

PLEASE INDEX AS

OTHER DOCUMENTS UPDATES

FILE No. TP/98/0100

JAN. FEB. MCH. APL. MAY. JUNE JUL. AUG. SEPT. OCT. **NOV** DEC

**PART 1**

PART 9

PART 2

PART 10

PART 3

PART 11

PART 4

PART 12

PART 5

PART 13

PART 6

PART 14

PART 7

PART 15

PART 8

PART 16



International Property Advisers

NdL/MLD/029907584

12 July 1999

Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea  
 Department of Planning and Conservation  
 Town Hall  
 Hornton Street  
 LONDON W8 7NX

10 Stratton Street  
 London W1X 6JR  
 Telephone 0870 900 89 90  
 Facsimile 0171 499 4723  
 www.gvagrimley.co.uk

FAO: Derek Taylor

Dear Sir

**'KENSINGTON WESTSIDE' WARWICK ROAD LONDON W14**  
**REF: TP/98/0100/A/42/2114: DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS**

Further to the meeting at your offices on 29 June 1999, we enclose a set of the minutes. In respect of many of the points we are preparing additional drawings, but a number of questions/issues remain which could do with further clarification:

- **Drawing No. T311/P05 – South West Podium Entrance**  
 As discussed in the meeting, there is a drafting error on this drawing. However, it relates to the annotation as opposed to the drawing itself. The road annotated on P05(c) reads Warwick Road when it should actually read 'Access Road'. We enclose revised drawings P05(d) with the correct annotation.
- **Refuse**  
 We enclose the letter from St George (Allan Beadle) to Mr D Edwards of your building control department dated 21 June 1999. The letter sets out the strategy for refuse storage and collection. In addition, we enclose 4 copies of drawings T311/02(e) showing the refuse strategy and T311.P.201 showing the site layout.
- **Window Details**  
 We were advised in the meeting that the Borough requires further details of windows in the form of 1:20 plans showing the detailed appearance and the type of opening mechanisms.  
 Mr Taylor agreed at the meeting that the need for details of opening mechanisms might be considered onerous given that there are no conservation area or listed building considerations.  
 We would also comment that the relevant condition (2g) asks for details of fenestration and 'window openings' as opposed to opening mechanisms.  
 Please advise what is required in this respect.

- **Proposed Bricks**

I have sought the advice of our building department in respect of the long term performance of the proposed brick. The Baggeridge Rudgwick Selected Yellow Stock Brick conforms to British Standards Classification BS 3921:1985. This type of brick has a greater compressive strength and lesser water absorption percentage than a comparable Ibstock.

The brick is rated as FL which means that it is frost resistant and has a low soluble salt content.

Finally we would comment that the overall appearance of the building, as contributed by the type of brick used, is reliant on the procedure for quality control adopted for construction. In this case, St George, as a matter of policy, only use perfect bricks, and any that are damaged during transportation etc are discarded. The bricks are most susceptible to damage during transportation and prior to being used. Once part of the erected structure, the risk of damage is very limited.

- **Traffic/Highways Statement**

We have been advised that your highways officer Tom Mansfield had previously indicated that a statement would not be required. Please could you clarify whether or not it is necessary to submit a full statement, or whether drawings and a covering letter will suffice.

- **Acoustics**

We understand that your environmental health section has recently reported on some or all of the acoustic information we have submitted. Please could you advise.

- **Condition 15**

We would like the Borough's confirmation that the relevant details submitted in respect of roof plant housing are acceptable and that Condition 15 can now be discharged. This will we understand be on the basis that Condition 2c still needs discharging, and the details in respect of that condition may lead to a variation in Condition 15 details.

- **Condition 2f**

This condition requires details of external lighting. At the meeting it was agreed that this need not be a precedent condition and that it could be deferred, with an alternative limit to the effect that details should be submitted and approved before occupation.

- **Condition 11**

This condition requires details of tactile pavements/dropped kerbs etc. It was agreed at the meeting that these details could be deferred and dealt with once construction has commenced. We would like confirmation that this is acceptable and would suggest that details be provided 'before work on the relevant part of the development commences.'

