

## Appendix 2

### London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Article 4 Direction for basements: consultation responses received

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(1)	Mr & Mrs White	<p>We confirm our agreement that planning permission should be required prior to any basement development in the Borough given the disruption of such development and detrimental impact on the structure of neighbours' properties, the increased flood risk, loss of original garden planting, space and soil structure etc.</p>
(2)	Robin Jackson	<p>I think the Council should have more power to ensure that planning applications are required for both basement construction and the conversion to residential use of office and light industrial properties.</p> <p>This should not necessarily be required for every such change but it should be available to the Council to enforce if they so choose. The conversion of office and light industrial properties to residential use is of particular concern, I believe.</p>
(3)	Mr Oliver Pearcey	<p>I am writing to support strongly the proposed Article 4 Directions in respect of basement developments and conversions of office and light industrial space to residential accommodation.</p> <p>Having had the misfortune to live next door to one basement development (in [REDACTED]) I am very much of the opinion that these need full regulation under planning powers. In the particular instance in question there was disturbance from noise, vibration and deliveries for almost a year and the resultant development created what is still sub standard space. Hammersmith is an inner London Borough which has been developed at high density in the Victorian period; housing need in the Borough is largely for smaller units not over developed single houses which are readily available further out of Central London..</p> <p>Conversion of office and industrial space without consent should never have been agreed by the Government in the first place. It reduces employment space and generally creates</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>very sub-standard units which make comprehensive redevelopment much harder and also put up demand on everything from parking to education without any compensating controls or payments.</p> <p>I am delighted that the Council is planning to address both these issues through Article 4 Directions.</p>
(4)	Suzanne Burke	<p>I was surprised to find that certain development does not need planning permission. I think it is a good idea for the council to be involved in any project that is as involved as change of use from office to domestic. Although we do need more housing, we need housing for people who are not making a high salary and who our society needs to be living near their work, such as teachers, nurses, and others jobs who are significant contributors to a healthy society. What I notice is that these projects are not for that strata of society but for people who can afford well over £500,000.</p> <p>As to basement conversions, I can understand that it makes the difference to a growing family for whom moving would be a greater and unaffordable expense compared to digging down under a property which they are already in the process of owning. Although it is very disruptive to those around, the neighboring properties have the option of objecting at the point where the party wall surveyor comes in. I incorporated a flat in the building next door and for three months my neighbors above me had to put up with dust and the mess when they looked out their windows. However, I don't think they regretted giving me permission via the party wall survey, and now the view from their window is much improved. However, I do not think that huge double basement developments should be embarked on without the council's permission. I had to get council permission to knock through and connect two buildings which I own and where there was no digging down. I did not think that this was unreasonable because going through the council insured that I was doing everything by the book with the proper surveys throughout the the process. That way my neighbours' property was protected because building codes/practices were followed. I think the council's involvement was a good thing.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(5)	Susan Hewson	<p>There are far too many basement conversions going on at the moment. There have been at least three in our road and they result in excessive noise and interference, often from unprofessional builders. The houses in this road do have cellars but the foundations are very close to the water table and this can cause problems. When one house was having its basement converted a few years ago water was pouring down the gutters for several days. It is very disturbing that these conversions can be carried out without getting planning permission.</p>
(6)	Geoffrey P Gay	<p>My wife and I do not believe it is in the best interests of Ratepayers in LBHF to change the current permitted development rights</p>
(7)	Matita Glassborow	<p>I think that the Council should be a lot stricter on basement developments and that planning permission should be required for this type of work. It disrupts areas for months at a time with noise, constant delivery of building materials causing roads to be temporarily closed, and misery for neighbours. There have been instances of houses collapsing because regulations are flouted (an East European builder working alone in a basement in Fulham had the whole house collapse on top of him and the poor man was killed). In the more affluent parts of Fulham, eg the Hurlingham area, basement extensions have been going on for years. There is already quite a lot of subsidence in houses in the borough too and digging out basements can't be good for the neighbouring houses in a terrace.