					Printed on: 12/05/2025 09:10:04
Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/4953/P	emma jacobs	27 Lewes Road N12 9NH N12 9NH	10/05/2025 07:43:33	OBJ	Camden does not need state assets to be sold off to support private development. What Camden needs is more social housing and facilities for local people like artists studios that supports light industries. The building's current use as a meanwhile artists studio supports local people to develop skills and careers affordability. The Camden local plan identifies the areas as "a strong representation of local businesses" we need more artisanal spaces in Camden not less. Signed, Artist at 33-35 Jamestown Road

					Printed on: 12/05/2025	05
Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response	
2024/4953/P	Nicholas Williams	63a Jamestown Road London NW1 7DB	10/05/2025 13:36:50	COMMNT	As a joint freeholder of 63 Jamestown Road, who has lived here for over three decades, I remain dismayed and alarmed at the prospective negative impact of this development on the lives of residents and the wider community, and on the aesthetics of the street.	
					Firstly, the raison d'être of the application – to provide student accommodation – remains contentious and unproven. Simply from empirical evidence and common sense, the need for this, and the capacity of the area to absorb such an influx of temporary residents, is in doubt. What is certain are the negative effects on the area, from directly anti-social consequences of placing young people in an area noted for the availability of drugs and alcohol, to the effect on local services in an area already highly populated with residents and saturated with visitors.	
					• Fundamental review of the need for such student numbers, in line with current authoritative forecasts, compared with demand for social housing, plus assurances to prevent purpose-built student units in due course being commercially exploited via Airbnb or similar tourist accommodation.	
					Secondly, many concerns remain unaddressed in the amended application.	
					The proposed reduction in height is insignificant in negating the effect of gross intrusion on a venerable Camden streetscape of varied heritage and established residential character, consisting of a Georgian terrace and Victorian commercial architecture. Light will still be blocked out, to the detriment both of adjacent residential properties and commercial premises at numbers 32 and 34–36.	
					Abutting at such a height to within meters of the terrace building from number 61 onwards, the proposed structure will infringe on the privacy of residents, both on their balconies forming the southern, rear aspect of the terrace, and in the precious greenery of their gardens below.	
					As a bare minimum to ameliorate the negative impact of the above, we therefore propose:	
					• Further reduction in the elevation and number of storeys of the building.	
					• Significant curtailment of proposed westward extent of the new building, up to the entry to the site of No 57, and the terminating eastern wall of the terrace beginning at No 61, to reflect a more suitable scale and design.	
					The resubmitted plans do not allay fears of the true impact of sound on adjacent buildings from mechanical sources, notably the instillation of heat pumps. What will be the true noise impact, especially the effect on residents at the eastern end of the terrace? Especially so in summer months, when windows are open?	
					• Plants for heat pumps and other ancillary equipment to be located elsewhere in the building, and fully insulated to prevent noise disturbance.	

Also, has adequate consideration been given to the acoustic effect and noise pollution from the

C-shaped rear façade of the building, potentially amplifying noise from the proposed gardens or from open windows, to the discomfort of residents at 61, 63 and 65 Jamestown Road and neighbouring Arlington Road especially?

• What realistically will be the impact of reflected sound on the local environment from the rear of the building? And what restrictions will there be on community events, and use of live or recorded music at social gatherings?

Jamestown Road has also for many years maintained a delicate equilibrium between its residential, historic character, and the ever-westward encroachment of commercial elements from the High Street and nearby Camden Market. The proposal for flexible business units in part of the proposed development threatens to upset that balance, when businesses in Jamestown Road are clearly struggling, as reflected in the frequent change of owners and empty premises on the northern side of the road.

• The need for any commercial units whatsoever in this development should be reviewed. Furthermore, the location of these units – if any – should be restricted to the eastern end of the development, adjacent to the corner public house, rather than adjacent to the terrace, which would be negatively impacted by their proximity.

Though they are designated for Class E use, it is essential that there are in place safeguards prohibiting the extension of their use to that of late-night bars, nightclubs and other potential sources of noise and other disturbance to the people who live here. Provision to protect residents from the disturbance of early morning deliveries to those units should likewise be considered.

• Effective and durable safeguards in place to prevent new commercial units becoming sources of early morning noise and late-night disturbance and disruption in the street environment.

