

Planning and Development Control Committee

Agenda

Tuesday 12 January 2016

7.00 pm

COMMITTEE ROOM 1 - HAMMERSMITH TOWN HALL

MEMBERSHIP

Administration:	Opposition
Councillor Adam Connell (Chair) Councillor Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair) Councillor Colin Aherne Councillor Michael Cartwright Councillor Elaine Chumnery Councillor Natalia Perez	Councillor Lucy Ivimy Councillor Alex Karmel Councillor Robert Largan Councillor Viya Nsumbu

CONTACT OFFICER: Kevin Jacob
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
Tel 020 8753 2062
E-mail: kevin.jacob2@lbhf.gov.uk

Reports on the open agenda are available on the [Council's website](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council_and_Democracy):
http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council_and_Democracy

Members of the public are welcome to attend. A loop system for hearing impairment is provided, along with disabled access to the building.

For details on how to register to speak at the meeting, please see overleaf.
Deadline to register to speak is 4pm on Thursday 7 January 2016

For queries concerning a specific application, please contact the relevant case officer.

PUBLIC SPEAKING AT PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (PROTOCOL)

Members of the public are welcome to attend the Planning and Development Control Committee meeting.

Who can speak?

Only the applicant or their agent and people who have commented on the application as part of the planning department consultation process in support or against will be permitted to speak at the meeting. They must have been registered to speak before addressing the committee. Ward Councillors may sometimes wish to speak at meetings even though they are not part of the committee. They can represent the views of their constituents. The Chair will not normally allow comments to be made by other people attending the meeting or for substitutes to be made at the meeting.

Do I need to register to speak?

All speakers except Ward Councillor must register at least two working days before the meeting. For example, if the committee is on Wednesday, requests to speak must be made by 4pm on the preceding Friday. Requests received after this time will not be allowed. Registration will be by email only. Requests are to be sent to speakingatplanning@lbhf.gov.uk with your name, address and telephone number and the application you wish to speak to as well as the capacity in which you are attending.

How long is provided for speakers?

Those speaking in support or against an application will be allowed three minutes each. Where more than one person wishes to speak for or against an application, a total of five minutes will be allocated to those speaking for and those speaking against. The speakers will need to decide whether to appoint a spokesperson or split the time between them. The Chair will say when the speaking time is almost finished to allow time to round up. The speakers cannot question councillors, officers or other speakers and must limit their comments to planning related issues.

At the Meeting - please arrive 15 minutes before the meeting starts and make yourself known to the Committee Co-ordinator who will explain the procedure.

What materials can be presented to committee?

To enable speakers to best use the time allocated to them in presenting the key issues they want the committee to consider, no new materials or letters or computer presentations will be permitted to be presented to the committee.

What happens to my petition or deputation?

Written petitions made on a planning application are incorporated into the officer report to the Committee. Petitioners, as members of the public, are welcome to attend meetings but are not permitted to speak unless registered as a supporter or objector to an application. Deputation requests are not accepted on applications for planning permission.

Planning and Development Control Committee Agenda

12 January 2016

<u>Item</u>		<u>Pages</u>
1.	MINUTES	1 - 11
	<p>To approve as an accurate record, and the Chair to sign, the minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 30 November 2015 and 9 December 2015.</p>	
2.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
3.	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
	<p>If a Councillor has a disclosable pecuniary interest in a particular item, whether or not it is entered in the Authority's register of interests, or any other significant interest which they consider should be declared in the public interest, they should declare the existence and, unless it is a sensitive interest as defined in the Member Code of Conduct, the nature of the interest at the commencement of the consideration of that item or as soon as it becomes apparent.</p> <p>At meetings where members of the public are allowed to be in attendance and speak, any Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest or other significant interest may also make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter. The Councillor must then withdraw immediately from the meeting before the matter is discussed and any vote taken.</p> <p>Where Members of the public are not allowed to be in attendance and speak, then the Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest should withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is under consideration. Councillors who have declared other significant interests should also withdraw from the meeting if they consider their continued participation in the matter would not be reasonable in the circumstances and may give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Councillors are not obliged to withdraw from the meeting where a dispensation to that effect has been obtained from the Audit, Pensions and Standards Committee.</p>	
4.	PLANNING APPLICATIONS	12 - 38

Please note that the page numbers referred to in the above planning

applications report correspond to the pages appearing in the full agenda reports pack only (the link to this pack is on the top of this page).

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes



Monday 30 November 2015

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Adam Connell (Chair), Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair), Colin Aherne, Elaine Chumnerly, Alex Karmel, Natalia Perez and Viya Nsumbu

Other Councillors:

26. MINUTES

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Control Committee held on 11 November 2015 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

27. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Michael Cartwright, Lucy Ivimy and Robert Largan.

28. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

29. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

29.1 Fulham Town Hall, Fulham Road London SW6 1ER, Parsons Green and Walham 2015/04022/FUL & 2015/04023/LBC

The above applications were considered together.

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

The Committee heard representations from a representative of the applicant in favour of the proposed development and against the Officer recommendation to refuse permission.

The Committee voted on each of the applications separately and it was agreed unanimously that both applications should be refused.

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1) That Planning Application 2015/04022/FUL be refused on the grounds set out in the report.
- 2) That Planning Application 2015/04023/LBC be refused on the grounds set out in the report.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm
Meeting ended: 8.30 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Kevin Jacob
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
Tel 020 8753 2062
E-mail: kevin.jacob2@lbhf.gov.uk

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 30.11.2015

Reg ref:	Address	Ward	Page
2015/04022/FUL	Fulham Town Hall, SW6	Hammersmith Broadway	6

Page 8 Insert 'Policy BE1 of the Core Strategy 2011;' in last sentence of reason for refusal 1 after "London Plan Policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.9;"

Page 9 Insert Comments from

Twentieth Century Society 10.11.15
Fulham Society 11.10.15
Hammersmith and Fulham Historic Buildings Group 17.10.15
Historic England London Region letter 27.10.15
Disability Forum 21.10.15
Victorian Society 20.11.15
Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service 06.11.15

Page 18 Insert new para 4.8a
'Victorian Society have written in (20.11.2015) to object to the development on the following grounds:

- 'serious and unjustified harm to the Grade II* listed building and would be detrimental to the significance of the Walham Green Conservation Area.
- fully endorse comments of Historic England in its letter of 20 October and support its conclusion that implementation of the scheme would be both harmful and unjustified.
- loss of a large amount of the building's array of high quality historic fabric and fittings. The removal of the main staircase from the Harwood Road block would be particularly damaging and would deprive the building of one of its most impressive architectural features. It would also inhibit understanding and appreciation of the plan form, manner of circulation and function of this part of the building.
- other elements of the historic interior would also be lost, including staircases, doors and attractive leaded windows. The alterations proposed to the unusual and well preserved historic lavatories on the first floor would be damaging and regrettable.
- The extent of demolition proposed would strike at the heart of the reasons for the building's II* listing, thereby causing serious harm to its significance.
- The use of the Grand Hall as a showroom would detract from its appearance and impressive spatial qualities. The installation of a glazed office partition would further compound that harm.
- subdivision and conversion of the Assembly Rooms and Concert Hall in order to create residential accommodation would be harmful and loss of public access to them
- some significant and damaging alterations to the exterior of the building; the dormers to the roof of the Harwood Road block; upward extension and comprehensive adaptation of the fenestration of the handsome 1930s block, which would fundamentally alter the relationship of the various elements that make up the Town Hall complex, harming its setting and reducing the positive contribution it makes to the Conservation Area.

