Empress State Building
in the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
planning application no. 2013/05175/FUL

Strategic planning application stage II referral

The proposal
Change of use from Class B1 (Business) to Class C3 (340 Residential units) and ancillary uses (excluding the basement), together with a Retail Unit (Class A1-A4), works of external alterations to the building and works of demolition to the base of the building.

The applicant
The applicant is Empress State Limited Partnership (a wholly owned subsidiary of Capital and Counties Properties PLC), the architect is KPF, and the agent is DP9.

Strategic issues
Issues with respect to housing, affordable housing, climate change and transport have been satisfactorily addressed since Stage One and the proposed residential conversion is supported in strategic planning terms. The scheme will contribute a key element to the wider Earl’s Court redevelopment.

The Council’s decision
In this instance, Hammersmith & Fulham Council has resolved to grant permission subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement and planning conditions.

Recommendation
That Hammersmith & Fulham Council be advised that the Mayor is content for it to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and does not therefore wish to direct refusal or direct that he is to be the local planning authority.

Context
1 On 13 December 2013, the Mayor of London received documents from Hammersmith & Fulham Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. This was referred to the Mayor under Category 1A of the Schedule to the 2008 Order:

- 1A “Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”.

context
On 20 January 2014, the Mayor considered planning report D&P/3264/01, and subsequently advised Hammersmith & Fulham Council that the application did not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 63 of the above-mentioned report; but that the possible remedies set out in that paragraph could address these deficiencies.

A copy of the above-mentioned report is attached. The essentials of the case with regard to the proposal, the site, case history, strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance are as set out therein, unless otherwise stated in this report. Since then, the application has been revised and further information supplied in response to the Mayor’s concerns (see below). On 3 April 2014, Hammersmith & Fulham Council decided that it was minded to grant permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement and planning conditions, and on 11 April 2014 it advised the Mayor of this decision. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, direct Hammersmith & Fulham Council under Article 6 to refuse the application or issue a direction to the Council under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application and any connected application.

The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

The decision on this case, and the reasons will be made available on the GLA’s website www.london.gov.uk.

**Update**

At the consultation stage, Hammersmith & Fulham Council was advised that the application did not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 63 of the above-mentioned report; but that the possible remedies set out in that paragraph could address these deficiencies:

- **Loss of employment space:** The loss of employment space in this location is justified in strategic planning terms; however Hammersmith & Fulham Council should confirm that they are satisfied with its loss before the application is referred back at Stage 2.

- **Affordable Housing:** The viability of the scheme should be fully assessed at the local level to ensure that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing is provided in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12.

- **Housing:** Residential quality is generally good although further information is required on the one bedroom units on floors seven to eleven of the eastern side of the northern bookend. Further information should also be supplied on how the quality of the residential units will be secured in relation to the neighbouring indicative buildings in Plot BW06 of the Masterplan. The size of units is appropriate although further information is required on affordable housing provision. Further information is required on the location of children’s play space.

- **Climate change:** Further information should be provided on the energy strategy calculations; the timescale for connection to the district heating network and detail of the connection point; and confirmation that both retail and residential uses will be connected to the site heat network.
• **Transport:** TfL have no objections to the proposals, however suitable conditions and mechanisms must be agreed by which access routes can be safeguarded; and car parking, cycle parking, a travel plan, delivery and servicing plan and construction logistics plan can be secured.

7 Since then, the applicant has responded to these matters as set out below.

### Loss of employment space

8 At Stage One, it was accepted that the loss of employment space in this location was justified in strategic planning terms; however Hammersmith & Fulham Council was requested to confirm that it is satisfied with the loss. The Council’s committee report contains a detailed analysis of the relevant planning policies and the justification put forward for its loss, concluding that the loss is acceptable.

### Affordable housing

9 As requested at Stage One, the applicant has provided a financial viability assessment proposing 30% affordable housing, comprising 102 units in total, made up of 71 one-bedroom units and 31 two-bedroom units, to be delivered before more than 70% of the market housing units are occupied (or a payment-in-lieu received, as explained below). Although more family sized affordable units would be desirable, the outline permission for the wider Earl’s Court development (Ref: PDU/2780/02 and PDU/2781/02) secures a significant proportion of family sized housing, within identified ranges. The 102 units would all be of intermediate tenure, as preferred by Hammersmith & Fulham’s Core Strategy, which is based on local need.

10 The Council subsequently commissioned an independent assessment, which confirmed that the proposals represent the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. The affordable housing contribution is secured in a draft section 106 agreement.

