

## **Summary Submission**

### **From: The Residents of Fitzroy Mews**

#### **Introduction**

We have been subject to considerable paperwork from Camden Council and the Applicant, documentation that has been both helpful and confusing, and yet none of the provisions it proposes have been submitted as a revised application.

It is of concern to us that the matters discussed in the numerous and often contradictory documents will be extremely difficult for the Council to either police or impose, to the inevitable and significant disadvantage of neighbouring residents.

We have requested that the Applicant should submit a revised application that captures his true and 'agreed' intentions, but this has not been done.

#### **Primary Matters**

In the application and in subsequent correspondence, five matters in particular have been framed with considerable ambiguity.

#### **1. Permitted Hours and Method of Operation**

The Council and the Applicant have placed much weight on the deemed agreements within the document from Charlotte Street Association (CSA). This document indicates different operating hours to the application but also includes inconsistencies that need to be removed to enable them to be properly enforced.

From this document we would wish the applicant to be subject to the '**Outdoor Areas**' and "**Amended Hours**" sections which provide for:

##### **Internal** opening and operating hours:

Monday to Wednesday 12:00 to 23:00  
Thursday to Saturday 12:00 to 23:30  
Sunday 12:00 to 22:00

##### **External** opening and operating hours:

Monday to Sunday 12:00 to 21:00, with clearance by 21:30.

On all days last orders for food and drink are to be 30 minutes prior to the closing time of both inside and outside areas.

The CSA section 2 "**Amended Hours**" contradicts the "**Outdoor Areas**" section and the CSA "**proposed condition i**". It presently enables extended external operating hours. This should be corrected in favour of the 21:00/21:30 ceasing of all external area operation.

## 2. External Seating

We have previously raised the safety issues and environmental damage that would be the consequence of the proposed extent of on-street dining included in the application. We have also raised the inconsistencies in the capacities being applied for in the Application.

On 12 November 2025, in response to our safety and nuisance concerns, the Applicant wrote to say that his application was yet to be confirmed:

*“Secondly, regarding the **use of the pavement and roadway on Cleveland Street**, we will prepare and provide a **plan showing the exact limits of our external area**, clearly marking the seating layout and boundaries for customers. This will ensure there is no obstruction or encroachment beyond the agreed space.”*

Whatever revised proposals the Applicant intends, none have been advised or included in any formal documentation or a revised application. These should be known and recorded before any permission is granted.

However, even knowing of the Applicant's intentions, the Council seems to only focus on the external seating within the property boundary. We do not consider it appropriate that the Council and Applicant should agree to an operating permission based on a specific maximum capacity and maximum area for external covers, while still allowing consideration of a doubling of that number and tripling of the area by the subsequent addition of a 'streeterie'. Cleveland Street suffers considerably from the use of streeteries, indeed, they have previously been removed from this section of the road as they created a particularly unpleasant and unsafe pavement and road environment. We consider that any agreement to external dining should be an absolute and unchangeable maximum, and that it should be contained within the property boundary.

## 3. Deliveries and Collections

The CSA “**proposed condition j**” on motorbike collections should be included in any permissions and strictly enforceable rather than “*Generally*” and “*whenever possible*”. The location of the single collection point should be defined as directly outside the Cleveland Street restaurant door, and not, as seems to be necessitated in other locations on Cleveland Street, on the yellow lines on the opposite side of the street or in front of adjacent properties, or via the rear Fire Door on Fitzroy Mews. This will much improve street safety and minimise the impact of restaurant noise and groups of smoking riders collecting under resident's windows.

## 4. Rear Exit to Fitzroy Mews

On 16 November 2025, in response to our concerns, the Applicant wrote:

*“As requested, I can confirm that our intended delivery point is solely the main entrance on Cleveland Street. There will be no deliveries through the fire door on Fitzroy Mews under any circumstances. The fire door is for emergency use only and will remain locked and restricted at all times.”*

We would wish to see this agreement formally included in all permissions to operate the restaurant. Fitzroy Mews has previously suffered from supply deliveries, uncollected waste bags, motorbike collections and restaurant ‘ventilation’ through the open fire doors and windows of adjacent restaurants. Apart from the safety issues of a blocked fire exit within the restaurant, these activities have created considerable noise,

disruption and safety issues in the Mews that have taken years to resolve. This should not reoccur with this restaurant for want of a formal provision banning the use of the Fire Exit other than for emergency escape.

The CSA document, in the “**Plan Layout Drawings**” section, appears to tolerate the use of the Fire Door for “*certain deliveries*”, and this should be struck out.

## 5. Restaurant Extractor Fan

The Applicant’s large black restaurant extractor fan ductwork attached to the building facing Fitzroy Mews and climbing almost to the top of the building has been the subject of considerable correspondence over the years. It is poorly fixed to the wall and makes banging noises in the flats, and its outlet is below roof level, being insufficiently high to properly distribute the foul cooking smells that come from it. We consider that the opportunity to permit the operation of the restaurant should take these matters into account and ensure the restaurant’s environmental obligations are fully complied with.

The CSA document, in the “**Kitchen Extract Duct**” section reiterates these concerns, and also raises Town & Country Planning concerns, but no action is proposed.

## Summary Actions

The amount of correspondence on this matter, and the remaining length of this submission, stem entirely from the contradictory claims and ‘agreements’, and the absence of any robust and reasonably enforceable application.

Given our experience with other restaurants and the extreme efforts we are forced to endure to encourage Camden to undertake their duties to protect our environment, we naturally consider it extremely important that any approved application is clearly defined, safe, not excessive, not expandable, and readily enforceable by a Council team that are known to us and will react swiftly and effectively to any reported infraction.

We thank you for your consideration

## From: Residents of Fitzroy Mews

Conor Cassidy	1 Fitzroy Mews
Sigrun Musa	1B Fitzroy Mews
Tony Meadows	1B, 3 and 7 Fitzroy Mews
Trisha Chauhan	3 Fitzroy Mews
Bill Petrie	4 Fitzroy Mews
Joe Hutton	4 Fitzroy Mews
Giada Vercelli	5 Fitzroy Mews
Valerie Deruelle	5 Fitzroy Mews
Alessandro Franchi	5 Glebe House
Lucia Ruggiero	12 Glebe House
Richard Whish	14 Glebe House
Jean Louis Journade	15 Glebe House