

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Timothy Church	43 Leverton St	21/09/2015 22:22:30	OBJ	<p>Objection</p> <p>We are writing from 43 Leverton Street. Overall, we would be supportive of the regeneration of the site. We hope strict environmental standards are maintained especially with regard to the removal of asbestos.</p> <p>We would like to note that throughout the documents there is no information on the impact of the proposed development to properties at 41, 43, and 45 Leverton Street. Plus there are no drawings to show the proposed redevelopment from that perspective. The commercial property is our back property wall.</p> <p>Our concerns/objections are as follows:</p> <p><b>Sunlight on the garden</b>            Currently our garden enjoys no blockage of sunlight from the existing roofline of the commercial property. The proposed development appears to build right to the shared brick wall and extend the roofline beyond the current slope. We are concerned the development will restrict the sunlight to our garden which has been redesigned just this year to take advantage of the conditions as they exist today.</p> <p><b>Damage to the garden</b>            It is noted the existing shared exterior wall will be retained, but our concern is any damage to the exterior wall and any fallout into our garden. We have spent both time and money to establish the garden so want to ensure there will be compensation should the garden be impacted by the development.</p> <p><b>Light pollution</b>            Currently, given the hours of use of the commercial property, we have absolutely no light pollution from the commercial property at night. We are concerned the type of use indicated for the commercial property will see longer working hours and light pollution from employees working late within the commercial building, lights being left on overnight, ambient light from computer monitors, etc.</p> <p>We would like to be provided with some more information on the impact of the proposed development to our property - specifically the brick wall (which currently has two small frosted windows), the sunlight, light pollution and the garden.</p>

---

2015/4501/P	cheryl mclennan	43a Leverton St NW5 2pe NW5 2pe NW5 2pe	20/09/2015 20:40:31	INT	<p>The proposal does not appear to be taking local residents quality of life into consideration. If this project does go ahead, it will, most definitely, cause major disruption during construction and after. Parking difficulties, noise and more foot fall are already prevalent in this narrow and densely populated area. Any additional buildings, work spaces, residential, or other, will only exacerbate the current problems, thus causing a nuisance to all within proximity.</p>
-------------	-----------------	--	---------------------	-----	---

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	S Lock	First Floor Flat 52 Fortess Road London NW5 2HG	19/09/2015 08:59:35	OBJ	I write as the owner occupier of a flat on Fortess Road and strongly object to the current proposal of the M&A Coachworks redevelopment at 36- 52 Fortess Grove which backs onto our property.

#### Change of use

One of the reasons I bought here 8 years ago was that our building was not overlooked by any other residential buildings, the back of the house where the bedrooms are was quiet, and I felt safe knowing that there was no way of entering any of the back gardens due to sharing the high walls and roof of the workshop.

As we already live on a busy main road, the quiet at the back of the building is very important to our lives and general wellbeing. Sound disturbance is currently minimal - (expected) workshop noise week days and daytime business hours only. There is some neighbour disturbance during the summer months when residents are out in gardens and the beer garden at the Pineapple on Leverton St. This noise carries phenomenally and is amplified between the back of Fortess Road and Railey Mews, making it difficult to sleep/ enjoy our homes.

To change the use of M&A Coachworks to contain 9 residential premises, with an open walkway along the full length of the building on the Fortess Road side, and open spaces for each of these which actively encourage people to gather outside (as per artists impressions of the housing) at the end of our gardens is not acceptable. This walkway should not be open. Along with the "unofficial" roof terraces/ green roofs there is ample opportunity for much more noise and light disturbance than with a commercial premises. Not to mention the noise, vibration, dirt and asbestos during the planned 18 month development.

I note from the residents meeting with the architects that they are proposing 9 residential units which is the maximum amount permitted without having to include any affordable housing. Kentish Town does not need any more luxury housing developments! - it needs affordable workspaces and housing. As with other recent developments in the area - The Pianoworks on Fortess Road, The Piano Yard on Highgate Road and the current development next to Chris Ruocco tailors on Fortess Road, they are all beyond the affordability of local people, they are sold off to foreign or buy to let investors and within weeks of being on sale are available for extortionate rents. Three bedroom houses in Kentish Town will not be affordable and will be rented out to multi occupation professionals, not families, (especially with the no parking/ permits rule) increasing the number of people who will be living there, who will be coming and going at all hours and worsening noise and light levels.