- **Condition 13**

It was agreed at the meeting that it would be unreasonable for this to be a precedent condition as the applicant is beholden to a third party (Notting Hill Housing Trust) to agree and provide the information. Please could we have confirmation that this condition can be deferred for NHHT to deal with.

We are faxing this letter, and the enclosures will accompany the hard copy in the post. Please could you contact Madeleine Duddy of these offices to discuss the above points.

Yours faithfully

**GVA Grimley  
Planning Department**

Enc.

**ST GEORGE – WARWICK ROAD  
DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS  
NOTE OF MEETING  
29 JUNE 1999**

**ATTENDING**

Derek Taylor	(DT)	RBKC Case Officer
Nicholas de Lotbiniere	(NDL)	GVA Grimley
Madeleine Duddy	(MD)	GVA Grimley

COMMENTARY	ACTION
<p><b>1. Introduction</b></p> <p>NdL opened meeting and asked that the issue of additional affordable and market-price units be discussed.</p> <p>DT indicated that he had some knowledge of the situation in relation to Drayton Gardens but asked for full brief.</p> <p>NdL explained that St George are dealing with another site at Drayton Gardens where 16 new units are proposed. This will mean that 5 new affordable units need also to be provided.</p> <p>David Cassells, case officer for that scheme has agreed in principle that these units can be provided off-site at the Warwick Road scheme, if this is agreeable to other parties (including DT).</p> <p>NdL advised that 8 additional affordable units can be provided on the Warwick site giving a surplus of 3 units.</p> <p>NdL also advised that a further 8 market-price units can also be accommodated on the site without altering building envelope or floor areas.</p> <p>DT saw no reason to oppose these new units, but asked for confirmation that Notting Hill Housing Trust (NHHT) are happy with the unit sizes and overall unit mix.</p> <p>DT mentioned that if the additional units are simply being created by sub-divisions, then resulting units may be of unsatisfactory size.</p> <p>NDL thought that the units did meet NHHT's minimum size requirements.</p>	<p>MLD to check with Client</p>
<p><b>2. Car Park Access (Condition 4)</b></p> <p>NdL asked about the proposed new car park entrance and whether it can be considered as a non-material alteration.</p> <p>DT advised that he has received indications that</p>	

COMMENTARY	ACTION
<p>NHHT are not happy with the changes. DT advised that if NHHT cannot support the changes, the Council will ask for a new application to consider the changes. NdL advised DT that St George are working to a very tight timescale and a new application at this stage would not be helpful. DT agreed that if NHHT concerns could be overcome so that they support the proposal, then the issue could be considered as non-material and no planning application would be required.</p>	<p>NdL to review position and report back to DT.</p>
<p><b>3. Condition 2g (fenestration/window openings)</b> DT advised that drawings at scale 1:20 or larger are required of the sample windows to show the general external appearance, including opening mechanisms. NDL queried the need for detail of 'opening mechanisms' in view of the fact that there are no listed building or conservation area issues involved. DT agreed to check with the design officer (Nick Corbett) to ascertain exactly what is required.</p>	<p>MLD to chase for details of what is required, and refer back to Client.</p>
<p><b>4. Condition 2a (external materials)</b> DT referred to the <u>North West Elevation Entrance Area</u> and advised that a section showing the natural ground level, existing and proposed, as it seems that raised blank wall is presented directly on to pedestrian frontage, which wouldn't be acceptable. DT referred to drawing no PO4(c) which will need to be updated.  DT referred to Nick Corbett's comment that roof top railings, which are shown on North West elevation drawing PO4 (c), are not appropriate and need to be set back. Roof plan needs to show railings set back 2 or more metres to stop visibility from below.  DT referred next to <u>SW Podium Entrance Elevation</u>. Commented that seemed that drawing shows flank very close to Warwick Road: Is set back 2.8 metres on drawing P001(c), and only 2.0 metres on drawing P05(c). This should also be checked against approved drawings. DT considered 2.0 metres to be too little set back.</p>	<p>MLD to arrange for additional drawings  MLD to arrange with architects for revised drawing.  MLD to check approved drawings and refer back to architects/client for clarification.</p>

