

Application reference: 21/3954/LBC BARNES WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
16.11.2021	07.01.2022	04.03.2022	04.03.2022

Site:

Hammersmith Bridge, Castelnau, Barnes, London

Proposal:

Works, which include both permanent and temporary interventions, to pedestals to allow for stabilisation works. Temporary dismantling of short sections of existing parapets to allow for the provision of a new temporary scaffold ramps for pedestrian and cyclist access. Erection of temporary timber hoarding around the saddles and pedestals (details of works outlined in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement)

Status: Pending Decision (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Ian Hawthorn
Hammersmith & Fulham Council
Town Hall, King Street
London
W6 9JU

AGENT NAME

Mr Tim Abbott
Mott MacDonald House
8-10 Sydenham Road
Croydon
CR0 2EE
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on 21.01.2022 and due to expire on 11.02.2022

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

English Heritage 1st Consultation
21D Urban D
LBRUT Transport
Environment Agency
The Royal Commission On Historical Monuments Of England
Transport For London
Joint Committee Of The National Amenity Societies

Expiry Date

07.02.2022
07.02.2022
31.01.2022
07.02.2022
07.02.2022
07.02.2022
07.02.2022

Neighbours:

84 Temple Sheen Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7RR -
61 Christchurch Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AN -
13 St Hildas Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9JE -
23 Lonsdale Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9JP -
64 Lillian Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9JF -
"-
44 Castelnau Mansions, Castelnau, Barnes, London, SW13 9QU -
5 Merthyr Terrace, Barnes, London, SW13 8DL -
8 Nassau Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9QE -
Flat 2, 35 Castelnau, Barnes, London, SW13 9RS -
76 Gerard Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9QQ -
55 Lillian Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9JF -
125 White Hart Lane, Barnes, London, SW13 0JW -
54 Nassau Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9QE -
14 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PD -
22 Hillersdon Avenue, Barnes, London, SW13 0EF -

56 Gilpin Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8QY -
 166 Sheen Lane, East Sheen, London, SW14 8LZ -
 4 Thorne Street, Barnes, London, SW13 0PR -
 13 Boileau Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9BJ -
 27 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PF -
 95 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ -
 35 Suffolk Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9NA -
 207C Castelnau, Barnes, London, SW13 9EA -
 61 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ -
 33 Oriel Drive, Barnes, London, SW13 8HG -
 27 BOLINGBROKE ROAD, LONDON, W14 0AJ -
 10 Broughton Avenue, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7TS -
 106c, Richmond Hill, Richmond, TE10 6RJ -
 37 ST ELMO ROAD, LONDON, W12 9EA -
 West House, 108 South Worple Way, East Sheen, London, SW14 8TN -
 27 Charles Street, Barnes, London, SW13 0NZ -
 2 Queensmere Court, Verdun Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9AT -
 8 Suffolk Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9NB -
 77 Dyers Lane, Barnes, London, SW15 6JT -
 44 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PG -
 13 Carlton Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7RJ -
 56 Castelnau, Barnes, London, SW13 9EX -
 56 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QB -
 2A Vicarage Drive, East Sheen, London, SW14 8RX -
 238 Sheen Lane, East Sheen, London, SW14 8RL -
 Flat 18, Doyle House, 46 Trinity Church Road, Barnes, London, SW13 8ED -
 31 Church Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8NW -
 12 Harding House, 20 Trinity Church Road, Barnes, London, SW13 8EH -
 4 Rectory Road, Barnes, London, SW13 0DT -
 60 Lonsdale Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9JS -
 73 Lillian Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9JF -
 10 Coval Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7RL -
 15 Melville Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9RH -
 36 Railway Side, Barnes, London, SW13 0PN -

History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 96/2336/FUL
 Date: 10/04/1997 Erection Of Floodlighting And Decorative Lighting

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 96/2341/LBC
 Date: 10/04/1997 Erection Of Floodlighting And Decorative Lighting

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 97/1458
 Date: 22/08/1997 Strengthening And Remedial Action To Bridge: Crossgirder Connections And Cantilever Flange Refurbishment.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 97/2741
 Date: 29/07/1998 Replacement Of Hammersmith Tower Bearings Strengthening Of Longitudinal Stiffening Trusses Replacement/modification Of Some Of The Hangers.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 19/2813/LBC
 Date: 29/11/2019 Partial dismantling; removal; storage and re-assembly of the four deviation chambers, two at each end of the Bridge.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 19/2813/DD01
 Date: 15/01/2020 Details pursuant to the partial discharge of (U0073162) photographic survey and (U0073168) recording dimensions. Details pursuant to the full discharge of (U0073163) Scaffolding / Temporary Structures (U0073164) Identification of Panels (U0073165) Transport and Storage and (U0073166) Hidden Bolts Method Statement

