17 Cumulative Effects Assessment

17.1 Introduction

17.1.1 This ES Chapter considers the potential for cumulative effects arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and presents an assessment of the significance of identified cumulative effects.

17.1.2 Cumulative effects can occur as either interactions between different effects associated with just one project or interactions between the effects of a number of developments occurring within the same area.

17.1.3 As a result, two types of cumulative effects have been considered within this ES as follows:

- **Intra-Project Effects:** The combined effects arising as a result of two or more effects from the Proposed Development interacting, for example upon a single receptor or resource. An example would be where a local resident is affected by dust, noise and a loss of visual amenity during the construction of a scheme, with the result being a greater nuisance than each individual effect alone.

- **Inter-Project Effects:** The combined effects of the Proposed Development with several other developments in the same area (referred to as 'cumulative schemes') which may, on an individual basis be insignificant but, together (i.e. cumulatively), have a significant effect. An example would be surface water runoff likely to be generated by the construction of a proposed supermarket, which would need to be added to the predicted surface water runoff figures for the Proposed Development, in order to understand the true potential effects as a result of the combined schemes.

17.2 Legislative Context

17.2.1 The requirement for cumulative effects assessment is stated in the following EU directives and UK legislation:

- European Commission (EC) Directive 85/337/EEC (Ref. 17-1) requires assessment of "the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the project".

- European Directive 2014/52/EU (Ref. 17-2) (amendment of 2011/92/EU above) states that criteria for assessment includes "the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the use of natural resources"; and

- The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2011 amended 2015 (Ref. 17-3) states within Schedule 3(1) that "the characteristics of a development must be considered having regard, in particular to … b) the cumulation with other development" and within Schedule 3(2) that "the existing land use" and Schedule 4(4) "description of the development on the environment which should cover… cumulative effects".

17.2.2 This ES Chapter considers the potential for cumulative effects arising as a result of different effects (i.e. noise and dust effects combined) from the Proposed Development and effects arising from the Proposed Development in conjunction with other development schemes located within approximately 1.5km of the site. The 1.5km study area is shown in Figure 17.1 (see below section on inter project effects). An approximate area was used to allow the Local Authorities (London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC)) to include major developments just outside of this area. The other cumulative schemes are either submitted for planning, have a resolution to grant planning permission or are under construction.
17.3 Methodology

Intra Project Effects

17.3.1 There is no established EIA methodology for assessing and quantifying the combined effects of individual impacts (i.e. intra project effects) arising from a proposed development on sensitive receptors. However, the EC has produced guidelines (Ref. 17-4) for assessing these type of effects “which are not intended to be formal or prescriptive, but are designed to assist EIA practitioners in developing an approach which is appropriate to a project...”.

17.3.2 AECOM has reviewed these guidelines and has developed an approach which uses the defined residual effects of the Proposed Development to determine the potential for intra project effects.

17.3.3 This ES has identified a number of beneficial and adverse effects during demolition, construction and on completion and occupation of the Proposed Development. These include effects of minor, moderate and major significance. Several effects on one receptor or receptor group could theoretically interact or combine to produce a combined significant overall effect.

17.3.4 For some environmental effects, no interactions with other effects can occur and so no intra-project cumulative effects could arise. For example, impacts to daylight and sunlight availability do not interact with impacts on archaeology, or as resulting from contaminated land. For other environmental effects it is apparent that interactions could occur and impact in different ways upon an individual receptor or receptor group, such that combined cumulative effects may occur. Combined cumulative effects are more likely to arise when the receptor or receptor group is more sensitive to change. Typical examples include ecological and human receptors.

17.3.5 For the purposes of assessing intra-project effects, the identified residual effects, as set out within the individual technical chapters of the ES, have been reviewed against the receptors they affect. Where there is more than one effect on a particular receptor, there is a requirement to determine whether there is the potential for effect interactions. If there is the potential for effect interactions then consideration has been given as to whether there is the potential for any resultant combined cumulative effect.

17.3.6 The assessment within this Chapter will identify each sensitive receptor (for the purposes of the assessment of combined effects, the receptor and receptor groups are those defined within Chapter 4: EIA Approach and Methodology of this ES) and consider the residual effects identified within the EIA which may act upon this receptor, taking into account committed mitigation. Only residual effects which are classified as being of minor, moderate, or major significance have been considered in relation to the potential for combined effects. Residual effects of negligible significance have been excluded from the assessment of combined or intra project effects as, by virtue of their definition, they are considered to be imperceptible to an environmental/socioeconomic resource or receptor.

Inter Project Effects

17.3.7 The assessment of inter-project effects relies on interpretation of the assessments undertaken for the Proposed Development, with reference to the assessment and interpretation of data available for other nearby developments that do not form part of the existing baseline. Where available, reference has been made to ESs which have been prepared to support planning applications for other developments. For developments which are not EIA Development, and for which an ES is not available, professional judgement has been used to identify likely significant effects based on available data and using quantitative or qualitative assessment approaches. In addition, effects of other developments may not have been expressed in consistent forms or prepared using a similar methodology.

17.3.8 The IEMA publication Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment (IEMA, 2004) (Ref. 17-5) recommends that an EIA should assess the effects of a scheme cumulatively with other developments only when there are likely to be significant effects. When evaluating the potential for significant effects there is often considerable uncertainty in the
assessment, although in general it can be assumed that effects of each development in isolation would need to be minor or above in order to result in a significant cumulative effect.

17.3.9 In order to assess the inter-project cumulative effects, a review of planning applications for developments near the site was carried out in consultation with LBHF and RBKC in order to identify those development schemes which may potentially give rise to significant cumulative effects together with the Proposed Development. A number of developments were identified (referred to as ‘cumulative schemes’), and the location of each is shown on Figure 17.1. In identifying the cumulative schemes, consideration was given to their distance from the Proposed Development, the scale of the development, project timescales and predicted lifetimes.

17.3.10 The cumulative schemes shown on Figure 17.1 are also listed in Table 17.2 are considered to be of a scale and close enough to the site to have a potential significant combined effect together with the Proposed Development. The final list of cumulative schemes was agreed in consultation with LBHF and RBKC.

17.3.11 The information has been taken from the LBHF and RBKC planning application website and the level of assessment in consideration of cumulative effects has relied on information which is available in the public domain for each of these relevant developments, including Environmental Statements submitted in support of the planning applications where available.

17.3.12 The developments considered in the assessment of cumulative effects are based on schemes in respect of which a planning application has been submitted prior to 29 March 2016.

