

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Penny Furniss	10 The Chesterfields 1(B) King Henry's Road London NW33QP	05/08/2014 13:24:55	COMMNT	<p>We object to the planning application 2014/4681/p for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The planning application is mis-leading in describing large air extractor units as 'vents'. Assurances from Cowshed - given to the building's residents by Ms Tanya Nathan in September 2013 - that there would be no extractor units at the rear of the Chesterfields - have proved similarly misleading. The 'engineer's report' is not independent.2. The proposed extractor units will have a continuous detrimental effect on residents, particularly, but not exclusively, those at ground level, and these effects include significant noise and clean-air pollution. These anti-social effects continue and, if anything increase, at weekends.3. Camden Council have repeatedly defended residents in this immediate area from planning encroachments of this kind and this has helped preserve the residential community which now exists. <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Penny Furniss, Matilda Wnek, Albert Wnek. Flat 10</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Tim Katz	109 Lady Margaret Road London N19 5ER	04/08/2014 18:03:39	OBJ	<p>We object to the planning application 2014/4681/p (case number) for the reasons below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The two units in question are not “vents” as described in the planning application. They are large air extractor units. They are being used to dispel all the unpleasant smells from the cowshed café and spa. These air extractors units have only been pre existing since January 2014 by Cowshed when they were illegally installed at the rear of the chesterfields. If you need confirmation that these were not installed before this date then please speak to other chesterfield residents and previous businesses of 115-117 regents park road- “Boom interiors” and “lost in beauty”. In the previous decade no extractors units have been running at the back of The Chesterfields. 2) These proposed extractors units are out of keeping with the residential area that is at the back of the chesterfields 3) The proposed extractor units are out of keeping and encroach into the conservation area at the rear of the Chesterfields 4) The proposed extractor units are within a couple of feet of one home and yards from everyone else’s and they encroach on the residential area at the rear of The Chesterfields. Because of the enclosed walls at the back of the chesterfields the cooking/ chemical smells will stay in the area and the noise from the extractor units will be amplified 5) There isn’t a location where these extractor units could be installed within the Chesterfields that wouldn’t have an adverse effect of the residents lives- that is why in the past it has always been refused. 6) The engineers report commissioned by Cowshed/ the landlord on their behalf is not independent and is unilaterally setting what they consider to be an acceptable DB level. Camden Council make a subjective decision on what is and isn’t an acceptable noise level and this isn’t governed by DB level. 7) The noise and smells from these units has a detrimental affect on the lives of the residents. When they had the extractor units previously operating it was a relentless barrage of unpleasant noise and cooking/ chemical smells for 7 days a week, 12 hours a day. 8) Cowshed are now preparing and serving food on an industrial scale – they are operating a café first and a spa second which is against the previous assurances they gave to the residents of the Chesterfields and Camden council planning department and contradicts an assurance given in September 2013 by cowshed representative Tanya Nathan. She made it clear there would be no extractor units at the rear of the chesterfields and would instead be at pavement/street level at the front of the property. 9) There isn’t an engineering solution that will create extractors that are totally silent and that don’t dump unpleasant smells in and around the homes of the residents of the chesterfields. The two-extractor units have already been briefly used and they prevented us from being able to enjoy our

