

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1373/P	J E Stewart	23 Lancaster Grove London NW3 4EX	21/04/2014 18:04:00	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal, as I fear that, eventually, it would cause the loss the Sir Richard Steele as a local pub and community asset, where, for many years, people of all ages, races and walks of life have met, conversed and enjoyed a drink. It is likely that hotel room occupants would complain of noise and having to go through a crowded pub to get to their rooms.</p> <p>The loss of the possibility of live music and dancing, which encourages customers, in the pub, could lead to a loss of trade (and, therefore, profit). As for smoking being disallowed in the beer garden, this would be extremely difficult to enforce. Asking smokers to leave the pub (and their drinks), to go out onto the pavement and walk along it to an area (physically) unconnected with the pub, would be very inconvenient for them. So, again, customers could be deterred, leading to a loss of trade and profit.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1373/P	John CRYNE	10 Sneyd Road	23/04/2014 16:08:46	OBJ	<p>On behalf of the North London Branch of CAMRA and its 1,600 members, I object to this application.</p> <p>The fact that the current application retains A4 use might seem to make it more attractive to The Campaign for Real Ale but the pub could lose a vital component of its ability to be a pub.</p> <p>It is possible that this application, as opposed to the other residential conversion, creates a better future for the pub, in that hotel residents will use catering facilities and will most likely be customers of the pub, but it is important to make these points.</p> <p>The top floor was, I believe, once used as accommodation for the owner/manager which will be lost. The floor above the pub has been used as a function room hosting comedy, theatre and many other events over the years. This will be lost, diminishing the value of the public house amenity to the local community.</p> <p>It is important that the above reductions in space which a traditional pub would normally require do not render the "new pub" unviable and allow the owner to use that as an argument to allow its future conversion to other commercial (non-pub) use.</p> <p>Installation of accommodation above pubs can be fraught with difficulty, the pub has large garden and it is difficult to see how noise there from would not affect hotel guests, causing complaints. It might prove necessary to close the garden early which might negatively affect viability.</p> <p>Clearly if the new hotel makes it clear that the rooms are above a public house and that all modern building techniques are used to sound proof the rooms, then, for some guests, staying above a lively pub can be attractive.</p> <p>If the Council were minded to approve the application, notwithstanding the objections detailed above, they should attach planning conditions as follows.</p> <p>A condition attached to the consent which removes the permitted development rights which would assist in ensuring the long-term survival of the public house use on the premises. This is very common place where the removal of permitted development rights is needed to achieve a valid planning objective (in this instance protecting the pub as a community facility). There is a standard form of words for such a condition as follows:</p> <p>“Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), planning permission shall be required in respect of development constituting a change of use to uses within Use Classes A1, A2 or A3 to the Second schedule to the Order, or for any proposal to change the use temporarily to B1 business use under the extension of Permitted Development enacted in 2013. In addition, planning permission shall be required for any demolition which would otherwise constitute permitted development.”</p> <p>There is ample precedent for this. In the case of The Wenlock Arms in Hackney, the local Council allowed the development of the upper stories (into private flats) with the imposition of a Moran</p>

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

Condition (removal of the permitted development rights, effectively an Article 4 Direction) to help maintain the remaining pub's long-term survival.

Should the Council be minded to approve the application, then everything must be done to ensure that A4 use for the remaining pub-part is protected.

---