

Richard Byrne

From: Richard Byrne
Sent: 09 October 2023 20:32
To: Harris, Reece (Avison Young - UK)
Cc: Patel, Smruti (Avison Young - UK); Jenkinson, Laura (Avison Young - UK)
Subject: EoT confirmation - The Alderman - Application Ref. P1274.23

Hi Reece,

Thank you for the e-mail.

Please can you treat this e-mail as the request and confirmation for the revised extended target date for 11th December 2023.

We can review the EoT date when the revised information is submitted.

Kind regards,

Rich.

Richard J Byrne | Planning Officer

London Borough of Havering | Planning Service
Town Hall, Main Road, Romford, RM1 3BB

t 07568 608 580
e richard.byrne@haverling.gov.uk
w www.haverling.gov.uk

From: Harris, Reece (Avison Young - UK) <reece.harris@avisonyoung.com>
Sent: 09 October 2023 11:44
To: Richard Byrne <Richard.Byrne@haverling.gov.uk>
Cc: Patel, Smruti (Avison Young - UK) <smruti.patel@avisonyoung.com>; Jenkinson, Laura (Avison Young - UK) <Laura.Jenkinson@avisonyoung.com>
Subject: RE: The Alderman - Application Ref. P1274.23

Hi Rich,

I hope you are well.

Further to my email below, can you please let me know if an extension of time until **11th December 2023** is agreed?

Many thanks,

Reece

Reece Harris
Associate Director

Mobile +44 07442369100
reece.harris@avisonyoung.com | avisonyoung.com

From: Harris, Reece (Avison Young - UK)
Sent: 05 October 2023 17:25
To: Richard Byrne <Richard.Byrne@havering.gov.uk>
Cc: Patel, Smruti (Avison Young - UK) <smruti.patel@avisonyoung.com>; Jenkinson, Laura (Avison Young - UK) <Laura.Jenkinson@avisonyoung.com>
Subject: RE: The Alderman - Application Ref. P1274.23

Hi Rich,

Thank you again for providing your feedback on the application for the demolition of the public house.

I am pleased to confirm that we are putting together additional material for your consideration following your email below, which we should be able to send over within the next two weeks.

I'm aware that the current target decision date for this application is 11th October 2023. To allow sufficient time for us to provide and for you to review the additional material, can we please agree an extension of time until **11th December 2023**?

Many thanks,

Reece

Reece Harris
Associate Director

Mobile +44 07442369100
reece.harris@avisonyoung.com | [avisonyoung.com](https://www.avisonyoung.com)

From: Richard Byrne <Richard.Byrne@havering.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 September 2023 17:15
To: Patel, Smruti (Avison Young - UK) <smruti.patel@avisonyoung.com>
Cc: Harris, Reece (Avison Young - UK) <reece.harris@avisonyoung.com>
Subject: The Alderman - Application Ref. P1274.23

CAUTION: External Sender

Hi Smruti,

I hope the feedback was constructive and will help in taking the proposal forward.

I would just like to point out before going into the details of the application that we did ask at the pre-application meeting to have sight of a supporting document prior to submission for the demolition of the public house. This was to provide feedback to help the application process as we did point out emphasis of the requirement of HC7 to demonstrate there was an exception to outweigh the loss of the public house. I appreciate you were not at the meeting and the application has now been submitted so may find similarities between the recent comments and this e-mail.

Turning to the application I have carefully reviewed the supporting statement with due regard to London Plan Policy HC7. I won't repeat the policy in full in the interests of brevity but I will use Part B of the policy for structural purposes.

I understand Part B to require the protection of public houses unless a marketing exercise has been undertaken which demonstrates that there is no realistic prospect of the building being used as a public house in the foreseeable future. Should there be no heritage, cultural, economic or social value identified a marketing exercise would not be required.

With knowledge of the background of this case a marketing exercise has not been undertaken and the application has sought to demonstrate that there is no heritage, cultural, economic or social value associated with the public house.

Heritage

I agree the site is not in a Conservation Area, the building is not either a Listed Building or within a setting. Furthermore, I agree the building itself in architectural terms would not hold a heritage value.

However, pertinent to the other topics I would hold reservations if the use of the building as a public house from a social history perspective can be discounted on the information provided. The Harold Hill estate represents a post war housing extension and the public house I have assumed would have been constructed during the same period as the surrounding housing and the Farnham Road shopping precinct, almost acting as a social hub. Given it is during the era of the new town movement as the catalyst of development following the second world war I feel further research is required to establish if the public house holds any social history which would contribute towards its heritage value. Although I have placed this paragraph into the heritage section, the social history aspect of the public house may cross over into a cultural and social value as it is more associated with the lives of people than the building itself.

Cultural

I note the comments regarding the public house is not operated by a sports club or team and it is difficult to find a website or indeed a social media presence.

It does become less clear in the covering letter in how there to be no cultural value. The covering letter states there appears to be a low cultural offer at the premises but offers no clarification how it came to that view. The section continues into a more generalised section about music and TV events etc before jumping to poor attendance, advocating it does not have actual value to merit its retention (heavily summarising).

I feel that this aspect does need further exploring given it has a licence for entertainment (either televised or live) where events can take place in the public house which would suggest a more cultural value than as reported in the covering letter to being limited.

This I admit could be an endless list but as a suggestion and from my own experience are there any teams such as darts or pool which regularly use the public house for events? Have there been events, either for commercial purposes or for charity that have taken place recently within the public house? In respect of televised events are there any particular sport or non-sports that are shown? The pub manager / landlord / landlady might be better placed to help with the types of answers.

