

Further objection to Planning Application - 2020/2367/P by Victoria Stacey

Site Address: Land to the rear of 115-119 Finchley Road London NW3 6HY

I write further to my previous objection following new submissions by Deliveroo.

Deliveroo have produced a summary of their log book including excuses for transgressions of the OMP. There is a high number of incidents to say that much of the time the site was running on reduced trading due to Covid. The reasons behind the breaches are irrelevant. The fact that of the 500 or so logs, that there is such a high number of reportable breaches is relevant:

- 62 delivery breaches
- 82 rider breaches
- of the 46 resident reported complaints, 13 of these incidents were not included in the Deliveroo logs (during a time when most residents would have been housebound more than usual)

All these 95 breaches happened *despite* the OMP having had ample time to bed in.

This document and it's 500 or so entries, is in itself evidence of how the section 106 agreement has been ineffective and, as the inspector stated in her appeal summary, it should not be the burden of the CWG or local residents to monitor transgressions. Each one of these events is evidence of the disruption caused to locals. This is time boxed, has been impacted by Covid and so represents at least a third of the incidents that would be expected over a year.

Sitting on the CWG involves repeatedly explaining the impact of breaches of the OMP and how this has a negative impact on the neighbourhood. Each time Deliveroo attempt to rectify these issues, it seems a new one appears. We have been working together as a group to ensure the effectiveness of the OMP. However, the numbers of issues recorded in the log after the OMP has been embedded for so long is not sustainable, and I fear that if planning permission were granted, the CWG would not be able to help to enforce the OMP and standards would eventually slip to the further detriment of residents.

The claim that the majority of complaints from the public are from a select few local residents is to be expected.

As a member of the CWG I can confirm that the ability to complain against breaches of the OMP is not in the public domain. There is no signage nor explanation that the site is being run under conditions, and that the public can report breaches. The signage itself has often been missing or out of date for the whole time of operation.

What is in the public domain is the Planning application. There are a larger number of objections on the official portal than complainants to the OMP email address. This is because people sign up to local planning notifications but who is going to have read the appeal decision from last year and then located the section 106 agreement and then gone

on to learn of the OMP, to then read that and then find the email address? There has been no publicity of this complaint procedure so it is not going to be well supported locally.

In spite of that, there are still a large number of complaints made by a few people who are doing no more than going about their own business and simply witnessing breaches every time they pass the site. We are not making up deliveries arriving too early or riders cycling on pavements and cutting through children's playgrounds these are well evidenced facts and we want these activities stopped. The 2 residents who live together who are mentioned in the report have only been in London for about 10 days since March and they have still witnessed multiple breaches, all of which have been confirmed by Deliveroo to be genuine breaches of the OMP.

We have not petitioned other residents about Deliveroo as we are not an organisation, we do not have a budget and infinite time on our hands to carry this out. We can't ask people in the same way they can petition their riders. But if Camden were to approach other residents I am sure they would have plenty to say.

Notwithstanding the breaches of the OMP, the industrial plant illegally erected on the building goes against Camden's planning regulations. They are an eyesore and not suitable for that location.

There are frequent cooking smells which cannot be explained by residents cooking or other much smaller businesses. I feel someone putting their nose over a chimney and smelling only a little smell at one point of time (odour report) does not replicate the actual way the air would travel. A little smell dropping down into Dobson Close or rising up to Cresta House (depending on wind direction etc) for hours is like a tap dripping into a plugged sink - eventually the sink will fill. In the same way, these smells from their plant eventually form to be a nuisance.

Finally, in relation to the petition of drivers by Deliveroo and the letters from partners, my objection is to the location of the site, its negative impact on local residents, impact on bus lanes, local road users, and its ugly equipment and smells. If it were to be moved, there would be no loss of employment as they could lift and shift their operation to a more suitable location that is not in the middle of a residential area like this one. Then everyone would have what they wanted, Deliveroo can continue their kitchen, riders and site staff retain their jobs, and residents could have their quiet little neighbourhood and pavements back.

For completeness of evidence I would ask:

Can Deliveroo confirm that both log books have been kept for the entire duration of the section 106 agreement.

Can Deliveroo publish all of the minutes of all of the CWG meetings since the CWG was formed as only one has so far been published.