

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2813/P	Anna Kogan NAsser	27/07/2021 10:55:19	OBJNOT	Highly opposed to this and find it unacceptable damage to our property on top of what has already occurred. As per Simran email dated 27/7 he is clarifying that this will increase the noise level in our garden (which is part of our property). All acceptable to you of course. But not to us - not ON TOP of everything you have done so far here. That is not going to be acceptable. On top of putting that horrid ugly building overlooking our garden (1m away), without notifying us before planning permission . Which is reducing our ability to use our garden, now you want to add noise and you find it acceptable because it is not heard near our house and only at the end / middle of our garden? Have you people no shame at all? On top of breaking our wall in April and our neighbours walls and NOT paying for it yet and you surveyor being awol? We will fight this with everything we have - permanent noise increase is not something you can add on TOP of the damage you have done to us so far.
2021/2813/P	Hussein Nasser	27/07/2021 15:14:59	OBJ	<p>I/We are the residents/owners of 233 Goldhurst Terrace which is adjacent to where the heat pump would be placed if this application is approved.</p> <p>I/We have read the planning application 2021/2813/P and have the following objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The movement of the Heat Pump will increase sound levels in our garden which we enjoy on a regular basis. The use of an arbitrary 5m and 10m range to decide that the noise is acceptable is wrong as we use the full length of the garden regularly. If there is noise from a heat pump this will severely impact our ability to enjoy our property.</li> <li>2. I would echo the objection of Mr H G Sugiura, which can be found here: <a href="http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9122099/file/document?inline">http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9122099/file/document?inline</a> that the methodology used to "calculate" the noise even at these arbitrary points is outdated and therefore useless (point 5 in his complaint).</li> <li>3. Furthermore, the calculations with respect to ambient noise have no basis as at no point has anyone from RBA Acoustic entered my property to measure the ambient sound. Therefore, the whole report and its "calculations" cannot be relied upon. Given that this is the basis upon which the whole planning application is based and we have shown that it's completely not based on any real observations I struggle to see how this application can be approved.</li> <li>4. As Mr. Sugiura also says in his complaint it is disingenuous to say that night time noise will be significantly less due to day time operation of the building unless the planning permissions specifically prohibit night time use AND more specifically prohibits the operation of the heat pumps at night.</li> <li>5. As Mr Sugiura also puts it in his complaint (which we echo) "Noise emission levels from the reselection of the proposed roof level plant particularly low frequency tonal noise is likely to give rise to significant adverse impact on the health and quality of life of residents external and internal amenity". I would also add that people using the Health Centre will also be impacted by this given they are closer. Why anyone would want children in a creche to be subject to this noise is baffling.</li> </ol> <p>It is for these reasons that we object to this planning application and would like the original design to hold or at the very least, more mitigation measures put in place to eliminate the noise in our garden.</p>