



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Statement of Consultation – Hammersmith Town Centre SPD

(August 2024)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This statement sets out details of the consultation undertaken on the review of the council's draft Hammersmith Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It sets out the details of the consultation and includes a summary of the main issues raised by those that responded and how these have been addressed.
- 1.2 The SPD provides supplementary detail to policies concerned with Hammersmith Town Centre within the Local Plan.
- 1.3 In accordance with the Regulations, the draft SPD was subject to an 8-week consultation with key stakeholders, developers and local residents. This took place from 23rd January to 19th March 2024.
- 1.4 The Hammersmith Town Centre SPD is also supported by an Equality Impact Assessment carried out in accordance with the Equality Act 2010. In addition, we considered the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, specifically Schedule 1 (the criteria for determining the likely significance of the effects on the environment). Officers came to the conclusion that an SEA was not required. This assessment was sent to key environmental stakeholders including Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency who raised no objections through the consultation to the council's view that the SPD was not likely to have significant environmental effects.
- 1.5 The SPD provides guidance for development associated within Hammersmith Town Centre. It contains a brief identification of the overarching policy context, including national and London wide policy relevant to meeting local housing, economic and business needs.
- 1.6 The SPD is informed by a Resident-led Masterplan completed in 2019. The Masterplan was shaped through extensive collaboration with local residents and outlines the key opportunities and challenges in Hammersmith, areas for growth and key interventions to help restore the identity of the town centre. It focusses particularly on the public realm, giving the streets and spaces back to the pedestrians, whilst providing space for new development and bringing cultural life to the heart of Hammersmith. The SPD seeks to provide a planning framework for the masterplan findings to provide planning guidance for developers and residents for Hammersmith town centre.

- 1.7 The SPD sets out a range of requirements to be delivered through the planning application process, as well as more detail on implementation to ensure policy objectives are delivered. In particular, it indicates areas of opportunity within the centre, including Hammersmith Broadway and King Street together with key interventions such as a potential Flyunder and improvements to the gyratory. There is also specific guidance related to accessibility, sustainability, heritage, tall buildings and density, public realm and transportation.
- 1.8 The SPD is necessary to ensure that up-to-date guidance on Hammersmith Town Centre is in place to help implement the Hammersmith and Fulham Industrial strategy, to support the adopted Local Plan and to comply with regulatory requirements.

2. Consultation Undertaken

- 2.1 When undertaking consultation on the SPD, we followed the processes outlined in its Statement of Community Involvement which was adopted in November 2015.
- 2.2 Public consultation on the draft SPD ran for 8 weeks until 19th March 2024. The document was made available on our website and on our 'Have your say' consultation portal. In addition, we promoted participation in the consultation on our digital channels, the weekly e-newsletter as well as on the 'Nextdoor' engagement platform. The SPD was made available at the borough reference libraries and on our website, as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement. Additional targeted consultation was carried out, including publicity via the council's Twitter account and a series of workshops at the Irish Centre in Hammersmith and online. We wrote to specific consultation bodies outlined in the Regulations and to general consultation bodies, such as amenity groups, resident associations, businesses and others. We also had dedicated sessions on the SPD with our Design Review Panel and a presentation at the Hammersmith BID board meeting.
- 2.4 Following the consultation on the draft SPD, a number of amendments have been made in response to the representations received. This Statement of Consultation provides a summary of the responses received to each topic area and how we have addressed these comments. A full schedule of the representations received and officer responses as well as a revised version of the SPD can be found on our website at: www.lbhf.gov.uk/localplan

3. Summary of Responses

- 3.1 In total, 149 representations were received from 39 organisations/individuals to a variety of topics within the SPD.
- 3.2 A full schedule of the representations received including officer responses can be found on the council's website. This shows how officers have addressed each comment received and outlines the changes which have been proposed.
- 3.3 A summary of the representations received to each topic area of the SPD can be found below.

General Comments

General comments included those which didn't relate to a specific topic area of the SPD but related to the document as a whole. A total of 45 comments were received made up of fourteen individuals, nine businesses and nine statutory consultees/organisations, as set out in full detail in the Schedule of Representations. These included the Hammersmith Society, Hammersmith BID, and the Inclusive Design Review Panel. Of these, 21 comments were broadly supportive of the SPD some of which also sought more detail, further wording or sought changes.

Overall, there were many comments seeking more details, or a stronger position on development or specific sites that can't be achieved in Supplementary Planning Guidance. As SPDs are guidance documents, the Hammersmith SPD must be read with the policies in the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan and London Plan. The SPD is a planning document and therefore it can only guide development that requires planning permission and cannot include planning policies, and therefore some suggestions were beyond its remit. There will be an opportunity to make representations on land use matters in the future as part of a local plan review.

A number of comments were made seeking the reopening of Hammersmith Bridge, which is outside the remit of the SPD, and on the SPD's references to replacing the gyratory and Hammersmith flyover with a flyunder. Whilst this is an ambition of the council, and appropriate to set it out as such in the SPD, there is no delivery timetable at present as the project requires significant funding and resources from central government.

A number of comments and suggestions were made on connectivity and the public realm. We agree this is important and have made changes to the text. In response to Ingka Centre's comment on the role and potential of Livat in providing better pedestrian connectivity and potential for further pedestrian improvements, we have added their suggested reference to the Livat centre. Some helpful suggestions were also received regarding personal safety and security, and inclusive design and we have made changes. We have added reference to better connections between the two tube stations in response to a comment made by a resident. We have also

taken on board their suggestion and added reference to Secured by Design Standards, and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTD). In response to TfL Spatial Planning, we have included more text on inclusive wayfinding, on considering the range of needs which should be designed into spaces and added references to the GLA's Safety in Public Spaces: Women, Girls and Diverse People and the Mayor's strategy to eliminate Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG). We note and agree with the very detailed representations made from the Inclusive Design Panel on barriers faced by disabled people in the built environment. Within the limited remit of supplementary planning guidance, we have sought to reflect this by adding text to the Vision to provide an overarching approach to achieving an accessible and inclusive town centre that provides a positive experience for all.

We have been prompted by residents' comments on urban greening/trees to add a reference to living wall and deciduous tree cover which is also referred to in our Climate Change SPD.

A number of comments were made on design, character and tall buildings. Residents' concerns included impact of tall buildings on local character and skyline, the need to be located sensitively and to be justified and balanced with public /community benefits. The Hammersmith BID wanted to see more details included on tall buildings. We note the concerns, however SPDs provide indicative guidance in relation to tall buildings and design, and whilst a material consideration, planning applications must be determined using planning policies and site-specific considerations. Planning applications for tall buildings will be assessed against the London Plan and Local Plan policies.

A number of detailed representations were made on commercial uses, including from organisations with sites in the Hammersmith SPD area (Romulus and Britel Fund Trustees Ltd, Marks and Spencers and Reef group). Topics included offices, student accommodation and visitor accommodation. Marks and Spencer and Reef Group sought inclusion of their site and reference to student housing policies. Romulus were concerned that the SPD had not considered greater diversification of uses and commented that the social and economic market conditions and declining office market in recent years. There was support for the SPD vision for retrofitting, regeneration and diversification of uses. The Hammersmith Society noted the need to balance the need to promote Hammersmith as a business centre, with current working practices. Britel Fund Trustees Ltd wanted the SPD to allocate sites and to provide more detail on housing and affordable housing.

