

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	14/02/2019
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	17/02/2019
Officer			Application Numbers	
Samir Benmbarek			2018/6320/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
2A South Hill Park London NW3 2SB			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Change of use of first floor level (function room and store) from public house (Use A4) to 1x 2 bedroom self-contained flat with associated access, refuse storage and cycle parking (Use C3)				
Recommendation:	Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:			No. of responses	57	No. of objections	57
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Multiple site notices were displayed in close proximity to the application site from 14/01/2019 (expiring on 07/02/2019). A press notice was also displayed from 17/01/2019 (expiring on 10/02/2019).</p> <p>Due to an error on the plotting of the site and address, the application was re-consulted on with the correct information. Corrected site notices were displayed in close proximity to the application site from 14/01/2019 (expiring on 07/02/2019) and a press notice was displayed on 24/01/2019 (expiring on 17/02/2019).</p> <p>To date, 57x objections have been received from the following addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Parliament Hill • 7 Parliament Hill • 34 Parliament Hill • 42 Parliament Hill • 44 Parliament Hill • Ground Floor Rear, 71 Parliament Hill • Chatham Cottage, 71A Parliament Hill • Flat 1 Parliament Court, Parliament Hill • Flat 8, 8 Parliament Court, Parliament Hill • 1 South Hill Park • 3 South Hill Park • Flat 1, 10 South Hill Park • Flat 1, 19 South Hill Park • 24 South Hill Park • 33 South Hill Park • 35 South Hill Park • Flat 2, 41 South Hill Park • 40 South Hill Park • Flat 2, 41 South Hill Park • 42 South Hill Park • Flat 2, 49 South Hill Park • 48 South Hill Park • 50 South Hill Park • 59 South Hill Park • 61 South Hill Park • 5 South Hill Mansions, 68-70 South Hill Park • 79 South Hill Park • 80B South Hill Park • 81 South Hill Park • 82 South Hill Park • 84 South Hill Park • 86 South Hill Park • 90 South Hill Park • 97A South Hill Park 					

- 103C South Hill Park
- 114 South Hill Park
- 116 South Hill Park
- 2 South Hill Park Gardens
- Flat 3, 10 South Hill Park Gardens
- 14A South Hill Park Gardens
- 17 South Hill Park Gardens
- Basement Right, 17 South Hill Park Gardens
- 23 South Hill Park Gardens
- 24B South Hill Park Gardens
- 7 Nassington Road
- 10 Nassington Road
- 39B Nassington Road
- 45 Nassington Road
- 16 Heath Hurst Road
- 17 Heath Hurst Road
- 12A Keats Grove
- The White House, Keats Grove
- 104A Constantine Road
- 67 Langbourne Mansions, Langbourne Avenue,
- 6 Fawley Road
- Ground Floor Flat 101 Fordwych Road
- 12 Frampton Road, Epping, Essex

The comments are summarised as below:

Principle of loss of A4 Floorspace/ Function Room

1. Pub is designated as an Asset of Community Value (ACV);
2. Object to the loss of the function room which served the community and is considered valuable;
3. Many events and functions were hosted in the function room bringing the community together;
4. Function room was used for a variety of events- eg. book clubs, movie clubs, musical performances, local meetings, political meetings
5. Focus of the community;
6. Community spaces need to be retained and preserved;
7. There are no local substitutes for the existing function room;
8. Social and interpersonal value of the function room;
9. Loss of community as a result of proposal may result in loneliness and mental health issues.

Proposed Residential

1. There is not a shortage of flats in the area;
2. Another luxury flat is not needed in the area;
3. Proposed residential at first floor level would undermine the operation of the pub at ground floor level.

Transport

1. Road blocks with the previous application which would be likely to occur with this application

Other

1. Magdala Pub forms part of the identity and character of the local neighbourhood
2. Previous to current licensees/operators of the pub, the Magdala was running successfully

3. Appears to be no intention for the Magdala Pub to reopen
4. Pub was forcibly closed two years ago and has not operated since
5. Discrepancies and error of fact and within the planning, design & access statement and marketing report
6. Blatantly false attempt to operate the bar so has presented itself as a failed and unprofitable business
7. Pub deliberately kept closed and manipulation of other factors such as unachievably high rents to deter a prospective occupiers from operating a pub business
8. Spaces of the building have been eroded way to make the pub unviable for continued business
9. No regard for the status of the site as an ACV

It is worth noting that one of the objectors to the scheme was a previous lessee of The Magdala. Their response is quoted as below:

"I am writing to object to the proposed plan to turn the 1st floor function room of The Magdala in to a 2 bedroom flat. My interest is as the former lessee of The Magdala (2007-2014), and prior to that as Manager. I have been involved in the local South End Green community since 1998. I must say that without the function room, we would have struggled at times to keep The Magdala profitable. The fact that we were very much a Community Pub, and this room was OFTEN used for community purposes, also highlights its importance whilst we were there.

As well as regular events and functions, the room was integral to our Sunday lunch trade. Without the function room, our Sundays would have had nowhere near the success we experienced. Our Sunday lunches were well known in the area. It was a great space also for families with younger children, feeling they could enjoy lunch, without disturbing diners downstairs. The room was open from 12-5, during which time we often did 2-3 sittings. The capacity of the room was 40 people. I would calculate that having the function room allowed us to generate approximately an extra £2,000 each Sunday.

Christmas parties really held us afloat financially. Without the function room, we would have been unable to accommodate large parties/groups for Christmas lunches/dinners. We were generally fully booked from beginning of December to the weekend before Christmas. Sometimes lunches and dinners. Again, many regular bookings returning each year, some even booking the date at their party for the following year.

