

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Addendum 11.02.2025

| REG REF. | ADDRESS | WARD | PAGE |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 2024/02343/VAR | Olympia Way | Brook Green | 10 |
| Page 95 | Add "contributions" after "Area wide traffic management review" | | |
| Page 95 | Delete "Travel plan monitoring fee for construction works TP and commercial occupier TP" and replace with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Construction works travel plan monitoring fee - £5,000 ▪ "Commercial occupiers travel plan reviews - £5,000 per review at year 1, 3 & 5" | | |
| Page 96 | After "Carbon Offsetting – estimated at £21,443" add "plus any potential increase in the event that the council adopt a new tariff and / or top-up payment(s) in the event that the revised energy strategy indicates under performance against the original target" | | |
| 2024/02343/VAR | Matrix Studios | Parsons Green and Sandford | 98 |
| Page 102 | Add informative about permitted hours for building work, construction and demolition works (0800 - 1800hrs Mondays to Fridays and 0800 - 1300hrs on Saturdays and at no other times, including Sundays and Public/Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed with the Environmental Health Officer). The informative will also require that neighbours be notified in writing of demolition/ building works at least 21 days prior to the start of any site works; contact details of a person responsible for the site works should be made available for enquiries and complaints for the entire duration of the works; best Practicable Means (BPM) should be used in controlling dust emissions, low vibration methods and silenced equipment and machinery and no waste materials should be burnt on site. | | |
| Page 106 | Delete Para 1.16 | | |
| Page 118 | Para 7.8, fourth line. Delete 'maximum' and replace 'approximately' | | |
| 2024/02395/FUL | Matrix Studios | Parsons Green and Sandford | 124 |
| Page 142 | Para 2.5, 3 rd line, delete '29' replace with 30 due to late letter received on 11/2/2025 from 121 Studdridge Street which raises no new concerns apart from objections to the conclusions of the Glare Report and the CIL estimate. | | |
| Page 157 | Para 6.14, fourth line. Delete 'maximum' and replace 'approximately' | | |
| 2024/01917/FUL | Flat 1, 49-67 Fitz-George Avenue | Avonmore | 171 |
| Page 183 | Delete Para 2.3 and replace with: 2.3 The Inspector upheld the reasons for refusal and the appeal was dismissed on flood risk, a lack of measures to secure car parking permit free and unacceptable living conditions of future occupiers with regards to outlook and daylight & sunlight. The Inspector's decision carries significant weight in the determination of this application. | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------|------------|
| Page 190 | Delete Para 4.28 and replace with 4.28: As demonstrated above, the unit would receive acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight. While the previous appeal Inspector considered the daylight, sunlight and outlook unacceptable, with the additional information provided on this current application we consider on balance the proposal to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation, and the limited outlook alone would not justify refusal. | | |
| Page 191 | Add to Para 4.33 a new first sentence: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was on the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to secure a car-free development. The current application has addressed this reason for refusal. | | |
| Page 192 | After Para 4.41 and a new Para 4.40A: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was due to an inadequate Flood Risk Assessment, which did not include a Sequential or Exceptions Test; nor any details of the structural water-proofing methods; or confirmation of active drainage devices or a non-return valve to be fitted. However, the current application is supported by a FRA Addendum which has provided the aforementioned information. Officers have reviewed this new information and consider that this addresses the previous concerns. | | |
| 2024/01918/FUL | Flat 2, 49-67 Fitz-George Avenue | Avonmore | 194 |
| Page 206 | Delete Para 2.3 and replace with: 2.3 The Inspector upheld the reasons for refusal and the appeal was dismissed on flood risk, a lack of measures to secure car parking permit free and unacceptable living conditions of future occupiers with regards to outlook and daylight & sunlight. The Inspector's decision carries significant weight in the determination of this application. | | |
| Page 212 | Para 4.28 add after the last sentence: While the previous appeal Inspector considered the daylight, sunlight and outlook unacceptable, with the additional information provided on this current application we consider on balance the proposal to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation, and the limited outlook alone would not justify refusal. | | |
| Page 213 | Add to Para 4.33 a new first sentence: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was on the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to secure a car-free development. The current application has addressed this reason for refusal. | | |
| Page 215 | After Para 4.41 and a new Para 4.40A: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was due to an inadequate Flood Risk Assessment, which did not include a Sequential or Exceptions Test; nor any details of the structural water-proofing methods; or confirmation of active drainage devices or a non-return valve to be fitted. However, the current application is supported by a FRA Addendum which has provided the aforementioned information. Officers have reviewed this new information and consider that this addresses the previous concerns. | | |
| 2024/01918/FUL | Flat 4, 29-47 Fitz-George Avenue | Avonmore | 217 |
| Page 229 | Delete Para 2.3 and replace with: 2.3 The Inspector upheld the reasons for refusal and the appeal was dismissed on flood risk, a lack of measures to secure car parking permit free and unacceptable living conditions of future occupiers with regards to outlook and daylight | | |

& sunlight. The Inspector's decision carries significant weight in the determination of this application.

Page 236

Para 4.30 add after the last sentence: While the previous appeal Inspector considered the daylight, sunlight and outlook unacceptable, with the additional information provided on this current application we consider on balance the proposal to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation, and the limited outlook alone would not justify refusal.

Page 236

Add to Para 4.36 a new first sentence: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was on the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to secure a car-free development. The current application has addressed this reason for refusal.

Page 238

After Para 4.44 and a new Para 4.44A: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was due to an inadequate Flood Risk Assessment, which did not include a Sequential or Exceptions Test; nor any details of the structural water-proofing methods; or confirmation of active drainage devices or a non-return valve to be fitted. However, the current application is supported by a FRA Addendum which has provided the aforementioned information. Officers have reviewed this new information and consider that this addresses the previous concerns.

2024/01918/FUL

Flat 5, 9-27 Fitz-George Avenue

Avonmore

240

Page 252

Delete Para 2.3 and replace with: 2.3 The Inspector upheld the reasons for refusal and the appeal was dismissed on flood risk, a lack of measures to secure car parking permit free and unacceptable living conditions of future occupiers with regards to outlook and daylight & sunlight. The Inspector's decision carries significant weight in the determination of this application.

Page 259

Para 4.30 delete the last sentence and replace with: While the previous appeal Inspector considered the daylight, sunlight and outlook unacceptable, with the additional information provided on this current application we consider on balance, the proposal to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation, and the limited outlook alone would not justify refusal.

Page 260

Add to Para 4.36 a new first sentence: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was on the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to secure a car-free development. The current application has addressed this reason for refusal.

Page 261

After Para 4.44 and a new Para 4.44A: One of the reasons the appeal Inspector dismissed the previous application was due to an inadequate Flood Risk Assessment, which did not include a Sequential or Exceptions Test; nor any details of the structural water-proofing methods; or confirmation of active drainage devices or a non-return valve to be fitted. However, the current application is supported by a FRA Addendum which has provided the aforementioned information. Officers have reviewed this new information and consider that this addresses the previous concerns.