</p> <p>I am also concerned at the amount of commercial properties in my part of Fulham being turned into residential accommodation, and not what I would call "luxury" accommodation either as mentioned in the Council newsletter! Near my house two newsagents have been turned into flats, a tyre fitting shop is in the process of being turned into flats and so has the furniture depository in [REDACTED]. I don't doubt that the [REDACTED], which has been empty for about 20 years and is supposed to be "industrial use only" will also be given permission to be turned into flats. How can the infrastructure and</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>transport cope with all the extra people who will move into the area? The occupants of this type of property aren't given space to keep a dustbin and tend therefore to put their rubbish out on bags on the pavement, whenever they feel like it, and it often gets broken into by foxes and strewn around. Fulham is not the clean borough it once was, it's full of fly tips and litter. and a great deal of the fly-tipping is happening outside these new flats above shops or shops that have become flats.</p> <p>In summary, I don't believe all these basements are necessary - especially for wine cellars and swimming pools! We need little businesses and commercial premises too. Our precious little businesses are fast disappearing (the businesses rates are driving a lot of them out) and being replaced by hastily constructed, hideous flats.</p> <p>I would very much like the Council to take a far more pro-active role in planning regulations and preserving what's left of the independent businesses we have in Fulham.</p>
(8)	Siobhan McGrath	<p>These works are noisy, dirty and disrupt to all people in this area. There is never a week when there is not a team of construction workers causing dirt, traffic, noise etc.</p> <p>Yet the fact that I have windows (wooden casement) that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will not renew with Double Glazing, because they state are prohibited, because I happen to live on [REDACTED] which they state is situated in a Conservation area is totally unfair and damaging to my already very poor health is under fair.</p> <p>There should be more consultation on allowing Properties in Social Housing to upgrade Windows.</p> <p>That should be the priority.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(9)	Jackie Pemberton	<p>Although I am not a homeowner, since moving into my property I have been subject to massive amounts of noise connected with development of all types directly next to or opposite our building. There is also an old building directly in front of our block that is going to be knocked down and made into flats. Constant noise has had a direct effect on my own health.</p> <p>When work was being carried out on the house directly in front of and to the side of our block, the developers did not seem to have any rules they adhered to in terms of using council land to bring in trucks with dangerous machinery put directly in the exit for residents, and piling slabs up dangerously.</p> <p>The noise was extensive particularly as our flats are built in such a way that there is no room to escape from the noise on one side.</p> <p>I have the greatest of sympathy for anyone who has to endure endless noise from people digging into basements sometimes for well over a year and without proper recourse to anyone when there is obvious flouting of common sense.</p> <p><b>FLOODING</b></p> <p>As Hammersmith and Fulham has been subject to numerous complaints of flooding with the involvement of Thames Water and all that this entails in terms of disruption and noise to tenants in chosen areas and costs involved, I do not understand why basements are being encouraged in any way in a flooding area.</p> <p>In most cases, these basements are wanted for greed not need, for example, there are many huge houses that have a minimum of people living in them and it is not for want of extra space for need but rather for the benefit of making even more huge profits on what are already overly expensive properties. I believe this should be weighed up when this type</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>of work causes such drastic effect on peoples lives in terms of noise and pollution nuisance. It seems that our borough generally has become one big building site and that there is no end in site but developers or home owners should not be allowed to do what they like, when they like...if permission is granted for this there will be no end to the consequences not least stress and increased NHS use for mental health cases, I would imagine as well as the already increased health problems relating to respiratory problems in both adults and children.</p> <p>It is my understanding that some boroughs have not only stopped building works on the weekend but that basement work is not seen as something that is a good thing.</p> <p>I believe that the people affected (often many people) should have more rights than the property developers who quite often have no regard to anything but the profits that will be achieved.</p> <p>My humble opinion is that I think it is wrong for Councils to give carte blanche to anyone or any firm that will make many peoples lives a complete misery for long periods of time.</p>
(10)	Rosita Sherrard	<p>Dear Sue,</p> <p>As you know I have had a terrible few months with basement redevelopment both next door and now 3 doors away. However considerate the builders are, it is still hell. The noise was so excruciating I had to go away for 2 weeks. When I was at home I couldn't hear the radio, TV or do anything but go out and the timings of these events were totally unpredictable. As as said in my previous objection, builders are allowed to make as much noise as they like for 55 hours a week which is well over the normal working week of about 40. On top of this we have loss of amenity on the road as more and more parking spaces are taken up by building works. We have portable lavatories sitting outside our front doors.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>bright lights on 24hours a day. Deliveries made outside the permitted building hours. It is horrific. EU Regs say that one has the right to the enjoyment of one's property. Not when basements are being built.