Disturbance from construction work over several years will diminish the quality of life of Jamestown Road residents, and employees in adjacent businesses, whatever precautions are implemented. How will construction be integrated with Camden Council's ongoing plans for the reform of traffic flows, to cause minimal inconvenience to residents and road users in terms of congestion, access and road safety?

And has the impact on other parameters, for example air pollution, drainage and water supply now been realistically assessed?

The impact of the proposed excavations at the boundary with the terrace, and the historic buildings at No. 57, remains unclear. Nos. 61, 63 and 65 Jamestown Road all have either bedrooms or separate apartments at basement level. We are understandably worried about the effect of major excavation only a few metres from our properties. According to the report, asset protection agreements will be agreed with each asset owner. This category should also include the owners of houses on Jamestown Road.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Printed Response	n: 12/05/2025	09:10:04
2024/4953/P	sue holston	Apt 101 The Glass Building 226 Arlington Road NW1 7HY	10/05/2025 09:22:09	INT	I wish to repeat my objection to the proposed development As I wrote to you at the end of last year Camden certainly needs more social occupant of 101 the glass building I am concerned about my loss of light. The building and the proximity of the building to Arlington Road are a matter of con- here happily for 20 years enjoying the light but please consider leaving an arr where the existing gates are; I have mobility issues and rarely leave the flat especially important to me	height of the ncern. I have live a of open space	

					Printed on: 12/05/2025	09:
Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response	07.
2024/4953/P	Andrew Kennedy	226 Arlington Road, Apartment 103	nent Arlington Road. My main objections remain as origin		I wish to object and make comments on the proposed redevelopment in Jamestown Road and Arlington Road. My main objections remain as originally submitted in December 2024 and I do not consider them to have been adequately addressed.	
		The Glass Building, NW1 7HY			Main Objections:	
		/111			The height and design of the proposed development, which is inappropriate for the local character and setting, even recognising that there has been a reduction in height of the student accommodation but not to C3, the block on Arlington Road. I would propose that further consideration is given to the 'massing' of these proposals in relation to the local residential area. In particular the proposed 'flat frontages' and solid brick blocks on both blocks onto Jamestown Road and Arlington Road are not in keeping with the character and settings locally. I would propose that both road frontages could be 'indented ' at intervals to break them up. eg on doorways and staircases in the C3 block onto Arlington Road	
					Much of the use being for student accommodation when student numbers in higher education are falling. I feel that the balance is incorrect between social housing and student housing. This does not appear to have been addressed. My original comments still stand.	
					• The impact on traffic and road safety. The proposal for lorries appears to have been 'copied' from elsewhere, as it refers to "Chalk Farm Road," which is not nearby. The proposal also includes lorries travelling north up Arlington Road. This is impossible with the recent changes to the junction at Arlington Road and Parkway, this road is already congested and Cavendish School is currently proposing further restrictions for child safety reasons.	
					• The noise and disturbance to a residential area both during construction and in its use, including the commercial units. This has not been addressed. The commercial units may also not be viable as recent commercial units nearby remain vacant and all footfall travels north up Camden High Street to Camden Market and not east - west. This is recently encouraged by the pedestrianisation of part of Camden High Street going north from Camden Town Tube Station.	
					In addition many of the original submitted comments on the proposal were pertinent and included appropriate suggestions. However the responses have mainly been 'rebuttal', often without serious exploration eg further evidence needs to be provided on the consideration of using a ground source heat pump for heating in such a development site, given the urgency of	

frontage rather than flat solid brick frontage. The adjacent Arlington Road residential block has indented frontage with doorways set back. The proposed development could replicate this

the impacts of climate change. Many of the responses to previous comments eg amendments to the HIA merely review the original documentation in the light of the changes proposed and do not address original comments and criticisms. Similarly the right to light and sunlight, as identified in previous comments from Jamestown Road, also applies to The Glass Building opposite the C3 Arlington Road development and its height has not been reduced and it has not been addressed at all. Consideration should be given to its height and its redesign to be of lesser mass, preferably less high and potentially set back further on Arlington Road and with indented

design. The design currently fails to take account of the residential nature of the area and is inappropriate for the local character and setting.

In summary my overall main concerns still hold.

