

Representations Received from Local Residents

From: Keith Rowley
Sent: 06 August 2020 19:43
To: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>
Subject: Application 37 Hestercombe Avenue; ref 2020/00536/LAPR

FAO Ms Maria Dimitriou

Dear Ms. Dimitriou,

I have today been trying repeatedly to lodge an objection to the above application through the LBHF online portal.

I have tried two different computers and every time I receive a message informing me that there has been a systems error.

I therefore set out the text of the objection below and would be grateful if you would please acknowledge its receipt and that it will be considered by LBHF.

Many thanks.

Best regards,

Keith Rowley

Text of objection

My wife and I have lived at Hestercombe Avenue, just 12 doors way from the property to which the application relates, since June 1987, and we wish strongly to object to the application.

First, though, I would mention that, contrary to the normal practice for at least planning applications, the notice advertising the application is not displayed in the street on a lamp post so that it would be immediately apparent to anyone walking along Hestercombe Avenue.

Instead the application has been affixed to the wall of the property, which means that it is necessary (1) to observe that a public notice has in fact been affixed to that wall and then (2) enter onto the front path of the subject property in order to read the notice. It is impossible to read the notice from the street.

It is therefore likely that a considerable number of people who live in Hestercombe Avenue will not have seen the notice and hence be unaware of the application,

despite their being affected by it. I would respectfully query whether this complies with the spirit, if not the letter, of the relevant statutory requirements, especially in the context of such an important application.

As to the substance of the application, Hestercombe Avenue is a pleasant family dominated exclusively residential road, albeit it already suffers badly from excess traffic due to "rat running" by persons seeking to avoid the Fulham Road/Munster Road crossroads.

So far as we are aware there are no retail businesses that operate from any property in Hestercombe Avenue and, if granted, this application would set a thoroughly undesirable precedent. There are numerous empty shop units in the adjacent Fulham and Munster Roads which would be available and suitable for taking delivery of and despatching spirits as the applicant wishes to do. He would still be well able to carry on his online classes from his home (to which activity we cannot and do not have any objection). Conversely any retail user of domestic premises is undesirable, but especially one both selling alcohol and involving the very significant vehicular activities described in the application.

The figures given by the applicant for vehicle movements are explicitly based on expectations or estimates, though so far as we are aware the applicant has not provided any detailed documents to support the same. No doubt if the business is successful, those numbers will multiply. Even if they are not exceeded (and policing them, five days a week between 12.00pm and 7.00pm, would be an impossible task), this would still be a significant and unwarranted extra traffic burden and disturbance imposed on all residents of Hestercombe Avenue for the benefit of one resident only.

It may also be noticed that the hours in question, 12.00pm to 7.00pm, include the entirety of the afternoon rush hour when Hestercombe Avenue is already very busy with traffic (see above). The road needs less traffic, not more, and certainly not more commercial vehicles of the type described in the application, which would include what we understand to be a 7.5 ton Luton box van.

For all these reasons we object to the application.

Chantal and Keith Rowley

From: Keith Rowley

Sent: 12 August 2020 09:37

To: Dimitriou Maria: H&F <Maria.Dimitriou@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: White Lisa: H&F <Lisa.White@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Application 37 Hestercombe Avenue; ref 2020/00536/LAPR

Dear Ms. Dimitriou,

Thank you for your email and for confirming that our representations will be considered.

Whilst we do of course completely understand your desire to resolve the matter informally, at present we do not wish either to withdraw our objections or to modify them in any way.

Without detracting from the totality of those objections, we would respectfully reiterate:

(1) The undesirable precedent of permitting retail activity in what is an exclusively residential road.

(2) The fact that the vehicle movements, including a lorry, described in the application are estimates only, are significant in themselves and will doubtless be exceeded if the business expands.

(3) The undesirability of any activity which brings additional traffic, especially commercial vehicles, into an already overburdened residential road.

