

## **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 a resident of Flat 12, 35 Cranley Gardens.

The 132B Fulham Road Planning Application

- the building subject to the planning application is immediately adjacent to and to the rear of 35-37 Cranley Gardens, and to the side of the Listed 132 Fulham Road and lies in a Conservation Area

- the application envisages the complete demolition of the existing 2 storey structure and replacement with a 3 storey new building, including the excavation of basement which will roughly double the volume of space in the new building.

- The application states: "Demolition of dwelling house and erection of a replacement dwelling house with a two storey 2 bedroom detached house with a subterranean development"

My concerns are:

Lack of Consultation with Neighbours by Crossley

Given the substantial number of Objections to the previously withdrawn application in December 2016, it seems unacceptable that the developer has ridden roughshod over neighbours prior concerns in the pursuit of an ugly and oversized basement development, despite neighbours reaching out and wishing to engage with this unscrupulous developer in the 4th quarter of 2017. I think this demonstrates the disrespect that Mr Crossley has for neighbours' numerous issues and concerns over a basement development in a Conservation Area over a 20 month timeline. Surely this over-bearing attitude and lack of respect should weigh heavily against Mr Crossley by the RBKLC Planning department and councillors?

The track record of consultation by the 132b owner/developer has been thoroughly unsatisfactory to date and is a strong leading indicator of poor future behaviours which demonstrates a flagrant disregard for the recommendations of the RBKC Senior Planning Officer. I can only conclude that the applicant will continue to ignore other/future RBKC recommendations, on a selective basis, to the

detriment and disregard of neighbours in this conservation area.

Mr Crossley wishes to avoid engagement with local people and hide behind a phalanx of well paid consultants.

#### Lack of Appropriate RBKC Notice

I find it of grave concern that the only RBKC notice of this development appeared to be a single official document attached to a single lamp post outside 132b Fulham Road. Residents on Cranley Gardens may well have missed this unobtrusive and inconspicuous document. This strikes me as a somewhat sinister approach to handling a planning application which previously received a substantial number of objections. Neither were previous complainants properly notified 21 days in advance by RBKC in writing (which would seem appropriate), nor were those who have a freehold or leasehold interest in immediately adjacent properties (Certificate B). This lack of appropriate notice seems to have been an oversight by RBKC Planning authorities?

#### Inaccurate Title to Land Represented in Crossley Drawings

There are some inaccuracies in some drawings filed by Mr Crossley (page 3 of the Cousins & Cousins Report of December 2017) which appear to contradict the title documents filed in the Land Registry (please refer to BGL51222 Land Registry Current Title Plan showing title for 35/37 Cranley Gardens limited). I am concerned that this might represent creeping land grab and encroachment by Mr Crossley in pursuit of this oversized and extensive basement development.

#### Structural:

We're concerned about the basement excavation and 20 month construction period, which may have material adverse effects on our 7 storey block of late nineteenth century Victorian brick flats (and neighbouring properties) due to soil movement or subsidence (either during construction or at some point in the future). There is also a party wall to 35/37 Cranley Gardens which may be damaged.

The Applicant's Ground Movement Assessment Report of October 2016 prepared by CGA to support the application acknowledges risk and potential damage to neighbouring properties. The report refers to the need for "very good quality workmanship with a single lift is essential in controlling further ground movement" (section 7.1). It further goes on to state: "To ensure movements do not start to fall outside of those predicted it is recommended that a formal monitoring strategy is implemented on site in order to observe and control ground movements during construction" (section 7.1).and an

ongoing "monitoring regime ...to manage risk"). The Conclusions (section 9) state that "The construction will generate ground movements due to a variety of causes including elastic rebound". The Conclusions also acknowledge the risk of ground loss beneath neighbouring properties, again an unacceptable consequence of this extensive and unwanted basement development.

This desktop report acknowledges the risk of ground movement outside of a range of theoretical predictions without any articulation of the consequences of such risk to the adjacent 7 story block of Victorian flats and Georgian terrace, and provides no satisfactory reassurance for neighbouring properties at risk of damage. This proposal entails soil movement risk of an uncertain quantum for neighbouring properties and there is widespread evidence of multiple basement excavations causing building collapses in the London area (most recently publicised in Camden earlier this week) demonstrating that desktop calculations and risk management practices are on occasions flawed, particularly when involving much older existing properties. Why compromise the safety/integrity of nearby buildings with many residents for a project of dubious merit undertaken by a developer for a single family residence?

I submit that this basement development is contrary to policy C7 (not safeguarding the structural stability of neighbouring buildings).

Environmental:

There are a number of "environmental" concerns:

Conservation Area: 132B is situated in the Thurloe/Smith's Charity Conservation Area of RBKC and as such we feel that we'd wish to preserve the nature and proportions of the existing building at 132B, which was originally conceived in 1899 as a 1 story billiard room extension to 37 Cranley Gardens (not a 3 story accommodation as currently proposed).