2024/4953/P Miriam Hill 69 Jamestown 10/05/2025 16:43:40 OBJ As a homeowner on Jamestown Road, I would like to comment on the and development, currently undergoing re consultation. My concerns remain of the proposed development. Although the amended design reduces the development by one storey, this has little impact on the overall design an streetscape.	with the height o	e heigh of the	ht and bulk	
The height of the proposed building remains out of keeping with all of the Visually it is much taller and bulkier than the surrounding buildings on Jamestown Road and Arlir		•		
be clearly seen in the images accompanying the Design & Access Statement acco proposal.	mpanying	ng the	amended	
 The height and bulk of the development significantly alters the view the aspect looking at the Locally Listed terrace houses from 61-85. Its he with the buildings surrounding, making an incongruous addition to the stu The locally listed pub at 31 Jamestown Road is dwarfed and oversh development as designed. There doesn't appear to have been any serio to heritage issues and locally listed buildings despite these being empha planning policy for preserving the character of Camden Town. 	ight is al eetscape adowed us consid	also ind be. by the ideration	nconsistent le ion given	
Loss of Light/ Overshadowing As the proposed development remains significantly taller than the rest of Jamestown Road, including the locally listed terrace houses 61-85, it will amount of light these houses and their back gardens presently enjoy. Th overshadow the rear of my property and our garden, significantly reducir	significa e building	antly ii ng will	impact the I	
Conclusion: While I welcome redevelopment of this unattractive block, the height of the development is out of keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood. It does not deliver sufficient afford a disruption, loss of light and impact on the local streetscape. A similar pro- reducing the height of the development to a level consistent with the neigh with an increased percentage of affordable housing would fit seamlessly and improve the streetscape.	ble hous posed de	sing to leveloj ig builo	opment Idings and	
Regards, Miriam Hill				

Printed on: 12/05/2025

09:10:04

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/4953/P	Sue Atkinson	301 The Glass Building 226 Arlington Road London NW1 7HY	09/05/2025 22:51:11	OBJ	Comments on proposal - 33 – 35 Jamestown Road and Arlington Road 2024/4953/P
		2011001111111111111			I wish to object and make comments on the proposed redevelopment in Jamestown Road and Arlington Road. My main objections remain as originally submitted in December 2024 and I do

Main Objections:

not consider them to have been adequately addressed.

• The height and design of the proposed development, which is inappropriate for the local character and setting, even recognising that there has been a reduction in height of the student accommodation but not to C3, the block on Arlington Road. I would propose that further consideration is given to the 'massing' of these proposals in relation to the local residential area. In particular the proposed 'flat frontages' and solid brick blocks on both blocks onto Jamestown Road and Arlington Road are not in keeping with the character and settings locally. I would propose that both road frontages could be 'indented ' at intervals to break them up. eg on doorways and staircases in the C3 block onto Arlington Road

Printed on:

12/05/2025

09:10:04

• Much of the use being for student accommodation when student numbers in higher education are falling. I feel that the balance is incorrect between social housing and student housing. This does not appear to have been addressed. My original comments still stand.

• The impact on traffic and road safety. The proposal for lorries appears to have been 'copied' from elsewhere, as it refers to "Chalk Farm Road," which is not nearby. The proposal also includes lorries travelling north up Arlington Road. This is impossible with the recent changes to the junction at Arlington Road and Parkway, this road is already congested and Cavendish School is currently proposing further restrictions for child safety reasons.

• The noise and disturbance to a residential area both during construction and in its use, including the commercial units. This has not been addressed. The commercial units may also not be viable as recent commercial units nearby remain vacant and all footfall travels north up Camden High Street to Camden Market and not east - west. This is recently encouraged by the pedestrianisation of part of Camden High Street going north from Camden Town Tube Station.

In addition many of the original submitted comments on the proposal were pertinent and included appropriate suggestions. However the responses have mainly been 'rebuttal', often without serious exploration eg further evidence needs to be provided on the consideration of using a ground source heat pump for heating in such a development site, given the urgency of the impacts of climate change. Many of the responses to previous comments eg amendments to the HIA merely review the original documentation in the light of the changes proposed and do not address original comments from Jamestown Road, also applies to The Glass Building opposite the C3 Arlington Road development and its height has not been reduced and it has not been addressed at all. Consideration should be given to its height and its redesign to be of lesser mass, preferably less high and potentially set back further on Arlington Road and with indented frontage rather than flat solid brick frontage. The adjacent Arlington Road residential block has indented frontage with doorways set back. The proposed development could replicate this

