

**Henry, Genna**

---

**From:** Chivers, Jennifer  
**Sent:** 20 July 2015 09:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application 2015/2575/P Jamestown Road

[REDACTED]

Jennifer Chivers  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 3303

---

**From:** Cotton, Richard (Councillor)  
**Sent:** 17 July 2015 19:04  
**To:** 'Robin Hamilton'  
**Cc:** Chivers, Jennifer; Callaghan, Patricia (Councillor)  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application 2015/2575/P Jamestown Road

Dear Mr Hamilton,

I believe that the deadline for objections was 9<sup>th</sup> July and I am not sure if you have sent an objection to the Planning Department. I have copied this to the Planning Officer dealing with this application and also to my co-councillor Cllr Pat Callaghan (the third ward councillor, Cllr Pietragnoli is a member of the Planning Committee so cannot be involved at this stage. I will try and find out on Monday exactly where we're at with this application.

Kind regards,

Richard

Cllr Richard Cotton  
Labour Councillor for Camden Town  
with Primrose Hill Ward

[REDACTED]

Twitter @richardcotton10

**Camden Town and Primrose Hill ward surgeries** – Cllr Lazzaro Pietragnoli, Cllr Richard Cotton & Cllr Patricia Callaghan

1st Friday of every month 6-7pm Pirate Castle, Oval Road

1<sup>st</sup> Saturday of every month 11-12pm Primrose Hill Community Library, Sharpleshall Street

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of every month 6-7pm Castlehaven Community Centre

3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of every month 6-7 pm Primrose Hill Community Association, Hopkinsons Place

4<sup>th</sup> Friday of every month 6-7pm United Reform Church, Buck Street

---

**From:** Robin Hamilton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 July 2015 21:47  
**To:** Cotton, Richard (Councillor)  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2015/2575/P Jamestown Road

Dear Mr Cotton,

As you are one of our ward councillors, I would like to draw your attention to the planning application relating to a development in Jamestown Road .

Regarding the new application 2015/2575/P, I would like to comment as follows;

The council have previously gave planning permission for the development with newly created 4 th floor as mixed usage and the new 5th floor as residential. ( application ref 2013/8265/P )

The applicant at the time argued that this mixed use of the building would both give increased office space and residential flats which are much needed in the area.

Having secured planning permission the developer has now reverted to having just office space in this new application.

Surely this new application should be looked at afresh, as the space will be used differently, and the fact that permission was given for mixed use should be put aside.

Planning permission was given for mixed use, and this is now not the case. They said they were providing much needed homes but with the new proposals there are no residential housing units.

The council gave permission for an increase of 383 sq m , which would create potentially 32 new jobs.

Under the new application the increase of office space would be 1,448 sq m .

This is an increase of 21% of office space, and we argue this would make it an office space far too large for a road the size of Jamestown Road.

The increase in the height of this development is of great concern . It is a very important setting as the council is aware. It would be detrimental to the canal side if the height of the new building exceeds that of the Iceworks, and is not in line and in keeping with the surrounding buildings . It would be an eye sore. If the new development goes ahead as per the application the solar panels and plant on the top of the building would be higher than the Iceworks roof and considerably higher than that of the Holiday Inn.

The solar panels and lift shaft overrun which are proposed for the 5th floor should not be higher than on the Iceworks.

If no 5th floor was added but only one extra, the 4th floor was built in the new development, there still would be an extra 839 sq metres , which is an increase of 12.5% office space. Surely this would be a reasonable increase and the developers would make enough profit, especially as they are now not having to make residential units.

The developer wishes to simplify and so surely adding only a single floor would do this.

If the 5th floor is not built there is still a potential of 632 people to be employed on site. A considerable number .

A 12.5 % increase in office space would meet the council's policy aims for using and refurbishing existing office buildings and increasing employment in the area . Even this would mean an addition of approximately 70 more employees which will automatically cause more noise in the area.

This would still generate a large increase of footfall in the area, and services on site will still increase, but by a more reasonable and acceptable degree.

It would however be much more appropriate in busy and highly congested Jamestown Road compared with the proposed application.

Regarding the party wall with the Iceworks, the rear facade of the existing development site extends 9cm against the rear wall of the Iceworks on certain floors. We would strongly object to any proposal for the new wall to extend outwards any further on amenity grounds. We ask for confirmation that the new wall will not change position.

In conclusion, we respectfully ask the councillors in the planning committee to reject the application for the reasons above, unless the development has a height no more than the Iceworks and in scale with the surroundings.

This would still meet the objectives for the area and still create increased employment.

Yours faithfully,

Robin Hamilton,  
Flat 10, The Iceworks,  
36 Jamestown Road,  
London NW17BY