Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6931/P	John Cryne	10 Sneyd Road NW2 6AN NW2 6AN	15/02/2017 14:10:18	OBJ	Camden Council placed an Article 4 on the A4 premises to prevent change of use without planning permission and there has been a "for let" sign on the A4 premises for at least 2 years but one suspects the amount the owners are seeking + the reduced space available for a pub have resulted in a lack of interest. They should never have been allowed to develop the upper flats as they did, seriously compromising the available trading space. The removal of the landlord and staff accommodation inhibits the working functions of the bar and cellar. The commercial pub activity, if it had happened, would have become a "lock-up" pub with no resident staff. Lock-up pubs have higher insurance costs, difficulties with delivery arrangements (which have to be done during restricted hours when staff are present on-site to provide access and sign for goods) and a difficult commercial history (they are hard to run without resident staff and therefore there is a problem obtaining tenants for these establishments.) As a planning committee you will be familiar with the pattern of these development applications. The upstairs is converted into residential flats, usually for letting at inflated market rents. As a result of access to this residential area upstairs (and attendant fire escapes) the bar area on the ground floor looses trading space and becomes a less attractive commercial proposition. Because the bar is smaller and has become a lock-up (with all the attendant problems outlined above) the bar and cellar become unattractive to potential tenants. As a result the developer can say after 2 years that they have had trouble letting the ground and basement floors as a pub. Then they apply for change of use. As a result the pub is lost. The Pakenham has had much of its operating space taken away. Whether it still has the facility to do food I do not know but food was a key part of its offering. As was live sport and late night opening. Would all or any of that work underneath a residential development where no doubt the residents of the upper floors would put pressure on the pub to restrict its activities and noise. Again, I have no idea of the rent that was being sought on the remaining A4 area but the fact that no-one seems to have shown interest (although proof should be supplied) when there are many operators looking for venues in London is likely indicative of a mismatch between the rent being asked for and the (non) viability of the space that remains. Local campaigners like CAMRA call it the Trojan Horse. The Pakenham has been well and truly Trojaned and there is no alternative but to lodge an objection to this final proposed nail in the Pub"s coffin.