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

property then and will so again. To allow these extractors would be anti social and the smell and noise would adversely affect the lives of the local residents. It's never been allowed in past and we would ask you don't allow it now.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Imre Lake	62 Regents Park Road London NW1 7SX	06/08/2014 15:11:27	OBJ	<p>We object to the planning application 2014/4681/p (case number) for the reasons below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The two units in question are not “vents” as described in the planning application. They are large air extractor units. They are being used to dispel all the unpleasant smells from the Cowshed café and spa. These air extractors units have only been pre existing since January 2014 by Cowshed when they were illegally installed at the rear of the Chesterfields. If you need confirmation that these were not installed before this date then please speak to other Chesterfield residents and previous businesses of 115-117 Regents Park Road- “Boom interiors” and “Lost in Beauty”. In the previous decade no extractors units have been running at the back of The Chesterfields. 2) These proposed extractors units are out of keeping with the residential area that is at the back of the Chesterfields 3) The proposed extractor units are out of keeping and encroach into the conservation area at the rear of the Chesterfields 4) The proposed extractor units are within a couple of feet of one home and yards from everyone else’s and they encroach on the residential area at the rear of The Chesterfields. Because of the enclosed walls at the back of the Chesterfields the cooking/ chemical smells will stay in the area and the noise from the extractor units will be amplified 5) There isn’t a location where these extractor units could be installed within the Chesterfields that wouldn’t have an adverse effect of the residents lives- that is why in the past it has always been refused. 6) The engineers" report commissioned by Cowshed/ the landlord on their behalf is not independent and is unilaterally sets what they consider to be an acceptable DB level. Camden Council make a subjective decision on what is and isn’t an acceptable noise level and this isn’t governed by DB level. 7) The noise and smells from these units has a detrimental affect on the lives of the residents. When they had the extractor units previously operating it was a relentless barrage of unpleasant noise and cooking/ chemical smells for 7 days a week, 12 hours a day. 8) Cowshed is now preparing and serving food on an industrial scale – they are operating a café first and a spa second which is against the previous assurances they gave to the residents of the Chesterfields and Camden council planning department and contradicts an assurance given in September 2013 by Cowshed representative Tanya Nathan. She made it clear there would be no extractor units at the rear of the Chesterfields. Instead they would be at pavement/street level at the front of the property. 9) There isn’t an engineering solution that will create extractors that are totally silent and that don’t dump unpleasant smells in and around the homes of the residents of the Chesterfields. The two-extractor units have already been briefly used and they prevented us from being able to enjoy our property then and will so again. To allow these extractors would be anti social and the smell and noise