Potential Intra Project Effects

17.3.13 Table 17.1 provides a summary of the intra-project effects resulting from effect interactions. Consideration has been given to the enabling, demolition and construction stages, and also effects occurring once the Proposed Development is complete and operational. Where there are no significant impacts on a particular receptor, there is not considered to be a potential intra-project effect. For example, no effects above negligible were noted for air quality effects, therefore it is considered that there will be no intra-project effects in relation to air quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Identified Residual Effects (minor, moderate or major)</th>
<th>Potential Combined Effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Neighbouring residential properties, places of worship, schools and hotels and users of these buildings, current on-site employees** | **Construction**  
*Noise and Vibration* – During construction up to minor adverse effects have been predicted due to daytime construction noise and short-term minor adverse effects during night time construction works. Minor adverse effects from construction vibration.  
*Socio-Economic* – Minor adverse effect upon impact area residents due to a net reduction in jobs, as a result of relocation of stadium operations, and effect upon spending in the local area.  
*Socio-economic* – Minor/Moderate beneficial effect due to spending from demolition and construction workers, enhanced through the Chelsea Football Club (CFC) construction employment programme to encourage spending at local businesses.  
*Visual* – The visual effect experienced during construction varies from no effect to major adverse depending upon the location of the receptors. Up to major adverse effects upon residential receptors in close proximity have been predicted due to the demolition and construction associated with the Proposed Development.  
*Wind Microclimate* – Qualitatively, during periods of demolition, winds are likely to gather speed in open areas. As construction progresses impacts will vary and may be of lesser magnitude than those that will be experienced once the Proposed Development is complete. However, any undesirable wind conditions during construction will be temporary. | YES in relation to:  
Noise and Vibration  
&  
Visual Effects |
| **Operation** | **Noise** – Match day noise from crowds within and outside the stadium is predicted to have a minor adverse effect.  
Changes to match day operational road traffic noise levels are predicted to result in up to a minor adverse residual effect with the exception of Kings Road east of Edith Grove where a major adverse (significant) effect in the one hour before a 19:45 hours kick-off has been predicted.  
The implementation of the decking platforms is predicted to provide a minor beneficial effect at ground and first floors and a major beneficial effect at second floor level on Billing Place/Billing Street and Brompton Park Crescent/The London Oratory School.  
*Socio economic* – Several moderate and minor beneficial effects are predicted, these include changes in on-site employment, effects on property values, retaining the heritage value of Stamford Bridge, opportunities for the local labour market, and improved accessibility (both the increased number of entrances as part of the Proposed Development and entrances directly from the Fulham Broadway station). The loss of hotel provision, community facilities and existing housing are predicted to have a minor adverse effect.  
*Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Light Spill* – Daylight and sunlight impacts on the existing sensitive receptors as a result of the Proposed Development once completed and occupied have been considered and will result in largely negligible to moderate adverse effects, with the vast majority being negligible, which will be permanent (long term) and at a local scale. There will be some effects of greater significance in a minority of cases; however, the residual daylight levels are generally consistent with an urban location. A negligible to slight positive effect on light spill is likely as the design of the new stadium is more enclosed than the existing stadium, thereby reducing sports illumination spill and glare (on match nights). | YES in relation to:  
Noise and Vibration  
&  
Daylight and Sunlight  
AND  
Yes in relation to:  
Socio-economics  
&  
Flood Risk  
&  
Noise and Vibration  
&  
Visual Effects |
### Table 17.1 Intra Project Cumulative Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Identified Residual Effects (minor, moderate or major)</th>
<th>Potential Combined Effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td>Minor beneficial effects on people, buildings and infrastructure (on-site and downstream (East) of the site) are predicted for the risk of surface water flooding and risk of sewer flooding.</td>
<td>(Beneficial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual</strong></td>
<td>The visual effects experienced once the Proposed Development is operational vary from no effect to moderate adverse and major beneficial depending upon the location of receptors. Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29-32, 35 and 36 are considered to result in no effect, negligible or minor (adverse and beneficial) residual effects, Viewpoints 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 23, 24, 25 and 34 are considered to result in moderate to major beneficial residual effects, and Viewpoints 33 and 13 are considered to have moderate or moderate-minor adverse residual effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>Noise – During construction, minor adverse effects have been predicted due to daytime construction noise and short-term minor adverse effects during night time construction works. Minor adverse effects from construction vibration.</td>
<td>YES in relation to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Economic – Minor adverse effect upon impact area residents due to a net reduction in jobs, as a result of relocation of stadium operations, and effect upon spending in the local area. Minor/Moderate beneficial effect due to spending from demolition and construction workers, enhanced through the CFC programme to encourage spending at local businesses.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration &amp; Visual Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual</strong></td>
<td>The visual effect experienced during construction varies from no effect to major adverse depending upon the location of the receptors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation</strong></td>
<td>Noise – Match day noise from crowds within and outside the stadium is predicted to have a minor adverse effect. Changes to match day operational road traffic noise levels predicted to result in up to a minor adverse residual effect with the exception of Kings Road east of Edith Grove where a major adverse (significant) effect in the one hour before a 19:45 hours kick-off has been predicted.</td>
<td>YES in relation to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-economic – Several moderate and minor beneficial effects are predicted, these include changes in on-site employment, effects on property values, retaining the heritage value of Stamford Bridge, opportunities for the local labour market, and improved accessibility (both the increased number of entrances as part of the Proposed Development and entrances directly from Fulham Broadway station). The loss of hotel provision, community facilities and existing housing are predicted to have a minor adverse effect.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration &amp; Visual Effects (Adverse) AND Yes in relation to: Socio-economics &amp; Flood Risk &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Risk – Minor beneficial effects on people, buildings and infrastructure (on-site and downstream of the site) are predicted for the risk of surface water flooding and risk of sewer flooding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual</strong></td>
<td>The visual effects experienced once the Proposed Development is operational vary from no effect to moderate adverse and major beneficial depending upon the location of receptors. Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29-32, 35 and 36 are considered to result in no effect, negligible or minor (adverse and beneficial) residual effects, Viewpoints 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, 24, 25 and 34 are considered to result in moderate to major beneficial residual effects, and Viewpoints 33 and 13 are considered to have moderate or moderate-minor adverse residual effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Receptor</td>
<td>Identified Residual Effects (minor, moderate or major)</td>
<td>Potential Combined Effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Remedial and construction site workers | **Construction**  
*Noise* – During construction up to minor adverse effects have been predicted due to daytime construction noise and short-term minor adverse effects during night time construction works. | Noise and Vibration & Visual Effects (Beneficial) |
| | **Operation**  
Not applicable | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
| Future on-site users | **Construction**  
Not applicable as users will only be present on-site once construction is complete. | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
| | **Operation**  
*Noise and Vibration* - Changes to match day operational road traffic noise levels predicted to result in up to a minor adverse residual effect with the exception of Kings Road east of Edith Grove where a major adverse (significant) effect in the one hour before a 19:45 hours kick-off has been predicted.  
*Flood Risk* – Minor beneficial effects on people, buildings and infrastructure (on-site and downstream (East) of the site) are predicted for the risk of surface water flooding and risk of sewer flooding. | No combined effects are expected. |
| Ecology (Designated ecological sites, habitats and protected and notable species) | **Construction**  
*Ecology* – During construction, moderate adverse effects have been predicted on the District Line north of Fulham Broadway, West London line south of Earl’s Court and West London Line in Brompton SINC due to partial loss of the SINC as well as degradation of habitat.  
*Noise and Vibration* - During construction up to adverse effects have been predicted due to daytime construction noise and short-term minor adverse effects during night time construction works. | YES in relation to: Ecology, Biodiversity and Nature Conservation & Noise and Vibration |
### Table 17.1 Intra Project Cumulative Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Identified Residual Effects (minor, moderate or major)</th>
<th>Potential Combined Effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Operation**      | *Noise* – Match day noise from crowds within and outside the stadium is predicted to have a minor adverse effect. Changes to match day operational road traffic noise levels are predicted to result in up to a minor adverse residual effect with the exception of Kings Road east of Edith Grove where a major adverse (significant) effect in the one hour before a 19:45 hours kick-off has been predicted.  
*Ecology* – During operation of the Proposed Development moderate adverse effects have been predicted on the District Line north of Fulham Broadway, West London line south of Earl’s Court and West London Line in Brompton SINC due to permanent full/partial loss of the SINC as well as degradation of habitat. In addition, minor adverse effects have been predicted on wildlife/green corridors (affecting movement of species around the local area), allotments (loss of habitat) and improved grassland (habitat will be damaged / lost).  

No combined effects are expected upon designated ecological sites, habitats and protected species and notable species during the operation of the Proposed Development. Effects on this receptor group have been taken into account within Chapter 9: Ecology, Biodiversity and Nature Conservation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| **Construction**   | *Noise* – During construction, minor adverse effects have been predicted due to daytime construction noise and short-term minor adverse effects during night time construction works.  
*Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* - Construction activities are likely to have a major adverse effect on the archaeological and historic significance of The Billings and Brompton Cutting Conservation Area resulting in the significance being totally altered.  
Construction activities are likely to have a minor adverse effect on the setting of Billings Conservation Area and Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation Buildings.  
Construction activities are likely to have a minor adverse effect on the tranquillity of Brompton Cemetery, which includes a number of listed structures and buildings, due to visual and noise intrusions and a minor adverse effect on effect on character of area of the Moore Park Conservation Area as a result of construction activities and increased traffic.  

Yes in relation to:  
Noise and Vibration & Built Heritage                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| **Operation**      | *Noise* – Match day noise from crowds outside the stadium is predicted to have a typically direct, long-term (albeit over a short period when it occurs) minor adverse effect following mitigation at the dwellings close to the existing southern access points and at the northern façade of Sir Oswald Stoll Mansions due to crowds using the north decking platform over the District Line to the north-west. On match days noise from crowds inside the stadium is predicted to have a direct, long-term minor adverse (insignificant) effect at worst following mitigation.  
Changes to match day operational road traffic noise levels are predicted to result in up to a minor adverse residual effect with the exception of Kings Road east of Edith Grove where a major adverse (significant) effect in the one hour before a 19:45 hours kick-off has been predicted.  

Yes in relation to:  
Noise and Vibration & Built Heritage                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Identified Residual Effects (minor, moderate or major)</th>
<th>Potential Combined Effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Built Heritage** | - Effects on above ground designated heritage assets include minor adverse effects on Moore Park Conservation Area, the Billings Conservation Area, Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation Buildings and Brompton Cemetery.  
    - The visual effects experienced once the Proposed Development is operational vary from no effect to moderate adverse and major beneficial depending upon the location of receptors. Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29-32, 35 and 36 are considered to result in no effect, negligible or minor (adverse and beneficial) residual effects, Viewpoints 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, 24, 25 and 34 are considered to result in moderate to major beneficial residual effects, and Viewpoints 33 and 13 are considered to have moderate or moderate-minor adverse residual effects. |
| **Rail & Underground Network** | - **Construction**  
    - No impacts of minor, moderate or major significance are identified which would impact upon the rail and underground network.  
    - **Operation**  
    - *Transport and Traffic* – The Proposed Development will have a minor beneficial impact on pedestrian comfort levels on Fulham Road, between the site and Fulham Broadway Station, pre and post-match compared to existing match days. The biggest change in Underground trips as a result of the Proposed Development is forecast to occur on the District Line services from Fulham Broadway towards Earl’s Court following weeknight matches, and would be of minor adverse significance. However, it is noted that these impacts would be infrequent and of relatively short duration. It also noted that the highest number of match day passengers would only experience the minor adverse effect for two-stops between Earl’s Court and Fulham Broadway. | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
| **Traffic Flows on the Local Highway Network** | - **Construction**  
    - *Transport and Traffic* - During the peak period of construction traffic, which will be for a limited time within the overall construction programme, the proposed construction activities will result in a temporary (medium term) minor adverse effect in terms of the increase in Heavy Good Vehicles (HGVs) on the surrounding highway network. Whilst the increase in total vehicle flow is less than 10%, the effect on pedestrian and cyclist amenity and severance levels is considered to be temporary (long term) minor adverse, given the increase in HGVs detailed above. However, it should be noted that this effect would be limited to agreed construction working hours with deliveries to be limited to outside of the peak hours.  
    - **Operation**  
    - *Transport and Traffic* - Furthermore, owing to the closure of Fulham Road on match days, vehicle trips to the stadium during operation will be minimal, with traffic distributed over several approach routes to the site. As such, any additional vehicles will be distributed over a number of road links within an approximate 2km radius of the site, and will therefore have a negligible impact on particular link flows within the vicinity of the site compared to existing match days. | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
Table 17.1 Intra Project Cumulative Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Identified Residual Effects (minor, moderate or major)</th>
<th>Potential Combined Effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Subsurface utilities and Services      | **Construction**  
No effects of minor, moderate or major significance are identified during construction of the Proposed Development. | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
|                                        | **Operation**  
Minor beneficial effects on people, buildings and infrastructure (on-site and downstream of the site) are predicted for the risk of surface water flooding and the risk of sewer flooding. | |
| Underlying geology and Hydrogeology    | No effects of minor, moderate or major significance are identified during construction or following completion of the Proposed Development. | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
| Hydrology and Controlled Waters        | No effects of minor, moderate or major significance are identified during construction or following completion of the Proposed Development | No effects to interact and therefore no cumulative effect. |
Discussion of the Potential for Intra Project Effects During Construction

17.3.14 Table 17.1 shows that there is the potential for effect interactions to take place during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, and the identified receptor groups potentially subject to more than one effect during this stage are as follows:

- Neighbouring residential properties, places of worship, schools and hotels and users of these buildings, current on-site employees; and
- Neighbouring and local non-residential properties and users of these buildings;

Effect Interactions: Noise and Vibration and Visual Effects

17.3.15 The occupants of residential properties and users of commercial and community premises close to Stamford Bridge may experience combined adverse nuisance effects arising from visual intrusion and increased noise as a result of the enabling, demolition and construction activities (NB air quality impacts are not a contributing factor as they have been assessed as negligible).

17.3.16 Although there is the potential for these adverse combined nuisance effects to occur throughout the demolition and construction phase, these effects would generally be restricted to short periods of time due to the transient nature of the works and the magnitude of the effects will vary depending on the stage of works.

17.3.17 An outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is provided in ES Part 3, Appendix 2.B of this ES. The mitigation measures set out within this ES and the Outline CEMP have been committed to as a minimum, and will therefore be incorporated into a detailed CEMP. A commitment will be made to periodically review the CEMP and undertake regular environmental audits of its implementation during the enabling / demolition and construction works programme. Through implementation of the CEMP, the combined effect on the identified sensitive receptors will be minimised as far as is reasonably practicable, primarily through the use of Best Practicable Means.

