

06 June 2024

51 Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JH

Evidence Rebuttal Note

This rebuttal is written in response to the proof of evidence submitted by the London Borough of Camden. This rebuttal focuses on the issues of the visual impacts, impact on the conservation area and the issue of odour and vibration. In response to the most pertinent issues raised by Camden Council we find that the works undertaken are appropriate development.

Visual Impact

In regards to the impact on visual amenity, Camden Council states that “The fact that it does not create street clutter is not justification to impose this issue to the overlooking residential occupiers at the rear, where many only have windows facing this area.”

We understand the importance of minimizing visual clutter and declare that the visual impact of the flues and plant equipment in question is of no further consequence to the neighbouring residents than any other establishments. The visual impact of the flues is not excessive in the locality of the town centre and is deemed an integral part to the functioning of the business.

Conservation Area

Camden Council states that “Camden High Street is one of the borough’s most commercial areas, so it is accepted that there might be some immune development that would unfortunately erode the appearance of the Conservation Area. Again, this is not an invitation or justification to impose further clutter.”

While the Camden council acknowledges that necessary development to support commerce on Camden High Street may impact the appearance of the Conservation area, it is important to recognise that certain elements such as flues, are essential for the functioning of businesses. Therefore, categorizing these essential installations as mere clutter seems counterproductive to the goal of maintaining a thriving commercial environment.

We also recognise that part of Conservation Area’s designation stems from the commercial history of Camden High Street, and thus these ancillary plant additions help to retain the business uses and

assist in the prevention of these buildings falling into disrepair.

Odour and Vibrations

Camden council states that “The appellant fails to provide evidence to prove that ‘directing the flues into the air space at the centre of surrounding buildings results in no discharge of odours and fumes to the rear facades and windows of residential occupiers’.

We acknowledge that plant equipment at the back of commercial properties can have an impact on neighbouring residences. However, we contend that the level of impact described by the council falls within the reasonable expectations for a town centre location such as this. Furthermore, the impact is consistent with that experienced by other adjacent properties and businesses of a similar nature.

It is also important to note properties directly adjoining the property have an equal likelihood of emitting odours and vibrations, some operating further into the night. Some food establishments run their extractors late until 4am, whilst others have starkly more pungent smells as a byproduct of their function. These examples illustrate that the impact of the business in question is well within the normal range for this commercial area.

In addition, it is noteworthy that the land of which the extension in question is on is under dispute, as Carlow House do not own the property, as per the land registry.

Yours Sincerely,

Peter Jeffery

Managing Director

Peter.jeffery@sphere25.co.uk