

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Domenica Sansone	2 Railey Mews	14/09/2015 13:08:27	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to Planning Application 2015/4501/P, for the redevelopment of the Workshop at 36-52 Fortess Grove and 20 Fortess Grove London NW5 2HB. I am seriously affected by this project, since four of the proposed, new residential units will be either directly adjacent to my house (2 Railey Mews), or backing right onto my house. The project impacts upon my privacy, security and peace, as well as potentially damaging the structure of my building.</p> <p>As a general objection to the overall density of the project, I would like to point out that originally, the mews houses would have backed onto the gardens of the houses in Fortess Road. This is demonstrated by the fact that the rear windows on the ground floor of my property are blocked. The existing workshop at the back of Railey Mews is a much later building. It has neither historical nor architectural value and its footprint should not be used as a design reference point to justify a greater density of residential housing than would otherwise be appropriate. Of course, any developer will want to cram as much into a project as possible, in order to maximize commercial returns before walking away. However, such greedy use of space should not compromise the existing community and residents.</p> <p>The project should take, as its design reference point, the manner in which residential houses were and are built next to each other. I note that the proposed design, despite the fact that it specifies a very high number of residential dwellings, does not include a high enough number to qualify for having to provide the Council with an affordable housing quota. A smaller number of residential units could allow the creation of green buffer zones between the new residential units and the existing houses.</p> <p>The particular aspects of the project's proposed design to which I object, along with my explanations, are as follows:</p> <p>Objection: I strongly object to the rear, flat, green roofs of house design types A and B, along with access doors onto such roofs.</p> <p>Explanation: Three of the proposed, new residential units back directly onto my house. The rear flat roofs of these units, as designed, butt up against the rear of my property, with no space or buffer area in between.</p> <p>Residents of each unit will be able to access these flat roofs via a door located beside the study room on their second floor landings. Although the project's architects have described these doors as being 'for maintenance only', there is no way of preventing residents from accessing the roofs for purposes other than maintenance. Indeed, the design actually invites these roofs to be used as terraces, given that they have flat, green surfaces, easy access and a greater amount of possible sunshine than the ground floor gardens incorporated elsewhere in the designs.</p> <p>The windows of my two bedrooms (situated at the rear of my property) would be at the eye level of anyone standing on the proposed roofs, even if people are outside my bedrooms for 'maintenance purposes' only. Clearly, this would be a breach of my privacy. However, I am also deeply concerned that my security would be compromised, as the flat roofs would provide access right up to my bedroom windows, not just for residents, but for any would-be intruder.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

At the moment, I enjoy security and total privacy. Naturally, I would like to keep it this way, and I see no reason why the project's design cannot respect that. I note that there are no 'maintenance access' doors or hatches provided to flat roofs in other parts of the designs, as may be seen from the 3-D satellite images. Furthermore, there is a 'low, privacy screen' specified on the plans, but the exact purpose of this screen is not clear. Since the study window is specified as being 'opaque', what and whose privacy is supposed to be screened? Is this screen intended as a safety balustrade for the use of the flat roof as a terrace?

In early versions of the project, a pitched roof had been proposed. This seems like a much better design option.

Objection: I object to the open courtyard areas incorporated into house design types A and B.

Explanation: In the current designs, the courtyards of at least two of the residential units are a distance of only 3.5m from the windows of my two, rear bedrooms. The design of these open courtyards, being small and enclosed by walls, means that they will act as funnels for house noises and potential kitchen smells, which is a well-known phenomenon in countries where open courtyards are common. Myself, and any occupants of my two bedrooms, will be disturbed by noise, smell and possible light pollution emanating from the courtyards below, particularly given their close proximity.

At the moment, I suffer no disturbance from light, smell or noise emanating from the rear of my property in Railey Mews, which makes it a lovely and quiet place in which to live. The only, occasional noises occur within the working hours of working days. I see no need why an open courtyard (as opposed, say, to a covered glass space) has to be included in the designs.

Objection: I object to the skylights incorporated into the rear, flat, green roofs of house design types A and B.

Explanation: My primary objection is to the inclusion of rear, flat, green roofs within the designs for house types A and B, in totality, for my reasons as stated above. However, as a secondary point to this objection, I would like to point out further flaws in the design of these roofs, namely the inclusion of skylights within one metre of my property.

Such close proximity of skylights to the windows of my rear bedrooms would subject me and my house occupants to light intrusion and disturbance. Also in the drawings, it is unclear if these skylights will open or not. If they were to open, they would create extra noise pollution.