17.3.18 It is recognised that even with the implementation of the mitigation measures presented within the ES, nearby residential properties and occupants are likely to experience some residual adverse cumulative effects during some stages of the enabling, demolition and construction works due to the scale of the works and the nature of the area surrounding the site. Following implementation of mitigation measures and given the temporary, localised nature of effects, the overall cumulative effect on occupants of residential and commercial properties, during demolition and construction is likely to remain as minor to moderate adverse.

Discussion of the Potential for Intra Project Effects During Operation

17.3.19 Table 17.1 identifies the potential for effect interactions to take place during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, and the identified receptor groups potentially subject to more than one effect during this stage are as follows:

- Neighbouring residential properties, places of worship, schools and hotels and users of these buildings, current on-site employees;
- Neighbouring and local non-residential properties and users of these buildings; and
- Future site users.
Effect Interactions: Noise and Vibration, Visual Effects, Daylight and Sunlight, Flood Risk and Socio-Economics

17.3.20 The potential cumulative effects on users of residential or commercial properties and future site workers associated with the operational Proposed Development comprise reduced daily noise effects on non-match days but increased match day noise levels, less daylight/sunlight, reduced flood risk, increased and decreased visual intrusion, and beneficial changes in socio-economics.

17.3.21 Nuisance effects may occur to specific receptors through increased noise levels on match days, localised reduced daylight and sunlight effects and increased visual intrusion. However due to the infrequent and temporary nature of the adverse noise effects associated with match days and the localised nature of daylight and sunlight and visual intrusion effects, the overall combined effect is considered to be negligible to minor adverse.

17.3.22 The combined effects of socio-economic benefits, a reduction in flood risk, a reduction in noise levels due to implementation of the railway deck platforms and improvement in the visual environment is considered to be moderate to major beneficial due to the permanent nature of these effects.

17.3.23 During operation there may be combined adverse effects on nearby Conservation Areas as a result of the scale of the Proposed Development, and an increase in noise associated with football matches. However, due to the limited frequency and duration of matches, the combined effect is not considered to be any greater than the individual effects, and is therefore no more than minor adverse.

17.4 Potential Inter-Project Effects

17.4.1 The potential for significant cumulative effects arising from the Proposed Development combined with the other cumulative schemes identified in Table 17.2 is considered within this section. This is followed by a review of overall likely effects if all the cumulative schemes were to come forward. The assessment has been carried out on the basis of works relating to the Proposed Development commencing in July 2017 and the Proposed Development becoming operational by the beginning of the football season in 2021 (Chapter 3: Scheme Description). As most of the cumulative schemes identified have already gained planning permission, it is assumed that these schemes will be developed.

17.4.2 Geology, Soils and Contaminated Land

There are considered to be no cumulative effects on geology, soils and contaminated land from the Proposed Development and other committed developments in the immediate area. Off-site developments are not considered likely to affect soil contamination at the site. While there is the potential for groundwater within the River Terrace Gravels to be affected by off-site activities, it is considered that off-site groundwater contamination will, of necessity, be identified as part of the respective planning applications, and that conditions will be in place to ensure that effective drainage treatment and ground remediation is in place for all committed developments and that appropriate remediation will be a condition.
### Table 17.2: Cumulative schemes identified from the LBHF and RBKC planning portals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’     | Application Approved

Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’; Application 2 (land within LBHF) in conjunction with Application 1 (land within RBKC) (2011/02001/OUT & PP/11/01937).

Demolition and alteration of existing buildings and structures and the comprehensive redevelopment of the site including new open space, vehicular and pedestrian accesses and routes and a mixed use development comprising buildings to accommodate residential use (Class C3); office (Class B1); retail (Classes A1- 5); hotel and serviced apartments (Class C1); leisure (Class D2), private hospital (Class C2); Education/Health/Community/Culture (Class D1); below ground ancillary space (parking/plant/servicing etc). Replacement of the existing London Underground depot at Lillie Bridge with a new depot, vehicle parking and associated highways alterations, structures for decking over existing rail lines and tunnels, waste and utilities, enabling works including related temporary works and structures and other works incidental to the development. | 2011/02001/OUT and PP/11/01937 | 0.7km north west |
| 2       | Earl’s Court 2 Exhibition Centre                  | Application Approved

Submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission dated 14th November 2013 (ref: 2011/02001/OUT); relating to layout; scale; appearance and landscaping; submitted for approval for the following Development Parcels in LBHF: BW05-1; BW05-2; BW07-2; BW07-3; LP-4 (part); LP-6 and LP-9 (part); comprising a mix use development of 690 residential units and 4,895 m² (GEA) of commercial floor space (Use Class A1-A5), provision of landscaped public and private open space; and associated cycle and car parking spaces at basement and ground level. The application relates to Earls Court 2 Exhibition Centre, Lillie Bridge Rail Depot, West Kensington And Gibbs Green Housing Estates And Adjoining Land | 2013/05200/RES | 0.7km north |