</p> <p>I was pleased to see LBHF were doing a consultation but, although I don't consider myself to be totally stupid, the gobbledegook put out on your website is designed to put off anyone wanting to make a complaint. Why can't it be written in plain English with a summary of what your intentions are?</p> <p>I know that Estate Agents are recommending that house owners apply for planning permission to build a basement before putting their properties on the market. As I can't understand your website I don't know what you are planning, I can only assume it is some restriction on basement building. What ever it is you need to get a move on.</p> <p>At the height of the building noise last Autumn I wrote to Andy Slaughter MP who followed it up on my behalf. As a result he wrote back to me with a copy of a letter he had received from David Gawthorpe, Deputy Team Leader, Development Plans, which I attach here. It appears therefore it has taken the Council over 6 months to do anything about this. I was actually thinking of writing to him to ask how many basement planning applications the Council had received and how many they had turned down since I received this letter.</p> <p>Please will someone translate what is on the website and let me know what it says. Also, how many basement applications has the Council turned down since 2 November 2016?</p>
(11)	Canal & River Trust	<p>Thank you for your recent consultations on these two proposed article 4 directions.</p> <p>The Trust is the guardian of 2,000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales, of which approximately 60 miles are within our London Waterway. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that "living waterways transform places and enrich lives".</p>



Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>Within LBHF the Trust owns and manages the Grand Union Canal and its towpath.</p> <p>I can confirm that the Canal &amp; River Trust have no comments to make on the two documents, but support the proposals to remove these permitted development rights.</p>
(12)	John Pollard	<p>As a resident of [REDACTED] I would like the Council to consider the following points-</p> <p>Accepting that owners should be allowed to improve their property provided their improvements do not adversely impact on their neighbours -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There should be a restriction on the number of basement improvements authorised within a road at any one time. Too many big works close together means an excessive number of workers vans, soil removal/skip trucks, big delivery trucks and vans all parking in resident slots, double parking and road blocking makes life unreasonably difficult for all. For instance recently the ambulance could not get down our street and my dying wife had to be stretchered down the road to the hospice ambulance.</li> <li>2. Reasonable hours of work and noise restrictions need to be set and a system whereby neighbours can ensure enforcement established.</li> </ol> <p>I accept it is difficult for the council to differentiate but the freedom of a householder to improve his or her own home for the benefit of their family's quality of life should not be open to being abused by developers who move in to make a buck and in so doing make life hell for many over a prolonged period.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(13)	Peter Knox	<p>I wish to register my strong view that LBHF Planning should maintain the strongest possible level of control over basement planning applications.</p> <p>I remain very concerned over increased flooding and over development risks. We believe that basement conversions should be limited to the original footprint of the building concerned, with lightwells limited to only minimum escape route requirements. This can only be controlled through the direct involvement of the LBHF Planning department</p>
(14)	Helen Savery	<p>As a resident of H&amp;F i wanted to write to you as i understand that you are currently looking at planning permission regulations. I am uncomfortable and unhappy with the increasing number of basement developments in the borough. Even with the expertise of the best builders, i don't think that it is wise to dig into and under victorian buildings. We do not know the longer term effects of building basements, both on the houses themselves and on the surrounding homes, the latter of which who do not benefit in any way from these developments. If people desperately need more space, they need to build upwards or move home. It should be very simple. Also, i know that there is a view to increasing the value on the property which is also not an excuse for digging under these old buildings. Disruption is another issue - as soon as one basement is completed or nearly completed (often having taken a year or so to complete), another commences a few doors away. The constant noise and dust affects many people negatively, in many different ways.</p>
(15)	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 2nd May 2017.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Natural England does not consider that this Article 4 Direction for removing permitted development rights for basement development poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.</b></p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.</p> <p>If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p>
