I am one of the few respondents to this planning application who lives in close proximity to the property. I have no in principle objection to this venture, and in fact, am, in principle, supportive of it. However, I have reasonable concerns which I have consistently raised, relating to two things:

1. Management of emissions from the kitchen which is being built to serve the proposed café.

2. The effect of basement construction work on a mature Holm oak, the stem of which abuts the perimeter wall of the property.

As background to my current response, the owner’s approach to application for the work on 49 Willow Road has involved submission of 6 separate planning applications over a 24 month period. Most of these applications have requested progressive amendments to previous applications, rather than requesting additions. As such, each successive application requires cross-checking of the new with the prior, involving review of hundreds of pages of supporting documents. This approach by the owners to the planning process is frustrating and difficult for anyone trying to assess a particular application. Notwithstanding this, and the fact that I am time-poor (being the fulltime-working mother of a small child), I have taken the time to raise my concerns on successive these applications and do so again on this current application. Specifically:

1. I understand that the site of the kitchen has now been moved to the rear of the property. However, I cannot see details in the new plans for management of emissions (cooking smoke and odours) from the kitchen. Prior applications, in which the kitchen was located within the original, main building, showed emissions being directed through an existing chimney so that they exited the building at main roof level (above the third floor). This is important because it maximises the likelihood that cooking smoke and odours will disperse effectively.

Is it still intended that emission will be directed through this route? Can details of the planned egress route please be provided as part of the application? If there is to be a change from the previously-described route, can the odour report (still included in the current application but dated March 2019) please be updated accordingly.

In my opinion, given the particular nature of the area behind the property, in terms of space and air currents, there is potential for unacceptable odour due to poor dispersal, and unacceptable noise from fans and vents, if emissions are not directed via the third floor roof area, as previously indicated.

1. Also relating to the proposed new location for the kitchen, the plans show a door from the newly-sited kitchen opening to the rear of the property. Can a planning condition please be included that this door will be kept closed, therefore avoiding escape of kitchen odours and noise into the space to the rear of the property.
2. The current application, as with previous applications, includes a catalog from a company called AVT listing possible fan and vents that could be used to extract cooking odours and smoke. However, no indication is provided on which extraction system will actually be used. Choice of vent and fan has an important impact on potential noise affecting neighbouring residents. Can details please be provided of which vent and fan system will be used?
3. Previous applications specifically stated that the only items that would be cooked in this new kitchen are waffles and pancakes. This is important because, as described in the odour report dated March 2019, this substantially reduces the potential for offensive odours and fumes. The reference to waffles and pancakes does not appear in the current application (other than in the odour report dated 2019). I am not familiar with the procedures which apply in the case of serial different planning applications as have been submitted on this property, and thus I am not clear on whether this omission from the current application means that it would be deemed to no longer apply. For the avoidance of doubt, can the reference to the plan to limit cooking to waffles and pancakes please be specifically included in the current application.
4. The Holm Oak. The Holm Oak is a large mature tree which is growing in the garden of an adjacent property, with its stem abutting the existing extension of 49 Willow. I described in my comments made in Oct/ Nov 2020 to prior application 2020/3681/P, after seeking input from the tree officer of the Heath & Hampstead Society, why this tree is of tremendous value to wildlife and community in Hampstead. The council included a tree protection statement in its response to previous application 2020/3681/P. The tree protection statement stipulates actions to be taken to protect the tree during any construction work, including installation of an impermeable membrane along the boundary with Gardnor House to prevent the leaching of contaminates from the application site.

Rather than an impermeable membrane, the current application proposes use of installation of a cement board and tape structure, to be removed at a certain point.

Could the council please consider whether this will provide adequate protection, in particular whether the reference to cement boards needs to be qualified as impermeable (not all cement board are impermeable, even though they may be described as waterproof). Could the council also consider how appropriate is the plan to remove the cement boards after the cement is judged to be cured?

Thank you.