- Page 30 Para 5.68 to end of paragraph add:
'Policy 7.11 and 7.12 of the London Plan and the London View Management Framework SPG (2012) requires that development within the Protected Vista from Richmond Park to St Paul's Cathedral should not compromise the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate the cathedral.'
- Para 5.71 Delete second and third sentence and replace with:
'However, the listing pre-dated the coming into force of Schedule 17, paragraph 8.3 of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013. The 2013 Act amended section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which provides (so far as is pertinent) that on or after 25 June 2013, an entry in respect of the listing of a building may provide that an object or structure is not to be treated as part of the listed building. Because the Fulham Town Hall Building(s) were listed before 25 June 2013, Officers are of the opinion that the current listing entry cannot legally exclude parts of the building from the statutory listing and therefore, in common with other such older list descriptions, the description is for identification purposes only.'
- Para 5.71, insert extra sentence before last sentence in para:
'Since the 1934 extension was ancillary to the principal building at the date of listing, Officers consider it to be part of the listed building.'
- Page 31 Para 5.73 to end of paragraph add:
'The site falls within a Designated View Corridor 9.1A' within the London Plan and LDF which allows a view from King Henry VIII's mount in Richmond Park to St. Paul's Cathedral.'
- Page 34 Para 5.84, add extra bullet point:
' - Designated View Corridor 9.1A'
- Page 39 After 5.112 add new para 5.112a:
'The London View Management Framework SPG advises that developments must not exceed the threshold plane of the Landmark Viewing Corridor. The indicative height of the threshold plane around Fulham Town Hall is 55.5m AOD. The height of the roof to the Great Hall (the tallest part of the development) is 24.5 AOD. As this level is significantly below the threshold plane, it is considered that the development would not affect the protected view.'
- After 5.112 and 5.112a, add new para 5.112b:
Officers consider that the setting of the Moore Park Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II listed building at 472 Fulham Road would be preserved.
- Page 41 Delete para 5.121
- Page 45 Insert new para 5.122a, after 5.122 k) repair and restoration of the building's facades:
'Having reviewed the evidence submitted, Officers consider that it has not been demonstrated that the proposals are the optimum viable use of the listed building.'
- Page 64 Para 5.250, insert '9' after 8.
- Para 5.251, on sixth line after "remediation method statement" insert 'preparation of a remediation verification report'

Page 68 Para 270, add new heads of terms "20. 10% wheelchair units"

2015/04022/FUL Fulham Town Hall, SW6 Hammersmith Broadway 71

Page 73 Insert consultation comments:

Fulham Society 11.10.15

Hammersmith and Fulham Historic Buildings Group 17.10.15

Historic England London Region letter 27.10.15

Victorian Society 20.11.15

Insert 'Policy BE1 of the Core Strategy 2011;' in last sentence of reason for refusal 1 after "London Plan Policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.9;"

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Wednesday 9 December 2015

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Adam Connell (Chair), Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair), Colin Aherne, Elaine Chumney, Lucy Ivimy, Alex Karmel, Natalia Perez and Viya Nsumbu

Other Councillors: Wesley Harcourt

30. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Michael Cartwright and Robert Largan.

31. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Natalia Perez declared a significant interest in respect of the applications for St Paul's Girls School, Brock Green London as she was a member of the Board of Governors at Larmerier & Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School which was adjacent to the application site. She considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion and vote thereon.

32. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

33.1 St Paul's Girl School Brook Green London W6 7BS, Avonmore and Brook Green, 2015/02035/FUL & 2015/02036/LBC

Councillor Natalia Perez declared a significant interest in respect of the applications for St Paul's Girls School, Brock Green London as she was a member of the Board of Governors at Larmerier & Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School which was adjacent to the application site. She considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion and vote thereon.

The above applications were considered together.

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

The Committee received representations from the applicant and applicant's agent in support of the applications. They stressed that there were no plans to increase the number of the pupils at the school as a result of the proposal, that the school was fully engaged with the local community including local primary schools and had been fully involved with the Council in developing the proposals.

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/02035/FUL and unanimously agreed the application.

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/02036/LBC and unanimously agreed the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1) The Director for Planning and Growth be authorised to determine application 2015/02035/FUL and grant planning permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions set out in the report.
- 2) Planning Application 2015/2036/LBC be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

33.2 St Paul's Girl School Playing Fields and Pavilion Bute Gardens London W6 7DR, Avonmore and Brock Green, 2015/02037/FUL

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

The Committee received representations from the applicants agent in support of the application. She commented that the wider local community already had access to the school's sports facilities outside of school hours and it made sense for the school to focus its facilities in a way in which they could most efficiently be used. It was also stressed that Sports England was comfortable with the proposals.

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/02035/FUL and unanimously agreed the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

That the Director for Planning and Growth be authorised to determine Application 2015/02035/FUL and grant planning permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions set out in the report.

33.3 45A Goldhawk Road London W12 8QP, Shepherds Bush Green, 2015/04119/FUL

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

During the Committee's discussion of the proposals it was proposed by Councillor Karmel that the second paragraph of Condition 30 be amended to include office users and so forth and that an additional condition be added prohibiting the conversion of the proposed office space to residential use. After being duly seconded, the Committee voted on the proposed amendment and addition to the conditions and these were agreed.

The Committee then voted on planning application 2015/04119/FUL and unanimously agreed the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

The Director of Planning and Growth be authorised to determine Application 2015/04119/FUL and grant permission on the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to:

- 1) The addition of a condition prohibiting the conversion of the proposed office use space to residential use;
- 2) The amendment of condition 30 to include reference to office users;
- 3) The remaining conditions set out on the report.

33.4 327A Lillie Road London SW6 7NR, Fulham Reach, 2015/03455/FUL

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

The Committee received representations from the applicant's architect in support of the application. He commented that the existing building was not in keeping with the local context, but that the proposed property would be a high quality residential unit in keeping with Lillie Road.

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/03455/FUL and unanimously decided not to agree the Officer's recommendation to approve the application.

It was then proposed by Councillor Karmel and duly seconded that the proposal be refused on the grounds that the proposal would be detrimental to the outlook of neighbouring properties, had in appropriate fenestration, was not in keeping with the established terrace height of Lillie Road, provided insufficient amenity space, and would provide insufficient refuse storage provision. The Committee decided unanimously to agree these reasons for refusal.

RESOLVED THAT:

That Application 2015/03455/FUL be refused on the grounds that the proposal would be detrimental to the outlook of neighbouring properties, had inappropriate fenestration which was not in keeping with the established terrace height of Lillie Road, provided insufficient amenity space and would provide insufficient refuse storage provision.

33.5 Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order T/396/07/15 Land at 485 Fulham Road London SW6, Parsons Green and Walham

The Committee voted on the confirmation of Tree Preservation Order T/396/07/15 and unanimously agreed that it be confirmed without modification.

RESOLVED THAT:

Tree Preservation Order T/396/07/15 be confirmed without modification.

33.6 485 Fulham Road London SW6 1HJ, Parsons Green and Walham, 2015/05334/TPO

In discussing the proposal to fell the tree, Members of the Committee commented that on balance they felt that permission should be granted as in their view the particular species of tree at the site, a 'Tree of Heaven' had significant problems that outweighed the case for its protection. However, it was felt that an appropriate alternative species, potentially a form of Birch or Silver Birch should be planted as a replacement.

