

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Les Levidow	48 Fortess Rd NW5 2HG	30/09/2015 10:40:24	OBJ	<p>I have several objections to this proposal.</p> <p>During 2001-2003 I helped to organise the Nuisance Action Group (NAG), demanding that Camden Council take action to stop the noxious emissions from M&A Coachworks. Eventually there was a slight improvement in the stack, but the emissions have continued. For this reason, I would potentially welcome a change in use for the site. But the current proposal would be worse and so is rightly opposed by many residents.</p> <p>Here are some objections in brief:</p> <p>The new buildings have an inappropriate design, size and height. They clash with the nearby listed buildings and conservation area. The high density lacks adequate amenity space.</p> <p>New uses will have harmful impacts, e.g. if some units operate 24/7, increase in commercial vehicle traffic, garages potentially causing land contamination, etc.</p> <p>Neighbours will lose daylight privacy.</p> <p>Noise from new uses will disturb neighbours, even in the evening, potentially echoing in courtyards.</p> <p>Better uses should be considered, perhaps by inviting proposals from developers</p>
2015/4501/P	Robert Livock	34 Raglan Street London NW5 3DA	01/10/2015 23:34:26	SUPPRT	<p>I support this application for making better use of this underused site in a predominantly residential area. I support the retention of the majority of the employment use and the provision of 9 badly needed private family dwellings with no material affect on neighbouring amenity. The architects appear to have thought long and hard about their proposal so I hope you can recommend it for approval with the minimum of conditions according to government circulars. I would not like a repeat of The Castle and Pizza Express delays in this time of acute housing need.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Peter Gluckstein, Chairman Railey Mews Residents Association	11 Railey Mews London NW5 2PA	29/09/2015 10:27:53	OBJ	<p>I write as Chairman of the Railey Mews Residents Association, which incorporates residents and businesses on Leverton Street, Fortess Grove and Fortess Road.</p> <p>The members of the Association are unanimous in objecting to the proposed plans for the development of the former M&A Coachworks site at Fortess Grove and have joined together as an Association to fight these plans.</p> <p>Before attempting to list our concerns I would like to take issue with the “consultation process” which the no doubt highly paid Planning Consultants have attempted to portray in a positive light in the Planning Statement, pages 10 & 11, 3.17 and 3.18.</p> <p>The portrayal of what took place as a consultation process and the description of what took place at the Pineapple is so far removed from the truth as to cast significant doubt on all the other claims made by them in the document.</p> <p>What actually happened is that sometime in 2014 a tiny flyer was distributed, patchily, to a few homes in the area. This was A6 at best, maybe smaller, with tiny writing and was no doubt ignored by many of the homes that received it. It described a proposal to build 18 homes on the site. Some of the few residents who received it made queries, but there was no sense of consultation as in “What would you be happy to see here? What would be your concerns about a major housing development?” Most of our information came from chatting to employees of M&A as we passed them in Railey Mews! A further leaflet drop did take place in March, again with limited effect in that many neighbouring households do not recall receiving it.</p> <p>When the plans reached the second stage there was indeed a telephone conversation and exchange of emails between Ralph Cooley and myself and we agreed to hold the inaugural Railey Mews Residents Association meeting as described. A simple leaflet drop by us on the eve of the meeting unearthed at least 10 residents whose properties neighbour the site yet who had heard nothing about any proposal, ever.</p> <p>Furthermore, Cooley and CGMS did not “answer our concerns” at that meeting. They told us what their plans were and met every objection and complaint raised with one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That’s not our remit, we are just the architects; 2. It’s too late to change that now, you’ll have to object when the plans are published; 3. We’ve done our best, we think they are good plans but it’s a matter of opinion. <p>The Planning statement gives the impression that we were satisfied with their responses. In fact, ultimately, the 28 residents at the meeting were giving the Architects and consultants such a hard time and such a good kicking that Ralph Cooley, practically in tears, complained that he “didn’t HAVE to be here, (I) could be at home with my daughter.”! (The fact that they recollect 45 residents rather than the 28 present probably indicates HOW hostile they felt the meeting became!) There were 10 apologies received by the Chair, by the way, all of whom also object to the plans.</p> <p>I can provide a copy of the minutes of the meeting at which Cooleys and CGMS both formally acknowledged that the mood of the meeting was overwhelmingly hostile and that our questioning of the specifics of their plans in no way, shape or form could be taken to show that we accepted or welcomed them. I should also note that Camden have also been poor in their consultation process – a number of houses on the list of “neighbours” who should have been contacted have not been. Furthermore, despite registering our Association with the required and relevant sections within Camden we have not been contacted by Camden as part of this process.</p> <p>I will take one other issue, from the viability assessment provided by the Chartered Surveyors. They</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

state that the rough cost of refurbishing the property in order NOT to have to change the use would be £920,000. They then state that at current rents this would take 7 years to pay back, making the process “unviable economically”. An investment business (which is effectively what this charity is) which provided a 12% return on investment in the current economic climate would regard that as an excellent performance.

