From: Rob Lewis

Sent: 02 December 2022 02:17
To: Planning Planning; Elaine Quigley

Cc: Matthias Suchert

Subject: OBJECTION - Planning Application 2022/3622/P

Elaine,

With respect to Planning Application 2022/3622/P you will note that a number of residents of Queen Square have recently made complaints to Camden Noise Control that there was terrible air conditioning noise experienced, keeping residents awake.

In addition, we have made representations, through the Queen Square Gardens Trustees, that the area is suffering from bad noise pollution from many sources includes hotels and hospitals.

We now know that that is partly because equipment has been installed without planning permission at this hotel, and that that equipment even contravened conditions previously made on planning permissions.

Given the applicant's clear disregard for (a) their neighbours (b) planning conditions (c) planning law, they can clearly not be trusted to re-programme their equipment so that planning conditions will be met in the future, even if they try to claim so.

Further, the guidance given by the expert they paid for is not necessarily relevant, as surveys were done on days when the weather was mild. Noise pollution would be MUCH worse on days when more of air conditioning equipment was turned on, due to increased temperatures. The test should be on the hottest day of the hottest year, with the maximum of hotel occupancy.

As such, I believe the application must surely be rejected.

Any equipment should only be permitted on the basis that it can be proven that on a day when the maximum capacity of the equipment is fully on, and it is programmed to provide full capacity, it will still deliver less than 10db over the ambient sound.

Further, in the meantime, Camden must ensure that this unauthorised noise emitting equipment – which is in contravention of planning and which keeps residents awake at night – is immediately removed.

Many hotels deal with heat loss naturally, e.g. by allowing residents to open their windows. Air conditioning is a luxury, particularly when it has a material impact on residents, and in many cases prevents them sleeping at night.

The fact that the applicant has installed this equipment without getting planning, and openly admits that the current installation is breaking planning conditions and creating a nuisance, means that not only should the application be denied – but immediate action should be taken to ensure the current equipment is removed as the applicant is clearly not interested in being in a good neighbour, nor can be trusted to adhere to planning now or in the future.

Best,

Rob Lewis 5 Queen Square London WC1N 3AR