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Printed on: 12/05/2025 09:10:04 Response design. The design currently fails to take account of the residential nature of the are and is inappropriate for the local character and setting.
					In summary my overall main concerns still hold.
2024/4953/P	Christine Hancock	44 Inverness Street NW1 YHB	10/05/2025 09:54:22	OBJ	 Main Objections: The height and design of the proposed development, which is inappropriate for the local character and setting, even recognising that there has been a reduction in height of the student accommodation but not to C3, the block on Arlington Road. I would propose that further consideration is given to the 'massing' of these proposals in relation to the local residential area. In particular the proposed 'flat frontages' and solid brick blocks on both blocks onto Jamestown Road and Arlington Road are not in keeping with the character and settings locally. I would propose that both road frontages could be 'indented' at intervals to break them up. eg on doorways and staircases in the C3 block onto Arlington Road Much of the use being for student accommodation when student numbers in higher education are falling. I feel that the balance is incorrect between social housing and student housing. The impact on traffic and road safety. The proposal for lorries appears to have been 'copied' from elsewhere, as it refers to 'Chalk Farm Road,' which is not nearby. The proposal also includes lorries travelling north up Arlington Road. This is impossible with the recent changes to the junction at Arlington Road and Parkway, this road is already congested and Cavendish School is currently proposing further restrictions for child safety reasons. The noise and disturbance to a residential area both during construction and in its use, including the commercial units. This has not been addressed. The commercial units may also not be viable as recent commercial units nearby remain vacant and all footfall travels north up Cardnen High Street to Camden Market and not east - west. This is recently encouraged by the pedestrianisation of part of Camden High Street going north from Camden Town Tube Station. In addition many of the original submitted comments on the proposal were pertinent and included appropriate suggestions. However the responses have mainly been 'rebuttal'

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/4953/P	Mr Peter C Coe	Apartment 301, the Glass build 226 Arlington Road NW1 7HY NW1 7HY	09/05/2025 10:05:05	OBJ	Comments on proposal - 33 – 35 Jamestown Road and Arlington Road We wish to object and make comments on the proposed redevelopment in Jamestown Road and Arlington Road. My main objections remain as originally submitted in 2024 and I do not
					consider them to have been adequately addressed. Main Objections:

1. The height and design of the proposed development. The overall design continues to be inappropriate for the local character and setting. Recognising that there has been a reduction in height of the student accommodation but not to C3, the block on Arlington Road; We would propose that further consideration is given to the 'massing' of these proposals in relation to the local residential area. In particular the proposed 'flat frontages' and solid brick blocks on both blocks onto Jamestown Road and Arlington Road are not in keeping with the character and settings locally. We would propose that both road frontages could be 'indented ' at intervals to break them up; for example The planning demands for the Glass building ensured that the building introduced architectural design that ensured it did not appear as a sheer mass.

Printed on:

12/05/2025

09:10:04

2.Retail provision The suggestion that the ground floor would provide retail accommodation fails to understand that there is hardly any footfall west of Arlington Road along Jamestown Road. Having lived in the Glass building for twenty five years, we have watched a variety of retail start ups at the west end of Jamestown Road. None have survived. Moreover the Public house has changed hands almost every year and manages to attract very little custom.

3. Much of the use being for student accommodation.

• We believe that the balance is incorrect between social housing and student housing. This does not appear to have been addressed. Our original comments still stand .

• The proposal continues to over estimate the demand for student housing as we evidenced in our earlier comments.

• The noise and disturbance to a residential area both during construction and in its use, including the commercial units. This has not been addressed. The commercial units may also not be viable as recent commercial units nearby remain vacant and all footfall travels north up Camden High Street to Camden Market and not east west. This is recently encouraged by the pedestrianisation of part of Camden High Street going north form Camden Town Tube Station.

4 Construction Management Plan

At present the Construction Management Plan says that

3.5 Construction Stage Key Vehicular Movements/Deliveries are as follows:

Construction Stage Key Vehicular Movements/Deliveries are as follows: Piling/ Sub-Structure

Page 10 of 46

Excavation/Temporary works • The Piling rigs will be off-loaded on site. Entry onto site from Chalk Farm Road will be controlled by traffic marshals.

Cleary this must be rethought as access is not from Chalk Farm Road

The impact on traffic and road safety.

• The local vehicle routing details Figure 4.2 Local Vehicle Routing do not allow for the changes in traffic systems introduced by Camden Council.