The various functions/events we held upstairs often brought people to the pub for the first time, who would then become returning customers, hence having a longer-term effect on increasing trade. The space was so versatile, from meetings to buffets to comedy to weddings to children's classes. Whilst I appreciate the space was not utilised as much as the downstairs area, nevertheless it was a vital part of the business, without which we would have had to turn many prospective customers away, and I believe it was integral to the success of The Magdala as a whole.

The first planning application the developers submitted in 2014 included turning the function room in to a flat. This was turned down, noting the ACV on the property and the fact that the room was vital to the business and the wider community. Subsequently, when the work was done on the property, the first floor was blocked off, presumably already with the intention of leaving it vacant for a few years, before re-submitting the

application, due to non-use of the room. The reason the function room is "undesirable" for prospective buyers, is that it is inaccessible, and not included in the sale of the lease. I know a pub company who were looking to buy the pub about 2 years ago. It was precisely because the function room was NOT included, and the fact the kitchen had been stripped out that they decided not to pursue a purchase. That, and the fact that the rent was being quoted as £120,000 p.a. There is no way that with a massively reduced trading area & no kitchen that such an inflated rent is viable.

... Although there are other pubs in the area, The Magdala had a unique community feel to it, a home from home to many, and a community venue whose loss is being sorely felt. However, with a reasonable market rent, and full access to the first floor function room, The Magdala could once more be the hub of the community it once was".

**CAAC/ National
Amenity Society
comments:**

South Hill Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee

The South Hill Park CAAC were formally consulted. To date, no comments have been received.

Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum

The Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum responded objecting to the proposal. Their comments are as summarised below:

1. Contrary to policy EC1 of the emerging Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan;
2. Function room is important as it is used by the community and the function room forms part of ACV status of The Magdala;
3. Proposed ground floor function room is a poor replacement for the existing
4. The internal staircase has still not yet been developed although is within the plans of a previously approved application- this could be a factor in publicans not wanting to take the function room as it is not connected to the ground floor internally.

South End Green Association (SEGA)

The South End Green Association (SEGA) have responded, objecting to the proposal. Their comments are as summarised below:

1. SEGA made the first successful application for The Magdala to become an ACV;
2. Critical element of the usefulness of The Magdala to the local community is the first floor function room;
3. Community events held in the function room in which no suitable alternatives have been found following its closure;
4. Discrepancies and false information within the application submission;
5. SEGA supports the renewal of the ACV accreditation.

Magdala Rescue

As a result of this planning application, the 'Magdala Rescue' group was set up. The group was set up with the intention to ensure that the first floor of the public house is not lost and that the pub will operate again. Magdala Rescue have responded, objecting to the proposal. Their comments are as summarised below:

1. Numerous pieces of incorrect or misleading information in both the planning statement and marketing report;
2. The applicant's proposition is that the only way to open the pub viably is by cannibalising the first floor function room, to pay for works to the ground floor and basement, to attract an operator. This is not supported by sight of any detailed economic assumptions or evidence, which one would expect to see;
3. Specifically, there is no evidence that prospective operators declined to take-on the pub because of the function room;
4. The operator with whom the applicant had entered into advanced negotiations, made an offer to include the first floor function room, once she saw the applicant advertise it, but the applicant did not respond;
5. An enquiry as to the availability of The Magdala, from a Hampstead

resident involved in the pub trade, received a response from the applicant's agent, DCL, saying the pub has been under offer since January 2019;

6. The purpose of the marketing campaign for the pub was to collect evidence to show that no operators want the function room, thereby making it available for conversion to residential. This is confirmed by one of the applicant's team who in an email said, *In order to justify moving the function room to the ground floor, the council require evidence confirming that the first floor function room is not commercially viable. The pub and the function room, in their existing configuration, have therefore been marketed.*

Site Description

The subject site is a four-storey building with a basement located on the northern side of South Hill Park, nearby the junction of South Hill Park and Parliament Hill. The ground floor, basement and first floor is currently in use as a pub (Use A4), although it is now currently vacant. The basement level features restrooms and storage areas, the ground floor contains the bar while the first floor level contains a function room and storage area.

The second and third floor of the building are in residential use. The third floor was constructed by way of planning permission 2014/6588/P (further details in the 'Relevant History' section) which is also residential. Access to the first, second and third floor levels of the building are reached via access to the rear of the building. Currently, there is no internal staircase between the ground and first floor levels of the building.

The building is not listed but is located within the South Hill Park Conservation Area. It is described within the South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. It is also noted within the Statement that the Magdala Tavern was the first building to be constructed in South Hill Park in 1868.

The premises are designated as an Asset of Community Value (ACV).

Relevant History

Application Site:

2014/6588/P- Mansard roof extension to creation an additional floor; the creation of 2 self-contained 2 bedroom flats; ground floor rear extension to create addition pub (A4) space; new residential access, pathway and associated bike and refuse store. **Granted subject to S106 legal agreement 30/05/2015.**

Similar applications within the borough:

Carpenter's Arms, 105 King's Cross Road, London, WC1X 9LR

2017/7055/P- Change of use of the first and second floors from public house (Class A4) to create 1x2 bed flat at 1st floor level and 1x3 bed flat at 2nd floor level; erection of mansard roof extension to create 1x3 bed flat (Class C3) and associated works (part retrospective). **Refused and warning of enforcement action to be taken 16/03/2018.**

The Council's reasons for refusal were:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the loss of ancillary space to serve the public house, would materially change the character of an existing use designated as an Asset of Community Value and compromise the long-term viability and future of the public house which provides an important local community facility, contrary to policy C4 (Public Houses) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan June 2017, paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Policy 4.8 of the London Plan 2016.
2. The proposed replacement window and door to the shopfront, by reason of their inappropriate design and materials, would harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the host building, streetscene and conservation area contrary to policies D1 (Design), D2 (Heritage) and D3 (Shopfronts); and the separate street access to the upper floors would compromise the operation of the public house contrary to policy C4 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policy T2 (Parking and car-free development) of the London Borough of