11 These affordable housing units would be located in the wider Earl’s Court development, within the plots immediately surrounding the Empress State Building, but in addition to the affordable housing already agreed to be delivered as part of the wider development (1,500 affordable housing units). Although not within the building, these units would be located within close proximity and can therefore be viewed effectively as ‘on-site’. Due to the nature of the Empress State Building, the proposed internal conversion will result in large units, meaning that a much reduced number of affordable housing units could be provided, with higher service charges. This is accepted, in line with London Plan Policy 3.12, which seeks the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing.

12 Due to the length of time that will elapse before the building is vacated and the scheme implemented, the benefits of a review mechanism were considered by the Council and their independent reviewer. As a significant contribution (30%) of affordable housing is guaranteed, and consequently, as the applicant will bear the risk of providing this proportion, the absence of a review mechanism is accepted in this situation.

13 The affordable housing offer allows for the Council to receive a financial payment-in-lieu for affordable housing, capped at £16.3 million. This secures the contribution, should the affordable housing not be able to be delivered on the neighbouring plots as part of the wider Earl’s Court development, in the unlikely event that the applicant is not able to secure ownership of these estate lands. A process by which a payment-in-lieu would be determined is detailed within the section 106 agreement. GLA officers accept that a payment-in-lieu is unlikely, but that the section 106 agreement appropriately secures the process by which this may be determined.
In summary, the arrangements for affordable housing contributions now comply with London Plan Policy requirements.

Housing

Residential density

Given the characteristics of the site, the London Plan density matrix (Table 3.2 in support of London Plan Policy 3.4) would suggest a residential density of between 650 and 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare for this development. The proposal has a density of 2,832 habitable rooms per hectare, which is considerably above the London Plan matrix, although this is almost unavoidable for a residential conversion of a building of this height. Furthermore, when considered as part of the wider Earl’s Court development, the overall density of the wider area is 822 habitable rooms per hectare, which is within the density range. At Stage One, further information was requested on housing quality and affordable housing provision in order to justify the high density of the proposals. As detailed elsewhere in this report, this information has been provided and demonstrates that the density of the scheme is acceptable.

Residential quality

The Stage One report recognises the generally high residential quality of the proposals. In relation to the quality standards contained in the Mayor’s Housing SPG, the report states that taking into account the limitations of converting an existing building, the small number of areas of non-compliance is considered acceptable.

In order to mitigate the potential impact on residential amenity in the Empress State Building arising from the surrounding buildings proposed on Parcel BW06 as part of the outline planning permission for the wider Earl’s Court development, no residential units are included in the central sections on the eastern side of the proposed conversion. Consequently, below the twelfth floor, this space will be taken up by plant and amenity space, with residential units only towards the ends of the elevations near the book-ends. At Stage One, further information was requested on the design and use of the amenity space. The applicant has indicated this space will be planted communal winter gardens for residents, and that detailed designs will be developed in the detailed development phase. Although the information provided is limited, detailed drawings will be submitted and approved by the Council as required by planning conditions; therefore the level information provided is acceptable.

At Stage One, concerns were expressed about the outlook and restricted levels of daylight and sunlight of five units on the eastern side of the northern book-end, due to the proximity of buildings approved in the outline planning permission for the wider Earl’s Court development. The applicant has provided revised illustrative proposals for these surrounding buildings, which comply with the approved design parameters and seek to provide satisfactory residential quality in the Empress State Building. Although these proposals are only illustrative, the Council will secure the final designs through formal Reserved Matters applications, taking into account their impact on residential amenity for the Empress State Building. Furthermore, the Section 106 agreement restricts commencement of the scheme until the buildings on Parcel BW06 as part of the outline planning permission have commenced. This approach to securing the residential quality of the Empress State Building is accepted.

Housing Choice

As stated in the Stage One Report, the indicative mix of units of 34% (115) one bedroom, 33% (111) two bedroom, 32% (110) three bedroom, and 1% (3) four bedroom units are acceptable for this location. As affordable housing will not be provided within the building, it is accepted that no further information is needed at this stage on the number of family sized
affordable units; and as stated above, the wider Earl’s Court development secures a significant proportion of family sized housing, within identified ranges.

Children’s play space

20 The Stage One Report states that the proposal will generate a requirement for 514 sq.m. of playspace, and further detail was requested on the location of this space and how it will be secured, including timing. The Section 106 Heads of Terms secures provision of play space within the vicinity of the Empress State Building. Furthermore, the Heads of Terms restrict any development until work on the surrounding development parcel (BW06) of the wider Earl’s Court site has commenced, and the revised illustrative plans for plot BW06 include a pocket park, with the potential for play space, immediately adjacent to the Empress State Building. Although no more detail has been provided, it is recognised that the outline nature of the planning permission for the wider Earl’s Court development precludes this; however the Council should ensure that the provision of play space is secured through revised matters applications for the surrounding plots.

