

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Eric Stuart	22/10/2023 22:02:12	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the installation of the ventilation system and flue duct as a local resident of a neighbouring building to the premises. My objections are based on (1) noise, (2) unsightliness and (3) smells and the attendant loss of amenity to nearby residents.</p> <p>The equipment to be installed will result in noise in an area that is valued by residents for its quiet. The rear area between Neal Street, Endell Street, Shaftesbury Avenue and Shorts Garden is completely surrounded by buildings, which very effectively shields the rear area from street noise. For a residential community in the heart of the West End this is critically important. Visitors often note that it is remarkable how quiet the rear of the properties are despite being in the middle of an active and lively area. Many of the surrounding properties have rear gardens as well as bedrooms that face the rear. Disturbing noise from machinery will disrupt the quiet that residents need. The applicant's noise survey does not provide a full picture of the situation at the rear. The lowest recorded noise is given only for two periods: 07.00-23.00 and 23.00-0.700. The latter period is irrelevant if out of the hours of operation of the equipment. The former period is too broad a timeframe - separate measurements should have been given at the least from 19.00-23.00 to distinguish noise levels during the day, which are generally higher, from those at night which are lower and when residents are most likely to be at home. Measurements should have also been taken for more than one 24 hour period which may not be representative, including a weekday and a weekend day.</p> <p>No thought has been given to the design of the flue duct, of shiny metal, which will be the only flue duct visible in an area otherwise characterised by brickwork, roof slates and tiles, and painted iron and steel fixtures. As mentioned previously, this is overlooked by rear windows and gardens and significantly detracts residents' views of the Seven Dials Conservation Area by adding visual clutter in a material that is not harmonious with those of the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The flats neighbouring the site and their rear gardens are all located above the shops of Neal Street and Endell Street, at first or second floor level. As mentioned earlier, this area is fully enclosed by the surrounding buildings. The proposed flue duct terminates at second floor level - very close to the windows and gardens of the neighbouring flats. It is likely that exhaust smells will flow into those windows and gardens given the enclosed nature of the area.</p> <p>For the reasons above, I ask that the application be denied. If the application were to be approved, I would ask that strict conditions be attached - these should include maximum permitted noise levels, restricted hours of use, and annual inspections and maintenance requirements - although I will explain below why I do not believe that even these will be sufficient. The applicant's noise survey states that certain mitigation measures are needed to achieve the sound level and rating assessment shown in that survey - these are detailed in sections 5.5 and 6.0 and should form part of any required conditions. Given the proximity to residential windows, hours of operation should be limited to 11.00-21.00 only. The flue duct should also be placed within brick cladding to fit in with the surrounding area.</p> <p>I am very concerned that the applicant and its tenant will not comply with any conditions imposed by the Council and may even operate outside of agreed hours. The applicant has a history of non-compliance with planning obligations and requirements. Specifically, 2014/4417/P approved a change of use of 2nd and 3rd floors from office to 2 x 1 bedroom flats and 2015/5354/P approved a change of use from office to 1 x 1 bedroom flat at 1st floor level. These floors now contain about 9 studio flats that are being used for permanent AirBnB-style short term holiday lets in violation of planning consents and permitted use - in addition to the loss</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

