



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Wednesday 12 November 2014

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Adam Connell (Chair), Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair), Colin Aherne, Elaine Chumnerly, Lucy Ivimy, Alex Karmel, Robert Largan (arrived at 7:10pm), Natalia Perez Shepherd and Viya Nsumbu

10. MINUTES

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held on 10 September 2014 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

(Councillor Robert Largan was not present for this item).

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Cartwright. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Robert Largan.

12. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Adam Connell (Chair) declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of Bechtel House, 245 Hammersmith Road, W6 8PW, Hammersmith Broadway, 2014/04242/FUL, as his employer's pension was managed by the developer, Legal and General Assurance (Pensions Management) Ltd. Councillor Connell therefore left the room during discussion of the matter without speaking or voting thereon.

(Councillor Robert Largan was not present for this item).

13. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

13.1 Fulham Gas Works, Imperial Road, Parsons Green and Walham, 2014/03637/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes for further details.

The Committee voted on planning application 2014/03637/FUL and the results were as follows:

For: 5
Against: 3
Not Voting: 1

RESOLVED THAT:

The Executive Director of Transport and Technical Services be authorised to determine application 2014/03637/FUL and grant permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions set out in the report and Addendum.

13.2 Bechtel House, 245 Hammersmith Road, W6 8PW, Hammersmith Broadway, 2014/04242/FUL

Councillor Adam Connell (Chair) declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as his employer's pension was managed by the developer, Legal and General Assurance (Pensions Management) Ltd. Councillor Connell therefore left the room during discussion of the matter without speaking or voting thereon.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.6, in the absence of the Chair, Councillor Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair) assumed the Chair on the application above only.

Officers reported on a late representation received from a local resident and copied to all Members on the Committee, raising concerns about the materials and the height of the proposed building. In addition, a followed up email was received from TfL reiterating most of their comments made on paragraph 2.11, page 69 of the report, and seeking clarification.

The Committee heard representations in support of the application from the Chairman of The Hammersmith Society. She believed that the scheme would be an enhancement to the area, particularly by creating a park at the first floor podium. She outlined her concerns about the management and the use of the park, as well as the architectural solution for the ground floor entrance with the funicular lift.

The Committee heard representations in support of the application from the Applicant representative. He welcomed the support of The Hammersmith Society and assured that the park would have a management presence at all times. He

added that further details of the lighting, CCTV and design of the park were all subject to conditions.

Councillor Lucy Ivimy, seconded by Councillor Alex Karmel, requested that the applications to discharge Conditions 11 and 12, when received, should be determined by the Planning and Development Control Committee. This request was put to the vote and was agreed unanimously by all Committee Members.

RESOLVED THAT:

Subject to there being no contrary direction from the Mayor of London, that the Committee resolve that the Executive Director of Transport and Technical Services be authorised to determine application 2014/04242/FUL and grant planning permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement, and subject to the conditions set out in the report and Addendum.

(Councillor Adam Connell was not present for the discussion and vote on the application above).

13.3 Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order, T388/08/14, Land at 48 Ravenscourt Gardens, W6, Ravenscourt Park

RESOLVED THAT:

The Tree Preservation Order T388/08/14 be confirmed without modification.

Meeting started: 7.01 pm
Meeting ended: 8.34 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Katia Richardson
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
Tel 020 8753 2368
E-mail: katia.richardson@lbhf.gov.uk

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 12.11.2014

<u>Reg. No:</u>	<u>Site Address:</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Page</u>
2014/03637/FUL	Fulham Gas Works Imperial Road London	Parsons Green and Walham	7
Page 8	Delete Condition 3 and any reference to Condition 3 in paragraphs 2.13 and 3.96.		
Page 9	<u>Condition 5:</u> Delete “and Construction” in line 2 and point (n).		
Page 16	Line 1: Replace “Construction” with “Demolition”.		
Page 21	Paragraph 1.24: Point 2: Replace “Construction” with “Demolition”.		
Page 29	Paragraph 3.14: Insert after “(See Condition 7 attached)”; “...in accordance with SPD Design Policy 21 criteria (d). In relation to SPD Design Policy 21 criteria (c) Condition 8 would require an acceptable Interpretation Strategy to be in place prior to any demolition that demonstrates how features from the gasholders shall be incorporated into any future redevelopment for the site.”		
Page 31	Paragraph 3.25: Replace paragraph with; “The removal of the unattractive structures is considered to preserve the setting of the listed buildings through the removal of detracting elements such as the spiral guided staircases to gasholders Nos.3, 4, 5 and 6 and associated guide runners and pipework, along with the three ancillary buildings. When considering the effect of demolishing gasholder no.7 on the listed buildings and the conservation area it is concluded that while there is harm, given the nature of the structure and surroundings what is proposed will lead to less than substantial harm. The applicable tests are therefore those set out in paragraph 133 and 134 of the NPPF whereby the public benefits of the proposals should be weighed against the harm to heritage assets and paragraph 135 where a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”		
	Paragraph 3.27: Replace first sentence with; “Officers consider that the regeneration benefits including significant public benefits arising from a future redevelopment of the Gasworks Area will outweigh the harm to heritage assets associated with the demolition of Gasholder No. 7 in accordance with the provisions of Paragraphs 134 and 135 of the NPPF.”		
	Insert new Paragraph after Paragraph 3.28 “3.29 Officers acknowledge that there is a strong statutory presumption under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and as reflected in recent case law against the grant of planning permission for any development which would fail to preserve the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area. This is because the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the area is a consideration of considerable importance and weight. Officers have considered the proposals for demolition and have determined that the demolition of Gasholder No. 7 will cause some harm to the character and appearance of the Imperial Square and Gasworks Conservation Area and to the setting of the listed building through the loss of a landmark and historical association. Officers have given considerable weight to the fact that harm will be caused by the proposed demolition in reaching its conclusion. Officers assessment of the likely harm to the		