Climate Change

Energy

21 The applicant is proposing to connect to the Earl’s Court Masterplan district heating network and as requested the applicant has provided further details on the timescale for connection. The Earl’s Court Masterplan Site Energy Framework report identifies that the first energy centre will come on line in phases 3.1 and 3.2 of the Masterplan. The report states that these sites will be supported by a district heating system from 2021 and as these are adjacent to the Empress State Building, a connection will be made when the system is available.

22 The applicant has also confirmed that the apartments and the retail units will also have the ability to connect to the site heat network. A floor plan has been provided showing the location of the plant room on level five, including the heat exchangers for the district heating connection.

23 Based on the further information provided, a reduction of 315 tonnes of CO2 per year in regulated emissions compared to the estimated baseline is expected, equivalent to an overall saving of 41%.

Transport

24 As requested by TfL at Stage One, clauses have been secured within the Section 106 agreement preventing occupation of the development until access routes and car and cycle parking associated with the adjacent plot (BW06) of the wider Earl’s Court application are delivered. This will also have the effect of preventing occupation of any residential units prior to the relocation of the adjacent bus station, therefore addressing any potential conflicts between pedestrians and buses. This is welcomed by TfL.

25 It was accepted at Stage One that in changing the use of the Empress State Building from office to residential, the overall number of peak hour trips will be reduced. However, the nature of trips will change and as such a Travel Plan, Car Park Management Plan and a £150,000 contribution towards improving cycle infrastructure in the area have been secured through the Section 106 agreement, with a Construction Logistics Plan and Service Management Plan secured by condition. These were items requested by TfL at Stage One, and are welcomed.

26 In summary, the issues raised by TfL at Stage One have been adequately addressed and the development is in accordance with the transport policies of the London Plan.
Response to public consultation

27 Hammersmith & Fulham Council publicised the application by sending notifications to 1,133 neighbouring properties, as well as issuing site and press notices. The Council received four individual responses, including three objections and one in support. The representations received in response to the Council’s local consultation process are considered in detail within the Council’s committee report of 3 April 2014.

28 The grounds for objection included the loss of employment space; sense of community; health implications for residents living in tall buildings; light pollution and solar glare; waste, litter and maintenance; and noise during construction and after conversion.

29 Issues raised by objectors have been considered in this report, the Stage One Report, and the Council’s committee report.

Responses from statutory bodies and other organisations

30 English Heritage, the Environment Agency, Thames Water, Natural England, Network Rail and the Health and Safety Executive made no objections. London Underground made no objection subject to suitable conditions on below ground level construction. Sport England suggested further sport and leisure facilities may be required.

Section 106 Agreement

31 The draft section 106 agreement includes financial contributions as follows:

- £150,000 towards cycle infrastructure.
- £272,000 towards health care services.
- £50,000 towards day nursery services.
- £100,000 towards primary education.
- £60,000 towards secondary education.
- £500,000 towards a communities and regeneration fund to support the social and physical health of the local community.

32 The draft agreement also provides for 102 (30%) affordable housing units, over and above that provided as part of the wider Earl’s Court development.

Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority

33 Under Article 7 of the Order, the Mayor could take over this application provided the policy tests set out in that Article are met. In this instance the Council has resolved to grant permission with conditions and a planning obligation, which satisfactorily addresses the matters raised at Stage One, therefore there is no sound planning reason for the Mayor to take over this application.

Legal considerations

34 Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the Mayor has the power under Article 6 to direct the local planning authority to refuse permission for a planning application referred to him under Article 4 of the Order. He also has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application.
The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. In directing refusal the Mayor must have regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order, including the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, the effect on health and sustainable development, national policies and international obligations, regional planning guidance, and the use of the River Thames. The Mayor may direct refusal if he considers that to grant permission would be contrary to good strategic planning in Greater London. If he decides to direct refusal, the Mayor must set out his reasons, and the local planning authority must issue these with the refusal notice. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

Financial considerations

35 Should the Mayor direct refusal, he would be the principal party at any subsequent appeal hearing or public inquiry. Government guidance in Circular 03/2009 (‘Costs Awards in Appeals and Other Planning Proceedings’) emphasises that parties usually pay their own expenses arising from an appeal.

36 Following an inquiry caused by a direction to refuse, costs may be awarded against the Mayor if he has either directed refusal unreasonably; handled a referral from a planning authority unreasonably; or behaved unreasonably during the appeal. A major factor in deciding whether the Mayor has acted unreasonably will be the extent to which he has taken account of established planning policy.

37 Should the Mayor take over the application he would be responsible for holding a representation hearing and negotiating any planning obligation. He would also be responsible for determining any reserved matters applications (unless he directs the council to do so) and determining any approval of details (unless the council agrees to do so).