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

would adversely affect the lives of the local residents. It's never been allowed in past and we would ask you not to allow it now.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Claudia Ferro	12A The Chesterfield 1B King Henry's Rd NW3 3QP	04/08/2014 17:55:40	COMMNT	<p>1) The two units in question are not “vents” as described in the planning application. They are large air extractor units. They are being used to dispel all the unpleasant smells from the cowshed café and spa. These air extractors units have only been pre existing since January 2014 by Cowshed when they were illegally installed at the rear of the chesterfields. If you need confirmation that these were not installed before this date then please speak to other chesterfield residents and previous businesses of 115-117 regents park road- “Boom interiors” and “lost in beauty”. In the previous decade no extractors units have been running at the back of The Chesterfields.</p> <p>2) These proposed extractors units are out of keeping with the residential area that is at the back of the chesterfields</p> <p>3) The proposed extractor units are out of keeping and encroach into the conservation area at the rear of the Chesterfields</p> <p>4) The proposed extractor units are within a couple of feet of one home and yards from everyone else’s and they encroach on the residential area at the rear of The Chesterfields. Because of the enclosed walls at the back of the chesterfields the cooking/ chemical smells will stay in the area and the noise from the extractor units will be amplified</p> <p>5) There isn’t a location where these extractor units could be installed within the Chesterfields that wouldn’t have an adverse effect of the residents lives- that is why in the past it has always been refused.</p> <p>6) The engineers report commissioned by Cowshed/ the landlord on their behalf is not independent and is unilaterally setting what they consider to be an acceptable DB level. Camden Council make a subjective decision on what is and isn’t an acceptable noise level and this isn’t governed by DB level.</p> <p>7) The noise and smells from these units has a detrimental affect on the lives of the residents. When they had the extractor units previously operating it was a relentless barrage of unpleasant noise and cooking/ chemical smells for 7 days a week, 12 hours a day.</p> <p>8) Cowshed are now preparing and serving food on an industrial scale – they are operating a café first and a spa second which is against the previous assurances they gave to the residents of the Chesterfields and Camden council planning department and contradicts an assurance given in September 2013 by cowshed representative Tanya Nathan. She made it clear there would be no extractor units at the rear of the chesterfields and would instead be at pavement/street level at the front of the property.</p> <p>9) There isn’t an engineering solution that will create extractors that are totally silent and that don’t dump unpleasant smells in and around the homes of the residents of the chesterfields. The two-extractor units have already been briefly used and they prevented us from being able to enjoy our property then and will so again. To allow these extractors would be anti social and the smell and noise would adversely affect the lives of the local residents. It’s never been allowed in past and we would ask you don’t allow it now.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Helen Mildmay-White	Flat 9 Chestfield House 1b King Henry's Road NW3 3QP	07/08/2014 10:45:21	OBJ	<p>My balcony overlooks the site, and I can see clearly that these are not vents, they look like industrial extractor units. I am very concerned that the extractor units will create noise and unpleasant smells that will destroy the tranquility of the quiet area that my balcony overlooks and seriously reduce the enjoyment that I get from using my balcony or having the balcony windows open. This was certainly the case when the extractor fans were in use not long ago, the noise and smells of cooking were intolerable. As my flat is above the extractors the smells rise up and are particularly bad, and the noise seems to be amplified by the walls surrounding the area.</p> <p>The cafe is open all day and into the evening so there is never a time when this would not be the case and not have an adverse effect on those of us in The Chesterfields whose flats overlook the back area.</p> <p>I also fear that this will be very off-putting to potential buyers or renters that I might have for my flat who will also be concerned about noise and smells in what is primarily a residential area, and a conservation area.</p> <p>I am confused as to why these extractor units were ever installed at the back of the property in the first place, as in their planning application Cowshed said that they would be installed at the front, and that they would be serving cold and reheated food, and would primarily be a spa and not a restaurant. This no longer seems to be the case as the cafe is busy all day long serving hot food, and the spa and shop seems to now be a secondary element to the cafe.</p> <p>I can't see any way that these extractor units will not have an adverse effect on the lives of us whose properties overlook them, and on the value of our properties, and I cannot object strongly enough to this proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Georgina Jones-Pritchard	Flat 7 Chesterfield House 1B King Henry's Road London NW3 3QP	04/08/2014 21:25:41	OBJ	<p>1) The two units in question are not “vents” as described in the planning application. They are large air extractor units. They are being used to dispel all the unpleasant smells from the cowshed café and spa. These air extractors units have only been pre existing since January 2014 by Cowshed when they were illegally installed at the rear of the chesterfields. If you need confirmation that these were not installed before this date then please speak to other chesterfield residents and previous businesses of 115-117 regents park road- “Boom interiors” and “lost in beauty”. In the previous decade no extractors units have been running at the back of The Chesterfields.</p> <p>2) These proposed extractors units are out of keeping with the residential area that is at the back of the chesterfields</p> <p>3) The proposed extractor units are out of keeping and encroach into the conservation area at the rear of the Chesterfields</p> <p>4) The proposed extractor units are within a couple of feet of one home and yards from everyone else’s and they encroach on the residential area at the rear of The Chesterfields. Because of the enclosed walls at the back of the chesterfields the cooking/ chemical smells will stay in the area and the noise from the extractor units will be amplified</p> <p>5) There isn’t a location where these extractor units could be installed within the Chesterfields that wouldn’t have an adverse effect of the residents lives- that is why in the past it has always been refused.</p> <p>6) The engineers report commissioned by Cowshed/ the landlord on their behalf is not independent and is unilaterally setting what they consider to be an acceptable DB level. Camden Council make a subjective decision on what is and isn’t an acceptable noise level and this isn’t governed by DB level.</p> <p>7) The noise and smells from these units has a detrimental affect on the lives of the residents. When they had the extractor units previously operating it was a relentless barrage of unpleasant noise and cooking/ chemical smells for 7 days a week, 12 hours a day.</p> <p>8) Cowshed are now preparing and serving food on an industrial scale – they are operating a café first and a spa second which is against the previous assurances they gave to the residents of the Chesterfields and Camden council planning department and contradicts an assurance given in September 2013 by cowshed representative Tanya Nathan. She made it clear there would be no extractor units at the rear of the chesterfields and would instead be at pavement/street level at the front of the property.</p> <p>9) There isn’t an engineering solution that will create extractors that are totally silent and that don’t dump unpleasant smells in and around the homes of the residents of the chesterfields. The two-extractor units have already been briefly used and they prevented us from being able to enjoy our property then and will so again. To allow these extractors would be anti social and the smell and noise would adversely affect the lives of the local residents. It’s never been allowed in past and we would ask you don’t allow it now.</p>