We agree with the comment on referring to a wider range of visitor accommodation than just 'hotels' and have reflected this in the final draft. As SPDs are guidance documents, many of the comments made are appropriate to be addressed in the development plan. We will shortly be undertaking a local plan review, and there will

be an opportunity to engage with the local plan process including on the evidence base, new policies, regeneration areas and site allocations.

Both the Worshipful Company of Girdlers, and Patrizia and Nuveen suggested that the SPD is applied with greater flexibility and noted that planning obligations should not be at the expense of scheme viability. We agree that an element of flexibility and overall viability are important in bringing development forward, however SPDs provide guidance and cannot be used to determine the decision on planning applications. Use of planning obligations must be relevant and appropriate to a new development and avoid making it unviable.

The Environment Agency sought more details or inclusion on a number of environmental topics, including on flood risk/resilience, Biodiversity Net Gain and water resources. Some of the matters raised are included in the adopted Climate Change SPD which sets out both policy and best practice and is signposted in the Hammersmith SPD.

Introduction

Five issues were raised on the Introduction by three consultees: three from the Hammersmith Society and one each from the Hammersmith BID and one from another consultee.

The Hammersmith Society raised an issue about the “Where we are now” graphic, noting that further details were not provided on the development sites identified in this section or any explanations on their significance for the SPD. These comments were noted but no changes have been made to this section as it is presented for context only and to provide an overview of sites that are in the planning process or that have received planning permission, alongside other key opportunity sites. This helps to illustrate the scale of changes already taking place in Hammersmith town centre.

The Hammersmith Society also stated that the resident-led masterplan referenced in the SPD was not subject to public consultation and not endorsed by the residents’ group although it is also noted that it was a useful stepping stone if not a conclusive document when it was published in 2019. This comment has been noted. The resident led masterplan does not hold any planning weight and therefore was not the subject of a public consultation. However, key elements of the masterplan have informed the approach and guidance provided within the SPD. There were no changes proposed in relation to this comment.

The Society also raised a point about the length of the “Purpose of the SPD” section, saying that this could have been consolidated into a shorter statement to provide more clarity and engagement to the reader. This comment has been considered but the detail provided in this section is considered to be appropriate to explain the document and the policy framework for the SPD.

One consultee highlighted that although the introduction states that Hammersmith Town Centre is identified as having poor quality public realm and a poor pedestrian environment, there are many wide pavements and excellent public park spaces such as Ravenscourt, Brook Green and Furnival Gardens and also Lyric Square and St Pauls Green, raising the question of how the quality of public space is defined. This comment has been considered but no amendments made to the text. We agree that many parts of the town centre do have good public realm, but it is important to note the poor quality that does exist in the town centre.

The Hammersmith BID noted the introductory text and summarised the issues covered by the SPD. These comments were noted but did not require any changes to the text.

Setting the Scene

One representation was received from the Inclusive Design Review Panel, who noted that the “Setting the Scene” section was helpful but raised some issues with the “weaknesses” and “opportunities” it identified. In particular, the Panel made comments about the barriers in public realm faced by pedestrians, dominated by vehicular traffic and barriers faced by disabled people in the pedestrian environment. The Panel also felt that there should be more emphasis on making developments, open space and the public realm more inclusive. In response to these comments, the reference to “poor pedestrian environment” in the “Weaknesses” text box has been amended to also refer to “barriers faced by disabled people in the pedestrian environment”. Also, three bullet-points in the “Opportunities” text box have been amended to refer to “inclusive” mixed use development opportunities to deliver new homes and jobs; to highlight the “accessibility and inclusivity” of the public realm and open space and also to refer to how connections to the river should also be “inclusive”.

Purpose of the SPD

Two representations were received on this section from 2 different consultees: the Inclusive Design Review Panel and the Marks and Spencer and Reef Group.

As with the preceding section, the Inclusive Design Review Panel highlighted that there should be references to accessibility and inclusivity issues when talking about the development of the new Civic Campus site and also in the text on Hammersmith town centre’s role in providing arts, culture and leisure services.

There was also a call for the “Policy Context” section to reference the council’s policy on accessible and inclusive design as well as highlighting the need for compliance

with Building Regulation requirements on accessible and adaptable housing (standard M4(2)) and wheelchair housing (M4(3)).

Finally, the Panel noted that with regards to Master planning /Design Coding and Planning Briefs, that these would be encouraged as part of the Development Management process and that the Inclusive Design Review Panel may want to review development proposals to ensure that they comply with our Local Plan policy on providing accessible and inclusive design as well as other policies such as climate change.

As with the comments received from the Panel on the “Setting the Scene” section, the comments on referencing accessibility and inclusivity issues have been noted and a number of amendments made to the text in the introductory paragraphs to emphasise that Hammersmith Town Centre, its public spaces and sites such as the Civic Campus should strengthen the provision of accessible and inclusive sites and cultural and leisure services.

With regards to the comment on expanding references to the Local Plan policies and Building Regulation requirements on accessibility, it is considered that compliance requirements with regards to the M4(2) and M4(3) standards is already included in the Local Plan which the SPD document refers to.

On the final point about the Master planning, Design Coding and Planning Briefs comment, this is noted, and the relevant text has been amended to note that the master planning and design coding process should be used to facilitate optimisation and comprehensive inclusive development as part of the Development Management process. It should be noted that the role of a design review panel is advisory and not intended to replace the role of planning officers in determining compliance with policy.

The Marks and Spencer and Reef Group noted that the Master Planning/Design Coding and Planning Briefs section of the SPD mentions that the council expects landowners for sites under multiple ownerships to work together to bring more comprehensive development forward. If they do not and take a phased approach to development, then it says proposals should illustrate how they would not fetter the ability of adjacent sites to come forward for an optimum form of development.

The Group highlights that this text appears to acknowledge that there are times when circumstances mean that sites under individual leaseholds which are part of a wider freehold will have to come forward in isolation, noting that this is the case for their site at 27-39 King Street. These comments have been noted but it is considered that no changes are required to the text.

Vision

Four representations were received on the “Vision” section from four different consultees: Hammersmith BID; the Hammersmith Society; the Inclusive Design Review Panel and the Environment Agency.

Hammersmith BID noted that the SPD builds on the previous Hammersmith Regeneration Masterplan work and emphasises the prioritisation of the public realm. However, it is also noted that the Residents Group that took part in that earlier work were more focussed on building heights.

With regards to the “Objectives for Delivery” that are set out in this section, the BID note that there is scope for an enhanced sense of space via a more diverse mix of uses, new public spaces, etc. They also emphasise that combining the Civic Campus redevelopment with the reshaping of the Broadway and Queen Caroline Street, to enable King Street to be a ‘strong’ spine connecting these, along with making improvements to connections to the river are key to transforming central Hammersmith, reuniting the centre. This is considered to be something that should be vigorously encouraged.

On the topic of “Anchoring Creative and Entrepreneurial Hubs”, the BID highlighted that affordability is the key to being able to exploit connectivity to encourage new creative and entrepreneurial uses, including by creating space in new and repurposed buildings. In the view of the BID and many of its members, the quality of Hammersmith’s public realm and leisure offer are fundamental to this objective.

Finally, the BID agreed that there should be a focus on genuinely affordable homes and notes that increasing housing in the town centre is seen as a way to enhance its vibrancy. However, they acknowledge that this will influence developers’ approach to proposed uses, mix and, importantly, the viability of proposals, potentially leading to pressure for increased density and building height.

With regards to the point about building heights, the SPD provides indicative guidance in relation to tall buildings, suggesting locations which may be suitable for large/tall buildings and providing indicative development parameters and identifying key views for consideration. Planning applications for tall buildings will be assessed against the London Plan and Local Plan policies, with particular focus on townscape, heritage, and other design considerations.

