Printed on: 08/02/2019 09:10:04 **Application No: Consultees Name:** Received: Comment: Response: 2018/6320/P 05/02/2019 22:36:38 OBJ Joanne Scott I object to this application for the following reasons-The Magala was once a popular pub used by local residents for events, including the South End Green Residents Association (SEGRA). The function room on the first floor is critical to the success of the future of the pub and needs to be retained, so that the pub can be marketed as a viable business. It is vital to protect this community spaces, as so many areas are disappearing. Since the pub closed in 2014 SEGRA has been unable to find a suitable venue for their meetings and events. The developer should not be allowed to make false statements in their design and access statement. SEGRA claim that the statements in paragraphs 4.1, 4.2, 4.4 are untrue. SEGRA claim that there has been no dialogue with them and the developer, so how can the developer be allowed to claim these meetings took place? The application should be thrown out on the basis of these false statements alone. I would request that the Planning Officer acknowledge these comments from SEGRA and add them to the officer"s report. The ground floor area of the pub should be preserved and it looks like the new stairs in the proposed plans will mean the loss of part of the ground floor of the pub, thus reducing the size of the A4 existing use. Retaining the same floor area for the pub (A4 use) should be a material consideration. The developer proposed converting part of the ground floor of the pub to a function room, which will further reduce

There is no mention of retaining the pub beer garden, as it looks like the flats would use it for cycle storage. There needs to adequate space in the plans for storage and delivery of beer barrels/kegs, so this should be added as a condition.

the size of the pub area. The applicant also mentions a full "marketing campaign", without backing this up with

facts. I used to love going to the Magdala with friends after going for walks on Hampstead Heath. The Magdala is a much loved pub and the local community would love to see it reopen with the function room upstairs. Please can Camden Council consider granting protected ACV status to the pub to protect it from over development. The Magdala's owner, Ori Calif is not to be trusted. His company, CTLX illegally demolished The Carlton Tavern in Maida Vale and Westminster Council are forcing him to rebuilt the pub "brick by brick". CTLX has no respect for history and would certainly not care about preserving the pub"s history - where Ruth

Ellis shot her lover, before becoming the last woman to be hanged in the UK.

The London Plan 2011 prohibits unacceptable loss of an operational public house, which performs an important community role. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 70 specifically protects public houses.

The proposed development does not protect the A4 use within the overall scheme. The Planning Officer should insist on noise insulation being a material consideration, secured by condition to protect the pub from future complaints from the flats upstairs. Developers often use this "Trojan horse" tactic to apply for change of use at a later date.

I would urge Camden Council to reject this application and also request that Enforcement Officers should visit the pub to ensure that CTLX, do not illegally convert the pub or demolish the building, as they did to the Carlton Tavern in South Kilburn. Please listen to the 60+ objections and reject this application. If this application goes to Planning Committee SEGRA should be asked to speak against the proposal.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Printed on: 08/02/2019 09:10: Response: | :04 |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|---|-----|
| 2018/6320/P | Nigel Steward | 05/02/2019 13:44:04 | COMMEMP ER | This application contains so many errors of fact that it should be withdrawn by the Council urgently . | |
| | | | EK | We had a similar situation at No 4 Keats Grove last year & Camden Planning Officer has rescued the situation & has all sides , including the neighbours on an even keel already . | |
| | | | | Other objections to this proposal are based on the actual facts see SEGA and the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum | |
| 2018/6320/P | Celine Castelino | 06/02/2019 12:15:01 | APP | The function room should be protected as community space. The developers made false statements in the application claiming they met with Residents groups. They didn't. The new staircase on the ground floor will be larger then existing stairway - ensuing in the loss of pub area on ground floor. This is a historic building and should be protected. The current owner has a bad track record - he illegally demolished a pub when planning permission had been rejected. Please stop the destruction of community assets. | |
| 2018/6320/P | Steven | 06/02/2019 17:23:12 | OBJ | I write to object to this application. | |
| | | | | 1) The function room on the first floor is a part of the community that has been greatly missed which the building has been closed. I object to its loss to the community. | |
| | | | | 2)The Applicant claims that he has consulted with SEGA who do not object. I understand this to be untrue - and that SEGA do object and want to keep the community space open. This key misstatement should make the application subject to being withdrawn for correction. | |
| | | | | 3) The building is an official Asset of Community Value which acknowledges its importance to the community as a living space, aside from its history. | |
| | | | | The Applicant bought the building with clear knowledge of its heritage and community listing. He claimed to want to restore it as a pub. However, the pub has not re-opened. | |
| | | | | 4) Now the applicant applies to convert the 1st Floor to another flat. He claims that unless this is done, he cannot find a buyer or tenant for the pub. This is disingenuous as it all about the profit level. It may be true that, sold separately, the ground and first floors will be more valuable than a sale or lease as one unit. However the cost will be borne by the community which will lose a community space as part of the value of this community asset. As the applicant is a developer who bought the building in full knowledge of the constraints, it is not for the community to be deprived because he "changes the rules" and no longer wants to offer any community space. | |
| | | | | 5) Further the pub below will be short of overall floor area and not be very desirable. | |
| | | | | 6) In detail there is an apparent contradiction over the size of the space being lost to community use only some 500sqft, the area of the flat and the rest of the space. | |