

# Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Tuesday 20 March 2018

## PRESENT

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

**Others:** Councillor Donald Johnson

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Cartwright.

### 2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Adam Connell declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Fulham Cross School as his partner was a Director (School Governor) of Fulham College Academy Trust. He had not discussed the application with them. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Alex Karmel declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as he had friends which lived on Ravenscourt Road. He had not discussed the application with them. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Alex Karmel declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Fulham Football Club. As a local resident he had received free tickets to a match at Craven Cottage. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Lucy Ivimy declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew one of the objectors. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Jacqueline Borland declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew an objector but had not

discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Viya Nsumbu declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew one of the objectors but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

### **3 DECISION TO RE-ORDER 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.

At the start of the meeting, Committee was informed Councillor Michael Cartwright had provided his apologies for absence as he was unwell. The Committee noted this was his last Planning and Development Control Committee meeting and thanked him for his input to the Committee over the last twenty-four years.

### **4 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches, Ravenscourt Place, London W6 0UQ, Ravenscourt Park 2017/03835/FUL**

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which made minor changes to the report.

Councillor Alex Karmel declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as he had friends which lived on Ravenscourt Road. He had not discussed the application with them. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Lucy Ivimy declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew one of the objectors. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Jacqueline Borland declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew an objector but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Viya Nsumbu declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew one of the objectors but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

The Committee heard a representation in objection to the application from a local resident. Some of the points raised included: The proposal was located in a conservation area and data provided by the applicant in support of the proposal, was flawed, as the Vauxhall Bridge location was dissimilar to the proposed residential location. Customer numbers would be higher than those stated by the

applicant and there would be greater noise, nuisance and disturbance to local residents, especially at weekends. The hours of operation were not suitable for a residential location. The proposal would have a negative impact on the highway and cause parking stress locally. Residents had not had a fair opportunity to be heard and should the application be approved, it would be an example of bias to the applicant.

The Committee heard a representation in support of the application by the Centre Manager. Some of the points raised included: The proposal had been refined since the February 2018 meeting and steps had been taken to engage with a local residents' spokesperson. Noting the comments at the previous meeting, the entrance had been changed from Ravenscourt Place to Ravenscourt Road. No single day events would be held and no alcohol would be sold. Amplified music would not be played. The proposed hours of operation had been amended so that on week days, the centre would close at 10:30 pm. The start time in the mornings was not unreasonable as many local gyms opened at 06:00 am. It was anticipated that regular residents' events would be held and it was hoped the Committee would make a decision at the meeting as delays were proving costly.

The Committee considered the consultation which had been undertaken since February and noted the discord between residents and the applicant. On balance, the Committee felt there needed to be adequate time for further consultation to be undertaken by the applicant before a decision could be made by the Committee. The Committee welcomed the significant steps the applicant had taken in relation to amended access but thought the associated travel plans were optimistic.

Councillor Colin Aherne proposed that the application be deferred to enable further consultation with residents to be conducted. This was seconded by Councillor Lucy Ivimy.

The Committee voted on application 2017/03835/FUL and whether to defer the item to a future Committee meeting. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:  
8  
Against:  
1  
Not Voting:  
0

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/03835/FUL be deferred to a future Committee meeting.

**Fulham Football Club Stevenage Road London SW6 6HH Road,  
Palace Riverside 2017/04662/FUL**

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

Councillor Alex Karmel declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Fulham Football Club. As a local resident he had received free tickets to a match at Craven Cottage. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Introducing the report, officers confirmed that three late letters of objection had been received from local residents. Officers explained that the Port of London Authority had withdrawn their objection and it was likely, that should the application be approved, a river licence would be granted.

The Committee heard representations in objection to the application from three local residents. Some of the points raised included: The officer report was misleading and the effect the proposal would have on prevailing wind conditions was significant. Should the application be approved, it would prove extremely difficult to sail past the stadium. Contrary to the officer understanding, the Port of London Authority hoped the application was refused. The proposal would result in 200 days of activities throughout the year which would be disruptive to local residents. The riverside walk would be closed on match days and on the event days which meant it would be closed to residents for the majority of the time. The proposal would result in increased noise and disruption and affect the local park.