4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards affordable housing, would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough, contrary to policy H4 (Maximising the supply of affordable housing) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

2016/0759/P- Change of use of the first and second floors from public house (Class A4) to create 1x2 bedroom and 1x3 bedroom flat (Class C3); erection of mansard roof extension to create 1x3 bedroom flat (Class C3) and associated works. **Refused 18/04/2016.**

The Council's reason for refusal were:

1. The proposed residential flats would result in loss of space within the existing public house which would prejudice the long term retention of the public house which is an important local community facility contrary to policy CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP15 (Community and leisure uses) of Camden's adopted Local Development Framework.
2. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed co-location of residential units and the public house would not cause harm to the residential amenity of the future occupants of the upper floor flats, or prejudice the operation of the public house, due to noise disturbance, contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of development) and CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) and DP28 (Noise and vibration) and policy DP15 (Community and leisure uses) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing for the residential units would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP18 (Parking standards and the availability of car parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary highway works, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP21 (Development connecting to highway network) and DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a Construction Management Plan, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians and protect their amenity, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP20 (Movement of goods and materials), DP21 (Development connecting to highway network) and DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Appeal APP/X5210/W/16/3153219 against refusal 2017/0759/P dismissed 04/04/2017.

The main issues considered at appeal were:

- i. Whether the proposal would prejudice the long term retention of the public house which is an Asset of Community Value (ACV); and
- ii. Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants of the upper floor flats or prejudice the operation of the public house with particular reference to noise disturbance.

In respect of the first point, which related to the first reason for refusal, the Inspector considered that the proposal would result in the loss of part of the premises that contribute to the functioning of the pub and that the development would therefore prejudice the long term retention of the public house which is an ACV, contrary to the overall aims of Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy, Policy DP15 of the Development Plan, emerging Policy C4 of the Local Plan and the Framework which seek to safeguard the community benefits that may arise from public houses.

In respect of the second point, which related to the second reason for refusal, at the Hearing the Council confirmed that the revised Noise Impact Assessment by KP Acoustics dated 24 May 2016 overcame the original concerns regarding noise levels within the building, and that external noise could be controlled through conditions. As such, the Inspector considered that the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants of the upper floor flats without prejudice to the operation of the public house with particular reference to noise disturbance, and therefore the proposal would accord with the provisions of Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and Policy DP26 of the Development Plan. However, the Inspector noted that this would not outweigh the harm identified regarding the long term retention of the public house which is an ACV.

Appeal overturned by a High Court judgement No. CO/2318/2017 on 17/10/2017.

The judgement concluded that the Inspector had erred in law in not properly considering evidence about a potential lease and that the appeal should be heard again.

Appeal APP/X5210/W/16/3153219 against refusal 2017/0759/P dated 04/04/2017 subsequent to High Court judgement no. CO/2318/2017. Appeal dismissed 17/09/2018.

The main issue considered at appeal were:

- i. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the use of the public house as a valued local community asset. (The public house has been designated as an Asset of Community Value (ACV))

The Inspector considered that while the loss of the second floor would not adversely affect the operation of the public house, it was concluded that the loss of the first floor accommodation and its potential to contribute to the ACV would adversely affect the public house. The current use, while providing a high class A4 establishment, does not provide the same community service, and this may continue as long as the owner and landlord want, but it remains important to ensure that the building can function as an ACV in the future in accordance with the development plan policies to protect such uses and loss of their floor space. The Inspectorate further continued to conclude that although some weight is attached to the provision of housing this does outweigh the need to protect community assets as identified by Camden Local Plan Policy C4 as promoted by the London Plan Policy 4.48.

Packenhams Arms, 1 Packenhams Street, London, WC1X 0LA

2016/6930/P- Change of use from pub/drinking establishment (Use Class A4) to office (Use Class B1a) at basement and ground floor levels. **Refused 03/10/2017.**

The Council's reason for refusal was:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the office use, would fail to provide a suitable alternative community use which reflects this building's community, heritage and townscape value and the contribution it makes to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, contrary to policies C4 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

Golden Lion Public House, 88 Royal College Street, NW1 0TH

2013/4793/P – Retention of public house at basement and part ground floor level (Class A4) and change of use from public house (Class A4) at part ground and first, second and third floor levels to provide 4 (3x2, 1x3 bed) residential units (Class C3), erection of three storey (including roof level dormer) extension on north (Pratt Street) elevation, extension at basement level, alterations to provide ground floor entrances on Pratt Street elevation, and associated alterations. **Refused 25/06/2014; Appeal APP/X5210/A/14/2218740 dismissed 02/10/2014.**

The Council's reasons for refusal were:

1. The existing local public house, in its current form, is considered to serve the needs of the local community and is registered as an asset of community value in accordance with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011. Its proposed reconfiguration and modification would harmfully compromise and undermine the use of the existing public house. Therefore the public house would fail to be developed and modernised in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community, which in turn would fail to enhance the sustainability of communities, contrary to policy CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policies DP15 (Community and leisure uses) and DP29 (Improving access) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies, paragraphs 69 and 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policy 4.8 of the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan January 2014.
2. The proposed roller shutters, by reason of their location, materials, method of opening and lack of detailed drawings indicating inappropriate design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of a building which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing for the four residential units proposed, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP18 (Parking standards and the availability of car parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary highway works, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP21 (Development connecting to highway network) and DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

