

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: I am writing to object to this application to demolish a perfectly acceptable house, in extremely close proximity to adjoining buildings, in keeping with its surroundings, in a conservation area. The process by which these works will be carried out will create a significant and unacceptable disruption and risk on Fulham Road and to adjoining resident's properties.

I would also like to complain about the frankly underhand way in which RBKC's Planning Department have notified residents of this application. Although the previous application to redevelop this site received a very significant number of objections, and was refused, it seems that the Planning Department felt that (as I understand it) one small notice on a lamp post on the Fulham Road was sufficient to draw people's attention to this matter. This lack of transparency by the Planning Department is surprising and unacceptable.

Over many years, in common with our neighbours in Cranley Gardens and adjoining properties, we have enjoyed the view over the swathe of gardens and green space that runs between Cranley Gardens and Selwood Place, across to the rear of Elm Park Gardens. The view over 132B, which has a particularly attractive roof and sits well within this greenery and alongside the adjoining buildings, has been an integral part of this attractive vista. I now understand that one of the reasons it sits so well within its surroundings is that this was the intention of the Council in approving a 1986 application for the site (RBKC Application No. TP/86/2030/M/39), recognising as well its historic and integral relationship with 35-37 Cranley Gardens.

The applicant and their advisors have either not understood or chosen to ignore the genuine nature of the traffic flow on this very busy part of Fulham Road (A304). There are three hospitals in close proximity, one of which (the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital) has an accident and emergency department. The fact that the property is adjacent to two busy junctions, a zebra crossing, next to two busy bus stops (routes 14, 414 345 and 211, all classed as high frequency by Transport for London), and close to a set of traffic lights is also not adequately acknowledged or dealt with.

Local residents will know that throughout the day (and not just in the rush hour) buses pass each other, there are many cyclists, very many emergency vehicles, and often accidents, blockages and altercations at the crossroads where Cranley Gardens and Elm Park Gardens, meet the Fulham Road (immediately next to 132B). In the lengthy period during which this work is to be carried out, there will therefore certainly be very, very many occasions when

Fulham Road will be blocked and/or dangerous for significant periods of time as a result of waiting vehicles associated with the proposed works at 132B.

I assume that the three hospitals, and in particular, the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital have been consulted in respect of this application as the risk that emergency traffic will be unacceptably delayed by the volume and type of vehicles parked alongside 132b Fulham Road will be clear to any local resident. I assume that the Council, which presumably has a duty of care to all Londoners, will seek further advice from the relevant bodies on this matter to prevent unacceptable and unnecessary delay on the road outside 132B in the event of an emergency.

The Fulham Road is a recognised blackspot for toxic particulate air pollution, I would also like to think that the Council would take this matter into consideration, when considering this Application. The large volume of vehicles moving to and fro to the site, turning their engines over for periods of time outside 132B, and causing knock on traffic jams and disruption will certainly increase toxic particulate pollution.

More broadly I would ask that the strategic objectives of the RBKCs Air Quality and Climate Change Action Plan 2016-21 are taken fully into consideration when considering this application. Having reviewed this document briefly I would have thought it falls foul of several of the Council's aspirations to recognise and capitalise on the "wonderful synergy that exists between efforts to improve public health and efforts to improve the environment" (forward by Cllr Timothy Ahern). For example (and not limited to):

How will permitting the parking of construction traffic on the Fulham Road for a significant period of months achieve the aim of reducing pollution achieve this goal (physical measures and requirements to lower NO2 and PM emissions. (4. Aims, 1. Reduce Emissions)

How will agreeing this application support vulnerable patients discharged from hospital with heart and lung conditions. Has the Planning Department consulted with the Environmental Health and Public Health departments to ensure that they are aware of such a disruptive and polluting redevelopment and the need to provide air quality advice so close to the Royal Marsden and Brompton Hospitals? (6. Action Plan, 1)

How will allowing a development which blocks a busy thoroughfare on the way to Chelsea FC's football ground at Stamford Bridge encourage visitors to major venues to walk or cycle? (6. Action Plan, 51). While I imagine Stamford Bridge does not qualify as a "major" RBKC venue, the spirit of the plan is clearly to encourage walking or cycling on accessible roads and pavements not thoroughfares blocked for months on end by construction traffic, skips and debris.

How will approving a planning application with such a large footprint and impact on its surrounding environment, ensure that biodiversity is improved not damaged by new build and refurbishment. (6. Action Plan, 71). In this respect I would also point out that there is an existing TPO for 37, Cranley Gardens (11/73 T81 Sycamore 1/74) that I assume is intended to protect a tree at the rear of the building (presumably on 132Bs plot, given that there also is I understand

some question over landownership of parts of this plot, and a recognised historical relationship with 35-37 Cranley Gardens and 132B Fulham Road). I have observed that the owner of 132B has undertaken tree work over the last few months and would ask the Planning Department to consider the biodiversity matter generally and the specific TPO in the context of a) this application, b) rules applying to TPOs and b) the biodiversity requirements of the Action Plan 2016-21.

Sent by:

Elizabeth Wade

Flat 12, 35 Cranley Gardens
London

Date of Comment:

SW7 3BD

16/02/2018 14:05:52

Comment type:

Objection