Conclusion

38 The matters raised at consultation stage, namely those relating to housing, affordable housing, climate change and transport have been satisfactorily addressed. The proposed residential conversion is supported in strategic planning terms and the scheme will contribute a key element to the wider Earl’s Court redevelopment.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects Team):
Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects
020 7983 4783    email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk
Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development & Projects)
020 7983 4895    email justin.carr@london.gov.uk
Martin Jones, Case Officer
020 7983 6567    email martin.jones@london.gov.uk
Empress State Building

in the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

planning application no. 2013/05175/FUL

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral

The proposal
Change of use from Class B1 (Business) to Class C3 (Residential) and Ancillary Uses (excluding the basement), together with a Retail Unit (Class A1-A4), works of external alterations to the building and works of demolition to the base of the building.

The applicant
The applicant is Empress State Limited Partnership (a wholly owned subsidiary of Capital and Counties Properties PLC), the architect is KPF, and the agent is DP9.

Strategic issues
The proposed residential conversion is supported in strategic planning terms as it will deliver a key element of the Earl’s court redevelopment, however, issues with respect to housing, affordable housing, climate change and transport should be addressed before the application is referred back to the Mayor at his decision making stage.

Recommendation
That Hammersmith & Fulham Council be advised that the application does not yet comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 63 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in that paragraph could address these deficiencies.

Context
1 On 13 December 2013, the Mayor of London received documents from Hammersmith & Fulham Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the Mayor has until 23 January 2014 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor’s use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under Category 1A of the Schedule to the 2008 Order:
• 1A “Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”.

3 Once Hammersmith & Fulham Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself.

4 The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

5 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

6 The Empress State Building was built in 1961, originally with 28 floors, designed by Stone, Toms & Partners. The tricorn shaped building is named after the Empress Hall, which formerly stood on the site, and in tribute to New York’s Empire State Building. Its 2003 renovation, to a design by Wilkinson Eyre, retained but modified the three Portland Stone bookends, replaced the metal and glass cladding, added a single storey circular building at the base, and added three glazed floors taking its height to 31 storeys. The building is currently occupied by the Metropolitan Police Service, providing 56,127 sq.m. (GIA) of office space, with a lease running until 2019.

7 The building is currently surrounded by car parking, with the ground level rising by approximately five metres from south to north. Earl’s Court exhibition centre lies to the north-east, and Transport for London marshalling yards to the north. Most of the surrounding area will be redeveloped as part of the Earl’s Court Masterplan (PDU/2780/02 and D&P/2781/03), which recently received outline planning permission. The Empress State Building, from ground floor upwards, is not part of that permission, however it does permit the demolition of the single storey circular podium building. The red line boundary for the Empress State Building application site is at ground floor level, and the basement levels are included in the Masterplan.

8 The nearest part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is the A3220 Warwick Road, approximately 550m to the east of the site. Three bus routes stop outside the site on Lillie Road, with further bus routes stopping on North End Road and Warwick Road within an acceptable walking distance. The site is also located approximately 300 metres from West Brompton station, served by District line and London Overground services. Further District line and Piccadilly line services are also accessible from Earl’s Court station, approximately an 11 minute walk north-east of the site. As such it is estimated that the site records an excellent public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a, on a scale from 1 to 6.

Details of the proposal

9 The application seeks to change the use of the building from offices (Class B1) to residential (Class C3). The Masterplan assumes the building remains in office use; however the Metropolitan Police Service has recently completed an analysis of its major building portfolio and has concluded that the building is no longer required. This, together with the expiry of the existing lease in 2019, has resulted in a review by the applicant as to the most feasible and sustainable long-term use of the building, and is the reason why a change of use is now proposed. This application requires no consequential amendments to the outline planning permission for the Masterplan.
The proposal is to convert all office space to provide 340 residential units ranging from one bedroom, to four bedroom duplexes, together with a 353 sq.m. (GIA) retail/restaurant unit at first floor level. Due to the level change across the site, this retail unit will provide level access to the proposed High Street, set back from the street behind an open space. The exterior elevations of the building will be re-clad with glass and anodised bronze, with balconies introduced, and the Portland stone corners of the building will be retained but modified.

The ground, first and second floors will provide residential amenity space and the retail unit. Residential units will take up the remainder of the building, apart from the north-east facade which will contain plant on floors three to six and residents’ amenity space on floors seven to eleven. The top floor will become a shared residential lounge.