The findings can help articulate if there to be or not to be a cultural value.

Economic

Firstly it should be noted that the licence for the public house allows trade to continue past 9pm and in fact is able to serve alcohol and run licensable activities until 11.30 Monday to Sunday with the premises being closed at 12am (later times for Christmas Eve, patron saints days and Burns Night).

I feel more explanation is needed to why the public house cannot contribute towards the night time economy given the potential of opening later under licence. Although closing at 9pm currently, is there a particular reason and evidence to support the reason? Furthermore, what about daytime trade and employment opportunities?

In the absence of further information I remain unconvinced that closing at 9pm and not being on a main thoroughfare being the reasons to suggest that it does not have an economic value.

Social

Unfortunately I do not share the position of the covering letter.

I feel using evidence from nine years ago (2014) to purport anti-social behaviour remains high and has no social value to the community is difficult to support. Whilst the public house did have its licence removed, it is now operational with its licence enabling the public house to remain open until 12am. Given also the period of time and intervening events that have happened, so much has changed from nine years ago to cite as evidence for the application.

When doing a simple web search my attention is drawn to the public house being used as a warm space and news stories about the loss of the public to the detriment of the community. Some of the news stories outline that patrons may have to travel further afield or that it is not possible to go further afield thereby preventing residents the use of the public house.

I acknowledge that the web search results could be considered anecdotal but nonetheless they suggest an element of a social value for the public house which the covering letter has not demonstrated.

Proposed Mitigation Options

I note the covering letter does provide mitigation measures to be taken into account. Although the measures are not sufficient to outweigh the loss of the public house I do wish to provide comments should it be considered to revised the supporting information and continue the current application.

The covering letter mentions a Memorandum of Understanding with the current operator. I understand a MoU to be a statement of serious intent which is agreed voluntarily by equal partners of the commitment, resources, and other considerations that each of the parties will bring. Although this has a moral force, it does not create legal obligations. No other information has been provided except that it gives first refusal for a different site on the Farnham Road development site. A MoU is not a legally binding document and does not guarantee a public house would be on the Farnham Road development site given uncertainty of scheme being brought forward which would align with the ongoing operation of the pub.

I do feel this needs to be further explored and further information provided to give more certainty there would be a unit in the proposed Farnham Road development if this is to be given more weight for this application in the planning balance.

I take on board the proposal to establish a meanwhile use within the existing Farnham and Hildene estate, however in the absence of any further information it is difficult to consider if this is a material factor for this application.

Conclusion

Taking into account all of the above points at this stage I am unable to support the application as it is considered, in the absence to the contrary, that there are values worthy of the retention of the public house. As no marketing evidence has been submitted the application would be recommended for refusal.

I remain unconvinced of the proposed mitigation measures and if weight can be applied at this stage of the application on the basis of the information presented.

Without prejudice to other matters of this application which have not been discussed I am not in a position to support the application.

The comments I have made, in particular relating to the values of protection, are not insurmountable. To address the comments it will however require time to correlate the information to ensure it is robust for it to be considered against the protection values.

I am happy to request an extension of time but before doing so could I ask if the points in this e-mail are considered first, taking advice from your Client and then provide me with an indication of how you would like to proceed. If additional time is required to compile further information could you provide a broad timescale so I can tailor the extension of time request.

I have not discussed a marketing exercise given the content to the covering letter and the time involved to carry out a robust marketing exercise. If this is preferred after considering the options it will then depend on the duration and quality of the marketing exercise undertaken. I would suggest though that the current application be withdrawn and a new application submitted at a later date with an accompanying marketing exercise.

I trust the above provides a sufficient response. Should you wish to discuss the matters further please do not hesitate to contact me. Just to make you aware that I am on annual leave next week but returning Thursday 21st September.

I hope you have a relaxing weekend.

Kind regards,

Rich.

Richard J Byrne | Planning Officer

London Borough of Havering | Planning Service
Town Hall, Main Road, Romford, RM1 3BB

t 07568 608 580

e richard.byrne@havering.gov.uk

w www.havering.gov.uk

From: Patel, Smruti (Avison Young - UK) <smruti.patel@avisonyoung.com>

Sent: 15 September 2023 08:42

To: Richard Byrne <Richard.Byrne@havering.gov.uk>

Cc: Harris, Reece (Avison Young - UK) <reece.harris@avisonyoung.com>

Subject: The Alderman - Application Ref. P1274.23

Hi Richard,

Thank you for sending across the written pre-application feedback. Noting the broader comments in regards to the public house, are you able to provide your thoughts on the demolition of the public house application?

Many thanks,

Smruti Patel (she/her/hers)

Senior Planner

Planning, Development & Regeneration

M: +44 (0)7825 244 094

smruti.patel@avisonyoung.com | avisonyoung.com

This document is strictly confidential and is intended only for use by the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or other action taken in reliance of the information contained in this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Any views expressed by the sender of this message are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Havering. If you have received this transmission in error, please use the reply function to tell us and then permanently delete what you have received. This email was scanned for viruses by the London Borough of Havering anti-virus services and on leaving the Authority was found to be virus free. Please note: Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications.

Havering Council's Privacy Notice can be found on our website Data Protection, https://www.havering.gov.uk/info/20044/council_data_and_spending/139/data_protection, which outlines your rights and how we collect, use, store, delete and protect your personal data.