

From: [Redacted text]
Sent: 26 August 2022 15:30
To: Pickup, Tina
Subject: Comments for Planning Application APP/22/00332

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Dear Tina,

Thank you for the update and the revised "Cooking Processes" document.

I need to report that the smells relating to cooking are becoming stronger and more frequent in Frobisher Gardens, and the side window to the cafe remains open at all times during cafe opening hours (as I reported previously). This means there is an output of cooking smells from the side of the cafe, even though the planning application states that all odours/extraction will be to the front of the building. The window being open is, therefore, contradictory to the application.

I have reviewed the updated document relating to cooking processes at Cross Kitchen and need to say that it has not reduced my concerns in any way. There is a very clear statement in the document that menu items are cooked by a variety of methods - including "sautéed". As you know, the definition of sauté is: "**to fry food** in a small amount of fat....." (i.e., not deep-frying). Therefore, it is not correct for the planning application to make a statement that "No frying or deep frying takes place within Cross Kitchen or ever has.....". This is a massive contradiction and it is very clear that frying is now actually happening - even though there is not permission to do so. I am not clear how this can be monitored by HBC, but this practice should be stopped (perhaps in an attempt to reduce the food odours now affecting neighbouring properties). I would be concerned now if the "Cooking Processes" document was updated, re-submitted or superseded with the word "sautéed" removed - the applicant has clearly admitted that such frying is happening as part of their standard menu.

Another concern is the fact that there is a griddle in the kitchen - it makes no sense to me why it would be necessary to install a griddle if it was not to be used for cooking. This does not appear to be an economic method only to ".....keep sauces at safe temperatures....". It would appear only a matter of time before the griddle is used to cook food - and that, essentially, would become another form of frying. You will note from point number 4, under "Operation" in the user guide for the griddle, that it states "Check levels in the fat drawer regularly. Do not let it overflow." This would only be necessary if there was fat involved in the heating of the griddle (or cooking on the griddle), which, in effect, makes it a frying device. If there is a requirement to check the levels of fat, that would imply that even if the griddle is being used only to ".....keep sauces at a safe temperature...." that there would be some requirement to heat fat

I am also concerned that, to my knowledge, Cross Kitchen only have permission for domestic cooking appliances. On reviewing the supplier details for the Silverlink 600 Griddle, it is clearly defined as "catering" equipment, with the supplier's website stating that the griddle is "....perfect for cafes, pubs and restaurants.....". This would appear to be outside of the previously agreed cooking restrictions for the cafe.

I strongly object to this planning application on the basis of my previous comments, and the comments (above) that are reinforced by the latest feedback from Cross Kitchen to try to support their application.

Many thanks,
[Redacted text]