

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4952/P	Simon Green	24/12/2022 14:11:38	INT	<p>I have several concerns regarding this application. We have met with the applicant and have voiced our concerns directly with them, but would like the planning application to reflect changes to address our concerns.</p> <p>My concerns are:</p> <p>The current sound insulation between Ruspini House is very poor with residents at Market House able to hear residents next door (talking, laughing) and can hear the bathroom light pull being switched on and off. The proposal is just to line the party wall with plaster board using 'dot and dab'. This provides no air gap which is crucial in mitigating sound travel. Battens should be fixed to the wall (providing an air gap) and then sound insulating plaster board should be fixed to these battens, to minimise sound pollution.</p> <p>The proposal is to move rooms so that currently bedrooms at Ruspini House adjoin bedrooms at Market House, which makes sense in terms of limiting noise disturbance. In the proposal, a living room at Ruspini House will now adjoin a bedroom at Market House. This is not acceptable and will create noise issues in the future.</p> <p>I would like maximum noise limiting measures in place between the party wall between Ruspini House and Market House.</p> <p>I am very concerned regarding the proposed 6 heat pumps and the associated noise from these. I understand, there is no proposal to limit their usage. I would like a time constraint placed over the units and an assurance that the noise from the units will not be intrusive to adjoining residential units.</p> <p>I am also concerned regarding the new ventilation flue and request such flues are placed internally away from the party wall to limit noise pollution to the residents of Market house.</p>
2022/4952/P	Paul Smart	24/12/2022 23:39:13	INT	<p>Overall the refurbishment of Ruspini House into quality accommodation is welcome. As a resident and part owner of the adjacent Parker House I have two concerns which I would like to be considered.</p> <p>Firstly I am concerned about noise from the air source heat pump units proposed ; we are already subject to noise nuisance from assorted cooler units from catering premises in Great Queen Street and the addition of additional fan- powered air circulating equipment can only make this worse. The noise assessment uses noise emissions for newly installed heat pumps. We know from experience that fan motors get more noisy with age and planners must assure us that noise containment for the proposed units is future-proofed for mid life fan noise emissions.</p> <p>Secondly it was a known fact when Ruspini House was previously occupied that soundproofing between Ruspini and Market houses was poor. Given the fact that (for example) TV sets may be mounted on the party wall it might be prudent to require a greater level of noise-proofing of the party wall for the protection of occupants of nos 18, 1, 4 and 6 Market House and for the future benefit of the adjoining properties in Ruspini House who will not desire noise impact from Market House.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4952/P	Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee)	27/12/2022 12:24:56	OBJNOT	<p>As the amenity society for the area, Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) objects to some aspects of this application. We support other aspects.</p> <p>We would withdraw our objection main objections subject to modifications, and planning conditions being added to any consent to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>ASPECTS SUPPORTED</p> <p>We support the addition of internal space for waste as this will improve the public realm and internal living spaces within the flats.</p> <p>We support the addition of internal bicycle storage as this will encourage pollution-free travel, improve the public realm and improve security.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>ASPECT SUPPORTED BUT SPECIFICATION REQUESTED</p> <p>We support the replacement of window frames with similar metal ones as, with moderate maintenance, these are likely to remain looking smart for longer. However, the application does not detail the type of metal to be used. To provide a clear improvement upon UPVC, we ask that aluminium (or an alternative, non-corroding metal) be specified under any consent.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>ASPECTS OBJECTED TO, BUT CONDITIONS SUGGESTED</p> <p>Our objections relate to the outside space to the rear of the property. The space is very enclosed; odours circulate and noise echoes.</p> <p>The space is overlooked by existing flats in other buildings and will be overlooked by the new flats too.</p> <p>Two dwellings at 35 Great Queen Street and one dwelling at 34 Great Queen Street, immediately behind the space, are not marked on the plan. The 6 dwellings at Market House, the building immediately adjacent to Ruspini House and overlooking the outside space are also not marked on the plan.</p> <p>ACCESS TO OUTSIDE SPACE</p> <p>We object to the alterations to the window and door opening in the rear elevation so as to increase access to the outside space. Use of the space for smoking or leisure at antisocial hours will have a negative impact on families living on those flats.</p> <p>We would withdraw this objection if two Planning conditions were added to any consent:</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

1. Restricting hours of use of the private outside space to between 08:00 and 21:00 during the week, 09:00 to 22:00 on Saturdays and 10:00 to 21:00 on Sundays.
2. No smoking permitted in the private outside space.

AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMPS

We object to the installation of 4 external Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) in the outside space behind the building. The acoustic report shows the noise generated by the plant is likely to be very close indeed to the maximum permitted – the predicted noise levels at night being only 1dB lower. It only takes a small change in wind direction or a small reduction in performance of the units to exceed the permitted level. And, as mentioned above, noise tends to echo in this sort of enclosed space, often being amplified. Noise at sensitive facades above the equipment is therefore likely to be louder.

We would withdraw this objection if:

- a) the mitigation measures were increased so as to reduce the projected sound levels to 4dB below the target range rather than only 1dB, and
- b) if two Planning conditions were added to any consent:
 1. Restricting hours of use of the ASHPs to between 08:00 and 22:00.
 2. The provision of a professional maintenance contract for the ASHPs, with quarterly checks logged and available for inspection by neighbouring residents.

Further, we note that the council will require the ASHPs not to be used in cooling mode, and ask that this is added as a clear Planning condition to any consent. This should not be left to chance, but the equipment should be required to have this function disabled.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4952/P	John Carson	24/12/2022 14:41:10	OBJNOT	<p>Apologies if this is a resubmission but i hadnt finished typing and it seemed to send.</p> <p>I have several concerns regarding this application. We have met with the applicant and have voiced our concerns directly with them, but would like the planning application to reflect c our concerns.</p> <p>My concerns are:</p> <p>I am very concerned regarding the proposed 6 heat pumps and other plant/machinery on roof and multiple rear balconies and the associated noise from these. I understand, there is no proposal to limit their usage. I would like a time constraint placed over the units and an assurance that the noise from the units will not be intrusive to adjoining residential units. No other offices or pubs are allowed to operate out of hour so how can this be considered here? The rear area is atrium like so any noise reverberates and is amplified. allowing night time operation would make life intolerable. we already need to battle philomena and offices who accidentally or otherwise leave a/c and extratctor stuff on overnight. please dont make it impossible for us to sleep.</p> <p>I am also concerned regarding the new ventilation flue and request such flues are placed internally away from the party wall to limit noise pollution to the residents of Market house.</p> <p>The current sound insulation between Ruspini House is very poor with residents at Market House able to hear residents next door (talking, laughing) and can hear the bathroom light pull being switched on and off. The proposal is just to line the party wall with plaster board using 'dot and dab'. This provides no air gap which is crucial in mitigating sound travel. Battens should be fixed to the wall (providing an air gap) and then sound insulating plaster board should be fixed to these battens, to minimise sound pollution. surely a refurb/rebuild of this significance would need this?</p> <p>The current staggering of room types is sensible, but the proposal is to move rooms so that currently bedrooms at Ruspini House adjoin bedrooms at Market House, which makes sense in terms of limiting noise disturbance. In the proposal, a living room or kitchen at Ruspini House will now adjoin a bedroom at Market House.</p> <p>This is not acceptable and will create noise issues in the future. for reference they are effectively the same building.</p> <p>I would like maximum noise limiting measures in place between the party wall between Ruspini House and Market House.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4952/P	John Carson	24/12/2022 14:30:25	OBJ	<p>We have a few concerns regarding this application. We have met with the applicant and have voiced our concerns directly with them, but would like to reflect these worries here.</p> <p>My concerns are:</p> <p>Most importantly., I am very concerned regarding the proposed 6 heat pumps and other machinery on roof and multiple rear balconies, and the associated noise from these. I understand, there is no proposal to limit their usage. I would like a time constraint placed over the units and an assurance that the noise from the units will not be intrusive to adjoining residential units. No offices or pubs nearby are permitted to have a/c units operating overnight so this suggestion, however environmentally sound, could make sleeping hours intolerable. How can Camden sanction sleeping hour units operation when this has been against policy until now. We already have to battle philomenas and other premises who fail to operate in permitted hours, accidentally or not, leaving noisy a/c and extractor units on</p> <p>I am also concerned regarding the new ventilation flue and request such flues are placed internally away from the party wall to limit noise pollution to the residents of Market house.</p> <p>The building is next door and effectively the same build as Market House. The current sound insulation between Ruspini House is very poor with residents at Market House able to hear residents next door (talking, laughing) and even able to hear the bathroom light pull being switched on and off. The proposal is just to line the party wall with plaster board using 'dot and dab'. This provides no air gap which is crucial in mitigating sound travel. Battens should be fixed to the wall (providing an air gap) and then sound insulating plaster board should be fixed to these battens, to minimise sound pollution. Surely this would be a bare minimum in a complete redevelopment/rebuild such as this?</p> <p>The proposal includes a change to staggering of room types. currently bedrooms at Ruspini House adjoin bedrooms at Market House, which makes sense in terms of limiting noise disturbance. In the proposal, a living room or kitchen at Ruspini House will now adjoin a bedroom at Market House. This is not acceptable and will create noise issues in the future.</p> <p>I would like maximum noise limiting measures in place between the party wall between Ruspini House and Market House.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4952/P	Erwan Toulemonde	23/12/2022 16:00:30	OBJ	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I would like to comment on the application as an owner and resident of Market House (building next to Ruspini House), living just on the other side of the party wall.</p> <p>Firstly, I am grateful to the owner of the building for renovating the building to such a high standard and for having kindly engaged in a dialogue to progress potentials issues.</p> <p>I am in favour in many of their upgrades (i.e. windows,...) and look forward to working with them on improving the external look of both blocks, around a cohesive design, which will enhance the street and the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</p> <p>I would though like to register comments here to officialise concerns I have to date and I am asking my Council to play a constructive role in helping come to the best outcomes for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all Market House current and future residents - all Ruspini House future residents <p>My family and I are owners and residents of flat 6, with comprises all of Market House 4th floor. We bought the place in June 2021 when Ruspini was unoccupied.</p> <p>We have 2 major concerns</p> <p>A- Extremely poor noise insulation between buildings through the party wall</p> <p>Noise transmission is terrible between buildings, as confirmed by tenants that lived there been there when Ruspini House was tenanted and as confirmed by the all the noise I could hear during some partial stripping out of Ruspini house.</p> <p>Due to the structure of these both similar building, noise even travels all the way to the other end of Market House (as raised by flat 5 tenants in November)</p> <p>Also, as part of the proposal, there is a change of use for one a room on the 4th floor that is proposed to become a bathroom and will be noisy. This bathroom would be right next to our bedroom with only currently an ineffective party wall between them, and we are very concerned by the noise impact there, and across the whole width of your floor.</p> <p>Current noise insulation between blocks is basically insufficient and full occupation of both blocks will result in unacceptable noise levels for residents of both sides, due to the construction type of these 2 identical blocks.</p> <p>I feel that just a 'fit for purpose approach' will not resolve the issue and I would be grateful to the owner of the building and the Council to apply "gold star sound insulation" of the party wall so we do not face noise pollution in the future. It might also bring excellent thermal insulation for Ruspini House</p> <p>I really foresee problems for us as residents but also for residents on the other side in Ruspini House, as we</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