The Black Cap, 171 Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JY

2012/1444/P – Change of use of first, second and third floors from bar/restaurant use and ancillary accommodation to residential (Class C3) to provide 2x 2-bedroom units and 1x 1 bedroom unit with rear roof terraces at first and third floor levels and a rear balcony at second floor level, alterations to windows and doors on side and rear and creation of refuse and cycle stores for flats at ground floor level. **Refused 16/05/2012; Appeal APP/X5210/A/12/2184317 dismissed 04/03/2013.**

The Council's reasons for refusal were:

1. The pub and restaurant use at first floor level is considered to serve the needs of a specific and local community, therefore its loss without a replacement facility or evidence provided to demonstrate that the facility is no longer required, is contrary to policies CS3 (Other highly accessible areas), CS7(Promoting Camden's centres and shops), CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services), DP12 (Supporting strong centres and managing the impact of food, drink, entertainment and other town centre uses) and DP15 (Community and leisure uses) of Camden's Local Development Framework.
2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area contrary to policy CS11 (sustainable travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
3. The application fails to adequately demonstrate whether the residential flats would experience an acceptable level of internal noise contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) and DP28 (Noise & vibration) of Camden's Local Development Framework.

Sir Richard Steele, 97 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 4RL

2016/1189/P – Change of use of the first and second floors from public house (Class A4) to residential (Class C3) to provide 4 self-contained flats (Class C3) (2x1 bedroom and 2x2 bedroom flats), demolition of existing toilets and kitchen and erection of new single storey ground floor rear extension to provide new function and community room, relocation of existing kitchen extraction flue and associated external works. **Granted subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 23/11/2017.**

2014/1367/P – Change of use of the first and second floors from public house (Class A4) to create 2x1 bedroom and 2x2 bedroom flats (Class C3); extension and relocation of existing kitchen extract flue and associated works. Refused 26/11/2014; **Appeal APP/X5210/W/15/3003396 dismissed 22/07/2015.**

The Council's reasons for refusal were:

1. The proposed development would harmfully compromise and undermine the services and facilities that the existing public house and its garden provide in supporting the needs of the local community and its ability to contribute to Camden's cultural heritage, contrary to policy CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policies DP15 (Community and leisure uses) and paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policy 4.8 of the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan January 2014.
2. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed co-location of residential units and the public house would not cause harm to the residential amenity of the future occupants of the upper floor flats, contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of development) of the London

Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing for the residential units would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP18 (Parking standards and the availability of car parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary highway works, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP21 (Development connecting to highway network) and DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Enforcement History

Ref: EN16/0615- First floor is no longer part of the pub - is not being offered as part of the lease of the pub and was not when the pub briefly opened accessible. PP 2014/6588/P stated that the retention of the ground floor pub and first floor function room was supported as they were considered to be assets of community value. **Closed 22/09/2016.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

The London Plan 2016

3.16- Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

4.1- Developing London's economy

4.8- Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector and related services and facilities

7.15- Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting the appropriate soundscapes

Emerging London Plan

HC7 Public Houses

Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth

H1 Maximising housing supply

H4 Maximising the supply of affordable housing

H6 Housing choice and mix

H7 Large and small homes

A1 Managing the impact of development

A4 Noise and vibration

C4 Public Houses

C6 Access for all

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

CC5 Waste

T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

T2 Parking and car-free development

T4 Promoting the sustainable movement of goods and materials

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (Updated March 2018)

CPG2 Housing (Updated March 2018)

CPG7 Transport (September 2011)

CPG8 Planning Obligations (Updated March 2018)

CPG Amenity (March 2018)

CPG Community spaces, leisure facilities and pubs (March 2018)

Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018

EC1- Healthy retail mix

South Hill Park Conservation Statement 2001

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Change of use of the first floor of The Magdala (2A South Hill Park) from public house (Use A4) to residential (Use C3) to create 1x 2bedroom self-contained flat;
- Formation of associated access, refuse storage and cycle parking facilities.

1.2 The proposed flat at first floor level would replace the existing function room and store. The existing function room located at the front of the first floor level measures 47sqm while the store room at the rear of the first floor level measures 15.3sqm. The remaining circulation space at first floor level located by the staircase measures 14.4sqm.

1.3 The proposed 2 bedroom flat would measure 82sqm in floorspace occupying the entirety of the first floor level. At ground floor level, a ground floor level function room would be proposed at the rear of the bar area. This proposed function room would measure 29.7sqm.

2. Assessment

2.1 The main issues for consideration are:

- Land use;
- Dwelling mix, standard of accommodation and affordable housing
- Affordable Housing
- Design;
- Neighbouring amenity;
- Transport;
- Waste;
- Community Infrastructure Levy

3. Land Use

3.1 Public houses are considered to play an important community and cultural role. As places where members of the community meet and gather, they support social well-being and strengthen community cohesion. They sometimes provide important community meeting space and host local meetings, events and entertainment. Many pubs contribute to local culture and identity and this is closely related to a pub's long-standing presence in the locality. The closure of a pub can lead to the loss of an area's vibrancy as well as its diversity and interest. Some pubs are additionally important as they are heritage assets and architecturally distinguished.

3.2 Pubs also have an important economic function in contributing to the vitality of town centres or neighbourhood centres and providing a hub for the surrounding neighbourhoods. Pubs support local employment and entrepreneurship, provide valuable work experience for young people and support jobs in the wider economy through the pub supply chain. They provide important outlet for breweries in Camden and London to sell their products.

3.3 Furthermore, some of the most interesting and unique pubs attract customers from a wide catchment area and may be important in terms of their tourism value or to a protected group

defined under the Equalities Act 2010.