#### Privacy/ Security

Secondly, and also due to the change of use is the issue of privacy. We are not currently overlooked by any other buildings as we face directly onto the roof of the coachworks, there is no need for curtains,

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

and the back of the house is quiet and secluded. Many bedrooms along the terrace have floor to ceiling french doors and balconies at the back which will suddenly be very exposed from the windows of the proposed houses. The proximity of these windows, where there is currently a roof - is a major concern.

Despite the original workshop wall remaining, once the roof is removed, the security that we have always enjoyed at the back of the house will be compromised as the wall will be open on the other side- allowing possible access to the gardens & backs of houses.

#### Design/ Materials

Thirdly, the proposed development is a horrendous eyesore squeezed into the middle of a conservation area. Fortress Terrace is Grade II listed. This is an area of architecturally historical interest, and another reason for choosing to live here in the first place. Current architectural drawings and plans make a complete mockery of this. Yes, it's great to keep the current external walls, but it is not great to use cheap, modern and ugly techniques and materials - exposed metal roof beams, metal cladding etc. No thought has been given to trying to make this development fit into the area. Some of the refurbishment currently happening at the back of Railey Mews is new, but the choice of brick colour and windows helps it blend in with the older buildings. The design and materials need to be much more sympathetic to the surrounding area - not the monstrosity that is currently proposed- I do not want that to be the view from my windows - this development will have a huge negative impact on this historical area. We have many well established trees and gardens in Fortress Road and extra care should be taken not to disrupt or damage these during any works.

#### To conclude

I would be far more supportive of the workshop remaining a commercial building, along with a sympathetic restoration of 20 Fortress Road. A refurbishment of the current building, which would attract new industry and money into the area would be far more beneficial to Kentish Town than yet more unaffordable housing.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Tania Voaden	19 Fortess Grove Kentish Town 19 Fortess Grove Kentish Town London	21/09/2015 06:41:03	COMMEMP ER	<p>t is over intensive housing. The density of the housing is inappropriate in a conservation area and given the proximity to surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The house design does not reflect in its style any of the surrounding buildings with regard to being in context, as a conservation area this must be a consideration of design.</p> <p>There seems to have been little consideration of views of the development from the public realm.</p> <p>The studio proposal adds a floor immediately adjacent to our house with windows that directly overlook the large roof lights in our bedrooms with inevitable concern for the privacy of our family.</p> <p>The windows in the studios at ground floor level should remain translucent as they directly look into the garden at 19 Fortess Grove at low height.</p> <p>It is essential that the turning circle is retained in front of the proposed studios for residents of Fortess Grove to exit onto the main road safely. It is unsafe for vehicles and pedestrians for vehicles to reverse blindly out of this narrow street.</p> <p>We have not been fully consulted on the development plans and the local residents have been kept informed of plans through the work of the local residents association rather than through and clear communication from the developer.</p>
2015/4501/P	Tania Voaden	19 Fortess Grove Kentish Town 19 Fortess Grove Kentish Town London	21/09/2015 06:41:26	COMMEMP ER	
2015/4501/P	Matthew Feldman	45B Leverton Street London NW5 2PE	25/09/2015 16:04:32	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposed development on the basis that it will adversely affect the amenity of residential premises in the immediate area by reason of noise, traffic congestion and excessive on-street parking both during the day and night. At present, parking can be problematic due to the limited space available.</p> <p>Further, the proposal for the commercial premises involves a significant increase in use and density which will have a negative impact on the community, and is inappropriate for a conservation area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Professor Anna Robins	50 Fortess Road NW5 2HG	22/09/2015 08:09:05	INT	<p>The garden of my house ( 50 Fortess Road) backs into the west wall of M&amp;A coachworks, therefore, the peace and quiet of my garden will be effected considerably if the application goes ahead . Far too many houses are being squeezed into a small area which is effectively occupied by four houses on the Fortess Road( ie those which adjoin the existing building.) The noise during building works will be considerable during building works and will remain so once it is completed.</p> <p>There is a dearth of facilities for children in this area , and the Trust would be well advised to consider this problem rather than see the development simply as a profit-making exercise, then it would be far more in keeping with the intentions of Eleanor Palmer.</p> <p>In addition, I have serious concerns about the removal of the roof from the existing building. No one has given any assurance about its safe removal or that care will be taken to protect our gardens.</p> <p>Finally , the traffic from M&amp;A coachworks is quite heavy, and not everyone takes due care when approaching the Fortess Road from Fortess Grove. This safety issue should be addressed.</p>
2015/4501/P	Alexander Carefull	44a Fortess Road London NW5 2HG	22/09/2015 20:07:13	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object against current plans.</p> <p>I live on Fortess Road. The development sits at the end of my garden.</p> <p>My property is Grade IIa-listed and the development will have a major impact on the character of the property. The back of the house and walled garden is quiet, private and not overlooked. This development will increase the noise levels and overlook the back of the property. The design in my opinion is unsightly and will be visible from my property also.</p> <p>I do not believe English Heritage approval has been sought.</p> <p>The initial proposal used out-dated maps to calculate the proximity of the development to surrounding buildings and conveniently did not include the extension my my house built in the 1980s which extends about 2/3 into the garden. Camden's design guides stipulate at least 18m aspect distance between the habitable rooms of rear-facing properties. Since the buildings will be so close to my existing bedrooms, I will be easily overheard and overlooked.</p> <p>The density of housing suggested will produce a lot of noise, which given the proximity, will cause a nuisance.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Craig Neilson	18 Fortess Grove London NW5 2HD	24/09/2015 20:16:02	OBJNOT	I would like to object to the above planning application. This is for a number of reasons which I list below:

#### 1/ Employment Space

The existing buildings have 1,400m<sup>2</sup> of employment space whilst the proposals state that 1,067m<sup>2</sup> will be re-provided. This is a 23% reduction in total space which is clearly a considerable reduction and conflicts with Policy CS8 which is in favour of safeguarding existing employment sites. For such a mixed use scheme to come forward an equal provision of employment space should be provided. Indeed on Page 7 of the DAS, Cooley Architects recognise this point and state: "Any new development would be required to maintain at least an equal amount of employment space and create premises suitable for new, small and medium enterprise". It therefore seems strange this advice was ignored in the proposals of the final scheme.

It is also clear from the viability report that it does not appear the existing premises have been marketed at all to see if a new occupier would take a new lease on the buildings. The advice therefore provided by the agent, Davis Brown, needs to be treated with caution as it is untested.

#### 2/ Daylight and Sunlight of Residential Units

The daylight and sunlight report is not a user friendly document and is somewhat misleading. Not only does the drawings in Appendix A not refer to the block numbering of the scheme (contrary to what the opening paragraph of 7.1 says) but all the results have been shown as averages in Appendix B. It is therefore impossible to understand the full daylight and sunlight implications of each of the residential units and specific rooms within them. It is essential the applicant resubmits a revised daylight and sunlight report that clearly lists the daylight and sunlight implications for each room in each unit. The drawings also need to clearly where there rooms are in terms of location in the scheme.

Notwithstanding the above I have reviewed the information above and it's clearly evident even using the applicant's presented data that the scheme fails badly in terms of sunlight. To suggest, as the applicant has done, that the scheme's daylight levels somehow compensate for the extremely poor sunlight levels is a rather crude over simplification of the current position. Bearing in mind the sunlight guidance suggests at least one window within the main living room should receive 25% of total annual sunlight, it's quite striking that blocks A,B and C achieve between 5-10%. Similarly in the winter period instead of achieving the recommended 5% the blocks achieve between 0-2%. This is such a large failure in terms of sunlight that it does raise a question about the living environment of these residential units and can't simply be waived away by the potential levels of daylight as suggested by the applicant.

#### 3/ Size and Scale of Commercial Space

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

The proposed commercial unit although it sits within the M&A Coachworks building, it is much more dominant in appearance than the existing building. That is because the existing building has a pitched roof whilst the proposed scheme has a much more a rectangular appearance. The result is views from the Fortess Road will be dominated by this new commercial building. The building will also be much more visible from within Fortes Grove itself than what is currently there.

#### 4/ Outdoor Amenity Space

Although there is a schedule of areas for the residential and commercial units there is not a schedule setting out the development's outdoor amenity space? The Planning Statement suggests that 7.7m2 is being provided per unit but it is hard to properly consider this without understanding clearly how this has been calculated? Similarly it's not clear how play-space is being provided or where it will be located?

#### 5/ Refuse Collection

Although sufficient refuse storage is being provided for the new development it is not clear how this will be collected? Refuse lorries currently back into Fortess Grove and use the existing forecourt to collect waste from the employment units whilst the refuse from the residential units on Fortess Grove are collected on foot by the refuse collectors. The new development reduces the forecourt outside the employment units making it very difficult for refuse lorries to back down into it, meaning they will likely need to remain on Fortess Road which will potentially have implications for the traffic that uses this road. Also the travel distances of the refuse collectors (for the residential units on Fortess Grove) will be increased. The situation will be even worse during the construction of the scheme bearing in mind deliveries for the new development will be coming from this entrance.