(Incidentally, and this is for the Politicians not the Planning department, it does raise the issue of just what the “Charity” is playing at. According to the Charity Commission website, the Estate Charity of Eleanor Palmer generates £76,000 per annum. They spent over a third of this paying Architects and Consultants fees in 2014, probably a good deal more this year. How much money are they trying to raise from this process – obviously they can only do this once so what are they going to do to raise money in the future? Why is a body with ostensibly charitable aims not prepared to field queries from local residents about their plans? Why did they not insist on a proper consultation process? Why do two Councillors who were until recently on the Board of the Trust not appear to know anything about these plans?)

So, given the above background information how much credence can be given to the rest of the proposal? They appear to have gone through the various Policy and Planning documents with a fine toothcomb, looking for snippets or part sentences that will support their application yet all the while trampling all over the spirit in which they were written.

It is typical of their whole approach that they propose nine houses, so no affordable housing is required. It is typical that they structure the proposal in such a way that the contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy would be a measly £250,000. They claim to have designed to fit in with the spirit of the location, but actually just make a nod to the ugly, 1970s shutters which are clearly an obtrusive add-on rather than the fine old brickwork. They claim to have designed the project in the spirit of the neighbourhood but what they propose is dull, ugly work that bears no relation to the surrounding streetscape

The green roofs will inevitably become another balcony or terrace, ruining the privacy and security of residents of Railey Mews, they have used outdated plans which don't take account of new(ish) extensions on the Fortess Road side, they overlook bedrooms on Fortess Grove, the fire escape on Railey Mews will become a rat run to the pub or the shop or a smoker's corner and no matter what they may say about being considerate developers it's a pound to a penny, judging by their “don't give a damn” attitude to date, that construction will be a total nightmare.

Objectors to this proposal such as Dame Ruth Silver, Corvin Roman and Michael Pia among others have done extensive research into the Policies and Planning statements that SHOULD apply to this development and have written their objections accordingly. I don't propose to waste your time by quoting their sources, but instead would like to commend their efforts to your attention.

Finally I would like to stress that the neighbours of this site are not NIMBYs. We recognise that something has to be done to the site. Some of us feel that the Viability Study is a self-serving sham and that refurbishment of the premises and occupation by a future generation of companies needing studio, creative, office or light industrial facilities is a viable option. Others that some smaller scale development, with fewer houses and more consideration of the amenities of existing residents would be in order. We would welcome the opportunity for genuine dialogue with the owners to look at ways forward. All of us, however, object strongly to the development as it is proposed and the immediate neighbours in particular are genuinely afraid that their quality of life will suffer in the future if this

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	17 railey mews	17 railey mews	01/10/2015 16:21:18	OBJNOT	<p>proposal succeeds.</p> <hr/> <p>It would appear that this scheme is another attempt at shoe horning inappropriate housing into a difficult site without making any contribution beyond the current owners profits. It is unlikely the new houses would meet basic needs such as daylight and amenity space that anyone living in a new house should assume as a given. The fact that the only way of getting any daylight is to have a 'courtyard' creates a big problem for the neighbours amenity with the additional noise from potentially nine families. The nature of the surrounding buildings in scale and material exacerbates the acoustic problem significantly affecting the neighbours. Given the only way of providing daylight is using glass roof lights and 'courtyard', we are concerned about the significant light pollution this will generate. Is housing absolutely necessary here and isn't there a better use of this building. Kentish town is a mixture of work units and housing and wouldn't this handsome industrial building be better used as studio space or creative workshop units? Has this been explored properly? This is a conservation area and both the proposed use and the quality of the design does not appear to address this. Parking is a big problem in the area and there is simply no capacity for additional cars. The current design includes a fire escape onto railey mews and we are concerned about the potential abuse of this leading to additional traffic and noise in the mews. The disturbance from fire drills would be inevitable but we are concerned that over time the door will be propped open with everyone using it as just another entrance (you only have to stand in the mews when people are in the garden at the pub to appreciate how noise reverberates and exaggerates the impact)All this can be avoided if a smarter strategy can be developed to have the escape towards fortress road where the noise will not be as prominent?</p> <hr/>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	S.J.Coe	16 Railey Mews London NW5 2PA	02/10/2015 05:06:35	OBJEMAIL	I This apparent "brown-field site" is not vacant or dis-used - it is currently occupied and fully functioning - and has long been operated in Fortress Grove by an established reliable local small company, which will be forced to relocate to an out of London location. Although adding only one new domestic frontage to the Mews to which it is annexed at the southern end, this proposed development & the change of use - effectively doubles the human population of Railey Mews - to which it physically attaches, although 9 houses proposed - are being compressed into a block width representing only 4+1/2 frontages in the Mews, as can be easily seen from above - on plan. The highly compressed visual effect of this bank of 8 attached housing units to be formed within the foot-print of the M6A Coachworkshop facing Fortress Grove - appear too narrow and do not conform to the established pattern in this part of the Conservation area. The style might look better somewhere else quite cramped - appearing vertically rather too high if they were to exceed the existing building. Levels drawn - do seem optimistic. As for impact on local services, experience would suggest that 5 houses on this site would be more in keeping with local densities - and one would further suggest that a new premium apartment block in this location - would very likely attract unofficial subletting - over and beyond the occupancy levels intended, in an attempt to cover the high premium rentals required. Representing 26 new bedrooms the plan does not seem to show adequate amenity space relative to bedrooms.. & although adding no additional car parking provision - the vehicle demands in terms of taxis and deliveries to this number of occupiers - is likely to be considerable & take place day & night. Green roof spaces are also liable to be subverted to barbecue uses. It is further noted - that a garage frontage has been dispensed with, at the single new residence in Railey Mews, contrary to that requirement & this facility being maintained in the remaining domestic residences within the mews & being consistent with the nature and expectation for an Off Street Parking facility being mandated and the requirement for retention - being insisted on - elsewhere in the Mews.. known for it's historic garage doors. Railey Mews is regularly featured in booklets of illustrated London Walks. This off street parking facility - being the essential characteristic in the nature of every London mews property also mitigates the need for storage generally and especially for storing other forms of personal transport i.e. bicycles or motorcycles, being kept off the road. The ambient noise factor - emanating from this development via the various openings - at window and roof level - is not to be underestimated in a location where an echo chamber effect is to be expected, following the removal of the existing workshop roof, which has "contained" any sounds.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Further-more this new noise level is likely to be most noticeable during evenings and at night-time - (and especially on Sundays) - when the the existing vehicle workshop has customarily been completely silent.

