

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4822/P	Midge	01/12/2024 09:32:53	COMMNT	The kitchen smell is not being filtered by extractor fans. There are areas of this planning permission that do not meet the necessary approval. We want you to decline the application
2024/4822/P	Gillian Allan	01/12/2024 06:07:14	COMMNT	<p>1. This application is an attempt to seek retrospective planning consent. The comment that an extract system with a vertical, full height extract flue would probably NOT be viewed favourably is an attempt to post rationalise a cheaper solution. There is a full height extraction system at La Collina restaurant at 17 Princess Road.</p> <p>2. The Albert proprietors state that they own the roof on which the extraction fan is placed. This is untrue as the roof is defined as a retained part of the building and as such is owned by the freeholder. There is room to situate the fan within the grounds of the pub.</p> <p>3. The 'upgraded' ventilation system has attempted to deal with the fumes rising up into the apartments by redirecting the outlet down into the courtyard. As well as being unpleasant, making the courtyard unliveable and pushing the fumes into the entry hall, it is also possibly in breach of the Hospitality and Catering Industry code as set out here: 'High-level discharge of extracted air is often needed to prevent nuisance to neighbouring properties. Avoid rain caps and other devices that impede upward vertical velocity. Never use devices that direct the discharge downward as they encourage down draught and re-entry of fumes into the building.'</p> <p>4. There is no noise, vibration and ventilation assessment included in the application which is a council requirement.</p> <p>5. The Albert proprietors have also stated in their application that the hours of opening are irrelevant to this application and the proposal does not involve commercial activities both of which are untrue.</p> <p>6. The extractor fan is switched on well before and and left on after the pubs designated opening hours.</p> <p>7. The planning application that was approved in 2019 placed great emphasis on retaining the garden as a community amenity. The open space of that garden has now disappeared in a clutter of poorly considered wooden structures. These structures also have electric lighting and I think it fair to question if the correct fire prevention protocol was followed. The outdoor area is often crowded with families with children and is a smoking area.</p> <p>8. Although the application covers both the wooden seating booths in the garden as well as the fan, it does not mention the bar which was installed in the garden in June this year.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4822/P	Lorna Fowler	30/11/2024 11:50:28	OBJNOT	<p>I am writing to object most strongly to the Albert's retrospective planning appeal. The illegal changes they have made, while being aware what was permitted, prove that they prioritised their business over rules to protect their neighbours. The seats are permanent, not the moveable type the pandemic permitted and right against neighbours' boundaries, rather than set back 2 metres. The noise in this overcrowded garden is unbelievable. Walk out of my front door, diagonally opposite, and head across the road and one is assailed by noise as soon as one goes down the side of the pub. Walk behind the Albert and it's like being at a football match. For Auden Place residents, the flat dwellers above the pub and neighbouring gardens the noise is unbelievable. I cannot imagine the numbers which must be there. I regularly walk between The Albert and Auden Place to the garden entrance of La Collina. There by contrast, is a large garden filled with tables and scarcely a whisper affects its neighbours.</p> <p>Of course The Albert, which for the 40+ years I've lived here was always, before its closure to be remodelled, a quiet well attended friendly neighbourhood pub, never a nuisance to its neighbours. On its reopening Sam was keen to liaise with neighbours and changed the opening hours he had planned to less long ones at the weekend. Recently, however, other things than the seating have changed. Quite without permission there is now an extra bar in the garden which operates outside normal licensing hours; in fact the Albert has become a law unto itself and the noise now generated is unbelievable and unfair, especially as it operates outside the law and planning rules in a quiet residential conservation area. In no way is it the "asset of community value" which saved it from becoming totally residential with a house with a garden in its garden. Would that it were residential if its current lack of consideration of noise control and Asb continues.</p> <p>One other thing has changed which was pivotal when the Albert reopened. I cannot recall whether it was in the Deeds of the residential dwellings created with an additional floor in the former landlord and family space, or in conditions imposed by the developer to make the new flats more saleable, or imposed by planners, or building inspector, but the Albert was limited in its ability to cook since it was not allowed to have an extraction fan below the level of the highest flat, to protect those residents from cooking smells. Sam was well aware of this limitation and I recall discussing with Sam and a neighbour the fact it would be selling scotch eggs sandwiches and reheated foods. At that time Sam was keen to please the neighbours and we were all delighted to have the Albert back.</p> <p>Recently however the Albert has, without planning permission installed a low level extraction fan, which historically it was forbidden to do. The top end of our neighbourhood is protected from noise by the gates ordered by our MP on Primrose Hill: we need the same protection. This too is even more a quiet residential neighbourhood than the Regentd Park Road end, with only the quiet La Collina restaurant which finishes serving at 9pm.</p> <p>You have already had many complaints about The Albert but nothing has been done. Unless our Councillord can protect us these 3 seats will be more vulnerable and we like our councillors as we did their 3 predecessors. Princess Road and Auden Place are not Camden Town.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4822/P	Jonathan Howe	01/12/2024 06:36:56	OBJ	<p>I am an owner of one of the flats above the Albert pub. I continue to have grave concerns regarding the developments at the pub below us.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to point out some factual inaccuracies in the application as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Are Hours of Opening relevant to this proposal? Answer No." The hours of opening are entirely relevant to the developments as this is when the beer garden is operational. The Kitchen Extract Ventilation System (Extractor) generally operates beyond the hours of opening, with no consistent time of operation but often prior to and past the pub's Hours of Opening. 2. "Does this proposal involve the carrying out of industrial or commercial activities and processes? Answer No." The pub is clearly a commercial enterprise. 