

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

2015/4501/P	The occupiers	5 Railey Mews NW5 2PA	16/09/2015 17:59:56	OBJ	
-------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------	-----	--

To whom it may concern,

I write to formally object to the plans that have been submitted to you regarding the proposed re development of the workshop at 36-52 Fortress Grove and 20 Fortress Grove London NW5 2HB.

Firstly I have to strongly voice my disappointment at the lack of consultation with direct neighbours and the local community that this build will affect in a massive way. This redevelopment has caused concern to lots of people living in the community. In particular there are issues with health, noise, privacy, light, security, over population, drain on services and resources, impact on the community, conservation issues, design and size and the consequences for surrounding residents.

The noise that will be generated from the people living in these proposed eight 3 bedroom houses plus the 2 bedroom house will be something new and extra that my child and I will have to live with. My child has autism and noise is a major issue. This will be traumatic for them to have to live with and it is likely I will be forced out of my home of sixteen years so as to meet their needs. I urge you to speak to someone who is knowledgeable in autism to understand how that issue holds huge amounts of substance. Imagine listening to nine different radio stations at the same time. This is the effect the noise will have on my child. They struggle as it is with the present noise levels and especially now that over recent years there has been an influx of large families with children, we currently live alongside a total of seventeen primary aged children. Adding extra noise from nine new large families living on-top of us in such close proximity will be tough to tolerate.

Added to that the absurd idea of a court yard is just that, absurd! The noise levels generated from this new acoustic like space will bounce all over the place. I cannot have my front windows open due to the noise of the Pineapple Pub situated on the corner of the mews and with children playing outside my house. To have to shut my rear windows as well due to the noise coming from this re development is not fair or right. We shouldn't be force to live in what can be deemed as a 'closed box'.

Issues with privacy are obvious, The plans show that windows from the proposed houses can potentially look into my bathroom and bedroom. House numbers 2, 3 & 4 Railey Mews back on to this workshop but number 5 is also included as the building backs onto half of number 5. When people go onto the 'green roof space' they will be directly behind my property looking into my windows and not only that they will have access to my property through my windows which is not an issue as it stands now. This is a security risk and it's not fair that I should have to secure my property by shutting the only windows I can open while the new residents can sit out on a proposed green roof that backs onto my home. The re development is designed so that the residents are secured in what appears to be an enclosed, private, gated, exclusive up market housing development.

Problems will arise from overpopulating the area. The plan is to build nine houses that back onto only three and a half which are in Railey Mews. That is double! Why cram so much into the space? It appears the need to maximise profit outweighs any common sense. The local community is buckling under the strain of an already over populated area. New homes were recently built in Linton House so the area really doesn't need more housing. The area is in dire need for work opportunities or something that will benefit people already living in the community. School places are in high demand to a point

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

where legal/court action is being taken by parents who cannot get their children into the local schools serving the area. It is a big problem. Adding a further nine families to the area is not going to help, it will add to that burden.

Where will the people who are to live in these house going to park? There are issues with parking in Railey Mews. When the architect were invited by local resident to meet and discuss our concerns, they drove to the venue which proves parking will be an issue, even if they aren't given residents permits nothing stops them parking in Railey Mews when restrictions are not in place.

There are numerous conservation issues that need addressing, properties already listed in the area will be affected by this new eye sore. Is everyone sure that what is being removed is allowed to be removed?

The design and size is just ridiculous. The proposed three levels is a really inconsiderate idea. It is a floor higher than the properties already here, this will cause light and again privacy issues. Keep the proposed houses in line with the height of the two level houses they will be infringing upon. And again if houses must be built then I think they need to go back to the drawing board and redesign the whole thing. As an alternative idea why not build semi detached houses but turned at a 90 degree angle. That way we, the Railey Mews resident won't have windows looking into our bedrooms and bathrooms, and them not us, we will just see a roof as we do already.

