

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3907/P	Kate Harrington	6 North Mews London we1n 2.jp	22/09/2015 10:29:13	COMMENT	While I support the application, I would like approval to be conditional on the works being completed within a reasonable time (say, 3 months) and subject to consequences (such as suspension of licence) if the conditions are not met. I live at 6 North Mews, one of the row of residential properties that back on to 73 Gray's Inn Road. My ground floor bedroom window diagonally adjoins 73 Gray's Inn Road and is less than 10 metres from the noisy flue and air conditioning units. Both the noise and the vibrations are disruptive and make that bedroom uncomfortable. In addition to the formal enforcement action, I have visited Gibo Café on several occasions to see what is being done about the persistent and disruption noise at the back. While I am delighted that something is at last being done about this situation, I'm conscious that the nuisance has been outstanding since 2004. Given that, I would like approval to be conditional on the works being completed within a reasonable time and subject to consequences if the conditions are not met.

Application No: 2015/3907/P	Consultees Name: Neil Seagers	Consultees Addr: 	Received: 22/09/2015 14:17:47	Comment: SUPC	Response: I agree with the basic principles of this application. However, there are a few caveats.
---------------------------------------	---	--	---	-------------------------	--

The landlord of this building has shown scant regard for adhering to any regulations. The first application for installation of machinery some 10 years ago was made retrospectively after we had to endure this plant that was illegally installed. In fact the original requirements of this approval were never complied with and the units have been operating illegally for the past 10 years. This current application is similarly retrospective in nature. The equipment was significantly upgraded and no pre authorisation was sought. It has taken a concerted campaign of some years to come to this point where we have the opportunity to comment on this installation. This seems to have been brought about by the new tenants who have some understanding of the nuisance they are causing. The landlord let the premises with no indication of the issues that were outstanding.

The acoustic engineers report is noted and this sets out the issues clearly. However, this report significantly underplays the level of residential dwellings that surround this machinery. It makes a comment about the nearest dwelling being 10 metres away and the next nearest 20 metres. This is not true. The nearest dwellings to this machinery are probably 2 metres away in the apartments on the first and second floors of this building. the houses and flats opposite are likely to be about 5 metres away on the opposite side of the void. All the properties that surround these units are residential from the first floor up and it is the roof of the ground floor where the equipment is sited. There is just one building which has office premises at these levels, which is some way down the road. The site is actually variously 3,4 or 5 storeys and is completely enclosed on all four sides by residential buildings. This makes the acoustics in the void very complex. Small sounds travel the length and breadth of the void and are echoed and amplified at various levels.

At the moment the only people who are probably not impacted or offended by this machinery are the operators themselves. It is located on their roof, where they have no access, out of their earshot, so they are completely unaware of its impact.

The recommendation to install extraction machinery inside their premises is, in my view, the correct solution. Thereby limiting all noise interference to inside their premises. I

In my view the Air Conditioning units should also be installed inside their premises or vent out onto Gray's Inn Road. By doing this it ensures that is no interference or nuisance to the surrounding properties at the rear. There is discussion about location of the extraction vents for the AC units away from the premises. In view of the fact that these units are completely surrounded by residential premises, I cannot imagine that there is any ideal direction for these units to vent. This is an additional reason for these to vent into Gray's Inn Road.

The other issue which has not been dealt with in this application is the issue of cooking fumes. At the moment they vent at roof level but fall back into the void and hang around as the ventilation there is not sufficient air movement to move them. In my view the ventilation stack should extend well over the roof of the property and vent eastwards into Gray's Inn Road where it will cause less offence.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3907P	SATHISH IYARPALANI	75 GRAY'S INN ROAD HOLBORN LONDON	25/09/2015 19:40:52	WREP	Lastly there is the issue aesthetics. The rear of our buildings is not the most attractive space but it is significantly worsened by all of this machinery. The previous recommendations to install wooden enclosures on this equipment was ignored. The aesthetics should be taken into account when approving this application. There is a quote that the restaurant wishes to extend the operating hours beyond the current closing time of 17.30. I would strongly object to that. As mentioned earlier, the landlord has no respect for the planning regulations for this property. I would request that if these conditions are approved and imposed then Camden Council is robust in ensuring strict adherence to the conditions. It is essential that this is signed off at the completion of the works before it is finally approved for operation. I received your letter dated 03 September 2015 on 21 September 2015. I have tried to contact you on 020 7974 3366 since then but the call simply connects to a piece of music and no one ever picks up the phone. I understand that the Applicant has made this application retrospectively, and my representations are made on that basis. The design encourages roosting pigeons adjacent to the windows of 75 Gray's Inn Road (as well as 73 Gray's Inn Road) and is causing / has caused environmental health problems by pigeon droppings on to the walls and into the yard of 75 Gray's Inn Road, and this needs to be addressed urgently. As there are residential flats at 73 Gray's Inn Road near the level of the pigeons roosting on the apparatus, the subject property would also benefit from necessary remedial measures. Some time ago, there were constant complaints of noise nuisance from neighbours in respect of the noise from the extractor fans of the restaurant at 73 Gray's Inn Road, which had been on-going for a considerable period, but in view of the works it is requested that the noise levels be checked by the Council to ensure that the noise emanating from the apparatus - whilst it is operating at different speeds - is within acceptable levels. As regards the emission of the extracted fumes, it is understood that the proposed design provides for these to be emitted in a vertical direction over 73 Gray's Inn Road, whereas the previous contraption had been pointing in the direction of the windows of 75 Gray's Inn Road for many years. Whilst the amendment proposed is welcome, it is requested that the Council check the environmental feasibility of the design by an on-site visit, whilst the apparatus is in operation, in order to ensure regulatory compliance. I would welcome a conversation with Mr Fergus Freeney in relation to the above matters. I confirm that I wish to be notified of the committee date.