We will seek to increase the amount of housing in the town centre to create a more diverse and vibrant town centre. In each case, proposals will be required to be well designed across a mix of tenures and uses and comply with London and Local Plan Policy on building height, density, mix and affordability. No changes to the text are considered necessary on these points.

Hammersmith Society noted that the vision ‘...to restore the heart of the town centre...’ is the Local Plan aspiration to which the SPD should provide shape, direction and reality but then also considers that the objectives for delivery set out as part of this vision could be presented in a more concise way.

These comments have been noted but no changes are considered to be required. Further shape and direction are provided in the Spatial Framework section, through the visions for the character areas and key sites. The text expands upon the overall vision which has been separated into different objectives for clarity.

The Inclusive Design Review Panel highlighted that they want to build upon the strengths set out in the Vision section to reaffirm the role of the town as an accessible and inclusive well connected heart of West London life, along with inclusive and affordable homes. The Panel is also keen to emphasise that the highway network should be redesigned to enhance accessible and inclusive movement and connections with existing open/ green spaces and key cultural destinations.

The Panel expressed support for the replacement of the Hammersmith flyover with a tunnel as this would remove an eyesore and physical barrier and help to significantly enhance the townscape, lessening the impact of through traffic, releasing valuable land for accessible and inclusive development.

The Vision of a green and healthy town centre was also supported including delivery of new accessible and inclusive public spaces and landscaping/urban greening to enhance amenity, air quality and biodiversity, creating accessible and inclusive green corridors/active travel. There was also support for the enhancement of the existing Arts and Culture offer through accessible and inclusive festivals/pop-up events and for improvements to the evening economy.

Finally, there was recognition that new developments will strengthen the identity of the town centre and could help create healthy, green, accessible and inclusive buildings and wider environment, helping to reveal the heritage of Hammersmith, whilst also adapting to climate change - creating a more inclusive Hammersmith that everyone, including disabled people, can enjoy.

The Panel’s comments are noted. The key objective for delivery as set out in the Vision section is to increase vibrancy and create a stronger sense of place. Accessibility and inclusivity are of course important aspects and are a thread which runs throughout the document. However, to further emphasise this, some amendments have been made to the opening Vision statement (under the heading of “Hammersmith – The Heart of West London)” to add references to developments strengthening the identity of an accessible and inclusive town centre, creating a wide

variety of opportunities for employment as well as living in inclusive and affordable homes and references to the highways network being enhanced to improve accessibility and inclusiveness.

The “Key Outcomes listed in this section have been revised to add a new outcome relating to the creation of “an accessible and inclusive town centre which provides a positive experience for all”.

The Environment Agency supported the inclusion of a “Sustainable green and liveable Hammersmith” as a key objective for delivery of the Vision although they also recommended that there is emphasis that all developments should significantly enhance the blue and green infrastructure network and restore, enhance, and increase wildlife and biodiversity.

The EA also made a recommendation that reduction of flood risk should be incorporated into this objective, as redesigning the public realm, particularly using green infrastructure can have multifunctional benefits including reduced flood risk.

These comments have been noted. To a large extent, these issues are included and detailed in the council’s recent Climate Change SPD, and links to planning policy requirements on Urban Greening Factor and Biodiversity Net Gain. The Climate Change SPD is referenced in the “Purpose of the SPD” Section of the Hammersmith SPD as part of the relevant policy context and must be considered as a material consideration in planning decisions. However, an amendment has been made to the “Sustainable, green and liveable Hammersmith” section to add a reference to flood risk reduction.

Spatial Framework

Key concepts

Several consultees commented on the ‘Key Concepts,’ ‘What we can Achieve’ and ‘Realising Opportunities’ sections on page 20-26.

Britel Fund Trustees Ltd queried whether the map extracts contained in each textbox of the Key Concepts section are intended to be indicative to each concept and whether they are a site-specific allocation. It was also requested if each map extract could contain details of the town centre regeneration boundary. The comments have been noted and it has been explained that the SPD does not contain site allocations other than those contained in the Local Plan and the intention behind the concept mapping is to highlight objectives for the centre. It has not been considered necessary to include the town centre regeneration boundary within the map extracts.

The Environment Agency were supportive of the Key Concepts but suggested a stronger emphasis on using green and blue infrastructure and active travel in improving connections to the river. In response, we have agreed to add wording encouraging the use of green and blue infrastructure and active travel to the 'Improving Connections to the River' textbox on page 20.

Referring to each objective in the Key Concepts, the Hammersmith Society felt the diagrams were ineffective and would be better replaced by a single annotated image. The comments were noted, and it has been explained that there is a single Spatial Framework diagram on pages 24 and 25, annotated with each Key Concept with the intent for each concept explained on pages 20-23. A suggestion was also made by the Hammersmith Society for the listing of design principles in the 'Realising Opportunities' section, and also about the importance of planning briefs. We have noted the comments and explained that since design principles are specific to each character area, it is not considered necessary to list them out in this section. The role of the planning brief has been highlighted in this SPD. Site allocations in the Local Plan provide a great amount of detail on our strategic sites in the borough.

The Marks and Spencer and Reef Group were supportive of the objectives included in the Key Concepts. This comment was noted, and the support welcomed.

Hammersmith Broadway Character Area

Various comments were made relating to the section of the SPD addressing the Hammersmith Broadway character area on pages 27-32.

Referring to the map on page 28, the Marks and Spencer and Reef Group suggested that the cultural route linking Lyric Square with St Paul's Church is moved further to the west to demonstrate that this can be facilitated. We have agreed to update the diagram to reflect this as a secondary pedestrian route.

The Worshipful Company of Girdlers highlighted that the proposed public realm works and networks of north-south links across King Street need to be deliverable, with public realm enhancement minimising land-take to what is absolutely necessary and compensated for through height of development permissible. These comments were noted and we have explained that the council will work closely with developers and landowners taking into account land ownerships, viability and density as part of planning discussions as sites are brought forward.

Hammersmith BID put forward a suggestion of 10-20 storeys for building heights in the Hammersmith Broadway area and commented that the guidance for the Livat Centre is very loose. The Worshipful Company of Girdlers and Patrizia and Nuveen suggested there could be scope for a height greater than 11 storeys on King Street. We have noted comments, clarifying that the opportunities highlighted in the SPD

are not exhaustive or formal site allocations and that height maps are indicative only, with key design principles to be developed upon in the future.

A comment was received from one consultee highlighting the importance of existing transport links such as the gyratory in the context of the proposed flyunder. It was also commented that the bus facility could be better integrated into the Broadway Centre, recommending for a broader redesign and integration of the Broadway shopping centre, tube station and bus station. The comments have been noted and we have highlighted that as part of the public realm improvements, the gyratory would still exist but be reconfigured, and that the site aspirations for Hammersmith Broadway would include the creation of a new, enhanced public transport interchange.

The absence of addresses on King Street in the 'M&S/Boots/One King Street' Key Site was noted by Patrizia and Nuveen and the Worshipful Company of Girdlers. We have agreed to update the Key Site to include a reference to the group of site addresses, as '1-79 King Street/12 Black's Road'.

The Hammersmith Society suggested that clear pictorial illustration and annotation is needed for the 'Future Vision' map on page 28 and that a clear strategy needed for the flyunder and gyratory proposals. The comments have been noted. It has been outlined that the legend to the map on pages 28-29 provides an explanation for each intervention and that the visions for the strategic sites like the gyratory and the flyunder will be developed further as part of site discussions, planning briefs and/or masterplans.