The consequences will weigh heavily on existing residents if this re development is allowed to go ahead as it has been proposed. Railey Mews is frequented at night by people parking up to have sex in cars and out in the open. People, in particular teenagers drink, smoke and hang out in the Mews. If this is built behind us we will also have to endure the antisocial behaviour from behind our homes as their design allows for it. It will also make us vulnerable to thieves. This idea provides further opportunities for such behaviour it will also creates new opportunities especially if there is a new 'run through' linking the Mews to Fortress Road. (The fire exit.)

It has been a struggle coping with the property directly next door to us being demolished and rebuilt. The dust and dirt from the development going on next door have left my home dusty and dirty, although there is a promise to clean my windows the exterior look awful and the windows are a mess, can it be a guarantee that my rear windows which I do not have access to will be kept clean? It may seem trivial but to find your house constantly covered in dust and dirt is unbearable. Even though there are controlled hours of work I have been disturbed and inconvenienced. They may not bang a nail until 8am but it didn't stop skips arriving at 5.30-6am on a daily basis nor the scaffolding lorries arriving early same goes for lorries delivering materials, the list goes on. Neither does it stop noise from builders arriving from 7am onwards with engines running, doors shutting, metal fences rattling and them chatting away outside.

There are many negative consequences attached to this planning application. I urge you to reconsider allowing the space to become residential, I believe it should remain for commercial use. This redevelopment appears to be a private gated housing project that will only benefit it's residents. It brings nothing that benefits people already living here, instead it has caused concern and worry. The

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

plans are so over ambitious that they have become offensive.

There are health and safety issues that need addressing, for instance the asbestos roof. How will that be managed? Will tests be carried out on the land? I ask as there is contaminated land in this area whereby some residents are forbidden to grow their own food produce for consumption. Over the years I have learned some of the history of this area, I am lead to believe this site was heavily bombed during WWII. Is this something that needs to be considered as a safety issue?

Regarding the proposed office space, to be honest I am too exhausted trying to make sense of the house designs that I haven't the energy to try and understand that part of the development in order to digest, evaluate and articulate my thoughts and concerns by September 22nd. All I can muster up for this part of the project is, where will the smokers loiter? What business will be using these offices? What will be the hours of work? Deliveries? Smells? Noise? Mess?