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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Ruth Stevenson	Flat 14 Chesterfield House 1B King Henry's Road London NW3 3QP	06/08/2014 17:39:57	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer</p> <p>I would like to object to the planning application case number 2014/4681/p - by Cowshed for the 'pre-existing vents/air exchange system' at the back of the building at 115 – 117 Regents Park Road to be granted retrospective planning permission.</p> <p>My living room and garden are directly opposite the vents/air exchange system and my quality of life has already suffered due to the vents/air exchange system which Cowshed installed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly the vents/air exchange system are only 'pre-existing' because Cowshed illegally connected them up and upgraded them when they took over the lease of the building at the end of 2013/start of 2014. They may argue that is not true, but the fact is the 'vents/air exchange system' had previously been overruled by the wisdom of Camden Planning Office and were not operational prior to Cowshed's occupancy of the building. <p>Cowshed are well aware that permission for the vents/air exchange system to be 'operational' had previously been rejected by Camden Planning Office who felt it would be detrimental to the lives of the residents in the Chesterfields. Despite reassurances to Chesterfield residents by Tanya Nathan at Cowshed (which she gave us in writing) she has reneged on the promise to vent the extractors/air exchange system to the front of the property – she also listed all the reasons why it would be inappropriate to the residents for the vents/air exchange systems to be at the back.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cowshed are blatantly flouting the planning decisions previously put in place to protect the residents' lives in the building. Cowshed told us (in writing) that the liquor license was purely so their clients having treatments could have a glass of champagne to accompany their treatment. It is now clear to me that the spa is incidental to the ever growing café. • When permission was granted by Camden Planning office for the change of use from A1 to café /spa, it was done so on the basis that several things were adhered to including; keeping the windows at the rear of the building sealed shut – Cowshed constantly flout this condition of the change of use; from 8am to 9pm every single day including weekends, my quiet enjoyment of my property and garden has been ruined as a consequence and I am under stress from the constant café sound track to my life, the constant clinking of cups and saucers, the sound of dish washers being filled and emptied, the conversations of the staff are completely audible as if they were in my own back garden. The window they keep open against planning instructions means that smells and noises are constant all week and all weekend and if the vents/air exchange system are allowed the noises and smells will be even worse. • When Cowshed first switched the vents/air exchange on, I couldn't believe the level of noise – if those vents/air exchange system are allowed to be turned back on again, the constant hum which seems to be at a frequency that drives me insane could ultimately force me out of my home. When the vents/air exchange system are on I find myself staying inside my flat and shutting all the doors and windows to try to escape the noise without success. Please do not let this café and its extraction fans be the sound track to my life – my home was peaceful and stress free for the ten years before Cowshed arrived. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I also object to the extraction fans/air exchange system on the basis that when they were operating my son and I suffered what I can only describe as allergies, sneezing, coughing, running eyes, stuffy

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

nose, runny nose – so not only are the extractors/air exchange system noisy, I believe they dump allergens and pollutants and food smells into my garden and into my living room which is directly opposite the vents/air exchange systems and kitchen windows. I would quite happily submit to allergy tests for myself should you wish to witness or corroborate my claim. I also kept smelling what I thought were phantom smells in my living room, when I opened my window to let fresh air in, it was apparent the smell was coming from the direction of the extractors.