The application materials also include illustrative proposals for the development of the area immediately around the Empress State Building, known as Plot BW06. This plot is part of the Earl’s Court Masterplan outline permission, and is not part of the proposal considered here; however it has informed the layout of the Empress State Building proposals. The illustrative scheme for Plot BW06 has been revised within the parameters of the Masterplan outline permission as a result of the proposed change of use from office to residential. It includes three buildings of eleven and twelve storeys comprising office, community/cultural, residential and retail uses, with parking at ground and basement levels. It also includes landscaping and pedestrian routes around the Empress State Building. The approved parameter plan for Plot BW06 does not currently include the basement area underneath the Empress State Building; however a Section 96A application has been submitted to Hammersmith & Fulham Council seeking a minor amendment to include this basement area in Plot BW06.

Case history

On 31 October 2013, a pre-planning application meeting was held with the Greater London Authority at City Hall and on 15 November 2013 a pre-application advice report was issued to the applicant. This report concluded that the principle of a residential conversion was acceptable in strategic terms, although further information was requested at submission stage relating to the loss of business floorspace; affordable housing; viability; residential density; housing mix; detailed design; residential quality; play space; surrounding routes; inclusive access; energy strategy; climate change adaptation; and transport.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Employment: London Plan
- Housing: London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context, draft SPG
- Affordable housing: London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy
- Density: London Plan; Housing SPG
- Tall buildings/views: London Plan, London View Management Framework SPG
- Urban design: London Plan; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context, draft SPG; Housing SPG; London Housing Design Guide; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG
For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the 2011 Hammersmith & Fulham Core Strategy, the 2013 Hammersmith & Fulham Development Management Local Plan and the 2011 London Plan (with 2013 alterations).

The following are also relevant material considerations:

- The 2012 Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area Joint Supplementary Planning Document (ECWKOA SPD).

**Principle of development**

The site lies within the Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area (ECWKOA) as defined in London Plan Policy 2.13 and Table A1.1, which states that the Opportunity Area is capable of accommodating at least 4,000 homes up to 2031.

London Plan Policy 3.3 ‘Increasing Housing Supply’ recognises the pressing need for new homes in London and Table 3.1 gives an annual monitoring target of 6,150 new homes per year in Hammersmith & Fulham between 2011 and 2021, (although this figure does not include the increment in the ECWKOA identified by the EIP Panel).

The proposal for a residential led development would contribute towards the Borough’s and London’s housing need and is therefore supported in strategic planning terms.

**Loss of employment space**

The ECWKOA SPD contains a Key Principle ES1, which states that:

- “Existing business floorspace in the OA should be renewed and modernised or replaced through development proposals to maintain and intensify existing employment provision. Applicants should establish the requirements of existing tenants through consultation and demonstrate how these have been taken into account in their proposals.”
The proposal would involve the loss of a significant amount of employment floorspace (56,127 sq.m. GIA). In support of this, the applicant has provided justification in a CBRE report ‘Loss of Employment Case’. The report examines projected demand and supply for office-based employment in Hammersmith & Fulham and the six surrounding Boroughs using the latest GLA figures (London Office Policy Review 2012), finding that there is a projected over-supply of 27%. The report recognises the potential of the ECWKOA to develop as a new business district to complement the West End; however the potential of the Empress State Building to contribute to this is limited as it will become available in 2019, when the surrounding area will be a major construction site, continuing until the early-2020’s. Furthermore, the report finds that it would be difficult to attract an occupier to take the entire building, due to its limited floorplates and floor to ceiling heights; while small and medium sized occupiers in this location would be unlikely to be able to support the higher rents and service charges that a tower building entail.

London Plan Policy 4.2 ‘Offices’ provides strategic support to redevelop office provision to improve London’s competitiveness, however it also supports managed conversion of surplus capacity to more viable uses. Paragraph 22 of the NPPF also states that “where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits, having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities”.

It is also relevant to note that the Earl’s Court Masterplan includes 94,833 sq.m. (GEA) of office floorspace and an the applicant has estimated the area’s job capacity, excluding construction jobs, as 8,970 full time equivalent jobs, which is considerably above the 7,000 indicative employment capacity contained in Table A1.1 of the London Plan. The Masterplan includes some smaller format B1 space in the area around the Empress State Building, while larger scale office space is located near to the A4 West Cromwell Road, further to the north.

To conclude, the loss of employment space in this location is justified in strategic planning terms; however Hammersmith & Fulham Council should confirm that they are satisfied with its loss before the application is referred back at Stage 2.