The Committee heard a representation in support from the Applicant. Some of the points raised included: The football ground was part of the fabric of the local area. During the consultation phase, 95% of respondents had stated that they wished the Club to remain at Craven Cottage. The Club had ambitions for promotion and expansion / commercial development was necessary. The Club was keen to create a destination and waterfront front attraction which could be enjoyed by supporters and local residents. The current proposal was different to the one which was submitted in 2013 and had less impact on local wind conditions. The proposed riverside walkway would enhance and connect the Thames Path. The Club accepted the proposal would affect local residents and park users and was committed to taking mitigating actions through s106 contributions.

Councillor Donald Johnson spoke as a ward Councillor. Some of the points raised included: The non match day commercial activity proposals had been submitted at the latest possible opportunity. Up to 200 events for up to 5,000 people would have a detrimental effect on the local area. He had attended one of the Clubs consultation events on 19 December 2017 and had been informed that there were no significant plans for commercial events. The Saudi Super Cup in 2014 was cited as an example of a poorly managed commercial event and how this could have a negative impact on local residents. Further concerns were raised about traffic impacts and the effect on blue light response times and the impact on Bishops Park. Closing his remarks, he stated that the riverside walk should remain open and that ideally, the application should be deferred for further consultation including the transport management plan.

The Committee considered the commercial proposals and the 200 events per year which were anticipated. Concerns were expressed about the potential level of disruption to local residents and in particular widespread use of taxis to attend events. In response, officers confirmed that although the maximum attendance at an event was 5,000, the majority of events would be for 500 persons only. The committee noted that during the construction phase, part of Bishops Park would remain closed to the public for up to 32 months. Further topics that were discussed included the closure of the river walk on match and activity days, the need to maintain a historic club, cycle routes / transport links, the effect of the proposal on car parking locally and the design proposals.

In the course of discussions, Councillor Iain Cassidy proposed that the review of parking zones include zones T and W as well as X and Y. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Colin Aherne. The Chair, Councillor Adam Connell, proposed a limitation on the number of large scale events which could be held in Bishops Park to 10 per year. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Alex Karmel.

Officer's explained that Bishop's Park was outside the red line and it was not proposed to hold events in Bishop's Park and this restriction would not be necessary.

The Committee considered the possible effects of the proposal on prevailing wind conditions and officers explained that having reviewed the data supplied by an independent expert, the Port of London Authority had decided to withdraw their objections. Members also explored the use of the commercial space and whether noise restrictions could be imposed. Councillor Alex Karmel proposed that delegated authority be granted to officers to word an appropriate noise condition, limiting the decibels at the stadium during commercial activities. This was seconded by Councillor Lucy Ivimy.

Members discussed the pace trails across Bishops Park stemming from the proposed large scale events and how these were set to worsen over time. Councillor Karmel proposed that the Head of Terms of the s106 Agreement be amended to include a review of the condition of Bishops Park to be held every 10 years to determine whether ongoing maintenance was still required. This was seconded by Councillor Lucy Ivimy.

It was agreed that only one review mechanism is required at the end of the first 10 year period, and no further action be required if it is demonstrated that no harm has occurred.

The Committee voted on application 2017/04662/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendations set out in the report, addendum and the following changes: the motion to include T and W and X and Y in the review of parking zones, amending the Head of Terms to review the mitigation measures to Bishops Park arising from the s106 to after 10 years and for Officers to draft a condition relating to noise arising from special / commercial events. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

7  
Against:  
2  
Not Voting:  
0

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/04662/FUL be approved:

1) Subject to there being no contrary direction from the Mayor for London; that the Committee resolve that the Director of Planning and Development be authorised to determine the application and grant planning permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the planning conditions listed.

2) To authorise the Director for Regeneration, Planning & Housing Services in 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.

**57 Ellerby Street, London SW6 6EU, Palace Riverside 2017/03156/FUL**

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

The Committee heard a representation in objection from a resident. Some of the points raised included: the proposal was contrary to the Design Access Statement and the design incorporated bay windows which had not been added to numbers 53 to 63 Ellerby Street and so would look incongruous. The design did not enhance or preserve the conservation area. The height of the proposed rear extension exceeded 3.3 metres, the height allowed under permitted development. The rear bay window should either be not permitted or conditioned to incorporate obscure glazing to address overlooking and privacy concerns.