- 3.4 Policy C4 of the Camden Local Plan seeks to protect public houses which are of community, heritage or townscape value. Policy C4 states that “*Applications involving the loss of pub floorspace, including facilities ancillary to the operation of the public house, will be resisted where this will adversely affect the operation of the public house*”. This is further reinforced in paragraph 4.83 of the supporting text which states that the partial loss of a pub and ancillary facilities may be detrimental to its character, community value or future viability.” It further goes on to comment “*these changes can lead to a pub being less profitable and as a consequence, more vulnerable to further redevelopment, potentially leading to a pub being lost altogether*”. The introduction of non-ancillary uses is also recognised: “*In some cases the loss of part of a pub may lead to its continuing operation being undermined by the greater likelihood of complaints relating to noise and nuisance from occupants of new non-ancillary uses*”.
- 3.5 Policy C4 reflects paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which urges Local Planning Authorities to plan positively for the provision and use of public houses and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities. Alongside this, policy 4.8 of the London Plan (2016) promotes sustainable access to goods and services that Londoners need. Pubs contribute to ‘lifetime neighbourhoods’ that are welcoming, accessible and inviting environments that provide facilities available to all, regardless of age, health or disability. Policy HC7 (B) of the emerging London Plan reads that “*Applications that propose the loss of public houses with heritage, cultural, economic or social value should be refused unless there is authoritative marketing evidence that demonstrates that there is no realistic prospect of the building being used as a pub in the foreseeable future*”.
- 3.6 A major issue for pubs is the loss of part of their operating space such as beer gardens, function rooms, commercial kitchens and ancillary accommodation for managers, other staff members and/or guests. This can impact a pub’s character and continuing ability to operate. The loss of one or more elements of a pub may undermine its appeal or lead to negative impacts on the amenity of the surrounding area or conflict between incompatible uses.
- 3.7 Prior to the submission of this application, the internal staircase was removed linking the ground floor and first floor levels. Previously this staircase would have linked the function room with the main pub area at ground floor level. Access to the function room (and the rest of the first floor level) is now independent of access to the ground floor pub; access is gained through a staircase at the rear of the building.
- 3.8 It is considered that this operational space is a major part of the functioning of the public house, and the removal of this space (along with the previous removal of the internal staircase) would greatly restrict the operations of the public house at ground and basement floor levels, reducing its quality.

Value by the Community & Asset of Community Value (ACV)

- 3.9 Policy C4 (a) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will not grant planning permission for proposal to change the use of a public house (in whole or in part) unless it is demonstrated to the Council’s satisfaction that “*the proposal would not result in the loss of pubs which are valued by the community (including protected groups) unless there are equivalent premises available equivalent of meeting the community’s needs served by the public house*”.
- 3.10 CPG Community uses, leisure facilities and pubs requires applications which include the loss of a pub or pub floorspace to provide information regarding existing public houses and their facilities in the area served by the pub that is subject to the proposed scheme. A community survey is not required in this instance as the pub is an Asset of Community Value (ACV). Appendix 5 of the submitted marketing report lists nearby public houses and other facilities.
- 3.11 An Asset of Community Value (ACV) is a building or piece of land which currently, or in the recent past, furthers the social wellbeing, or cultural, recreational or sporting interests of the

local community and is expected to do so in the future. The Council formally registers an asset subject to certain criteria. If it does, and when the owner decides to sell the asset, a local group can trigger a six-month moratorium on the sale giving them time to raise the funds to purchase it (sometimes referred to as a 'right to bid'). Owners have to consider bids but they do not have to accept them. The Council, when determining planning applications for community facilities, treats the listing of an ACV as an indicator of local support and evidence that it furthers the social wellbeing and interests of residents.

3.12 Magdala Public House was nominated as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on 30 July 2014, and was granted as an ACV on 29 August 2014. Currently, there is an application to extend the pub's status as an ACV for an additional five years until 2024. The previous and current nominations for ACV status are submitted in line with the Localism Act 2011 and demonstrates that the premises provide a recognised community function.

3.13 Within the representations received by the Council through public consultation, there were numerous comments that highlighted the many events that the first floor held for the local community. These ranged from private events for members of the local community (birthday parties, anniversary parties, wedding receptions etc.), local community and political meetings (e.g.-residents association meetings) and culture and the arts (book clubs, movie nights, etc.). A list of events compiled by the local community can be found in Appendix I of this report.

3.14 The received comments have mentioned that due to the events that took place in the function room (in conjunction with the everyday operation of the bar); The Magdala is a public house that is an important and well-used facility for the local community. This is reflected in the level of public interest with this application. Since its closure, the comments have gone on further to mention that there have been no suitable local alternatives that can accommodate the variety and scale of events that occurred in The Magdala. As a result, the various respondents have mentioned that this has led to a loss of social and interpersonal connections within the local community as well as the diminishment of the local community 'spirit' as a whole (please refer to summarised responses within the 'Consultations' section of this report).

3.15 Within the planning statement submitted, the applicant comments that a consultation process was made with the local community (both individuals and groups) in which the consensus was that they were supportive of the loss of the first floor space and that they want The Magdala to reopen. Whilst it can be demonstrated the local community does want to see the public house reopen, the public consultation responses (particularly those from local groups) do not correlate with the assertion that the local community are in favour of the loss of the first floor level.

3.16 The current status and nomination to continue The Magdala as an ACV is a further demonstration the site is highly valued by the local community and the function room plays a vital role in this (as noted within the public consultation responses).

Marketing Evidence

3.17 Policy C4 (b) of the London Plan states that the Council will not grant planning permission for proposal to a change of use of a public house unless it demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that '*there is no interest in the continued use of the property or site as a public house and no reasonable prospect of a public house being able to trade from the premises over the medium term*'.

3.18 In conjunction with criterion B of policy C4, CPG Community uses, leisure facilities and pubs advises applicants that a marketing exercise and viability assessment is required to satisfy criterion B.

