

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/3793/P	Ricci Freitas	06/09/2019 15:31:00	OBJ	<p>Re: Applications 2019/4304/A and 2019/3793/P</p> <p>I wish to object to the above two applications relating to the ground floor, commercial premises at 87-89 Marchmont Street.</p> <p>Firstly, despite the confident claim by the applicant's agent that this is a 'permitted development', i.e. not requiring a change of use permit, I believe that the proposed new business constitutes a change of use from the existing shop, as it is clearly intended to be a restaurant, with an inevitable take-away component requiring an A5 permit.</p> <p>The planning application will not comply with Camden's Planning Guidance – CPG Town Centres and Retail, March 2018, which does not permit food and drink uses in premises larger than 100 square metres (these premises were described as being 201.24 square metres in the most recent planning application). It also fails to comply with the regulation restricting food uses to 25% of the total commercial premises in the Neighbourhood Shopping Centre. It will also bring about three consecutive food outlets, when a maximum of 2 in a row is permitted.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the possibility of litter caused by take-away cartons, the potential detrimental effect on residential amenity which might arise from late opening hours, the potential use of the private forecourt for tables and chairs, light nuisance from illuminated signs and digital screen, noise and pollution from delivery trucks and home delivery scooters. The proposed intermittent lighting on the window advert/display is expressly forbidden within the conservation area, and the opaque window treatment impacts on community safety, despite the applicant's inexplicable claim to the contrary. I am also concerned about the potential increase in deliveries by large food vehicles with noisy fridge motors (already a serious problem along the street), and home delivery motor scooters coming and going from the premises in what is primarily a residential street.</p> <p>I share the concerns of residents living above the premises, who have apparently not been consulted by the applicant about these proposals, about the possibility of cooking being undertaken on site, with no extraction or ventilation, and no indication of acoustic or fire separation between the commercial premises and the residential units. This is all the more disappointing because the applicant is proposing to change the front door to the residential parts.</p> <p>Although not strictly a planning consideration, we should be concerned about an international restaurant chain encroaching on our largely independent retail centre, with only the Costa Coffee franchise breaking the mould a few years ago.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that the proposal might bring about improvements to existing shop front, with its over-sized fascia sign and cluttered windows, I see this as a missed opportunity to restore the elegance of the original Edwardian shop front, with its large windows, stall-risers and appropriate signage.</p>