

The Case Officer
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

8 November 2021

Dear Madam/Sir,

Regularisation Planning Application for Extant Development at LUMI, 82 Camden High Street, London NW1 0LT (Planning Portal Reference PP-10129655)

This letter accompanies submission of an odour impact assessment (ref: 20212483M483C) carried out at the above-referenced site by Compliance 4 Buildings Ltd..

The findings of the report are that the odour exposure of extant (proposed) exhaust ventilation causes only a *'low risk'* and *'slight adverse effect'* to neighbours. The report states this slight adverse effect can be improved on through installation of ducting to disperse extract air further away from the site, specifically eastwards and therefore further away from the flats directly above the application site.

The Applicant presents the case that this preferred slight improvement (or indeed any ducted solution) would not be implementable without causing a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the other residents of the building.



Figure 1. Aerial view of the application site from the north. The affected walls are highlighted red.

Figure 1 shows the rear courtyard, which is hemmed in by the external walls of the site's host building to the southeast (SE) and southwest (SW). To the northeast (NE) and northwest (NW) are boundary walls which terminate at first floor level. The NE and NW walls are not appropriate for routing ducting and are therefore excluded from being considered for external ducting.

The SE and SW walls are also inappropriate for routing external ducting. Both walls have opening windows to habitable rooms. In addition, at the rear of the host building is a private roof terrace at third floor level. Routing ducting along either the SE or SW walls will either impact the visual amenity of the first / second / third floor flats, or the amenity of the third floor roof terrace.

The current proposal presents a '*slight adverse effect*'. Given the very tight site constraints, this is preferred over routing of external ducting, which will demonstrably cause greater visual and odour impact on the building's residents.

We therefore present that the Applicant's current proposal (as installed) for a carbon-filtered wall vent is the least harmful and only practical way of extracting air from the application site.

Yours,

Seb Kouyoumjian

Seb Kouyoumjian BA(Hons) DipArch MA ARB RIBA CEPHD
DIRECTOR

CC Sophie Bowden, Enforcement Officer, LB Camden