of badly needed housing for Camden, the Council may be being deprived of the appropriate Council tax revenue given the current use of the property. 2019/0934/P approved installation of aluminium framed doors and glazing to shopfront but the shopfront installed differed from that on the plans. 2011/0826/P denied the replacement of existing shopfront and installation of new doors at ground floor level of existing commercial retail unit and enforcement action was to be taken in respect of the old shopfront which had been removed and which was noted as a shopfront of merit in the Seven Dials Conservation Area Statement. The enforcement notice was never complied with. In around 2019, metal Critall-style windows at the rear and side elevation of the property were removed and replaced with modern uPVC windows to the detriment of the Seven Dials Conservation Area without obtaining planning permission. Most recently, preparations are currently being made for an fluorescent light internally illuminated fascia sign to the shopfront with no application having been made for the requisite advertising consent. This would be against the principles set out in the Council's Seven Dials Conservation Area Statement as well as in the Seven Dials Study put out by the Seven Dials Trust. All of this demonstrates a disregard by the applicant and its tenant of the Council and its planning requirements, its neighbours and its neighbourhood, and shows that any approval, even with conditions, is subject to high risk of non-compliance.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Joaquim Menino Fernandes	22/10/2023 23:29:35	OBJ	<p>the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise: -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 & 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicant's own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</p> <p>Design: -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</p> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area) -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</p> <p>Conditions of Use: -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>Applicant's current planning breaches: -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref: EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this. -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbors are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Joir Benedeti	20/10/2023 17:58:17	COMMNT	<p>I am a resident of Flat 5 74 Neal Street, which is the neighbouring block of x6 flats, that will be negatively impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>To note the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 & 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicant's own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building. <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell. <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area. <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity. <p>Applicant's current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref: EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	janey mykura	20/10/2023 17:19:36	OBJNOT	<p>I am a resident at 74 Neal Street, in Flat 6. I want to object to this application as it will cause real damage to local residents: it will be noisy, it will smell, it will pollute and have a very negative impact on the area. There are terraces at the back of the 74 Neal Street flats and the proposed extraction system is only a few metres from these quiet family areas. The extraction system is much closer to these flats than the applicant's own building so they are shifting the noise and smell to the neighbouring properties and the families living there. I object to the proposal as it will cause a major loss of amenity and quality of life for these residents. Neal Street is a residential area and the proposal is totally out of keeping with the neighbourhood and will be very detrimental to a large number of families.</p> <p>The proposed structure is an eyesore, totally out of keeping with the residential flats and the Seven Dials conservation area.</p> <p>The hours of use are totally unsuitable for a residential area with families and children. They propose operating hours until 2300 which will be awful for the residents.</p> <p>In addition residents are already experiencing problems with 76 Neal Street having been partitioned into short term flats so the residents would want to ensure there were enforceable conditions of use including hours, fire safety, noise control.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Henry Hogarth	20/10/2023 15:47:28	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 74 Neal Street, which is the neighbouring block of x6 flats, that will be negatively impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>To note the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 & 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicant's own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building. <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell. <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area. <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity. <p>Applicant's current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref: EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this. -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbours are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Vincent Kirchner	20/10/2023 20:42:34	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 74 Neal Street, which is the neighbouring block of x6 flats, that will be negatively impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>To note the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 & 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicant's own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building. <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell. <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area. <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity. <p>Applicant's current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref: EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this. -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbours are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Gremio Fernandes	22/10/2023 23:32:30	OBJ	<p>i oppose the proposal on the following grounds</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 & 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicant's own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building. <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell. <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area. <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity. <p>Applicant's current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref: EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this. -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbors are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Covent Garden Community Association (form completed by Amanda Rigby, Exec. Rep. for Seven Dials)	30/10/2023 00:11:04	OBJNOT	<p>As the amenity society for the area, Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) objects to this application for the reasons detailed below.</p> <p>Our preferred solution in a location of this type is for premises to use a filtered air recirculation system with no external pipework or equipment to affect neighbouring amenity. A number of these now operate within other restaurant premises in the Covent Garden area. (An example of a supplier may be found at: https://www.premierrestaurantengineering.co.uk/canopyairrecirculationextractor.html)</p> <p>If this option is not possible for some genuine policy or technical reason, then we would withdraw our objection if the application were modified and conditioned in the following ways (in addition to the usual conditions upon noise and vibration):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The flue relocated in its entirety onto the rear of 76 Neal Street itself, and clad on the 3 external sides with brickwork to match the building. - The height of the flue extended well above the roof of 76 Neal Street, so as to discharge well above the roof level of neighbouring residential units too. - Hours of use limited to 8am to 9pm Monday – Thursday, 8am – 10pm Friday, 9am - 10pm Saturday and 10am - 9pm on Sundays, and these hours to be controlled automatically with a timer switch. - A maintenance contract to be entered into by the applicant with an independent contractor prior to commencement of use, to include a deep clean and check of the full system at least every 3 months, and the logbook for this to be made available to neighbouring residents along with the contractor's contact details.