The quietness of Railey Mews has always been it's main attraction & any extra noise is deleterious to those particular residents - who live and work silently at home.
An overbearing imposition which compromised this peace factor would be detrimental to residents and visitors alike, to appreciating this environment.

The loss of their jobs by the skilled and formerly local current workforce at the M&A. Coachworks premises is also to be regretted - as to them, it is not directly compensated by the few new extra potential work stations within the proposed "studio section".

& Those actual craft skilled jobs and personnel - are lost to the area and local economy, when pushed out of London, as is most probable in this case. Long serving employees would then have to commute out of town.

Camden"s EC 5 policy issues have carried weight previously.

The impact of this development on a local employer displaced.. is also regrettable. Many such small viable companies continue to fall prey to excessive landlord demands for intensive development & high returns.

Permitting such a change of use colludes with such a climate. IMHO:

S.C... - 1.10."15

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Tom Silver	7 Railey Mews NW5 2PA	29/09/2015 14:51:01	OBJ	<p>I am writing to outline my objections to the proposed development to the Workshop on Fortess Grove.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The front elevations of the proposed type A and B houses directly overlook the flats within Eleanor House and the gardens of the houses on Fortess Road. Having recently re-developed 6 & 7 Railey Mews, windows were only allowed to 'overlook' the gardens of Fortess Road by using obscured glazing. This is clearly not what Cooley Architects have in my mind – it is my belief that the elevations as drawn will not be permitted. I would note that the flats are named 'Eleanor House' so might be owned by the trust. It is my understanding that planning applications have to be looked at on an 'arms length' basis so, even if they do own Eleanor House, it does not factor in favourably when it comes to a planning permission. 2) Following on from the overlooking to the west, there is also overlooking/security issues to the east. Namely houses 2, 3, 4 & 5 on Railey Mews. I believe there is a security risk to these houses - what is to stop users of the houses utilising the flat roofs to overlook or even gain access to the houses on Railey Mews? 3) Light and noise pollution are also possibilities for the houses in the surrounding area as the habitable rooms are in very close proximity. A lot more evening noise will occur with 9 new residential houses in place of a workshop/garage that only operates within traditional business hours. 4) The density/massing of the project is also too high. The proposed houses are enclosed on both sides with little to no amenity space. Amenity space as outlined by Camden Council is a minimum of 9 sqm per residential occupier and 0.74 sqm per commercial occupier. As the proposed residential houses are all 3 beds, they would need a minimum of 27 sqm of amenity space. Unless I have missed something, they fall short of this requirement. 5) Contamination. Surveys are needed for hazardous materials such as asbestos. Asbestos is only dangerous when moved so, if asbestos is discovered (more than likely when looking at the roof), a clear plan needs to be actioned. I would also note that garages are known to have the potential for causing land contamination as particles from factory emissions can settle in the ground. 6) A report from Highways is required to outline the impact of the proposed development on the local infrastructure. 7) The buildings on Fortess Road directly to the west of the proposed development are listed (I believe Grade II but possibly Grade II*). This proposed development directly affects their setting and it is the Council's duty to preserve and enhance the setting of all listed buildings. Have English Heritage been consulted? 8) The "fire escape" that allows access into Railey Mews must be extinguished. It will undoubtedly be used as a cut through to the Pineapple Pub and as a congregation area for the smokers within the offices. It also causes a change to the Railey Mews frontage that is unacceptable - The facade must be in keeping with the rest of the mews.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Les Levidow	48 Fortess Rd NW5 2HG	30/09/2015 10:40:02	OBJ	<p>I have several objections to this proposal.</p> <p>During 2001-2003 I helped to organise the Nuisance Action Group (NAG), demanding that Camden Council take action to stop the noxious emissions from M&A Coachworks. Eventually there was a slight improvement in the stack, but the emissions have continued. For this reason, I would potentially welcome a change in use for the site. But the current proposal would be worse and so is rightly opposed by many residents.