposal will have a detrimental, negative impact on the visual environment of this conservation area, which is characterised by pitched roof tops and long views. It represents a disturbing intrusion on that environment.</p> <p>64 Fitzjohn's Avenue is included amongst properties that make a positive contribution to the conservation area.</p> <p>For the immediate neighbours at 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue and 12 Akenside Road, the proposal represents an unwelcome loss of visual amenity. It will be an unsightly eyesore not only for these residents, but for others, particularly those on Akenside Road, whose windows will also be in direct line of the proposed roofscape.</p> <p>The positioning of a considerable amount of technical kit on a flat roof not only raises the height of this building, making it more domineering in relation to its neighbours, but seems to represent an example of the kind of installation normally associated with new build blocks of flats or offices in a more commercial setting. It is an inappropriate development here.</p> <p>Acoustic Impact</p> <p>Secondly, the health and well-being of neighbouring residents matters.</p> <p>The inevitable noise from the operation of Air Source Heat Pumps, added to background noise, will increase noise pollution for immediate neighbours. This will be particularly apparent in hot weather when residents keep windows open at night and the proposed air conditioning units are likely to be running at full capacity. The submitted acoustic report states that such units are noisier in cooling mode than in heating mode. The report suggests that noise can be mitigated by acoustic housings and that strong tonal frequencies are not likely to be significant. Significant for whom? It is known that disturbed sleep patterns have a detrimental effect on health and well being.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Green Credentials

This is far from being a passive house project. Given the amount of waterproof concrete that has been used and the need to have perpetual pumping to mitigate water table problems with the site, it is surprising to see that the original green roof, that was intended to mitigate water run off, is largely discarded in this new proposal. If approved, this would be a sad loss. A green roof has the effect of making some concession to the visual landscape presented to immediate neighbours and could contribute to the ecological diversity of the area. The new proposal makes no concessions whatsoever.

I believe good modern design needs space to breathe and should sit comfortably in its setting in order to contribute to visual vibrancy. There are many good examples of this in the conservation area. Unfortunately, the proposed building is cramped and overstuffs the site. The new roof proposals exacerbate an already overbearing aspect.

I would wish my future neighbours every happiness in their new home, but would trust that they will recognise that respect for the amenity of others is a part of this positive approach.

One would hope that Camden Planning will consider the context of this project and support the concerns of the many families affected by the new proposal. Please refuse approval.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3624/P	Emma casdagli	28/09/2020 15:23:12	OBJ	<p>I am the owner of the upper ground flat of 64 Fitzjohns Ave which I currently rent out, but which I anticipate living in in the next 2-3 years.</p> <p>I understand that the owners of No. 66 Fitzjohns Ave have asked for a variation in their planning permission to allow them to install air source heat pumps as well as angled voltaic panels on the roof of the new building.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the potential noise pollution from these installations operating day and night in close proximity to my flat. Although I understand that the acoustic report states that the Db rating will be below the background level noise we already have and claims that louvred acoustic housings will further mitigate this noise, noise does bounce around off vertical surfaces and my flat does not have double glazed windows. In addition, air-conditioning in hot summer periods (when my tenants would normally be opening their windows) is a noisier operation (as stated in the chosen design) and will be extremely disruptive.</p> <p>Another significant issue is that all this equipment on the roof will inevitably raise the height of the building above that specified in the planning permission.</p> <p>I also note that the original plan was for a "green roof" both to make it more attractive (from both Fitzjohns Ave and Arkenside Rd) and to mitigate water run-off problems for a site already having to use pumps on a permanent basis. The revised plan seems to leave little or no space for this "green roof".</p> <p>For all the above reasons I would ask you to reject this variation</p> <p>In addition, although not the subject of this variation, I understand that the main entrance approach design has been rejected by Camden Council because it failed to comply with step free access. I'm very concerned that the owners will now argue that the only solution would involve increasing the height of the building to accommodate headspace without the need for steps to go down into the ground floor.</p> <p>It was entirely the responsibility of the owners to come up with a step free access entry within the stipulations of the approved plan including the height restriction. Other solutions not involving an increase to the height should still be possible and if the owners have started building and the work they have done to date does not allow for those other options, they should be required to adjust the work already done so that it can.</p>