- Context: The new build is substantially larger than the existing building and represents a substantial 88% increase in internal accommodation and living space. The new building will be a concrete and glass structure quite different from the existing neighbouring historic brick buildings, including both the Victorian 35/37 Cranley Gardens and the Grade 2 listed Georgian terrace of 130-132 Fulham Road. As such the proposed new building of modern design (resembling a harshly edged industrial dustbin) will be unsightly and out of keeping with the proximate historic neighbouring brick terraces. As such we strongly disagree with the Cousins & Cousins Design & Access Statement (section 1.0) that the new build will be "both inspired and sympathetic toward its context". This is a highly misleading and inaccurate statement cobbled together on a remote desktop by marketing consultants with no regard to the contextual realities. On the contrary the existing building of brick construction, albeit of recent 1980s vintage,

has been built to be sympathetic toward its context and was designed carefully to fit into its environment. We therefore strongly disagree with the Cousins & Cousins statement regarding the existing building "132B Fulham Road currently offers no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the site and general surroundings" (section 2.2), and thus do not support the case for demolition.

- Light Pollution: We are concerned at the light pollution emanating at night from the proposed low new building, which will be clearly visible from the overlooking properties of 35/37 Cranley Gardens, and other Cranley Gardens properties. What appears to have been proposed is an excessive number and size of skylights/rooflights; the skylights themselves seem to cover a large proportion of the roof area and might appear at night to resemble an airport runway in the midst of this historic Conservation area. The plot, which is overlooked by Cranley Gardens, will also emit much light from the excessively large and numerous lightwells and rooflights which will spill into Cranley Gardens in an unacceptable manner.

- Visibility: The building of 132B is clearly visible from a large number of properties which overlook it (Cranley Gardens, Fulham Road, Elm Place, Selwood Place and Elm Park Gardens among others). From certain angles (in particular from the Fulham Rd in front of number 132) the proposed new build with its harsh lines and glass/concrete structure would appear totally out of keeping with its neighbours and deliver an ugly contrast to the adjacent Grade 2 listed Georgian terrace. We strongly disagree with the Montagu Evans Planning & Heritage Statement (section 1.5) which states that the new build will "enhance the setting of nearby listed buildings"; on the contrary we believe this proposal will substantially detract from them.

I submit that this development is contrary to Policies CL1 (does not enhance character of area), CL2 (modern design), CL3 (within conservation area), CL4 (lack of regard for adjacent Listed building) and CL5 (light encroachment on neighbouring properties).

Disruptive:

- Disruption/Noise: The building works may take up to 20 months (per the Construction Traffic Management Plan prepared by Caneparo dated April 2016), and prove to very disruptive to a number of 35-37 Cranley Gardens and local residents both in terms of noise. Of particular concern is the disruption caused by the piling and excavation of the basement, involving as Montagu Evans refers in their Planning & Heritage report "associated heavy machinery" (section 1.5). This noise would be substantial from other sources even were the applicant to utilise silent piling machinery.

- Traffic Management: Traffic on the already busy Fulham Rd will be disrupted arising from the undoubted challenges for access to the very constrained 132B site. We are concerned more broadly for the

local community due to increased traffic congestion and associated air pollution arising from the proposals highlighted in the Caneparo report, which envisage heavy lorries parking up outside 132B a number of times and many hours during each working day.

The proposed works will caused traffic disruption on the Fulham Rd for up to 20 months, affecting thousands of Londoners each day using this vital transport artery. The disruption is a function of the poor access to the building site and need for the parking up of a large vehicles for a time each day (Grab Lorry, HGV & LGV) for the loading of ballast and loose materials and other purposes. We would note that the Fulham Rd is a narrow 2 lane artery, and access of this nature will inevitably cause significant traffic disruption and associated air pollution.

I also note that there are 3 major hospitals (Chelsea & Westminster, Royal Marsden and Royal Brompton) within a short distance which are dependent on freeing moving Fulham Rd traffic for meeting and improving emergency ambulance response times (which have been recently deteriorating across the country generally). We also note the nearby traffic lights and bus stop immediately opposite 132B. We believe that the increased traffic flow and congestion, bus stops, pedestrian crossings, and traffic lights would interact with the applicants disruptive works (heavy goods vehicles parked up for many hours) thereby creating a dangerous convergence affecting health and safety in such a confined and restricted part of the Fulham Rd close to 132B.

I further note the Mayor of London's recent initiative to set up a Congestion Task Force, and the subsequent publicity which it received in the Evening Standard dated 1 December. We applaud this initiative which we feel should benefit many working Londoners and will help London work.

I feel that this planning application is misjudged and significantly disruptive to many Londoners in the Fulham Rd vicinity, I believe that the long term residents of the borough and their quality of life should be a priority, and this proposal involving a basement development will be a direct contributor to more traffic, more lorries and greater congestion and air pollution. The adverse impact on the local community should be a key consideration for RBKC planners, and a rejection of this proposal would be consistent with the goals and recommendations of important institutions such as the Royal Town Planning Institute ("The New Urban Agenda") and the UN sustainable Development Goals covering quality of life and health of communities. These ambitions for local communities should be weighed heavily in the decision related to this proposed development which benefits a single developer/family.

I submit that this development is contrary to Policy CL5 as being harmful to the occupants of local properties due to the increase in traffic, servicing, parking, noise, disturbance, odours and vibration arising over a 20 month development timeline.

I strongly urge an RBKC rejection of this highly unsatisfactory planning application, such a rejection being consistent for a borough council which prides itself on "more than anywhere else preventing basement developments" (Trudi Elliott of RTP1, 6 December 2016 at RBKC planning debate "Planning The Future").

Yours faithfully

Sent by: H Brian K Williams  
H Brian K Williams

Flat 12, 35 Cranley Gardens  
London

SW7 3BD  
Date of Comment: 16/02/2018 14:30:29  
Comment type: Objection