The Environment Agency suggested that the SPD should acknowledge that much of the Hammersmith Broadway area, including the site for the flyunder proposal is within Flood Zone 3. We have noted the comments, acknowledging the flood risk and clarifying that any work undertaken in this area would be subject to the requirements of the Local Plan relevant to mitigating flood risk. Therefore, no changes to the existing text are deemed to be necessary.

Addressing the Key Site at the Livat Centre, Ingka Centres noted that the wording of the text 'the future development of this site' could be misinterpreted as an objective of redeveloping the shopping centre. We have agreed to amend the text in this section to 'future use and diversification on this site.' It was also pointed out that the Livat Centre is incorrectly labelled as Kings Mall on the map of Hammersmith Broadway on page 27 and that it is unclear whether the proposed key intervention to improve the pedestrian area on King Street is proposed for the entire length in front of the Livat Centre. It has been agreed to update the Kings Mall annotation to reflect the centre's current name and that the image of the vision for the Hammersmith Broadway area would be adjusted to cover the Livat Centre.

Royal London Asset Management welcomed this part of the SPD's aim to diversify the town centre offer and support the encouragement of potential highways and public realm improvements. These comments have been noted and the support welcomed.

Strategic Site – Flyover, Hammersmith Gyratory and Adjoining Land

Eleven stakeholders made comments specifically relating to the Strategic Site HRA2 (Flyover, Hammersmith Gyratory and adjoining land).

Hammersmith BID raised concerns on the potential costs of the flyunder, commenting that the gyratory reconfiguration realises most of the flyunder's public realm benefits and recommended that the Council prioritise these changes as relatively easy 'quick wins' compared to the flyunder. Similarly, one resident suggested that the gyratory should be decoupled from the flyunder, to speed up the benefits to the public realm.

The Marks and Spencer and Reef Group generally welcomed the overarching principles of improving connectivity and accessibility but highlighted that the existing and future access and servicing requirements for stores on King Street need to be accommodated for in any design. A concern was also raised on the funding of the flyunder largely through developer contributions and the potential impact this may have on the viability of developments coming forward. Similar concerns regarding viability were raised by the Worshipful Company of Girdlers and Patrizia and Nuveen.

TFL raised that concerns on the scale of funding required for the flyunder's delivery and that the feasibility of the proposed cycle route on the A4 and the gyratory system would also need to be fully investigated with discussions on funding needing to take place.

Comments were made by one consultee on the transport linkages proposed as part of the gyratory reconfiguration, raising concerns that certain residential roads would be more likely to become busier. Similarly, another consultee raised concerns about the impact of pedestrianisation from the gyratory and flyunder projects on residential streets, since this could have the impact of directing traffic to these areas.

Concerns were also raised by various stakeholders on the overall feasibility and estimated cost of the flyunder, the funding by developer contributions and the potential for higher, denser development as a result and the effect on traffic in nearby residential areas. Other concerns included railway lines and access road in and out of the tunnel.

Historic England noted that because the proposed development areas for the flyunder and gyratory are covered by two Archaeological Priority Areas (APAs), any plans for the large-scale works should consider the archaeological implications of the work and consult the Greater London Archaeological Service.

All of the above comments have been noted. An explanation has been provided that the flyunder and gyratory while related are two separate long-term projects both of which will be subject to further consultation, feasibility work, traffic modelling and discussions on financing. Regarding the APAs, it has been explained that the SPD is a supplementary document which should be read alongside the Local Plan which identifies policies on APAs and that any proposal affecting these areas would need to demonstrate compliance with these policies.

King Street Character Area

Respondents also commented specifically on the King Street Character Area.

Various comments were made by one consultee regarding links to Brackenbury Village and the riverside, the Livat Centre, public realm, transport and amenity space. These comments have been noted, highlighting that the SPD sets out a broad vision and the specifics of proposals will be further developed through planning briefs, masterplans and planning applications.

The Environment Agency recommended that since much of the King Street area is in Flood Zone 3, the section should include reference to the flood risk. Comments have been noted and it has been explained that the SPD sits alongside the Local Plan and that any work undertaken in this area would be subject to requirements of the Local Plan relevant to mitigating flood risk.

The Hammersmith Society suggested proposals to activate railway arches north of King Street would be a 'potential diversion from the benefits of King Street'. The comments have been noted and has been explained that activating the railway arches would promote use by SMEs and creative industries. It was also put forward that an image would be useful to illustrate proposals for the King Street 'key intervention' on Page 37. It has been agreed to include a supporting image on this page.

Eastern Quarter Character Area

Several respondents addressed the Eastern Quarter Character Area.

The Environment Agency suggested that the SPD acknowledge areas falling within Flood Zone 3. Comments have been noted and it has been explained that the SPD

sits alongside the Local Plan and that any work undertaken in this area would be subject to requirements of the Local Plan relevant to mitigating flood risk.

One consultee raised concerns and made suggestions about the integration of new developments into the town centre, CCTV coverage, public realm and the extent of the character area. Hammersmith BID raised concerns and made suggestions on building heights at the key sites in the character area. The comments have been noted and it has been clarified that the SPD sets out a broad vision and proposals will be further developed through planning briefs, masterplans and through planning applications.

Northern Quarter Character Area

Comments were also made on the Northern Quarter Character Area. Britel Fund Trustees expressed support for the future development of this area. The support was welcomed. Observations were made by another consultee on traffic management of this area and routes for emergency vehicles. The comments were noted.

Key/Strategic Sites – General Comments

Several general comments were made on the Key/Strategic Sites in the SPD.

The National Grid identified that one or more of the sites cross or are in close proximity to National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) assets. They recommended that the SPD contain wording for development proposals in these areas to include a strategy responding to the NGET Design guide Principles. Comments have been noted. It has been explained that this level of detail would be best placed in a Development Plan Document rather than the SPD and that NGET assets would be captured in a review of the Local Plan.

TFL Spatial Planning were generally supportive of the key sites contained within the SPD but noted that enhanced public transport interchanges and upgrades to the Hammersmith Broadway station would need to be subject to further engagement work to determine feasibility and funding. The comment was welcomed, and it has been acknowledged that the redevelopment would be subject to further discussion with TFL.

Concerns were raised by one consultee on height and densities of new developments and open space. The comments have been noted and it has been clarified that the Hammersmith Regeneration area is identified as an appropriate location for high-rise development in the Local Plan and the London Plan and therefore any impacts will be carefully assessed against the relevant policies to avoid adverse impacts on the area.

Some consultees expressed general support on the replacement of the flyover. These comments of support were welcomed.

Developer Guidance

Several comments were received on the Developer guidance section in the SPD.

Hammersmith BID were generally supportive of the developer guidance and made comments on some of the principles set out in the guidance. On the Key Principle H6 “Mix of Uses”, the BID noted that the council aims to create 10,000 new jobs in Hammersmith by 2035. On this point, given the current office vacancy rates, they suggested a review of the ‘Industrial Policy’ and that developments should be inherently convertible - ‘Long Life, Loose Fit, aspects such as escape provision, floor plate widths, daylight/sunlight.

The comment has been noted. It has been explained that employment and economy policies in the Council’s Local Plan are designed to respond to changing demand and supply and to establish the need for continued uses. Other matters including measures of escape provision are dealt with Building control and covered by other policy provision.

