

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Wednesday 27 July 2016

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair), Colin Aherne, Michael Cartwright, Lucy Ivimy, Robert Largan, Viya Nsumbu and Wesley Harcourt

Other Councillors: Councillor Sue Fennimore

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Control Committee held on 8 June 2016 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adam Connell (Chair), Natalia Perez and Alex Karmel.

8. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

9. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

9.1 Hazel House, Myrtle House, Holme House, Holkham House, Burnham House, Royston House, Suffolk House And Norfolk House, Sulgrave Road, London W6, Addison 2015/05734/FUL

At the start of the meeting, the Vice-Chair explained Mr Slaughter MP was registered to speak and he had used his discretion to allow Mr Slaughter to address the Committee first as he needed to attend a different meeting.

Mr Slaughter MP made a representation against the application. He listed a number of concerns including: lack of consultation by the developer with local residents, building regulations and access to the proposed properties, over development and density of accommodation in the area, lack of affordable housing contribution by the developer and the proposal marginally meeting the minimum standards of acceptable development standards.

The Committee heard a representation in support of the application by the Architect on behalf of the applicant stating that this new application had complied with all of the requests made by the Local Authority. The size and scale of the original scheme had been reduced, two daylight and sunlight studies had been conducted to address right to light concerns, noise concerns would be addressed through the construction.

The Committee heard representations against the application from three residents. They listed a number of concerns including: overdevelopment, saturation of flats in the area, noise and disturbance, right to light, inadequate refuse and cycle storage. Further concerns included: access and how the proposed stairways would be integrated into the scheme, lack of consultation by the developer and not being compliant with the London Plan.

The Committee heard representations against the application from Councillor Sue Fennimore, Ward Councillor for Addison.

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/05734/FUL and the results were as follows:

For: 0
Against: 7
Not Voting: 0

The Committee therefore decided not to agree the Officer's recommendation to approve the application. It was then proposed by Councillor Cassidy and duly seconded that the proposal be refused on the following grounds:

- (i) Density would be too high
- (ii) Inadequate refuse, recycling and cycle storage would be provided
- (iii) Impact on the existing stairway access
- (iv) Design would not preserve or enhance the conservation area
- (v) Noise nuisance to neighbours from the proposed roof terraces
- (vi) Impact on drainage, and lack of sustainable drainage provision

The Committee decided unanimously to agree these reasons for refusal.

RESOLVED THAT:

Planning Application 2015/05734/FUL be refused on the following grounds:

- (i) Density would be too high
- (ii) Inadequate refuse, recycling and cycle storage would be provided
- (iii) Impact on the existing stairway access

- (iv) Design would not preserve or enhance the conservation area
- (v) Noise nuisance to neighbours from the proposed roof terraces
- (vi) Impact on drainage, and lack of sustainable drainage provision

9.2 91- 93 King Street, London W6 9XB, Hammersmith Broadway 2016/00573/FUL

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

The Committee heard representations in support of the application from the agent. Some of the points he raised included the high quality of the design, improved A2 space, the provision of seven new dwellings and good public transport connectivity.

The Committee voted on planning application 2016/00573/FUL and the results were as follows:

For: 7
Against: 0
Not Voting: 0

RESOLVED THAT:

The application 2016/00573/FUL be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and Addendum.

9.3 Site At Junction Of Western Avenue And Old Oak Road,London, Wormholt And White City 2016/02387/FUL

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

The Committee heard representations from the Chairman of the Hammersmith Society. Some of the points he raised included the design incorporated some art deco elements evoking the buildings past, the design and materials were suitable for its location and the welcomed use of angled windows on the north elevation to Westway. He added that occupants should be granted access to the garden.

The Committee heard representations in support of the application from the Architect. Some of the points he raised included the high quality of the design, the close dialogue with the Local Authority throughout the Planning process, the reduction in scale and height of the proposal, the ground floor had been raised as requested.

The Committee voted on planning application 2016/02387/FUL and the results were as follows:

For: 7
Against: 0
Not Voting: 0

The Committee therefore decided to agree the Officer's recommendation to approve the application.

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2016/02387/FUL be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report an Addendum and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm

Meeting ended: 9.25 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Charles Francis
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
Tel 020 8753 2062
E-mail: charles.francis@lbhf.gov.uk

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 27.07.2016

Reg ref:	Address	Ward	Page
2015/05734/FUL	Hazel House, Myrtle House, Holme House, Burnham House, Royston House, Suffolk House, and Norfolk House, Sulgrave Road, W6	Addison	9
Page 12	Condition 11., line 2: After 'of the proposed' add '1.7 m high'		
Page 13	Reason for condition 13. After 'development site' add 'adjoining premises'		
Page 16	Add letter from: flat 6, Holme House, Sulgrave Road, W6		
	A further objection and commentary have been received from a resident at 2 Eric House – no new planning issues have been raised that have not already been addressed in the officers' report.		
Page 16	Para 1.1, line 1: replace 'east' with 'west'		
Page 23	Para 3.23, line 8; after 'Percy House' add 'Irene House'		
2016/00573/FUL	91 - 93 King Street W6 9XB	Hammersmith Broadway	32
Page 33	Drg Nos.: Replace 011 (Rev.D) with (Rev.E); 013 (Rev.D) with (Rev.E); 014 (Rev.C) with (Rev.D); 030 (Rev.C) with (Rev.D); 031 (Rev.C) with (Rev.D); 030 (Rev.E) with (Rev.F); 040 (Rev.G) with (Rev.H); 041 (Rev.F) with (Rev.G) and 042 (Rev.F) with (Rev.G).		
	Condition 2 – change drawing numbers to be the same as in Drg Nos.		
Page 38	Condition 24, line 1: After 'until a' add 'sustainable'		
Page 43	Consultation Comments – Delete 'Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group'		
Page 55	Para 3.51, line 4: Delete 'close proximity to'		
Page 60	Para 3.79, lines 1 and 2: Delete 'planning application' and replace with 'application property'; delete 'in an' and replace with 'adjacent to'		
2016/02387/FUL	Site at Junction of Western Avenue and Old Oak Road	Wormholt and White City	63
Page 64	Drwg nos. and condition 2: replace 200B to 207B inclusive with 200C to 207C inclusive.		
Page 64	Add an additional condition (no.40) as follows:		

'Details of the methods proposed to identify any television interference caused by the proposed development, including during the construction process, and the measures proposed to ensure that television interference that might be identified is remediated in a satisfactory manner shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved remediation measures shall be implemented immediately that any television interference is identified.

To ensure that television interference caused by the development is remediated, in accordance with Policy 7.7 of The London Plan 2016, Policy BE1 CC4 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DM G1 and DM G2 of the Development Management Local Plan 2013'.

- Page 81** An objection has been received from 147 Braybrook Street. Access matters raised have been addressed in the report. The impact of the proposal on pedestrian crossing routes at the A40 is critical is a matter for TfL, who have not raised this as an issue.
- Page 82** Ealing Civic Society have commented by letter dated July 22nd. They say that a number of amendments have been made to the proposal which largely address their concerns about mass and bulk in earlier applications for this landmark site. They say that in the light of this, they have no comments to make on the application.
- Page 83** Add the following to the end of para 2.11. 'HAFAD have recently met with the developers to discuss accessibility arrangements for the scheme. Following minor revisions to the proposed floorplans to incorporate refuges for people who use wheelchairs, HAFAD have no objection to the proposed development.'
- Page 91** Delete para 3.38 and replace it with the following para: ' The Hammersmith & Fulham Disability Forum have considered the proposed development and, following minor revisions to the floorplans, have no objections to the proposed development. '
- Page 103** Para 3.99 Heads of Terms. Add an additional head of terms as follows: 'The applicant to enter discussions with TfL to secure the adoption of the strip of land at the north of the site, for use as part of the cycle super highway network'.
-