(16)	Margaret Wade	<p><b>RE: Last newsletter 12 May. by copy of this I am advising neighbours, as I do not think everyone receives the newsletter. We will note the closing date for you to receive comments is 6 June 2017</b></p> <p>Over the years many, many residents have complained, to you, to our MP, to Government ministers, over and over again, about the overdevelopment of these Fulham houses. Hundreds of small, 3 bedroomed houses, originally classed as “cottages” developed into 5 bedroom houses, with 4 bathrooms, basements, hideous roof “pods” and sanitised gardens with no thought to the flood risk; let alone the wildlife, which is essential for our own.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>So I am curious as to why you now asking us to let you know what we think about basements and general development. You have never taken any notice of our concerns before, despite the loss of light, and the enormous damage and consequent expense to the adjoining properties, both their houses and gardens. The dirt, the noise and the traffic congestion cause misery to many other residents. The damage to drains is also a concern, as the builders always wash the cement remains down the roadside drains, and it is now many, many years since the regular clearing of the drains was discontinued.</p> <p>So can we expect you now to take notice, and put a halt to all these developments? It would be comforting to think so. But I fear that “precedents have been set” will be given as an excuse for not doing so. Sometime though, they must be stopped.</p> <p>You ask if we think you are being over generous to the developers. Yes. Not only generous, but slack in enforcement of the rules. Work on one development nearby was started 6 months before you even sent out the notice of the planning application to the neighbouring properties!</p> <p>I will look forward to hearing further news on this issue.</p> <p>I would just like to add one further comment to my first email</p> <p>I think that MPs, Councillors and Planning officials should visit some or the owners of adjoining properties to developments, they would see for themselves the horrendous damage caused and normally calm people reduced to tears.</p> <p>I recently saw the damage to two of my neighbours' properties, the damage was unbelievable, and in one case they have not been fully recompensed.</p> <p><b>THESE DEVELOPMENTS MUST BE STOPPED.</b></p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(17)	Valeree Barlow	<p>I have lived in my present house, [REDACTED], for the last 25 years. Although one would hope that the borough councillors would put the interests and welfare of the citizens at the forefront of their decisions all too often my neighbours and I have felt badly let down by the Planning Department. Developers are given a virtual free hand at the expense of the inhabitants and the environment.</p> <p>I would like Article 4 to be much tougher.</p> <p>The basements are getting bigger and bigger. Five have been built round me, including one which extended under the house under the garden and under 3 garages. There is ongoing work on the house on my left, and the undeveloped house on my right is on the market. Apart from the filth, there are times when we cannot hear ourselves speak and times when we have to turn off the radio or TV.</p> <p>Furthermore I am shocked by the cement and water and the paint residue which the builders tip down the drains. They rarely clean up after themselves.</p> <p>I cannot believe that the Council is thinking of giving the Developers total freedom.</p>
(18)	Rebecca Fitzgerald	<p>Our household is profoudly against basements as they alter the water table and cause leaks. We live at [REDACTED] and neighbours in [REDACTED] have had their lives made a misery with a basement in that street.</p> <p>I do not believe people should be allowed to launch these basements which are often in order to rent the houses out. Local people pay the price because of the noise. Many builders do not obey the rule of stopping work at 1pm in Hammersmith and Fulham so the weekend is also made wretched.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>I work from home so I specially hate the noise from basements.  Insurers too are becoming very wary about their effects on the stability of the rest of the houses in the row.  If people want more space they should move elsewhere.  At the very least the developers should have to get permission.  I am a member of the Hammersmith Society.</p>
(19)	C Godfrey	<p>Yes I would urge the Council to impose Article 4 requirements for planning permission for basements under houses and for change of use to residential.  This will help protect non developed century old terraced housing from flooding by changes in the water table caused by neighborouring developments and preserve the character of the high streets.</p>
(20)	Annabel Knox	<p>I wish to register my strong view that LBHF Planning should maintain the strongest possible level of control over basement planning applications by requiring that they are all subject to a full planning evaluation process. Adjoining households should always be notified of this type of development to enable them to express their views concerning the work and the impact it will have on their properties as well as increased flooding risk and over development risks. We believe that basement conversions should be limited to the original footprint of the building concerned with lightwells limited to only minimum escape route requirements. This can only be controlled through the direct involvement of the LBHF Planning department.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(21)	Transport for London	<p><i>Please note that these comments have been prepared by officers in TfL Planning and are made entirely on a 'without prejudice' basis. They should not be taken to represent an indication of any Mayoral response in relation to this matter. These comments also do not necessarily represent the views of the Greater London Authority, which has been consulted separately.</i></p> <p><i>The following comments are made in TfL's capacity as a provider of transport infrastructure, services and operations and as a strategic highway authority within London.</i></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL) on the Article 4 Direction made by your Council to remove permitted development rights for basements, lightwells and any other development below a dwellinghouse. In general, the scale of the development covered by the proposed Direction is unlikely to be a significant concern for TfL</p> <p>However, please be reminded that TfL should continue to be consulted by Hammersmith &amp; Fulham Council on basement proposals in properties adjacent to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and those close to any London Underground (LU) or London Overground (LO) infrastructure. On a wider level, TfL should continue to be consulted on proposals that are adjacent to TfL operational and non-operational land and property holdings. This is ultimately to ensure the safe operation of the strategic transport network in the event of inappropriately designed or constructed development.</p>