<sup>1</sup> Measured from the closest point of the site to the closest point of cumulative scheme where the planning application boundary is shown on Figure 17.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3       | Seagrave Road | Application Approved  
Application for minor material amendments to the extant permission ref: 2011/02000/FUL, granted 30th March 2012; which comprised the demolition of all existing buildings and the development of 808 residential units comprising; 8 residential blocks (Blocks A-H) ranging from 4 to 16 storeys (C3); 30 residential town houses (C3), a gym facility with associated cafe (D2) in addition to landscaping, plant, parking, servicing and new access arrangements. The minor material amendments comprise revisions to four residential blocks (Blocks A, B, G & H); relocation of the gym facility and the main basement vehicular entrance; updated landscaping proposals and the rewording of various planning conditions attached to the original planning permission. | 2011/02000/FUL and 2013/01213/VAR | 0.4km north |
| 4       | 1-9 Lillie Road | Application Approved  
Demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 65 residential units (C3) and 864 m² (GIA) of A1/A3/D1/D2 floor space within 2 new buildings ranging in height from 6 to 12 storeys; together with plant, parking at basement level, servicing, new access arrangements and new publicly accessible public realm and open space. | 2013/02620/FUL | 0.6km north |
| 5       | Stewart's Garages 72 Farm Lane | Application Approved  
Demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site by the erection of a part 2, part 3, part 4, part 5, and part 6 storey, plus lower ground floor and two storey basement building, comprising 107 self-contained apartments, together with associated on-site gym facilities at lower ground floor level, 122 car parking spaces at basement levels (accessed off Seagrave Road) and landscaping. | 2011/03974/FUL | 0.1km north |
| 6       | Farm Lane Trading Estate 101 Farm Lane | Application Approved  
Redevelopment to provide 50 residential units (40 houses and 10 flats) involving the demolition of the existing buildings (except the entrance arch fronting Farm Lane); formation of basement car park (accessed from Farm Lane) and cycle parking; creation of private communal amenity space and associated landscaping. | 2011/03004/FUL | 0.3km north west |
| 7       | Car Park Adjacent To Hammersmith & City Line Station | Application Approved  
Comprehensive redevelopment to create two mixed use buildings, one 11 storeys in height to the north of the site with rooftop plant and one 9 storeys to the south with rooftop plant, containing offices (B1) and restaurants (A3), with associated on-site servicing and car park area, cycle parking and creation of new landscaped public realm. | 2010/02842/FUL | 2.6km north west |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8       | Kings Mall Car Park Site | Application Approved  
Demolition of the existing West 45 office building, 950 space public car park and small section of railway viaduct which lies within the site boundary, and redevelopment of the site comprising a single building with heights ranging from 4 to 17 storeys, plus 2 basement levels, to provide a mixed use development comprising a 700 space replacement public car park, 529 square metres of ground floor commercial floorspace (use classes A1-A4, D1 and D2) and 418 new homes, with associated hard and soft landscaping, private open space, vehicular accesses and servicing facilities, residential parking (53 spaces), and cycle parking (460 spaces). | 2012/03546/FUL | 2.7km north west |
| 9       | Bechtel House | Application Approved  
Demolition of the existing building and the redevelopment of the site in the form of a new part 10-storey, part 12-storey office building, with some retail and/or restaurant floor space at ground/first floor level; related car and cycle parking; and associated landscaping/public realm works, including a new entrance plaza on Hammersmith Road and the landscaping of the podium deck at the rear. | 2014/04242/FUL | 2.3km north west |
| 10      | Hammersmith Embankment Site known as ‘Fulham Reach’ | Application Approved  
Hybrid Planning Application (part outline/part detailed) for the mixed use development of the site to provide; 744 residential units, ancillary residents' gym and pool; 3,823 m² of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1-A4, B1, D1 and D2); 440 m² boat storage facility and ancillary boat club facilities (Use Class B1/A4/D1/B8); comprising 8 blocks (ranging from 3 to 9 storeys in height); basement level parking for 470 cars, 44 motorcycles and 956 bicycles; a pontoon extending into the Thames River; landscaped open space; works to the Thames Path; new site access arrangements; alterations to the public highway and realignment of access routes through Frank Banfield Park and Park boundary treatment; (Approval sought for Access, Layout and Scale, with matters of Landscaping and Appearance reserved for later determination). Plus; Full details (Access, Layout, Scale, Appearance, Landscaping) for Phase 1; comprising 138 residential units; 1,169 m² of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1-A4, D1 and D2) and 440 m² boat club/storage facility (Use Classes B1/A4/D1/B8) within a 8 storey building, with podium level private amenity space (Block A); Thames Path works; Thames River Pontoon; vehicle access to basement parking level off Chancellor's Road and landscaping. | 2011/00407/COMB | 2.2km north west |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11      | 181 - 187 King Street Town Hall Extension | Application Approved  
Demolition and partial demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment and refurbishment to provide civic offices, 196 residential dwellings, a cinema, shops, restaurants and bars, within Use Classes B1, C3, D2, A1, A3 and A4, together with civic square and other public realm works, landscaping, car parking (including basement car parking), servicing, access and related development. | 2013/03091/FUL               | 3.1km north west        |
| 12      | Riverside Studios And Queens Wharf | Application Approved  
Non-Material Minor Amendment to Planning Permission 2013/03799/FUL granted on 22nd January 2014 for the redevelopment of the site to provide 165 residential units and 8,633 m² of commercial floorspace. Amendments sought comprise changes to the Crisp Road frontage including the re-design of kiosk to provide a larger commercial unit; recessing the scene dock doors to reduce their prominence on the street; addition of an entrance to Riverside Studios from Crisp Road; re-arrangement of residential entrances and bin stores to increase the glazing to the facade to provide more active frontage. Other changes involve internal modifications to residential cores and circulation areas, and an increase in the size of the cooling towers within the building. Amendments to the wording of condition 2 (drawing numbers), 58 (signage) and 59 (gates to scenic dock) and new conditions 72 and 73 to control the hours and use of the commercial unit on Crisp Road. | 2013/03799/FUL and 2014/04247/NMAT | 2.5km north west        |
| 13      | The Tent Site                        | Application Approved  
Redevelopment of the site involving the erection of a part six, part eight and part twelve storey building; comprising retail showrooms and restaurant / cafe uses at ground floor level, with the upper floors in residential use, providing 89 apartments; ranging from one to three bed units. Basement parking for 59 cars (including 9 disabled bays), together with cycle parking for 126 bicycles. Formation of a new public plaza adjacent to Chelsea Creek, including a new area of public realm, which links up with the Thameside Path, and provides a children's play area and cycle parking for 20 bicycles. | 2012/03395/FUL               | 0.5km south             |
### Table 17.2: Cumulative schemes identified from the LBHF and RBKC planning portals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fulham Wharf 51 Townmead Road - Sainsbury's</td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td>2010/02481/FUL</td>
<td>1.4km south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redevelopment to provide a supermarket (9,395 m² gross retail floorspace), 463 residential homes (ranging 3-17 storeys in height), a creche (152 m²), restaurants/cafes/bars (731m²), a training centre (118 m²) and a gym (128 m²) within Use Classes A1, A3 and A4, C3, D1 and D2, a riverside walk, landscaped gardens, public open space and the use of the jetty as a landscaped ecological area, together with car and cycle parking, servicing, access and the demolition and part demolition of the existing buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lots Road</td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td>PP/02/01324 (RBKC) and 2002/03132/FUL &amp; 2011/03122/FUL (LBHF)</td>
<td>0.6km south east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New planning application for erection of part 5, part 6 storey building containing 110 affordable dwellings and erection of part 6, part 7, part 8 storey building containing 18 private market dwellings; hard and soft landscaping; Creekside path; associated amenity space; car parking (59 spaces) and cycle parking (167 spaces). The application will result in a reduction in the number of dwellings that will be developed on site when planning permission ref. no. 2002/03132/FUL (granted on 30/01/06 for the development of 382 residential dwellings) is built out. There will be a reduction in affordable housing provision from 213 dwellings to 110 dwellings; reduction in height of the main affordable housing block HF3 to part 5, part 6 storeys from 8 to 10 storeys; change of 36 intermediate affordable dwellings within building HF2 to 18 private market dwellings; and a revised access layout. This will result in a reduction of total dwellings across the site to 297 dwellings from the previously approved 382.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chelsea Harbour Design Centre</td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td>2008/03034/FUL</td>
<td>0.6km south east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of the Chelsea Harbour Design Centre (11,627 m² GEA (11,578 m² GIA)) involving exterior alterations and new façade treatment at all levels to the existing/proposed buildings; including new pedestrian links, access arrangements, lighting and landscaping and; alterations and extension at ground floor level to the Chambers Building (amendments to planning permission dated 13 May 2008 ref:2007/02290/FUL, relating to increase in floorspace and new external appearance).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17.2: Cumulative schemes identified from the LBHF and RBKC planning portals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17      | Imperial Wharf - Townmead Road | Application Approved  
Variation of Condition 1 to allow revisions to the approved drawings for Block L of planning permission 2011/03709/VAR granted 27th March 2012. A series of mixed use developments by St George (Central London) Ltd. Specifically Stages 2 & 3 obtained reserved matters approval in 2009. Current application for land bounded by Imperial Road, Fulham Gasworks and Railway Line and Imperial Wharf J2 (Chelsea Creek) should also be given consideration (2011/01472/COMB).  
2011/01472/COMB - Hybrid Planning Application (part outline/part detailed) for the mixed use development of the site following demolition of existing office building, comprising 489 residential units (including 147 affordable residential units), 1,190 sq. m of commercial floorspace (Use Class A1-A5), 8,896 sq. m of office floorspace (Use Class B1), within seven buildings ranging from six to eight storeys in height, and a 25 storey building; formation of water basin, two canals and navigable lock to replace existing Chelsea Creek barrier gates; provision of public and private open space; cycle and 402 car parking spaces at basement level. Approval sought for Access, Layout and Scale, with matters of Landscaping and Appearance reserved for later determination. Full details submitted for Phase 1 comprising 290 residential units and 925 sq. m of commercial floorspace within four buildings ranging from six to eight storeys and a 25 storey building, 113 basement level car parking spaces, formation of lock, basin and one canal. | 2013/04805/VAR | 0.9km south |
| 18      | Carnwath Road Industrial Estate | Application Approved  
Redevelopment of site to provide a mixed use scheme consisting of the erection of 1 x 5 storey building graduating in height towards the River Thames between 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 storeys; and the erection of 1 x part 5, part 6, part 9, part 10 storey building, plus basement car park; providing 257 dwellings (use class C3) including the reprovision of 8 existing flats adjacent to Carnwath Road Industrial Estate; together with 915 sq. m of retail floorspace (use class A1), 653 sq. m of restaurant / café floorspace (use class A3); associated hard and soft landscaping, public and private open space, new public realm, pedestrian and cycle routes, vehicular access and servicing facilities, basement car parking (153 spaces) and cycle parking (335 spaces). | 2012/02048/FUL | 1.6km south |
### Table 17.2: Cumulative schemes identified from the LBHF and RBKC planning portals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19      | Hurlingham Wharf Carnwath Road | Application Approved  
Redevelopment of vacant former wharf site to provide a mixed use scheme consisting of the erection of 1 x part 5, part 6, part 7, part 8, part 9 storey building, plus basement car park; providing 148 dwellings (use class C3); together with 98 sq. m of retail floorspace (use class A1); 753 square metres of restaurant / cafe floorspace (use class A3); 121 sq. m of office floorspace (use class B1); 175 sq. m of Canoe Club (use class D2) new Thames Path; associated hard and soft landscaping, public and private open space, new public realm, pedestrian and cycle routes, vehicular access and servicing facilities, basement car parking (89 spaces) and cycle parking (212 spaces). | 2012/02046/FUL               | 1.8km south             |
| 20      | Whiffin Wharf Carnwath Road   | Application Approved  
Redevelopment of vacant former wharf site to provide a mixed use scheme consisting of the erection of 1 x part 4, part 5, part 6, part 7 storey building, plus basement car park; providing 70 dwellings (use class C3); together with 94 sq. m of office floorspace (use class B1); new Thames Path; associated hard and soft landscaping, public and private open space, new public realm, pedestrian and cycle routes, vehicular access and servicing facilities, basement car parking (43 spaces) and cycle parking (87 spaces).  
2012/04017/CAC - Demolition of all existing structures on site. | 2012/02047/FUL and 2012/04017/CAC | 1.7km south             |
| 21      | Hurlingham Retail Park        | Application Approved  
Redevelopment of site to provide a mixed use scheme consisting of the erection of 1 x part 3, part 4, part 5, part 6, part 7, part 8, part 9, part 10 storey building (plus basement) and 1 x part 5, part 6, part 7, part 8, part 10, part 12 storey building (plus basement); providing 239 dwellings (use class C3); together with 3,045 sq. m (Gross Internal Area) of flexible retail / restaurant / public house / wine bar floorspace (use classes A1, A2, A3, A4); upgraded Thames Path; works of repair and alterations to the river wall; associated hard and soft landscaping, public and private open space, new public realm, pedestrian and cycle routes, vehicular access and servicing facilities, car parking (213 spaces) and cycle parking (556 spaces).  
2013/02870/FUL and 2013/02871/CA - Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing buildings and structures at 362 Wandsworth Bridge Road including Flats at 1-3 Carnwath Road; and associated works. | 2013/02870/FUL and 2013/02871/CA | 1.6km south             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Baltic Sawmills</td>
<td>Application Approved Demolition of existing buildings and the erection on Carnwath Road of 1 x part 4, part 5, part 6 storey building and 1 x part 1, part 5, part 6 storey building, plus basement car park and residents gym to provide 135 apartments and one single, family dwelling; and the erection on Sullivan Road of 13 x terraced, mews style houses of 3 storeys plus mansard roof; with associated car parking (140 spaces), cycle parking (172 spaces, plus 8 visitor spaces), motor cycle parking (6 spaces), landscaping and amenity space including children's play area</td>
<td>2011/01753/FUL</td>
<td>1.6km south west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Albert Wharf, Swedish Wharf and Comley’s Wharf Wandsworth Bridge Road</td>
<td>Application Approved Redevelopment of site following demolition of all existing buildings to provide a mixed use scheme consisting of the erection of one five storey building facing Townmead Road, one part five/part six storey building facing Wandsworth Bridge Road, one part eight and part nine storey building around a raised podium and one thirteen storey building providing a total of 233 dwellings (use class C3) and ancillary gymnasium; together with site wide energy centre; 9,875 sq. m. Safeguarded Wharf including 8,069 sq. m (GIA) of concrete batching plant with ancillary offices (use class B2); 823 sqm (GIA) of retail/cafe/restaurant/bar floorspace (use class A1/A2/A3/A4); new Thames Path with associated lift/stair access (to both east and west of the site); new jetty within the River Thames to serve the wharf; associated hard and soft landscaping; private open space; vehicular access and servicing facilities; car parking and cycle parking; and other works incidental to the proposals.</td>
<td>2014/03250/FUL</td>
<td>1.5km south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area</td>
<td>See Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’ – Figure 17.1 Ref 1 RBKC and LBHF, in partnership with the Mayor of London (GLA), have produced a joint planning framework to guide future development in the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area. This framework is called the Earl’s Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area Joint Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It supplements planning policies in the boroughs’ Development Plans and the London Plan. It will also be taken into account in deciding planning applications within the Opportunity Area. On 19th March and 22nd March 2012 the LBHF and RBKC, respectively, adopted the Earl's Court and West Kensington Joint Supplementary Planning Document (SPD);</td>
<td>2011/02001/OUT and PP/11/01937 (See Figure 17.1 Ref 1)</td>
<td>0.3km north west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 17.2: Cumulative schemes identified from the LBHF and RBKC planning portals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Map Ref</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning Application Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Distance from Site (km)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>West Brompton Village</td>
<td>PP/15/00369</td>
<td>0.6km north</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition and alteration of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site, for the erection of buildings comprising single storey basement, and part three, part four storey buildings for 638sqm of retail space (A1), 16 residential units (C3), and related ancillary uses; together with the provision of new open space; provision of vehicular and pedestrian accesses and routes from Old Brompton Road; including all associated highway works; structures for decking over existing rail lines and tunnels; and other ancillary and incidental works to the development - Land comprising of 348-350 Old Brompton Road, a cutting for the West London Line, hard standing to the south of Earl's Court Exhibition Centre, and parts of Lillie Bridge and Old Brompton Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>100 West Cromwell Road</td>
<td>PP/11/00107</td>
<td>1.3km north west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of five buildings (up to a maximum of 13 storeys in height including basement level) to provide a maximum of 278 residential units, provision of an extension at ground floor level to existing retail store of 1,722 sq. m (NIA), community and leisure facilities (comprising 3,880 sq. m gross external area), creche facility and cafe, hard and soft landscaping, provision of parking and cycle spaces, provision of vehicular and pedestrian access, improvements to the existing public realm and all ancillary and associated works, servicing, storage, plant and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>195 Warwick Road</td>
<td>PP/14/03148</td>
<td>1.6km north west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 (to reduce size of basement and repositioning of all blocks ) of planning permission PP/13/06787 for Demolition and redevelopment of the site to provide up to 251 residential units (use Class C3), up to 12,700 sq. m of use class C2 (up to 89 units); up to 430 sq. m of flexible commercial/community use (use classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/B1), hard and soft landscaping works; highway and infrastructure works; engineering works including basement and lower basement excavation works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>213-215 Warwick Road</td>
<td>PP/14/03889</td>
<td>1.4km north west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 (compliance with approved drawings) for the reduction in size of the basement, repositioning of Blocks B, C and D, increase of 1 unit in Block C from 81 to 82, reduction in height of Block C and reduction in the width of the road to of planning permission (PP/13/06790, PP/12/05112, and PP/11/01175 for Redevelopment of the site to provide 99 market residential units and 59 affordable housing units, 542 sq. m of Class A1, A2, A3 or D1 use within four buildings of 7 - 17 storeys in height together with the provision of public and private open space, new access road, basement car parking and associated hard and soft landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Ref</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</td>
<td>Planning Application Reference</td>
<td>Distance from Site (km)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29      | 245 Warwick Road | Application Approved  
Variation of condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission PP/08/00218 (Redevelopment to provide 174 market residential units and 81 affordable residential units, 481 sq. m of Class A1 (shop), Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services), Class A3 (Restaurant and Cafes) or Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutional) use, together with open space and associated access, parking and landscaping) for amendments to floor to floor heights, unit size, mix of market residential units, block size and alterations to basement. | PP/14/01234 | 1.4km north west |
| 30      | 375 Kensington High Street (School) | Application Approved  
Redevelopment of site to provide a single form entry primary school on Warwick Road; hard and soft landscaping works; highway and infrastructure works; engineering works including extended basement excavation works; plant and equipment and associated ancillary works. | PP/13/07159 | 1.8km north west |
| 31      | Redevelopment of Clearings 1 & 2 Draycott Avenue | Application Approved  
Demolition of Clearings 1 & 2, Leverett Street and Denyer Street depot (collectively known as Clearings site), redevelopment to provide 69 residential units comprising 62 apartments and 7 town houses, with ancillary facilities for residents, basement car parking, landscaping, and walkway between Mossop Street and Denyer Street and a replacement RBKC street cleaning facility on part of depot site. | PP/13/02659 | 2.1km north east |
| 32      | Marlborough School (and enabling commercial development on Sloane Avenue) | Application Approved  
Demolition of building and redevelopment to provide two form entry primary school with associated play facilities and a mixed retail (A1/A2/A3) and office building, separated by a pedestrian link between Draycott Avenue and Sloane Avenue. | PP/13/02652 | 2.0km north east |
| 33      | Redevelopment of Chelsea Cinema site | Application Withdrawn  
Partial demolition and redevelopment of 196 - 222 King's Road with a two storey basement excavation, to provide cinema floor space at basement and ground floor level; retail use at ground, basement and first floor level fronting King's Road and Chelsea Manor Street; office use at ground, first, second, third and fourth floor level; roof top bar/restaurant at basement, ground and fifth floor level; public house at basement and ground floor level; and residential floor space at ground, first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth floor levels. New plant and equipment; hard and soft landscaping; works to the public highway; and other ancillary associated works. | PP/14/03650 | 1.7km east |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Planning Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Royal Brompton</td>
<td>Awaiting Decision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.5km east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>This draft SPD has been prepared following an Issues and Options Consultation in November and December 2013. When it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adopted, this guidance will be supplementary to the Council’s Core Strategy and will be used to assess planning applications for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Royal Brompton Hospital’s sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Crossrail 2</td>
<td>Awaiting Decision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.4km east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crossrail 2 is the proposed new high-frequency, high-capacity rail line for the South East, running through London and into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey and Hertfordshire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for London carried out its first public consultation on Crossrail 2 between 14 May and 2 August 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The current intention is that Crossrail 2 will serve Chelsea with a stop on the King’s Road, at or close to the fire station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although there have been three consultations already, (see Crossrail 2 consultation), the Crossrail 2 authorities have not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yet finalised their plans. The most recent consultation took place between October 2015 and January 2016. Crossrail 2 was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>given the green light in the March 2016 Budget and further development, options testing and analysis in response to feedback are the next steps, planned for 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>William Sutton</td>
<td>Application Approved</td>
<td>PP/15/04878</td>
<td>1.7km north east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Proposals to redevelop the Sutton Estate in Chelsea to provide ‘homes that secure the future of social rented housing on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate and within Chelsea for both our current and future generations of tenants’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A planning application has been submitted to the RBKC. The application documents are currently being reviewed by the Council’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planning team to make sure they have all the information they need in order to determine the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Ref</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Application Status (as of March 2016) and Scheme Details</td>
<td>Planning Application Reference</td>
<td>Distance from Site (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 37      | Thames Tideway Tunnel – Cremorne Wharf Depot | Application Approved  

