

From: Avril Nakouzi [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2015 15:34
To: Planning
Cc: Chivers, Jennifer
Subject: Fwd: PLANNING APPLICATION 2015/3447/P

>
>
>
> To The Planning Department,
>
>
> **Re: NOTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF REVISED OR AMENDED PLANS FOR AN APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED WORKS OR DEVELOPMENT**
>
>
> As we have no detailed information from the applicant we can only respond on what has been submitted.
>
> To replace a solid functional fire door (much needed in the case of the proposed business with floating debris and large machinery) with a small version of our front doors with added open grills and a duct at the top to let out or take air in.
>
> **OBJECTION**
>
> The applicant has already been told that they cannot use our private area as any aid to their extraction units. Either to take air in or let debris out. We do not want hair, dander, noise and smells in our entrance/garden/lane area.
>
> Should their large intended machines fail in any way and together with the heavy use of the grooming parlour 7 days a week it is inevitable this will happen.
> We have also been told by technical directors of 4 large extraction unit companies (names available on request) that it would be impossible to guarantee 100% efficient performance of any sort of equipment of this sort.
>
> There will be continual seepage polluting our private area.
> We are now being threatened with pollution, noise and smells at the front and the rear of the shop.
>
> **OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THE APPLICATION**
>
> None of the applicants existing 3 Barkers shops are beneath or near residents so a comparison cannot be made.
> It is not acceptable to conduct a dog grooming business beneath residents per se, especially as there are two whose lives would be threatened by exposure to animal dander.
>

From: Elizabeth Boyd [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2015 20:29
To: Planning
Subject: 57 South End Road NW3 2QB

For attention of Jennifer Chivers

Application ref: 2015/3447/P

I object most strongly to the application from Pets At Home to introducing vents to the rear door of the shop - 57 South End Road. As you know this shop unit forms part of a residential block of flats - Wentworth Mansions. These proposed vents would vent directly into the private gardens of Wentworth Mansions which are owned and used by the residents for relaxation. A number of residents have medical problems affecting their lungs and breathing so adding dangerous emissions into the atmosphere would make these conditions worse.

I understand that Pets At Home do not have any of their dog grooming shops situated within a residential block of flats so why do they continue with 57 South End Road when they are aware of the many objections from the residents of Wentworth Mansions and others.

Yours sincerely
Elizabeth Boyd

Sent from my iPad

From: John Mackrell [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2015 23:49
To: Planning; Avril Nakouzi; John Waite; Susan Brandt
Subject: Application no 2015/3447/p

At Wentworth Mansions, we are surprised that Camden Council is still entertaining the noxious project for a dog-grooming business below us on South End Road.

A world-reputed expert on dander and its often catastrophic effect on asthmatics, some of whom live above the proposed shop, has expressed his concern. Are we to understand that you have consulted other medical experts, who favour the venture?. If so, please name them.

There are many other grounds on which we disapprove of the establishment of the dog-grooming business. For instance

1. The poor reputation of the firm, as exposed on television
2. The firm's employment of unqualified staff, who might well have no understanding of the risks they are taking.

Yours sincerely,

Dr John Mackrell