3.19 A marketing exercise was submitted within the application in an attempt to justify the loss of the ancillary floorspace. The applicants claim that the existing public house has limited interest to potential leases and that this has been affected by the additional cost of operating the first floor level. In an attempt to demonstrate that commercially the first floor level of the

premises are unviable, marketing evidence has been submitted. The marketing report includes evidence of a marketing campaign between January 2018 and November 2018 (when the application was submitted) which included online adverts as well. The marketing report includes the adverts and methods used to advertise the premises and to reach out to prospective clients. It also contained responses between January and August 2018 (a period of eight months). It should be noted that the minimum marketing period required as stated within CPG Community uses, leisure facilities and pubs is 12 months.

3.20 The marketing report (p.2) summarises that 4x prospective operators were interested in The Magdala should the function room not be included and that overall there was generally no interest in the first floor function room. The offers which were generated are as follows:

- A restaurant company has offered £82,500 per annum for a new 15 year lease inside the 1954 Act for the ground and basement only. They require 9months rent-free to fit out the site. They require the ground and basement only;
- A pub company have offered a stepped increases over the first five years up to £100,000 per annum, to open market rent review in the 10th year for a new 20 year lease, inside the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954, for the ground and basement only. They require 9 months rent-free to fit out the property. They require the ground and basement only;
- A pub company have offered a rent of £90,000 per annum for a new 30 year lease inside the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 for the ground and basement only. They require a rent-free period of 9 months to fit out the property. They require the ground and basement only;
- A pub company have offered a rent of £45,000 per annum for a new 15 year lease inside the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 for the ground and basement only. They require a rent-free period of 9 months to fit out the property. They operate The Alma in Newington Green, North by Northwest in Islington, King William IV in Hampstead, Old Eagle in Camden and Molly Moggs in Soho. They require the ground and basement only.

3.21 Within the marketing report, the applicants claim that the key points of the feedback from perspective occupiers generally included:

- Large amount of competition in the area (examples being Garden Gate, Roebuck, The George, Freemasons Arms, The Stag, King William IV, Horseshoe, Holly Bush and The Wells);
- The property is located in a secondary location where there is less footfall than the main high street;
- The ground floor was not sufficient in size;
- The surrounding area is too residential;
- No footfall;
- There is no beer garden;
- Prospective operators could not afford the rent;
- Current market- closure of businesses have put operators off from expanding;
- Corporate and large multiple operators have properties in the area and surrounding area;

- Public House is desirable but do not want a function room.

3.22 Despite the claim that the 4x prospective operators did not want to take on the function room, other information within the marketing report seems conflict this information. Appendix 3 of the marketing report contains written communications (emails) between prospective occupiers and the applicant in regards to operating The Magdala. Despite the fact the responses demonstrated no interest in operating the premises, the main reason highlighted within the responses was the high rent. None of the responses contained referenced the first floor function room (or first floor in general).

3.23 The market evidence and communications within Appendix 3 suggests that the rent proposed by the applicant is above the market norm for a pub in the North London area. Therefore, limited weight is placed upon this submitted marketing report. Appendix 3 of the marketing exercise contains an asking rent of £120,000 per annum for the premises within the communications to a prospective client. The examples used of other pubs across London ranged from around £58,000 to £88,000. It should be commented that each pub within Appendix 4 are within different localities across North London and are of different sizes and locations (prime, non-prime etc.) which would contribute to the different asking rents. Despite this, the quoted asking rent of £120,000 per annum is exceedingly higher than the range of asking rental values presented within the marketing report.

3.24 Overall, the evidence demonstrates that there is a desire for the unit as a public house and despite the assertions within the marketing report that the first floor space is one of the reasons that prospective licensees wish to operate The Magdala, there is no evidence within the marketing report to support this claim. Therefore, the marketing evidence does not satisfactorily demonstrate that there is no interest in the running of the first floor level of the building as an A4 space.

3.25 The submitted marketing exercise was not accompanied by a viability assessment. This would have been required (see detailed within CGP Community uses, leisure facilities and pubs) if justification based on viability were to be given any weight. Without this, no weight is applied to this aspect of the justification.

3.26 Policy EC1(4) of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan states that the Neighbourhood Plan does not support the conversion of first floor or higher space where it has not been demonstrated there has been a long history of vacancy. Although the first floor level has been vacant, this is by way of the premises closing as opposed to no interest and this does not demonstrate a *long* history of vacancy.

Land Use Conclusions

3.27 It is considered that the proposed conversion of the first floor would harmfully compromise and undermine the use of the existing public house and prejudice its long-term retention. The proposal would make the premises less attractive to potential tenants and would reduce its capacity to function as an ACV with a wide range of activities for local residents. In turn this would fail to enhance the sustainability of communities contrary to policy C4 of the Camden Local Plan.

3.28 Furthermore, the submitted marketing evidence does not satisfactorily demonstrate that there is no demand for the first floor level of the premises (or the public house as a whole). Therefore, it is considered that there is still an interest in the continued use of the first floor as a public house and there is no justification to suggest otherwise. A viability assessment was not included within the application submission.

3.29 At ground floor level, the proposed function room/space is considered to not mitigate the loss of the function room and ancillary space at first floor level. The proposed floorspace of the ground floor function room is smaller than the existing first floor function room. It is considered the proposed function room and would not be able to accommodate some of the events and

number of attendees that the existing function room can. Additionally, it is considered that the location of the proposed function room at ground floor level would deplete viable bar space causing further detriment to the operation of the public house.

3.30 In light of the above, the proposed development by reason of the loss of the first floor ancillary space, without adequate justification, would materially change the character of an existing use designated as an Asset of Community Value and compromise the long-term viability and future of public house which provide an important local community facility, contrary to Policy C4 (Public Houses) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017, paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018, and Policy 4.8 of the London Plan 2016.

