

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Adam Greenhalgh  
**Sent:** 20 March 2024 14:03  
**To:** Planning  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application - 2023/5391/P

---

**From:** Don HIBBS [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 20, 2024 12:19 PM  
**To:** Adam Greenhalgh <Adam.Greenhalgh@camden.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** IARA Inkerman IARA [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning Application - 2023/5391/P

[REDACTED]

*Dear Mr Greenhalgh,*

*You are receiving this objection to Planning Application 2023/5391/P by e-mail as I have been blocked by Cloudfire from submitting my objection in the usual "comments" section of the on-line application.*

*I would therefore appreciate your acknowledgement of receipt of this objection.*

Dear Adam Greenhalgh

Ref: Planning Application 2023/5391/P

For the third time for this building, I submit an objection to the granting of this application. One could almost think that the applicant is trying to wear down LB Camden's resistance?

I object to the proposal for the following reasons:

1 The proposed development, by virtue of its height, mass, scale and detailed design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, street scene and wider area while failing to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjacent Inkerman Conservation Area. This despite the applicant, by dint of erecting a very noticeable safety fence on the roof of and to the front of the building, trying to establish that the height of a seventh floor already exists, a tactic sadly successful in an adjoining building.

2 The proposed development, by reason of the poor level of outlook and ventilation to the proposed studios, would fail to provide adequate internal living conditions for the perspective occupiers, resulting in substandard accommodation that would be harmful to the amenities of future occupiers.

3 The proposed development, due to its height, massing, scale and location, would result in a material loss of outlook as well as having an overbearing impact and an increased sense of enclosure on the occupiers at 74 and 55-57 Holmes Road,.

4 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a student management plan, would fail to protect the amenities of the surrounding area contrary to policies. Particularly should LB Camden's declared aim of closing off Cathcart Street at its junction with Inkerman Road, and of closing off Willed Road at the junction with Inkerman Road, be implemented.

5 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for defining that the occupation of the student units would be restricted to students in full or part time higher education at specific education institutions and no part of the property to be sold as a separate self-contained unit, would fail to supply appropriate student housing and lead to accommodation that would be inappropriate for private use. This is particularly true as the building is already being used as a cheap hotel for foreign groups, is listed on "Air BnB" sites as tourist accommodation, and has been used as a temporary solution to LB Camden's housing problems. It is also listed as the Camden Campus for "SCL International College", an organisation offering short-term language courses to Singaporeans.

6 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a Construction Management Plan, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users, and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally. Again, this is particularly relevant to the LB Camden's proposed measures for traffic along Holmes Road. (see 5 above)

7 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure highway contributions to undertake external works outside the application site, would fail to secure adequate provision for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. Holmes Road is already in a very bad state, particularly outside number 55-57 where one half of the road floods due to sunken surfaces.

8 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a car-free development, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area. There are always cars parked outside the building at all hours. The closures of Cathcart and Willes Roads (see 5 above) would exacerbate the problem.

9 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a Student Travel Plan, would be likely to give rise to significantly increased car-borne trips and would result in a unsustainable form of development.

10 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions for public open space, would be likely to contribute to pressure and demand on the existing open space in this area.

11 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a local employment and apprenticeships agreement will be likely to lead to the exacerbation of local skill shortages and lack of training opportunities and would fail to contribute to the regeneration of the area.

G. A. Hibbs  
46 Willes Road,  
Kentish Town,  
London NW5 3DL

