

---

**From:** Peres Da Costa, David  
**Sent:** 14 January 2021 18:20  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: 2020/4336/P Objections and comments on revised noise impact report 81 Belsize Park Gardens London NW3 4NJ

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

Can this be logged as an objection 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:** Ian Dench [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 January 2021 16:05  
**To:** Peres Da Costa, David <[David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk](mailto:David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk)>; Planning <[Planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@camden.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Alistair Barr [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 2020/4336/P Objections and comments on revised noise impact report 81 Belsize Park Gardens London NW3 4NJ

**[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  
I hope you are well in these trying times.  
We don't appear to be able to submit these online.  
Please acknowledge receipt.

Best  
Ian Dench

[REDACTED]  
12 Lancaster Stables  
NW3 4PH

1.  
The new AHU unit is still where the old one was (right next to our roof terrace) The optimum position is surely in the middle of the flat roof equally distant from all surrounding properties and the garden.  
They say that the positioning of the unit and of the solar panels depend on acoustician's comments; a full acoustic and vibration report should be submitted for consideration by an independent qualified acoustician.

2.

There is no mention of vibration, this used to be a big problem. They should move the AHU to the centre of the flat roof to avoid vibration issues.

3.

They claim:

“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.”

I find it hard to believe that the background noise is the same as that generated by plant. It sounds so quiet on our roof terrace. Scott and Partners called their measurements into question before.

Also they don't seem to combine measurements for plant and secret garden.

4.

In section 5.5 of the noise report once again they state:

“However, given that the predicted levels were above the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) at the nearest adjoining roof terraces it will be important that the plant noise emissions are minimised as far as practicable during the detailed design of the plant.”

This is not very reassuring. If this is still the case I don't understand why they don't move the AHU further from our properties.

5.

They say:

“4.29 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).”

The level of sound insulation is NOT high! We were disturbed before, as were our neighbours, there is only a 100mm brick party wall. They do need to ensure soundproofing measures are installed in all adjoining walls.

6.

They state:

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

In propose a planning condition is very necessary.

All six adjoining properties suffered intolerable noise disturbance every day when the property was used as a gym. This must be rectified as part of this new application