(22)	Chair of Magravine Gardens & St Dunstons Road Residents Association	<p>I write as the Chair of the Margravine Gardens and St Dunstons Road Residents Association, having consulted our membership.</p> <p>Residents in these roads strongly support the Council's proposals to make an Article 4 direction in respect of these two forms of development (ie to require planning consent) for the following reasons.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p><u>Basements</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The potential disruption to traffic and parking in residential streets caused by the large vehicles needed to remove spoil, often causing the road to be blocked for 20 minutes at a time.</li> <li>2. Noise and loss of amenity to neighbours during works.</li> <li>3. The increase in noise transmission to neighbouring terraced properties once conversion is completed. This may result from more comings and goings on the staircase or a greater number of people living in the property. It may also be caused by structural alterations which increase sound transmission</li> </ol> <p>We consider that when providing planning permission for basements the council should impose strict conditions on the matters referred to above, and in respect of noise transmission automatically require a high level of sound insulation between the converted property and neighbouring terraced properties, on all floors and particularly on the staircase party wall. The conditions imposed should be posted to all neighbouring properties affected so that residents can raise objections if the conditions are flouted.</p>
(23)	Sarah Fletcher	<p>I wish to register my view that the council should require planning permission be sought concerning the creation of basements below houses, particularly in the conservation areas of the borough. I also think tighter restrictions should be put in place, if planning is given, concerning the nuisance caused locally during the work.</p> <p>Insufficient thought is given to the number of cars and car parking caused by extending properties, and greater emphasis should be given to making sure gardens are not entirely paved over.</p>



Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(24)	Steven Allin	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to OBJECT to the plans by Hammersmith &amp; Fulham council to change the current planning framework for building developments.</p> <p>Despite the fact that you are advertising a consultation, it is VERY concerning that it seems you have already made your mind up.  In your own words your documentation says <i>“The Direction shall come into force, subject to consideration of any representations received”</i>.  How can you write a statement such as that BEFORE the consultation? Frankly it is shocking and controlling behaviour!</p> <p>If you think it’s possibly a good idea, consult FIRST, before getting so far down the decision path that it looks like all you want is a rubber stamp of your decision from residents.</p> <p>This is an underhanded approach to changing planning and I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE CHANGE.</p>
(25)	Sally Tantot	<p>I would like to support the plan to increase restrictions to the above.  We have been directly affected by a basement development carried out by the new owners of [REDACTED]  The property was purchased as two separate flats and then gutted and redeveloped as one residential home.  we objected to the plans as we understood the work would have a large impact on our adjacent property.  Work was started in autumn 2015, since then until January 2017 there was constant noise and vibration. the house was open to the elements and therefore unheated for many months and we have an incredible amount of dirt in our house from the works.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>In addition we have cracks in most internal and external walls, quarry tiles in our kitchen are cracked, our garden is awaiting replanting, our external and internal doors no longer close correctly, the drains have not been checked for damage and the owners and developers are still disputing the costs to correct this damage. This despite a party wall agreement.</p> <p>Since the family has moved in to the property, we hear every noise, as they have removed virtually all internal walls and this acts as a sound box. Prior to the work we heard minimal if any noise from the property.</p> <p>Whilst obviously not all developers will be as inconsiderate, it is difficult to do such work without upheaval, noise and dirt for the adjacent properties and I feel that such works should be controlled more strictly.</p> <p>I would be very happy to give further information on our experience if it would help in setting out guidelines for tighter control of basement developments.</p>
(26)	Oliver Rippier	<p>I have lived in the Borough for over 10 years now.</p> <p>As ever, it is the naysayers who shout the loudest. Fundamentally, living in a city with a growing population means they need to be accommodated somehow. It makes sense that they are housed in areas that are well connected to public transport, such as LBHF.</p> <p>It is an unhappy coincidence that many properties in LBHF fall into the higher ends of the stamp duty spectrum which means it is very expensive for owners to move to properties that might suit their needs. Extending where one lives is sometimes the only rational choice rather than forcing people to leave area.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>The housing stock of LBHF was designed at a time when people lived in larger family units and it needs to be adapted to suit the way we live now. The press around basements is generally hysterical and the 'mega basements' that are brought to attention bear no relation to the reality of most of the works that are proposed.</p> <p>Construction disruption should never be a reason for stopping development as the anti-social aspects of the works can be dealt through strong management regimes, as controlled within the planning consent). <b><u>We need to invest for the future...</u></b></p>