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 19/2813/DD02

Date:16/06/2020

Details pursuant to the partial discharge of U0073162 (Photographic Survey) and U0073168 (Recording Dimensions)

Development Management

Status: INV

Date:

Application:21/3738/VRC

Application Reference Number: 2019/02727/LBC Date of Decision:

01/11/2019 Condition Number(s): Condition 5 - transport and storage

Current wording: Prior to the dismantling of the cladding panels to the deviation chambers, details including method statements of the proposed method of salvage, transport, protection and secure storage of the cladding panels including the storage location shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with such details as have been approved. Condition 13 - reinstatement timeframes Current wording: Within 2 years of the decision date of the application hereby approved, the reinstatement works including the repainting (in colours to match the existing) of those elements of the bridge affected by the works shall have been completed to a standard agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Conditions(s) Removal: delay in completion of the development Condition 5 - Transport and storage Prior to the dismantling of the cladding panels to the deviation chambers, details including method statements of the proposed method of salvage, transport, protection and secure storage of the cladding panels including the storage location shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to any subsequent change to the storage location of the salvaged cladding panels, details including method statements of the proposed method of transport, protection and secure storage of the cladding panels including the new storage location shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with such details as have been approved. Condition 13 - Reinstatement Within 5 years of the decision date of the application hereby approved, the reinstatement works including the repainting (in colours to match the existing) of those elements of the bridge affected by the works shall have bee...

Development Management

Status: PDE

Date:

Application:21/3954/LBC

Works, which include both permanent and temporary interventions, to pedestals to allow for stabilisation works. Temporary dismantling of short sections of existing parapets to allow for the provision of a new temporary scaffold ramps for pedestrian and cyclist access. Erection of temporary timber hoarding around the saddles and pedestals (details of works outlined in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement)

Enforcement

Opened Date: 21.05.2019

Enforcement Enquiry

Reference: 19/0233/EN/ADV

Application Number	21/3954/LBC
Address	Hammersmith Bridge, Castelnau, Barnes
Proposal	Works, which include both permanent and temporary interventions, to pedestals to allow for stabilisation works. Temporary dismantling of short sections of existing parapets to allow for the provision of a new temporary scaffold ramps for pedestrian and cyclist access. Erection of temporary timber hoarding around the saddles and pedestals (details of works outlined in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement)
Contact Officer	Sarah Griffiee
Target Determination Date	04.03.2022

1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer has considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Hammersmith Bridge is a suspension bridge which links Castelnau in Barnes with Hammersmith over the River Thames. The bridge is currently closed to vehicle traffic but is still in use for pedestrians and cyclists. The structure is Grade II* listed.

The site is subject to the following constraints:

- Archaeological priority
- Floodzone 2 and 3 but benefitting from flood defences
- Community Infrastructure Levy band – higher
- Castelnau Conservation Area
- Highway maintained at public/private expense
- Landmark: Ref 1
- Metropolitan Open Lane site
- Protected Vista
- Barnes Village Planning Guidance: Character Area 2

Hammersmith Bridge is described as follows in the Historic England listing description:

Hammersmith Bridge is an elaborate suspension bridge that is 250.5m long and 13.1m wide carrying an 8.2m wide carriageway formed from wrought-iron girders. The bridge has wrought-iron parapets, mild steel chain links and air draught gauges both up and down stream. There are monumental anchorages surviving from the early C19 bridge; these have been substantially rebuilt in the interests of greater strength. The abutments and piers are made of concrete clad in Portland stone and cast-iron. The road decking dates from 1973-6.

The skeletal wrought-iron framework of the towers, the cross-beams and related superstructure is clad in ornamental cast-iron castings, gilded in places. The bridge is very ornate and the decorative iron blocks that support the walkway sit on squat, clustered Doric columns on stone piers in the river. The bridge is painted dark green and gold, the colour scheme that Bazalgette originally intended as seen on the original plans. There are some heraldic designs on the towers: the Royal Arms of the UK, Guildford (the county town of Surrey), Colchester (the county town of Essex) and the crests of the county of Kent and the cities of London and Westminster

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Works, which include both permanent and temporary interventions, to pedestals to allow for stabilisation works. Temporary dismantling of short sections of existing parapets to allow for the provision of a new temporary scaffold ramps for pedestrian and cyclist access.