The Committee voted on application 2015/05334/TPO and unanimously decided not to accept the recommendation to refuse the application and to approve the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

Application 2015/05334/TPO be approved subject to appropriate standard conditions and the replacement of the current tree with an appropriate replacement from the Birch or Silver Birch species.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm

Meeting ended: 8.55 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Kevin Jacob
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
Tel 020 8753 2062
E-mail: kevin.jacob2@lbhf.gov.uk

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 9.12.2015

Reg ref:	Address	Ward	Page
2015/2035/FUL	St Paul's Girls' School, Brook Green, W6 7BS	Avonmore and Brook Green	2
Page 3	Officer recommendation - delete and replace with a revised recommendation as follows: 'That the Committee resolve that the Director for Planning & Growth be authorised to determine the application and grant planning permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions set out below.'		
Page 3	Drawing nos. and condition 2: Replace '1377-NB-G200 E-01' with '1377-NB-G200 E-01 Rev.01'		
Page 39	Para 3.106, line 8 – delete 'S278'		
2015/02037/FUL	St Paul's Girls' School, Playing Fields and Pavilion Bute Gardens, W6 7DR	Avonmore and Brook Green	45
Page 46	Officer recommendation - delete and replace with a revised recommendation as follows: 'That the Committee resolve that the Director for Planning & Growth be authorised to determine the application and grant planning permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions set out below.'		
Page 46	Drawing nos. and condition 2: Add '1377-SS-G100-P-00-001 Rev.01'		
Page 51	Condition 27, last sentence – after 'be used' insert 'for community use'		
Page 57	Para 2.2 – line 1, delete 'Three' and replace with 'Two'; line 2, delete '9 Bute Gardens'		
Page 74	Para 4.2 – at the end of the para add 'and subject to the completion of a legal agreement'.		
2015/04119/FUL	45A Goldhawk Road, W12 8QP	Shepherd's Bush Green	75
Page 76	Officer recommendation – delete 'Executive Director' and replace with the 'Director for Planning & Growth'.		
2015/03455/FUL	327a Lillie Road, SW6	Fulham Reach	110
Page 113	Delete Condition 11 and Replace with New Condition 11: The development hereby permitted shall not commence until further details of a Surface Water Management Strategy including full details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS), with a maintenance programme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The SUDS scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved		

details prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, and thereafter permanently retained and maintained in line with the agreed plan.

To ensure that surface water run-off is managed in a sustainable manner, in accordance with policy 5.13 of The London Plan, 2015, Policy CC2 of the Core Strategy, 2011, and policy DM H3 of the Development Management Local Plan, 2013.

Page 114	Condition 13, delete '10' and replace with '8'
Page 118	Para 3.11, second line insert 'not' after 'property and would'.
Page 119	Para 3.17, first line delete 'with basements'
Page 120	Delete '4.0'
	Renumber paragraphs 4.1 to 4.5 (incl) 3.19 to 3.23 (incl) respectively
Page 121	Delete '3.5' and renumber 3.40a
Page 127	Delete 3.47 and renumber 3.71a

Agenda Item 4

London Borough Of Hammersmith & Fulham

Planning Applications Committee

Agenda for 12th January 2016


Index of Applications, Enforcement Actions, Advertisements etc.

WARD: REG NO:	SITE ADDRESS:	PAGE:
Ravenscourt Park 2015/01357/FUL	3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	13
Ravenscourt Park 2015/01358/LBC	3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	34

Ward: Ravenscourt Park

Site Address:

3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB



© Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. London Borough Hammersmith and Fulham LA100019223 (2013).

For identification purposes only - do not scale.

Reg. No:
2015/01357/FUL

Case Officer:
Barry Valentine

Date Valid:
23.03.2015

Conservation Area:
St. Peter's Square Conservation Area - Number 1

Committee Date:
12.01.2016

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs R Nott
3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB

Description:

Erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and upper ground floor levels, creation of a balcony at upper ground floor level and the erection of an external staircase from upper ground floor level to lower ground floor level; excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the enlargement of the lower ground floor level, including associated landscaping and new trellis.

Drg Nos: P210 Rev E, P211 Rev E, P212 Rev E, P213 Rev E, P214 Rev E, P215 Rev E, P216 Rev E, P217 Rev E.

Application Type:

Full Detailed Planning Application

Officer Recommendation:

That the application be approved subject to the condition(s) set out below:

- 1) The works hereby granted consent shall not commence later than the expiration of 3 years beginning with the date upon which this consent is granted.

Condition required to be imposed by section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).'

- 2) The works hereby approved are only those specifically stated in the written description and indicated on the approved drawing numbers P210 Rev E, P211 Rev E, P212 Rev E, P213 Rev E, P214 Rev E, P215 Rev E, P216 Rev E, P217 Rev E.

In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building, in accordance with Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM G3 and DM G7, and Core Strategy (2011) policy BE1.

- 3) All new windows and doors hereby approved to the rear elevation shall be timber framed and painted white and thereafter permanently retained in this form.

In order to ensure that the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the property, the character and appearance of the conservation area; the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3, DM G5 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 4) The development shall be finished in painted sand and cement render with ashlar coursing lines to match the existing.

In order to ensure that the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the property, the character and appearance of the conservation area; the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 5) Any replacement rainwater goods installed shall be cast aluminium painted black, and thereafter permanently retained in this form.

In order to ensure that the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the property, the character and appearance of the conservation area; the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 6) The new wrought ironing balcony and railings shall match the existing metal railings on the rear elevation and shall be painted black, and thereafter permanently retained in this form.

In order to ensure that the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the property, the character and appearance of the conservation area; the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 7) The proposed balcony hereby approved shall not be used until the raising of the existing garden wall on the boundary with No.4 St Peter's Square, as shown on drawing No.P214 Rev.D is completed and constructed in London stock bricks to match the existing facing brickwork in terms of colour, texture, bonding, pointing and mortar colour. The works shall thereafter be permanently retained in this form.

In order to ensure that the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the property, the character and appearance of the conservation area, to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1 and to prevent overlooking in accordance with policy DM A9 of the Development Management Local Plan, 2013, and Housing Policy 8 (criteria ii) of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning, 2013.

- 8) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until detailed drawings of all new windows, including opening style, and doors in plan, section and elevation at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by

the Council. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved drawings, and permanently retained as such thereafter.

In order to ensure that the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the property, the character and appearance of the conservation area, to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3, DM G5 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 9) Prior to the commencement of development, a statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council outlining proposed flood mitigation measures that include the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS), including system of maintenance. This statement shall include details how any SUDS will be maintained. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved and thereafter permanently retained and maintained in line with the agreed plan.

To ensure that flooding and surface water run-off is managed in a sustainable manner, in accordance with policy 5.13 of The London Plan 2015, Policy CC2 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM H3 of the Development Management Local Plan 2013.

Justification for Approving the Application:

- 1) On balance Officers consider that the proposals would preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. The proposed extension would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring living conditions. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity provided by trees. The impact of the development on flooding could be mitigated through condition. The application complies with Core Strategy policy (2011) BE1; Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM A9, DM E4, DM G3, DM G5, DM G7, DM H3 and DM H9; Planning Guidance SPD Design Policies 31, 34, 61 and 62; London Plan (2015) policy 5.13 and the NPPF including para 132.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000
LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

All Background Papers held by Andrew Marshall (Ext: 3340):

Application form received: 20th March 2015
Drawing Nos: see above

Policy documents: National Planning Policy Framework 2012
The London Plan 2011 and Revised Early Minor Alterations to The
London Plan, 2013
Core Strategy 2011
The Development Management Local Plan 2013
Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document July 2013

Consultation Comments:

Comments from:

Dated:

Neighbour Comments:

Letters from:

Dated:

83 Black Lion Lane London W6 9BG	01.05.15
15 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	29.04.15
27 St Peter's Square London W6 9NW	01.05.15
2 St Peter's Villas London W6 9BQ	17.04.15
2 St Peter's Villas London W6 9BQ	15.04.15
2 St Peter's Villas London W6 9BQ	21.04.15
Flat 7 Albion House 39 St Peter's Square London W6 9NN	21.04.15
43 St Peters Square Hammersmith W6 9NR	17.04.15
4 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	25.04.15
9 St Peters Square Hammersmith London W6 9AB	02.05.15
43 black lion lane London W6 9BG	30.04.15
18 St Peter's Square Hammersmith London W6 9AJ	30.04.15
58 Black Lion Lane London W6 9BE	28.04.15
30 St. Peter's Square London W6 9UH	24.04.15
81 Black Lion Lane London W6 9BG	28.04.15
6 St Peter's Villas London W6 9BQ	26.04.15
Flat 5, Albion House, 39 St. Peter's Square, W6 9NN	17.04.15
8 St Peters Square Hammersmith London W6 9AB	02.05.15
7 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	02.05.15
44 St Peter's Square London, W6 9AA	26.04.15
16 St Peters Square London W6 9AJ	26.04.15

OFFICERS' REPORT

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 The application property, 3 St. Peter's Square, is a three storey plus lower ground floor level building located on the eastern side of the square.

