

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3277/P	G Arnott	17/09/2020 16:43:49	OBJ	Application 29 Tottenham St. 2020/3277/P

I wish to object to the application on the grounds that it will cause a severe negative impact on the amenity of our property through odour and noise.

I live at 31a Tottenham Street, directly next door to 29 Tottenham Street. Some four years back (2016), the restaurant at 29 Tottenham Street made significant alterations to the extract system without planning permission – we have had severe odour and noise problems since then. Council Officers for Environmental Health (Georgina Seraphim) and Planning (John Sheehy) visited in March (2020) and, I understand, investigated and concluded there was a severe problem and, accordingly, took immediate action.

The new extract system proposed does not appear to be a significant improvement on the one that was deemed to be entirely unsuitable.

Positioning of flue (extract duct):

I note that the existing drawings are inaccurate and misleading. They show the existing flue lower and further to the left than it actually is; in reality, it is positioned above their rear terrace brickwork and not below as shown.

The proposed drawings reposition the flue considerably to the left; moving it to the left (albeit minimally higher) brings the distance from the top of the flue closer to us, which will worsen the impact on us (a marked-up photo showing these positions has already been sent to the Planning Officer Nathaniel Young for reference).

The submitted drawings do not indicate in which direction the flue vents. I recall John Sheehy saying that a new extract should vent vertically (upwards), however, there is nothing in the application to ensure this.

The application's Design and Access Statement refers to the proposal sharing strong similarities to the approved extract duct and ventilation system at 70 Charlotte Street. However, 70 Charlotte Street's extract duct follows the roof profile at an angle to the apex of the roof whereas 29 Tottenham Street's proposed extract does not.

Odour Mitigation:

The application does not address how they will deal with the odour, our biggest problem. I note that DEFRA guidance for a new extract requires: Odour – Submission of an approved scheme for odour control. I see no such submission in their application.

They have listed various pieces of equipment, but given no assessment of how these will mitigate the odour that could still emit from the flue.

For example, I note that they show a 'gigabox fan'. This appears identical to the one they had and were required to remove; in fact, the internal fan mechanism of the recently removed system appears to have been retained on site and not disposed of. It will not improve matters reinstating what was already proved to be a problematic system.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Noise Mitigation:

The noise report used in the application contains anomalies.

### 3.0 Results

They have used the opening hours as 07:00 to 23:00 and 23:00 as a worse-case scenario. However, the premises have a late-night refreshment licence for:

23:00-00:30 Monday to Saturday

23:00-00:00 Sunday, Christmas Day and Good Friday.

The previous restaurant did, in fact, have the extract running much later than 23:00 and, I understand, any subsequent restaurant is entitled to do so. So, to use their own criteria, the worse-case scenario for the reading should be 00:30.

### 2.2 Measurement Location & 4.0 Criteria:

The report states: Additionally, there are several other restaurants in the area which back onto the rear of this restaurant with a large amount of building services plant, although this was not noted to be operating during the survey.

Additionally: They have asked to relax Camden's standard criteria by 5dB due to Covid-19.

The adjacent café/food establishments (27 Tottenham St & 69 Charlotte St) have never opened late in the evening and the other nearby restaurants they refer backing onto (67 Charlotte St & 57 Charlotte St) closed down entirely last year (one more than a year before lockdown), so have no active plant, even outside lockdown.

Late evening, I would expect there would be no plant noise from offices (even pre/post Covid-19). Therefore, I see no impact on the ambient noise for the purposes of this report from Covid-19.

### 2.1 General

The assessment was made Monday 18th May to Wednesday 20th May 2020.

I recall that an unusual occurrence might have occurred over these dates: loud music through the evenings. On one of the evenings I met a neighbour who was also concerned about the noise; we ascertained this was probably coming from the rear of 29 Tottenham St or thereabouts. My neighbour rang the doorbell of 29 Tottenham St to ask them to turn the music down. This music might have caused anomalies in the assessment of the existing ambient noise.

In summary:

I object on the grounds that our property would suffer a severe loss of amenity from the application.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Flue position: The proposed flue position worsens a situation that has already been deemed unacceptable and should not be shifted closer to our property.

Odour: No approved scheme for odour control has been submitted and there are no indications the new extract will improve what has already been deemed as unacceptable.

Noise: The noise report should take into account the points I have indicated.

It has already been established that the extract from 29 Tottenham Street has given us severe odour and noise problems – to the extent that we have not been able to open the windows to our living spaces or use our outside terrace when the restaurant is open. I had hoped to see an application that would address these issues, but this does not and could potential worsen the situation. I am happy to support an amended application that addresses these issues satisfactorily.

---