4. Dwelling mix, standard of accommodation and amenity of future occupiers

Dwelling mix

4.1 Policy H7 of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will aim to secure a range of homes of different sizes in all residential developments and will seek to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Sizes Priorities Table. The Priority Table indicates that market housing with two or three bedrooms are of the highest priority and most sought after unit size.

4.2 The proposed development comprises of 1x 2bedroom self-contained flat which results in 100% of high priority dwellings in the development.

Standard of accommodation

4.3 The proposal would provide 82sqm of residential floorspace. The proposed floorspace of the residential unit has been assessed against the minimum residential space standards as set out within the London Plan, listed in the table below.

Unit	No. Bedrooms	Storeys	GIA	London Plan Standards	Difference
1	2 (4person)	1	68sqm	70sqm	-2sqm

4.4 The proposed unit is considered to be of an acceptable size as it is marginally less than the minimum space requirement for a 2x bedroom, 4x persons self-contained flat.

4.5 Overall, the proposed new residential unit complies with the housing policies of the Camden Local Plan. However, this does not outweigh the principle loss of the A4 space that has demonstrated to provide a place of value to the local community

Amenity of future occupiers

4.6 Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan ensures that new development does not cause adverse amenity impacts upon the future residential occupiers. This in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy, overlooking, outlook, noise and vibration and odour

4.7 The proposed new unit are considered to provide a good standard of residential accommodation in terms of layout, circulation, room sizes, daylight, sunlight and outlook. The units would be dual aspect.

4.8 As the proposal would result in the creation of a noise sensitive receptor within close proximity to the public house at ground floor level, an acoustic report was submitted within the application. The acoustic report was reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer who concluded that the report demonstrates compliance with certain criteria through reasonable acoustic measures. This is based on generic assumptions such as the pub would

accommodate up to 90 persons and that the source of noise does not include music.

4.9 In order the amenity of future occupiers (in regards to noise) to be maintained, this would mean that the ground floor pub could not play live or amplified music. The restriction of playing music would seriously undermine the continued viability of the ground floor pub or should music be played could lead to complaints from the residents of the proposed first floor flat. This in turn could lead to the continued operation and viability of the pub being jeopardised.

4.10 There would also be concerns of noise and general disturbance from the entries and exits of patrons to the pub. The front windows that would serve the proposed living room would be in close proximity to the entrance of the pub below in which the noise would travel through the windows.

4.11 Additionally, the 3x front windows which face the street and the 1x side window which faces the small beer garden/yard would be used to naturally ventilate the proposed flat. As a result the flat could be adversely impacted in regards to odour as a result of cigarette smoke travelling up through the windows from patrons using the beer garden or congregating outside.

4.12 Although the proposed flat would be of a good residential standard, the proposal fails to demonstrate that the co-location of the proposed first floor flat and the ground floor pub would not result in either harm to amenity to future occupiers or prejudice the operation of the pub.

4.13 In light of the above, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed co-location of residential units and the public house would not cause harm to the residential amenity of the future occupants of the first floor flat, or prejudice the operation of the public house, due to noise disturbance and odour, contrary to policies C4 (Public Houses), A1 (Managing the impact of development) and A4 (Noise and vibration) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

5. Affordable Housing

5.1 Policy H4 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's aims to seek to negotiate the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. Policy H4 states "*We will expect a contribution to affordable from all developments that provide one or more additional homes and involve a total addition to residential floorspace of 100sqm GIA or more*". Policy H4 (g) states that where developments have capacity for fewer than 10 additional dwellings, the Council will accept a payment-in-lieu of affordable housing. The addition of residential floor space proposed is 82sqm. This additional GIA falls below the 100sqm trigger (as well as providing 1x unit), therefore an affordable housing contribution would not be required if the scheme were considered as acceptable.

5.2 As the proposal result in the creation of 1x dwelling with and a GIA of less than 100sqm, an affordable housing contribution is not required in this instance.

6. Design

6.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all development. The following considerations are contained within policy D1 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of the neighbouring building, and the quality of materials to be used. Within areas of distinctive character or adjacent to one, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which contribute to and create the character, in line with policy D2.

6.2 No external alterations are proposed within the development and as such, policies D1 and D2 are not applied to the determining of this application.

7. Neighbouring Amenity

7.1 The site is neighboured by a number of buildings with residential uses. Policy A1 of the

Camden Local Plan ensures that development does not cause adverse amenity impacts upon adjoining or neighbouring residential occupiers in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy, overlooking, outlook, noise and vibration and odour.

7.2 Due to the scheme consisting of a change of use at first floor level with no physical alterations, it is considered that the proposal would not impact upon the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers.

7.3 This does not outweigh the Council's considerations that the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed first floor flat would be harmed by virtue of the operation at ground floor level which in turn would jeopardise the viability and continuation of the public house.

8. Transport

8.1 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 3 and the site falls within the South Hill Park Controlled Parking Zone.

8.2 As per the requirement of policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan, should planning permission have been recommended for approval, it would have been subject to a car-free legal agreement to ensure that future occupants of the development are aware that they are not entitled to on-street parking permits. Policy T2 seeks to ensure car-free development in low parking provision areas.

8.3 In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the residential units as car-free housing, the proposal cannot be supported as this would contribute unacceptably to parking congestion in the surrounding area and promote the use of non-sustainable transport, contrary to policies T1 and T2 of the Camden Local Plan.

