

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1462/P	[REDACTED]	15/06/2020 23:50:45	OBJ	<p>I am disappointed to have to respond to this matter as an objection to an application for retrospective planning consent for plant installed unlawfully. The applicant is a commercial property group of companies of significant size with considerable management experience. Neighbouring residents' concerns ought to have been addressed at the outset - when attempts were made to discuss in good faith with directors of Tish restaurant and its parent company.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The original consent under 2018/4042/P provided for unobtrusive location of plant within a natural recess created by varying heights of the rear roofline, and against the rear walls in a manner that would not harm the visual amenity of flats located above the subject premises. The HVAC condensers were to be further shielded visually and acoustically by an acoustic enclosure and the (filtered, treated and attenuated) extract exhaust was to exit at a right angle away from the rear elevation of the flats above (see drawing 125815-PL-EL-02). This arrangement broadly followed the way plant is organised for the other two significant restaurant premises within the commercial parade, namely GBK and Pizza Express, and was unobjectionable. 2. It is unclear and therefore unjustified (beyond a vague statement that this is to 'rationalise the previously consented plant, and to maintain the operational efficiency of the kitchen') why what has been built deviated from the consented arrangement, and (specifically) why connections could not have been made internally to the existing already expanded equipment. Thus removing the need for the additional external equipment entirely. We would therefore urge the Council to refuse permission and take enforcement action unless proper justification is forthcoming. 3. In Savills covering letter dated 24 March 2020 on behalf of the applicant, it is claimed that the plant unlawfully installed is not more visually intrusive than that previously consented. This is manifestly untrue. I am unable to attach a photograph to this online comment, but will submit separately by email. The plant, rather than being hidden by the proximity to the rear of the building, by a natural change of level, and by specific enclosure, is now smack bang in the middle of what anyone looking out from the flats will see. And is of a completely different character to all surroundings - seemingly like an escapee from the Centre Pompidou, but without the architectural merit. Visual shielding, at the very least, is essential in this predominantly residential area. 4. It is further claimed that there will be no detrimental noise impact. In this instance, due to the unlawful installation prior to consent being obtained, we have been able to observe (and listen to) the plant in operation, and can assure Camden Council that this assertion is incorrect. An irritating whine, amongst other tones, is emitted. 5. Finally, the unlawfully installed extract plant has vent terminals parallel to the rear elevation of the flats in Allingham Court. Treatment and filtration appear to be negligible compared to the main, consented, extract terminal vent. This is much more likely to cause odours and/or smoke to collect against the rear where there are many domestic windows, further harming the amenity of residential occupiers. Again, at the very least, these terminals should face away from the building. <p>For these reasons I request that the application is refused and that enforcement action is taken to bring Tish into compliance with the existing planning permission.</p>