A general comment was made by one consultee who noted that in the section there is no reference of Secured by Design as a planning condition. It has been explained that planning conditions for Secured by Design will be necessary for any relevant application within the town centre. The requirement for Secured by Design is already embedded in the Local Plan as well as the Planning Guidance SPD. Therefore, no changes have been made to the text.

On the topic “Climate Change and Sustainability” one consultee has highlighted that greenhouse gas emissions are mostly generated by the A4. Adding that the decline in the High Street has more to do with post- covid effect, the arrival of Westfield and the lack of investment in the Kings Mall. The respondent also pointed out that limiting the circulation of all vehicles within the town centre as a measure to tackle climate change and increase sustainability may not be the best way to achieve the aim. They indicated the need for new developments to support vehicles which are not all electric and similarly, residents require access to private transport alternatives. They stated that solar power should be also a consideration as well as sustainable low carbon developments and long-term development management.

The council’s approach to new residential developments is car parking free measures in locations where PTAL is high unless evidence is provided to show that there is a significant lack of public transport available. This matter is addressed in the Local Plan and detailed in the council’s recent Climate Change SPD which includes further guidance also on renewable energy and low carbon development. Comments have been noted but we considered that no amendments to the text were required.

Concerns were also raised by one consultee on height and densities of new developments and how the density of type of use should be a consideration in new development to ensure the vitality and viability of the town centre throughout day and nighttime economy. The comment was noted, and we clarified that the Council's Local Plan policies relating to town centre development encourages uses that can contribute to the evening economy. The vision for Hammersmith town centre is to increase the diversity in the range of uses being provided to add vitality to the centre.

With regard to key principle H4 – View Management, one consultee raised some concerns about 'unintended impacts' of new developments upon sight lines and existing development, emergency services radio transmission and the BID town centre radio network and suggested that planning conditions should be applied to mitigate such impacts. They also stated that view management is important for various uses, including the impact tree planting could have in obstructing the view of CCTV cameras. The comments have been noted. We consider that this level of detail is not appropriate for this SPD and therefore no changes were made.

On the topic "Architectural Excellence", one consultee raised concern about the residential development along the A4 by the Civic Campus for lacking architectural excellence but appreciated the inclusion of Secured by Design principles for internal and external spaces. The consultee also emphasised the importance of street design, security, appropriate planting etc. We agree that design measures mentioned by the consultee are important considerations for development proposals coming through the planning process and these impacts will be addressed by the Council's Local Plan policies.

Finally, the consultee commented on the "Active and Accessible Places" section regarding activity and access at ground floor and the proposed approach to the public realm. They also queried the legibility of cycle routes and secure cycle parking measures. These comments have been noted. The council's vision is to restore the heart of the town centre promoting jobs and a wider mix of uses promoting tourism and supporting local communities and businesses. The council will seek to ensure that new developments create accessible and inclusive environments to remove any barriers to access from all residents, visitors and users of the town centre. The "Active and Accessible Places" section focuses mainly on the permeability and legibility of routes in order to improve the public realm making it more accessible, attractive, enjoyable and inclusive.

The Environmental Agency (EA) recommended revising wording to focus more on biodiversity net gain and the urban green factor. The EA also appreciated that flood risk matter was included in the SPD and suggested the introduction of a specific paragraph to encourage developers to consider the risks of flooding at an early stage of the design process, with particular emphasis on sites that are within the tidal breach extent. The consultee also suggested a stronger wording concerning the provision of new/enhanced enabling links into the existing London ecological network of parks,

waterways the river and introduction of SuDs. While the comments were welcomed, no changes are considered necessary as they are already embedded in environmental policies within the Local Plan.

Britel Fund Trustees were supportive of principles H5 and H6. They noted that the SPD follows the approach developed by the 2019 Masterplan and in relation to tall building the illustrative gradient map supports tall buildings 10+ storeys. An additional comment was made in relation to Key Principle H2- Tall buildings, where the consultee suggested a change to the text box of the gradient map. We agreed on the proposed change would ensure consistency and therefore have updated the gradient map accordingly.

Most of the comments received by Royal London Asset Management were supportive of the principles set out in the Developer Guidance, particularly of key principles H1, H2 and H7. In one of their comments, they identified Queen Caroline Street site as potential landmark/gateway location within Key Principle H3. The comments have been noted but it is considered that no changes are required to the text.

FORE Jersey Limited were supportive of principles in the developer guidance section, particularly in regard to H1, H2, H5, H6 and H7 key principles. With regard to principle H3 – Landmarks and Gateways', the consultee encouraged a review of landmark/gateway locations to include 255 Hammersmith Road / Butterwick Road. This comment has been considered but no amendments have been made on the point raised.

Hammersmith Grove Residents Association emphasised the urgent need to address climate change and asked that we cross reference this SPD to our SPD on climate change. They highlighted flooding as local issue requiring adaptation measures and the integration of these in the SPD. They suggested references to the Council's Climate and Ecological Strategy and the Climate Change SPD. We agree with the proposed change, and we have added text to improve clarity.

One consultee encouraged the Council to look at mitigating the impact of Heat Islands particularly around the Broadway as well as identifying "shaded/cooler" areas in summer for office workers and residents to shelter from extreme heat. They also recommended encouraging more EV chargers and more bicycle safe storage units for commuters and office workers.

Climate change and adaptation are detailed in the Climate Change SPD and therefore we are content that the SPD is referenced and we do not need to replicate this detail. In terms of overheating, the Council is committed to reducing its impact by requiring major planning applications to mitigate overheating in line with the London Plan cooling hierarchy and reduce the urban heat island effect. This is also something that is reflected in the Local Plan and Climate Change SPD. The council actively support

electric vehicle charging, its provision is strongly encouraged in new developments where car parking is proposed.

HGRA raised concerns as to how proposals in the SPD might impact on the Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area and have proposed amendments to the description of the area to include reference to the Conservation Area. We have considered the comments and have agreed to update the tall buildings gradient map to exclude the north-western extent of 26-28 Hammersmith Grove as not being suitable for tall buildings to reflect the interface with the scale of adjacent terraces and the need for a transition in height along this boundary.

TfL made a comment on principle H2 -Tall Building, suggesting a change in the development parameters set out in the guidance where 'building heights of between 10- 20 storeys might be achievable'. TfL suggested that the upper height limit is deleted, and that reference is made to height being determined via a design-led approach and as part of a development which delivers significant public benefits.

This SPD provides indicative development parameters for tall buildings that may be considered appropriate for the regeneration area. However, detailed consideration of these matters will be required through the development management process. As per Local Plan Policy DC3, the general character of any particular area will always be an important consideration in assessing the acceptability of tall buildings and a full design appraisal of the impact of a tall building will always be required.

Marks and Spencer and Reef Group requested an update the wording to acknowledge that student use is also an acceptable use in the Town Centre. We considered the comment but such uses would need to be assessed for their acceptability against relevant Local Plan and London Plan policies.

The Hammersmith Society raised concerns relating to the gradient map which suggests that tall buildings may be acceptable at 26-28 Hammersmith Grove. According with the consultee this map contradicts ongoing discussions between residents, the council and developers and could undermine the emerging consensus. The comment has been considered and changes made to the map. The tall buildings gradient map has been updated to exclude the north-western extent of 26-28 Hammersmith Grove as not being suitable for tall buildings.

The Hammersmith Society commented on the "Architectural Excellence" topic emphasising that the illustrations limited to major development projects fail to enhance the importance of architectural excellence in smaller projects. We agree with the consultee's view that architectural excellence should be enhanced in small developments, however it is important to note that the illustrations at page 53 are only intended to be as example of high-quality architecture and successful landmark buildings.

