

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: Dear Mr Massey

I am writing to you as owner and resident of 37 Cranley Gardens to object to the application for the demolition of the existing building and construction of three storey house on 132b Fulham Road. Although the owners of 132b have been working on this application from at least July 2015 I became aware of this and the proposal in its previous very similar form through a letter sent by their consultant Montague Evans and therefore I have not been able to draw the necessary professional expertise to evaluate such a complicated project. However I take the opportunity to provide you with my initial immediate concerns below that will be followed up in due course by experts' reports:

1) Structural:

I am very concerned by the deep excavation for the basement which will be going to at least 4.5m below the ground level of the adjacent to my property and therefore, despite the theoretical calculations provided in the soils report, poses a huge risk of ground movement and thus subsidence and damage to the whole building, which is a 7 storey block of flats. That in the past the building has proven prone to shift and susceptible to cracks due to the lack of deep armed concrete foundations. Besides, the Ground Movement Assessment Report of October 2016 prepared by CGA to support the application acknowledges risk and potential damage to neighbouring properties and this is not acceptable under any circumstances and particularly not to pursue financial gain at a risk of the livelihood or other. A more specific assessment has been commissioned by the freehold company to a structural and civil engineers consultancy, detailing the specific technical aspect of the danger the proposed development represent for the building and it has been sent to you separately.

2) Right of Light:

I am specifically concerned that the proposed development, in particular the raising of a length of party wall substituting the fences and hedges with bricks and cement are going to result in a loss of light and increased sense of enclosure that will cause adverse effect on our residential amenity. A more specific assessment has been commissioned by the freehold company to a Chartered Surveyor

specialising in rights of light and daylight & sunlight amenity, and has been sent to you separately.

3) Privacy:

The 132b plot is overlooked by 35 and 37 Cranley Gardens and the light from excessively large and numerous light wells and roof lights will spill directly into No 37 Cranley Gardens during night time. A more detailed analysis of this light pollution that will affect in particular my household but also the rest of residents can be found in the objection filed by the Kensington Society. However it is my intention to obtain an independent opinion on the expected level of light pollution.

4) Design and heritage:

The proposed development does not respect the existing context, character and appearance and I do not believe that it is taking advantage of any available possibility to improve the quality and character of buildings, the area and the way it functions. The building, its suggested materials and style are more in keep with the Malibu California area than Thurloe and Smith's Charity Conservation Area. Again to further articulate this important aspect of British heritage I understand the freehold company has retained a chartered architect specialised in the provision of professional and technical advice on projects involving new development in historic areas and the conservation, who will be able to file a report.

5) Traffic & Congestion:

There is a double length bus stop directly opposite the entrance to 132b leaving a maximum 8 meter road space to the opposite kerb, so the additional presence of a parked, high sided commercial vehicle reduces that substantially and although Caneparo Associates calculate 'two large cars' can pass I believe it is very unlikely, and furthermore does not consider commercial vehicles, buses, refuse carts, vans, etc. which upon observation over several few minute slots at mid- morning seem to average over 40% of traffic. Moreover, bus routes 14, 211, 345 and 414 serve Fulham Road and commercial vehicles favour this arterial route to Central London, so traffic will gridlock with larger vehicles almost straight away. A brief taster of what it means having Fulham Road running single lane in this junction has been provided few weeks ago with the road work in Old Church street, the gridlock was so severe that it was propagated to South Kensington and Brompton Road.

It goes without saying that there are a list of additional points that concern me that have been brought to your attention already by the several other objections and that I am not reporting here for brevity.

Yours sincerely.

Luigi La Ferla

Sent by: Luigi La Ferla
37 Cranley Gardens
London

Date of Comment: SW7 3BD
15/02/2018 14:01:18
Comment type: Objection