During the course of discussions, the Committee explored a number of issues including the 45 degree angle and whether this still applied, the height of the proposed rear extension, which the Committee agreed was overbearing and the incorporation of the bay window. The Committee also considered the overlooking aspects of the bay window design and agreed that should the application be approved; these windows would need to incorporate obscure glazing. Councillor Alex Karmel proposed the condition that the bay window overlooking 59 Ellerby Street should be glazed or fixed shut. This was seconded by Councillor Lucy Ivimy.

The Committee voted on application 2017/03156/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval set out in the report 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 then voted on a motion to refuse the application. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:  
5  
Against:  
4  
Not Voting:  
0

### **RESOLVED THAT:**

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/03156/FUL be refused due to the unneighbourly and overbearing design, the failure to enhance or preserve the conservation area and the height of the rear extension.

### **223-229 Dawes Road, London SW6 7RD, Munster 2017/04441/FUL**

Introducing the report, officers confirmed that amended drawings had been submitted by the applicant which had increased the private amenity space from 6 to 8 metres compared to required 36 metres. In addition, the Applicant had provided marketing information for the proposal for 9 months, compared to the required 12 month period.

The Committee heard a representation in support from the Agent. Some of the points raised included: the Applicant had worked closely with the Council at the pre-application stages and had been led to believe a decision of approval would be made under delegated authority. The proposal enhanced the commercial space. Updated marketing materials had been submitted to the Authority.

Discussing the application, the Committee noted that the proposal was contrary to policies E1 and E2 and that 12 months of marketing materials had not been supplied but were required. The Committee considered that the scheme was overly dense and constituted an over development of the site. In addition, Members asked about the nature of the pre-application advice which had been sought by the Applicant. In response, officers confirmed that all pre-application advice included a caveat which clearly stated that an approval of a planning application was not guaranteed. In this case, officers confirmed after detailed examination of the application had been conducted, the officer recommendation for the application was refusal.

The Committee voted on application 2017/04441/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation set out in the report and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/04441/FUL be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer report and addendum.

**Fulham Cross School, Munster Road, London SW6 6BP, Munster  
2018/00136/FUL**

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

Councillor Adam Connell declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Fulham Cross School as his partner was a Director (School Governor) of Fulham College Academy Trust. He had not discussed the application with them. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

The Committee heard a representation in support from the Executive Principal. Points raised included: The school desperately needed to modernise its gym and science classrooms. The internal layout of the current science lab was poor and the gym was too small for a school of its size. The new gym would improve the sporting facilities of the school and the health and fitness of pupils. The application sought to enhance existing facilities and was not related to a growth in pupil numbers. The proposal would see the removal of a link corridor and modern building techniques would ensure the school became more energy efficient.

The Committee voted on application 2018/00136/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation set out in the report and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2018/00136/FUL be approved for the reasons set out in the Officer report and addendum.



**Land Bounded by 58 Wood Lane And Westway, London W12 7RZ,  
College Park and Old Oak 2017/04276/FUL**

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

The Agent attended but chose to waive his right to speak at the meeting.

The Committee voted on application 2017/04276/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation set out in the report and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/04276/FUL be approved:

1) Subject to there being no contrary direction from the Mayor for London, that the Committee resolve that the Director for Planning & Development be authorised to determine the application and grant permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions listed below;

2) To authorise the Director for Regeneration, Planning & Housing Services in 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.

**M&S White City Site, 54 Wood Lane, London W12 7RQ, College Park  
and Old Oak 2017/04567/RES**

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

The Committee voted on application 2017/04567/RES and whether to agree the officer recommendation set out in the report and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/04567/RES be approved for the reasons set out in the Officer report and addendum.

**5. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2018 and 6 March 2018 were agreed as an accurate record.

In his closing remarks, the Chair expressed his thanks to officers and fellow Committee Members for their support over the last four years.

Meeting started: 7:05 pm  
10:45 pm

Chair .....

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