

---

**From:** Peres Da Costa, David  
**Sent:** 14 January 2021 18:09  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Planning application 2020/4336/P 81 Belsize Park Gardens

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Can this be logged as a comment on M3 and added to HPE RM

Thanks

David Peres da Costa  
Senior Planning Officer

Tel.: 020 7974 5262  
Visit [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk) for the latest council information and news

---

**From:** Kate Anderson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 14 January 2021 16:20  
**To:** Peres Da Costa, David <[David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk](mailto:David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk)>  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Planning application 2020/4336/P 81 Belsize Park Gardens

**[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 Mr Peres Da Costa,

Further to my email to you of 22 November 2020, I have the following further comments to make in response to the "Revised Noise Impact Assessment" which was added to this application no. 2020/4336/P on 16 December 2020:

**Drawing no: 1241-SK-01A:**

I note that the location of both the new AHU and the solar panels depends on "acoustician's comments". Which acoustician? A full acoustic and vibration report should be submitted for consideration by a qualified acoustician before the location of this plant is finalised.

**Clause 4.23:**

The predicted mechanical plant noise emissions of 47 dB LAeq,T are equal to the representative background noise level (refer to Paragraph 4.17) at the closest roof terrace."

These measurements have been questioned before by Scott and Partners in their report as it is hard to believe that the measurements are equal. In addition, the combined measurements for plant and secret garden have not been provided. The applicant should make these explicit for review.

**Clauses 4.29 - 4.30:**

“The level of sound insulation currently provided by the separating walls is not known however it is likely to be quite high based on the masonry construction and the previous use (high noise levels would have been generated in the leisure use at times, particularly in the gym areas used for group classes).”

I can confirm that the level of sound insulation **is NOT high**; we were frequently disturbed before when the gym was operational and I made a formal noise complaint against the gym owner as a result of being woken up from noise from the gym. The applicant will definitely need to install sufficient soundproofing measures, especially in the wall adjacent to the residential properties to the north, including but not limited to additional acoustic wall liners.

We know that between our premises, 6 Lancaster Stables, and 81 Belsize Park Gardens there is only a 100 mm brick wall and because all our neighbours on either side of our premises have suffered equally from noise transference during gym use we believe that must be the construction throughout. Therefore this statement should be re-written and appropriate acoustic insulation measures proposed as part of a revised design.

**Clause 4.31:**

“This detailed design assessment could be secured by the imposition of a planning condition if deemed necessary by Camden Council.”

As referred to above, I consider such a planning condition not only necessary but essential to the quality of my family's life.

**Clause 4.32:**

“The nursery will only be operational during the daytime and therefore there would be no risk of adjoining residents being disturbed in the evening or nighttime”

This point is noted but have they factored in the noise that will be generated by cleaning the premises after the nursery has closed each day? And early morning set-up? This has been a significant issue in the past. The gym officially closed at 10pm but the noise of cleaning and rearranging equipment in the gym carried on long afterwards and was a significant disturbance to our family's sleep.

In conclusion, six dwellings suffered intolerable noise disturbance every day when the property was used as a gym which compromised the environmental health issues for the residents. This noise disturbance resulted in complaints to the council. This must be rectified as part of this new application.

Kind regards,  
Kate Anderson, 6 Lancaster Stables NW3 4PH