Historic England acknowledged the positive impact of well-designed tall buildings but stressed the importance of understanding the heritage and townscape context of areas. They suggested that the guidance should be cross-referenced with the Local Plan and recommended consulting Historic England's Tall Building Advice Note when considering such developments. The comment has been noted and it has been explained that relevant policies in the Local Plan and in the London Plan are referenced in the supporting text of H2 key principle. The council will assess any planning application scheme for tall buildings very carefully, taking into account the character of the area/site and its heritage value.

Delivery & Implementation and concluding comments

Four representations were received on the "Delivery and Implementation" section from three consultees: Hammersmith BID, TFL and Inka Centres.

One representation was received on the "Conclusions" section from Hammersmith BID.

Hammersmith BID highlighted that cooperation between the Council and a wide range of stakeholders, including Hammersmith BID is the key to delivering the vision and objectives for Hammersmith identified in this SPD. With regard to the actions set out in the short term (0-5 years), they suggested adding more text to improve clarification. We agree that this section can benefit from additional wording and therefore more text has been added to include engagement with the Hammersmith BID when developing a town centre management plan.

TfL welcomed its inclusion in delivering the SPD but noted no current funding has been allocated for the specified interventions in the SPD in their current Business Plan. They recommended expanding the list of planning obligations (S106 and CIL) to include active travel, Healthy Street measures and public transport capacity, aligning with the London Plan policy T9(C). They stressed the importance of these obligations and their willingness to collaborate on the SPD. We agree that the additional wording would provide a more detailed list although not exhaustive, better reflecting the London Plan. Therefore, a new bullet point has been added to the list of planning obligations.

Inka Centres suggested that any planning obligations in the SPD must comply with the criteria outlined in the Community Infrastructure Regulations. The comment has been noted but no amendments to the text are considered necessary. Policy INFRA1 in the Council's Local Plan addresses planning obligations in compliance with Reg 122 CIL Regulations.

With regard to the "Conclusions" section, Hammersmith BID were supportive of the key aims and highlighted that these aims reinforce BID and its members. They also emphasised that public realm improvement is key to the attractiveness of

Hammersmith to existing businesses considering their future and potential incoming businesses. We noted the comment and considered that no changes were required to this section.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Letters/emails sent to Consultees

Appendix 2: Public Notice

Appendix 3: List of people consulted

Appendix 1: Letters sent to consultees

Copy of letter/email sent to statutory consultees, local residents, amenity groups & developers/agents

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Spatial Planning, Economy Department
3 Shortlands, Hammersmith, W6

Tel: 020 8753 1081

Email: localplan@lbhf.gov.uk

Web: www.lbhf.gov.uk/localplan



23rd January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are just writing to let you know that Hammersmith and Fulham Council is consulting on a Hammersmith Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

This document will be out for public consultation for 8 weeks until 19th March 2024. The purpose of the SPD is to deliver a step change in the quality of the physical and built environment in Hammersmith, including transforming the public realm and transport network as well as redevelopment and refurbishment of buildings throughout the area.

Have your say

We welcome any comments you may have on this draft SPD during this 8-week consultation period. (See [Public Notice](#) for more details).

You'll find the documents online at:

[Have your say: Future of Hammersmith Town Centre](#)

The SPD can be viewed on the council's website, or you can read it at one of our three main libraries (Hammersmith, Fulham and Shepherd's Bush).

Let us know what you think by 11:59pm on 19th March 2024.

To comment on the document please write to us using one of the following:

- **Email:** localplan@lbhf.gov.uk
- **Letter:** Team Leader, Policy and Spatial Planning Team, Economy Department, Hammersmith Town Hall, King Street, W6 9JU

If you require further information, please contact us at localplan@lbhf.gov.uk. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

David Gawthorpe
Team Leader, Policy & Spatial Planning
Hammersmith & Fulham Council

**Copy of letter/email sent to Statutory SEA Consultees (Environment Agency,
Historic England & Natural England)**

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Spatial Planning, Economy Department
3 Shortlands, Hammersmith W8

Email: localplan@lbhf.gov.uk
Web: www.lbhf.gov.uk/localplan



23rd January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are just writing to let you know that we will be consulting on the Hammersmith Town Centre Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) for 8 weeks until 19th March 2024. The SPD provides further information and guidance to supplement the Local Plan on matters relating to Hammersmith Town Centre.

The SPD together with its supporting documents including an SEA screening are available to view on the Hammersmith and Fulham council website at:

[HAVE YOUR SAY: The future of Hammersmith town centre | London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham \(lbhf.gov.uk\)](https://www.lbhf.gov.uk/have-your-say)

If you require further [information](#) please contact us at localplan@lbhf.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

David Gawthorpe
Team Leader, Policy & Spatial Planning

Appendix 2: Copy of Public Notice sent to consultees & published on the Council's website

Public Notice inviting representations on the Hammersmith Town Centre Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 Regulation

Notice is hereby given that the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham has published a draft SPD and is inviting representations pursuant to Regulations 12 and 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

(a) Title of Document:

Hammersmith Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

(b) Subject Matter of, and the area covered by, the SPD:

The SPD will support the Local Plan which was adopted in February 2018. Its purpose is to provide supplementary guidance on the Local Plan policies the council will apply when considering planning applications for development proposals relating to Hammersmith Town Centre.

(c) Date by which representations must be made:

11:59pm Tuesday 19th March 2024

(d) Address to which representations must be sent:

Representations may be made either in writing or by email as set out below.

- Email to: localplan@lbhf.gov.uk
- By post to: Team Leader, Policy and Spatial Planning, Economy Department, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Town Hall, King Street, Hammersmith, W6 9JU

(e) Documents are available for inspection

The SPD and associated documents are available for inspection online at:

www.lbhf.gov.uk/localplan

In hard copy format during normal office hours at:

- Fulham Library which is situated at 598 Fulham Road 10am to 7 pm Monday to Thursday, 10am to 5pm Friday and Saturday and 11am to 5pm Sunday;
- Hammersmith Library which is situated in Shepherds Bush Road 10am to 7 pm Monday to Thursday, 10am to 5pm Friday and Saturday.
- Shepherds Bush Library which is situated at 6 Wood Lane 10am to 7pm Monday to Friday, 10am to 5pm Saturday and 11am to 5pm Sunday.

For further enquiries, please email localplan@lbhf.gov.uk

(f) Statement of notification

Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified email or postal address of the adoption of the SPD.