(4) The practical impossibility of policing the activities in question. By way of example only if, as per the application, the permitted hours are 12.00pm to 7.00pm, what happens if a vehicle arrives (e.g., 11.45am) or is held up by traffic and arrives late (e.g. 7.30 pm): is it seriously suggested that the driver will go away without collecting or delivering? The proposition needs only to be stated to be seen to be untenable (and it also applies whatever the permitted hours might be).

(5) This remains a proposal for the sole benefit of the applicant which will adversely affect the remaining residents (60+ houses) in the road.

We would also suggest that the proposed alternative conditions described in your email might be appropriate to a public house or high street shop (the latter being the location from which this activity should be carried out), but are both inappropriate and inadequate in the case of an exclusively residential road. For example, it is wholly implausible to think that commercial delivery drivers working to tight schedules under pressure will even read, let alone pay any attention to, any signs that are displayed.

In conclusion, whilst we will give the matter some further thought, unless you hear from us to the contrary please proceed on the basis that our position remains as stated in our original objection and this email.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Rowley (for and on behalf of Mrs. Chantal Rowley also)

From: Keith Rowley
Sent: 18 August 2020 11:04
To: Dimitriou Maria: H&F <Maria.Dimitriou@lbhf.gov.uk>
Cc: White Lisa: H&F <Lisa.White@lbhf.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: FW: Application 37 Hestercombe Avenue; ref 2020/00536/LAPR

Dear Maria,

Thank you for your two emails.

I apologise for not having responded before now but I am at present away with only intermittent access to email.

I note that my wife and I are now the only objectors, as to which I refer you to what we said in our original representations, *viz.*, that the unusual manner in which the notice was displayed means that it is likely that many residents of Hestercombe Avenue will have been unaware of the application.

You might, I would respectfully suggest, invite the applicant to readvertise the application in a manner which does not require persons to enter onto his property to read it.

As to the substance of the application, and whilst appreciating the work this causes for you, we do wish to maintain our original objection and for the comments in both my email of 12 August and this one to be treated as part of them.

Having considered the recent information provided by the applicant as set out in your email, the description now offered of the business would equate to annual vehicle movements of between 13 and 26 per year.

However the original application estimated at least three vehicles on the road per week and, on that basis, a maximum of 156 vehicle movements per year, which is six times 26. It was also implicit in the original application that, depending on how the business fared, the number of 156 movements could well be exceeded.

This does, I would suggest, amply demonstrate two of the points made in our representations, namely that (i) it is impossible to know with even the remotest degree of accuracy how many additional vehicular movements, including of a 7.5 ton lorry, this business would bring to a street already over-burdened with traffic and (ii) it would be impossible to police the actual number of those movements if a licence were to be granted.

All this supports what we have already said, namely that an existing retail shop unit in the adjacent Fulham or Munster Road is the proper place for this business, not a residential road.

I thank you for your further assistance.

Yours sincerely, Keith Rowley

From: noreply@lbhf.gov.uk <noreply@lbhf.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 July 2020 17:39
To: Dimitriou Maria: H&F <Maria.Dimitriou@lbhf.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Licensing Application 2020/00536/LAPR

Licensing Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 5:39 PM on 10 Jul 2020 from Mr Richard Power.

Application Summary

Address: 37 Hestercombe Avenue London SW6 5LL

Proposal: Licensing Act - Premises Licence

Case Officer: Maria Dimitriou

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Power

Email:

Address: Hestercombe Avenue London

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Licensing Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 5:39 PM on 10 Jul 2020 My family and I live next door to the applicants, at Hestercombe Avenue, and we support the application.

The covid-19 crisis has had a significant impact on many livelihoods across the borough so it is important that local communities rally around and support those brave enough to embark on a new enterprise and adapt their business during this period of uncertainty. The small volume of deliveries will go unnoticed compared to the appetite for Amazon and Ocado up and down the street!

We wish Stephen Manktelow every success with his new business.

Kind regards
Richard Power