

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 22 September 2015 16:23  
**To:** Ampoma, Nanayaa  
**Subject:** FW: Nanayaa Ampoma Ref: 2015/1211/P

Seyi Enirayetan  
Planning Technician  
Planning Solution Team

Tel: 0207 974 3229  
Web: [www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

---

**From:** Tristan O'Dwyer  
**Sent:** 21 September 2015 15:16  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FAO: Nanayaa Ampoma Ref: 2015/1211/P

Sirs,

Please pass my comments on to the committee.

I am astounded that Camden council would even consider this utterly cynical application. A viable and profitable pub has been left to rot by developers in order to support an application to turn it into yet more unaffordable residential property. The planning officer is either naive or venal to recommend this application and history will judge you as philistines and cultural vandals who care nothing of heritage or community.

It is telling that the officer's report lists a long list of objects, and a much shorter list in support, and yet still recommends that the application be granted.

None of the units meet lifetime home standards and none of the units have the required access to external space. There is no provision for parking, which should in itself be grounds for rejection. These are not the kinds of homes Camden needs- they are simply vehicles for profit and the council should be ashamed to be acting as facilitators. Camden is losing a community asset and Victorian heritage building in order to build sub-standard housing which doesn't even meet its own criteria.

Camden needs to urgently adopt a similar policy framework in respect of public houses as Barking and Dagenham.

<https://www.lbbd.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Last-Orders-Preserving-Public-Houses-SPD-2014.pdf>

The freeholder should be compelled to advertise the pub as a going concern for at least 12 months before any change of use is even considered, and no such permission should be granted until they can first prove lack of viability.

Camden has a very poor record on protecting community pubs and heritage assets, and councilors with a poor record of voting for these kinds of developments should be mindful of their position at the next elections. I would urge the committee to reject this and all similar applications and to implement a proper and robust policy which adequately protects local pubs and serves the community.

Yours faithfully,

Tristan O'Dwyer