The Thames Tideway Tunnel is a 25km wastewater storage and transfer tunnel between Thames Water's operational sites at Acton Storm Tanks and Abbey Mills Pumping Station. The tunnel would intercept a number of combined sewer overflows (CSOs) that frequently discharge into the River Thames.  

Cremorne Wharf Depot is one of 24 sites in London which are required to construct and operate the project. The proposed development at the Cremorne Wharf Depot site would intercept the existing Lots Road Pumping Station CSO. A CSO drop shaft would be constructed, together with an interception chamber to intercept the CSO, a connection culvert, and a short connection tunnel to the main tunnel. | WWO10001 | 700m south east |
| 38      | Thames Tideway Tunnel – Carnwath Road | Application Approved  

The Thames Tideway Tunnel is a 25km wastewater storage and transfer tunnel between Thames Water’s operational sites at Acton Storm Tanks and Abbey Mills Pumping Station. The tunnel would intercept a number of CSOs that frequently discharge into the River Thames.  

Carnwath Road is one of 24 sites in London which are required to construct and operate the project. The Carnwath Road Riverside site is a main tunnel drive and reception site. The proposed development includes driving the tunnel boring machine (TBM) from this site westwards to Acton Storm Tanks. In addition, the tunnel boring machine, used to excavate the main tunnel driven from Kirtling Street, would be removed at Carnwath Road Riverside. It would also receive the Frogmore connection TBM. There would be no CSO interception at this site. A shaft would be constructed and the TBM would be launched through the base of the shaft and driven west to Acton Storm Tanks. | WWO10001 | 1.7km south |
| 39      | Counters Creek Flood Alleviation Scheme | A flood alleviation scheme to reduce the risk of basement sewer flooding to properties within RBKC and LBHF. This scheme has not been included in the cumulative effects assessment as the planning application for these works has not been submitted. Therefore at the time of preparing this ES information required to include this scheme in the cumulative effects assessment is not currently available in the public domain. | Not applicable (application not submitted to date) | Approximately 100m at its closest point. |
Figure 17.1: Location of Cumulative Schemes
Ecology, Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

17.4.3 In respect of cumulative effects on ecology, only those projects within 1.5km of the planning application boundary have been considered as it is unlikely that in-combination effects would arise over distances greater than this. The majority of the cumulative schemes considered in this assessment will result in no net loss of biodiversity, and some will have a net gain in biodiversity as outlined in Table 17.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref.</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Application Status (as of March 2016)</th>
<th>Planning Application Reference</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)²</th>
<th>Net gain in biodiversity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Main Earl's Court Site 'Comprehensive Scheme'</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2011/02001/OUT and PP/11/01937</td>
<td>0.7km north west</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Earl's Court 2 Exhibition Centre</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2013/05200/RES</td>
<td>0.7km north</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seagrave Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2011/02000/FUL and 2013/01213/VAR</td>
<td>0.4km north</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-9 Lillie Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2013/02620/FUL</td>
<td>0.6km north</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stewart's Garages 72 Farm Lane</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2011/03974/FUL</td>
<td>0.1km north</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Farm Lane Trading Estate 101 Farm Lane</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2011/03004/FUL</td>
<td>0.3km north west</td>
<td>No ecology report to review, from Design and Access statement appears that likely to be a Net Gain in Biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Tent Site</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2012/03395/FUL</td>
<td>0.5km south</td>
<td>The Ecology chapter concludes that the likely effect on the habitat mosaic is considered to be minor beneficial during the operation of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Measured from the closest point of the site to the closest point of cumulative scheme where the planning application boundary is shown on Figure 17.1
### Table 17.3: Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Cumulative Schemes Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Distance from Site</th>
<th>Ecological Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulham Wharf 51 Townmead Road - Sainsbury’s</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2010/02481/FUL</td>
<td>1.4km south</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>PP/02/01324 (RBKC)</td>
<td>0.6km south east</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Harbour Design Centre</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2008/03034/FUL</td>
<td>0.6km south east</td>
<td>Possible Net Gain in Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Wharf - Townmead Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2013/04805/VAR</td>
<td>0.9km south</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Wharf Swedish Wharf and Comley’s Wharf Wandsworth Bridge Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2014/03250/FUL</td>
<td>1.5km south</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2011/02001/OUT and PP/11/01937</td>
<td>0.3km north</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Brompton Village</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>PP/15/00369</td>
<td>0.6km north</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 West Cromwell Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>PP/11/00107</td>
<td>1.3km north west</td>
<td>Unknown – unable to review documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213-215 Warwick Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>PP/14/03889</td>
<td>1.4km north west</td>
<td>Unknown – documents not available for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Warwick Road</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>PP/14/01234</td>
<td>1.4km north west</td>
<td>Unknown – documents not available for review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.4.4 None of the sites listed above are immediately adjacent the Proposed Development and there are limited pathways between the sites for combined effects to occur, with the sites being separated by urban areas. As such the main cumulative effects are likely to arise in-combination with the six planning applications which form part of the Earl’s Court development (Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’, Earl’s Court 2 Exhibition Centre, Seagrave Road, 1-9 Lille Road, Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area and West Brompton Village), all of which are within 0.7km of the Stamford Bridge development and affect some of the same ecological receptors. The identified in-combination effects of the developments are detailed in Table 17.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Effects on Ecological Receptors</th>
<th>In Combination Effect with Stamford Bridge</th>
<th>Mitigation and Residual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’</td>
<td>Loss of approximately 25% of the West London and District Line SINC. Loss of a small section, (approx. 10%) of West London Line South of Earls Court SINC). Temporary loss of foraging, commuting and resting habitat for bats and birds.</td>
<td>Both developments will impact West London Line South of Earls Court SINC. Stamford Bridge results in the permanent loss of 39% of the SINC, as such in-combination 49% of the SINC will be affected by both developments. Loss of foraging, commuting and resting habitat for bats and birds.</td>
<td>The landscaping strategy for both schemes includes measures to ensure the integrity of the SINC. For Earls Court development there is a net gain in biodiversity and linear features such as hedges, wet woodland, green roofs and vertical greenery are proposed, as well as enhancement of the SINC. The residual impact on the West London Line South of Earls Court SINC upon completion and occupation of the Earls Court Development Proposals has been assessed as being of minor beneficial significance. Stamford Bridge development maintains the integrity of the wildlife corridor by retaining trees and scrub where it is feasible to do so and through strategically located perimeter planting, creating a green wall on the external parapet of the eastern decking platform and ensuring a gap is always retained between the decking platform and the boundary wall of Brompton Cemetery. The trees will be of type and size that will allow species, including birds and pollinators, to navigate and move securely along the wildlife corridor, attracted by cover and food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17.4 Cumulative Effects with Earls Court Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Effects on Ecological Receptors</th>
<th>In Combination Effect with Stamford Bridge</th>
<th>Mitigation and Residual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl's Court</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability. The latter will be in the form of flowers for pollinating insect species and the insects themselves as prey for birds. Several ancillary service buildings (e.g. security booths and kiosks) form part of the architectural design and will be installed with small, species-rich green roofs. The proposed green roof in the north-east corner of the site (as shown in ES Part 3, Appendix 2.D) has potential scope to include a range in the substrate depth to create different conditions, encouraging even more plant species diversity which in turn will support a range of insects and other invertebrates.

