

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes



Tuesday 10 October 2017

PRESENT

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

Others: Councillors Guy Vincent and Cllr Ben Coleman

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Cartwright

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

4 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.

**Palco House, 11-21 Beavor Lane, London W6 9AR, Ravenscourt Park
2017/01571/VAR**

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

The Committee heard a representation in objection to the application by two residents. Some of the points raised included: the reasons for the original condition remained in place and should still apply. The application was made before the majority of new homes were occupied so this minimised the number of comments from concerned residents. The officers' report was misleading as the diagrams

were from a 2013 application and did not reflect the current position and contrary to the report, there was parking stress in the area. The increase in night time traffic would cause noise, nuisance and air pollution and comments from immediate neighbours had not been included in the officer report. Further concerns were raised about a commercial bin which had not been moved despite requests from residents, smoking, littering and continual light pollution if the application were approved.

The Committee heard a representation from the Applicant. Some of the points raised included: OMNI Group was one of the largest employers in the Borough. The rationale behind the removal of condition 18 was that the business needed to operate outside core working hours to service the hotel and hospitality sectors. The business already asked staff to be considerate so that the amenity of neighbours was not affected. The applicant explained he was willing to accept restrictions to the conditions limiting staff numbers and deliveries to the site should the application be granted.

The Committee voted on application 2017/01571/VAR and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
0
Against:
9
Not Voting:
0

The Committee voted on a motion to refuse the application. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
9
Against:
0
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED THAT:

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/01571/VAR be refused due to the unacceptable impact on residential amenity—for the reasons for applying the time limitation condition which are set out when permission was granted for the original planning permission.

**North Lodge Hammersmith Cemetery, Margravine Gardens, London W6 8RL,
Fulham Reach 2017/02174/FUL**

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

The Committee heard representations objecting to the application from two residents. Some of the points raised included: allegations that actions had been taken to try and dissuade residents from speaking against the application at the Committee meeting; the use of the flat roof as terrace; the design was not sympathetic to the street scene and roof lines would be altered within the conservation area which was contrary to policy.

The Committee heard a representations from the Applicant and one resident in support of the scheme. Some of the points raised included: the scheme has a high quality design which would improve the look of the existing building. It was alleged that a campaign of misinformation had been waged against the development to increase opposition to the scheme. There had been no objection from the Applicant's direct neighbour who would be most affected by the proposal.

The Chair stated that the Committee were disappointed to learn about allegations of anonymous letters and smear campaigns in the planning process, which the Council condemned and denounced.

Councillor Guy Vincent spoke as a ward Councillor on the proposal. The points he made were: ward councillors had been working closely with officers and the applicant to try and address some the concerns which had been raised at public meeting. He confirmed that the development of the flat roof was prohibited by condition and the main concern regarding the views from the cemetery was partly addressed by Condition 21 in the addendum. He suggested that at the end of the first sentence of Condition 21, the following might be added:

"Which shall include details of a boundary fence, hedge, wall that conceals the extension from the view of users of Margavine Cemetery other than to allow a view from the inside of the widows of the extension"

The amendment to condition 21 as suggested by Cllr Vincent was proposed by Councillor Cassidy, seconded by Councillor Aherne and was agreed by Committee.

The Committee discussed the design of the proposal and impact of it on neighbours at length and the repeated planning applications which had been made for a 5m basement. The legal officer confirmed that only way the basement could be controlled would be by the use of a legal agreement to curtail its development. Councillor Karmel proposed that should the application be granted, that it be subject for a legal agreement to negotiate between officers and the applicant regarding the basement. This was seconded by Councillor Ivimy and agreed by Committee.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02174/FUL and approve the officer recommendation of approval and the changes set out in the addendum subject to an amendment to condition 21 and a legal agreement.

This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/02174/FUL be approved subject to the Addendum, an amendment to condition 21 and a legal agreement.

Edith Summerskill House Clem Atlee Court, Lillie Road London SW6 7TD Fulham Broadway 2017/01849/FUL

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

The Committee heard a representation in objection to the application by two residents. Some of the points raised included: it was a case of replacing one eyesore with another and the number of dwellings had nearly doubled from 68 to 133. It would adversely affect sunlight, daylight, increase overlooking, adversely affect local infrastructure and there was a lack of access for emergency vehicles. As the Council has an interest in the application, it was opportune for it to be as tall as possible. There had been a lack of proper engagement by the Council and the developers about the application.

Councillor Ben Coleman spoke as a ward Councillor on the proposal. The points he made were: There were local concerns about the height of the proposal and he asked why it had to be an extra 20 metres tall. Officers explained that this was due to development economics.

The Committee discussed a number of issues. These included: the design, amenity space and foot print of the building. Other issues included the access of emergency vehicles, the effect of the proposal on the local micro climate and heat insulation.

During discussions Councillor Harcourt noted that the CO₂ footprint failed to meet the 35% reduction target. He proposed that officers be asked to include of a new condition requiring an amended CO₂ energy assessment statement. This was seconded and agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Karmel expressed concerns about the way in which the letters from the GLA (about the proposal) were circulated and that they had not been posted on to the website so they could be viewed by residents.

In the course of discussions Councillor Cassidy noted condition 28 and the points raised about sound insulation. Councillor Cassidy proposed that condition 28 be amended to read “5 decibel attenuation to all rooms”. This was seconded and agreed by the Committee.

