

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4095/P	Steven Fisher	8 Jack Straws Castle North End Way London NW3 7ES	05/09/2017 12:58:29	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this planning application. I am the owner-occupier of one of the first-floor residential apartments at Jack Straws Castle, positioned directly above the commercial premises.</p> <p>1. The supporting documentation asserts that: "A gym in this location has not been financially viable due to land Values and Market Rental Costs in this area and as a result will cease to operate on this site." This is a bizarre assertion, which is not borne out in reality. In fact, there is an existing gym already functioning on the premises, and I understand with no plans to cease operations. As other respondents have commented, this gym provides specialist personal training facilities to the local community, a service that differs from the other gyms in the surrounding area. The reference to market rental costs is a strange one: I infer that this means that the applicant (who is also the landlord) could charge a higher rent if the council allows the change of use. This may no doubt be a good result for the applicant, but I doubt that this is a valid objective of local planning policy. On the contrary, if this application is approved, it can only serve to undermine the ongoing viability of this existing business, with the consequent loss of employment for the staff currently working there, and loss of amenity for those local residents who appreciate the service offered.</p> <p>2. In addition, I wish to object more specifically to the detail of the proposed plans for the ground floor of the premises. These plans indicate a door linking the "Open plan office space" and the "Landlords Loby (sic)". In fact, the space labelled as being the landlord's lobby is the communal hallway leading to the residential apartments on the upper floors of the block. At present, this door is sealed shut, as indicated on the existing ground floor plans accompanying the application. These detailed plans contradict the assertion made elsewhere in the documentation that: "There will be no major internal alterations or any change to the existing access arrangements." It is not clear why the change of use should require the unsealing of this door, but the impact of this layout change is likely to compromise the security of the existing residents. Absent any amendment to the proposed plans to confirm that this door will remain sealed, this provides an additional reason to reject the application.</p> <p>3. I also note that the accompanying documentation proposes that: "There is space available on the rear courtyard to provide 5 cycle spaces." This is not the case. In fact, the use of the rear courtyard is reserved for the use of residents only, and is not available for the commercial premises. This has been guaranteed by the applicant within the terms of the lease that I hold with him.</p> <p>4. I note that the previous change of use approval (ref 2004/2042/P, as amended by 2007/5133/P) incorporated a number of conditions, which were established in order to safeguard the amenities of the adjoining residential premises. These included restrictions on the overnight use of the commercial premises, on the playing of music, and on the maximum number of persons on the premises. In the event that this application is approved (which I would oppose), I request that the same conditions ought to remain in place for the new use as an office. Such conditions ought not to be contentious in the</p>

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

context of the proposed use, but would still be appropriate in order to safeguard the amenity of the adjoining residents.

---