Erection of temporary timber hoarding around the saddles and pedestals (details of works outlined in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement)

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above however the most relevant planning history is as follows:

21/1770/FUL – Erection of a new river pier, associated walkway and landing for a temporary period of up to three years for the purpose of providing a passenger and cyclist ferry service associated with the temporary closure of Hammersmith Bridge; the application also includes public realm works, including a new temporary pedestrian walkway and landscaping scheme. Withdrawn: 26.11.2021

19/2813/LBC - Partial dismantling; removal; storage and re-assembly of the four deviation chambers, two at each end of the Bridge. Granted: 29.11.2019

- DD01 - Details pursuant to the partial discharge of (U0073162) photographic survey and (U0073168) recording dimensions. Details pursuant to the full discharge of (U0073163) Scaffolding / Temporary Structures (U0073164) Identification of Panels (U0073165) Transport and Storage and (U0073166) Hidden Bolts Method Statement. Granted: 15.01.2020
- DD02 - Details pursuant to the partial discharge of U0073162 (Photographic Survey) and U0073168 (Recording Dimensions). Granted: 15.06.2020

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

1 letter of representation in support has been received from Sarah Oline, MP for Richmond Park and her comments can be summarised as follows:

- Bridge is an integral piece of London’s transport infrastructure
- Has impacted daily travel routes such as for school children and key workers
- Support proposal for permanent stabilisation

49 letters of representation in support has been submitted and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Support
- Key to ensure pedestrian and cyclist access
- Key piece of London-wide infrastructure
- Should be completed as soon as possible
- Positive decision should not be delayed
- Meets objectives of stabilisation and heritage
- Essential works

2 letters making a general observation have been submitted and the comment can be summarised as follows:

- Will help pedestrians and cyclists
- Concern that cycle/taxi service is required for elderly and disabled use
- Small element towards maintaining temporary access
- Request information on long term plans regarding vehicular use of the bridge
- Bridge closure is causing local traffic chaos and pollution to south of river

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2021)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

Policy HC1 Heritage Conservation and Growth

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan>

Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1	Yes

Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes	
--------------------------------------	-----	-----	--

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

Listed Buildings

These policies can be found at:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:

Castelnau Conservation Area Statement

Determining applications in a Conservation Area

In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to that duty, decisions of the court have confirmed that for development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area, a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

In applications where the decision-maker is satisfied that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area, the statutory presumption against granting planning permission described above falls away. In such cases the development should be permitted or refused in accordance with the policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

Determining applications affecting a Listed Building

Sections 16(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that, when considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, or whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to this duty decisions of the court have confirmed that a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. However, this does not mean that the weight that the decision-maker must give to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting is uniform. It will depend on, among other things, the extent of the assessed harm and the heritage value of the asset in question. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to a listed building or its setting is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

In considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent, in accordance with section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Local Planning Authority is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The Bridge is Grade II* Listed and is sited within Castelnau Conservation Area. As such, great weight shall be given to the conservation of the heritage assets in accordance with policy LP3 and the NPPF. This application seeks permission for temporary and permanent works to stabilise Hammersmith Bridge.

Background

The NPPF sets out at paragraph 194 that applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected which the application has done in this instance via the heritage statement included within the Design and Access Statement. The significance is summarised below.

The bridge holds architectural significance due to its overall appearance including monumental towers, ornamentation and lavish colour scheme and heraldry.

The bridge also holds technological special interest due to its materials and as it is a replacement of one of the first modern iron suspension bridges to cross the Thames. While the bridge itself has been replaced, the original foundations remain.

The bridge also holds significance as a result of its historical association with Sir Joseph Bazalgette who designed the current bridge and was also an eminent Victorian engineer who also designed important structures such as the London Sewer System and other London bridges.

As such, any proposed works should sustain and enhance the significance of the heritage asset and where there is harm to the significance, this shall not be permitted unless the identified harm is outweighed by public benefits.

Temporary Works

The proposed temporary works include the localised dismantling of pedestrian parapet panels and dismantling and off-site storage of additional cast iron deviation chamber casing panels.

