

[REDACTED]

**Sent:** 31 December 2014 15:27  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Re: objection to: 2014/6935/P Re: RESPONSE PLEASE...! Re: The Albert Pub - Planning Application ref: 2014/2533/P

For the avoidance of doubt I am referring to the applications made in connection with the Albert Pub at 11 Princess Road, London, NW1 8JR

Regards,  
Nick Plinston

On 31 Dec 2014, at 15:20, nick P gmail wrote:

Dear Mr Freaney & Patricia Callaghan, and others,

I understand you are the person to write to in connection with the planning applications for development of the Albert pub on process road in Primrose Hill. Application numbers: 2014/6935/P and 2014/7338/P

I wish to record that I strongly object to any development of this pub, particularly the beer garden, which is a rare amenity and valuable well used public space.

Also see my email below from: 06 November 2014 00:29 that further sets out in more detail the reasons for my objection.

Please can you reply to this email to confirm you have received this and that my objection has been registered.

Could you advise me how many objections have been received to this application?

One other question, I see from reading the application that the pub has been designated 'Land use A5' 'hot food takeaways'. It is clearly not a takeaway place, can you explain the decision as to how this 200 year old pub has been designated as a takeaway venue?

Regards,  
Mr Nick Plinston  
26B Southampton Road, NW5 4JR

On 6 Nov 2014, at 19:00, Callaghan, Patricia (Councillor) wrote:

Dear Nick

I am sorry around that time we got many enquiries about the Albert, and apologies for not getting back to you.

Eimear

I am right in saying that this was decided at members briefing?

Nick

The planning application for building in the garden has not been in the planning process yet, and talking to people I am sure that there will be many objections when this happens.

We are trying to get the Albert listed as a community asset, as many people in the area feel as you do.

Best wishes

Pat

---

**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE PLEASE..! Re: The Albert Pub - Planning Application ref: 2014/2533/P

Dear Mr Plinston – this application has been granted. The decision was made in June but was in draft form for 2 months as it was subject to a S106 legal agreement. This agreement was signed in September and the decision notice issued on 11 September.

Eimear Heavey  
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2949

---

**Subject:** RESPONSE PLEASE..! Re: The Albert Pub - Planning Application ref: 2014/2533/P

Councillors,

It has been three months since I send you my email about the Albert Pub in Primrose Hill, and you have not responded.

Could you please respond to my email to explain what you are doing about this?

Regards,

Nick Plinston

On 8 Aug 2014, at 12:50, nick P wrote:

Dear Local Councillors:  
Lazzaro Pietragnoli  
Patricia Callaghan  
Richard Cotton,

I have just this week discovered there are proposals and a planning application to convert the Albert Pub in Princes Road, Primrose Hill to residential accommodation; with a draft decision from Camden Council to grant permission.

I understand the proposals are to convert upper floors to residential use, with a possible further future proposal for the beer garden to be built on to provide new private housing.

I gather the new owner of the pub is a developer with a track record of running pubs down and converting them to residential use. The developer has apparently cited the beer garden as being 'under used'. This comment in itself reveals much about their future intentions for the pub, as the beer garden is in fact very well used throughout the summer months, and the local area is very lucky indeed to have the facility.

In proposing to build on the beer garden the developer clearly does not care about how popular the pub is, nor do they care that local community groups, sports groups, and families use the facilities. It is quite possible the developer's real agenda is to gradually run the pub down, making staged applications for change of use to residential, with the pub gradually becoming unviable economically with eventual closure and conversion entirely to private residential use being the end game.

Londoners have seen this process many times before, and whilst some pubs simply haven't had as a base situation the necessary footfall to stay in business, this one has always been and continues to remain very popular, and fairly unique in character with a broad cross section of clientele for the area.

The current application lodged with the council sees the upper storeys converted to private residential flats, the result of which will be for pub staff to have to be located off site, which will erode the ability of the pub to operate efficiently. This change is simply the thin end of the wedge. I was shocked to see the planning officer has recommended the planning application is approved, and Camden council has given a 'draft approval'. I have read the reasoning given by the planning officer that these extra flats on the upper storeys will be 'welcome in the area', but I would note that doubtless they will be sold to wealthy individuals, whereas the space is currently occupied by the staff who work and live on site at the pub. I simply don't see how the change of the nature of residents on site will particularly benefit the area, unless the council is seeking to actively drive out people who earn less than six figure salaries.

Probably it is too late now as Camden has reached a draft decision, but I am writing to express I strongly object to the application for any residential development at this pub. It is the start of a process that will very likely see the pub eventually close, and that will be a real shame for the area. (Please note there is an online petition against the residential development

that has attracted nearly 500 signatures – at this link: <http://www.change.org/petitions/save-the-albert-pub-petition-here>).

Once the pub and its beer garden are gone, they will be gone forever, with the local community suffering the loss for the sake of a property developer's profit and some section 106 money, with no real tangible long lasting benefit for the local community whatsoever. This should not be allowed to happen.

Regards,  
Nicholas Plinston

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.