The Committee voted on planning application 2017/01849/FUL and the results were as follows:

For:

5

Against:

4

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/01849/FUL be approved subject to the changes set out in the addendum, the amendment of condition 28 and the inclusion of a new condition requiring an amended CO₂ energy assessment statement.

Watermeadow Court, Watermeadow Lane, London, Sands End 2017/01841/FUL

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

There were no registered speakers on the item.

The Committee discussed a number of issues. These included: the height, room density per hectare, amenity space and design including the internal layout of the proposal.

As per the Edith Summerskill discussions, Councillor Harcourt raised the topic of the CO₂ footprint and its failure to meet the 35% reduction target. He proposed that officers be asked to include of a new condition requiring an amended CO₂ energy assessment statement. This was seconded and agreed by the Committee.

In the course of discussions Councillor Cassidy noted condition 29 and the points raised about sound insulation. Councillor Cassidy proposed that condition 29 be amended to read “5 decibel attenuation to all rooms”. This was seconded and agreed by the Committee.

Committee discussed the housing mix, percentage of affordable housing and land contamination levels at the site. Councillor Karmel asked officers to provide further

information about the extent and levels of contamination at the site and for this to be circulated outside the meeting.

The Committee voted on planning application 2017/01841/FUL and the results were as follows:

For:

5

Against:

4

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/01841/FUL be approved subject to the changes set out in the addendum, the amendment of condition 29 and the inclusion of a new condition requiring an amended CO₂ energy assessment statement.

160-164 Hurlingham Road, London, SW6 3NG, Parsons Green and Walham 2017/02950/FUL

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report. Officers reported 6 additional objection letters had been received.

The Committee heard a representation from a representative of the Applicant in support of the scheme. Some of the points raised included: the site was underused and in poor condition both internally and externally. The application sought to enhance the existing employment use and to provide an attractive, sensitive environment which would be modern, sustainable and provide commercial space suitable for a variety of business sizes. At least 380 jobs would be created. The design had been rigorously tested over two years, been through pre-applications three times and the Design Review Panel had been complementary.

The Committee discussed a variety of issues and these included: the design, the implications of the proposal on local traffic conditions, including speeds and volumes and the use of the café site. Councillor Karmel proposed a new condition that should the application be approved then the A1 / A3 use of the café should only be used by employees. This was seconded by Councillor Cassidy and agreed by the Committee.

Further topics which were discussed included: the extent of the development in residential area, the effect on the views in and out of the conservation area and the possible impact of noise and nuisance arising from the use of roof terraces. Councillor Karmel proposed that condition 24 should be amended to, restrict the A1/A3 hours of use from 0730 to 2200 and B1 hours of use from 0730 to 2100. This was seconded by Councillor Harcourt and agreed by the Committee.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02950/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval, the changes set out in the addendum and amendment to condition 24 as set out above. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
3
Against:
6
Not Voting:
0

The Committee voted on a motion to refuse the application. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
8
Against:
1
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED THAT:

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/02950/FUL be refused due to an adverse traffic impact, harm to residential amenity due to noise from the use of the roof terrace, the design and height of the building and harm to the conservation area.

67 - 69 Aspenlea Road, London W6 8LH, Fulham Reach 2017/02410/FUL

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

The Committee heard a representation from a representative of the Applicant in support of the scheme. The main point which was raised was the new application addressed the outstanding concern raised by the Planning Inspectorate and should now be approved.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02410/FUL to approve the officer recommendation and the changes set out in the addendum

For:
9
Against:
0
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/02410/FUL be approved subject to the addendum.

**Threshold and Union House, 65 Shepherd's Bush Green London W12 8TX
Shepherd's Bush Green 2017/01898/FUL**

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

The Committee heard a representation from a representative of the Applicant in support of the scheme. Some of the points raised were: at the core of the hotel ethos was the use of public space at its base. Hoxton would be working closely with the Bush theatre and with various arts and culture programmes within the area. Hoxton were committed to local employment and the hotel would create around 190 jobs.

The Committee voted on application 2017/01898/FUL to approve the officer recommendation and the changes set out in the addendum

For:

9

Against:

0

Not Voting:

0

RESOLVED THAT:

That application 2017/01898/FUL be approved for the reasons set out in the report and the changes in the addendum.

**The Triangle (5-17 Hammersmith Grove) And Britannia House (1-11
Glenthorne Road), 3 And 3A Hammersmith Grove And 12-18 Beadon Road,
Hammersmith W6 0LH, Hammersmith Broadway 2017/02717/FUL**

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

The Applicant's representative chose not to speak at the meeting.

The Committee discussed a number of issues. These included: the proposed building line, the height of the building compared to the two opposite, the loss of a building of merit at 3 Hammersmith Grove. Comments included that the scheme had not gone far enough to overcome the reasons for refusal of the appealed scheme.

The Committee voted on application 2017/02717/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval 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 voted on a motion to refuse application 2017/02717/FUL. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:
6
Against:
3
Not Voting:
0

RESOLVED

That the officer recommendation of approval be overturned and application 2017/02717/FUL be refused due height, massing, loss of a building of merit at 3 Hammersmith Grove and views in and out of the conservation area.

1. MINUTES

The minutes were agreed subject to the following amendments: Palace Wharf, Rainville road, that the application number be corrected, that “members of the public returned at 9:05 (and not the Committee)” and correcting the tense to the past tense so the application was resolved.

Meeting started: 7:00 pm
11:42 pm

Chair

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