I listened one evening recently (from the comfort of my sofa) when Cowshed employed people with microphones to hang them out the back of the building. If you listen to the wild track of their recording without the vents/air exchange system on you will see just how quiet the area is. As soon as they put their vent/extractor/air exchange system on level one the peace is disrupted, my heart sank the more they cranked up the extraction. I listened to the men as they joked about how they had to go and “write a good report”.

I must admit to finding this his whole situation extremely stressful and upsetting I look forward to hopefully putting the matter rest so we can all get back to enjoying our lives at the Chesterfields. Thank you for taking the time to read my objection.

Yours faithfully

2014/4681/P Helen Mildmay-White Flat 9 Chestrfield House 1b King Henry's Road NW3 3QP 07/08/2014 10:45:14 OBJ

My balcony overlooks the site, and I can see clearly that these are not vents, they look like industrial extractor units. I am very concerned that the extractor units will create noise and unpleasant smells that will destroy the tranquility of the quiet area that my balcony overlooks and seriously reduce the enjoyment that I get from using my balcony or having the balcony windows open. This was certainly the case when the extractor fans were in use not long ago, the noise and smells of cooking were intolerable. As my flat is above the extractors the smells rise up and are particularly bad, and the noise seems to be amplified by the walls surrounding the area.

The cafe is open all day and into the evening so there is never a time when this would not be the case and not have an adverse effect on those of us in The Chesterfields whose flats overlook the back area.

I also fear that this will be very off-putting to potential buyers or renters that I might have for my flat who will also be concerned about noise and smells in what is primarily a residential area, and a conservation area.

I am confused as to why these extractor units were ever installed at the back of the property in the first place, as in their planning application Cowshed said that they would be installed at the front, and that they would be serving cold and reheated food, and would primarily be a spa and not a restaurant. This no longer seems to be the case as the cafe is busy all day long serving hot food, and the spa and shop seems to now be a secondary element to the cafe.