1.2 The property is located within the St Peter's Square Conservation Area. This property forms part of a grade II listed terrace (nos. 1 to 6 consec) dating from circa 1825 to 1830. There are a significant number of listed buildings within vicinity of the site, including 7 to 15 St Peter's Square (consec) (grade II listed) to the south, 3 to 6 St Peter's Villas (consec) (grade II listed) to the north and nos. 79 to 87 (odds) (grade II listed) Black Lion Lane to the east. The garden in the centre of St Peter's Square is included on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade II.

1.3 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 (good).

1.4 The site is located in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency.

1.5 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the erection of a rear extension at lower ground and upper ground floor level, installation of a balcony at rear ground floor level, erection of an external staircase from proposed upper ground floor level balcony to the garden, erection of new trellis and excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the erection of extensions.

1.6 Listed building consent is also sought for the extensions and internal alterations including changes at lower ground and upper ground floor level, alterations to the layout of the first floor bathroom and replacement of the timber floor in the lower ground floor spare room with a solid concrete floor.

1.7 This is a joint report relating to matters arising from both the planning application and the listed building consent application.

1.8 The proposed two storey rear extension would be located on the southern side of the property. The extension would extend to a depth of 2.25m from the current rear wall. The extension would extend to a height of 4.4m above the property's garden level. In front of this extension at ground floor level would be a terrace/balcony that would extend 1m from the rear wall of the extension and be 5m in width. Centrally located steps would lead from the terrace/balcony to the garden. On the rear elevation of the rear extension three sets of timber framed French doors at ground floor level and timber framed sash windows at lower ground floor level are proposed. The external wall of the extension would match the existing building i.e. painted sand and cement render with ashlar coursing lines.

1.9 Since the submission of the planning application but prior to the committee meeting in July, further information was been received from the applicant. Officers received a revised sunlight and daylight test and amended drawings that redrew the neighbour's window, its opening style and size. The original sunlight and daylight test was the same as that submitted in connection with the previous applications (2014/02131/FUL & 2014/02132/LBC). The revised sunlight and daylight test provides updated VSC figures for the proposed development.

1.10 These applications were first reported to Planning Committee on 29th July 2015; at which Members agreed with officers' recommendations and decided to grant planning permission and listed building consent. Since that time the council's decision has been subject to a legal challenge. A judgement from the court on November 18th 2015 confirmed that leave to Judicial Review was granted, as it was decided that the council did not address the question of whether the development would affect the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings. Council's legal advice was to concede to judgement. Accordingly, a consent order quashing the planning permission has been made; and the cases need to be reported back to PADCC for further consideration and decision.

PLANNING HISTORY

1.11 Listed building consent (1983/00974/LBC) was granted on 14/07/1983 for alterations at first floor level to front elevation involving the installation of French windows and canopy roof, removal of rear extension at ground floor level and formation of balcony and external staircase and alterations to the fenestration of the rear elevation.

1.12 Planning permission (2014/02131/FUL) was refused on 03/07/2014 for the erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and upper ground floor level, creation of a balcony at upper ground floor level, erection of an external staircase from upper ground floor level to lower ground floor level, excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the enlargement of the lower ground floor level, including associated landscaping and new trellis. The reason for refusal was as follows:

'The proposed two storey extension would result in an overdevelopment of the site and would be unacceptable in the interests of residential amenity. More particularly, the proposed rear extension, by reason of its excessive size, bulk, height and depth in close proximity to the neighbouring residential property at 4 St Peter's Square would result in an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development and an unacceptable loss of light, outlook and increased sense of enclosure to this neighbouring property. Furthermore, the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test demonstrates that there would be noticeable loss of daylight to the bedroom window at 4 St Peter's Square. The proposal is thereby contrary to Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM G3 and DM A9, and SPD Housing Policy 6 and Criteria 3 of SPD Housing Policy 7 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2013).'

1.13 The Council's decision to refuse planning permission was appealed (APP/H5390/D/14/2226014); and the appeal was subsequently dismissed on 29/10/2014.

1.14 A listed building consent application (2014/02132/LBC) that accompanied the above planning application (2014/02131/FUL) was granted on 01/08/2014. The description of development was as follows:

'the erection of a two storey rear extension at semi-basement and upper ground floor level, including the creation of a balcony at upper ground floor level and the erection of an external staircase from upper ground floor level to lower ground floor level; excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the enlargement of the lower ground floor level, including associated landscaping and new trellis; internal alterations include bricking up existing window opening at lower ground floor level; removal of existing wall between new kitchen and living room at upper ground floor level; creation

of two new internal door openings to the dining room at upper ground floor level; cupboards to bathroom removed at first floor level; and replacement of timber floor in lower ground floor spare room with solid concrete floor'.

1.15 The main difference between the planning permission (2014/02131/FUL) and listed building consent (2014/02131/LBC) applications and the current applications is the proposed depth of the rear lower ground and ground floor extension. The proposed extension projected 3.5m from the current rear wall of the application property under these previous applications, compared to 2.25m proposed in the current applications.

1.16 Planning permission (2014/05968/FUL) was refused on the 03/03/2015 for the 'erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and upper ground floor levels, creation of a balcony at upper ground floor level and the erection of an external staircase from upper ground floor level to lower ground floor level; excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the enlargement of the lower ground floor level, including associated landscaping and new trellis.'

1.17 The reason for refusal was as follows:

'The proposed extension by virtue of its height, depth, bulk and location would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring living conditions and would be unneighbourly. In particular the proposed extension would appear unacceptably dominant and overbearing when viewed from the rear lower ground floor bedroom window located within No.4 St Peter's Square. The proposal is contrary to policies in the adopted Development Management Local Plan (2013), particularly policies DM G3 and DM A9. The proposal is also considered not to accord with guidance outlined in the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2013), particularly SPD Housing Policies 6 and 7.'

1.18 A listed building consent application (2014/05969/LBC) that accompanied the above planning permission application (2014/05968/FUL) was granted on 03/03/2015. The description of development was as follows 'erection of a rear extension at lower ground and upper ground floor; including the creation of a balcony at upper ground floor level and the erection of an external staircase from upper ground floor level to lower ground floor level; excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the enlargement of the lower ground floor level, including associated landscaping and new trellis; Internal alterations to lower ground and ground floor levels including bricking up of window to the rear elevation at lower ground floor level; replacement of timber floor in lower ground floor spare room with solid concrete floor; installation of folding partitions at lower ground floor level; removal of existing kitchen at lower ground floor; installation of gas log fire at lower ground floor; new internal door opening at lower ground floor level; removal of existing wall between new kitchen and living room at upper ground floor level; creating a new opening in the existing wall between the study and dining room and installing a jib door at upper ground floor level; installation of a new serving hatch with jib door; alterations to first floor bathroom.'

1.19 The Council's decision to refuse planning permission (2014/05968/FUL) was appealed (APP/H5390/D/15/3038210); and the appeal was subsequently dismissed on 24/08/2015. It should be noted that the date the Inspectorate issued the decision to dismiss the appeal in connection with planning permission (2014/05968/FUL), was after these current applications were previously reported to PADCC on the 29/07/2015.

