

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Wednesday 11 January 2017

7:00pm

Assembly Hall – Hammersmith Town Hall

PRESENT

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

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Control Committee held on 14 December 2016 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

8. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Wesley Harcourt declared an interest in respect of the briefing on Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation. He is the LBHF delegate sitting on the ODPC Planning Committee. He considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the item.

Councillor Alex Karmel declared an interest in respect of Stamford Bridge Grounds, Fulham Road, London SW6 1HS as he is a Chelsea fan and several years ago had a share of a season ticket. He considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion and vote thereon.

9. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Briefing - Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation

Councillor Wesley Harcourt declared an interest in respect of the briefing on Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation. He is the LBHF delegate sitting on the ODPC Planning Committee. He considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the item.

A briefing was provided by Michael Mulhern on behalf of the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation.

RESOLVED THAT:

The briefing was noted.

Stamford Bridge Grounds, Fulham Road, London SW6 1HS

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes for further details. In addition, two further representations were received 11 January (post publication of the Addendum) from Flat 4, 438 Fulham Road, SW6 and Alpha Planning Ltd (on behalf of residents in Hilary Close, SW6)

Councillor Alex Karmel declared an interest in respect of Stamford Bridge Grounds, Fulham Road, London SW6 1HS as he is a Chelsea fan and several years ago had a share of a season ticket. He considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion and vote thereon.

At the start of the meeting, the Chair explained that due to the high level of public interest in the application, he had used his discretion and rather than the 10-minute maximum (5 minutes for, 5 minutes against), he had decided to allow members of the public address the committee for a total of 30 minutes. Based on the number of representations received, the Chair allocated 9 minutes to those in favour of the application and 21 minutes to those opposed to it.

Following the meeting, all registered speakers were contacted by Committee Services and given the opportunity to submit their speaking notes for the public record. Those received are appended to the minutes for reference.

The Committee heard representations in support of the application by the Applicant, Agent and a respondent in support of the application. A number of points were raised and included:

- The stadium was of architectural distinction and would become one of the world's most distinguished sports venues.
- The stadium would contribute greatly to London's visitor economy and to the social and economic prosperity of the local community.
- Extensive consultation was conducted between the project team, Council officers and technical consultees to ensure that all relevant planning issues associated with the scheme were addressed.
- Extensive consultation was carried out with residents, local amenity groups and numerous i.e. organisations Transport for London, Network Rail, The Royal Parks, the Metropolitan Police and the Greater London Authority.
- Consultation events held at Stamford Bridge Stadium and were well attended.
- The stadium design was well received by the council's Design Review Panel.
- Numerous design amendments had been made including:
 - I. Reconfiguration of the decking platforms over the railways, particularly to the east, to cut back from neighbouring residential properties.
 - II. Increased perimeter planting.
 - III. Revised landscape proposals to increase greening and improve bio-diversity.
 - IV. Incorporation of on-site renewable and low energy in the form of a CHP plant.
 - V. Changes made to the roof and refining the façade treatment.
 - VI. Reduction in parking spaces; and changes to the accessibility statement.
- Comprehensive Environmental Statement, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan and Outline Construction and Logistics Plan had been submitted.
- On-going consultation with those neighbours with particular sensitivities throughout the design development and construction process would be held.
- The proposed development was compliant with the development plan.

The Committee heard representations against the application from eight residents. They listed a number of concerns including:

- The current scheme and in particular the raised pedestrian walkway, would destroy the green cutting conservation area and damage the peaceful tranquillity and rural feel of the Billings.
- The proposed walkway would visually clash with the small 19 century houses and destroy residential amenity.
- The stadium would be visually dominant.
- The loss of trees to make way for the walkways
- Sunlight and daylight would be seriously affected.
- RBKC has deemed the development to be harmful and unacceptable.

- The night-time construction proposed would cause chronic sleep deprivation which could contribute to further health problems.
- The development would increase noise, crime and pollution
- The position of the walkway was unsuitable and would be harmful and cause a sense of enclosure.
- Noise would increase significantly and noise receptors had been sited incorrectly so would give inaccurate readings.
- Residents were unaware of what provisions had been made in the event of a terror attack.
- Residents had not seen a threat assessment or emergency planning diagram.
- The proposal should be refused on the grounds of bulk, mass, and scale.
- The design was over bearing.
- The stadium did not relate to the local area as it would tower 100ft over residential properties.
- The design was contrary to policy as there would be a net loss of housing to the local area.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking - The turning point of the walkway would mean that thousands of queuing fans would be able to overlook gardens, kitchens and bedrooms of some residential properties.

The Committee heard representations from Councillor Stainton, Ward Councillor for Parsons Green and Walham. Councillor Stainton requested clarification on the use of the Bovril Gate entrance on non-match days.

During the course of discussions, the committee raised a number of points. These included:

- The overall quality and design of the stadium.
- The enforceability of condition 80 related to the Use Class Order and number of allowable persons on site on non-match days.
- Concerns expressed about the extent of the decking platforms, design, the loss of existing green space and impact on the amenity of residents.
- Concerns about privacy and overlooking from the decking platforms.
- Concern as to whether television signals would be affected.
- The lack of controls on Sunday parking within RBKC and the likely impact on Hammersmith and Fulham.
- Taxi Management .
- The impact of bus travel.
- Job loss and job creation related to the stadium construction and employment opportunities after the completion of the stadium.
- Loss of light to Stamford Cottages.
- Impact of queuing on the north decking platform.
- Microclimate conditions of the playing pitch.

- Delivery and Servicing Management Plan.
- Construction Traffic Management and Logistics Plan.
- Demolition and Logistics Plan.
- Demolition/Construction Waste Management Plans.
- External Lighting Strategy.
- Height of barriers/boundary walls/fences treatment along the edges of the decking platforms.
- Sought clarification on S106 agreement..Amendment to the wording of Condition 85 including the removal of the wording “unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority”.

It was moved and seconded that the following conditions be brought back to committee for consideration, should the application be approved:

- Condition 17: Demolition and Logistics Plan.
- Condition 18: Demolition and Waste Management Plan.
- Condition 19: Construction Traffic Management and Logistics Plan.
- Condition 20: Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Condition 47: External Lighting Strategy.
- Condition 46: Details related to the height and form of sound barriers / boundary walls / fences treatment along the edges of the decking platforms.
- Condition 72: Delivery and Servicing Management Plan.

And amendment to wording of Condition 85 as set out above.

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/05050/FUL and the results in relation to Recommendation 1 in the officer report were as follows:

For: 10
Against: 0
Not Voting: 0

The Committee voted on planning application 2015/05050/FUL and the results in relation to Recommendation 2 in the officer report were as follows:

For: 10
Against: 0
Not Voting: 0

RESOLVED THAT:

The application 2015/05050/FUL be approved subject to there being no contrary direction from the Mayor for London and upon the completion of the legal agreement and the conditions set out in the report and Addendum.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm
Meeting ended: 10:22 pm

Chair

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