

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6788/P	Matthew Feldman	45b Leverton Street London NW5 2PE	01/02/2018 11:35:50	OBJ	<p>We are the owners/occupiers of 45b Leverton Street and 43a Leverton Street respectively and wish to record our strong objection to planning application Ref: 2017/6027/P and 2017/6788P, and in particular, to the applications at Unit C and Unit B which comprise a new roof and entrance and additional storey of office floor space.</p> <p>We should point out that we were not aware of these applications until a few days ago when we spoke to a neighbour. We are not aware that they were widely publicised, nor that there had been any consultation. It is also noted that the applications were made shortly before Christmas when residents are commonly away and/or have little time to deal with detailed applications of this kind and of such a scale.</p> <p>The concerns of residents of Leverton Street and 1 Railey Mews in relation to loss of privacy, and loss of light were dealt with to some degree by the amendments made to the original planning application (2015/4501/P). The proposals in the current applications appear to be an attempt to go behind the amendments that were made, and fail to meet the amenity concerns of the residents.</p> <p>We would endorse the objections already made about the rear of the building described as Studio C being used for general access to Unit A and B, including the prohibition of refuse collection and access for bicycles, which would have a seriously detrimental impact on the quiet, residential nature of the area; that the proposed acoustic roof to Studio C is not in keeping with the prevailing roofscape of the Conservation Area; and the relocation and repositioning of the proposed plant.</p> <p>Further, and in particular, we strongly object to the windows to the east elevation of the proposed additional storey extension to Unit B, and would ask that they be removed; and that the proposed one storey extension to Unit B is set back further, in line with the right heights approved under planning permission 2015/4501/P.</p> <p>Furthermore, we would reiterate the concerns that the additional storey to Unit B is too large and flies in the face of the originally approved scheme, which sought to reduce overlooking, sense of enclosure and daylight/sunlight impact.</p> <p>As set out above, the proposed windows would not only overlook our gardens and all of those of the properties at Nos 41 to 49 Leverton Street, but the kitchen/sitting room and main bedroom at 45b Leverton Street, giving rise to significant privacy issues.</p> <p>It would appear that the Daylight/Sunlight Report of GIA dated 30 November 2017 does not contain any or any proper or detailed assessment of the loss of daylight/sunlight to any specific windows/doors at the rear of the properties at Nos 41 to 49 Leverton Street. However, it is noted that in their "No Skyline Analysis", there is said to be a proposed loss of light of up to 57.37% to one of the properties (unspecified) located between 41 and 49 Leverton Street.</p> <p>Finally, as a general point, it is clear that the developers are seeking to maximise the development potential for this site. Whilst the new plans incorporate windows to the proposed additional storey on Studio B, which we strongly object to, we are also concerned that the developers (or their successors) might in the future seek a change of use to residential use of Studio B, which would mean that the gardens of 41 to 49 Leverton Street would be overlooked, as well as the kitchen/sitting room and main bedroom of 45b Leverton Street, on a permanent basis by residential occupants.</p> <p>For the above reasons, we would urge the Council to refuse both of these applications as currently proposed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Matthew Feldman 45b Leverton Street
					Cheryl McLennan 43a Leverton Street
2017/6788/P	Hugo Plowden	58 Leverton Street	31/01/2018 18:55:48	OBJ	<p>The terrace of houses on Leverton Street from no.50 to 70 is not allowed to build upwards on the grounds of being in a conservation area, despite being standard Victorian houses. As such, it would, I believe, be hypocritical to allow a building which could be considered to be far more architecturally distinctive in the same conservation area to build upwards and I object to this aspect of the application.</p> <p>I also object to the site being accessed via Railey Mews, which would destroy the quiet character of the mews, which was never designed to house a complex employing 300 odd people. This is also liable to lead to more noise in Leverton Street, which is a narrow street already containing a pub, that the council has allowed to expand (both in terms of size and opening hours) despite many objections by local residents, thereby creating more noise for residents who live within earshot. Access via Railey Mews to this development will only worsen this situation.</p>
2017/6788/P	Josie Tennant	58 Leverton Street	31/01/2018 19:07:07	OBJ	I object to this application on the basis that entrance to the site via Studio C will result in more traffic, people and noise on Leverton Street, potentially at any time of day or night.
2017/6788/P	Timothy Church	43b Leverton St NW5 2PE	31/01/2018 20:12:44	OBJ	<p>I (43 Leverton Street) was not consulted on this renovation and firmly object to the changes that will extend the structure and install windows that will directly overlook my property and result in a significant loss of privacy.</p> <p>Currently there are no windows allowing views of the garden and back of the property (bathroom and kitchen) area. The proposed development completely alters this and will have windows immediately on or adjacent to my property's border. This is a massive change of use and design and will have a significant impact on daylight, views, privacy, noise and light pollution, and general increased activity on the bordering area that can only be seen as a negative and very intrusive.</p> <p>There has to be a better way to improve the former Coachworks while minimising its impact on local residents and drastically altering their home life.</p>