

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2015/4456/P | Robert Brown | 396 York way London N79LW | 11/12/2015 18:17:39 | OBJ | Speaking on behalf of local traders on Brecknock Road and York Way, where I run a green grocers and florist, we have noticed a decline in business since the pub closed last year. The pub attracted customers from all over, many of whom also used local businesses such as mine. For example the pub often hosted wedding parties and wakes and the customers would purchase flowers locally. Also more generally customers would purchase fresh produce from my shop on their way home. Judging by the feedback I'm getting, the strength of feeling locally is strong among both businesses and residents about the closure of this pub. Feeling is still strong in this area. Perhaps Mr Moore things by submitted all these applications and revisions that we might go away, but if anything we feel we are getting stronger. The latest revision is very similar to the first application and it feels like we are going round in circles. Please see this guy for what he is and save our pub. Please reject this proposal and save our pub. It's been there for over a hundred years and we aren't going anywhere either. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2015/4456/P | Richard Lewis | 27 Shepherd House York Way Estate London N7 9QB | 11/12/2015 11:44:10 | OBJ | <p>I would like to OBJECT to the recent amendment to Planning application 2015/4456/P, on the grounds outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant has now filed 4 different applications, alterations, and revisions for this site, and it is clear he has no interest in truly running a pub on this premises. We have previously shown that this man is a property developer who specialises in turning all space formerly occupied by traditional pubs into flats. 2. The current proposals read as yet another 'Trojan Horse' application – such as those seen elsewhere in Camden, and in London NW5 in particular at Leighton Arms, Brecknock Road NW5; Dartmouth Arms, York Rise, NW5. Via such applications, significant changes are proposed to existing community pubs to render them unviable, facilitating the closure and loss of the pub completely at a later stage. Given the developers historic pattern of behaviour, it is difficult to envisage this proposed new pub being other than a precursor to further development and in time another flat. 3. Many of the objections filed for applicant's previous application 2015/0906/P (which he was invited to WITHDRAW) included material planning considerations equally relevant to this revision. I urge planning office to re-read the objections filed to that application, and to note in particular the following: 4. Removal of ancillary accommodation is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (Para. 70) This revision appears to have done away with the manager's accommodation and kitchen areas which would pose a grave risk to the viability of any kind of public house. For the Admiral Mann to have any chance of operating as a pub (as it had done continuously since the Victorian era up until its closure) it is imperative that there is suitable ancillary space. The pub featured ancillary accommodation above it in the form of a flat and kitchen area to serve the pub. This was designed as part of the original pub building to provide a home for the licensee/manager and his/her family. The flat is ancillary to the pub. This is a typical arrangement, and this proposal does away with it. National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 70) has been used by inspectors to defend a pub use and to maintain established pub facilities e.g. gardens and landlord's accommodation. The conversion of this large building into a development of flats and subsequent reduction in size would result in the loss of the pub as a community facility. This planning application is therefore contrary to NPPF Paragraph 70. |

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

5. Reduction in floorspace/seating, & lack of kitchen will render the pub unviable. Despite various adjustments, the commercial space shown on the current revision remains some 22% smaller than that presently provided (original floorspace of Admiral Mann 162sq m in 2 separate bars vs proposed development of ~127sq metres in one bar). The substantially reduced floor area includes a 26% reduction in the number of available seats (reduction to ~65 vs ~82 in the current pub). Sufficient seating always leads to a more relaxed drinking environment. The reduced seating and loss of kitchen space to service functions will permanently compromise the chances of this perfectly viable community pub continuing to support its two ladies and gents darts teams, and other ancillary events which provided a significant % of the turnover of the pub.

6. Asset of Community Value (ACV) status In approving our application to have the Admiral Mann listed as an ACV, London Borough of Camden said “The pub was used by long term local residents of all social classes who are not well served by other public houses in the area which tend to serve a younger, more transient population. There have been closures of similar pubs in the local area in recent years and it seems that the Admiral Mann was the only pub of its kind left in the local area.”

7. Department for Communities and Local Government, in a response to an E-petition entitled Save our Pubs, change the Planning Laws - <http://epetitions.direct.gov.uk/petitions/66572> “recognise that community pubs are important assets, making a significant contribution to the economy and providing local hubs that strengthen community relationships and encourage wider social interaction.”

8. “The local planning authority may take the listing as an Asset of Community Value into account as a material consideration when determining any planning application. Local and neighbourhood plans should be consistent with and reflect the strong support for pubs in the National Planning Policy Framework. This encourages local planning authorities to plan positively to support the sustainability of communities. This includes plans to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs.”

9. Please ensure you/the planning committee give material consideration to the ACV status and act to ensure that the building as described on the original ACV application remains preserved in its

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

Comment: **Response:**

current use class so that it may further the social wellbeing of the community in accordance with Section 88 of the Localism Act 2011.

10. Grounds to reject proposed application: under 2011 London Plan policies The significant community cohesion recognised by Camden when granting ACV status would potentially be threatened by reduced space and potential noise complaints. As such, the proposal could be contrary to 2011 London Plan policies 3.1 (Ensuring Equal Life Chances for All), 3.16 (Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure), 4.8 (Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector) and 7.1 (Building London's neighbourhoods and communities).

11. Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (proposal submission Nov 2015) Policy CC3 “seeks to implement the policies set out in the following documents: Camden CS7, CS10, DP12, DP15; Protecting the Pub Report CAMRA (2012); Pubs and Places – the Social Value of Community Pubs IPPR 2012 and Keeping Local (Steve O’Connell, GLA 2013). Its Reasoned Justification recognises “The public houses listed above [which include The Admiral Mann] provide, and have provided for many years, much needed space for meetings and for social interaction. Many of these public houses have also played an important part in Kentish Town’s history, and some have particular value because of historic events that have taken place within or around them, or possess valued architectural historic characteristics. All these public houses also have social or cultural value for particular groups in the community.

As a tenant myself privately renting a flat inside an inner-London Borough, I am only too aware of the issues surrounding housing in this city, however methods to address housing issues should not come at the expense of community amenities, and especially so with those with historical and heritage aspects to them. As I understand it, the pub is a locally-listed non-designated heritage asset. Any proposals to demolish and significantly alter the building, such this or any other application, revision, or amendment to ought to be met with serious consideration, indeed I would argue again it should be refused.
