

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Wednesday 5 May 2021

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

2. **ROLL-CALL AND DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Councillors: Colin Aherne, Wesley Harcourt, Rebecca Harvey, Alex Karmel, Rachel Leighton (Chair), Natalia Perez, Asif Siddique and Matt Thorley

For transparency, Councillor Alex Karmel confirmed that he knew one or more of the objectors. As he considered this would not prejudice his vote, he remained in the meeting and voted on the item.

3. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2021 were agreed.

4. **32A VEREKER ROAD, LONDON, W14 9JS, NORTH END, 2020/01112/FUL**

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

For transparency, Councillor Alex Karmel confirmed that he knew one or more of the objectors. As he considered this would not prejudice his vote, he remained in the meeting and voted on the item.

The Committee heard representations from two objectors to the application. The Committee also heard a representation in support of the application from the Applicant.

In the course of discussions, Councillor Alex Karmel proposed that the Committee declined to determine the application. This was seconded by Councillor Matt Thorley. Before a vote took place on this proposal, Councillor Alex Karmel recused himself at 8:38 pm for the remainder of the meeting.

The Committee voted on the proposal to decline to determine the application as follows

For:

1

Against:

6

The Committee voted on the proposal to approve application 2020/0112/FUL as follows:

For:

2

Against:

4

Not Voting:

1

The Committee voted on the four reasons to refuse application 2020/0112/FUL as follows:

1. That application 2020/0112/FUL be refused as it would offer sub-standard living accommodation:

For:

5

Against:

0

Not Voting:

2

2. That application 2020/0112/FUL be refused as it would generate light pollution and light nuisance:

For:

5

Against:

0

Not Voting:

2

3. That application 2020/0112/FUL be refused as it would generate noise pollution from any open roof lights:

For:

5

Against:

0

Not Voting:

2

4. That application 2020/0112/FUL be refused due to an insufficient construction method statement.

For:
5
Against:
0
Not Voting:
2

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2020/0112/FUL be refused for the reasons set out above.

Meeting started: 6:30 pm
Meeting ended: 9:45 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Charles Francis
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
Tel 07776 672945
E-mail: charles.francis@lbhf.gov.uk

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

REF.	ADDRESS	WARD	PAGE
2020/01112/FUL	32A Vereker Road	North End	
Page 14	After last paragraph, add paragraph: "7. Environmental Quality Potentially contaminative land uses (past or present) have been identified at, and or, near to this site. The applicant is advised to contact the Council should any unexpected staining or malodours be encountered during the redevelopment either on or within floor/ground materials."		
Page 18	After paragraph 1.21, add paragraph: "In September 2020, the Planning and Development Control Committee refused planning permission (2020/01566/FUL) for the replacement of existing roof with new raised mansard roof to be no greater than the existing ridge line, with rooflights; excavation of the basement to provide accommodation at lower ground floor in connection with an existing residential unit; Repairs to the brickwork, parapet and doorway portico and replacement of the existing window with double glazing and replacement of front door to Fairholme Road. The application was refused on the grounds of substandard levels of residential accommodation for future occupiers, by reason of insufficient levels of sunlight and daylight to the living accommodation at basement and lack of ventilation to the kitchen".		
Page 20	Paragraph 2.2, after point 3, insert new paragraph "4. Four late letters of objection, two of which were from a previous objector, including a response to the officer report, however no new issues were raised and all issues are summarised within the table beginning on page 20."		
Page 34	Paragraph 3.33: Delete last sentence and replace with: "Given the location and scale of the proposed development at the front of the building and the obscured views of the rooflights which are also small in scale, the proposed scheme would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a heritage asset overall. The scale of harm would be to the lowest end of the scale of less than substantial harm."		
Page 34	Delete paragraph 3.34.		
Page 35	Add the following to the beginning of paragraph 3.36: "The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider Barons Court conservation area which it is desirable to preserve in accordance with s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The less than substantial harm has been identified in relation of the introduction of additional rooflights within the southern roofscape of the development. Elsewhere, there is no additional harm to the character and appearance of the property and the conservation area. Officers therefore consider that this very minor harm which would be outweighed by public benefits. These benefits include the repair/restoration of the Fairholme Road elevations of the property; which will enhance the character and appearance of the building and the conservation area." And within the third line, delete: "in providing extended, modernised accommodation"		