

**Application No:**  
2016/0948/P

**Consultees Name:**  
Victor Levine

**Consultees Addr:**  
Henley Court

**Received:** 05/05/2016 15:23:45  
**Comment:** OBJECTION

**Response:**  
Dear Sirs/Madams,  
Re: Application No. 2016/0948/P 2A Englands Lane NW3 4UG

I write as someone who has been involved in Englands Lane for some forty years initially as a resident and shopkeeper renting from the Church Commissioners and subsequently as the owner of shop 2, and then shop 2B and eventually shop 2C as well in Englands Lane and former owner of flats 1, 2 and 3 in Antrim House above the subject property and as a director of Antrim & Priory Management Ltd - the freeholders and managers of the whole building in which the subject property resides.

I wish to point out that in my view this shop is not suitable for A3 use for the following reasons:-

1. Unlike its two neighbours it has no direct access to the rear yard which is of considerable benefit for A3 users to dispose of rubbish and receive deliveries of food etc and for staff to get fresh air during short breaks.
2. Also unlike its two neighbours it has no wall in the main rear yard where through drafts carry away smells etc on which it could mount ventilation and extraction equipment away from the light well which has bedrooms above and no draft to carry away cooking smells from the enclosed well.
3. Also unlike its two neighbours it has no extraction, filtration and ventilation equipment in place nor permission to install such equipment from the management company which would be required and may well not be obtained.
4. The business operating there has had to be cautioned several times for breaches of its lease including for example allowing liquids to flow through its floor onto the restaurant below which is totally unacceptable.
5. With the welcome addition of 2B Englands Lane there are sufficient A3 users in this Lane and having three in a row would be detrimental to the well balanced mix of this important local shopping street.
6. It will not be possible for this property to extract to the roof as Camden prefer because the residents above object strongly to this as some of them have roof decks there and all of them have windows which would be affected by this so permission would not be given for rooftop ventilation.

The above summary reflects not only my view but the views of many of the other ten occupants of the building who for a variety of reasons may not feel able to express this to you directly.

I trust you will refuse this application which if approved will create unacceptable air and noise pollution for the neighbours and disturb the delicate balance of this excellent lane.

Kind regards,  
Victor Levine FCCA, MSc, Bus. & Mgt., FMBIM (retired)