Objection: I object to the windows provided for the studies on the second floors of house design types A and B.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

Explanation: The windows of the studies look directly into the windows of my rear bedrooms. Although the architects have specified 'opaque glazing', there is no reason why occupants cannot change the glazing to clear, which would provide a view directly into my bedrooms. Furthermore, if the windows were opened, there would be a clear view into my bedrooms.

Once again, this would lead to a potential breach of privacy. There is absolutely no need for such a window to be included within the design, as natural light may be brought into the studies from other directions, both in house types A and B.

Objection: I object to the façade of the proposed house in Railey Mews.

Explanation: Railey Mews is part of a conservation area. As such, the aesthetics of any new house or modification must be in line with the existing style of the other, neighboring houses.

In the proposed design, the architects include aluminum cladding for the façade, along with brand new doors. The aluminium cladding is justified by the architects as being a reference to the existing shutters of the building. However, it should be pointed out that these shutters probably date from the 1970s, whereas the building itself is original, dating to the foundation of the mews.

The façade, in undergoing a redesign, should show greater respect and sympathy for the overall integrity of the mews, rather than to a brutal and questionable design addition.

Objection: I object to the proposed fire exit from the commercial space onto Railey Mews.

Explanation: The façade of the proposed house in Railey Mews includes a fire exit for the commercial, office space.

The position of the fire exit disturbs the aesthetics of the façade. However, more significantly, the fire exit could potentially be used as an alternative entrance to the commercial offices, which would create regular pedestrian traffic. At present, the offices are only accessible from Fortress Grove, whereas a 'back door' in Railey Mews might provide a more direct and preferable route towards Tufnell Park tube station.

At present, Railey Mews is a quiet, residential road at all times. Its character should not risk being marred by becoming a rat-run for office commuters, or a hang-out for cigarette smokers (as frequently happens at office fire exits).

Matters of concern

In addition to my objections, I would like to raise the following matters of concern, which I should like clarified.

Manhole location:

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

My property's manhole is, at present, located in the floor of the warehouse, but still accessible. In the proposed scheme, there is no reference to a relocation of the manhole. I cannot be expected to access the manhole within a kitchen of the new development, so where will it be located?

Asbestos removal:

The roof and premises of the existing warehouse are known to be containing asbestos and probably other toxic materials. The planning application refers to the use of specialized removal companies, but makes no mention of the high risk of exposure to these toxic materials by the current residents during the time of the demolition of the warehouse. With the bedrooms overlooking the warehouse, it might be prudent and necessary for the residents to vacate their houses whilst the warehouse is dismantled, demolished and the waste taken off site. No clarity has been provided about this matter.

Disruption management:

With limited access to the site from both sides, the proposed work will create significant disruption to the local residents for a long period. Reduce parking spaces, traffic of heavy trucks, noise and dust. In order to minimize disruption for the neighbours and the environment, we would need to see a much more detailed planning of the work schedule with its rules and regulations. Access to the site should not be allowed through Railey Mews and working hours should be strictly limited from Monday to Friday only and no delivery at all should be allowed before 8am.

2015/4501/P	Paul Jackman	APT C The Piano Works 32 Fortess Rd London NW5 2HB	14/09/2015 15:54:55	OBJEMPER	<p>I have recently purchased a flat (lower & raised ground floor) which directly overlooks the proposed building site.</p> <p>As I understand it Mr Peter Gluckstein and other residents in Railey Mews NW5 are wanting to see this whole site remain as a site for light industry.</p> <p>I am in favour of the proposed plans. Half the site for 9 residential houses and half for light industry. I think this proposal would help to enhance the immediate surrounding area.</p> <p>I believe the architects are proposing aluminium girders to connect from the new houses to the existing walls of the building. I wonder how these girders would weather and how visually pleasing they would be over a period of time ? Personally I am not in favour of this.</p> <p>The architects are proposing to build new houses within the existing walls of the garage building but not to clean up / wash the old walls. Would you like to buy a new house within dirty old walls ? I wouldn't. Please will the architects consider washing / cleaning the existing walls ?</p> <p>I would like to know how they propose to dispense with the asbestos that is currently on site ? Even with my windows closed I can smell cigarette smoke from outside in my flat.</p> <p>How are they going to keep building dust to a minimum ?</p> <p>Are there hours when work is not permitted on site ? If there are can you tell me what they are please ?</p> <p>Kind Regards Paul Jackman</p>
-------------	--------------	--	---------------------	----------	--