CONTEXT

The building is in a mixed-use area. It is highly residential to the rear of the building, where the equipment is proposed to be located. There are 6 family flats next door at 70-74 Neal Street and another 3 next door on the other side at 78 Neal Street. There are even more dwellings behind, with 7 flats at 61-61a Endell Street, 7 more at 71 Endell Street, and 4 in the small buildings in between. 76 Neal Street itself has consent for 3 flats (one on each 1st-3rd floor) and we believe may be used as residential on the 4th and 5th (top mansard) floors; however, the building has been divided into studios without consent and is being used for illegal holiday letting.

The proposed location of the flue is in courtyard to the rear of 70-74 & 76 Neal Street, which also backs onto the Endell Street properties listed above. This courtyard is a quiet space with high walls, where sound echoes, and where any fumes move around and can enter living room windows.

The space is an attractive element of the Seven Dials Conservation Area, providing much-needed relaxation space for residents, particularly the balcony areas of the flats at 70-74 Neal Street. 78 Neal Street, next door to the application site, is a listed building, as is 80 Neal Street.

The applicant has a long history of non-compliance with Planning law and conditions, and even enforcement action. This has been well documented by Mr. Eric Stuart in his objection dated 22/10/23. This history makes

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

it all the more essential that any planning consent is 'water-tight'. Clearly refusal of this application and insistence on an entirely internal air handling system would be the best way of achieving this.

ISSUES RAISED BY THIS APPLICATION, AND SUGGESTED MITIGATIONS

Fumes

The development does not accord with Camden's Planning Guidance Design 9.13 which states that: "Where mechanical or passive ventilation is required to remove odour emissions, the release point for odours must be located above the roofline of the building and, wherever possible, adjacent buildings." It is noted that the guidance refers to adjacent buildings, not just those adjoining.

The proposed equipment is currently designed to discharge at the level of windows belonging to neighbouring dwellings only 3-4 metres away, which would damage amenity of the families (including children) living there. It is perfectly possible to design equipment at the rear of these buildings to be much higher, above the roofline of 76 Neal Street and adjoining residential buildings. This would be most easily achieved if the flue were attached to the back of 76 Neal Street itself.

Appearance

Camden's Local Plan 7.34 states that "Building services equipment, such as air cooling, heating, ventilation and extraction systems, lift and mechanical equipment, as well as fire escapes, ancillary plant and ducting should be contained within the envelope of a building or be located in a visually inconspicuous position".

Again, the clear preference would be for an entirely internal air handling system. The second choice would be for the flue to be located in a visually inconspicuous position, the best option for which would again be if it were attached to the back of 76 Neal Street itself.

The rear amenity space is within the prime Seven Dials Conservation Area, in one of the Streets laid out by Thomas Neal in the 1690s. Any extraction flue, whether located as proposed, or relocated to the rear wall of the building, is within the context of the listed buildings.

No metal flue in its unadorned state is either attractive or sympathetic to this sort of historic context. To make them more acceptable, flues have successfully been clad in brick in this conservation area, for example at the rear of 2 Neal's Yard and 15 Shorts Gardens under application ref. 2017/1655/P. We suggest this as an option here if an entirely internal air handling system is not possible.

Noise & Vibration

This is a noise sensitive site, as described above. It is therefore essential that any equipment generates no sound above ambient at any point in the day or night.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

It is unfortunate that the applicant's noise survey did not consider any receiver point at the rear of the neighbouring family flats. However, it is clear that these flats will receive significant impact from any sound that emanates from the equipment and echoes around the courtyard.

