
From: Owen Ward [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2022 14:59
To: Miriam Baptist
Cc: Nick Baxter; Planning Planning
Subject: Comments on 2022/0718/P - Franchis

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Miriam,

Thank you for visiting the site with me a few weeks ago. I was unfortunately called away on urgent family business and I am now back catching up with consultation responses.

1. As mentioned on the site, this particular block has borne the brunt of exceptionally poor enforcement action over the past ten years or so. Any existing plant, shopfront alterations, rear alterations, etc are almost all illegal and without any permission. We have been working with Camden's enforcement team to address these concerns and have made about forty separate reports. However, only one has been actioned across 5 years so far. As such, limited weight should be afforded to any precedents set by illegal alterations.
2. As mentioned, the 'Critall' door to the shopfront was considered inappropriate and the applicant agreed to revise the drawings to show a simple glazed door matching the existing shopfront. A traditional-type door should not be used unless the entire shopfront is refurbished to a traditional design.
3. The principal consideration at the rear is likely to be the conflict between preserving neighbouring amenity, and preserving the character/appearance of the conservation area. The rear elevations to these buildings are characterful and mostly well-preserved.
4. The use of the business requires some form of extraction. Without the extraction vent, unacceptable harm would be caused to the residents above and adjacent to the business, by means of cooking smells and fast moving air around windows. The use of the business as a restaurant cannot be controlled due to the current use class schemes.
5. It was my opinion that the size of ventilation duct was excessive. While I believe a large ventilation duct could be accommodated on these rear elevations without causing excessive harm, the duct and associated plant was excessively large.
6. It would be useful if the applicant could justify the required size and type of ventilation system based on the size of the kitchen. As I understand it, ducts can be made as small as about 50mm diameter, the only drawback is that smaller size causes more noise. A balance should be struck between these two considerations.
7. I do not have the necessary expertise or knowledge to comment further, but will be contacting a building services engineer to see what he thinks about it.
8. I also wondered on the site whether the air could be ventilated to the rear of the flat roof of the extension rather than to the top of the terrace itself. I could not see any disadvantage to this approach. This would preserve the rear elevation of the building, and also conduct the air further from habitable spaces.

Owen Ward