In terms of protected species, both developments include provision of green walls and green roofs which will provide foraging and commuting habitat for bats and birds. The Stamford Bridge development also facilitates the movement of birds and insects around the site using ‘stepping stones’ such as the significant planting in the South Terrace and strategically located perimeter planting, which is substantially greater than the existing perimeter planting within the grounds. The Earls Court development includes hedges and wet woodland, creating linear features for bats and birds to move around the site. As well as foraging and commuting habitat the Earls Court development includes the provision of resting sites, such as bat and bird boxes, log piles and insect houses.

In the long term, for protected species the Earls Court Development Proposals has been assessed as being negligible, whereas Stamford Bridge ranges from slight adverse to slight beneficial. Cumulatively the effect on protected species will not be altered due to in-combination effects.
Table 17.4 Cumulative Effects with Earls Court Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Effects on Ecological Receptors</th>
<th>In Combination Effect with Stamford Bridge</th>
<th>Mitigation and Residual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 Exhibition Centre         | Potential for indirect effect on (less than 10%) of West London Line South of Earls Court SINC | There is potential for both schemes to have indirect effects on the SINC, as well as the direct effects which will arise from the Stamford Bridge development. | Mitigation will be in place to minimise in-direct effects on the SINC for both schemes, such as sensitive lighting, hoarding to prevent dust and rubble falling onto the site and measures to minimise noise. Therefore there will be no in-combination effect on the West London Line South of Earls Court.  

The landscaping for Seagrave Road includes provision of 1.5ha of open space. Habitats planted include wet woodland, scattered trees, native hedges, grassland and scattered scrub. Green and brown roofs will be provided as well as faunal refuges.  

With the landscaping the assessment concludes that at least a minor beneficial impact is predicted on the SINC.  

The cumulative effect of the two schemes is considered to be no greater than the effects of each discretely. Retaining the integrity of the West London Line South of Earls Court SINC, will ensure that faunal species present within Stamford Bridge will be able to commute to and use the habitat provided as part of the Seagrave Road development. |
| Seagrave Road               | Construction of the proposed development and associated ‘Lost River Park’ will impact 18.5% of West London Line South of Earls Court SINC. | Both developments will impact West London Line South of Earls Court SINC. Stamford Bridge results in the permanent loss of 39% of the SINC, as such 57.5% of the SINC will be affected by the combined developments.  

Loss of foraging. | The landscaping strategy for both schemes includes measures to ensure the integrity of the SINC.  

For Lillie Road the landscaping plan will create a net gain of approximately 77 trees and the creation of 3415 m² of soft landscaped habitats which are likely to benefit wildlife and maintain the functioning of the SINC as a green corridor. However there will be an increase in disturbance and a net reduction in habitat of value within the SINC, as such the assessment |
### Table 17.4 Cumulative Effects with Earls Court Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Effects on Ecological Receptors</th>
<th>In Combination Effect with Stamford Bridge</th>
<th>Mitigation and Residual Effect*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuting and resting habitat for bats and birds.</td>
<td>concludes a minor adverse effect on the SINC. The mitigation for Stamford Bridge is as outlined under Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’ above. In-combination the function of the SINC will be retained. However there is likely to be an increase in disturbance, as parts of the SINC are included within the ‘Lost River Park’. With the permanent loss of 39% of the SINC from the Stamford Bridge development there is potential for the disturbance impacts at Lillie Road to be exacerbated. However it is considered that this would be a minor change and that with the net gain in biodiversity at Earls Court, Seagrave Road and Lillie road this potential in-combination effect would not be significant. In terms of protected species, both developments include landscaping that provides foraging and commuting habitat. The Lille Road development also includes provision of bat and bird boxes. In the long term for protected species the Lillie Road proposal has been assessed as being negligible, whereas Stamford Bridge ranges from slight adverse to slight beneficial. Cumulatively the effect on protected species will not be altered due to in-combination effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area</td>
<td>Part of above developments</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Brompton Village</td>
<td>Part of above developments</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17.4.5 Following a review of the Environmental Statements for projects within 1.5km of Stamford Bridge, it has been concluded that only the developments which form part of the Earls Court Development have potential to give rise to significant in-
combination effects. Whilst the same receptors are affected, including West London Line South of Earls Court SINC, no significant cumulative effects on ecology, biodiversity and nature conservation are predicted as the landscape strategy for each scheme ensures the integrity of the West London Line South of Earls Court SINC, with the greatest impact on the SINC being predicted for the Stamford Bridge proposals.

17.4.6 In addition to the above measures it is likely that a package of additional off-site habitat compensation measures will be agreed with both the Royal Parks (who won and manage Brompton Cemetery) and LBHF (focussed on parks within their ownership that are cloaked in closest proximity to Stamford Bridge. These measures are not taken into account in the above assessment, as they are currently not developed in sufficient detail; however they will contribute to offsetting the cumulative effects of the cumulative schemes.

Noise and Vibration

17.4.7 Due to the distance to the cumulative developments, there are unlikely to be any significant cumulative construction phase effects during construction of the Proposed Development.

17.4.8 The assessment of construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development has resulted in negligible (insignificant) effects. This is largely due to the relatively high existing traffic flows. It is anticipated that there is potential for the noise levels to increase when considering cumulative traffic flows but this will depend on the demolition/construction programme of the individual schemes. However, the effect is likely to remain insignificant due to the existing flows on the surrounding roads being relatively high.

17.4.9 In addition, mitigation measures have been put in place to manage the potential noise effects from construction traffic. It is likely that other developments considered as part of the cumulative assessment will also apply these mitigation measures.

17.4.10 Table 17.3 below shows the current baseline noise levels and the future noise levels from the Proposed Development in combination with the cumulative schemes. The future road traffic noise levels use the same baseline as existing, to ensure there is no double counting of growth (i.e. a growth factor added, as well as adding the cumulative schemes, which are most likely already in the growth factor).

17.4.11 The road traffic noise predictions without the Proposed Development (current baseline) have been undertaken using the 1-hour traffic data (flows and the proportion of HGVs 06:00 and 24:00) provided in Chapter 13: Transportation and Traffic and based on the following assumptions:

- Vehicle speeds and gradients remain unchanged between the different scenarios; and
- Standard bituminous, impervious surface (e.g. hot rolled asphalt) on all roads.

17.4.12 The future baseline road traffic data included forecast traffic movements associated with operation of the Proposed Development and the forecast road traffic movements associated with the following cumulative schemes based on a review of the reports submitted in support of their planning applications:

- Earls Court;
- 1-9 Lillie Road;
- 72 Farm Lane;
- Kings Mall Car Park Site;
- Fulham Reach;
- Riverside Studios;
- Tent Site;
- Fulham Wharf;
- Lots Road;
- Carnwath Rd Industrial Estate, Whiffin Wharf, Hurlingham Wharf, Baltic Sawmills, Albert Wharf, Swedish Wharf, Comleys Wharf;
- Clearings and 1/2 Draycott Ave; and
- Marlborough School.

17.4.13 Some of the above schemes had negative traffic flows and in these instances a flow of zero has been assumed. The future flows assume 30 matches over the course of the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road Traffic Noise Levels, dB LA_{10,hour}</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Baseline (2016)</td>
<td>Future Levels Including the Proposed Development and Cumulative Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Bridge south of Rutland Grove</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giddon Road south of A4</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End Road south of Barons Court Road</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilie Road east of North End Road</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Brompton Road west of the Little Boltons</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham Road east of Edith Grove</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham Road west of Billing Road</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Road east of Edith Grove</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Road by railway line</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17.3: Inter-project Operational Road Traffic Noise Levels, dB LA10,18hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road Traffic Noise Levels, dB LA10,18hour</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Baseline (2016)</td>
<td>Future Levels Including the Proposed Development and Cumulative Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyne Walk</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Avenue north of Townmead Road</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Bridge Road</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney High Street</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17.4.14 Comparing the above table with the significance criteria in Table 12.5 (Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration) shows that there will be a direct, long-term negligible effect on all roads as a result of the operation of the Proposed Development and the cumulative schemes listed in Table 17.2.

