

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 28.09.2020

<u>Reg. No:</u>	<u>Site Address:</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Page</u>
2020/01524/FUL	Edith Summerskill House, Clem Attlee Court, SW6	Fulham Broadway	10
Page 26	Condition 32 – replace condition wording with ‘Prior to occupation of the development, details of the installation of the Zero Emission Air/Water Source Heat Pumps and Zero Emission Emergency generators to be provided for space heating and hot water shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Approved details shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation/use of the development and thereafter permanently retained and maintained.		
Page 47	Para. 5.1.1 - Change 2018 to 2019		
Page 55	Para 5.2.38 – Replace PTAL 2 with PTAL 4		
Page 63	Para 5.3.25 – Delete last sentence which read “This is not therefore a proposal which Policy DC3 says should be resisted”		
Page 72	Para 5.3.76 – Replace ‘negligible to neutral change’ to ‘negligible to adverse change’.		
Page 77	Para 5.3.114 Add to the beginning of the first sentence ‘In the assessment of...’ – Replace reference to ‘Central Fulham Conservation Area’ with ‘Walham Green Conservation Area’ and ‘Central Fulham’ with ‘Central Fulham/Walham Green’.		
Page 82	Para. 5.4.15 – Correction, replace 24 with 26 John Smith Avenue		
Page 86	Para 5.4.27 – After ‘NSL’ add ‘in isolation; 12 will adhere to the BRE test for daylight NSL and VSC.’; After sentence ending ‘...existing situation’ add additional sentence: ‘For VSC in isolation and the 42 windows relevant for assessment, 14 would adhere to the BRE guide. Where there are breaches the percentage ranges form 20-57% however the retained VSC values for the majority of impacted windows retain values of some 20% or see no more than a 3% change.’		
Page 89	Para. 5.5.11 – Replace 2017/02100/FUL with 2020/01306/FUL		
Page 102	Para. 5.14.2 – replace 25 apprentices with 14, 64 work placements with 14 and delete from ‘and 30 full-time...’.		
Page 103	Para 6.4 – Delete first bullet point and replace with: 14 Apprenticeships; 14 work placements; Local procurement amounting to 10% of the total construction cost -After Public realm contribution add ‘of £50,000’ -Add bullet ‘To carry out and complete and retain the Wind Mitigation Measures before first occupation of the building. -Para. 7.2 – To the end of the first sentence add ‘...and s66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990		

In addition to the corrections and clarifications listed Members will note the receipt of representations set out on behalf of an objector relating to the methodology and assessment carried out by the applicant with regard to heritage and TVIA views.

Officer response

It is noted that representations include submission of Heritage and Townscape reviews prepared by Heritage Collective on behalf of the objector, alongside responses to these submissions by the applicant's townscape and heritage consultants.

The views of these parties, alongside other representations; including those from Historic England have been considered in reviewing heritage and townscape considerations of the proposal scheme. From the outset, it should be noted that the original assessment in the main officer's report has been informed by an independent assessment of the proposal scheme by officers. Officers have had regard to the documentation provided by the applicant, as well as that provided by objectors and statutory consultees. Ultimately, however, the judgements presented in the main officer's report read together with this addendum are those officers themselves have reached in light of all of the documentation provided by all parties as well as their knowledge and understanding of the proposal and the local area.

As mentioned within the main body of the report, the application site is not located within a Conservation Area and does not feature any heritage assets within its boundary. Consequently, the assessment of heritage and townscape largely falls to consider the impacts of the proposals scheme upon the significance of surrounding heritage receptors resulting from any change to their setting.

Information supporting the application and representations received make specific reference to GPA3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second edition) 2017, prepared by Historic England and Edition 3 of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ('GLVIA3'). As representations confirm, both documents are not intended to serve as a 'prescriptive methodology' and alternative approaches may be equally acceptable, provided they are demonstrably compliant with legislation, national policies and objectives. Having considered the documents provided by the applicant, objectors, and Historic England, officers are satisfied that there is information to enable them properly to form a judgement in relation to the impacts of the proposed development (including townscape and heritage impacts) in the context of the Council's statutory duties as well as relevant local and national policy.

It is usual for heritage consultants to reach different professional and subjective views upon the methodologies employed and assessments undertaken. These views are acknowledged and have been carefully considered as part of officers' own assessment of the application; as reported in the main officer report and this addendum.

Church of St Thomas of Canterbury

The harm to the setting of St Thomas of Canterbury Church and the group of heritage assets located within its curtilage has been considered in detail as part of officer's assessment of the scheme. Whilst Historic England consider the proposal would cause serious harm to the listed building, their latter comments confirm that this harm would be 'less than substantial' applying the NPPF test.

Officers have carefully considered these comments and agree that the harm caused by the development to the Church of St Thomas of Canterbury would be 'less than substantial' although their judgement is that it falls lower on the scale of less than substantial harm than Historic England suggest in their comments. It is considered that the higher architectural quality and detailing of the existing church building (particularly its spire) would enable the building to retain due prominence in a variety of surrounding viewpoints.

Moreover, in terms of balancing this less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the scheme, officer's are of the view that Historic England has given insufficient weight to other public benefits of the scheme in their assessment, focussing mainly upon the provision of affordable housing. There are additional public benefits from the scheme which require consideration; including the high architectural quality of the development, new/upgraded community facilities and new/enhanced public spaces and routes provided to improve the legibility and wayfinding to the Clem Atlee Estate.

Church of St John – Walham Green

Section 5.3.114 of the main officer report details officers' assessment of the impact of the proposed development upon this Grade II listed building. Taking into consideration the additional representations received, officers do not consider that their overall assessment in relation to this asset should be modified.