Now regarding the fire exit. Fortress Grove and the workshop/garage have managed for years without one. Adapt the adaptations so that access to the mews is not needed. It seems the design has created problems and issues that need not be there. So for many reason I fiercely object to the whole idea that has been submitted to your department.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	James Gregory	63 Leverton St NW5 2NX	16/09/2015 16:34:55	OBJ	<p>As a local resident, I have serious concerns about the detail of this proposal; these are detailed below. However, the following aspects are very welcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The proposal lays out a plan for an increase in local employment. I welcome that (although with some rethought, this could be even better).</li> <li>b) The buildings as current are clearly beyond their useful life. The site needs redevelopment.</li> <li>c) I welcome the proposed reduction in roof height (assuming I'm reading the plans correctly).</li> <li>d) I welcome the cessation of industrial usage, including the removal of the metal chimney that is unsightly and emits nauseous (possibly noxious) fumes.</li> <li>e) I welcome any improvement to the ugly frontage on No 2 Railey Mews, on the proviso that the new frontage would be in keeping with the other mews houses and aesthetically attractive.</li> </ul> <p>My concerns and principal objections to the plan as submitted in Application 2015/4501/P are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Excessive density of proposed housing. Fewer properties would lead to less of an impact on surrounding properties, and local amenities (esp. schools).</li> <li>2. The impact on the rear of properties in lower Railey Mews. Several comments have been already made about the roof terraces and overlooking rear windows. The green roof idea is nonsense (inevitable abuse of the maintenance-only access). I think a pitched roof would suit.</li> <li>3. The proposed fire escape in Railey Mews. This seems completely inappropriate; it would inevitably lead to everyday egress from the commercial unit into Railey Mews. It would also be detrimental to the façade of No 2 Railey Mews.</li> <li>4. Impact on Railey Mews itself. There should be no works access via Railey Mews. This is a quiet street that operates like a village green – most properties on Railey Mews have no private outside space, so the street operates in a unique way (outside play space for children etc.). Having construction traffic rumbling up and down it, and through the tightly packed streets around Leverton St, would be very detrimental to the health and wellbeing of local residents, especially children.</li> <li>5. The proposed housing contains some curious architectural features, most particularly the aluminium buttresses. The design needs to be sympathetic to surrounding properties.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Diana Rozo	10 Railey Mews	16/09/2015 19:50:57	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to this application in its currently proposed for the following reasons/concerns:</p> <p>1) Too high an increase in density and resulting noise created by squeezing six new properties to back onto three already on Railey Mews (current numbers 2, 3 and 4) as well as the property proposed on Railey Mews. At the moment the noise, traffic and disturbance generated by the occupant of the site is barely noticeable. Why are so many properties needed and why is change in use for the workspace required to such a high density extent?</p> <p>2) The proposed facade to the property on Railey Mews appears out of place compared to the facades of the rest of the Mews houses. Surely this is an opportunity to add local details to the character zones within the conservation area rather than allowing negative contributions that degrade the area.</p> <p>3) The combination of change of use to offices and proposal to retain a fire escape on Railey Mews is likely to give rise to increased footfall, noise, loitering/smoking due to improper use unless there are adequate restrictions on use. Whilst there is access at the moment in practice this is barely used or noticeable.</p> <p>Overall this application shows a lack of understanding, attempts an incremental intensity of residential use, adds pressure for car parking (whether or not spaces are provided) whilst adding very limited green areas or trees on the ground (not on the roofs, this is simply an attempt to provide access and increase profit on sales for the developer)</p> <p>A clear lack of consideration is being given to the conservation area and to what the inhabitants value. Rather to date consideration is only being given to profit at inhabitant's and the conservation area's expense.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Corvin Roman	10 Railey Mews London NW5 2PA	17/09/2015 00:33:38	OBJ	<p>Let me first state that I am not in objection to the development of the site, whether with regards to the addition of residential property nor to the change in commercial use.</p> <p>What I do object to is the general disregard to properties and occupiers surrounding the site and the ethos behind the conservation area that is evident in multiple aspects of the application.</p> <p>As stated by the council a "Conservation Area designation is about recognising the significance of an area and what gives its special character. Designation is not intended to prevent change but to make sure that the effects on what people value about a place are properly considered." A "Conservation Area designation carries the responsibility to preserve and enhance the area"</p> <p>One of the key point is "...the effects on what people value about a place are properly considered." People in this context mean those living around the site!</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement, Heritage Statement and Viability Report have not been carried out by independent third parties and are clearly biased in favour towards the aims of the Estate Charity of Eleanor Palmer which are to maximise the potential of their assets and improve returns. It is very clear from the first planning submission that the employer was attempting to push planning boundaries and rules beyond the maximum extent allowable for their own profit and without due regard to the spirit of the council's development framework (especially given the conservation area status) simply to appear to be acting in better faith with the second application. Unfortunately this second submission goes nowhere near far enough with regards to addressing concerns.</p> <p>Given the size of the development site, its location and the needs of the local community I believe it would be in all parties interest to appoint an independent consultant to give a genuine appraisal, statement and report on how the site should best be developed.</p> <p>This would not be done with the objective of improving or maximising assets or returns for the owner at the expense of the area and surrounding inhabitants rather an honest interpretation of the council's framework with due respect to adjoining properties and occupants should take precedence. The owner will undoubtedly have an increase in revenue and their asset but must this be maximises to everyone else's detriment?</p> <p>In no particular order my key objections are:</p> <p>1) Material change in use and resulting impact historically most of the site would probably have been garden or green amenity space. Once converted to warehousing most recently the light industrial use has seen minimal noise or disruption to surrounding properties and residents (certainly in my experience on Railey Mews) and little human use in terms of coming and going. In fact there is none outside weekday working hours and weekends. The proposed change of use will not only make an irreparable change but also make it materially worse: significant use during working hours and after working hours with a far, far larger number of bodies in the same space.</p>

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

2) Density/massing of building

Additionally the proposed conversion will contain a significantly higher number of independently occupied areas incurring a much higher cost to build and disruption to the area during construction that would not otherwise be required.

