

From: Matthias Suchert
Sent: 01 December 2022 07:35
To: Planning Planning; Elaine Quigley
Subject: - OBJECTION - Planning Application 2022/3622/P
Attachments: GOSH_Local_Survey2111.pdf

Importance: High

[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.

Planning Application 2022/3622/P

-OBJECTION-

Dear Ms Quigley,

I am objecting to the Planning Application for additional Air Conditioning Inverter Units as set out in the documents supporting above application.

I am aware this is a retrospective application. I must, at the beginning point out that planning conditions have already been not adhered to - which leaves little doubt it will continue to be the case with whatever 'remedial' work is undertaken or proposed.

I live in 2 Queen Square, directly opposite and on height of the plant installation. Several statements in the Application do not reflect the massive increased ambient noise.

In the Acoustic Survey, Timed metering windows appear to be skewed favourable to give a good reading. The plant noise emissions contravene Camden's directives for new installations. The developer has failed to show regard for the local residents by not internalising the plant room.

The temperature window for projection in the Survey does not reflect the large increases that are projected for Central London summers in the future. With the projected temperature increases, the noise output of the plant will again, despite all efforts, break the regulative output limit. These temperature conditions will be encountered quite soon, every summer and every year for longer periods of time. There are no remedial conditions set to take into account known and projected ambient temperature increases. Have the Surveyor run the Survey on real projected ambient temperature increases and assess these results, please. It is a future problem waiting to happen.

A relocation inside the building frame would be the only acceptable location for such a large plant. Token efforts only, at best, were made in envelope planning or energy conservation/insulating upgrades to prevent the need for such a large plant.

Basically, Planning omissions are being repaired in functionality by enlarging and externalising the required plant to support this omission - instead of fixing the omission itself. Only, this happens at the detriment of all neighbours by increasing the noise output.

Structurally, I see the plant sitting on a steel frame - without noise dampening technology applied. The entire frame will add to the transmission of noise.

The Acoustic survey rests on projected, assumed noise developments. Apparently these are unreliable, otherwise no after-fixes would have been necessary. It must be assumed that the projections will be missed. It is not clear what remedies will be taken if the targets are not met.

Enforcement is inadequate, at best.

There is no regard for quiet hours or a proposal to switch any plant off during times of rest and/or weekends.

In its proposal, the developer claims that

"The installed condenser units and proposed sound insulation enclosure are to be located within a rear lightwell atop an existing roof, which is entirely screened from view from the public realm, the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and any listed buildings. They would have no impact on visual amenity and will not harm the setting of any heritage asset."

which is manifestly false. I can see the proposed plant and mistake-mitigating sound proofing box very well from my property. It is a listed building. it does harm the heritage asset by increasing its ambient noise to a point where it becomes ridiculous to even talk about a residential area. A heritage is not only manifest in bricks, buildings and layouts, but also in its inherent liveable qualities of everyday life. Quiet enjoyment is one of them.

It seems that in conjunction with several other noise complaints, Camden's Noise Strategy is failing its residents to the point of being a liability in terms of rights.

I expect you to impose real solutions and not let the developer pollute the heritage asset that is the conservation area. I hope you will take under advisement an attached survey recently conducted for a different planning application - this clearly showing that a majority of your employers, your constituents, are very concerned about additional noise producing equipment.

There is a significant creep upwards of the ambient noise conditions - which is, as it is currently, the baseline for many planning decisions. This snowballing of noise pollution must stop, it must stop on your watch and it must stop right now.

Kind regards

Matthias Suchert