282 North End Road

282 North End Road is a Grade II listed building, which is situated to the east of the application site. The main significance of this building relates to the quality of its architecture, (particularly its front façade), front curtilage and boundary enclosures facing New North Road. Towards the rear of the site, substantial alterations/extensions have taken place which have limited/no significance overall.

The proposed development would, in certain views, frame views of the listed building, however owing to the distance between the two sites and the presence of intermittent mid-range buildings, officers consider that this would not result in any harm to the setting or significance of the Listed Building overall.

Non-designated heritage assets – Locally Listed, Buildings of Merit

Officers have fully considered the impacts of the proposals upon locally listed, and any other buildings of merit found within close proximity to the application site. They have done so with the benefit of their own knowledge of the locality and its historic environment. As already described, it is not considered that the development would have any harmful impacts upon the setting of these assets. Consequently, the development is not considered harmful to these assets with due consideration of paragraphs 189 and 197 of the NPPF.

Central Fulham Conservation Area

Impacts of the new development upon the setting of this Conservation Area have already been considered by officer within sections 5.3.86 and 5.3.87 of this report.

Taking into consideration the additional representations received, officers do not consider that this assessment should be modified. The officer assessment references the existing setting of the Conservation Area including a number of taller buildings within its setting. The proposed development would have a similar impact, (although notably taller), to these existing buildings which would cause harm. However, this harm would be limited when considering the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; where the significance of the Victorian terraces would be preserved overall.

Seddelscombe Road Conservation Area

Impacts of the new development upon the setting of this Conservation Area have already been considered by officers within sections 5.3.88 and 5.3.89 of the main officer report.

Taking into consideration the additional representations received, officers do not consider that this assessment should be modified. Whilst the new development would act as a vista terminator within views looking west along Anselm Road, this change to its setting would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

TVIA views

Officers have undertaken an independent assessment of the townscape views presented within the Townscape and Visual Impact assessment submitted with the application. For the ease of understanding, views have been grouped and their impacts assessed.

Taking into consideration the additional representations received from both the objector and the applicant, officers do not consider that this element of the assessment should be modified.

- Page 118** Condition 8 Reason, delete 'that the amenity of occupiers of surrounding premises is not adversely affected by noise, vibration, dust, lighting or other emissions from the building site' and delete 'CC6, CC7, CC10, CC11 and CC12'
- Page 126** Condition 31, after 'BS5837:2012.' add 'These measures should apply to any tree on site, and any trees in neighbouring gardens whose theoretical Root Protection Areas extend into the site.
- It is expected that no demolition, no storage of plant, spoil and materials, nor any construction will take place within the RPAs of the trees, and if there is any excavation necessary within an RPA it should be carried out by hand so any roots are carefully exposed. Roots with a diameter of less than 50mm can then be cleanly severed with sharp secateurs or a hand saw. Roots greater than 50mm should be retained, or only severed after discussion with the Local authority's Arboricultural Officer.'
- Page 129** Condition 42, delete 'building/ development site' and replace with 'new buildings (Centre for Design Innovation, Staff Hub and maintenance building) hereby approved'
- Page 129** Condition 43, after 'emitted from' add 'the new', and delete 'development' and replace with 'new buildings (Centre for Design Innovation, Staff Hub and maintenance building)'
- Page 130** Condition 44, after 'Prior to use' add 'of the new', and delete 'development' and add 'new buildings (Centre for Design Innovation, Staff Hub and maintenance building) hereby approved'
- Page 132** List of representations: add reference to letter dated 20 September 2020 from the Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group.
- Page 142** Para. 4.8, delete '32 representations' and replace with '41 representations'
- Page 154** Paragraph 6.2.17, after 'Science Courtyard to the south.' Add 'Officers consider that the building has a low to moderate level of significance.'
- Page 183** Para. 7.4 Point B, after 'Travel Plan' delete ' - monitoring cost (£3,000 paid at review years 1, 3 and 5)'

- Page 202** Delete first paragraph condition 24, and replace with;
Prior to commencement of the development, details of external artificial lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. Lighting contours shall be submitted to demonstrate that it does not exceed lux levels of E3 Environmental Zone criteria of vertical illumination of neighbouring premises and is in accordance with the recommendations of the Institution of Lighting Professionals in the 'Guidance Notes for The Reduction of Obtrusive Light 2020'. Details should also be submitted for approval of measures to minimise use of lighting and prevent glare and sky glow by correctly using, locating, aiming and shielding luminaires. Approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained.

Page 209 Paragraph 1.14 add:
The applicant has advised that this extant permission cannot be implemented because the scheme is now economically unviable. If implemented, the current business would have to relocate for a period of two years at considerable cost, that would result in disruption to customers and staff. As such, an alternative more modest scheme has been explored.

Page 211 Paragraph 3.6 replace with:
This family-run business franchise has been in the Borough for almost 100 years and in terms of sales, is the largest in Europe. Unlike the 2018 permission, the current proposals would allow the business to continue uninterrupted on site whilst works are undertaken and would therefore help to retain the associated jobs. The applicants seek to increase their investment in the sale of the latest technology notably Electric Vehicles and aim to encourage more customers to invest in these models. The proposed upgraded offices, reconfigured showroom with renewed emphasis on technology and the retained workshop would all combine to help the business to have a successful future in this location. This element of the proposals complies with Policy 4.3 of the London Plan and policies E1 and E2 of the Local Plan (2018) and Policy E1(A) of the draft London Plan.

2020/00646/FUL 104 King Street, London W6 Hammersmith Broadway 228

Page 228 Add: "Bradmore Conservation Area"

Page 251 Para. 2.6. Building A: 1st line: delete "plus basement".