(27)	Sian Webster	<p>I am taking this opportunity to tell you how I feel about basement developments because we have lived with our neighbours developing theirs for 2 years on one side and so far 6 months on the other. It has been horrendous and very stressful. We have had endless noise and dust. We cannot use our garden at the moment in this hot weather and cannot have the windows open because clouds of dust come over the wall all the time. I cannot hang my washing on the line. There is no peace. You cannot read a book or a newspaper or sit quietly in your own home. It has forced my husband who works from home, to go out to sit in cafes or the library. It has forced me out endlessly because I cannot stand the noise. The walls in our house in [REDACTED] are pretty thin - we can hear every single hammer bang and when they drill into the party wall, I cannot hear the radio or the phone in my own kitchen. It has been intolerable. I have also had to clean up clouds of dust which have been forced through the party wall under the skirting during demolition nextdoor.</p> <p>As well as this, our front garden is covered in dust, the pavement is filthy, the gutter is filled with cement - the amount of cement I see being brushed into drains is alarming. Endless skips being emptied, lorries delivering more supplies.</p> <p>They work from 8 until 6 Monday to Friday. Until 1pm supposedly on Saturday. I have had to go over and tell them off about drilling on a Saturday and a few weekends ago there was</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>someone drilling on a Sunday. All this happening when my husband's mother is dying and we all need our peace....</p> <p>I think you should be much stricter with builders about the hours that they work. We neighbours deserve to have a break at weekends. I also fail to understand why the current basement is so much worse in terms of noise than the one before. They seem to be using far more steels and cutting far more holes into the party wall than the other side did.</p> <p>For the sake of all other people who have to put up with this nightmare, please try and do something</p>
(28)	Angela Walsh	<p>I think the council would be correct to exclude basements from permitted development, as I think sometimes they are the only means of stopping a property being overdeveloped against neighbours wishes. Also in the case of leaseholders of flats/apartments, freeholders could enlarge a property against the wishes of the leaseholders.</p> <p>As an example, at the moment my ground floor flat is on the market and the viewers who have expressed most interest were adamant that to progress to a sale, pre-approval for a basement (for such approval is specified in our legal paperwork) would have to be given by my fellow freeholders. Obvious they are not prepared to do this without sight of plans etc, but if this pre-approval was not a legal requirement and this was a permitted development, the work could go ahead without them being consulted.</p> <p>You would like to think that owners/developers would be considerate of their neighbours, but unfortunately this is not always the case.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(29)	Historic England (GLAAS)	<p>Thank-you for consulting Historic England's Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service on the above Direction to remove permitted development rights relating to basement development.</p> <p>The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) provides archaeological advice to boroughs in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and GLAAS Charter.</p> <p>In addition to the Scheduled Monument of Fulham Palace, there are currently 12 Archaeological Priority Areas (APAs) within the Borough, as outlined in the LB Hammersmith and Fulham Archaeological Priority Areas SPD. These are defined areas where, according to existing information, there is significant known archaeological interest or particular potential for new discoveries. APAs act as a trigger for consultation with the borough's archaeological adviser and are justified by a description of significance which will inform development management advice and decision making. GLAAS are in the process of reviewing the Archaeological Priority Areas for each of the Boroughs we advise in accordance with our Greater London Archaeological Priority Area Guidelines which are published on the Historic England website <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/greater-london-archaeological-priority-area-guidelines/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/greater-london-archaeological-priority-area-guidelines/</a>.</p> <p>As basement developments can cause harm to heritage assets of archaeological interest and sometimes significant harm, a programme of prior archaeological assessment leading to potential mitigation strategies is usually required. This is in accordance with the NPPF and GLAAS Charter as well as the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan. GLAAS would therefore welcome the application of development management planning controls with such proposals. We can also offer to update the Borough's APAs in line with the guidance provided in the above link and/or provide training on such matters.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		Please note this response relates solely to archaeological issues and that should you require further advice with regards to Listed Buildings and Areas, you should contact our Development Management and Historic Places team.