**Traffic and Transport**

17.4.15 An assessment of cumulative traffic effects has been undertaken within Chapter 13: Transportation and Traffic of this ES, in line with the opening year of the Proposed Development to take into account those cumulative schemes identified that are likely to have overlapping transport impacts within the vicinity of the site. This assessment includes effects on pedestrians and cyclists as other road users.

**Construction**

17.4.16 In order to understand the volume of traffic generated by construction sites in the area of the Proposed Development, a review of cumulative schemes identified for consideration in traffic terms has been undertaken as detailed below. A full list of cumulative schemes included within the cumulative construction traffic assessment is contained in ES Part 3, Appendix 2.A.

17.4.17 The review of construction sites and traffic information has been based on information contained within the public domain. Where construction information is not available for sites, vehicle numbers have been calculated based on the site’s plot area, using derived relationships between plot area and resultant vehicles from other comparable construction sites in the area.

17.4.18 In order to compare construction traffic for cumulative schemes in combination with the Proposed Development, the following analysis uses the average daily number of HGV movements associated with each development during the construction phase. However it is noted that for any development site, as well as peak months (shown in this analysis) there will be peak days within some months which is typical of construction works.
17.4.19 Figure 17.2 provides an illustration of the forecast average daily construction vehicles associated with development sites in the area during the construction period of the Proposed Development.

17.4.20 As shown by Figure 17.2, a peak daily total of approximately 550 construction vehicles are forecast to be generated by construction sites in the vicinity of the site; this is forecast to occur in spring 2017 prior to construction of the Proposed Development. During the peak construction period of the Proposed Development itself (September - November 2018), the cumulative construction traffic is forecast to be lower based on cumulative schemes currently consented and in the public domain, with approximately 220 construction vehicles per day.

17.4.21 However it is noted that each of the above cumulative schemes will have different construction vehicle routings and will therefore not necessarily utilise the same links on the local highway network.

17.4.22 Nevertheless, as noted above, it is recognised that there would be the potential for cumulative traffic effects to arise in the event that the demolition and construction programmes of some or all of the cumulative schemes overlap with those of the Proposed Development, especially for those schemes which lie closest to the site.

17.4.23 The Club is therefore committed to working with the key authorities to ensure effective coordination with other developments, together with comprehensive delivery and monitoring of construction activity. It is understood that a formal co-ordination group, which oversees all construction activities in the area, will be implemented and the Club is committed to this.

17.4.24 Furthermore, it is anticipated that each scheme coming forward would be required by LBHF to develop its own CEMP and Outline Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), and that vehicular numbers and vehicular routes would be agreed in advance with LBHF and TfL in each case through this process.

17.4.25 For the Proposed Development, CLP (required pursuant to a planning condition) will provide consideration of measures to mitigate any cumulative effects (for example, use of a booking system, sharing suppliers as far as practicable, etc.).
17.4.26 The appointed Principal Contractor will have a dedicated logistics team that will complement the construction team for the project. The logistics team will be led by an experienced manager who is conversant with the challenges associated with construction delivery management in and around the Borough. The detailed CLP and implementation of the CLP will be the responsibility of the appointed logistics manager.

17.4.27 It is therefore considered that the overall effect for construction traffic in the cumulative scenario would be greater than that in the Proposed Development scenario. The measures outlined above would reduce any such effect as far as practicable.

Figure 17.2: Cumulative Schemes Forecast Daily Construction Vehicles

17.4.28 As previously noted, the future typical level of visitors to the site on non-match days is expected to be of a similar level to existing conditions. A match day represents the highest demand scenario in terms of numbers of visitors to the site, and as such has been the primary assessment within the Transport Assessment and this ES.

17.4.29 Over the course of a year there are typically 25-30 matches at the stadium, the majority of which do not coincide with the peak demands (i.e. weekday AM and weekday PM peak periods) on the transport network (pedestrian, highway network, cycle network and public transport). Whilst the arrival period of weeknight matches does have some overlap with the weeknight PM peak period, these fixtures are infrequent and typically occur on 5 to 10 occasions per year.

17.4.30 It is also noted that a stadium generates significant transport demand, but generally only for a relatively short period of time; this results in short lived transport impacts in the vicinity of the stadium before quickly dispersing around the wider network. Given that the majority of matches do not coincide with the AM and PM peak periods, and that match day events are relatively infrequent, the effect of the cumulative schemes in addition to the Proposed Development is not considered to be significant on the surrounding transport network in relation to existing match days, particularly given the short term nature of the demand on match days.
17.4.31 *Pedestrian Movement* - Each of the cumulative schemes considered will generate pedestrian trips, however, as with the Proposed Development, they will each be required to cater for their own pedestrian demand and to deliver design solutions that enable easy pedestrian movement and do not restrict capacity. Pedestrian flows will also generally be local to each development, with pedestrians using the surrounding streets and footways.

17.4.32 On match days, fewer pedestrians are forecast to enter/exit the stadium via Fulham Road following implementation of the new north decking platform to the Fulham Broadway match day entrances. As such, the pedestrian comfort levels experienced on Fulham Road, between the site and Fulham Broadway station are expected to be an improvement over existing levels.

17.4.33 A stadium generates significant pedestrian activity, but generally only for a relatively short period of time; this results in short lived pedestrian crowding and ‘hotspots’ around the stadium and on pedestrian desire lines from public transport services, before quickly dispersing around the wider network.

17.4.34 As a result, it is envisaged the pedestrian trips generated by the Proposed Development, in addition to the committed developments, will have an effect of negligible significance on the pedestrian network surrounding the Proposed Development, particularly given the short term nature of pedestrian flows on match days.

17.4.35 *Cycle Network* - Each of the committed developments will generate their own cycling trips. As with the Proposed Development they will each be required to deliver schemes designed to maximise connections to the existing cycle network and provide sufficient cycle parking spaces. These will translate as mitigation measures and when considered collectively, it is considered that the cumulative schemes should result in an effect of negligible significance on the capacity on the local cycle network.

17.4.36 *Public Transport – Buses* - Based on the frequency of services, and number of additional passengers within the vicinity of the site, it is considered the additional numbers of bus journeys associated with the Proposed Development would have a negligible effect on the local bus network.

17.4.37 As noted in the Transport Assessment submitted as part of this planning application, and as agreed during the EIA scoping discussions, the capacity implications of the proposed changes in bus passenger numbers are to be assessed by TfL Buses.

17.4.38 Each of the cumulative schemes considered will generate their own specific London Underground trips, however, as with the Proposed Development, each scheme will be required to accommodate their own demand and to deliver improvements where capacity constraints exist.

17.4.39 *Rail/Overground Network* - In order to assess the proposed opening year of the Proposed Development, 2021, an extract from the TfL RailPlan (v7) model has been used (ES Part 3, Appendix 11.B). The RailPlan model extract, provided by TfL, provides future year flows on the network by utilising population, employment and economic forecasts. Using this data, a future year assessment has been undertaken.

17.4.40 The District Line is forecast to operate within capacity in the future year of 2021, including with the Proposed Development operational. This is owing to the planned capacity improvements on the District Line which is to result in an additional 16 trains per hour on the Wimbledon branch. Therefore, the Proposed Development will have a negligible effect on the London Underground network when operational, particularly given the short term nature of match day demand. Further details can be found in the supporting Transport Assessment and Transport Assessment Addendum, submitted in support of this planning application.

17.4.41 Each of the cumulative schemes considered will generate their own rail trips, however, as with the Proposed Development, each scheme will be required to cater for their own demand and to deliver improvements where capacity constraints exist and as a result there is unlikely to be a significant impact.

17.4.42 As a result of the proposed upgrades (signalling upgrades to the Circle and District Line and new trains on the District line, improvements to Earls Court and West Brompton Station and Crossrail) proposed the Rail/Overground network, as detailed within Chapter 13: Transportation and Traffic and within the Transport Assessment (ES Part 3, Appendix 11.A),
it is expected the increase in trips on the network, as a result of the cumulative schemes, unlikely to result in a significant impact.

17.4.43 Local Highway Network- Owing to the Fulham Road closure on match days, vehicle trips to the Stadium itself are minimal with traffic distributed over several approach routes to the site. Additional vehicles will be distributed over a number of links within an approximate 2km radius of the site, and will therefore have a negligible effect on particular link flows within the vicinity of the site compared to existing match days. Furthermore, the traffic flows on surrounding links is comparable for match and non-match days, with the majority of links generally experiencing a reduction in traffic flow on match days; this is likely to be a result of traffic strategically re-routing away from the area when a match is taking place.

17.4.44 However, whilst local traffic congestion will typically be experienced pre and post-match on match days, this is very short lived. The Club will therefore seek to reduce private car use by both staff and spectators on match days as part of commitments included within the Match day Travel Plan (ES Part 3, Appendix 11.B), through promotion of sustainable travel modes and other incentives.

17.4.45 It is also recognised that a reduction in car parking availability near the site is key in influencing a mode shift in order to reduce trips by private car. It is therefore proposed that a review of the current match day parking controls in operation is undertaken following the stadium redevelopment; it is envisaged that the parking control review will be undertaken following implementation of the Proposed Development, so the match day parking impacts can be addressed appropriately at the relevant time.

17.4.46 A Stadium Management Plan (SMP) will be prepared in order to address all public safety, crime prevention and local transport management issues related to the use of the stadium on match days and non-match days. The SMP will have five integrated components including; Events Management Plan; Operations Plan; Local Area Management Plan (LAMP); Travel Plan (TP); and Monitoring Programme.

17.4.47 The LAMP will specifically aim to ensure that in the interests of public safety there is a defined primary network for pedestrian movement to and from the stadium; and that this is managed in a way that has an acceptable impact upon existing residents and businesses within the area surrounding the stadium. Furthermore, any amendments to the road closure/bus diversions (as per the current arrangement) will be detailed in the Stadium Management Plan and Local Area Management Plan, both of which are live documents which LBHF will feed into together with the Club and Met Police.

17.4.48 As a result of the above mitigation measures, it is envisaged the vehicle trips generated by the Proposed Development, in addition to the committed developments, are unlikely to give rise to long term significant effects on the surrounding highway network in relation to existing match days, particularly given the short term nature of traffic flows on match days.

Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Light Spill

17.4.49 All of the relevant developments listed in Table 17.2 are considered to be located too far away to interact with the Proposed Development, or will not be visible from any identified receptors, such that there will be no noticeable effect on daylight, sunlight, overshadowing or light spill over and above the effects that would result from the Proposed Development alone. Therefore no inter-project cumulative effects relating to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing are predicted.

