

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 18.07.2023

REG REF.	ADDRESS	WARD	PAGE
2022/01953/FUL	Shepherds Bush Police Station, 252/256 Uxbridge Road	White City	8
Page 70	Para 6.8, Point 1, line 2: Delete `,or until any subsequent Local Plan review no longer identifies this need,`		
Page 71	Section 11: Delete: ` S278 Works`; Add `Prior to the commencement of development, enter into a S278 Agreement to fund the following works:`		
2022/03682/FUL	La Reserve Hotel 422/428 Fulham Road	Walham Green	73
Page 74	Amend description of development: second line, delete `to replace the previously demolished building` and insert `The retrospective demolition of existing buildings and` Condition 2, add drawing no. PL10 Rev B (West Elevation)		
Page 79	Condition 15, first sentence, delete “new trees” and replace with “seven new replacement trees”. Condition 16, first sentence, delete “Condition 14” and replace with “Condition 15”.		
Page 80	Condition 21, after the second sentence, add “has been submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority”.		
Page 82	Condition 26, at the end of first sentence, add “Approved details shall be fully implemented and permanently retained and maintained during the construction phases of the development.”.		
Page 84	Condition 29, first sentence, delete “Condition 23” and replace with “Condition 28”.		
Page 92	Delete Condition 52.		
Page 95	Under Neighbour Comments, add to the list “39A Moore Park Road”		
Page 97	Paragraph 1.12, second sentence, replace “23 March 2018” with “23 March 2021”.		
Page 98	Delete Paragraph 1.18 and 1.19 and replace with: “1.18 For the purposes of the current application, officers consider that the baseline condition of the site, should be that the site is vacant. Harm to the character and significance of the locally listed buildings of merit has occurred in full. In considering whether it is currently expedient to take enforcement action, officers have considered the planning history of the site. At this time, prior to any decision on this application, the previous demolition of the building is a criminal offence, and the Council has the		

ability to prosecute. Such action would not be time constrained. At the same time, an enforcement notice seeking to remedy the breach of planning control would require the original buildings to be reinstated on-site or any new build granted permission to be implemented within a timescale.

1.19 If planning permission is granted under the current application, which includes retrospective demolition, then officers consider this affords the Council the best opportunity to secure the replacement building on the site in a specific timescale agreed and secured via the binding legal agreement with the applicants. Non-compliance with that agreement would result in swift prosecution action being instigated in the courts.”

- Page 98 Paragraph 2.2, first sentence, delete “9 objections”, and replace with “8 objections and 1 letter neither objecting nor supporting”.
- Page 101 Para 3.15, second sentence, delete “43” and replace with “70”
- Page 102 Paragraph 4.1, second sentence, delete “The existing hotel building”, and replace with “The original hotel building occupying the site”.
- Page 105 Paragraph 4.18, after last sentence, add: “Given the quality of the replacement building and the fact that the application site is currently vacant, there are considered to be positive heritage benefits from the scheme in repairing this element of street frontage and complementing the character of the adjacent locally listed, buildings of merit. As such, the development is not considered to result in harm to character or significance of the Moore Park Conservation Area or the setting of adjacent heritage assets.”
- Page 106 Paragraph 4.27, delete second sentence and replace with: “The proposal would make a positive contribution to the urban environment and would not cause undue harm to the character or significance of the Moore Park conservation area.”
- Page 107 Paragraph 4.29, delete and replace with: “There are several mature trees at or near the rear boundary with Hilary Close. The application is supported by an Arboricultural report which includes mitigation measures to protect the trees during and after construction. Two of the Norway Maple trees to the front of the site, (have already been felled), and a Common Lime tree to the rear, which has outgrown the site due to its cramped location, will be felled and replaced by suitable alternatives. The Council’s Arboricultural Officer has considered the report and is satisfied that these three trees can be replaced with seven semi-mature Birch trees to the site frontage, and that the remaining trees in and around the site will be protected during the works and their long term health will not be compromised by the proposed development. Conditions would be attached to secure the implementation of the measures contained within the Arboricultural report, and the planting of replacement trees. On this basis the proposal complies with London Plan Policy G7, OS5 of the Local Plan (2018) and SPD (2018) CAG6.”
- Page 117 Under 8), delete “Demolition and”.
- Delete obligation ‘7) Provision of a Servicing and Deliveries Management Plan’
- After 12), add “13) obligation to ensure that the replacement building is implemented in an agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council through the submission of a building contract to ensure that development is completed in a timely manner”.

2023/00262/ADV 54 Uxbridge Road Shepherd's Bush Green 130

Add informative to decision notice: `The applicants attention is drawn to the fact that the erection of scaffolding may require separate Highways consent. You are advised to contact the Council Highways team prior to the commencement of any work to ensure all relevant consents and licences are obtained for the works. Further information on licenses can be found via the following links on the Council website - <https://www.lbhf.gov.uk/business/highways-licences/scaffolding-licence>.

2023/00907/FUL 90 Devonport Road Coningham 142

Page 147 Para 6.8; line 8: Delete `not`

Page 147 Para 6.8: line 9: Delete `Officers consider that the proposed development does not satisfactorily comply with Policy HO11` and add this line to the end of paragraph 6.9.