setting of the listed building and to the conservation area is a matter of planning judgement and in the view of officers is less than substantial. Officers consider the following as important factors which outweigh the strong presumption against approval of the proposal, Firstly, as identified above, the proposal accords with the development plan. Secondly, the scheme will permit the regeneration benefits as identified in the Core Strategy strategic policy and thirdly officers assess that the harm caused to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building is less than significant.”

Page 40 Paragraph 3.91: Insert at end of paragraph;
 “It should be noted that where reference is made in this report to a Building Contract to be provided for the redevelopment of the Gasworks Area it only relates to the future development phase where Gasholder No.7 is located.”

Reg. No: 2014/04242/FUL	Site Address: Bechtel House 245 Hammersmith Road, W6 8PW	Ward Hammersmith Broadway	Page 43
-----------------------------------	---	--	-------------------

Page 48 Condition 11: Insert: “...on that part of the scheme...” after “...demolition of existing building)”

Page 57 Condition 46: On 2nd line: Delete “...lifts to the basement car park...” Add “...lift to the basement cycle parking...”

Page 58 Condition 49: Add: “No part of the development shall be used or occupied until it has been carried out in accordance with the approved details”.

Pages 61& 63 Justification: Transport: On 3rd line: Delete “...and implementation of a car permit free scheme” and Planning Obligations: 4th line: Delete “...of education, health and leisure facilities...” and Add “...economic development initiatives, including local training and employment opportunities and procurement”.

Page 75 Paragraph 3.16: Delete reference and text in relation to Design Policies 45 and 46 of the Supplementary Planning Documents and Insert reference and summary of text in relation to Design Policy 48 “Policy 48 states that new buildings must be carefully designed to maintain or enhance the contribution of the setting to the significance of the conservation area.”

Page 79 Paragraph 3.38. Replace existing paragraph with the following wording:
 “Overall it is considered that the impact of the proposals on the surrounding townscape and heritage assets would be acceptable. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the Brook Green conservation area and the Hammersmith Broadway conservation area would be neutral, and it is considered that the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings would be preserved and enhanced”.

Page 84 Paragraph 3.65. Replace existing paragraph with the following wording:
 “Policy DM J5 and Table 5 of the Development Management Local Plan seek to ensure that satisfactory cycle space is provided for all developments. A total of 414 cycle parking spaces are proposed for the office, retail and restaurant components of the development for both staff and visitors, located in secure and sheltered locations of the main building. This includes 366 long stay cycle spaces located in a single area in the basement level. This space would be accessible by a lift and stairs from a lobby at the ground floor level entrance, which in turn would be near to the proposed new public square. A further 48 folding cycle spaces would be provided to the rear (south) of the lobby at ground floor level. Shower and changing room facilities would be

provided on site in the basement area. A further 40 short stay spaces would be provided in the form of 20 Sheffield cycle stands in the public space areas fronting Hammersmith Road. As such the scheme provides 454 cycle parking spaces which complies with London Plan standards. A condition (condition no. 30) is proposed to ensure the provision and retention of the cycle storage space”.

Page 84 & 85 Replace numbering to Paragraphs 6.67 & 6.68 with 3.67 & 3.68.

Page 85 Table following Paragraph 3.69. Add total. Revised table now reads:

Time Period	Undergrd, light rail, tram	Train	Bus	Taxi	Motorcycle	Car or Van	Cycle	Foot	Other	Total
08:00 09:00	378	32	98	3	13	7	65	138	8	743
17:00 18:00	359	30	93	4	12	11	62	159	8	738

Page 87 Paragraph 3.77: It should be noted that 194 Hammersmith Road is a commercial property and not in residential use.