

**From:** Schloeffel, Ross  
**Sent:** 18 December 2022 20:23  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application - 2022/5393/PVL

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Camden Planning team

I wish to comment on the Planning application 2022/5393/PVL made by the 'Lore of the Land' pub at 4 Conway Street, W1T 6BB.

. I strongly object to the application on the following grounds.

### **1. Noise from new uses**

Conway street is a very small (circa 100 yard) street consisting almost entirely of Georgian terraced houses. The council prohibits residents from installing sound-proofed double-glazed windows or doors on heritage grounds. The design of the street means that noise from the roadway reverberates between the two terraces and is transmitted directly into the houses of residents. There is no way for residents to protect themselves from excessive noise – residents are completely reliant on the council and local businesses in that regard.

During the summer, the Lore of the Land pub participated in the 'streatory' trial which involved allowing drinkers onto a space in the street until 10pm every night. The noise and disruption suffered by residents from the street drinking trial was overwhelming, completely destroying any prospect of a reasonable home life. Having 50+ people drinking in street causes such a high level of noise that ordinary activities become impossible within residents' houses. For example, on some nights during the 'streatory' trial, it was not possible to have a work conference call in our home office without others on call asking why there was a street party going on. Normal conversations became difficult and sleeping before 10pm is impossible. These are basic, everyday activities which the noise from the 'streatory' trial made impossible. If the planning application were approved, the increase in noise from street drinkers will be of a similar level and effect – this should never be permitted.

Any extension to the pub's outdoor space would therefore be highly detrimental to the lives and wellbeing of local residents. To permit 50 – 60 people to be drinking on the street (seated or otherwise) until late at night every day would have a devastating impact on the lives of the pub's neighbours. Conway street is completely unsuitable for outdoor drinking, particularly late into the evening on weekdays. Residents with young families or elderly residents suffer incredible hardship from excessive noise and disruption after 9pm and there is no possibility of mitigating that disruption through soundproofing (and this should not be required in the first place).

### **2. Design and size**

The plans submitted as part of the application show plan which would convert roughly a quarter of the entire street into an outdoor drinking space for the pub. This is grossly oversized. There is no

reasonable basis on which the council should consider allocating such a large portion of a tiny residential street to outdoor drinking. It would also be completely unprecedented - so far as I can tell, would be completely unprecedented in Camden or almost anywhere else in London. The proposed design would result in a 400% increase in the amount of drinking space outside the pub.

The pub is already large and has three levels of licenced space. There is no justification for the pub to now be granted an even larger space on the street.

The proposed design shows seven 'picnic' style tables – that design is consistent with a beer-hall style drinking barn and not dining. All other 'streatery' proposals were for outdoor dining, but Lore of the Land appears to want to install a space which is predominantly for drinking. It is inconceivable that the council would approve a huge beer-hall style drinking-space on a tiny residential street.

### **3. Disabled access**

During the 'streatery' trial, the entire space in front of the pub was, in effect, allocated to the pub as a drinking space. With a very large number of people in the drinking space and more out the front of the pub, there is a lot of people on the footpath, going between the spaces or order drinks, use the bathroom etc. This meant that access for disabled people on that side of the street was completely blocked.

The new proposal would have the same effect as there would again be a large amount of people on the pavement which will block access for pedestrians (or at the least, make walking on that section of the street highly intimidating). This cannot be policed without multiple security people monitoring it all the time (and it shows the unsuitability of this proposal that, to safely implement it, would require the installation of a material security operation on a residential street).

### **4. Resident views**

I have spoken directly with the great majority of residents who live in the vicinity of the pub. Residents are unanimously opposed to the proposed extension of the pub area and the creation of an outdoor drinking space. Those residents I have spoken with represent a diverse group and are a mix of private and social renters plus private owners.

There have been multiple, overlapping proposals made by the pub in recent weeks and residents have been struggling to keep up with them all. Many residents responded to the 'streatery' consultation – this planning application deals with the same outdoor extension to the pub, but many residents are now confused as to why there are two consultations for the same thing. Planning team members should consider resident responses to the 'streatery' proposal as well as any received directly in relation to this planning application.

Residents are genuinely fearful of the impact which the proposed outdoor extension to the pub's drinking space would have on their lives. As noted above, the noise and disruption caused by the failed 'streatery' experiment was devastating for the pub's neighbours and residents now cannot understand why Camden council would seek to impose the enormous cost of a similar outdoor space (now with tables and chairs, but also including heaters, so that the noise and disruption will occur all year round) on ordinary people in the street. Residents are not seeking to shut down the pub, but are fiercely opposed to an unnecessary extension of the pub onto the roadway.

I would be happy to discuss my objections further.

Ross Schloeffel