The above points raise some serious concerns of the proposed scheme and until they are addressed granting planning consent would at best be controversial and at worst challengeable. I would recommend the Council to reject the scheme until all of the above points are addressed. I suspect in terms of Sunlight this will not be possible.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	William Bobe	9 Railey Mews	22/09/2015 13:42:33	OBJ	<p>I object to the addition of a fire escape to Railey Mews and changing the structure / facade of the coach works building on Railey mews. The house in Railey mews should just be that.</p> <p>There should be no fire escape linking the commercial space to Railey mews. This will encourage people to cut through - hang around smoking. It happens everywhere.</p> <p>The building is in a conservation area and the existing window openings and facia should not be changed to accommodate a fire escape. This building should maintain its features - it will look in keeping with its history too. All changes can and should be done within the garage door area.</p> <p>Finally the drawings are not very detailed and the scale in relation to other buildings I'd not right - eg the heights of the buildings appear to be mis matched. There should be accurate plans submitted to get a proper idea of the scheme. Thank you.</p>
2015/4501/P	Wendy Proctor	17 Fortess Grove London NW5 2HD	19/09/2015 20:59:37	OBJ	<p>I object to this development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The design of the development does not in any way attempt to replicate the the original features of the building it is replacing and is therefore not consistent with the principles and spirit of the Conservation Area in which it sits.</li> <li>2) The development does not include any affordable housing which is sorely needed in this area. The plan to build 9 houses appears to be a deliberate ploy to avoid including any affordable housing as this is only a requirement if there are 10 houses or more.</li> <li>3) There is the potential for the new commercial units to be open and operational for longer hours than the current business which will result in significantly increased traffic, noise and disturbance.</li> <li>4) The replacement of a single commercial business, which is only open during the day, with nine new domestic 3-bedroomed houses will also lead to a significant increase in noise and disturbance during the evening and weekend.</li> <li>5) The plans indicate that the new properties will have flat roofs which may very well be used by the occupiers as roof terraces. Experience of other recent developments in the area strongly indicates that outside spaces such as balconies and roof terraces produce an increase in noise, as well as loss of privacy for nearby houses.</li> <li>6) M&amp;A Coachworks has an asbestos roof which will result in serious contamination to the area in the event of it being dismantled. What is the plan to deal with this?</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion,I have a number of concerns about this development - and would like to attend the committee at which the application is discussed. Please inform me of the date of that committee.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Peter Gluckstein	11 Railey Mews London NW5 2PA	21/09/2015 16:07:09	OBJ	<p>I will respond to this application as Chairman of the Railey Mews Residents Association under separate cover, when i will attempt to summarise the myriad objections of virtually all local residents to this ill-conceived and shoddy plan.</p> <p>However, as an individual who does NOT back on to the property but who would still be affected by the noise, poor design and disruption caused by the proposal I would also like to register my objections.</p> <p>I have lived in the Mews for 11 years and am raising my young family here. I moved here because it was quiet, had a "historic" feel to it and felt like it had a real sense of community.</p> <p>This plan potentially ruins all that. The massive disruption which will be caused by the demolition and rebuilding of this building, partly in the Conservation area as it is, would not cease as far as the residents are concerned once completed.</p> <p>The noise generated by 9 new families is likely to be intolerable. The green rooves to the rear will become secondary terraces and the courtyard will act as a funnel for noise.</p> <p>The fire escape onto Railey Mews will inevitably be used as a permanent access, increasing traffic in the Mews and likely a site for the smokers. At the moment the 12 children under 7 who live in the Mews can play pretty freely outside (we don't have any other outside space) and I fear the development will put an end to this.</p> <p>Also as a long term resident I know a number of business people who have had to relocate out of the Borough due to Linton House becoming flats and their businesses being kicked out. There is simply not enough office, studio or creative space in this area. We don't need houses, we need workspace.</p> <p>Finally I have to say that I find the design pretty atrocious. The Architects did their best to defend it at the meeting we held, but really - the only nod to the existing building is not to the typical brickwork of the area but the ugly steel shutters added in the 70's. As for the aluminium buttresses, please. That fits in exactly how?</p> <p>I understand that disruption during building is not an issue that Planning can consider but I would like to state that if this proposal does go ahead - or anything like it - I feel very strongly that we need to impose fairly draconian work place rules on the builders regarding hours of work, site safety, approach to the site and in particular treatment of asbestos and other contaminants if we are to avoid catastrophic disruption to the lives of the many residents who live here happily at present.</p>