

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 10:11  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Automatic reply: The Albert. Application no.2014/7338/P

And another objection for this app to be logged

Thanks

---

**From:** Heavey, Eimear  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 09:59  
**To:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Subject:** FW: Automatic reply: The Albert. Application no.2014/7338/P

Sorry Ferg

Eimear Heavey  
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2949

---

**From:** Terry Goodfellow [\[mailto:\[REDACTED\]\]](#)  
**Sent:** 18 December 2014 19:45  
**To:** Heavey, Eimear  
**Subject:** RE: Automatic reply: The Albert. Application no.2014/7338/P

Dear Mr Heavey

I wish to make a strong objection to this proposal.

- The proposed conservatory is not a replacement for the existing conservatory, it is an enlargement, and as such, along with application no.2014/6935/P , will occupy 2/3rds of the existing garden.
  - As such, it will destroy what has become a real community asset(the garden) which is enjoyed in good weather by many.
  - It would seem that this proposal is to turn the pub into a restaurant: There are plenty of restaurants already in the area.
  - This is yet another example of 'infilling' of valuable open space which will adversely affect the character of the area. When are we to be rid of these greedy developers who want to cash in on high property values?
- Terry Goodfellow

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 10:19  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Albert Pub Primrose hill planning applications 2014/6935/P and 2014/7338/P

Another objection to be logged

Cheers

---

**From:** Callaghan, Patricia (Councillor)  
**Sent:** 18 December 2014 22:02  
**To:** Freeney, Fergus; Walmswell, Beth

[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Albert Pub Primrose hill planning applications 2014/6935/P and 2014/7338/P

Fergus

I strongly object to the separation of these 2 planning applications, as they are both for the same site and same building—and I feel it is disingenuous to seek to look at them in any other way.

The sinking of yet another basement area in that vicinity will surely cause more instability, and flood danger. If you look 10yards from this potential building, we have the Auden Place estate, which is densely populated, and already suffers from insufficient 'soak away' of rainwater.

For the residents on that side of Auden Place, there will be a loss of light, overlooking and encroachment, from a house in such close proximity.

At present it is a local public house, looking at these plans, it seems that the owner wishes to change it to a restaurant, which would impact badly on the social amenity of that area.

The pub garden would be cut by two thirds, if a house was built on this site, which would mean that the pub, as it is now, would be non-sustainable. We have already lost No 1 Edis St, which has been turned into family accommodation, we do not need to lose another social meeting place, and the Albert really is a community venue!

I would ask you to refuse this application

Patricia Callaghan Local Councillor

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 10:20  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: The Albert: Application no. 2014/7338/P

And another

---

**From:** Terry Goodfellow [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 December 2014 19:49  
**To:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Subject:** The Albert: Application no. 2014/7338/P

Dear Mr Feeney

I wish to make a strong objection to this proposal.

- The proposed conservatory is not a replacement for the existing conservatory, it is an enlargement, and as such, along with application no.2014/6935/P , will occupy 2/3rds of the existing garden.
- As such, it will destroy what has become a real community asset(the garden) which is enjoyed in good weather by many.
- It would seem that this proposal is to turn the pub into a restaurant: There are plenty of restaurants already in the area.
- This is yet another example of 'infilling' of valuable open space which will adversely affect the character of the area. When are we to be rid of these greedy developers who want to cash in on high property values?

Regards,

Terry Goodfellow

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 10:21  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Albert pub

Another - cheers

-----Original Message-----

From: Caroline Cooper [\[mailto:\[REDACTED\]\]](#)  
Sent: 18 December 2014 11:24  
To: Freeney, Fergus  
Subject: Albert pub

I am abroad on business and only have five mins.  
Please do not destroy yet another pub and yet another garden in Primrose Hill.

Caroline Cooper (sent from my phone).  
68 Regents park road. Nw1 7sx.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 16:43  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: The Albert, Primrose Hill

Another objection

---

**From:** Jonathan House [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 December 2014 13:27  
**To:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** The Albert, Primrose Hill

Dear Sir,

My partner and I would like to lodge a strong objection to the following planning applications.  
2014/6935/P and 2014/7338/P regarding the proposed changes to the Albert Public House in Primrose Hill, London NW1.

We have enjoyed frequenting this establishment over the past 8 years and feel that the loss or alteration of this facility would have a serious negative impact on the local community.

