

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2020/4399/P | robert mc cracken | 22/11/2020 17:43:58 | OBJNOT | I object and add o my previous cooments that the background noise levels which were used were dominated by traffic but that has lessened now that the streets have been pedestrianized |
| 2020/4399/P | Peter Robson | 22/11/2020 09:55:52 | NOBJ | No objection.... though anything that minimises visually the impact of the ducts would be appreciated such as planting together with noise mitigation measures. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2020/4399/P | Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee) | 22/11/2020 21:39:29 | OBJNOT | <p>Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) would ask the LPA and the applicant to reconsider these proposals. Rather than install a system with extensive exterior elements that can have negative impact on surrounding buildings, on their occupiers and the immediate area (including the Conservation Area), we believe that a recirculating extraction system would be preferable, requiring no equipment to be located outside the building.</p> <p>We give this example of a provider, but there may be newer & better ones available: https://www.premierrestaurantengineering.co.uk/canopyairrecirculationextractor.html</p> <p>-----</p> <p>If the LPA is satisfied that there is no alternative but to install a replacement external extraction system at this site, then CGCA will not maintain its objection in principle. There are elements of the design that we welcome relative to the previous system, such as the ease of access and the smaller rooftop plant.</p> <p>However, we do object to details of the proposals, and ask for conditions to be attached to any consent to protect the occupiers of neighbouring buildings. We suggest some possible text below. It should be borne in mind that the previous occupier of the site, Souk restaurant, caused considerable nuisance to its neighbours over many years from noise and smells produced by the extraction equipment, and that the LPA was unable to enforce against this either under Planning or Environmental Health regimes. It is therefore a matter of some anxiety to neighbouring occupiers that this opportunity is taken to ensure that this never happens again.</p> <p>SUGGESTED CONDITIONS IF CONSENT WERE GRANTED</p> <p>Noise & vibration</p> <p>In addition to the council's usual requirement upon noise levels near to sensitive facades being at least 10dB(A) less than the existing minimum background measurement we ask that "the background noise measurement shall be reassessed prior to installation, and at least every 2 years thereafter".</p> <p>This is because background noise measurement for this application was taken in July 2018, more than 2 years ago. Since then the background noise levels have dropped considerably and we hope will continue to do so. This is not a short-term improvement because of Covid-19, but because traffic reduction measures are being implemented across the Seven Dials area.</p> <p>For example, last week we commented on a nearby application where daytime LA90 was below 50dB(A) out on Mercer street in September 2020 (not during lockdown – see Westminster planning application ref. 20-06543-FULL). Whereas the measurement for this application gives 55dB(A) inside a residential development on Shorts Garden, which should be far quieter.</p> <p>We also ask that, "prior to use, machinery, plant or equipment and ducting at the development shall be mounted with proprietary anti-vibration isolators and fan motors shall be vibration isolated from the casing and adequately silenced and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development".</p> |

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

And that, "after installation, tests shall be carried out to assess noise and vibration levels, to check that the equipment is working as planned".

Maintenance

We ask that, "prior to use of the development, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council, of a suitable cleaning schedule and/or maintenance contract for the intake, extract and odour control systems. Approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained. A maintenance report for the equipment shall be submitted for approval each quarter, and compliance of the same in relation to vibration, odour and noise. Reports shall be made available to the public by the freeholder on request".

The reason for this is that, in our experience, the need to maintain equipment can become a low priority for operators over time. Yet it is always better to prevent problems rather than trying to deal with them for years afterwards. Quarterly checks are the recommended industry standard. Regular cleaning also reduces the risk of fire. Happily, the new access arrangements should make this much easier than before at this site.

Hours of use

We ask that "all equipment shall be turned off outside the hours at which the premises are open to the public, but in any case not to operate outside the time window of 9am to 10pm each day. Equipment shall have an automatic, timed switch to achieve this".

The reason for the timer is that there have been problems in the area with staff leaving equipment on all night. At such hours this area is dead quiet, which means that equipment which passes noise tests at other times becomes a nuisance later, when neighbours are trying to sleep.

Appearance

We ask that "planting shall be added around the rooftop enclosure" to make its appearance more sympathetic to the residential surroundings.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/4399/P | Anja Saunders | 22/11/2020 21:25:51 | COMMNT | <p>This installation needs conditions put on it to minimise noise nuisance and unsightly structures heard and seen in the immediate environment, particularly by residents living nearby.</p> <p>The equipment needs to be enclosed by panels and roof enclosures preferably with green planting to help pollution and provide a natural outlook for residents like myself living on a similar height to the hatches.</p> <p>The whole ventilation system needs to be on a timer so between the hours of 23.00 and 8.00 there is no noise so residents can sleep. There needs to be a noise monitor for the other times.</p> <p>The equipment needs a maintenance schedule and proof of maintenance needs to be able to be produced upon request from affected parties.</p> <p>Smoke should not be emitted from the equipment</p> |
| 2020/4399/P | A T | 22/11/2020 20:34:46 | OBJNOT | <p>I am in favour of improving the look of the enclosure which is currently tatty, but I think the acceptable noise limit is too high in a very quiet, secluded historic area. I rely on opening my windows into the courtyard for ventilation and will be disturbed by the noise, especially at night. The target ambient level is too high for such a quiet residential area, already extremely quiet and even more so now that it is pedestrianised. It should be noted that 4 additional homes have been built into this area, and another two are planned, meaning it is densely populated with small units that rely on windows on this side for ventilation in the summer. If the noise cannot be further attenuated I think there should be a timer preventing the system from being used between 11pm and 8am, as the restaurant does not operate within these hours. This should be achieved by means of a timer, and not on a trust basis, as unfortunately local restaurants have a poor track record of complying with local rules designed to protect residents (cf rubbish room).</p> |
| 2020/4399/P | robert mc cracken | 22/11/2020 17:35:50 | OBJNOT | <p>I object</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The noise will be tonal 2 In practice it will be noticeable especially on my outdoor amenity space which is just above the extractor and in my bedroom if the window is open. 3 The extractor should not be operated between 23.00 and 08.00 4 a condition should require that there be a smoke filter, which is changed regularly 5 A condition should prohibit the emission of visible smoke-- (which from a kitchen tends to have an offensive odour)--which the previous extractor often did 6 A condition should require annual reports by independent monitors that (1) the noise report's predictions are in the vet correct and (2) that the smoke filtering system is functioning properly |