### Housing

A total of 340 units are provided, made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable housing

London Plan Policy 3.9 seeks to promote mixed and balanced communities by tenure and household income. London Plan Policy 3.12 seeks to secure the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing and paragraph 3.74 of the London Plan states that affordable housing provision is normally required on-site. Only in exceptional circumstances should it be provided off-site or through a cash in lieu contribution. London Plan Policy 3.11 requires that 60% of the affordable housing provision should be for social rent and affordable rent, and 40% for intermediate rent or sale.
27 The applicant has acknowledged these policies in the application materials; however it has not provided any detail on affordable housing provision other than to say “the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that can be delivered by the proposed development, in the context of the above policy considerations, is currently being assessed by the applicant and includes an analysis of viability”. As advised at pre-application stage, the financial viability assessment should justify the amount of affordable housing and the proposed tenure split and is expected to analyse a range of rent levels and include any grant funding assumptions (if applicable), in order to demonstrate that the proposed affordable housing offer is reasonable and meets strategic policy requirements. It is understood that the Council have appointed independent consultants to assess this report and the results of this review should be shared with the GLA in due course. Early engagement on this aspect is strongly encouraged. GLA officers will update the Mayor on the findings of the assessment, and of any further negotiations, at the Stage 2 decision making stage. Affordable housing contributions should be secured through the Section 106 agreement.

Residential density

28 Given the characteristics of the site, the London Plan density matrix (Table 3.2 in support of London Plan Policy 3.4) would suggest a residential density of between 650 and 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare for this development. As stated at pre-application stage, a residential conversion of a building of this height will be likely to exceed the density figures given in the London Plan. This may be acceptable; however the application should therefore be exemplary in all other respects and provide a high quality living environment for occupiers, including amenity and play space, affordable housing, a mix of unit sizes, and high quality design. The proposal has a density of 2,832 habitable rooms per hectare, although the applicant also points out that when considered as part of the wider Earl’s Court development, the overall density is 822 habitable rooms per hectare. Further information on design quality should be provided as discussed below, and affordable housing provision should be confirmed.

Residential quality

29 All units meet the minimum space requirements given in Table 3.3 and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, and the majority comfortably exceed them, which is welcomed.

30 London Plan Policy 3.5 ‘Quality and Design of Housing Developments’ promotes quality in new housing provision, with further guidance provided by the Mayor’s Housing SPG. As requested at pre-application stage, the applicant has provided a detailed analysis of how the proposal responds to the quality standards contained in the Mayor’s Housing SPG. The proposal complies with the Baseline Standards apart from three relating to the number of units accessed from a single core, natural lighting of internal corridors, and car parking (for which different levels have been agreed in the Masterplan), and is only partially compliant with a further three standards relating to provision of stair lifts, amount of private outside space and level access to private outdoor space. Considering the limitations of converting an existing building, the small number of areas of non-compliance is considered acceptable.

31 The units are primarily single aspect due to the nature of the existing building, with the exception of dual aspect units located in the Portland stone bookends and the triple aspect units on the top three floors. Because the existing tricorn plan is orientated south, east and west there are no north facing single aspect units.

32 Space for plant will be located on levels three to five of the east side of the building, and private amenity space on levels seven to eleven. The private amenity space was described as a ‘residents’ winter garden’ in pre-application discussions, although no detail has been provided in
the application documents. Further information on the design and use of the space should be provided by the applicant. This plant and amenity space has been sited in order to reduce the number of residential units at lower levels that would have a limited outlook to the neighbouring office building included in Plot BW06 of the Masterplan. The concerns raised at pre-application stage about the quality of the remaining residential units at these lower levels due to the close proximity of the neighbouring buildings have been largely resolved. However, the five one bedroom units on floors seven to eleven of the eastern side of the northern book-end will have a limited outlook and restricted levels of daylight and sunlight. Consequently, the applicant is requested to reconsider the layout in these areas. The outlook of units on the western and southern sides of the building has been considerably improved by the alignment of the indicative buildings to the west and the removal of those to the south.

33 The applicant states that a Section 106 agreement will cover the relationship between the proposal and the Earl’s Court Masterplan, and will also prevent the Empress State Building being delivered on a standalone basis. This should include measures to protect the quality of the residential units in relation to the height, massing and location of the neighbouring indicative buildings in Plot BW06 of the Masterplan. Further information should be provided on how this will be secured.

Housing Choice

34 The indicative mix of units is 34% (115) one bedroom, 33% (111) two bedroom, 32% (110) three bedroom, and 1% (3) four bedroom units. London Plan Policy 3.8 ‘Housing Choice’ and associated planning guidance promotes housing choice based on local needs and seeks a balance of unit sizes in new developments. In general, the proposed unit sizes are acceptable for this location.

35 London Plan Policy 3.11 ‘Affordable Housing Targets’ also states that priority should be accorded to the provision of affordable family housing. As stated above, the approach to affordable housing and the number of affordable units is not yet known, however the Council should confirm that the provision of family sized affordable units, when known, meets local housing needs.