Thank you,

Kurt Engledow and Jonathan House  
41 Regents Park road, Primrose Hill  
London NW1 7SY

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Sent:** 22 December 2014 10:20  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Applications 2014/7338/P & 2014/6935/P the Albert

And another objection for these

cheers

---

**From:** Pam White [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 19 December 2014 17:33  
**To:** Freeney, Fergus  
**Subject:** Applications 2014/7338/P & 2014/6935/P the Albert

• I wish to object strongly to both these applications for the following reasons:

1. These applications have been submitted within days of each other **and** the planned changes to the site are adjacent to each other. The implications of one proposal are directly linked to the other and I think the separation of the applications creates a misleading scenario for those who wish to make comments.  
I am pleased to note that you will be dealing with both applications and I urge you to link your decision of each application to the other one. I think the applicant has not been straightforward by separating each proposal; it is a calculated and disappointing trick.
2. The proposed new conservatory is a further incursion on the existing Albert garden and would leave a tiny outside space which would inevitably impact on the viability of the pub. The previous landlords have publicly stated that the revenues from the garden were vitally important to the profitability of the pub.  
The garden is well-known for being a spacious public green space and is very often full to capacity with people eating, drinking and contributing to the viability of the pub.  
This new building combined with the proposed house would obliterate the garden and drastically affect the pub's profitability.
3. The pub and its garden are listed with the Council as an Asset of Community Value. The groups who use the pub for meetings are often to be found in the garden. There is no comparable facility in the area for these groups to relocate to therefore the effects of this proposal would have wider damaging implications for our community as a whole.
4. The garden as it currently exists offers a shared view from the garden to the footpath at Auden Place and vice versa. This affords a degree of shared surveillance for both locations contributing to neighbourhood safety. The proposed building combined with the house would remove this important view and threaten pedestrian safety.
5. The plans show folding glazed doors opening onto what would remain of the garden. This would increase noise nuisance for neighbouring properties from the activities inside the conservatory which would persist until at least 11.20pm. The garden has historically had a curfew time of 10pm to allow peace for the surrounding neighbours.
6. The plans show an intention to remove existing planted areas and replace them with static wall mounted benches. This is a further attack on the existing green space which hosts a wide variety of trees, plants and shrubs along with accompanying wildlife. The cumulative effect of the house, the conservatory and the changes to the tiny yard is an aggressive and destructive attempt to

basically pave over a beautiful, popular and utterly necessary green space in the pursuit of a profit. The cost to our community and the environment of this exercise in overdevelopment is unacceptable.

7. The building of this conservatory would create numerous pollution and safety concerns for those who live adjacent to the site and beyond. The site backs onto the Auden Place estate. It should be noted that the applicants, in their Planning Statement, Paragraph 6.3 refers to this important part of our community as this **"set piece flatted development has been a townscape disaster"**. I don't think I, or the residents of Auden Place would agree with this view.

Vehicular access is already constricted and in the event of an emergency the residents of the neighbouring properties, which include a nursery school, may be put at unacceptable risk due to restricted access during the construction.

The area around the site is densely populated with residential properties whose inhabitants would be subjected to an extended period of attack on their well-being and health due to the noise and air pollution that the construction process would create.

8. The proposals have serious implications for daylight levels on both the remaining yard area and also neighbouring properties both of which currently enjoy open outlooks and plenty of afternoon sunshine. The planned building combined with the proposed house would cast a permanent shadow upon these areas. Additionally the house's basement open space will not be graced by very much natural light. It is a lowered and shady open space, not the sort that any good house designer would wish to include. One can quite easily imagine it becoming dank and unpleasant. So as to 'garden' for this proposed house it is not an advantage in any way.

9. There plan to put a basement in the house will seriously affect the water table, cause more instability and flood danger in this densely populated area. Basement development should be resisted and this is one that is completely unnecessary to the livelihood of the pub itself, merely serving to make money for the developers.

10. The increase in the number of covers inside the pub, to approximately 80 covers, should be resisted. This is a local neighbourhood pub, NOT a restaurant. The present split between a pub with a smaller number of tables in its bar area, with extra tables outside in the garden seems to work admirably for the sort of pub that the Albert currently is.

11. There are rumours that the agenda of the applicant is to run the pub down and thus prove it non-viable, thereby speeding up its complete closure. These applications are patently the sort which would enhance this process and thus should be resisted. The applicant apparently has a track record of buying up pubs in adjoining London areas and closing them down in this way. Examples are The Magdala, The White Horse, both in S End Green, the Winchester in Archway and The White Bear in Hampstead, together with several more to a total of about twelve pubs. He would then turn the entire site into residential properties as he has already done with the upper floors of the pub.

12. part of the attraction of the Albert was the opportunity to have food in a traditional pub setting, both in the bar and garden. the food has hitherto been modest, good trad pub food, not the more expensive 'foodie' menus provided by some local pubs in Primrose Hill. At present the Albert is operating a reduced food offer with food dishes being imported, ready made, and merely heated up in the premises. for the continued operation of this as a proper pub it needs to have a full kitchen serving proper meals, hopefully in the style previously offered. For this reason, at least one of the regular groups, which used to meet at the Albert to eat and play scrabble every Saturday has taken its custom elsewhere, concluding that at the moment The Albert is 'unreliable' as a pub in which to have a weekly meal. This action speaks louder than words; let us hope it is not a presage for the future!

13. Neither of these applications preserve or enhance the CA and as such they should be refused.

In conclusion I would urge that this application be refused for the reasons stated above and in recognition of the Council's commitment to ensuring our pubs are viewed as important and vital parts of our communities.

Pam White

Email 