

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5016/P	Lee Huang	26A Cricklewood Broadway	29/10/2016 13:55:29	OBJ	<p>The first retrospective application for the installation of this plant was turned down previously and quite clearly, this new retrospective application is no different.</p> <p>We were led to believe that after the original application was turned down the Enforcement Department would take over and serve notice on the tenant, instructing them to shut down the machinery, as it was being used illegally. Clearly this has not happened, despite my efforts and as a result, myself and the other residential tenants have had to suffer this machinery running creating the noise and fumes affecting us all for more than six months. This is extremely unfair and unjust.</p> <p>The suggestion that the erection of a timber fence will not stop the noise and the generated fumes going to my kitchen window seven days a week is ridiculous.</p> <p>The simple matter is that an industrial machine of this size and nature is totally unacceptable to be used in a location adjacent to the residential dwellings which surround this area.</p> <p>I would highlight the reasons for my objection to the current retrospective Application No: 2016/5016/P as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Destruction of Amenities: The erection of timber fence dividing the garden will be harmful to the appearance of our building and loss of outlook to the detriment of residential amenity. Furthermore, the entrance to my own property and the amenity space that I have enjoyed for many years will be destroyed. The flower beds will have to be removed to make way for a foot path to my flat entrance. The size of the concrete plinth that this huge machinery sits upon with industrial pipes and cables passing through the rear of our building is extremely unsightly from the alleyway which serves the entrances to all of the flats in this row of properties and more importantly from the windows of the adjacent residential properties affecting, not just mine, but everybody's amenities. This machinery is just one metre away from my kitchen wall and clearly is visible from my window above. This will, in particular, affect the quality of my life and my neighbour next door whose window is in a similar position. The front of our flat is situated on A5, which is a busy road in Cricklewood Broadway with its noise and pollution from the traffic. The rear of these properties by contrast are residential in character and form part of a square with gardens and trees which previously were relatively quiet most times of the day and night. By objecting to this application, we hope to preserve our amenity. At the present time we do not feel confident allowing our children to play in the yard and although the proposal of a fence would make it safe they would no longer have anywhere to play. 2. Noise: Whilst each of the retrospective applications have included documentation supporting the design and noise standards, they do not take into account the reality of the situation. In this particular case, the condenser is used 7 days a week, 24 hours a day and 365 days a year. Whilst it may meet the noise standards for 10 or 20 metres away, clearly the actual noise level it produces is unacceptable due to its immediate location to my property. 3. Fumes: This machine generates hot fumes in the summer and cold fumes in the winter. We have already experienced the hot pungent fumes over this summer and as a result I have had to have my windows at the rear closed during their business hours 7 days a week.

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

This is very unfair as at this time of the year I would have liked to enjoy the fresh air which I am entitled to.

4. Safety:

Unfortunately, at times I have had teenagers and younger children climb over the wall into the yard. Now we have an interesting piece of machinery it is now even more likely to attract them. We are also concerned about the possible fire hazard being so close to the main building and now the additional worry of the suggestion of erecting a combustible timber fence.

Finally, the three properties at 22 - 26 were built as individual units during 1880 to 1890 and were not designed to be open planned together. As a result there has been movement affecting the internal and party walls of my property and no doubt the others adjoining. The construction of the floors are timber so naturally the soundproofing and noise transfer has increased many fold. However, my main concern is that the risk of a fire engulfing the entire building has also increased three fold.

I would be grateful if you take my comments into account, in particular, the affect it has on my personal life and the detriment of residential amenity when considering this retrospective application.

I strongly believe that this application should be refused on the overwhelming basis of this evidence.