36 As required by Policy 3.8, the applicant has confirmed that all units will meet ‘Lifetime Homes’ standards and that 34 (10%) of the units to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable. These units are spread throughout the building and include all unit sizes. Before the application is referred back at Stage 2, confirmation is required that these units are also spread across different tenures.

Children’s play space

37 Policy 3.6 of the London Plan sets out that “development proposals that include housing should make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs”. The applicant states that the proposal will generate a requirement for 514 sq.m. of playspace, and that this will be provided within the Masterplan area. Further detail is also required on the location of this space within the Masterplan area. The applicant states that this will be in addition to the 21,750 sq.m. of play space already secured as part of the Masterplan area, however the Council should provide further information on how this will be secured, including timing.
Tall buildings, urban design and heritage

38 London Plan Policy 7.6 ‘Architecture’ seeks the highest architectural quality. Policy 7.7 ‘Location and design of tall and large buildings’ further emphasises the importance of high quality design for tall buildings.

39 The massing of the building will remain largely unchanged and the proposed re-cladding sensitively responds to the original architecture. Some additional window openings will be inserted into the Portland stone book-ends of the building, but will not unduly change its appearance. The cladding of the three elevations will be replaced, introducing balconies, increased glazing and an element of bronze or copper cladding, which although discrete, will have a positive impact on the appearance of the building, and will give it a more residential character.

40 London Plan Policy 7.4 ‘Local Character’ states that new development should respond to its surrounding setting, be informed by its historic context and provide a human scale and relationship with street level activity. Policy 7.8 ‘Heritage Assets and Archaeology’ requires development to respect heritage assets by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. The applicant has provided an analysis of the impact on the surrounding townscape and heritage assets, including nearby conservation areas as part of the Environmental Statement, confirming that the alterations to the building will be almost imperceptible in middle distance views, and even in close views will not alter the overall composition of the building. This is accepted and the proposal complies with London Plan policies in this respect.

Inclusive access

41 The aim of London Plan Policy 7.2 ‘An Inclusive Environment’ is that proposals aim for the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion (not just the minimum) and that the design process has, from the outset considered how everyone, including disabled and Deaf people, older people, children and young people, will be able to use the places and spaces that are proposed. In line with London Plan Policy 3.8 ‘Housing Choice’, the applicant has provided a detailed Access Statement as well as a response to each of the sixteen Lifetime Homes criteria. Typical layouts of wheelchair accessible units have been provided confirming that 10% of units will be wheelchair accessible, spread across units sizes and floors. The proposal complies with London Plan inclusive access policies.

Climate Change

Energy

42 A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. Both air permeability and heat loss parameters will be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by building regulations. Other features include reduced thermal bridging, mechanical ventilation with heat recovery and variable speed drives. The demand for cooling will be minimised through natural ventilation where possible, mechanical ventilation and low energy lighting.

43 The residential element of development is estimated to achieve a reduction of 77 tonnes per annum (10%) in regulated CO2 emissions compared to the indicative baseline of the existing building (assuming residential use).
Baseline and ‘Be Lean’ figures for the retail unit should be provided in kgCO2/year, rather than per sq.m.

The applicant is proposing to connect to the Earl’s Court Masterplan district heating network and details of the timescale for connection should be provided.

The applicant is proposing to install a site heat network. The applicant should confirm that both apartments and retail uses will be connected to the site heat network. Further information on the floor area and location of the district heating connection point should be provided.

The applicant is proposing to connect to the Earls Court district heating network, which will be powered by gas CHP. The network will provide all of the space heating and hot water for the application site. The retail unit should also be connected to the heat network and any additional saving resulting from this connection should be reported in the carbon emissions summary table.

A reduction in regulated CO2 emissions of 224 tonnes per annum (33%) will be achieved through the ‘Be Clean’ part of the energy hierarchy.

The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies and is proposing to install 185 sq.m. of solar PV panels. A roof plan showing the proposed location of the PV panels has been provided as part of the application documentation.

A reduction in regulated CO2 emissions of 11 tonnes per annum (2%) will be achieved through the ‘Be Green’ element of the energy hierarchy.

Based on the energy assessment submitted at Stage 1, a reduction of 312 tonnes of CO2 per year in regulated emissions compared to the estimated baseline is expected, equivalent to an overall saving of 41%. The carbon emissions from the retail unit should be added to the figures reported and the carbon emissions and carbon saving figures should be updated following the comments given above.

Climate change adaptation

London Plan Policies 5.9 to 5.15 state the requirements in relation to climate change adaptation. The nature of the proposal limits the extent to which it can respond to these policies; however the applicant has provided a Sustainability Statement and Supplementary Environmental Statement, which provides details of the sustainable use of materials, water conservation and drainage measures, and pollution reduction features. These proposals comply with London Plan policies.