8.4 The development should provide 2x cycle parking spaces in line with CPG7 (transport). 11x cycle parking facilities have been indicated to be proposed; which is assumed to provide parking spaces for the existing residential occupiers of the site as well as the proposed. The proposed cycle parking facilities are contrary to CPG7 guidance; the facilities need to be covered, secured and fully enclosed from the elements and should not be vertical or semi-vertical. If the proposal was otherwise considered to be acceptable, it is likely that policy-compliant cycle parking spaces could be provided on site.

8.5 It is considered that due to the scale and internal nature of the development, a construction management plan (CMP) or a highways contribution would not be required for this application.

9. Waste

9.1 At ground floor level, adjacent to the proposed cycle parking, a bin store is proposed. The store would be able to accommodate 2x 170L freestanding wheelie bins (1x for refuse and 1x for recycling). This is considered to be acceptable.

10. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

10.1 Had the proposal otherwise been acceptable, it would have been liable for the Mayor of London and Camden CIL as the scheme involves the formation of 1x dwelling. The Mayoral CIL rate in Camden is £50 per sqm and the Camden CIL rate for residential development (below 10 dwellings) is £500 per sqm.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.

Appendix I: Community events held in the Magdala function room

1998-closing Every Thursday after rehearsals the Royal Free Hospital Choir would dine with between 10-25 people

2004 [names omitted] wedding party with 60 guests.

2008, June, Theatre show, "Xantippe" – recalled by [name omitted]

2008 [name omitted] 50th birthday party

2008-2011 The Alpine Comedy Club was run by [name omitted]

2009 [name omitted] surprise 40th birthday party

2008/or 09 Writing workshop run by acclaimed author [name omitted]

2009-2014 Weekly quiz night

Since around 2009/2010 until closing the function room was the venue for a community Christmas-time party

2009 til closing 2-3 times a year Southhillsiders (local residents) had social get togethers in the function room.

2011 CG Fitness (a local fitness training group based on the Heath) Christmas lunch for 15 people

2010, December, [name omitted] birthday dinner in function room

2010 One day seminar for Spinal Muscular Atrophy Trust with lunch provided by the pub, organised by local resident [name omitted]

2010 [name omitted] wedding dinner with 30 guests

2012 (approx) a live production of The Ruth Ellis Story

2011 Local resident [name omitted] has used the function room to film interviews and as a photo shoot space as in the attached link.

2011-2014 Funny Fridays comedy club run monthly by [name omitted], in the function room. (see detailed footnote from [name omitted]. It demonstrates the importance of the function room to residents and comedy talent. There is nothing similar in NW3)

2013 [name omitted] 60th Birthday party

2013 [name omitted] wedding reception in The Magdala pub – the function room was the food reception space for the 100 guests.

2013-14 Monkey Music classes for toddlers every week 9-12am

2014 funeral wake for [name omitted], a regular Magdala customer

2015 Traditional Irish music event – [name omitted]

SEGA and Hampstead Forum committees regularly met in the function room.

Park End surgery (just around the corner) used the function room for regular patient/practice consultations for about 5 years (dates not known)

Around 2014, a community arts discussion group, known as the 2a Group, met monthly and local residents gave talks on various subjects, eg film maker [name omitted] was booked to talk on “Openings of Movies” and [name omitted] gave a talk about Ethiopia.

QS (digital company) held monthly 9-5 off-site training days (dates not known)

Every Christmas [name omitted] the Butcher in Englands Lane held a Gloriana Roast dinner with between 26-30 guests in the function room.

The function room was used weekly for Sunday lunches and with 2-3 sittings and a capacity of 40 people it was hugely popular with the local community. Especially families with young children who didn't have to worry about disturbing diners downstairs

Christmas dinners were held every year in the function room and it was fully booked from the beginning of December til the last weekend before Christmas. Many returning customers at the end of the meal would book for the following year!

2016, September, [name omitted], fundraiser for the Welsh National Opera, contacted The Magdala's agents to enquire whether The Magdala would be open by December as he wanted to hire the function room for a fundraising/presentation event (can supply copies of email correspondence).

Meetings with the local community were held in the function room to discuss plans for what is now the Peace Garden.

Not long before the pub closed a local resident [name omitted] organised a games evening in the function room for local residents

Several residents have made contact mentioning they had family dinners, children's parties and other occasions but were unspecific about dates, so haven't mentioned them as above.

Footnote to [name omitted] Funny Friday submission.

Between 2011 and 2014 I ran a monthly night of Stand Up comedy in the Magdala Function Room. We called it "Funny Fridays" and we were always busy, sometimes full to bursting point (over 80 people, which probably broke fire safety regulations). The most popular headliner was local celebrity [names omitted] and others who have since gone on to be well-known comedians or comic actors with their own television shows, that's if they weren't already well known when we hosted them (which some were). We paid our acts which meant the low ticket price for customers was purely so we could break even, it was never run for profit or as a business venture by me. We charged £6 per ticket, rising to £7 in the final year. [Names omitted] who ran the pub back then let us have the room for free, and also to use their temporary stage, lighting and PA system so there were no overheads beyond paying for poster printing and the fees for the acts. Once a year, usually in December, we did a show for Charity where none of the acts got paid and 100% of the takings would go to a nominated charity. Ticket price for these nights was a "suggested £10" though customers could pay what they wanted.

Every July during those years we would also host weekly double-bills of hour-long previews for shows which were about to head to the Edinburgh Fringe Festival, run on the same basis as above but with the lower entry price of £5 since these were works in progress. The acts took 100% of the takings to put towards the vast expense of mounting a show at the biggest Arts Festival in the world. These nights, by their very nature, were not as well attended as the monthly mixed bills of comedians, though some (if the act was well known) did fill up.

When we knew The Magdala was closing and we hosted our farewell show, we could have filled the room three times over. These were always fun-filled, much-loved nights and there was a core of locals who would always attend, whoever was on the bill.