COMMENTARY	ACTION
<p>NDL agreed seeming inconsistency.</p> <p>DT referred to the proposed brick, the type of which he is concerned will not prove durable over the long term. Despite the manufacturer's letter, the Council remain unconvinced and require further evidence to show that the facing does not separate from the main body of the brick through weathering (in particular freeze-thaw). DT advised that the Council were unaware of any other buildings where this sort of brick has been used in the Borough. MLD suggested providing examples of buildings where it has weathered successfully. DT agreed, but advised that these should have been in place for a considerable period to prove the long-term durability of the brick. DT advised that if this is not possible, then should revert to traditional London stock brick. DT confirmed that the Council have no concerns over the appearance of the bricks, just durability. DT confirmed that otherwise, he is happy with the external details submitted.</p>	
<p><b>5. Condition 15 (roof plant housing etc)</b></p> <p>DT agreed that this can be discharged, but also mentioned that it is linked to condition 2e. MLD mentioned that Tom Holstein had noted that details on the means of external ventilation have been submitted, but DT has not received any. MLD advised that she would revert to DT once she had discussed with Client. DT commented that he was reluctant to discharge condition 15 without condition 2e being satisfied. NDL asked that No.15 be discharged now in any case and varied as necessary in respect of No.2e later. DT agreed.</p>	<p>MLD to investigate availability of external ventilation details.</p>
<p><b>6. Condition 2b (open land treatment/hard and soft landscaping including childrens' play area)</b></p> <p>NDL explained to DT that the latest drawing shows the children's play area returned to larger size. This results in the gardens of the ground floor NHHT units being reduced slightly, but they are still within NHHT minimum standards. NDL and DT agreed that need NHHT response before can confirm that is acceptable. NDL advised that he believed NHHT are happy with the change</p>	

COMMENTARY	ACTION
but MLD agreed to double check.	MLD to check
<p><b>7. Condition 2c (walls/fences/railings)</b>            DT confirmed receipt of drawing T311.PO2 but asked for more details: sample sections at 1:20 of each type of enclosure.            MLD agreed to chase.</p>	MLD obtain further drawings from architect
<p><b>8. Condition 2d (refuse storage/disposal)</b>            NDL referred to letter sent to RBKC building control from St George, and also to drawing no.311/02/e.            MLD agreed to send DT four copies of each.            NDL explained that refuse arrangements will require site manager/caretaker/staff to carry refuse containers to the site boundary twice a week for collection by RBKC contractors. This is because the distance between the storage and collection points is more than 25 metres.</p>	MLD to arrange drawings etc to be sent
<p><b>9. Condition 2f (external lighting)</b>            NDL commented that this issue does not need to be dealt with as a condition precedent and would like to write to this effect, asking for it to be dealt with at a later date (eg prior to occupation)            DT agreed.</p>	
<p><b>10. Condition 2h (balcony railings)</b>            DT confirmed that details were submitted on 22<sup>nd</sup> March and is not aware of any problems.</p>	
<p><b>11. Condition 4 (access road and junction details)</b>            DT said much more information is required: vision and kerb splays, internal signage details, internal circulation and traffic management, etc etc.            NDL asked if a report by traffic consultant should be submitted.            DT confirmed this.</p>	MLD to chase for traffic report
<p><b>12. Conditions 6 and 7 (vibration and noise)</b>            These have been dealt with together. DT confirmed that all three reports have been submitted and he is chasing Env Health department for their comments.</p>	
<p><b>13. Condition 11 (dropped kerbs/tactile paving)</b>            NDL asked if this can be deferred.            DT agreed.            MLD will write to this effect, and DT will confirm.</p>	MLD to write to DT



COMMENTARY	ACTION
<b>14. Condition 13 (landscape management)</b> NDL queried this as a precedent condition, as St George are beholden to NHHT to fulfil. NDL asked if the condition can be deferred for NHHT to deal with. DT agreed	MLD to write.
<b>15. Condition 14 (10% disability access)</b> In light of possible changes to unit nos, MLD agreed to check that still meet 10% requirement.	MLD