are making a lot of noise ourselves, and wish to find a way to go beyond basic building regulations. My family plan to live here for the next 30 years and I am keen to collaborate towards a solution to this problem.

B- Noise due to Heat pumps * 2 on the roof of Market House (and *4 at ground floor level)

We understand that is it the way forward to heat a building but would please like to request that

1- The pumps do not operate at night. I am unaware of the legislation and technicality around this, but the heat pumps being very close to our bedroom windows , we are please asking the council to set operating hours for the heat pumps, and for them then not to operate in core hours at night (10 pm to 7 am?), especially as during the warm months, all residents for Market House and Ruspini House will have their windows open. Current existing heat pumps next to other neighbours are disturbing them at night, and I would like to mitigate this disturbance ahead of time for both sides. I understand that heat pumps are the way to go for the environment but would like our Council to protect its local residents sleep as much as possible.

2- an official condition is put around the fact none of the 6 heat pumps could ever be used for cooling purpose. We have been given verbal reassurance, but I am just seeking official confirmation in the Council approval as to protect myself from any different owners / tenants, in years to come.

3- The noise report from the heat pump on the roof seems to refer to the noise being acceptable for 1 heat pump but the numbers do not seem to refer to the fact that there will be 2 heat pumps next to each other. I might have missed this or misunderstood but would please like the Council to seek advice, or ask the consultant for further test and ask that then the report is still fully acceptable with 2 heat pumps on the roof.

4- The solutions around the vibrations caused by the heat pumps are not listed in the report, and I would just welcome our Council to work with the building owner towards all mitigations possible, and them to confirm the specs around the vibration risk to you. Lastly, I would like to thank the owner of the building for the noise mitigations they are already planning around the pumps.

Thank you all very much.

Wishing you a great Christmas and a Happy New Year

Kind regards
Erwan