(30)	Karolyn White	<p>Due to the issues faced by other Boroughs, and their prudent decision to clamp down on basement developments due to the issues faced by local residents, in some cases too late in the day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holes in the road</li> <li>• Damage to local area</li> <li>• Damage to neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Increased population where additional flats built add to increased demand on local infrastructure.</li> <li>• Increased demand for local infrastructure and resource, which are already stretched, hospitals, doctors surgeries, schools, roads.</li> <li>• Due to increased population, roads are grid locked most of the time, adding to pollution to the area.</li> <li>• Closing of offices and conversion to residential space. Where are the increased population supposed to work?</li> <li>• Increased rates leads to closure of local business, again, where are the jobs?</li> </ul> <p>Stricter rules should apply if these are going to be allowed. The borough is going down-hill fast.</p> <p><b>No to basement and also No to conversion of office spaces for reasons above.</b></p>
(31)	Sanjeev Verma	I oppose the " REMOVING PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS RELATING TO BASEMENT DEVELOPMENT, DIRECTION UNDER ARTICLE 4(1) "

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
		<p>I feel that homeowners should keep their existing permitted development rights which is in line with Government Policy and is fairer to homeowners who want to build space under their property.</p> <p>I also feel that property owners have not been properly consulted. The council should have written to each of the freeholders / leaseholders and asked for their opinions and thoughts.</p> <p>For some people it is easier and cheaper to build a basement than it is to move owing to the increased stamp duty and also people want to stay in their homes for longer.</p>
(32)	Angelica Khera	<p>I oppose the " REMOVING PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS RELATING TO BASEMENT DEVELOPMENT, DIRECTION UNDER ARTICLE 4(1) "</p> <p>I feel that homeowners should keep their existing permitted development rights which is in line with Government Policy and is fairer to homeowners who want to build space under their property.</p> <p>I also feel that property owners have not been properly consulted. The council should have written to each of the freeholders / leaseholders and asked for their opinions and thoughts.</p> <p>For some people it is easier and cheaper to build a basement than it is to move owing to the increased stamp duty and also people want to stay in their homes for longer.</p> <p>Also to do this so close to a General Election may have purdah implications which need to be looked into as people have been distracted by the election.</p>

Rep No.	Name/Organisation	Comments
(33)	Peterborough Road & Area Residents Association	<p>Thank you for your letters of 25th April addressed to me on behalf of Peterborough Road &amp; Area Residents' Association concerning the Article 4(1) Direction removing certain permitted development rights.</p> <p>We considered the matter at our Standing Committee meeting this week but concluded that it would not be appropriate for us to make a representation.</p>
(34)	Highways England	<p>Thank you for your email dated 25<sup>th</sup> April 2017, advising Highways England of the above consultations.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In this case M4 and M40.</p> <p>Having examined the above documents, we do not offer any comments</p>
(35)	Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the proposed Article 4 directions covering basement extensions, and changes of use from offices to residential in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.</p>



<b>Rep No.</b>	<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		I confirm that we do not wish to comment on the proposed directions. You may wish to consult your own conservation staff who are best placed to provide advice on any implications for the historic environment.
(36)	Patrick Inglis	Is there any more supporting information to justify the article 4 direction removing pd rights?  Although you are saying this is a consultation, it looks a lot like you have made an application for the direction to the secretary of state already. Could you confirm what the actual situation is please?