

Statement from Joan Edlis

Almost everything I want to say has been said much better by preceding speakers or in the report, in particular Councillor Stainton's remarks, which cover all of mine and more, except for one. But these issues point to the root cause of all the other objections.

Let me tell you the story of a tree, Jan's tree, planted in her memory about the same time as the Ken Bates development. This semi-mature golden robin now overhangs Bovril Gate, which will be transformed into a sloping entrance ramp. The Club have every right to crown prune the overhanging branches, but in order to do the works this work they'll also need to root prune it by 30%. One or the other of these actions might be survivable but together will be fatal to this tree.

And this goes to the root of the problem: the Applicant has consistently downplayed and diluted the neighbouring residences by amalgamating Chelsea Studios and others into the featureless 'south of the Site' category. Hence the assessment of this tree's value as 'minor' since there are other trees nearby. But that is solely from the point of view of the Fulham Road. From our garden this tree, in leaf, provides a significant amount of privacy, day and night, as well as acoustic mitigation. It makes a significant visual contribution to our communal gardens and is not of minor value.

Chelsea Studios is annoyingly in the way: our living spaces are overlooked, we have 5 residences sharing the Shed End wall, we share the Bovril Gate wall and we are an open target for Bovril Gate wall jumpers, the proposed half wall an invitation to climb over into ours. So much for designing out crime.

Noise and Vibration? How can Chelsea Studios have a Matchday increase of 5.6 dB when the receptors are on the north and east of the site? What is the absolute dB? Undocumented. And the Shed Wall is a conduit for vibration from pile driving. All caissons must be auger drilled.

What happens if there were a Paris or Istanbul style attack at a Fulham Road entrance, blocking one of two main refuge areas? Can you really see 60,000 people safely exiting the stadium within 8 minutes? Would you kettle 40,000 people through those narrowing concourses? I'm no stadium designer but a simple glance at the plan shows optimistic crowd control and a disregard for panic stricken people desperate to get out. On a normal match day they predict a 40 min queue to get onto the tube from the new North Decking. Can't you just see people climbing up the green wall and leaping into the Catacombs? Kind of like jumping out a window in Paris.

Nowhere in the documents is there a Threat Situation diagram or Emergency Plan, other than 'will be developed in subsequent stages of the project'. Where is the mundane Housekeeping we get when attending conferences – the 'two exits to the left and right of the stage' kind of thing? Even the Met objects to bicycle parking on site as 'a significant security risk due to potential terror attacks.' Remember, these attacks all happened after the initial submission and should be taken into consideration. It's been suggested these issues have been addressed but are

confidential. We need to see them to feel safe. You must refuse permission unless it's absolutely safe.

But the root cause of all this is that this proposal is too big for this site. It's a balloon in a bucket. Go back to the drawing board.