

CFC NOTES

Project: Stamford Bridge Redevelopment **Date:** 07 February 2017


Ref: APL/00111/HIL4/DGu

Planning Committee Presentation - 11 January 2017

Firstly, thank you for affording me the opportunity to speak.

My name is Patric Johnson I live at x Hilary Close with my wife and 2 children, we have an effective party wall with the 'shed' wall as indicated on the map. I have lived there since 2004.

MAP



We logged an objected to the original application on the 5 key points

1. The design being overbearing and out of character with the surrounding area (monolithic / a spaceship / gothic)
2. The adverse effects that it represents to a conservation area.
3. The massive adverse impacts on our residential amenities during construction (noise, vibration, vehicle movements – 100 Lorries per day etc.)
4. The adverse impacts upon biodiversity – loss of two sites of importance for nature conservation.
5. And finally, post completion it will reduce the general quality of life in the area over the long term and have an adverse impact on residential amenities.

With the limited time allotted I will focus on the unacceptable impacts on our residential amenity as it relates directly to Hilary Close .


In short we consider that the proposed development by reason of its bulk, mass and scale will result in an over dominant development as it relates to my property and those of our neighbours. The physical mass is overbearing and completely out of scale with the surrounding area. Ignoring the direct loss of light issue, that applicant's consultants have already admitted. I wanted to quote from the within the officer's report (para 4.11.122)in that it says

“The proposed design has met the demands of a potentially difficult brief of achieving a 60 thousand seat stadium on this complex and sensitive site. The form of the proposed stadium has been influenced by its immediate surroundings, and builds upon the historic context of previous stadia on the site.”

This statement is simply incorrect. The stadium bears no relationship to its surroundings – it is basically a large gothic **coliseum towering some 32m.....or just over 100ft** above our properties.

(Please see the drawing)

9 See the architects drawing - Section E-E Drawing PN_ST_024.



One of the points in the planning submission was that the development will be

“no higher than the highest part of the existing stadium”.

This is, at best a manipulation of facts. As the highest part of the current stadium in relation to Hilary Close consists of a thin metal construct supporting the roof. Whereas The new stadium would have Solid walls, and a substantial roof structure rising an additional 25 metres or 80 feet above the enlarged SOLID walls. This is very apparent the various planning docs and highlighted in our original objection to the Planning officer as being unacceptable and overbearing



The net result therefore is an unacceptable and over-dominant relationship with the residential properties surrounding the stadium, as the imagery in Appendix 10 of the planning application shows (although interestingly **NO** image of what it would look like from inside Hilary Close presumably it was considered to hideous and overbearing.



Another focal point in this application appears to have been the desire to build a stadium that maximises capacity (60,000 spectators) coupled with the argument that the additional capacity will enable the **'young and local supporters'** greater access. Sadly this is not defined anywhere, and the

seventh proposed heads of terms within the officer's report (on para 6.12) is at best vague on the subject.

The reality is that the proposed development sees a doubling of the **'hospitality'** seats and boxes. (and increase from 4,600 to 9,200), with this class of seating consuming more than 20% of the overall floor space - thus it is at complete odds with the stated desire to satisfy 'young and local' group of supporters and more about simple the commercial returns.

In conclusion therefore

We believe that, when considered with the other objections that have been raised, there is clear conflict with national, regional and local policy. We consider that the development does not comply with the 4 key policies which we drew reference to in our original submission to the council.

As such we feel that

1. proportions, composition and scale **do not** enhance the public realm, but **do** cause harm to the amenity of surrounding buildings – **(Policy 7.6 of the London Plan)**
2. we feel that a flying saucer landing in the spot would better respect the townscape quality, and that this design is not additive with respect to the 'local context and character' of the surrounding area – **(Policies BE1 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM G1 of the Development Management Local Plan)**
3. and finally that this construct does not protect the amenities of neighbouring residents **(Housing Policy 8 in the Planning Guidance SPD)**

Accordingly I would request that you refuse planning permission for this development.