Appendix 3: List of people consulted on the SPD

Statutory Consultees

| |
|--|
| Canal & River Trust |
| City of London Corporation |
| Civil Aviation Authority |
| Environment Agency (London Team) |
| Greater London Authority |
| Hammersmith and Fulham Health and Wellbeing Board (H&WB) |
| Highways England |
| Historic England |
| Homes England |
| Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust |
| Imperial College London |
| London Borough of Barking and Dagenham |
| London Borough of Barnet |
| London Borough of Bexley |
| London Borough of Brent |
| London Borough of Bromley |
| London Borough of Camden |
| London Borough of Croydon |
| London Borough of Ealing |
| London Borough of Enfield |
| London Borough of Greenwich |
| London Borough of Hackney |
| London Borough of Haringey |
| London Borough of Harrow |
| London Borough of Havering |
| London Borough of Hillingdon |
| London Borough of Hounslow |
| London Borough of Islington |
| London Borough of Lambeth |
| London Borough of Lewisham |
| London Borough of Merton |
| London Borough of Newham |

| |
|--|
| London Borough of Redbridge |
| London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames |
| London Borough of Southwark |
| London Borough of Sutton |
| London Borough of Tower Hamlets |
| London Borough of Waltham Forest |
| London Borough of Wandsworth |
| London Port Health Authority |
| Marine Management Organisation |
| Metropolitan Police Service |
| Department for Levelling up, Housing and Communities |
| National Grid |
| Natural England |
| Network Rail Property |
| Networks Branch - London |
| NHS Property Services |
| North London Waste Plan |
| Office of Rail Regulation |
| OPDC |
| Port of London Authority |
| Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea |
| Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames |
| Sport England |
| Thames Water Property Services |
| The Coal Authority |
| The Planning Inspectorate |
| Transport for London |
| Transport for London Commercial Development |
| Transport for London Planning and Construction |
| Western Riverside Waste Authority |
| Westminster City Council |

Planning Agents & Developers

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| AECOM |
| Alsop Verrill LLP |
| Amec Foster Wheeler |
| Architects Muroblanco LTD |
| Asp Architects London Ltd |
| Barton Willmore |
| Boyer Planning |
| Carter Jonas LLP |
| CBRE |
| CgMs Consulting |
| Chase and Partners |
| Citydesigner |
| CMA Planning Ltd |
| Colliers International |
| Cushman & Wakefield LLP |
| Deloitte |
| Development Planning Partnership |
| Dlp Consulting |
| DP9 |
| Dron and Wright Property Consultants |
| Entec UK Ltd |
| ESA Planning |
| GL Hearn |
| GVA |
| Home Builders Federation |
| HTA Design LLP |
| ICENI Projects |
| Indigo Planning |
| Jones Lang La Salle |
| Kirkwell |
| Knight Developments Ltd |
| Knight Frank |
| Lambert Smith Hampton |
| Legal & General Property |
| London First |
| Maddox & Associates |
| Matthew & Son LLP |
| Montagu-Evans |
| Muroblanco LTD |

| |
|--|
| Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners |
| Peacock & Smith |
| Planning Perspectives |
| Planning Potential |
| Planview |
| Planware Ltd |
| PowerHaus Consultancy |
| Quinata Property Group |
| Quod |
| Rapleys LLP |
| Ransome & Company |
| rg+p Ltd |
| Rolfe Judd Planning |
| RPS Planning |
| Romulus |
| Savills |
| Shire Consulting |
| South East Waste Planning Advisory Group |
| SSA Planning |
| Strutt & Parker |
| Tesni Properties |
| Tetlow King Planning |
| TP Bennett |
| Turley Associates |
| U V ARCHITECTS |
| West & Partners |
| Wildstone Planning |
| Montagu-Evans |
| CBRE |
| Tetlow King Planning |
| Lambert Smith Hampton |
| Strutt & Parker |
| CBRE |
| Planview |
| Savills |
| Montagu- Evans |
| Daniel Watney |
| Gerald Eve |

General Consultees

| |
|--|
| Arcus Consulting |
| Safeguarding Planning Manager HS2 Ltd |
| Alumno Developments Ltd |
| Fulham Black Community Association |
| Greek Orthodox Church of St Nicholas |
| Barn Elms Rowing Club |
| St Aidan's East Acton RC Church |
| Advance Advocacy & NCH Violence Community Education |
| Christ Church |
| Ethiopian Christian Fellowship Church |
| Outside Edge Theatre Company |
| Fulham Primary Play Centre |
| Friends of Kenmont Primary School |
| London Corinthian Sailing Club |
| London Bubble Theatre Company |
| New Testament Church of God |
| The Phoenix Canberra Schools Federation |
| Polish Cultural Centre |
| POSK Polish Social & Cultural |
| Standing Together Against Domestic Violence |
| St Johns & St James Church |
| St Peter's Primary School |
| Holy Innocents |
| St Lukes Church |
| Hammersmith & Fulham Citizens Advice Bureau |
| Hammersmith & Fulham Skills Centre |
| Gateway Clubs (Mencap H&F) |
| Peabody - Old Oak Housing Association |
| The Boisot Waters Cohen Partnership |
| The Asian Health Agency |
| Burlington Danes School |
| Renewable Energy Association |
| Parents & Staff Association (PSA) |
| Holy Trinity |
| Business Centre- Hammersmith and Fulham |
| Campaign for Real Ale |
| Canalside Activity Centre |
| Broadway Shopping Centre |
| Friends of Bishops Park |
| St Paul's Church Hammersmith |
| St Charles Centre for Health and Welbeing |
| Dr Edwards & Bishop Kings Fulham Charity |
| Diocese of London |

| |
|--|
| Shepherds Bush Housing Group |
| Queens Park Rangers Over 60's Club |
| Townmead Youth Club |
| Ecologic Architects |
| Osborne Richardson |
| Catalyst Housing |
| British Red Cross Society- London Branch |
| The Consumers Association- Which? |
| NHS Property Services Ltd. (NHS PS) |
| Furnish / Staying First Community Store |
| St George plc |
| London United Busways Ltd |
| Sir John Lillie Play Centre |
| Masbro Brook Green Family Centre |
| Cluttons LLP |
| Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs |
| Age UK Hammersmith and Fulham |
| Ministry of Defence |
| DPDS Consulting |
| Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DVIP) |
| British Geological Survey |
| Department for Business, Innovation and Skills |
| BREEAM Department |
| Confederation of British Industry London Region |
| Considerate Constructors Scheme |
| Construction Industry Council |
| CIRIA |
| Cityscape Digital |
| Department for Culture, Media & Sports |
| Greek Cypriot Association |
| Fulham Football Club Ltd |
| Harper Collins Publishers |
| Hammersmith & Fulham Mind |
| H&F Volunteer Centre |
| LAMDA |
| Lyric Theatre |
| Parvez & Co |
| Rogers Stirk Harbour & Partners |
| Sons of the Thames Rowing Club |
| London Wildlife Trust |
| Workspace Group plc |
| Eric Parry Architects |
| Ealing Somali Welfare and Cultural Association |

| |
|---|
| Rapleys LLP |
| Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust Community Services |
| North London Waste Plan |
| Friends Families and Travellers- Planning |
| Fulham Court Community Group |
| Fulham Football in the Community |
| Fulham Archaeological Rescue Group |
| Fulham Palace Meadows Allotment Association |
| Our Lady of Dolours |
| Imperial College London |
| Central Gurdwara (Khalsa jatha) Sikh Temple |
| NOMS - Ministry of Justice |
| Hammersmith & Fulham Rugby Football Club |
| London Fire Brigade |
| Countryside Properties |
| Novotel Hotel |
| Hotel Ibis |
| St Augustine's Catholic Church |
| Chelsea Harbour Marina |
| Home Builders Federation |
| The Food Standards Agency |
| Community Law Centre |
| Open Spaces Society |
| High Speed Two (HS2) Limited |
| HUDU - Healthy Urban Development Unit |
| NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit |
| Friends of Hammersmith Hospital |
| Fulham Seventh-day Adventist Church |
| African Caribbean Women's Development |
| Action on Disability |
| Assael Architecture Limited |
| Ballymore Properties Ltd. |
| Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan - Institute of Indian Art & Culture |
| British Property Federation |
| British Retail Consortium |
| Brett Group |
| British Rowing |
| Burleigh College |
| Bush Theatre |
| Byrne Estates |
| Centre for Armenian Information & Advice (CAIA) |
| Princes Royal Trust |
| Charing Cross Sports Club |

