

**From:** Jason Bartfeld [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 January 2019 15:12  
**To:** Sheehy, John [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2018/5808/P

Dear Sir,

[REDACTED]

I have seen the objection filed by Michael Da Costa and both echo and support its contents.

There is a further objection to add. Were this application to be granted it would remove the amenity to the locality that was part of the decision of the Planning Committee when Jack Straw's was originally converted from being a public house. Despite the residential nature of much of Hampstead, there is very little gym space. Two gym operators have filled the space affected by this application over the last 10 years, and have ultimately failed only because the Applicant has sought to charge unrealistic rents for the space. Bearing in mind the Applicant's historical disregard for planning procedure in other areas of the site, the inference is this was both a deliberate and cynical ploy to replace gym space (which is valuable to the community) with residential space (for which there is no need in the area, but which is more profitable to the Applicant).

I hope that the Committee will refuse this application.

Jason Bartfeld QC

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.