

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 Stallwood,

Demolition of 132b Fulham Road to be replaced by a bulkier and boxy modern structure is beyond belief. The present windows are of a dormer style and allow for some privacy as they are recessed and high within the building, whereas the modern replacement has a full length glazed panel which will look straight in to our living room and only bedroom. There will also be an issue of artificial light which will of course can be intrusive at any hour of the night. The lower flats will suffer loss of light and suffer a sense of being closed in by the wider elevation at lower levels.

The present building is often assumed to be connected with our building as it sits behind the wall, which was its origin. The replacement will do likewise, but is a detested design throughout this neighbourhood by being so out of place in a conservation area.

There is unacceptable risk with large basement developments near old buildings which is supported by a number of complete structural failures which have been approved in London since this trend began - all previously rubber stamped convincingly by officials and structural engineers. It is only that by luck and coincidence this has not led to loss of life so far, and it is sickening that there would appear to be no resistance to such developments with warnings ignored when it would seem likely that a disaster will occur at some stage. Given the speed of collapse with, for example in Sumatra Road, Hampstead less than one week ago, can you imagine if this has occurred at night with occupants asleep? Being subjected to living with the fear of that in a multi storey mansion block while more than 14ft is to be excavated alongside our foundations is simply NOT ACCEPTABLE and I note that one of the RBKC Councillors has already voiced objection to you personally as well as structural engineers and solicitors.

The previous application PP/16/07412 was extremely similar to this, varying only (structurally) in some adjustments to the far side of the site, and while most of the objections from that have reappeared with the current proposal, please may the remaining who are undoubtedly unaware of this revised plan also be considered along with my own as they remain completely relevant, and RBKC DID NOT INFORM THE NEIGHBOURHOOD by notice:

M Martin - 33 Cranley Gardens
E Wade - 35 Cranley Gardens
J Harris - 37 Cranley Gardens
E Egiazarowa - 35 Cranley Gardens
R Watson - 1 Elm Place

Considering the backlash to this not just with signatures, but heart felt objections, I sincerely hope RBKC can serve the needs of the community over the preference of one developer and firmly refuse this proposal.

Sent by:

E Egiazarowa

35 Cranley Gardens

Date of Comment: 16/02/2018
Comment type: Objection