

PRESENT

Members of the Committee

Councillors Paul Warrick (Vice-Chairman), David Campion, Carol Caruana, Will Pascall and Marie-Therese Rossi.

Others in Attendance

Mr Geoff Burrage, Transport Planning Manager
Ms Sharon Cudjoe, Legal Adviser
Ms Fiona Rae, Senior Planning Officer - Central
Mr Robert Lancaster, Senior Planning Officer - North
Mr Graham Stallwood, Head of Development Management
Ms Sarah Day, Governance Administrator

A1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted that Councillor Warrick was chairing the meeting in place of Councillor Buxton.

A2 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of Agenda Item N10 it was noted that Councillor Campion knew Mr Malcolm Pawley from the Ladbroke Association, but confirmed that he had not discussed the application with him.

A3 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 13 NOVEMBER, 16 NOVEMBER AND 4 DECEMBER 2012

It was noted that Councillor Buxton would sign the minutes at the next formal meeting he attends.

A4 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – APPLICATIONS

With the permission of the Chairman, the Executive Director, Planning and Borough Development circulated a sheet of amendments to the report before the Committee, a copy of which had been placed on the Minute Book.

Agenda Items C12 and C13 – Park House Onslow Square, SW7

The Senior Planning Officer – Central introduced the reports drawing the Committee's attention to a revised Construction Impact Assessment,

Revision H. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the Addendum Report which included amendments to Conditions 2, 8 and 7; two additional conditions and three additional letters including one from English Heritage.

The Planning Officer gave an electronic presentation and confirmed that the Arboricultural Officer was satisfied with the proposal. The Planning Officer exhibited and explained the Basement Access and Logistics Plan and confirmed that only specially designated vehicles would go through the arch.

Responding to questions from the Committee, the Transport Planning Manager stated that access through the arch was constrained and therefore smaller vehicles only would be used to access the site. He confirmed that at peak periods there would be ten vehicles per day and stated that this would be for approximately 53 weeks.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Planning Officer confirmed that additional Condition 12 as set out in the Addendum Report required a survey of the listed arch.

Councillor Pascall requested that wheel guidance be included as a requirement of the conditions imposed to protect the arch.

The Planning Officer gave a description of the proposed basement and stated that plant was proposed in the basement, but said that no details had been submitted in relation to additional external ducting and therefore recommended a condition and informative to ensure that planning permission was sought for any additional plant equipment required.

The Chairman requested that Condition 12 be amended to require investigation and trial pits of the ground underneath the listed arch.

Ms Sophie Andreae, representing the Brompton Association, and Ms Eva Skinner, representing the Onslow Neighbourhood Association were called to the table and made the following points in objection to the application:

- The Residents' Associations objected to the application on the grounds of the impact of the proposed demolition, the loss of trees and the potential risks to nearby buildings;
- The report was misleading;
- Any application that needed fourteen conditions was inadequate;
- The application was equal to that of outline planning permission and many issues needed to be resolved;

- Mr Timothy Jones from English Heritage had stated that they had not been consulted and had no record of this application when contacted on 5 February 2013;
- Trees would be lost to provide site access and the conditions only provided limited protection;
- The listed arch was very small, constructed as a carriage entrance and the conditions imposed were not adequate to protect it;
- The listed arch was attached to two listed houses;
- The building works for this application would last for about three years and cause major inconvenience to local residents;
- Residents had already suffered the upheaval resulting from the works on Exhibition Road;
- The works would cause disruption on Pelham Road and the area around South Kensington Station;
- Lorries caused havoc in the area as they blocked the whole road when stationary;
- In this case, lorries would have to cross the road;
- All deliveries would be via the very limited entrance;
- The small arch was listed and had no foundations;
- The proposal would cause inconvenience to the whole area and would not just affect local residents; and
- There was a bus stop on the opposite side of the road that had not been taken into account.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms Andreae and Ms Skinner made the following points:

- In the space of 10 minutes ten buses would pass through the area; there were two bus stops on Sydney Street and one bus stop on Pelham Street
- The applications were contrary to the Core Strategy policies CL3 in relation to demolition, CR6 in relation to trees and CL2 in relation to the structural stability of neighbouring buildings;
- With so many conditions it was evident that the application was inadequate;
- The Construction Traffic Management Plan had only been published on the final day of the consultation;
- The proposal should be refused under the emerging guidance on basement excavations; and
- Conditions had even been amended on the day of the Committee meeting.

The Head of Development Management stated that English Heritage had commented on the application in its letter dated 12 October 2012 and a subsequent letter sent in January 2013.

Mr Neil Henderson, Gerald Eve LLP, representing the applicant was called to the table and responded to the objections with the following points:

- His client wanted to ensure that the works would be carried out with a minimum level of noise and disturbance to neighbours as priority; and
- Park House was unique insofar as it was set in an acre of land and the Construction Management Team intended to contain the site to reduce the likelihood of noise nuisance.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr Henderson and Mr Hills, the Architect, made the following points:

- An agreement would be made under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act to control noise;
- The contractors would join the Considerate Constructors' Scheme;
- There were no party wall issues;
- Park House was situated sixteen metres from any other properties;
- Bored piling methods would be used; and
- The external ventilation was included in the application, but would be set in the existing roof and would not be visible as the ventilation terminals would be housed in louvred boxes in the roof.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Transport Planning Manager made the following points:

- There was an agreed route with controlled timings and banksmen for all lorries;
- The road would not be closed, but traffic could be stopped temporarily;
- A telephone number would have to be provided under the Considerate Constructors' Scheme and the Construction Traffic Management Plan required that there should be a neighbourhood contact;
- Dumper trucks would transfer concrete from the lorry to the site and there would be banksmen to supervise this to ensure mess was cleared and ensure pedestrian safety; and
- At peak, there would be five concrete deliveries per day.

The Head of Development Management advised the Committee that an agreement made under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act could not be secured by planning permission and this should not hold any weight for the Committee when reaching its decision. He stated that most

of the conditions were recommended to protect residents and control the construction methods rather than requesting additional information.

It was noted that the Chairman and Councillor Pascall had visited the site.

The Chairman commented that once built, the basement would not be visible. He added that in his view the proposals above ground would improve the building.

After some deliberation, the Committee agreed that the planning permission should be granted subject to additional conditions requiring wheel guidance for vehicles passing through the arch and further investigations in respect of the structural stability of the arch, including trial pits.

RESOLVED –

That the recommendations be adopted subject to the additional conditions agreed above;

RESOLVED -

That the Executive Director's recommendations be adopted in respect of the following applications:

Agenda Item(s)	Site
N10	85 Elgin Crescent, W11 – additional representations were included in the Addendum Report
N12	50 Powis Square, W11 – additional representation had been received. It was noted that Councillor Caruana had visited the site.

Withdrawn – Agenda Item N11 - 19 Gordon Place, W11

Action by: EDP&BD

ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS

The meeting ended at 7.20pm

Chairman