The removal of panels from the pedestrian parapet is required to allow for the provision of a new temporary scaffold ramp which will ensure that pedestrians and cyclists can still use the bridge while the stabilisation works are occurring. From the information provided, it is understood that the scaffolding ramps themselves do not require listed building consent as they will not physically interact with the bridge. Once works are complete, it is proposed to reinstate the panels to restore the full length of the pedestrian parapet. The submitted Design and Access Statement sets out that there is evidence that some of the pedestrian panels have been removed before which evidences that replacement and removal is possible.

The removal of the deviation chamber casing panels is required to provide access to the seized roller bearings to facilitate the proposed stabilisation works (see permanent works below). While these are required to be removed as part of the proposed works, as with the pedestrian parapet panels, these elements are also proposed to be reinstated following the completion of the refurbishment works.

These temporary proposed works will result in some short-term harm to the appearance of the listed structure and as a result of the works required to remove and reinstate the features. However, this harm is considered less than substantial, and this identified harm is outweighed by the public benefits of such works which will allow for the long-term stabilisation and so conservation of the bridge and in that the works will allow for pedestrians and cyclists to use the bridge while these stabilisation works occur.

Permanent Works

The bridge was initially closed to traffic in 2019 after testing found significant cracks in pedestals from stress concentrations. This was found to be due to corroded roller bearings which had seized causing the pedestals to be overstressed. An application in 2019 approved opening up works which allowed access to remove the paint and fully inspect the condition. The proposed works here have been informed by the previous opening up works and are proposed to undertake the replacement of the roller bearings in order to stabilise the bridge.

The proposed permanent works include the addition of fabricated steel brackets, replacement of corroded steel rollers with elastomeric bearing and the filling of internal voids with fibre reinforced concrete and light cage of conventional reinforcing steel.

The proposed permanent works do include the removal of some original fabric such as the rollers and includes the introduction of non-traditional materials such as concrete. However, it is noted that these alterations will be sited internally within the casings and so will be screened from public view once the casings are reinstated. As such, these works do not harm the historical association with Bazalgette and do not impact on the external architectural appearance. It is also noted the works are required to preserve the technological special interest of the bridge. Given this less than substantial harm, and the public benefits of the works which will assist in the long-term conservation of the bridge as a listed heritage asset and for its use for pedestrians, the public benefits of the permanent works are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm.

Conclusion

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the Officer Planning Report – Application 21/3954/LBC Page 7 of 9

significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. In this instance, the works overall are considered to result in less than substantial harm to the listed bridge. However, the public benefits associated with long term stabilisation, and so conservation of the bridge and that the works will allow pedestrian access to remain while work are carried out, are considered to substantially outweigh this harm.

As such, the application is recommended for approval subject to condition.

Fire Safety

The London Plan 2021 contains Policy D12 which requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications to fulfil the criteria set out in Part A of this policy. The draft guidance confirms that this also applies to Listed Building Consents. Where the applicant considers parts of or the whole policy do not apply, this should be justified in a Reasonable Exception Statement (RES).

In this instance, a Reasonable Exception Statement has been provided. This sets out that as the works relate to a bridge and not a building, and given that some works are short term, this negates the requirement for some of the criteria. The author of the RES is a chartered engineer which is considered a suitable level of competency given the proposed scheme.

There are no existing fire appliances or assembly points and so none are proposed as the works will not substantially alter the structure such that these will be required. During the short term works, temporary scaffold will ensure pedestrian access/exit is retained which could be used during as a means of escape. In the long term, the use of the permanent footway will be reinstated for these purposes. During construction, minimal welding and cutting will be required on site and any such works will be undertaken with the benefit of a hot works permit which will also limit fire risk.

Passive and active safety measures like fire doors or fire alarms are not considered applicable due to the nature of the site as a bridge rather than a building.

As such, the information provided is considered to sufficiently justify why the policy is not applicable in this instance and so no objection is raised to the proposal in this regards.

7. LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker. The Mayor of London's CIL and Richmond CIL are therefore material considerations.

On initial assessment this development is not considered liable for the Mayoral or Richmond CIL however this is subject to confirmation by the CIL Administration Team.

8. RECOMMENDATION

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process. In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

Grant planning permission with conditions

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / ~~NO~~

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable YES* NO
(*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement YES* NO
(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file) YES NO

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials):SGR.....

Dated:25/02/2022.....

I agree the recommendation:

This application has been subject to representations. The Head of Development Management / South Area Team Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

South Area Team Manager: 

Dated:25.02.2022.....