</p> <p>Here are some objections in brief:</p> <p>The new buildings have an inappropriate design, size and height. They clash with the nearby listed buildings and conservation area. The high density lacks adequate amenity space.</p> <p>New uses will have harmful impacts, e.g. if some units operate 24/7, increase in commercial vehicle traffic, garages potentially causing land contamination, etc.</p> <p>Neighbours will lose daylight privacy.</p> <p>Noise from new uses will disturb neighbours, even in the evening, potentially echoing in courtyards.</p> <p>Better uses should be considered, perhaps by inviting proposals from developers</p>
2015/4501/P	Les Levidow	48 Fortess Rd NW5 2HG	30/09/2015 10:40:19	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4501/P	Frank Silver	6 Railey Mews NW5 2PA	29/09/2015 17:05:19	OBJ	<p>I write in objection to the plans submitted under the above reference as the Freeholder of 6 Railey Mews NW5. My property would be adversely affected by this application.</p> <p>My first comment is to review the applicant's site context in relation to Railey Mews.</p> <p>Railey Mews is a rare example of a Victorian Mews (circa 1860) that remains untouched by over a hundred and fifty years of development since it was originally built. There has been some repairs to the original buildings but the peaceful 'cul de sac' that was produced over 150 years ago remains relatively original and untouched.</p> <p>There are currently only seventeen dwellings that comprise Railey Mews.</p> <p>Due to each mews house not having any rear open space the mews itself has become an important resource to all the occupants of Railey Mews. The mews are used by the children and occupants of the mews houses as a play area and 'informal front garden'. The few cars that are permitted to park in the mews are arranged in blocks so as to create a chicane that ensures (along with the cobbled road surface) that vehicles travel at very low speeds which enables and allows the 'private use of public space' nature of the entire mews as informal but important and much used leisure amenity space.</p> <p>If the applicant had restricted their development to one infill dwelling fronting onto and using Railey Mews I would consider this would be an appropriate intensification of Railey Mews that can be absorbed without harming this important part of The Conservation Area.</p> <p>However it is clear that the intention is to use the misleadingly named "Fire Exit" to the proposed commercial space as a key entrance and exit to and from the proposed commercial space.</p> <p>The number of workstations proposed within the commercial space provides for in excess of 196 people to work in this locale. If a third of this number use the convenience of the access designed through Railey Mews this would result in a demonstrable overdevelopment and intensification of this entrance's use with Railey Mews and this has the likelihood of destroying forever the peaceful integrity of Railey Mews that has withstood development for over 150 years.</p> <p>As a minor observation the proposed elevation treatment to Railey Mews is unsympathetic and alien to the local vernacular with inappropriate cladding.</p> <p>The Railey Mews's dwellings that abut the existing building structures in Fortress Grove adjoin a 'mute' and enclosed roof. The application contemplates the removal of the enclosing roof and inserting 8 dwellings with minimal external space that results in a cramped form of development that ought to be rejected as inappropriate in this locale.</p> <p>There is a secondary issue with noise and overlooking of the houses in the lower half of Railey Mews that would result in demonstrable harm to the existing residents of Railey Mews.</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

I would urge the Planning Authority to reject this scheme as an inappropriate overdevelopment adjacent to The Conservation Area and invite the applicant to re-design and re-consider their proposals.

It is vital for the applicant to understand that the proposed commercial access via Railey Mews should be completely extinguished as this would destroy one of the last original Victorian Mews that remain in The London Borough Of Camden.

If the development of this site can only be achieved by destroying Railey Mew's quiet integrity then the local Planning Authority have a duty to preserve The Conservation Area above and before the employment benefit and profits that could accrue to the applicant.

I respectfully request that, for the material considerations given above, that this application is refused planning consent.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Silver
