

## **PLANNING APPLICATION PUBLIC COMMENT**

Application number: PP/17/07888  
Site Address: 132B Fulham Road, LONDON, SW3 6HX  
Proposal: Demolition of dwelling house and erection of a two storey 2-bedroom detached house with subterranean development

**Comment received:** THE APPLICANTS WERE CRITICISED FOR NOT OFFERING ANY NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATION WITH THE INITIAL (NOVEMBER 2016) APPLICATION AS WAS ADVISED BY RBKC AND HAVING THEN RECEIVED 34 OBJECTIONS TO CONSIDER, THEY OBVIOUSLY DISREGARDED THE CONCERNS. CONSIDERING THIS REVISED APPLICATION HAS AGAIN NOT BEEN SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION WITH NEIGHBOURS, IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR RBKC TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL PREVIOUS OBJECTIONS AS ENTIRELY RELEVANT.

I am particularly concerned that none of the objections on the visual outcome have been addressed despite being stated in the application that "the redevelopment of the site has previously been supported, subject to a sensitive and appropriate design scheme". I strongly object to the proposed design scheme which I find neither sensitive nor appropriate. In section 2.15 of the Planning and Heritage Statement it is stated that the building will have a limited impact on the Conservation Area as it's not visible from neighbouring dwellings/streets. We are then given various images of street views where the building is indeed hidden. It's no surprise that the view from the corner of Cranley Gardens and Fulham Road has not been included in the pictures as it provides a clear view of the building (which currently totally "blends in") and, therefore, a visible impact on the Conservation Area should this building be replaced by a modern structure.

The full rationale for my objection on this application remains as per my original submission to RBKC which I attach below.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed demolition and development relating to the above address.

I have read all the material submitted with the application from cover to cover and I can see that there has been a lot of work involved in preparing and evaluating this proposal.

I have to object to it, however, on the grounds of aesthetics and, more specifically, the "fit" of the proposed development within this conservation area.

I believe that the proposed design does not "draw on the character of the surrounding buildings" as stated in the application and that the proposed materials are completely "foreign" to this conservation area. Corten steel is not of "similar visual aesthetics to the red brick of the surrounding buildings" and concrete does not by any stretch of imagination "match the appearance and texture of stucco".

Reading through the application I cannot help but think that the "match" of the proposed materials with the ones used in nearby Queen Anne or Georgian style buildings has been oversimplified to one of colour and I feel this misrepresentation repeats itself throughout the application documents.

The proposed design is, in my view, an impressive modern building but one that would be better suited to a different area of London, Canary Wharf, for example.

I strongly disagree with the statement that "the design is sensitive to its historic context" and that it is "a modern interpretation" of the surrounding buildings. The Thurloe and Smith Charity is the first conservation area since the Conservation Act of 1967 and I believe that the juxtaposition of such a modern structure would have a very negative visual impact on the area. The documentation leads us to believe that the high perimeter wall of the property contributes to a limited visual impact but this is simply not the case. Walking on Fulham Road from Fulham to South Kensington on the corner with Cranley Gardens one gets a very clear visual of the property. This angle is not mentioned anywhere in the application. At the moment, even though the current building is not a listed building, it nonetheless completely blends in with the surrounding architecture. The fact that the house itself is not very noticeable is due to the fact that it blends in.

If the current structure were to be replaced by the proposed structure it would definitely stand out and not in a positive way. The suggested horizontal roof would be even more noticeable due to the low height of the building. It is stated in the application that the proposed development maintains the horizontality of the street. Horizontal roofs are not visually appealing but in more traditional buildings the eyes are usually drawn to other decorative details.

Finally, my understanding of developments within a conservation area is that they should preserve or enhance the architectural merit of the area. I believe that this proposal achieves neither.

Sent by:

Maria Vanger

Flat 5, 35 Cranley Gardens  
London

Date of Comment:

13/02/2018 23:06:12

Comment type:

Objection