• The proposal also includes lorries travelling north up Arlington Road. This is impossible with the recent changes to the junction at Arlington Road and Parkway, this road is already congested. During morning and afternoon 'rush hours' Jamestown Road and Arlington Road are gridlocked.

Cavendish School is currently proposing further restrictions for child safety reasons.

5. Learning from the Grenfell

The Grenfell Report states that

Part 14 Recommendations (Chapter 113) 2.126 We are invited by our Terms of Reference to make recommendations that we have reason to think will help prevent another disaster of the kind that overwhelmed Grenfell Tower and improve the ability of the authorities to respond to emergencies when they occur, as inevitably they will. 2.127 We do not think it would be appropriate or helpful to attempt to summarise those recommendations here because to do so would inevitably fail to do them justice. We should make it clear, however, that they are all firmly grounded in the evidence we have received and the findings we have made.

We are very concerned that the fire escape facilities for the domestic living units to not enable sufficient fire escape opportunities. The route depends on one exit which requires access along external galleries and into another block. Any frail, disabled or encumbered person would have difficulty with these fire escape proposals.

In conclusion

In addition to the above, many of the original submitted comments on the proposal were pertinent and included appropriate suggestions. The responses have mainly been 'rebuttal', often without serious exploration eg further evidence needs to be provided on the consideration of using a ground source heat pump of such a development site, given the urgency of the impacts of climate change. Many of the response eg amendments to the HIA merely review the original documentation in the light of the changes proposed and do not address my original criticisms. Similarly the right to light ETC CHECK applies to The Glass Building opposite the C3 Arlington Road Site but has not been addressed at all. Consideration should be given to its redesign to be of lesser mass and potentially set back further on Arlington Road and / or indented frontage rather than flat solid brick frontage. The design currently fails to take account of the residential nature of the area.

Page 11 of 46

In summary our overall main concerns still hold.

						T finited off.	12/03/2023	09.10.04
Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response			
2024/4953/P	Demir Sayiner	61a Jamestown Road	11/05/2025 21:41:33	OBJ	Camden			
		London NW1 7DB			I own the leases of the two apartments on 61 Jamestown Road, and	d the freehold of	of the building.	
					I have tried to get further information with regards to the changes to the council's website produces a server runtime error and does not related documents, such as revised drawings and comments. Giver that were included in the application previously, it is troublesome that without access to the revised drawings and reports.	allow access to the misleadin	o see any Ig drawings	
					I note from the description that there is a slight reduction in the heig cannot see if this is also true in the parts adjacent to the terraced h			
					I am hugely concerned about the proposed depth and height of the shadowing, and loss of light to my apartments at the rear aspect, es rear bedrooms. The small reduction that is implied in the notes, I an any adjacent to my property, certainly does not seem to sufficiently issue.	specially with re n not sure if the	egards to the ere has been	
					I also have concerns with regards to the rooftop plant, which should development to minimise any noise disturbances to their neighbours moved away from my property. The noise would cause a huge distu especially during hot summer nights when windows are open.	s and I hope it	has been	
					Further noise concerns still exist with regards how noise will emit from spaces towards its neighbours. Large gatherings should certainly be			
					As the owner of the property just a few meters away from the site, I excavations, and the possible issues that will arise from them. The possible that asset protection agreements will be agreed with each asset ow with the owners of houses on Jamestown Road.	previous report	ts mentioned	
					The building of large scale student accommodation is unlikely to ma community, as the new residents will be of transient nature. Residen much more positive contribution to the area, it badly needs. License term tourist lets in the holiday months should certainly be withheld, cannot be changed in the future.	ntial apartment es to use the bu	ts will make a uilding as short	
					The building will not be sympathetic to the character of the area, du reductions are certainly needed.	e to its sheer s	cale. Further	
					The introduction of commercial premises to a section of the street th currently also produces concerns with regards to increased footfall market spilling into a peaceful residential are. I strongly object to the the quality of life for the residents, especially if these units are being	from the high s ese, as they wi	street and II deteriorate	

Printed on: 12/05/2025

09:10:04

Page 13 of 46

the night, and are open early mornings and in the evenings.

Finally, disturbance from construction work over several years will diminish the quality of life of Jamestown Road residents, and employees in adjacent businesses, whatever precautions are implemented. How will construction be integrated with Camden Council's ongoing plans for the reform of traffic flows, to cause minimal inconvenience to residents and road users in terms of noise, congestion, access and road safety?