

FLASK WALK NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION Hampstead London NW3

(Representing the interests of residents of:
**Back Lane, Boades Mews, Flask Walk, Gardnor Road, Lakis Close, Lutton Terrace,
Mansfield Place, Murray Terrace, New Court and Streatley Place)**
[REDACTED]

Adam Greenhalgh Esq
Planning Officer, Camden Council
5 Pancras Square N1C 4AG

04/08/2022

Objection re: 71b Flask Walk – Planning Application Number **2022/1289/P**

Dear Adam

This is a supplementary statement from FWNA and should be read in conjunction with its letter of objection to the above application. Martin Colloms CEng MIET has commented on the addendum report of the applicant's acoustic engineer. His observations are appended to this supplementary statement.

Sections as numbered in the report.

1.8

All assumptive. Not a proper basis for predictive modelling.

1.9

is omitted – is document incomplete?

1.10

As has been pointed out, the complex topography of the location will result in similarly complex distribution of sound in both frequency and intensity. It likely that only field tests will give indicative predictions.

1.11

'The calculated level' is unlikely to be helpful because simple figures without considering distribution over area in such a site will not be representative.

1.12

A noise source level that is '10dB below the background' needs qualification as to intensity and frequency over the area of the site affected. This claim is unlikely to be reliable.

1.16

If measured in free space on a ground plane the claim of no significant tonal elements may be correct. But if in a fairly built-up enclosed location, the potential for local reflections and spatial resonances (amplification) has not been addressed.

The application makes no provision - as I believe is required - for regular maintenance of the unit to ensure the claimed noise levels are maintained.

1.17

Re 'the windows of the room adjoining the neighbouring terrace', examining the aerial view in this report, there seems to be some ambiguity about what is meant by '6 metres away', then 'at a right angle', and 'partially screened by the terrace wall'.

It states the windows assessed in the planning report worst affected are 1m further away which appears to be a reference to the rear windows of No.71.

This is confusing and needs to be represented in a clearer form, with more accurate distance figures.

As has been noted concerning other sections, 1.17 does not include any data concerning the semi enclosed nature of this acoustically complex site.

Signed for and on behalf of the committee of the FWNA

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the committee member.