Transport

The site is within the main Earl’s Court Masterplan area, which has outline planning permission. Access to the site is currently via West Brompton bus station. The application does not include either this area or the underground car parks proposed below the application site, which form part of Plot BW06 of the outline consent. Therefore, the application is reliant upon access arrangements, car and cycle parking being approved under a reserved matters application for Plot BW06, which will be submitted and approved separately. Should this approach be considered acceptable by the Council, any planning permission arising from this application will need to be subject to a Grampian condition to avoid conflicts between buses and residents,
which prevents occupation of any residential units prior to the relocation of the bus station, consistent with the outline permission.

54 A condition should also be included requiring submission of details of car and cycle parking in line with that agreed for the Earl’s Court Masterplan application in terms of overall number of spaces, split between residential and visitor parking, blue badge car parking and electric vehicle charging points. It is also noted that the Earl’s Court Masterplan application was subject to a condition setting out maximum and minimum ratios for car and cycle parking respectively. This may require further consideration if additional car and cycle parking is proposed to be delivered through the reserved matters application.

55 Trip generation has been carried out using TRAVL and is consistent with the assessment for the main Earl’s Court site and is considered acceptable by TfL. In changing the use of the Empress State Building from office to residential, the overall number of peak hour trips will be reduced, however, the predominant direction of travel will change. It is understood that the intention of the applicant is to vary the existing Section 106 agreement associated with the Earl’s Court Masterplan application, such that residential development within the Empress State building would count towards trigger points to deliver mitigation agreed under the extant permission. This approach is accepted by TfL.

56 Although a standalone travel plan, delivery and servicing plan and construction logistics plan have not been submitted, these plans were submitted for the Earl’s Court Masterplan application. This application should follow the same principles and as such, either new documents for this application should be produced (adopting the same approach), or a mechanism should be agreed by which the existing plans for the Earl’s Court Masterplan application are altered to take into account this new application.

Community Infrastructure Levy

57 In accordance with Policy 8.3 of the London Plan, the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) came into effect on 1st April 2012. On the basis of the current circumstances it is understood that a CIL payment would not be incurred; however the required CIL should be confirmed by the applicant and Council closer to the point at which the development is due to be commenced. The rate for Hammersmith and Fulham is £50/sq.m.

58 Hammersmith & Fulham Council has not yet adopted a borough wide CIL but plans to adopt one in 2014. The CIL will be set based on the Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which forms part of the adopted Local Plan/ Local Development Framework, as well as reflecting the viability of development in the Borough. The items to be funded through the borough CIL will be set out in the Borough CIL Regulation 123 list. It is the Council’s intention to take forward the mitigation and contributions as secured under the outline permission for the main site.

59 Use of the Borough CIL is seen as a key element in delivering key transport infrastructure in the Borough. This can range from localised pedestrian and cycle improvements to major rail or highway infrastructure, although it cannot be used to pay for bus network contributions. Transport for London invites further discussions with the Borough about the allocation of its CIL for important transport infrastructure, and in particular how this will be prioritised and the timing of delivery. This should take place alongside Section 106 discussions about site specific transport mitigation.

Local planning authority’s position
The Council’s position is not known.

Legal considerations

Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor’s statement and comments.

Financial considerations

There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

London Plan policies on loss of employment space; affordable housing; housing; tall buildings; urban design; heritage; inclusive access; climate change and transport are relevant to this application. The application complies with some of these policies but not with others, for the following reasons:

- **Loss of employment space:** The loss of employment space in this location is justified in strategic planning terms; however Hammersmith & Fulham Council should confirm that they are satisfied with its loss before the application is referred back at Stage 2.

- **Affordable Housing:** The viability of the scheme should be fully assessed at the local level to ensure that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing is provided in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12.

- **Housing:** Residential quality is generally good although further information is required on the one bedroom units on floors seven to eleven of the eastern side of the northern book-end. Further information should also be supplied on how the quality of the residential units will be secured in relation to the neighbouring indicative buildings in Plot BW06 of the Masterplan. The size of units is appropriate although further information is required on affordable housing provision. Further information is required on the location of children’s play space.

- **Tall buildings, urban design and heritage:** The proposals respond positively to the London Plan in these respects.

- **Inclusive access:** The proposals comply with London Plan policies.

- **Climate change:** Further information should be provided on the energy strategy calculations; the timescale for connection to the district heating network and detail of the connection point; and confirmation that both retail and residential uses will be connected to the site heat network.
• **Transport:** TfL have no objections to the proposals, however suitable conditions and mechanisms must be agreed by which access routes can be safeguarded; and car parking, cycle parking, a travel plan, delivery and servicing plan and construction logistics plan can be secured.

On balance, the application does not yet comply with the London Plan.

---
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