

Mark Nevard [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Adam Greenhalgh Esq  
Planning Officer, Camden Council  
5 Pancras Square N1C 4AG  
Re: - Planning Application Number 2022/1289/P

06/08/2022

I write to object to this application for the installation of air conditioning plant at this address.

[REDACTED] 71 Flask Walk and object on the grounds of the development being unnecessary., intrusive and environmentally unacceptable.

The two properties, listed Grade 2, built in 1888, comprise one building facing due south, constructed in double thickness red brick with large single glazed sash windows. Consequently both parts of the common frontage are exposed to the sun, the thickness of the brick walls forming substantial heat storage which is released into the building after several hours delay. This effect is very welcome, reducing heating bills throughout the year, but in high summer prolonged sun over several days requires through ventilation to keep the interior cool. Having lived in my house for over 30 years I have found that such ventilation from the basement rising through the house to vent through an opened skyline maintains cool temperatures at any time. In the recent heatwave with recorded temperatures of 40 degrees at peak the maximum temperature in my house did not exceed 25 degrees thanks to the use of natural ventilation, without fans but drawing the curtains on the hottest two days.

I agree with my neighbour's consultants that double glazing and/or external shutters are not acceptable solutions for a Listed Building, but internal secondary glazing can provide equally effective heat and sound insulation as a more acceptable solution with local and global environmental benefit. The property did have at least some secondary glazing previously but this was removed for the recent refurbishment.

Regarding noise intrusion at my house, my guest room windows are identified as being 7 metres away from the unit and the hum of the plant, even if constrained to the levels and times indicated in the application, would be persistent and noticeable. With time bearings and acoustic screening become less effective and the constraints on times of operation impossible to enforce.

The effect on my neighbour at 73 Flask Walk is, however, much greater. His outside terrace and the adjacent room with opening full height doors would be directly exposed to the sound and sight of the unit over the boundary wall which, contrary to the implications of the report, is about 6ft. high with the air conditioning unit at a higher level than this. There are windows of other residential units also close by and in direct line of sight to the proposed unit.

I am and have been on very good terms with the applicant over the several months of noise and dust inevitable with the amount of demolition and

construction at his property and regret that he omitted to discuss this proposal with me before his application as I believe that my proposal above, possibly combined with more use of natural ventilation, would solve his overheating problem and in addition giving improved comfort and reduced fuel bills in the coming winter.

Mark Nevard  
[REDACTED]