3. "Is the applicant the sole owner of all the land to which this application relates; and has the applicant been the sole owner for more than 21 days? Answer yes." The correct answer is 'No'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The commercial tenant does not have exclusive access over the roof space on which the Extractor has been placed. Under the definitions in the lease, the external roof forms part of the Retained Parts of the Building. In short: "Retained Parts: all parts of the Building other than the Property, the Flats and the Commercial Premises including: the main structure of the Building including the roof and roof structures, the foundations, the external walls and internal load bearing walls, the structural timbers, the joists and the guttering... etc". Therefore the Commercial Tenant is not the sole owner of this land. The Commercial Tenant contributes to the upkeep of the Retained Parts only in proportion to their unit entitlement across the whole building which also includes the Flats Tenants. - The area at which the Extractor discharges air is defined as 'Flats Common Parts' and include: "The external paths, driveways, yards, staircases, the Refuse Area and the Cycle Storage Area at or serving the Building; ... which are intended to be used by the Flat Tenants only." The Commercial Tenant has no interest over this land and has no rights over this area. The commercial tenant should be restricted to improvements only on land which is designated Commercial Premises. <p>With regards the Extractor; this unwanted addition has created, at times, untenable discomfort. The Extractor is operational 7-days per week, from morning to late night with no respite. Due to the noise, vibrations and fumes coming from the commercial pub-food kitchen we have been unable to open the windows directly above the unit (our own living/kitchen area) to allow cross ventilation through our flat. The system is an ugly collection of industrial-scale infrastructure which is not in keeping with the traditional architecture of the building nor the precinct. The wooden fence erected on the roof to 'hide' the Extractor is cheaply-assembled and does nothing to enhance the building. Despite attempts to mitigate the sound and smell, the Extractor discharges its fumes into the Flats' Common Parts (the exclusive-use entry yard), and tenants are obliged to pass through a blast of chip-fat fumes and keep our windows closed to prevent these smells entering our flats and contaminating our living spaces. I request Council to rule that the Extractor should be relocated to an area which sits within the definition of the Commercial Premises, discharge its fumes away from the Flats and either into public space (the street?) or within the Commercial Premises without encroaching onto, over or through the Flats, the Flats' Common Parts or anyone else's private property.</p> <p>With regards the lightweight, timber, non-permanent, covered seating within existing Pub Garden (Covered Seating); The addition of these elements has increased the patronage of the beer garden area. The roofing simply allows smokers to drink whilst under cover and so encourages smoking. One of the structures</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
<p>protrudes above the dividing wall between the Flats' exclusive entry and the beer garden and is detrimental to the ambience of the Flats' entry yard, over which the Commercial Tenant has no jurisdiction. An additional servery drinks shed has also been erected encouraging patrons to stay within the garden area to obtain drinks, thus adding to the increase in noise and foot-traffic in the garden. Cheaply constructed, the Covered areas do not improve the traditional heritage architecture of the building but contribute to the overdevelopment of the pub amenity.</p>				

2024/4822/P	Diana Milner	30/11/2024 15:38:28	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to object most strongly to the Albert's retrospective planning application. The illegal changes they have made, while being aware what was permitted, prove that they prioritised their business over rules to protect their neighbours. The seats are permanent, not the moveable type the pandemic permitted and right against neighbours' boundaries, rather than set back 2 metres. The noise in this overcrowded garden is unbelievable. Walk out of my front door, diagonally opposite, and head across the road and one is assailed by noise as soon as one goes down the side of the pub. Walk behind the Albert and it's like being at a football match. For Auden Place residents, the flat dwellers above the pub and neighbouring gardens the noise is unbelievable. I cannot imagine the numbers which must be there. I regularly walk between The Albert and Auden Place to the garden entrance of La Collina. There by contrast, is a large garden filled with tables and scarcely a whisper affects its neighbours.</p> <p>The Albert, which for the 40+ years I've lived here was always, before its closure to be remodelled, a quiet well attended friendly neighbourhood pub, never a nuisance to its neighbours. On its reopening Sam was keen to liaise with neighbours and changed the opening hours he had planned to less long ones at the weekend. Recently, however, other things than the seating have changed. Quite without permission there is now an extra bar in the garden which operates outside normal licensing hours; in fact the Albert has become a law unto itself and the noise now generated is unbelievable and unfair, especially as it operates outside the law and planning rules in a quiet residential conservation area. In no way is it the "asset of community value" which saved it from becoming totally residential with a house with a garden in its garden. Would that it were residential if its current lack of consideration of noise control and Asb continues.</p> <p>One other thing has changed which was pivotal when the Albert reopened. I cannot recall whether it was in the Deeds of the residential dwellings created with an additional floor in the former landlord and family space, or in conditions imposed by the developer to make the new flats more saleable, or imposed by planners, or building inspector, but the Albert was limited in its ability to cook since it was not allowed to have an extraction fan below the level of the highest flat, to protect those residents from cooking smells. Sam was well aware of this limitation and I recall discussing with Sam and a neighbour the fact it would be selling scotch eggs sandwiches and reheated foods. At that time Sam was keen to please the neighbours and we were all delighted to have the Albert back.</p> <p>Recently however the Albert has, without planning permission installed a low level extraction fan, which historically it was forbidden to do. The top end of our neighbourhood is protected from noise by the gates ordered by our MP on Primrose Hill: we need the same protection. This too is even more a quiet residential neighbourhood with only the quiet La Collina restaurant which finishes serving at 9pm. Princess Road but for The Albert is one of the quietest parts of Primrose Hill.</p> <p>You have already had many complaints about The Albert but nothing has been done. We like our Councillors as we did their 3 predecessors, but these seats will become even more vulnerable if we are treated as though we were Camden Town</p>
-------------	--------------	---------------------	--------	---