

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 15/11/2024 2:46 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Newlyn House Norwood Lane Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0YB
Proposal:	Retention and relocation of three air conditioning units to the exterior walls of the house.
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Norwood Lane Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

My wife & I wish to OBJECT to the planning application for the retention & relocation of three air conditioning units to the exterior walls of Newlyn, Norwood Lane Meopham

We [REDACTED] Newlyn in Joydens, Norwood Lane

We object for the following reasons:

The location of the air conditioning unit which on the side elevation of Newlyn adversely effects the amenity of the occupants [REDACTED]

The unit is located within 400mm of the side wall [REDACTED] it has been positioned at the front end of a passageway between [REDACTED] two houses which is a maximum of 860mm wide and a minimum of 585mm wide.

The unit is located within 1.5m of the opening casement [REDACTED]

The unit is far too close [REDACTED] bedroom & well inevitably result in noise disturbance during hot summer evenings when we would wish to keep [REDACTED] windows open for natural ventilation. This will inevitably give grounds for complaints to Environmental Health.

We note that a noise report has been submitted in support of the planning application however this report is based on a number of assumptions for example "50% on time for night was considered reasonable as such units are typically only switched back on during sunrise", we respectfully point out that this is an assertion without any substantiation and is no guarantee whatsoever that the units will not be used in a different way which will render the findings of the acoustic report meaningless.

The report goes on to say that "AC units generally operate at lower levels with a 'night' or 'silent' mode, by reducing the fan speed, and it is recommended this

feature be switched on for all units". Once again this is only a very general comment with no way of preventing excessive night-time noise if the operator chooses to operate the units differently.

Finally, we would note that no allowance has been made for the fact that air conditioning units have a well earned reputation for getting noisier as they get older and as bearings and fans begin to wear.

The unit is clearly visible from Norwood Lane, is very utilitarian in appearance and visually inappropriate for this prominent location.

The adverse impact on the view from Norwood Lane is made even worse by the substantial and unsightly services which have been installed as part of placing the unit in this unsuitable location. These services include electrical services and condensate pipework in prominent black shrouding.

These services are located well in front of [REDACTED] house and are an inappropriate addition to the street scene. These services combined with the existing satellite dish and extract vent make this part of the building cluttered & more like a plant area than a prominent part of the area in front of our houses.

Although the unit has been placed approximately 2m above ground level its location will hinder the use and enjoyment of the side passage [REDACTED]

This has been the case in recent years when trees [REDACTED] have been felled. Please note that the passageway is only 585mm wide at its narrowest point.

We object due to the impact this will have on carbon emissions and climate change and if these units are allowed to proliferate without any effective control this will be making dwellings far less energy efficient.

Finally, we note that the drawings submitted with the planning application are not correct and are not consistent. For example, the boundary line between Newlyn and Joydens shown on the site location plan & both block plans is totally different to that shown on the plans & elevations as existing and as proposed drawing no MAD-449-04. The MAD drawing is wrong and does not match site dimensions, in reality the houses are at a slight angle to one another.

If the plant is plotted on a drawing which is correctly drawn it will be found that the plant is overhanging the boundary and part of it is therefore located [REDACTED] land

It is a great sadness to us that [REDACTED] neighbours did not discuss [REDACTED] before the units were installed as a less intrusive solution could have been found, such as increasing the capacity of the unit on the rear elevation to design out the need for the unit in the side passage.

Kind regards