

## 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 the owner of Flat 16, lower ground at 37 Cranley Gardens, and my home will be very badly affected if the proposed re-development at 132b Fulham Road is permitted to proceed.  
My objection was prepared with assistance of a Surrey Councillor, Barry Cheyne with 25 plus years' experience in planning, and the former Mayor of Elmbridge.

Cllr Cheyne was astonished at omissions, discrepancies and inaccurate information contained within the documentation presented by Montagu Evans, all which unfairly favour the applicant and I was advised to commission specialist reports which will follow. The unreliability of the applicants' submission and the harmful nature of the proposal has prompted a similar chorus of dismay from Amanda Frame at The Kensington Society, Cllr Sir Anthony Coates and many objections.

The fact that my property, obviously one of the most affected was all but air-brushed from the application with elevations missing, windows misrepresented, habitable rooms not mentioned is most suspicious.

I invited planning officer Daniel Massey to a site-visit, and while I would prefer to confine my criticism to the applicants for their misleading representation I do not believe the issues have been appreciated by Mr Massey.

The applicants misled RBKC in the initial application by quoting a 3 meter party wall which they intend to build up 25cm. It is in fact a 2 meter wall with a SOFT PLY screen to a height of 1 meter principally on my side of the wall which I alone have maintained and reinstated since 1997. Less than 3 years ago I fitted the trellis to reinforce it slightly. Mr Massey describes this as a 'solid fence' which is wrong. When purchasing the apartment I was specifically advised by my surveyor to ensure that screen remained COLLAPSIBLE BY HUMAN IMPACT as it provides the ONLY route of escape in the event of FIRE within the building- my apartment being accessed via a double height internal staircase at the rear of 37 Cranley Gardens. Unfortunately I took your case officer's remark along the lines of 'it does not count as a fire escape' as quite sickening. In any event. It cannot be acceptable for my apartment to become imprisoned by a 3.25m sheer faced wall being constructed on top of 19th Century rendered brickwork which is just around 170

cm from my reception room, 110 cm from my kitchen and .

Since Daniel Massey's visit, the full horror of a proposed 'full height, full width window' in a 'family room' has been brought to my attention. It will look in to my bedroom where I have glazed patio doors and windows spanning the width of the room for light. My bedroom is misrepresented as having a tiny window, elevations are not shown either towards or away from my property and the application does not reveal my apartment as having habitable rooms. The existing 132b building has high, modest dormers above the sight line of our habitable rooms and they do not overlook. They serve a bedroom so there is a shared desire for mutual privacy which will not come with a wall of glazing in the proposal's principal entertaining room. And there is the issue of significant light spillage from the proposed glazing- undisturbed sleep will be impossible, and noise will travel.

Insofar as CTMP is concerned, and in fairness to Daniel Massey, he took note of the deficiencies within the Caneparo report and I will highlight these to you separately.

Aside from discrepancies which are already noted by the experts I have employed, I find yet more. Vibration- a huge concern, but barely addressed with the applicants wrongly claiming the development to be 'several meters away'. RBKC planning documents from Kensington Studies Library disprove the applicants' assertion that the present 132b is a worthless 1986 built building, but one of 19th Century origins which attracted respect and protection by RBKC planning officers when alterations were carried out in 1986.

The application has already proved to comprise of a deceptive and unreliable portfolio of documents and should be dismissed. Surely it can be demonstrated that any pre-application advice or encouragement towards this application is null and void on that basis?

Sent by:

Yours sincerely,  
Robert Hughes

Further OBJ Flat 16, 37 Cranley Gardens

Date of Comment: 01/03/2018  
Comment type: Objection