1.20 The main difference between planning permission application (2014/05968/FUL) and listed building consent application (2014/02131/LBC) which were dismissed at appeal on the 24/08/2015, and these current applications, is the depth of the proposed rear addition. The previously proposed extension extended 2.94m from the current rear wall compared to 2.25m under these current applications.

2.0 PUBLICITY and CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Both the planning permission and the listed building consent applications were advertised by way of site and press notices, and letters were sent to neighbouring properties. Nineteen letters of objection have been received in connection with the planning application, and fifteen objections have been received in connection with the listed building consent application. The letters of objection are from residents in Black Lion Lane; Devonshire Road in Chiswick; St. Peter's Square; St. Peter's Villas and from the Hammersmith and Fulham Historic Buildings Group.

2.2 The concerns of the objectors are summarised as follows:

- Overdevelopment of the property that would be harmful to the listed building, the listed terrace and the conservation area.

Officers' response- The extension in design terms is of an appropriate height and depth which is in keeping with the established built form of the terrace. The proposed extension would still ensure that large parts of the original rear wall of the property would remain unobscured which would help to ensure that the extension has an appropriate subservient relationship to the main original building. The proposed extension would preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural interest of the listed building; preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; preserve the setting of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square and preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. The extension would not result in overdevelopment of the property. The majority of the internal alterations already benefit from Listed Building Consent. The variations from the previous Listed Building Consent are minor and would not harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, or its setting, or the setting of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at No. 1-6 St Peter's Square.

- That the proposed extension is unneighbourly and would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property.

Officers' response - The proposed extension, due to its modest depth, is not considered to be unneighbourly; nor would it have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

- Impact of balcony on neighbouring living conditions in terms of privacy and noise nuisance.

Officers' response - The proposed balcony impact on neighbouring privacy and in terms of noise nuisance is considered to be acceptable. The balcony is modestly sized and any views that would be experienced from it would be similar to views that can already be experienced from existing windows and openings. Any additional harm would not be sufficient enough to the overall living conditions of neighbouring occupiers to justify the refusal of planning permission. The small size of the terrace would prevent its use

generating significant noise disturbance, especially when consideration is given in regards to the size of the existing garden and the potential for this outdoor space to be used and generate noise.

- Impact of the extension on neighbouring daylight/sunlight.

Officers' response- The proposed extension is smaller than the previous refused extension that was subject to appeal. At appeal the previous extension was considered to be acceptable by the Planning Inspectorate in regards to its impact on neighbouring sunlight and daylight.

- That the proposed extension would set a dangerous precedent.

Officers' response- Each application has to be assessed on its individual merits. An application cannot be refused on the basis that a similar extension elsewhere might cause harm.

- The applicants do not need the space.

Officers' response- The main consideration of the Council in the assessment of planning applications is whether the development proposal complies with relevant planning policies in the Development Plan, and national and regional planning policy. This is discussed in the report below.

- Errors on submitted plans.

Officers' response- The submitted plans and elevations are considered to be sufficiently detailed and accurate so as to be able to make a judgement on the impact of the development on the building, surrounding area and neighbouring properties and whether it is compliant with policy, guidance and whether it meets requirements of statutory legislation.

- Impact on plants and trees

Officers' response - There is an existing pear tree that grows within the garden of no.5 St. Peter's Square that is located immediately on the boundary wall. This tree is not of particular visual merit and as such it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission on the basis that this tree might be harmed. In addition, whilst a small number of shrubs and plants might be lost under the proposal, the impact on the green appearance of the borough and biodiversity is not such to justify refusal of planning permission especially when consideration is given to the size of garden remaining after the development would be completed. Many of these plants and shrubs are likely to grow back, or can be replanted after the development has been completed.

2.3 Hammersmith and Fulham Historic Buildings Group were consulted, and in summary have raised the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment of the property that would be harmful to the listed building, the listed terrace and conservation area.

Officers' response- The extension in design terms is of an appropriate height and depth which is in keeping with the established built form of the terrace. The proposed

extension would still ensure that large parts of the original rear wall of the property would remain unobscured which would help to ensure that the extension has an appropriate subservient relationship to the main original building. The proposed extension would preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural interest of the listed building; preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square and preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. The extension would not result in overdevelopment of the property. The majority of the internal alterations already benefit from Listed Building Consent. The variations from the previous Listed Building Consent are minor and would not harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, or its setting, or the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square.

- That the proposal unnecessarily demolishes part of the original party wall

Officers' response - Only a small section of the original party wall would be demolished. However, given that the rest of the boundary would be retained, this would not cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, its setting, or the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square.

- That the reliance of the applicants on providing for a Lifetime Home is quite unrealistic in this context.

Officers' response - The proposed extension would not create a lifetime home and as such this matter cannot be given significant weight in the determination of the applications.

2.4 St. Peter's Residents' Association were consulted, and in summary have raised the following concerns:

- That the proposed extension is un-neighbourly by reason of its easterly extension. That the bulk of the extension and balcony screening will lead to a loss in daylight and aspect.

Officers' response - The applicant has submitted a revised daylight assessment which demonstrates that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on neighbouring daylight. There would be some loss of aspect and increased in sense of enclosure associated with the proposal, but this would not be significant enough to be considered un-neighbourly.

- That the proposal would result in a loss of privacy from the balcony.

Officer's response - The proposed balcony impact on neighbouring privacy and in terms of noise nuisance is considered to be acceptable. The balcony is modestly sized and any views that would be experienced from it would be similar to views that can already be experienced from existing windows and openings. Any additional harm would not be sufficient enough to the overall living conditions of neighbouring occupiers to justify the refusal of planning permission.

2.5 Historic England was consulted in connection with the listed building consent and has advised the council to determine the application as they see fit.

2.6 The Council for British Archaeology, Ancient Monuments Society, the Georgian Group, the Twentieth Century Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, The Gardens Trust (previously known as Garden History Society) and the Victorian Society were consulted in regards to the listed building consent application. No responses have been received.

2.7 Ward councillor, Councillor Ivimy, has written to say that she was aware of concerns of local residents and groups, that this is a premier square and a hugely important conservation area; and that she considers it is important that the application is not approved just because the Council has run out of steam to 'fight' another set of applications at this property.

3.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 The relevant planning considerations in this case, to be assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), The London Plan and the Council's Local Development Framework, comprising the Core Strategy, Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) and the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (PGSPD) are:

- + Impact of the development on neighbouring living conditions.
- + Whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
- + Whether the proposal would preserve the setting of the listed building and whether the proposal would preserve the settings of other listed buildings including the listed terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square.
- + Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- + Whether the proposal would preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden.
- + The impact on flooding and whether the proposal provides accessible accommodation.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING LIVING CONDITIONS

3.2 The refused planning application (2014/02131/FUL) which was subsequently dismissed at appeal was for a similar lower ground and upper ground floor rear extension (see para. 3.6 for further details on the Inspector's conclusions in the most recent appeal). The previously proposed extension extended to a depth of 3.5m and was the same height as the current application. The appeal was dismissed on a single ground, that the proposed development had an unacceptable impact on neighbouring living conditions. In particular the Inspector highlighted the impact of the development on a bedroom located at lower ground floor level of the neighbouring property 4 St. Peter's Square. The key extracts from the appeal decision follow, and are detailed in para 3.3, and discussed below.

3.3 The Inspector said that:

"Policy 6 of the SPD relates to rear extensions and states that the Council 'will have regard to the existing established rear building lines of adjoining properties in determining applications for rear extensions'. It adds that planning permission will not normally be granted for extensions of more than 3.5m in length or where the original property has already been extended, where the combined depth exceeds that. Policy 7 of the SPD offers guidance on rear extensions to terraced properties; part (iii) is relevant to this appeal and seeks to limit the effects of an extension 'at a level higher' on a rear window of a habitable room.

However, there are matters applicable to this appeal which seek to limit the effects of a rear extension on neighbours. The neighbouring property at No 4 has a bedroom with its window in the rear elevation at the lower ground floor level, close to the boundary with the appeal site; I had the benefit of viewing this part of No 4 at my site visit. When measured from the rear elevation of No 4, the combined depth of the resultant building along the common boundary would be 4.65m (the existing projection plus the proposed 3.5m). Whilst the appellant argues that the proposal meets the requirements of SPD Policy 6, it seems to me that it must be relevant to take account of the fact that the rear elevation of No 3 is set further rearwards than the wall containing the window at No 4; this is supported by the opening sentence of Policy 6 which I have quoted in parts above. The fact is that the Council seek to limit rear extensions to a maximum depth of 3.5m in order, in part, to respect neighbourliness. In such circumstances I find it difficult to ignore the fact that No 3 is already deeper than No 4 at this point. Furthermore, the proposal is not just for an extension at the same level as the affected window but proposes a level above that, which would accentuate any effects.

In my consideration of these matters, I find that the height of the proposal, combined with the distance that it would project rearwards beyond the rear wall of No 4 would mean that the extension would appear unacceptably dominant and overbearing when viewed from the relevant bedroom of No 4."

3.4 The proposed extension subject to this application would extend to a depth of 2.25m, 1.25m less than the application that was dismissed at appeal. The proposed extension is the same height as the previously dismissed at appeal extension.

3.5 The appeal decision gives weight to the fact that the proposed extension would project 4.65m in front of the relevant window of No.4, and that this would be greater than the 3.5m recommended in SPD Housing Policy 6. This revised application has addressed this matter, and is now proposed to project to a depth of 3.5m in front of No.4's window.

3.6 The more recent dismissed appeal (APP/H5390/D/15/3038210) dated 24/08/2015 in connection with refused planning permission application (2014/05968/FUL) considered it necessary to take the same approach as the previous Inspector in appeal decision (APP/H5390/D/14/2226014). The Inspector states: "In this case, whilst the depth of the extension has been reduced, it would still project about 4.09m from this window (i.e. no.4's lower ground floor window that serves a bedroom). The result in practice, would be that outlook from the window would be severely restricted with a large and overly tall wall along the boundary creating a sense of enclosure." The Inspector also again noted Planning Guidance SPD Housing Policy 6 which explains that planning permission will not normally be granted for extensions of more than 3.5

metres in length and that the proposed extension would exceed 3.5 metres when measured from no.4's window. To reiterate, the current application is a revised proposal and the currently proposed extension would now project by 3.5m beyond the window at no.4.

3.7 SPD Housing Policy 7 is also of relevance, in particular criterion (iii). Whilst SPD Housing Policy 7 is more targeted towards narrower fronted terrace properties, it does provide a framework for assessing an extension's impact on a neighbouring property in terms of outlook. The proposed extension would be a level above the lower ground floor window of the neighbouring property at No.4 and would result in a 26% reduction in outlook, greater than the 15% recommended in the Planning Guidance SPD. It should be noted that the application refused at appeal would have reduced the outlook by 32%.

3.8 A site visit to No.4 was carried out by the case officer. It was identified that a bedroom window located at lower ground floor level adjacent to the boundary with No.3 could be materially affected by the scheme.

3.9 In favour of the proposal, the main affected window serves a small bedroom. This bedroom only makes up a small proportion of the overall floorspace of a generously proportioned house, whose other windows and associated rooms would otherwise largely remain unaffected. When standing in the centre of the room the view out of the window would largely be unchanged. The relationship between the window and the proposed side wall is not entirely uncommon in this terrace, there are similar boundary relationships between no.2 and no.3 and between nos.5 and 6. Both the room and property would continue to enjoy good views over the garden and to the south, with the level of aspect remaining good. The room affected is not part of the original house but a later extension constructed in the early twentieth century; albeit that it needs to be protected. The affected room is at lower ground floor level, an area of the property commonly associated with having poorer living conditions due to its floor level below garden level; albeit, again, that it needs to be protected.

3.10 Against the proposal is that this is still, despite its size, a used and valued room by the neighbour. The proposal would affect views northwards of sky when standing or sitting in the south eastern corner of the room. The proposal would still create a high boundary, albeit for a reduced length, from previous applications, that would increase the sense of enclosure both experienced within the room and parts of the garden above its current levels. The proposed extension would also slightly reduce the outlook to the kitchen located at lower ground floor level, the garden studio located in the rear garden, a bathroom located at ground floor level and the general garden area of No.4.

3.11 On balance, officers consider that the reduction in the size of the extension from previous schemes has now reduced the impact on the neighbouring property to an acceptable level. This amended proposal, in officers' view, has also addressed the Inspector's concerns. The arguments in favour of the scheme are now considered to be stronger than those against. It is officers' view that the development would not cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring living conditions in term of outlook and sense of enclosure.

3.12 In terms of sunlight, the proposed extension is located on the northern side of No.4 and is a sufficient distance away from No.2 so as not to cause significant and unacceptable harm to the level of sunlight that these neighbouring properties receive.

3.13 In terms of daylight, it is acknowledged that the Inspector dismissed the Council's concerns in regards to the previous 3.5m deep extension. The proposed extension is significantly smaller than the previous extensions, and therefore would have a reduced impact in terms of daylight. Since the submission of the planning application Officers have received a revised sunlight and daylight test that includes updates VSC calculations and amended drawings that have redrawn the neighbour's window, its opening style and size. The report shows that the neighbouring bedroom window would retain 88% of its existing VSC. No objection is therefore raised on this matter.

3.14 In terms of privacy, the proposed balcony and windows would experience similar views as existing openings. These views would primarily be of the neighbouring gardens rather than of neighbouring windows (except possibly of the rear garden studio) and would not be sufficiently detrimental to neighbouring living conditions to justify the refusal of planning permission. The balcony/terrace, given its small size, would not be able to hold a significant number of people. As such it is unlikely to generate significant noise disturbance. It should be noted that a similar balcony and proposed extension formed part of the previously refused, dismissed at appeal planning application. Neither the Council nor the Inspector raised objection to the proposed balcony's impact on neighbouring living conditions. The proposed terrace would therefore have an acceptable impact on neighbouring living conditions. The proposal complies with Development Management Local Plan (2013) policy DM A9.

IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS - CONSERVATION AREA AND LISTED BUILDING(S)

3.15 It is key to the assessment of these applications that the decision making process is based on the understanding of specific duties in relation to listed buildings and Conservation Areas required by the relevant legislation, particularly the Section 16, 66 and Section 72 duties of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 set out below together with the requirements set out in the NPPF. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states in relation to listed buildings that:

'In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the [listed] building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

3.16 A similar statutory duty in section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act applies to the determination of planning applications. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that: 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

3.17 Section 72 of the above Act states in relation to Conservation Area that: 'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

3.18 Paragraph 129 of the NPPF requires planning authorities to assess the significance of any heritage assets affected by development proposal, including their effect on their setting. This assessment shall be taken 'into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal' (para 129 of the NPPF).

3.19 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that:

"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional."

3.20 Core Strategy Policy BE1 'Built Environment' states that all development within the borough, including in the regeneration areas should create a high quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context and heritage assets. DM LP Policy DM G3 states that the council will require a high standard of design in all alterations and extensions to existing buildings. They are required to be compatible with the scale and character of existing development, their neighbours and their setting and should successfully integrated into the architectural design of the existing building. DM LP Policy DM G7 seeks to protect, restore or enhance the quality, character, appearance and setting of the borough's heritage assets. Policies within Planning Guidance SPD (2013) provide greater detail on the application of the policies set out in the Core Strategy (2011) and Development Management Local Plan (2013).

3.21 The previous planning applications (2014/02131/FUL & 2014/05968/FUL) and listed building consent applications (2014/02132/LBC & 2014/05969/LBC) were all considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. For reference, the most recent appeal decision (APP/H5390/D/15/3038210) in connection with planning application (2014/05968/FUL) concluded the following:

"The appeal building is a Grade II listed building within the St Peter's Square Conservation Area. Listed building consent has been approved for works by the Council who found that the proposal would not cause harm to the special architectural or historic interest of the building. I see no reason to take a contrary position in respect of my duties under Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended, with regard to the listed building or the conservation area."

3.22 The extension would have centrally located steps that would lead from the terrace/balcony to the garden. On the rear elevation of the rear extension three sets of timber framed French doors at ground floor level and three timber framed sash windows at lower ground floor level are proposed. The external wall of the extension would match the existing building i.e. painted sand and cement render with ashlar coursing lines. The proposed design of the extension, which includes its fenestration and materials as well as that of the balcony, are the same as previously proposed. The most significant

difference between the previous application and this current submission is the reduction in depth of the extension.

3.23 The report will now briefly identify the significance of each heritage asset and then proceed to consider the developments impact on the significance of that asset.

ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE ASSETS

3.24 LISTED BUILDING

The statutory list entry for the Grade II listed Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square dates from 1985 and is relatively short, as was normal for the time:

"Terrace of houses, arranged as two linked trios. c 1825-30. Stucco. 3 storeys and basement. Each house three windows wide. Centre house in each trio recessed, with projecting Ionic colonnade to ground floor, with iron balustrade over. Houses to either side with two bays projecting beneath pediment and outermost bays recessed with projecting Ionic porches. Balconies over with tented canopies. String courses between storeys; cornice and blocking course. Windows square headed, sashed except for ground floor, with French windows opening onto balconies with iron balustrades. Glazing bars mostly retained. Nos 1 and 3 with one bay extensions. Part of coherent scheme with Nos 7 to 19, 22 to 39 and 44 to 46 consec."

No. 3 St Peter's Square forms part of a unified scheme of houses, built in groups of three, with a single symmetrical façade, each house being three windows wide to give the scale and appearance of a large detached villa. Later extensions have infilled the gap between the two groups which form Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square.

3.25 LISTED BUILDING SETTING AND SETTINGS OF OTHER LISTED BUILDINGS INCLUDING TERRACE AT Nos. 1-6 ST PETER'S SQUARE

At the front of the building the wider setting is formed by the other buildings enclosing the central garden in St Peter's Square. At the rear of the building the wider setting is formed by the buildings within the street block formed by St Peter's Square, Black Lion Lane and St Peter's Villas including the other Grade II listed buildings around St Peter's Square and the Grade II listed buildings at Nos. 79-87 Black Lion Lane and Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Villas. On the east side of St Peter's Square the gaps between houses have been eroded by incremental extensions since the properties were built and many houses have been extended to the rear. The extension would be seen from a limited range of vantage points in the context of both the original groups of three houses and their later extensions, together with the rear elevations of properties in Black Lion Lane.

3.26 CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE CONSERVATION AREA

St Peter's Square Conservation Area consists of a nineteenth century predominantly residential speculative development which originally stretched from King Street to Hammersmith Terrace. Within the conservation area there is a variety in scale, form and architectural style. St Peter's Square itself forms the centrepiece of the conservation area with tall stuccoed houses, three storey over semi-basement overlooking a central garden square. Of a grand scale and proportions, the uniform materials and design provide a homogenous and impressive townscape with a strong sense of place. The Square has a strong feeling of enclosure created by the height of

the facades and the uniform building line which is strengthened in places by the remaining linking screen walls.

3.27 REGISTERED HISTORIC PARK AND GARDEN

The rectangular public garden at the centre of St Peter's Square was laid out between 1825 and 1830 by J. C. Loudon and forms the focal point for the residential development laid out around it. Originally the garden was private, but was bought by the local authority and opened as a public garden in 1915. The garden is included on Historic England's Register of Historic Park and Gardens at Grade II and forms the setting for the houses built around it. Registered Historic Parks and Gardens are defined as designated heritage assets in the NPPF. The garden forms one element of Loudon's planned hierarchy of landscape in the residential development around the square which also includes front and rear gardens.

3.28 ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE ASSETS - REAR EXTENSION TO LISTED BUILDING

The proposed extension's scale, height and massing are in keeping with the established built form along this side of St. Peter's Square. For example, Nos. 2 and 5 have extensions of a similar depth and height. A substantial part of the original rear elevation of the property would remain unaltered and unobscured, ensuring that the extension would not dominate the original parent building. The use of materials and the detailed design of the extension are in keeping with the character and appearance of the listed building. Officers consider that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the listed building.

3.29 LISTED BUILDING SETTING AND SETTINGS OF OTHER LISTED BUILDINGS INCLUDING TERRACE AT Nos. 1-6 ST PETER'S SQUARE

The inconsistent rear building line created by more than a century of incremental extensions to the rear of the properties on the east side of St Peter's Square including the extension to the subject property and the modest 2.5m depth of the proposed extension has lead Officers to consider that the development would not harm the setting of the listed building at No. 3 St Peter's Square, nor would it harm the setting of adjacent listed buildings including Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square.

3.30 CONSERVATION AREA

The development would result in a minor change to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which would not be visible from the street and which would not cause harm to its character or appearance. The proposed extension would be subservient to the main house and would leave a significant proportion of the rear elevation unobscured, particularly at high level where it is most visible from surrounding properties. The rear building line and footprint of the extension would not cause unacceptable loss of rear garden space. Officers consider that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

3.31 REGISTERED HISTORIC PARK AND GARDEN

Officers consider that the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden would not be harmed since the proposed development would be at the rear of the building and

would not be seen from within the garden at the centre of St Peter's Square or in conjunction with it. The traditional hierarchy of landscape would not be harmed.

3.32 ASSESSMENT ON SIGNIFICANCE OF LISTED BUILDING - INTERNAL WORKS

Internally, the only significant difference from the schemes previously granted listed building consent that remains extant is that a dividing partition wall at lower ground floor level within the proposed rear extension is no longer proposed and that there would now be a door from the previous Victorian extension into the proposed extension at lower ground floor level. Given that both alterations are minor and would not affect the original plan form of the property or any significant historical features, the proposed variations are considered to be acceptable, and would not cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

3.33 Internal works that already benefit from listed building consent (ref: 2014/02131/LBC, approved 01/08/2014) but are shown on submitted drawings include the demolition of part of the non-original rear wall at ground floor level, blocking up two internalised windows on non-original rear wall at lower ground floor level, insertion of new door into rear kitchen from corridor at lower ground floor level and insertion of faux/jib door and serving hatch with faux/jib door between dining room and existing study (proposed to become a kitchen) at ground floor level.

3.34 The section of the rear elevation at lower ground floor level that is to be demolished is not original and is likely to date from the late nineteenth/early twentieth century and is of lesser significance. Its demolition, especially in light of the improvements to the layout of the unit, is not considered to have a significant impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. The blocking up of the windows at lower ground floor level is not considered harmful due to their small size, lack of relationship with the historic fenestration of the property and due to them being non-original and of lower significance. The proposed single door opening at lower ground floor level is not harmful due to its appropriate design, size and location. The faux/jib doors will ensure that the room layout and form is retained ensuring that the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

CONCLUSION - IMPACT ON SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE ASSETS

3.35 On balance Officers consider that the proposals would preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural interest of the listed building; would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; would preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square and would preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. The proposal complies with Core Strategy policy (2011) BE1, Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM G3, DM G5 and DM G7 and Planning Guidance SPD Design Policies 31, 34, 61 and 62. The proposal is also compliant with the NPPF, in particular paras 132 and 134.

IMPACT ON TREE

3.36 The proposed extension would not undermine the green appearance of the borough as the proposed extension would only occupy a small area of the original garden. A poor quality pear tree located immediately on the boundary is likely to be

harmful by the proposed development. However, this tree is not of significant visual amenity value and therefore no objection is recommended to be raised. The proposal complies with DMLP (2013) policy DM E4.

ACCESSIBLE HOUSING

3.37 The applicant's Design and Access Statement states the desire to make the building a 'life time home'. The legend to Plan P216 Rev.E states 'Lifetime Homes arrangement for single floor living'. Policy DM A4 of the DMLP (2013) relates to accessible housing, but this policy only applies to new residential units rather than extensions to existing residential units. In addition, it is noted that the proposed extension would still not make the property lifetime homes compliant (if that was the intention), due to the bathroom not meeting minimum size recommendations and the fact that the property does not have level access from the street. Nevertheless, the proposed development may allow the occupants of the property to live in the property for a longer period of time due to the alterations being more suitable for their personal needs.

FLOODING

3.38 This site is in the EA's Flood Zone 2 and 3 which indicates a high risk to flooding from the Thames, although this does not take into account the high level of protection provided by the Thames Barrier and local river wall defences. If these failed, EA modelling shows that the site is not in an area that could be impacted by rapid inundation of flood waters. The site is not in a flooding hotspot in terms of surface water flood risk, although there are other locations around St Peter's Square where an intense storm could cause some flooding, most likely in basement areas at the front of properties. Sewer flooding is also a known issue in the borough. As required, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been provided with the application. Condition 9 is recommended to secure further detail. Subject to this condition it is considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on flooding or flood risk.

4.0 CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION


4.1 On balance Officers consider that the proposals would preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; would preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and would preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity provided by trees. The proposed extension would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring living conditions. The impact of the development on flooding could be mitigated through condition. The application complies with Core Strategy policy (2011) BE1; Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM A9, DM E4, DM G3, DM G5, DM G7, DM H3 and DM H9; Planning Guidance SPD Design Policies 31, 34, 61 and 62; London Plan (2015) policy 5.13 and the NPPF including para 132.

4.2 It is therefore recommended that planning permission and Listed Building Consent be granted.

Ward: Ravenscourt Park

Site Address:

3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB



© Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. London Borough Hammersmith and Fulham LA100019223 (2013).

For identification purposes only - do not scale.

Reg. No:
2015/01358/LBC

Case Officer:
Barry Valentine

Date Valid:
23.03.2015

Conservation Area:
St. Peter's Square Conservation Area - Number 1

Committee Date:
12.01.2016

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs R Nott
3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB

Description:

Erection of a rear extension at lower ground and upper ground floor; including the creation of a balcony at upper ground floor level and the erection of an external staircase from upper ground floor level to lower ground floor level; excavation of part of the rear garden in connection with the enlargement of the lower ground floor level, including associated landscaping and new trellis. Internal alterations to lower ground floor level includes bricking up of window to the utility room to the rear elevation; replacement of timber floor in the spare room with solid concrete floor; installation of folding partitions; removal of existing kitchen; installation of gas log fire; creation of a new door opening and reinstatement of original door. Internal alterations to upper ground floor level includes removal of existing wall between new kitchen and living room; creation of a new door opening in the existing wall between the study and dining room, installation a jib door and installation of a new serving hatch with jib door. Internal alterations to first floor bathroom include removal of cupboards and alteration of layout. Drg Nos: P210 Rev E, P211 Rev E, P212 Rev E, P213 Rev E, P214 Rev E, P215 Rev E, P216 Rev E, P217 Rev E.
P210 Rev E, P211 Rev E, P212 Rev E, P213 Rev E, P214 Rev E,

Application Type:

Listed Building Consent

Officer Recommendation:

That the application be approved subject to the condition(s) set out below:

- 1) The works hereby granted consent shall not commence later than the expiration of 3 years beginning with the date upon which this consent is granted.

Condition required to be imposed by Section 18(1) (a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by section 91 of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004).

- 2) The works hereby approved are only those specifically stated in the written description and indicated on the approved drawing numbers outlined above.

In order to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 3) All new windows and doors hereby approved to the rear elevation shall be timber framed and painted white and thereafter permanently retained in this form.

In order to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserve the settings of the adjacent

listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3, DM G5 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 4) The development shall be finished in painted sand and cement render with ashlar coursing lines to match the existing.

In order to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 5) Following completion of the works hereby approved walls, skirtings, floors and ceilings shall be repaired to match existing and shall be so maintained.

In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building, in accordance with Development Management Local Plan (2013) policy DM G7, and Core Strategy (2011) policy BE1.

- 6) Any replacement rainwater goods installed shall be cast aluminium painted black, and thereafter permanently retained in this form.

In order to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 7) The new wrought ironing balcony and railings shall match the existing metal railings on the rear elevation and shall be painted black, and thereafter permanently retained in this form.

In order to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 8) The proposed balcony hereby approved shall not be used until the raising of the existing garden wall on the boundary with No.4 St Peter's Square, as shown on drawing No.P214 Rev.D is completed and constructed in London stock bricks to match the existing facing brickwork in terms of colour, texture, bonding, pointing and mortar colour. The works shall thereafter be permanently retained in this form.

In order to preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, in accordance with policies outlined in the Development Management Local Plan (2013) in particular policies DM G3 and DM G7 and policies outlined in the Core Strategy (2011) in particular policy BE1.

- 9) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until detailed drawings of all new windows, including opening style, and doors in plan, section and elevation at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved drawings, and permanently retained as such thereafter.

In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building, in accordance with Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM G3, DM G5 and DM G7 and Core Strategy (2011) policy BE1.

- 10) Prior to commencement of the development, details of the internal elevations of the two storey rear extension in plan, section and elevation at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Council. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter permanently maintained in this form.

In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building, in accordance with Development Management Local Plan (2013) policy DM G7, and Core Strategy (2011) policy BE1.

Justification for Approving the Application:

- 1) On balance Officers consider that the proposals would preserve the character, appearance, setting and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings including the terrace at Nos. 1-6 St Peter's Square which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and preserve the setting of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. In this respect the proposal is considered to comply with Core Strategy (2001) policy BE1; Development Management Local Plan (2013) policies DM G3, DM G5 and DM G7; Planning Guidance SPD Design Policies 31, 34, 61 and 62; London Plan (2015) policy 5.13 and the NPPF including para 132.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

All Background Papers held by Andrew Marshall (Ext: 3340):

Application form received: 20th March 2015
Drawing Nos: see above

Policy documents: National Planning Policy Framework 2012
 The London Plan 2011 and Revised Early Minor Alterations to The London Plan, 2013
 Core Strategy 2011
 The Development Management Local Plan 2013
 Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document July 2013

Consultation Comments:

Comments from:	Dated:
Historic England London Region	09.06.15
Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group	16.04.15
Historic England London Region	16.07.15

Neighbour Comments:

Letters from:	Dated:
16A St Peters Square, London W6 9AJ	29.04.15
397 Goldhawk Road London W6 0SA	16.04.15
49 Black Lion Lane London W6 9 BG	11.04.15
53 Black Lion Lane London W6 9BG	16.04.15
53 Black Lion Lane London W6 9BG	28.04.15
58 Black Lion Lane London W6 9BE	28.04.15
6 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	04.05.15
4 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	25.04.15
Nag	28.04.15
30 St. Peter's Square London W6 9UH	24.04.15
130A Devonshire Road, W4 2AW	03.05.15
Nag	01.05.15
Flat 5 Albion House, 39 St Peter's Square, London W6 9NN	30.05.15
14 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	01.05.15
8 St Peters Square Hammersmith London W6 9AB	02.05.15
9 St Peters Square Hammersmith London W6 AB	02.05.15
3 St Peter's Square London W6 9AB	09.06.15

Please see Officers' report for planning application 2015/01357/FUL