Wind Microclimate

17.4.50 The cumulative schemes that are close enough to the site to potentially interact with the Proposed Development, in terms of the local wind microclimate, comprise: Seagrave Road (scheme 3), 1-9 Lillie Road (scheme 4) and Farm Lane Trading Estate (scheme 6), the locations of which are shown on Figure 17.3. All other cumulative schemes are considered too far away to influence wind conditions in and around the Proposed Development.
17.4.51 The assessment has been based on information relating to these three schemes available from the LBHF planning portal. The cumulative schemes were included in the Proposed Development model to assess the cumulative wind effects. The wind plots for the cumulative scenario are presented in *ES Part 3, Appendices 14.A and 14.B*.

17.4.52 The results of the cumulative assessment for pedestrian safety and comfort indicate that wind conditions within the site and the surrounding area remain within the recommended Lawson Criteria standards for pedestrian comfort and safety in the cumulative scenario. Therefore, the assessment for the pedestrian safety identified the cumulative wind effects as permanent, direct and negligible.

**Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**

17.4.53 Cumulative effects are caused by in-combination effects to heritage assets resulting from the Proposed Development together with other developments within a given study area (in this assessment a study area of 1.5km around the site has been used as shown on Figure 17.1).
17.4.54 There is considered to be no potential for cumulative effects on above ground heritage assets affected by the Proposed Development. This is due to the distance between the cumulative schemes and the heritage assets considered in the assessment, and how the setting of the heritage assets contributes to their significance, when considered with the other cumulative developments.

17.4.55 No previously recorded or potential archaeological deposits have been identified that could be affected by the Proposed Development as well as the cumulative schemes. Any physical effects on previously unrecorded assets would be on highly localised features upon which there can be no cumulative effects from other developments.

_Socio-economic_

17.4.56 A qualitative assessment has been undertaken taking into account the likely effects of the Proposed Development with cumulative schemes across the same broad themes of population, social infrastructure, employment and the local economy, consistent with *Chapter 14: Socio-Economics*. The cumulative schemes presented within Table 17.1 have been considered as part of this assessment, the location of which are shown in Figure 17.1. An overview of the potential cumulative socio-economic effects of the cumulative schemes in combination with the Proposed Development is given below.

17.4.57 Whilst the Proposed Development does not sit within the Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area it is located in close proximity and will play an important part in the envisaged regeneration of this area and its hinterland. The Opportunity Area contains a number of development sites (some of which are included within the listed cumulative schemes in Table 17.2) with a strategic aim to deliver a further 7,000 new homes and 9,000 new jobs over the next 20 years. The Proposed Development will contribute towards the physical and social regeneration of the adjoining area, benefitting from the leisure and employment opportunities offered by the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development will also, in the long term, benefit from the physical and social regeneration of the adjoining area, including the increased population and economic activity and the associated demand for services included within the Proposed Development.

17.4.58 The cumulative schemes are assessed to have the following overarching beneficial effects:

- The increased resident and workforce population from the cumulative developments will result in a significant increase in demand for goods and services within the local area, which will result in a permanent beneficial effect to local businesses and the economy;
- A range of uses and commercial opportunities planned across the cumulative developments will offer significant additional employment opportunities for local employees who may not have jobs re-provided on-site through the Proposed Development (although this loss has been assessed as minimal) and for those residents living in the area; and
- Likewise, the cumulative developments will also require a significant construction workforce to deliver the schemes which will also offer significant additional employment opportunities to local residents.
Townscape and Visual Effects

17.4.59 The Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) (Chapter 10: Townscape and Visual Effects of this ES) provides an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the surrounding physical fabric and character of the area, and on views of the site from its surroundings. The assessment takes into account the skyline of London, existing tall buildings and consented tall and large-scale developments that might also become visible in the selected views in the future. A cumulative effects assessment is provided within Chapter 10: Townscape and Visual Effects and considers those cumulative schemes which are considered to have the potential for cumulative effects, in combination with the Proposed Development. The cumulative schemes considered are:

- Main Earl’s Court Site ‘Comprehensive Scheme’;
- Earl’s Court 2 Exhibition Centre;
- 1-9 Lillie Road;
- The Tent Site; and
- Lots Road.

17.4.60 The approach to cumulative assessment is to focus on the additional effects of the Proposed Development on top of the cumulative baseline. The assessment concludes that once the Proposed Development is introduced into the cumulative baseline, it makes little to no difference to the results that would be apparent with the cumulative baseline on its own. The results of the assessment are as follows:

- No significant cumulative effects on townscape designations. Refer to ES Part 3, Appendix 8.B for further details;
- No significant cumulative effects on townscape character areas. Refer to ES Part 3, Appendix 8.B for further details, and;
- No significant cumulative effects on visual amenity. Refer to ES Part 3, Appendix 8.B for further details.

Surface Water

17.4.61 From a surface water perspective, it is reasonable to assume that standard good practice construction methods will be required as a condition of planning for all cumulative developments and that these measures will be implemented during their construction. Therefore should construction of other developments (committed or proposed) occur simultaneously it is considered that there would be no potential for significant cumulative effects on local surface water resources.

17.4.62 Because of the urban nature of the surrounding area and the nature of the Proposed Development there is a limited potential for the operation of the Proposed Development to create a heightened risk of diffuse pollutants being released to the water environment. In addition, given it is likely that the cumulative schemes will be developed in line with national, regional and local planning policy; it is considered that there would be no potential for any combined effects on the surface water environment.

Flood Risk

17.4.63 In relation to flood risk, the Proposed Development together with the cumulative schemes, are considered unlikely to result in a significant cumulative effect. It is reasonable to assume good practice site management measures will be employed during the construction phase of each scheme, and that the cumulative schemes are subject to appropriate
design, that takes into consideration drainage and flood risk in accordance with national and local planning policy. As a result, no significant cumulative flood risk effects are anticipated.

17.4.64 In addition, Thames Water would need to be consulted on all development applications to ensure that none of the developments would increase the risk of sewer flooding, and therefore it is considered unlikely that there would be a significant cumulative effect on the foul water infrastructure. If a development is considered likely to increase the flood risk then it would be the responsibility of that developer to arrange for improvements to the network to ensure the risk of foul water flooding is mitigated (i.e. increase the size of sewers or upgrade connections). Thames Water have additionally confirmed that they can accommodate flows from the Proposed Development without the need for off-site improvement.

Air Quality

Construction Phase - Emissions of Dust, Particulate Matter and NOx

17.4.65 The assessment of the impacts due to the generation and dispersion of dust and PM$_{10}$ during the construction phase has been undertaken using relevant assessment methodology published by the IAQM (Ref. 17-6). It has considered potential impacts at ‘human receptors’ within 350m of the site, and within 50m of the route used by construction vehicles on the public highway, up to 500m from the site entrance. Beyond these distances the impacts of dust soiling and increased PM$_{10}$ in the ambient air are very unlikely to give rise to significant effects.

17.4.66 Adverse cumulative impacts due to emissions of dust and particulate matter could occur where the construction phase of one or more committed development coincides with that of the Proposed Development. However, any such cumulative impacts would diminish with distance away from the Site so that beyond 500m or so the cumulative impacts will be negligible regardless of the performance of the construction phase mitigation that will be implemented for Proposed Development. As the risk of a significant air quality effect at adjacent receptors will be minimal for the Proposed Development - as the Applicant is committed to ensuring mitigation throughout the construction phase, then the risk of the Proposed Development causing a significant cumulative effect will also be minimal.

17.4.67 Relevant committed developments include:

- Seagrave Road residential development at 0.4km to the north of the site;
- Stewart’s Garages 72 Farm Lane residential development at 0.1km to the north of the site;
- Farm Lane Trading Estate 101 Farm Lane residential development at 0.3km to the northwest of the site; and
- The Tent Site mixed use development at 0.5km to the south of the site.

17.4.68 Emissions of NOx and particulate matter from the exhausts of construction vehicles and Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) could also give rise to cumulative impacts. However, such impacts are unpredictable. The Applicant for the Proposed Development is committed to minimising the extent of any significant adverse effect due to emissions from construction vehicles and NRMM as far as is reasonably practicable. The extent of any cumulative effects will likewise be minimised.

Operational Phase - Emissions of NOx and Particulate Matter

17.4.69 The assessment presented in Chapter 11: Air Quality demonstrates that the Proposed Development will not give rise to a significant effect and will be air quality neutral which is in accordance with the GLA’s requirements. As such the cumulative effect with the Proposed Development on air quality is very unlikely to be significant.
17.5 Summary

17.5.1 From the assessment of the potential for intra-project and inter-project cumulative effects it can be seen that there is the potential for both beneficial and adverse cumulative effects from the Proposed Development when considered together with the cumulative schemes.

17.5.2 Cumulative intra-project effects identified include effects upon:
- Neighbouring residential properties, places of worship and hotels and users of these buildings;
- Neighbouring and local commercial properties and businesses and users of these buildings; and
- Future on-site users.

17.5.3 Adverse intra-project cumulative impacts tend to occur during the enabling, demolition and construction stages of the Proposed Development, as a result of the combined nuisance resulting from increased noise levels, and increased visual intrusion nuisance effects due to daytime and night-time construction work.

17.5.4 Beneficial cumulative intra-project effects tend to occur throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development as a result of noise and visual improvements, socio-economic benefits and a reduction in flood risk.

17.5.5 The assessment of inter-project cumulative effects concludes there will be no significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, combined with the cumulative schemes identified, on any topic area, with the exception of socio-economics (detailed below).

17.5.6 The cumulative developments are assessed to have the following overarching significant beneficial socio-economic effects which either enhance the identified effects or help to further mitigate the adverse effects of the Proposed Development:
- The increased resident and workforce population from the cumulative developments will result in a significant increase in demand for goods and services within the local area, which will result in a permanent beneficial effect to local businesses and the economy; and
- A range of uses and commercial opportunities planned across the cumulative developments will offer significant additional employment opportunities for local employees who may not have jobs re-provided on-site through the redevelopment of the stadium (although this loss has been assessed as minimal) and for those residents living in the area, resulting in a moderate beneficial effect; and
- Likewise, the cumulative developments will also require a significant construction workforce to deliver the schemes which will also offer significant additional employment opportunities to local residents, considered a moderate beneficial effect.

17.5.7 Whilst the Proposed Development is not located within the Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area it is located nearby and will play an important part in the regeneration of this area and its hinterland. The Proposed Development will contribute towards the physical and social regeneration of the adjoining area, benefitting from the leisure and employment opportunities offered by the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development will also, in the long term, benefit from the physical and social regeneration of the adjoining area including the increased population and economic activity and the associated demand for services included within the Proposed Development.
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