I can't see any way that these extractor units will not have an adverse effect on the lives of us whose properties overlook them, and on the value of our properties, and I cannot object strongly enough to this proposal.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Phil Cowan	Flat One 2 Albert Terrace London NW1 7SU	06/08/2014 23:57:56	OBJ	<p>I object to the planning application 2013/4681/P on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The terminology in the application is misleading. It states that the installation of the machinery is to provide extraction and intake of air to the site when in fact the primary function is the extraction of unpleasant cooking odours.2. The area to which these odours will be released is a very enclosed and tall interior corner full of windows and balconies servicing many residential units. There is simply nowhere for the resulting odours to go other than into these flats resulting in a very detrimental effect on amenity.3. The constricted nature of the site also restricts the possibility of noise from the machinery dissipating and would in fact amplify the problem.4. Historically and contrary to the statement of the applicant the type of machinery described has never previously been installed or operated on the site. I was the previous leaseholder of the property from 2002 til 2013 and can catagorically state that there were never any vents or extractors situated or operated at the rear of the building during that time for the simple reason that they would have caused extreme loss of amenity to the rest of the occupants of the Chesterfields. <p>I would strongly urge that for the reasons stated and the disingenuous nature of the applicant's claims that the application be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	mark Scantlebury	14 chesterfield house 1b king henrys road nw3 3qp	05/08/2014 18:29:33	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to object to the planning permission</p> <p>The two units in question are not “vents” and are not pre-existing and for cowshed/firstplan/ Michael citron to call them air circulation units is at best stretching the truth. They are new extractor units that were originally installed without planning permission at the start of this year. They take dirty air out of the Café/ Spa and they dump it a couple of feet from our homes. If you are in any doubt please check the serial numbers, makes of the units as well as the new brick work around the units. I would urge you to contact the previous tenants- lost in beauty, boom interiors so you can corroborate this- noting the man who ran the art gallery, the final business is the current landlord Michael Citron</p> <p>Tanya Nathan from cowshed gave us a written assurance these units would not be installed. In September 2013 She wrote:</p> <p>Noise & smell/AC:</p> <p>Aware of the issues surrounding the disturbance that the units could cause at the rear of the building, our plans have incorporated an AC system that provides for the site by allowing for a plant cavity which leads to small air vents at the pavement level at the front of the site.</p> <p>Our café concept will not involve ‘cooking’ on a commercial scale – more food preparation - and therefore will not require an extract, just a domestic hood, and should not generate any unpleasant smells. As mentioned in my previous correspondence, we have a very similar set up in our W10 Cowshed location (opened 2005) which operates a café/spa and we have not had any smell or noise issues.</p> <p>She confirmed in this email that there would not be an “extract” and that there would be no units to the rear of the building. Hence in good faith none of the residents objected to the business.</p> <p>The two illegally installed units are one of their many breaches of planning law.</p> <p>Since they moved in they have ignored a condition of their planning (ref 2006/0277/P) which stated " The windows in the rear elevation at ground floor level shall be obscurely glazed and non openable and shall be retained permanently like so for the duration of the use hereby approved“</p> <p>They’ve forced open the windows, left them open constantly and positioned their kitchen behind them. It's been a nightmare.</p> <p>The Landlord of cowshed is also the landlord of “the little one” café in the same building. They are operating outside seating without the necessary planning permission and as I understand it the conservation area advisory committee have had to use enforcement on cowshed already this year.</p> <p>Cowshed, firstplan and Micheal Citron have an established pattern of build first and hope to get away with it later.</p> <p>Further more:</p> <p>These units are within a few feet of our neighbours home and a couple of yards from ours and other neighbours. They’ve had them running and the smell was revolting and the noise intolerable and could be heard and smelt not just in our garden but in our home as well. We have to know keep our windows permanently closed. The units are out of keeping with the conservation area at the back of the Chesterfields and the noise and smell has a detrimental affect on the lives of all the residents.</p> <p>Cowshed are now preparing and serving food on an industrial scale. Hence these units are being used to disperse the unpleasant cooking/ chemical smells from their spa into the residential area at the back of the chesterfields. This contradicts another written assurance by Tanya Nathan from Cowshed. She said:</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4681/P	Dr Catherine Horwood Barwise	6 Emerald House 1c King Henry's Road London NW3 3QP	06/08/2014 14:18:06	OBJ	<p>I really should stress that the main element of our proposal for the site is a spa, with its retail, and the café is an added element. The food preparation will simple i.e. sandwiches, warming of soup, pastries etc.</p> <p>There really should be no direct impact to the rear of the building from our operation, and the fact that this is predominantly a spa concept means that the natural atmosphere of the venue will be a calm and relatively quiet one.</p> <p>The spurious engineers report commissioned by Cowshed/ the landlord on their behalf is not independent, but is being used as a way to creep into the conservation/ residential area at the rear of the chesterfields and it is unilaterally setting what they consider to be an acceptable DB level. An acceptable level is subjective. The “report” doesn’t take into account the relentless barrage of unpleasant noise and cooking/ chemical smells 7 days a week, 12 hours a day. The noise reduction measures they are suggesting are negligible and pointless.</p> <p>Finally it has been an absolute nightmare having cowshed as our new neighbours from hell. They repeatedly flout valid planning laws- these extractors/ air circulation system/ vents is just one further example. They refuse to engage with us over these and other breaches of planning permission. They are using “retrospective planning permission” as a way around the planning law. The smells and noise these units produce are anti social, we know they are because we experience it when they have them on. We have endured 6 months of hell from this business and their landlord I would ask once and for all that Camden council planning department crack down on Cowshed and the landlord Michael Citron and to block this further infringement on our homes and let our lives go back to normal. I am happy to forward to camden all correspondence between us and cowsheds Tanya Nathan</p>
2014/4681/P	Michael Citron	Penthouse A The Chesterfields 1b King Henry's Rd London NW3 3QP	08/08/2014 15:32:55	INT	<p>I have NO objection to the installation of the unobtrusive vents at the rear of the property. The Cowshed has been a great enhancement to the street and have conducted themselves in a most professional manner</p>