Amongst the developers supporting documents it is stated that "we believe that continuing industrial use would not appeal to the majority of local resident tenants...refurbished would be difficult to secure commercial occupier / cost uneconomic" This is entirely untrue and only their unfounded belief!

For both points 1 and 2 above any development or refurbishment need only include minimal residential property and need not include such a significant shift in use of commercial space. The only reason not to do so is for the employer's stated aims that conflict with council's and the existing inhabitants.

3) Privacy considerations for certain neighbours and existing residents on Railey Mews

In conjunction with point 2 above the development appears to be squeezing far too many properties directly onto the back of a smaller number of existing houses on the Mews. These newly proposed properties back directly onto the windows and roofs of the Mews and the developer is planning to include green roofs in the new properties which would allow permanent access at any time. This should not be allowed under any circumstances since at the current time the Railey Mews houses look onto the roof of the warehouse meaning that no one in the warehouse space can see into or onto the Mews properties. Proposed green roofs will result in regular and permanent invasion of privacy to the Mews house occupiers and in order to avoid this unacceptable situation and precedent the design for any use of property in that space must be pitched roof only (as it is now) with no means to look out, into or onto the Mews properties given the short distance.

4) Design and green/amenity space

Council documentation states that within the conservation area "the residential areas are homogeneous historically and by design. The poor replacement of original building details and loss of gardens is detrimental to the quality of the residential area. The repair and reinstatement of these elements would enhance the conservation area." The key problems the council points out for the Kentish Town conservation area are:

- poor alterations and erosion of details that damages buildings and the area
- Threats to the quality of the area such as extensions and infilling of back gardens.
- cross-overs and forecourt parking constructed for individuals' ease of access when garden reinstatement would enhance the area.
- Alterations to windows for energy saving measures (timber to metal or uPVC) unnecessarily detrimental to the appearance of the buildings
- trees being vulnerable to the conflicting interests of property owners and the environmental benefit.
- The capacity for new development is low but incremental reinstatement of quality details, reinstating garden walls and railings and front gardens, will enhance the area. Negative or neutral contributing building would benefit from enhancement.

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

**Comment:**   **Response:**

The developer's architect's design and access statement refers to:  
 "‘robust industrial character’ of the existing buildings was emphasized”.  
 "The re-use of the industrial on Railey Mews was considered acceptable subject to detailed design.”  
 "The metal clad projected boxes are suggestive of cargo containers and their post-industrial counterpart, stacked container housing, an appropriate image for this framed setting"  
 “will be infilled with a contemporary intervention designed so as to harmonize with its setting”  
 “Expansive use of glass “  
 “A cross frame of steel"  
 "The solid infill of powder coated profiled steel panel”  
 “..the new intervention is in all cases contemporary- sharp-edged, lightweight materials and smooth reflecting surfaces contrasting with the raggedy edges and rough texture of the brickwork– and the idiom and references are a refined industrial aesthetic as should be deemed acceptable within this defined space “ (!!!)

So whilst the application acknowledges the requirement to keep certain historical details intact it completely misses this point and the huge opportunity to improve and enhance the area by picking up and attempting to replicate in the new property the very aspects of the current building that are either negative or neutral! I think the architect needs to go back to the drawing board and/or should return their fee.

There is also very little genuine consideration given to amenity and garden space. The developer should give this higher priority by providing more garden space, and courtyard and walks with trees. Instead they place too much importance on green roofs backing directly onto the houses of the southern end of the Mews affecting rights to privacy simply for the purpose of increasing the value of the properties. It is also claimed that the scope for landscaping would be limited given the boundaries but this is only through their own choice by seeking to maximise their employer's assets and revenues with too dense a number of properties in the space provided rather than paying due attention to the council's development framework that recommends more gardens and trees, less incremental intensity of residential use.