

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1189/P	J E Stewat	23 Lancaster Grove London NW3 4EX	28/04/2016 16:49:15	OBJNOT	<p>I do not believe that the proposed changes are compatible with the premises continuing to be used as a pub and social amenity.</p> <p>The Operational Management Plan states (paragraph 2.4) re the flat on the 2nd floor "This ancillary flat.....does demonstrate that the residential conversion and occupation of the building is possible and that both public house and residential uses are able to co-exist harmoniously". This flat is currently occupied by the Pub Manager. It cannot be deduced that occupation of flats on the 1st and 2nd floor of the building, occupied by people who have no particular connection with the pub, except for being in the same building, would necessarily be so happy with the proximity of a pub.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1 states that "The freehold of the proposed residential units would be held by the applicant (Faucet Inns Limited) who also owns the public house (Class A4) below. The applicant therefore has a financial and operational interest in the harmonious existence and operation of both uses and in protecting the respective amenity of each". However, paragraph 5.6 states that "In addition, the granting of planning permission would provide a further opportunity for the Council to control the activities of the public house." If the Council were to take the "opportunity" to "control the activities of the public house", it is unlikely that it would add to the profitability/viability of the pub. I fail to see how Faucet Inns Limited is seeking to protect the "existence and operation" of the pub by this statement.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.3 states the "In the interest of maintaining the amenity of the proposed flats above, the playing of live music would be prohibited along with dancing. This could be conditioned within the planning permission and the premises licence would be amended to reflect this change". Customers are encouraged to come to the pub when good live music is performed and some enjoy dancing, too. To prohibit these activities could mean the pub having fewer customers and thus becoming being less profitable and, therefore, endanger it continuing as a local community asset.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2 states "The main entrance from Haverstock Hill would be the single and only point of entrance and exit into the public house for patrons". The steps to the main entrance to the pub are steep and difficult enough for those of limited mobility, but pretty well impossible for disabled customers (e.g. wheelchair users). Surely it is not right to alter arrangements, so that a community asset, which was available to disabled people (who were permitted to enter the pub via the garden), becomes unavailable to them. Also of concern is the proposal to move the toilets from ground floor to basement level, making no provision for a toilet accessible to disabled customers.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3 states "and it is proposed that the beer garden is continued to be used as an amenity for the pub". However, paragraph 7.14 states that "Residents would walk through the entrance gate into the garden. They would then walk through the garden into the dedicated residential entrance into the building." And paragraph 7.18 "The refuse, recycling and cycle parking areas would be accessed by the residents via the garden." I cannot see that residents would be happy to have to walk through a crowded pub garden (especially with bicycles, refuse or recycling) between the pavement and their homes. It might not be entirely welcomed by pub customers either.</p> <p>Paragraph 16.4 seems to indicate that the Pub Manager would be on-site and available to occupants of the proposed flats 7 days a week for at least 11 hours a day. This is totally unreasonable.</p> <p>Although there is a proposal to provide a new function and community use room, this seems to be considerably smaller than the current first floor space allocated to that use.</p> <p>The planning application does not provide for any affordable accommodation, which is what Camden really needs. Also, I do not see how it answers the points made by the Council in refusing their</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>previous application (no.2014/1367/P) for flats on the upper floors.</p> <p>Faucet Inns do not have a good history of running pubs. The Dartmouth Arms in Dartmouth Park received planning permission to turn the upper floors into flats. It was closed at the end of January 2015. A report in the Camden New Journal on 21 January 2015 stated that "Fans of the Dartmouth Arms fear that once it has closed it will never reopen", but that Steve Cox (Managing Director of Faucet Inn) said "This summer, it will reopen as a new, improved Dartmouth Arms". It is still closed.</p> <p>Another of Faucet Inn's pubs, The Black Cap in Camden Town, having had 3 planning applications for change of use of its upper floors to flats refused, was closed very suddenly on 12 April 2015.</p> <p>All 3 pubs have ACV status, which, in the case of the Dartmouth Arms & the Sir Richard Steele, has been the subject of appeals by Faucet Inn Limited.</p> <p>Even if the problems that I have highlighted could be overcome, I am most concerned about the continuance of The Sir Richard Steele in the long term if the upper 2 floors were converted to flats. To lose this community pub, where people of all ages, races and abilities meet, converse and enjoy themselves, as has been the case for about 150 years would be a crying shame.</p>
