Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3936/P	James Fox	15/11/2021 19:57:01	OBJ	Following up to my previous objection, 1. I have made various requests, and tried to track down Camden Council's policy, about Kitchen Extractors, plant and machinery. 2. As I'm not able to find Camden Council's policy, I have found London Borough of Islington for noise emissions of new kitchen extracting system installation is as follows: "The proposed plant and machinery shall be operated so as to ensure that any noise generated is ¿not audible¿ outside the nearest residential premises. To demonstrate inaudibility, you will need to provide calculations that show that the plant noise level is 10dBA below the lowest background level (LA90 (15minutes)) 1m from the nearest residential window, over the proposed operating hours. Tonality must also be taken into consideration. 3. The 2x supersize air con units, and loud kitchen extractor - 3 loud sources of noise, is *NOT* 10dBA below lowest background level. 4. The units are directly outside my bedroom window, and they are switched on 3am, 5am, 6am, and 7am in then morning, causing significant disturbance and distress, causing me to wake up, whilst sleeping. They need to remove these units, and put them elsewhere. 5. The Daikin air website , SkyAir catalogue lists the noise as being between 66dBA and 70dBA per unit - there are 2x (two units) plus the noise from the kitchen extractor. I measure the noise to be 80dBC when all units are running together. Even if you discount my measurements, the spec sheet shows how loud the units are. The previous noise report numbers don't add up. http://www.daikintech.co.uk/Data/Split-Sky-Air-Outdoor/RXM/2019/RXM-71N2V1B_Databook_EEDEN19.pdf and https://www.daikin.eu/content/dam/document-library/catalogues/ac/sky-air/Sky%20Air_Product%20catalogue_for%20professional%20network_ECPEN18-100_English.pdf

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3936/P	James Fox	16/11/2021 23:16:48	OBJ	1. I live directly above the premises, and already made objections. The applicant has added further documents, about the kitchen extractor. 2. From national planning guidelines it says: " Discharge the extracted air not less than 1 m above the roof ridge of any building within 20 m of the building housing the commercial kitchen" "A stack should be positioned to be as far as possible from the nearest residential accommodation." "A stack discharging into a semi-enclosed area such as a courtyard or the area between back additions should be avoided." I have included more details at the end. 3. Horizonal release from the extraction system at first floor level is a prime example of poorly designed discharge from a commercial kitchen, see photo https://i.imgur.com/Bx4OOnj.png and see photo of a well designed system https://i.imgur.com/ZR2ZVhJ.png 4. I've gone through the newly added report and what they have installed is *not* working to stop the odour. I can smell everything they cook, burgers, chips, bacon, sausages, hash browns, and it's especially bad on weekends, wind direction and hot weather. Frying a few bits of bacon, as pictured, is not a good sniff test. 5. Even if they install a pipe, 1st floor level, then you are now pumping all the fumes into the 6 residents that live at 9 Pratt Mews, London NW1 0AD and they should be asked if they want to be put at risk, from catching cancer from this selfish restaurant who doesn't want to install a "Recirculation' System". 6. They should do an emissions test, similar to what is used for MOT, as there are hidden toxic chemicals being pumped out, this can lead to Lung problems, reduced lung capacity , Asthma cancer, headaches, and neurological issues. Some chemicals pumped into my bedroom, all day, and night would be Carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, formaldehyde , acrolein , acetaldehyde and particulate matter (not picked up on a sniff test). 7. These fumes are like breathing in 2nd hand cigarette smoke, or sitting next to an car/lorry exhaust pipe. Seriously distressing, harmful, and should *NOT* be allowed. Does not follow any logic or national planning, as above, and at the end of this email. I am badly affected by all this noise and odour pollution, preventing peaceful enjoyment of my property. 8. It's like they installed it in 2019, and then never changed the filters or installed any filters. The report doesn't mention anything about changing filters every 3 to 6 months, cleaning or servicing the unit etc. And from the smells, it's *not* working properly.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

9. The fumes are disgusting they should move to a "Recirculation' System" like all the other shops in Camden.

10.
Inadequate height of the discharge stack is one of the main reasons the emissions from a kitchen gives rise to odour nuisance. The stack design is paramount to achieving good dispersion. Good stack dispersion requires:

· The effective stack height (discharge height plus plume rise) must be high enough to ensure that adequate dilution takes place before the plume interacts with a receptor.

· Discharge velocity influences the plume rise and therefore the effective stack height. The effective stack height can be estimated from:

AH = 3W.d/U

where,

W (m/s) is the efflux speed at the chimney top

U (m/s) is the wind speed at the height of the stack

d (m) is the internal diameter of the stack

Ideally W/IJ should be greater than 4. If W/V is less than 1.5, then down wash will occur resulting in a reduced effective stack height.

· The discharge to be outside the wake of nearby buildings. Discharging ventilation air below a roof ridge may result in excessive entrainment within building down wash. In certain situations, the use of high velocity discharge systems can force the discharging plume out of the building wake.

· The flow to be unimpeded. Cowls can increase the static pressure, noise, potential down draught and risk of re-entry of the exhaust back into the building. Alternative stack terminals are available and include:

· terminals without integral drains e.g. reducing cone, solid top cones; and

· terminals with integral drains e.g. open top cone and drain, induction types and sleeve type.

· Straight and vertical discharge.

11. Guidance on stack requirements for commercial kitchens varies between Local Authorities. The range of guidance issued by Local Authorities is summarised below:

· Guidance on the minimum stack height ranges from:

· 1 m above the eaves of the premises and/or above any dormer window;

· 1 m above ridge height of any building within 15 m; and

· low level discharge should be avoided.

· The height of external ground level should be taken into account when setting stack height. This is particularly important on rising ground where houses may be located above the discharge.

· A stack should be positioned to be as far as possible from the nearest residential accommodation.

· A stack discharging into a semi-enclosed area such as a courtyard or the area between back additions should be avoided.

· Use of Chinaman's hats or other cowls is not recommended.

· The prevailing wind direction should also be considered in the ducting positioning.

· The ducting should be rigid in construction and resiliently mounted.

· Large section ducts may need bracing or stiffeners to prevent drumming. In certain instances restriction on stack height might arise, for example: