

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Tuesday 10 October 2017

PRESENT

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

Other Councillors: Councillors Guy Vincent and Cllr Ben Coleman

9. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Cartwright.

10. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

11. DECISION TO REORDER THE AGENDA

In view of members of the public present for particular applications the Chair proposed that the agenda be re-ordered, with which the Committee agreed, and the minutes reflect the order of the meeting.

12. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

12.1 Palco House, 11-21 Beavor Lane, London W6 9AR, Ravenscourt Park 2017/01571/VAR

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

The Committee heard a representation in objection to the application by two residents. Some of the points raised included: the reasons for the original condition remained in place and should still apply. The application was made before the majority of new homes were occupied so this minimised the number of comments from concerned residents. The officers' report was misleading as the diagrams

were from a 2013 application and did not reflect the current position and contrary to the report, there was parking stress in the area. The increase in night time traffic would cause noise, nuisance and air pollution and comments from immediate neighbours had not been included in the officer report. Further concerns were raised about a commercial bin which had not been moved despite requests from residents, smoking, littering and continual light pollution if the application were approved.

The Committee heard a representation from the Applicant. Some of the points raised included: OMNI Group was one of the largest employers in the Borough. The rationale behind the removal of condition 18 was that the business needed to operate outside core working hours to service the hotel and hospitality sectors. The business already asked staff to be considerate so that the amenity of neighbours was not affected. The applicant explained he was willing to accept restrictions to the conditions limiting staff numbers and deliveries to the site should the application be granted.

The Committee voted on application 2017/01571/VAR and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
0
Against:
9
Not Voting:
0

The Committee voted on a motion to refuse the application. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
9
Against:
0
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED THAT:

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/01571/VAR be refused due to the unacceptable impact on residential amenity—for the reasons for applying the time limitation condition which are set out when permission was granted for the original planning permission.

12.2 North Lodge Hammersmith Cemetery, Margravine Gardens, London W6 8RL, Fulham Reach 2017/02174/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

The Committee heard representations objecting to the application from two residents. Some of the points raised included: allegations that actions had been taken to try and dissuade residents from speaking against the application at the Committee meeting; the use of the flat roof as terrace ; the design was not sympathetic to the street scene and roof lines would be altered within the conservation area which was contrary to policy.

The Committee heard a representations from the Applicant and one resident in support of the scheme. Some of the points raised included: the scheme has a high quality design which would improve the look of the existing building. It was alleged that a campaign of misinformation had been waged against the development to increase opposition to the scheme. There had been no objection from the Applicant's direct neighbour who would be most affected by the proposal.

The Chair stated that the Committee were disappointed to learn about allegations of anonymous letters and smear campaigns in the planning process which the Council condemned and denounced.

Councillor Guy Vincent spoke as a ward Councillor on the proposal. The points he made were: Ward councillors had been working closely with officers and the applicant to try and address some the concerns which had been raised at public meeting. He confirmed that the development of the flat roof was prohibited by condition and the main concern regarding the views from the cemetery was partly addressed by Condition 21 in the addendum. He suggested that at the end of the first sentence of Condition 21, the following might be added:

"Which shall include details of a boundary fence, hedge, wall that conceals the extension from the view of users of Margavine cemetery other than to allow a view from the inside of the widows of the extension"

The amendment to condition 21 as suggested by Cllr Vincent was proposed by Councillor Cassidy, seconded by Councillor Aherne and was agreed by Committee.

The Committee discussed the design of the proposal and impact of it on neighbours at length and the repeated planning applications which had been made for a 5 m basement. The legal officer confirmed that only way the basement could be controlled would be by the use of a legal agreement to curtail its development. Councillor Karmel proposed that should the application be granted, that it be subject for a legal agreement to negotiate between officers and the applicant regarding the basement. This was seconded by Councillor Ivimy and agreed by Committee.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02174/FUL and approve the officer recommendation of approval and the changes set out in the addendum subject to an amendment to condition 21 and a legal agreement.

This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/02174/FUL be approved subject to the Addendum, an amendment to condition 21 and a legal agreement.

12.3 Edith Summerskill House Clem Atlee Court, Lillie Road London SW6 7TD Fulham Broadway 2017/01849/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

The Committee heard a representation in objection to the application by two residents. Some of the points raised included: It was a case of replacing one eyesore with another and the number of dwellings had nearly doubled from 68 to 133. It would adversely affect sunlight, daylight, increase overlooking, adversely affect local infrastructure and there was a lack of access for emergency vehicles. As the council has an interest in the application, it was opportune for it to be as tall as possible. There had been a lack of proper engagement by the council and the developers about the application.

Councillor Ben Coleman spoke as a ward Councillor on the proposal. The points he made were: There were local concerns about the height of the proposal and he asked why it had to be an extra 20 metres tall. Officers explained that this was due to development economics.

The Committee discussed a number of issues. These included: the design, amenity space and foot print of the building. Other issues included the access of emergency vehicles, the effect of the proposal on the local micro climate and heat insulation.

During discussions Councillor Harcourt noted that the c02 footprint failed to meet the 35% reduction target. He proposed that officers be asked to include of a new condition requiring an amended CO2 energy assessment statement. This was seconded by Committee.

Councillor Karmel expressed concerns about the way in which the letters from the GLA (about the proposal) were circulated and that they had not been posted on to the website so they could be viewed by residents.

In the course of discussions Councillor Cassidy noted condition 28 and the points raised about sound insulation. Councillor Cassidy proposed that condition 28 be amended to read “5 decibel attenuation to all rooms”. This was seconded by Committee.

The Committee voted on planning application 2017/01849/FUL and the results were as follows:

For:

5

Against:

4

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/01849/FUL be approved subject to the changes set out in the addendum, the amendment of condition 28 and the inclusion of a new condition requiring an amended CO2 energy assessment statement.

12.4 Watermeadow Court, Watermeadow Lane, London, Sands End 2017/01841/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

There were no registered speakers on the item.

The Committee discussed a number of issues. These included: the height, room density per hectare, amenity space and design including the internal layout of the proposal.

As per the Edith Summerskill discussions, Councillor Harcourt raised the topic of the c02 footprint and its failure to meet the 35% reduction target. He proposed that officers be asked to include of a new condition requiring an amended CO2 energy assessment statement. This was seconded by Committee.

In the course of discussions Councillor Cassidy noted condition 29 and the points raised about sound insulation. Councillor Cassidy proposed that condition 29 be amended to read “5 decibel attenuation to all rooms”. This was seconded by Committee.

Committee discussed the housing mix, percentage of affordable housing and land contamination levels at the site. Councillor Karmel asked officers to provide further information about the extent and levels of contamination at the site and for this to be circulated outside the meeting.

The Committee voted on planning application 2017/01841/FUL and the results were as follows:

For:

5

Against:

4

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/01841/FUL be approved subject to the changes set out in the addendum, the amendment of condition 29 and the inclusion of a new condition requiring an amended CO2 energy assessment statement.

12.5 160-164 Hurlingham Road, London, SW6 3NG, Parsons Green and Walham 2017/02950/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report. Officers reported 6 additional objection letters had been received.

The Committee heard a representation from a representative of the Applicant in support of the scheme. Some of the points raised included: The site was underused and in poor condition both internally and externally. The application sought to enhance the existing employment use and to provide an attractive, sensitive environment which would be modern, sustainable and provide commercial space suitable for a variety of business sizes. At least 380 jobs would be created. The design had been rigorously tested over two years, been through pre-applications three times and the Design Review Panel had been complementary.

The Committee discussed a variety of issues and these included: the design, the implications of the proposal on local traffic conditions, including speeds and volumes and the use of the café site. Councillor Karmel proposed a new condition that should the application be approved then the A1 / A3 use of the café should only be used by employees. This was seconded by Councillor Cassidy and agreed by the Committee.

Further topics which were discussed included: the extent of the development in residential area, the effect on the views in and out of the conservation area and the possible impact of noise and nuisance arising from the use of roof terraces. Councillor Karmel proposed that condition 24 should be amended to, restrict the A1/A3 hours of use from 0730 to 2200 and B1 hours of use from 0730 to 2100. This was seconded by Councillor Harcourt and agreed by the Committee.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02950/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval, the changes set out in the addendum and amendment to condition 24 as set out above. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
3
Against:
6
Not Voting:
0

The Committee voted on a motion to refuse the application. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
8
Against:
1
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED THAT:

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/02950/FUL be refused due to an adverse traffic impact, harm to residential amenity due to noise from the use of the roof terrace, the design and height of the building and harm to the conservation area.

12.6 67 - 69 Aspenlea Road, London W6 8LH, Fulham Reach 2017/02410/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

The Committee heard a representation from a representative of the Applicant in support of the scheme. The main point which was raised was the new application addressed the outstanding concern raised by the Planning Inspectorate and should now be approved.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02410/FUL to approve the officer recommendation and the changes set out in the addendum

For:
9
Against:
0
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/02410/FUL be approved subject to the addendum.

**12.7 Threshold and Union House, 65 Shepherd's Bush Green London W12 8TX
Shepherd's Bush Green 2017/01898/FUL**

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

The Committee heard a representation from a representative of the Applicant in support of the scheme. Some of the points raised were: At the core of the hotel ethos was the use of public space at its base. Hoxtons would be working closely with the Bush theatre and with various arts and culture programmes within the area. Hoxtons were committed to local employment and the hotel would create around 190 jobs.

The Committee voted on application 2017/01898/FUL to approve the officer recommendation and the changes set out in the addendum

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/01898/FUL be approved for the reasons set out in the report and the changes in the addendum.

**12.8 The Triangle (5-17 Hammersmith Grove) And Britannia House (1-11
Glenthorne Road), 3 And 3A Hammersmith Grove And 12-18 Beadon Road,
Hammersmith W6 0LH, Hammersmith Broadway 2017/02717/FUL**

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

The Applicant's representative chose not to speak at the meeting.

The Committee discussed a number of issues. These included: the proposed building line, the height of the building compared to the two opposite, the loss of a building of merit at 3 Hammersmith Grove. Comments included that the scheme had not gone far enough to overcome the reasons for refusal of the appealed scheme.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02717/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
4
Against:
5
Not Voting:
0

The Committee voted on a motion to refuse application 2017/02717/FUL. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
6
Against:
3
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/02717/FUL be refused due height, massing, loss of a building of merit at 3 Hammersmith Grove and views in and out of the conservation area.

13. MINUTES

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes were agreed subject to the following amendments: Palace Wharf, Rainville road, that the application number be corrected, that “members of the public returned at 9:05 (and not the Committee)” and correcting the tense to the past tense so the application was resolved.

Meeting started: 7:00 pm
Meeting ended: 11:42 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 10.10.2017

REG REF.	ADDRESS	WARD	PAGE
2017/01849/FUL	Edith Summerskill House	Fulham Broadway	7
Page 10 Page 31	Condition 7, replace 'staff' with 'resident'. Condition 9 delete 'Car &' Para. 1.7 - Table, change 2b4p (corner) to read 0 19 +19 and 2b4p to read 0 32 +32		
Page 43	Para 3.38 – delete from 'draft...' onward and replace with 'Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance in August 2017.'		
Page 43	Para. 3.39 – replace with:		
<p>Paragraph 2.66 states that London Plan Policy 3.14 and paragraph 3.82 are clear that schemes which include the loss of affordable housing will be required to ensure that existing affordable housing is replaced by better quality accommodation, providing at least the equivalent floor space of affordable housing. The Mayor expects existing affordable housing to be replaced on a like-for-like basis, meaning that, for example, homes at social rent levels should be replaced with homes at the same or similar rent levels, or that specialist types of affordable housing should be replaced with the same type of housing. Paragraph 2.67 states that where a borough is redeveloping an estate as part of a wider programme then it may be possible to re-provide a different mix of affordable housing on the estate, taking account of the wishes of people who want to return to the estate, if the affordable housing is re-provided like-for-like or increased across the programme as a whole. Paragraph 2.58 states that consideration should only be given to off-site provision where an alternative site or sites have been identified which would enable affordable housing provision more appropriate to the identified needs to be met. Para 2.59 states that off-site provision should be held in a separate "affordable housing pot" – where resources can be pooled and ring fenced to enable greater, or more appropriate, new provision to be made off-site, either on an identified site or as part of an agreed programme.</p>			
Page 43	Para 3.42. - Replace third sentence with 'The Site is currently occupied by a vacant building of 18 storeys in height comprising a total of 68 residential units (Class C3), 61 of these are social rented, the balance of 7 being leaseholders under Right to Buy.		
Page 46 Page 47	Para 3.60 to read 18 not 17 social rented units Para. 3.66 - Table, change 2b4p (corner) to read 0 19 +19 and 2b4p to read 0 32 +32		
Page 49	Para. 3.79 first sentence to read 'The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3-4 and this indicates a guideline density range of 200-700 HR/Ha.		
Page 49 Page 65	Para. 3.83 – Table change 2b4p(corner) total to 19 and 2b4p total to 32 Para 3.185 – delete bullet points. Second sentence to read 'A total of 224 Long Stay at mezzanine level with 4 cycle spaces at ground floor and 4 external visitor spaces'		
Page 66	Para. 3.196 – replace first two sentences with 'The edges of the site will be actively and passively overlooked with entrances from the covered arcade area.'		
Page 73	Para. 3.242 – replace first two sentences with 'The proposal in its present form leads to the improvement and provision of planting and as such would be secured by way of the landscaping condition. The indicative proposal for these treatments do provide the planting of a number of trees to the perimeter of the building, with the existing site offering little to no planting or ecological value.'		

Page 78 Para 3.272 – add point to heads of terms ‘prohibition of future residents to obtain parking permits as secured through section 16 of the Greater London (General Powers) Act 1974’

2017/01841/FUL Watermeadow Court Sands End 79

Page 83 Condition 9, replace ‘staff’ with ‘resident’. Condition 10 delete ‘Car &
 Page 98 Add condition (55) requiring the submission and approval of the dimensions of the vehicular lift and headroom of the car park prior to commencement
 Page 104 Para 1.13 – replace ‘mezzanine’ with ‘basement’
 Page 125 Para. 4.40 – delete from ‘draft...’ onward and replace with ‘Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance in August 2017.’
 Page 125 Para. 4.41 – replace with:

Paragraph 2.66 states that London Plan Policy 3.14 and paragraph 3.82 are clear that schemes which include the loss of affordable housing will be required to ensure that existing affordable housing is replaced by better quality accommodation, providing at least the equivalent floor space of affordable housing. The Mayor expects existing affordable housing to be replaced on a like-for-like basis, meaning that, for example, homes at social rent levels should be replaced with homes at the same or similar rent levels, or that specialist types of affordable housing should be replaced with the same type of housing. Paragraph 2.67 states that where a borough is redeveloping an estate as part of a wider programme then it may be possible to re-provide a different mix of affordable housing on the estate, taking account of the wishes of people who want to return to the estate, if the affordable housing is re-provided like-for-like or increased across the programme as a whole. Paragraph 2.58 states that consideration should only be given to off-site provision where an alternative site or sites have been identified which would enable affordable housing provision more appropriate to the identified needs to be met. Para 2.59 states that off-site provision should be held in a separate “affordable housing pot” – where resources can be pooled and ring fenced to enable greater, or more appropriate, new provision to be made off-site, either on an identified site or as part of an agreed programme.

Page 126 Para. 4.50 - £4.3m should read £4m
 Page 126 Para. 4.51 – 106 should read ‘105 social rented units’ and 27 should read ‘28 intermediate rent’
 Page 129 Para. 4.70 – change 17 to 18
 Page 149 Para. 4.206 – delete ‘and at least 2.6m for larger delivery vans and 5m for refuse lorries.’
 Page 163 Para. 4.302 – replace £7.8m with £4m
 Page 164 Para. 304 – to bullet point regarding parking permits add ‘as secured through section 16 of the Greater London (General Powers) Act 1974

2017/02950/FUL 160-164 Hurlingham Road Parsons Green and Walham 165

Page 166 After Officer Recommendation, delete “That the application be approved subject to the condition(s) set out below:” and replace with:

1: That the Committee resolve that the Lead Director for Regeneration Planning and Housing Services be authorised to determine the application and grant permission up on the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the condition(s) set out below.

2) To authorise the Director for Regeneration, Planning and Housing Services after consultation with the Director of Law and the Chair of the

Planning and Development Control Committee to make any minor changes to the proposed conditions or heads of terms of the legal agreement, any such changes shall be within their discretion.

Amend Condition 2) Delete all drawing no.s and replace with P_01A; 02; 03A; 04A; 05A; 06A; 07; 13; 14A; 15; 16; 23; 25; 26; 31, D_01, D_02, D_03, D_13, D_14, D_15, D_16, D_21, D_22, D_23, D_24, D_25, D_26, P_00, P_21A, P_22A, P_24A, P_32, P_33A, P_41A, P_42, P_43A, P_44A, P_45A, P_46, P_53, P_54A, P_55, P_56

Page 168 Amend Condition 13) Add at the end "...unless otherwise shown on the approved drawings."

Page 171 Amend Condition 23) delete "HUR_A_L20_03 Rev 3" and replace with "P_04A, P_05A and P_06A"

Amend Condition 25) delete "residential and"

Page 194 Paragraph 3.49 second line delete "split into two sections".

Paragraph 3.51 first line delete "loading bay" and replace with "a single yellow line now rather than a loading bay/yellow line", and on line four delete "loading bay".

Page 197 Paragraph 3.65, after "following" add "- Workplace Travel Plan with Year 1, Year 3, Year 5 monitoring"

2017/02410/FUL 67 - 69 Aspenlea Road Fulham Reach 199

Page 200 Delete Drawing numbers "pl_52; pl_53; pl_54; pl_62; pl_63" and replace with "pl_52A; pl_53A; pl_54A; pl_62A; pl_63A"
Add Drawing numbers "pl_64A and pl_65A"

**2017/02950/FUL North Lodge Hammersmith Cemetery, Margravine Garden Fulham
Reach 228**

Page 234 Add Condition 20:
The development shall not commence until detailed drawings of the doors and a typical bay on the elevations of the proposed building in plan, section and elevation at a scale of not less than 1:20 to be submitted in writing for the Council's approval prior to construction commencing and built in accordance with the approved drawings. (Reason) To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to prevent harm to the street scene, in accordance with Policies DM G3 and G7 of the Development Management Local Plan 2013, and Policy BE1 of the Core Strategy 2011.

Page 234 Add Condition 21:
The development hereby permitted shall not commence prior to the submission and approval in writing by the Council of details of the proposed boundary facing Margravine Cemetery and no part of the development shall be used or occupied prior to the completion of the boundary in accordance

with the approved details. The approved boundary shall thereafter be retained. (Reason) To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to prevent harm to the street scene, in accordance with Policies DM G3 and G7 of the Development Management Local Plan 2013, and Policy BE1 of the Core Strategy 2011.

2017/01571/VAR Palco House, 11-21 Beavor Lane Ravenscourt Park 247

Page 248

Add: New condition 1 "The development hereby permitted shall not commence later than the expiration of 3 years beginning with the date of this planning permission.

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).

Renumber all other conditions accordingly.

**2017/01898/FUL Threshold and Union House, 65 Shepherds Shepherds Bush Green 262
Bush Green**

2 additional letters of support were received on 9th October 2017, from Bush Theatre, and a resident of Pennard Road.

Page 272: Condition 30: After 2011, add "*And In the interest of air quality, to comply with the requirements of the NPPF, Policies 7.14 a-c of The London Plan (2016), Core Strategy 2011 Policy CC4 and Policy DM H8 of the Development Management Local Plan (2013)*".

2017/02717/FUL The Triangle Hammersmith Broadway 325

Additional consultation responses

Page 351: Add to 2.7:

Resident of Sycamore Gardens:

- Redevelopment is unnecessary
- Will be a significant increase in traffic around Beadon Road and Hammersmith Grove, even after the development is finished.
- The area does not need more office space
- Will cause disruption for probably at least 2 years to an already jammed traffic system in Hammersmith
- The proposed building is too tall, no building should be above 10 stories in this area. Will result in a losing of light, space and character.

Page 352: After 2.9 add:

Brackenbury Residents Association:

- An LBHF planning brief, assembled with public consultation, should have been in place to inform the development discussions.
- Adjacent buildings have set the height datum, promoting a pattern of overdevelopment.
- Not the place for a 'key marker' building which should be in the town centre, not the periphery. Edge-of-centre site should respond to smaller scale of adjacent residential streets, traditional environment, and the assets of the conservation areas.
- Height of proposed building would present a monotonous façade, which would block sky views and create a sense of entrapment, transforming Lyric Square from a recreational space into a forecourt to surrounding high buildings.
- Large vehicular entrance cut into side of the building introduces undisguised service back-door character, impoverishing the pedestrian environment, and unwelcome outlook for residential development opposite.
- Design of the proposed building fills the site close to its boundaries, presenting a mass of relentless form, barely relieved by the stepped façade and balcony landscaping, wrapped in sharp edged metal cladding. This is wholly out of place alongside a suburban high street and Victorian residential area, bringing unchanging, relentlessly repetitive facades in amongst the quirky, varied style of the Hammersmith surroundings.
- Introduction of a set-back to the existing building line on Hammersmith Grove is a welcome concession to urban context, but the dominance of the overall form remains unacceptable.
- These design proposals are not good enough for this important site and the application should be refused.

Page 354: Further to para 2.21 add:

GLA Stage 1 Response:

- Principle of development: The principle of development is supported in accordance with London Plan policy and will deliver qualitative and quantitative improvements to office provision within the town centre. The Council should ensure that the section 106 agreement secures public access to any gallery space delivered. The significant uplift of floorspace is welcome and would significantly improve the offer of Hammersmith Town centre as an office location.
- Urban design: The application complies with London Plan policy on urban design. It is not considered that this proposal would have a negative impact on any of the surrounding areas as the buildings have been designed to respond to the emerging townscape context. Accept that the Building of Merit could not be retained and that replacement development will comprise an exceptional design and will be of arguably greater quality than the existing building.
- Climate Change: The applicant should include further measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and provide further information in relation to heat networks, and future management arrangements in line with London Plan Policy 5.2.
- Transport: Car parking should be reduced in line with London Plan Policy 6.13. Contributions relating to Cycle Hire provision (£110,000), pedestrian crossing facilities and Legible London signage should be secured as well as conditions relating to London Underground infrastructure and construction traffic in line with London Plan policies 6.9 and 6.14.
- Recommendation: That Hammersmith & Fulham Council be advised that whilst the application is broadly acceptable in strategic planning terms, it does not fully comply with the London Plan; but that the possible remedies set out could address these deficiencies.

Page 386:

Delete para 3.166 and replace with:

3.166 The Applicant is expected to agree to enter into a legal agreement with the Council to which would include the following site-specific items (i.e. items which are not on the CIL r123 list):

- A contribution of £110,000 towards the Mayor of London's cycle hire scheme.
- A contribution of £25,000 towards the proposed Cycle Superhighway 9 scheme at the junction of Hammersmith Grove and Beadon Road.
- A contribution of £11,200 towards the additional maintenance of street trees in Hammersmith Grove and Beadon Road.
- A contribution of £20,000 for planting new street trees in Hammersmith Grove.
- Support for employment and training including a contribution of £75,000.
- Payments of £3,000 per travel plan at years 1, 3 and 5 to fund the review of each of the development's travel plans (as required to be submitted by condition Nos.60 and 61).
- A carbon off-set payment of £46,800 (or a different figure in line with the revised Energy Strategy to be submitted in accordance with condition No.22).
- The provision and management of a publicly accessible gallery to be provided on site.
- The provision and management of publicly accessible open space around the building within the site.