The noise survey suggests various attenuation measures, which would be essential to lessen impact.

However, we are aware that the applicant may not follow all the recommendations and conditions. And indeed, even if the installation is fully compliant, it may not remain so if poorly maintained.

We therefore ask that, in the spirit of CPG Amenity 6.29:

1. The equipment be out of use at noise-sensitive times when children are asleep and working family members may need rest. Hours of use should be limited to 8am to 9pm Monday – Thursday, 8am – 10pm Friday, 9am - 10pm Saturday and 10am - 9pm on Sundays. It is essential that these hours be controlled automatically with a time switch so that the situation is not dependent upon staff remembering to switch equipment off.

2. The applicant enter into a maintenance contract with an independent contractor prior to commencement of use, to include a deep clean and check of the full system at least every 3 months. It is essential that the logbook for this to be made available to neighbouring residents to view on demand, and that the contractor is available to take third party enquiries.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Amol Dhote	22/10/2023 23:27:02	OBJ	<p>I think the proposal should be rejected on the following grounds</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 & 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicant's own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building. <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell. <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area. <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity. <p>Applicant's current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref: EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (Airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this. -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbors are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Amrit Maan	22/10/2023 23:41:14	OBJ	<p>wish to object to the proposals for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. insufficient details, the drawings submitted are far from clear, and also confusing as they have the same drawing number so it is not possible to distinguish which works refer to which drawing for example the existing plans (basement and ground) is given on drawing number P100 rev D whereas the existing elevations rear and back are also given the same drawing number p100 but with revision o2. 2. the proposed exhaust duct is shown through the part wall between 76 Neal street and 74 Neal street, see plan P205 rev O. Clearly this is not possible as the applicant does now own 74 Neal street and the flu will be trespassing on this property. in addition the proposed duct exhaust shown to the rear elevation drawing shows the flu projecting into the rear of 72/74 rear yard, the applicant does not own 72/74 Neal street, this is not possible. 3. the statutory drawing P250 Rev shows a metal spiral staircase that links to the basement to the ground floor and a means for escape route.it is not clear at ground level how patrons using the spiral stairwell will gain access to the street level as it is entirely enclosed by neighboring properties , there is no apparent dedicated dedicated fire route to the street. in additional the spiral staircase clearly does not comply with building regulations with regards to its width step dimensions, so currently the fire evacuation proposals are seriously defective 4. the suggestion in the design of access statement that patrons will have cycle storage facilities in the basement is clearly fanciful, as it will not be possible to bring cycles up and down a staircase patrons are using to gain access to the sitting and bakery area. Similarly, the suggestion that employees will have provision of three cycle places in the ground floor is not shown the submitted plans and again not practical. 5. the suggestion in the design and access statement that the rear extract fan will somehow reduce noise and pollution is clearly not possible. the exhaust will clause additional noise. and the extract fumes despite the filters being installed will increase air pollution 6. the most serous objection to the proposals that the exhaust flue is only 3/4 metres from the rear windows of the residential accommodation next to the proposed bakery/kitchen as is the location of the flue and the noise will inevitably worsen the quality of life of the established residential flats at 74 Neal and residential flats at 78 Neal Street which include families and young children. In addition both 72 and 74 Neal street has residential accommodation over 4 floor levels and the proposed site of the flue will visually and environmentally adversely affect the amenity of the flats in question. 7. The design of the flue and is setting in the seven dials conversation area will cause harm to the quality of the conservation area. although not visible to the public, it will be very unlikely for the remainder of 72/74 Neal street 8. Finally being in the conservation area the addition of another restaurant/cafe will do harm to the street, as

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

there should be a balance of retail users to restaurants . the proliferation of restaurants/cafes within the street is harmful both visually and damaging to the special retail quality of Neal Street.
9. individual rooms above 76 Neal Street are being illegally let on on booking.com and airbnb