| |
|--|
| Communities Empowerment Network |
| Chiswick Seventh Day Adventist Church |
| Community Links |
| Campaign to Protect Rural England |
| AASHA |
| Bishop Creighton House- Care and Repair |
| Bishop Creighton House Settlement |
| Community Education Forum |
| Small Jobs Scheme |
| Somali Children's Advocacy |
| London Cyrenians Housing |
| deafPLUS |
| Disabled Living Foundation |
| Ecole Francaise de Londres |
| Hammersmith Eventim Apollo |
| First Plan |
| Fit Rooms Ltd |
| Friends of Wormwood Scrubs |
| Fulham United Reform Church |
| Goldcrest Homes |
| Hammersmith London BID |
| Hammersmith United Charities |
| Harrow Club |
| Home Builders Federation |
| Heritage of London Trust |
| Hogarth Architects |
| Derek Horne & Associates |
| Horn of Africa |
| National Housing Federation |
| Icon Architects |
| Industry Council for Packaging & The Environment |
| Landmark Information Group Ltd |
| Living Streets |
| London Councils |
| London Play |
| Lawn Tennis Association |
| The Lawn Tennis Association |
| Friends of Margravine Cemetery |
| The Mayhew Animal Home |
| Mobile Operators Association |
| Mount Anvil Ltd |
| St Mungo's Broadway |
| Murphy Dave Architects |
| Muscular Dystrophy Campaign |
| Hammersmith Hospitals NHS Trust |
| Retirement Fellowship Group |

| |
|---|
| Octavia Housing |
| White City Adventure Playground Support |
| Pocket Living Limited |
| Puffins Nursery School |
| QPR 1st Supporters Trust |
| Renewable Power Association |
| SPEAR- Resurgo Trust |
| River House Trust |
| Rivermead Court Limited |
| Hammersmith Salvation Army |
| Sickle Cell Society (H&F) |
| Southern Planning Practice Ltd |
| SSA Planning |
| Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation |
| St Peter's Church |
| St Simon's Church |
| Taylor Woodrow Prop Co Ltd |
| The Conservation Volunteers |
| Tetlow King Planning |
| Association for the Conservation of Energy |
| Brunswick Club |
| The Christian Community Church |
| Comer Homes |
| Traveller Law Reform Projection |
| Twynholme Baptist Church |
| Unite Group Plc |
| The Urban Partnership |
| Urban Intelligence Ltd |
| Virtual Engine |
| West London Business |
| Women & Girls Network |
| William Morris Society |
| Al Muntada Al Islami Trust |
| The William Morris Academy |
| Women's Pioneer Housing |
| Hammersmith & Ealing Woodcraft Folk |
| Yarrow Housing |
| CITAS (Community Interpreting Translation and Access Service) |
| Inland Waterways Association |
| Edward Woods Youth Club |
| ZSL London Zoo |
| Mentoring Project |
| Cedar Lodge Sheltered Housing |
| Federation of Small Businesses |
| Kensington Hotel |

| |
|---|
| Kim Wilkie and Associates |
| Hammersmith & Fulham London Cycling Campaign |
| Queens Park Rangers |
| London Buddhist Vihara |
| Arup Planning Consultants |
| Foster and Partners |
| Groundwork London |
| Howard Sharp and Partners |
| Michael Barclay Partnerhip LLP |
| Planning Potential |
| PRP Architects |
| St William Homes LLP |
| Cara Trust |
| Charlick & Nicholson Architects |
| David Lock Associates |
| Every Nation London |
| Fulham Palace Trust - Museum of Fulham Palace |
| Shepherds Bush Empire |
| Shepherds Bush Families Project |
| Hurlingham Club |
| Hurlingham Park Bowls Club |
| Foundations UK |
| The Crown Estate Commissioners |
| Hammersmith & Fulham Chamber of Commerce (now part of LCCI) |
| Westcity Holdings Ltd |
| PowerHaus Consultancy |
| National Deaf Children's Society |
| Bellway Homes North London |
| Big Yellow Self Storage Company Ltd |
| Normand Park Bowling Club |
| Deloitte Real Estate |
| Barker Parry Town Planning |
| The Georgian Group |
| Hammersmith Conservative Association |
| London Historic Parks & Garden Trust |
| Friends of Queensmill School |
| Rivercourt Methodist Church |
| The Serbian Society |
| St Mary's Friendly Group |
| St Stephen's & St Thomas' |
| St Stephen's with St Thomas Social Club |
| Women's Trust |
| GoverNment Property Unit |
| Riverside Artists |

| |
|---|
| Sisterhood & Brotherhood |
| Royal Yachting Association - Oxford Sail Training Trust |
| Paul Dickenson and Associates |
| CBRE |
| Polish Educational Society |
| The Bell Cornwell LLP |
| Natural History Museum |
| Patel Taylor Architects |
| London Diocesan Fund |
| The Diocese of London |
| BT Group Public Affairs |
| Conrad International Hotel London |
| Wyndham Grand London |
| Westfield Europe Ltd |
| Woodland Trust |
| Fulham Somali Women's Association |
| Fairview New Homes Ltd |
| Real Flame |
| Education Funding Agency |
| Lambert Smith Hampton |
| Shepherds Bush Road Methodist Church |

| |
|---|
| St Saviours with St Mary's |
| CAMOC museums of cities |
| Daisy Trust |
| Barons Court Project |
| Asian Elderly Group (Shanti Day Centre) |
| Shanti Day Centre |
| Holy Ghost & St Stephen |
| Somali Community Support Centre |
| London Underground |
| Our Lady (of Peperual Help) |
| St Katherine's Church |
| St Katherines Youth & Community Centre |
| Jones Day |
| Theatres Trust |
| DB Schenker Rail UK |
| St Andrew's Church |
| St Clement's & St Etheldreda's Church |
| L'Oreal |
| West & North West London Vietnamese Association |
| Royal Mail Properties & facilities solutions |
| Education Funding Agency |

Local Residents & Tenants Associations

| |
|--|
| Ashchurch Residents Association |
| Avonmore Residents' Association |
| Barons Court Garden Triangle |
| Brackenbury Residents Association |
| Brickfields Area Residents Association |
| Brook Green Residents Association |
| Cambridge Grove & Leamore Street Residents Association |
| Cathnor Park Area Action Group |
| Charecroft Estate Tenants and Residents Association |
| College Court Residents Association |
| Crabtree Estate Residents' Association |
| Digby Mansions Residents Association |
| Friends of Furnivall Gardens |
| Friends of Ravenscourt Park |
| Fitzgeorge Avenue Leaseholders Association |
| Fulham Reach |
| Fulham Society |
| Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group |
| Hammersmith Embankment Residents Association |
| Hammersmith Society |

| |
|--|
| Hammersmith Mall Residents Association (HAMRA) |
| Hammersmith Grove Residents |
| Kensington Society |
| King Henry's Reach Residents' Association |
| Loftus Road Residents Amenities Protection Association |
| Macfarlane Rd and Hopgood St Residents' Association |
| Peterborough Road and Area Residents' Association (PRARA) |
| P C Fulham Managements Ltd Parkview Court |
| Ravenscourt Action Group |
| Ravenscourt Society |
| Sinclair, Milson & Hofland Roads' Residents' Association |
| Stamford Brook Residents Association |
| St Peter's Planning concern |
| St. Peter's Residents Association |
| St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum |
| Westcroft Square Residents association |
| Woodlands Area Residents Including info for: White City Opportunity Area and Old Oak ward. |

Independent residents, in particular on behalf
of Beavor Lane, Chambon Place, Aiten Place,
Theresa Rd and St Peters Rd

