

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4456/P	Matt Marshall	Flat 2 Hilton House	28/08/2015 19:28:18	OBJ	Property developers ride roughshod over great British pubs far too often and it is great to see this proposal meet with the most vehement objection. The Admiral Mann is the local for some of my family members and I know how much they and the whole community value it. I have also frequented the pub on many occasions and enjoyed the atmosphere and community spirit it engenders. I am wholeheartedly in objection to the proposal.
2015/4456/P	Anna Taylor	22 c Huddleston Road London N7 0AG	28/08/2015 15:22:05	OBJ	I object to this planning application to change the integrity of this traditional two bar pub. Any demolition will increase a trend to lose historic features of London and increasing height will mean a loss of light to neighbours. In particular, please reject a proposal which changes this asset of community value from its current size and two bar layout that enables it to be home to locals including wheelchair users and darts teams. Reduction in size appears to be a ploy to reduce the pub's use and profitability so that it can subsequently be deemed unviable and replaced with residential units of no use to the local community.
2015/4456/P	Matthew Shaw	99 Royal College Street NW1 0SE NW1 0SE NW1 0SE	28/08/2015 11:34:19	OBJ	<p>This is a much loved community pub, which has served the community since c.1880. I object on of the following grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a significant overdevelopment on this site, which will immediately and irreparably damage a long established Asset of Community value; • addition of an extra storey to 9 Hargrave Place, which will affect the light of residents in Longmeadow flats to rear of Hargrave Place; • this is a 'trojan horse' application which seeks to strangle the Admiral Mann by surrounding it with unrelated accommodation; and via • a very significant loss of floor space for the pub – some 40%, will immediately render it unviable. • flats to be built above and around the pub, will make noise complaints inevitable; • Landlord's accommodation offered than in the current planning unit; splitting of the existing planning unit which experience elsewhere in Camden/other parts of London shows does not work. (Do not repeat the mistakes made on the Albert, NW1; and Dartmouth Arms, NW5) • proposal would radically change two locally-listed non-designated heritage assets.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4456/P	Dr Douglas Cowie	107B Junction Road N19 5QX	28/08/2015 09:44:55	OBJ	<p>I object to the application, which will ruin this much loved Community pub. I object on the grounds that this application represents a significant overdevelopment on this site, and it will immediately and irreparably damage a long established Asset of Community value; the addition of an extra storey to 9 Hargrave Place will affect the light of residents in Longmeadow flats to rear of Hargrave Place.</p> <p>This is a 'trojan horse' application which seeks to strangle the Admiral Mann by surrounding it with unrelated accommodation, as well as a very significant loss of floor space for the pub by about 40%, will immediately render it unviable. This is the third attempt by the developer to apply for redevelopment of this site; both previous applications have been denied, and any application affecting this community pub should also be denied. The flats to be built above and around the pub, will make noise complaints inevitable. Experience elsewhere in Camden and other parts of London shows the splitting of the existing planning unit does not work. (another pub near my residence, Dartmouth Arms, NW5 was destroyed by these mistakes)</p> <p>Finally, the proposal would radically change two locally-listed non-designated heritage assets.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4456/P	John Barkman	116c Jerningham Road London SE14 5NL	29/08/2015 11:19:05	OBJ	<p>This is a much loved Community pub, which has served the community since ~1880. I object on the following grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· a significant overdevelopment on this site, which will immediately and irreparably damage a long established Asset of Community value;· addition of an extra storey to 9 Hargrave Place, which will affect the light of residents in Longmeadow flats to rear of Hargrave Place;· this is a 'trojan horse' application which seeks to strangle the Admiral Mann by surrounding it with unrelated accommodation; and via· a very significant loss of floor space for the pub – some 40%, will immediately render it unviable.· flats to be built above and around the pub, will make noise complaints inevitable;· Landlord's accommodation offered than in the current planning unit;· splitting of the existing planning unit which experience elsewhere in Camden/other parts of London shows does not work.· proposal would radically change two locally-listed non-designated heritage assets.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4456/P	Nicholas Wells	59d Tufnell Park Road London N7 0PS	30/08/2015 21:52:15	OBJLETTE R	<p>I Object to Planning Application 2015/4456/P at 9 & 9A Hargrave Place N7 0BP, site of Admiral Mann Public house.</p> <p>The following are some of the reasons I Object to said application and wish to be considered by Planning and Council.</p> <p>The Admiral Mann pub is an Asset of Community Value. (e.g and surely including 9A existing ground floor existing Pub toilet facilities with disability access toilet, which after all are an integral part of a pub.).</p> <p>9 & 9A Hargrave Place are locally listed buildings.</p> <p>No provision for Affordable housing has been made in application. This would seem to be same case with the adjacent 1-7 Hargrave Place previous application by same applicant.</p> <p>No extra car parking facilities have been provided for any future residential use. This would seem to be same case with the adjacent 1-7 Hargrave Place previous application by same applicant.</p> <p>Inclusion of an indoor, for residential use only, Josta 2 tier cycle rack in Ground floor plan of 9 Hargrave Place -The Admiral Mann is a change of use. In conflict with A4 use. It will restrict pub space area use. And restricts use of potentially economizing all Toilet facilities (Male/ Female & Disability Access) on ground floor. A dedicated residents only indoor cycle rack is a luxury and planning appeasement that in no way helps with 9 & 9A residential car parking. People with bicycles still have cars. There is nothing to stop people who wish use a bicycle, to housing it in their own flat.</p> <p>Basement Extension of 40% and it's floor lowering, could cause problems with the part of Hargrave Place Road that already has on the other side has an embankment. Road at this point would effectively be on a deeper and longer ridge. Vehicles e.g Trucks could cause degradation of roadway in future. There is no commercial pub running reason given, for extra storage space in Basement as The Admiral Mann has current Basement beer storage that is fine. Extra Basement extension & lowering provision, can only be seen in to enable a residential use application for Basement in future. I consider new Male and Female Toilets in Basement are simply an aid to this, to take advantage of goodwill of Camden Council planning. Applicant has shown no interest in keeping open a viable Public House while planning Applications are going through. I propose new Male and Female Toilets in Basement is simply an aid to this, to take advantage of goodwill of Camden Council planning.</p> <p>A pub -The Admiral Mann brings foot fall custom to shopping area in Brecknock Road.</p> <p>Applicant plans to get rid off rooftop chimney stacks (with extra storey at 9 Hargrave Place) is not in keeping with a building of local heritage interest.</p>

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

Lastly I believe the Applicants Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) form has been filled out incorrectly.
Part 6(b) states: Does your application involve new non-residential floorspace? applicant has ticked No.
What is extra constructed Storage area in Basement then, if not non-residential floorspace?
This may well be an oversight by applicant, but they are so called professionals.
So it is think should Application 2015/4456/P should be void and have to be resubmitted.
Allowing Application to go forward as is, could show bias.

My recommendation is that application 2015/4456/P is REFUSED.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Nicholas Wells
