

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 07/05/2024

REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND PLACE

Application:	CON/24/00063	Agenda Item:	S54		
Address:	15 Selwood Place, LONDON, SW7 3QL				
Proposal:	Details required by Condition 3 (Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)) of planning permission PP/23/03872 (Construction of basement beneath part of the rear garden; replacement and extension of rear ground floor extension with rooflights)				
Applicant:	Investment				
Agent:	Mr Robinson Investment				
Properties notified:	Objections:	Support:	Comments:	Petition:	
0	8	0	0	0	
Listed building:	Grade II				
Conservation area:	Thurloe and Smith's Charity				

ADDENDUM REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND PLACE

1. Background

- 1.1 Planning application CON/24/00063 was considered by the Planning Applications Committee on 27th February 2024. The Committee resolved to defer their decision. The Committee's concerns related to the potential need for a skip and that if it is required its location at the parking bay on the road at Elm Place; the width of a 9m tipper vehicle would overhang the highway as the width of the vehicle is wider than a standard parking bay; and the site access should be via Selwood Place rather than Elm Place.
- 1.2 In response to these concerns a revised Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted on 14th March 2024.
- 1.3 Given the type of application, the scale and nature of the additional information, formal re-consultation with neighbouring residents was not required.

2. Further considerations

- 2.1 The revised CTMP which appears to have contractor input which demonstrate a significant reduction in the programme length to 23 weeks and the number of vehicles required for the project. Vehicle routing has also been reversed following neighbour concerns about the previous routing. The revised CTMP has also included measurements which demonstrates sufficient room for vehicles to manoeuvre into the suspended parking bay. As confirmed under Q23 of the CTMP, no skips would be placed onto the highway which would minimise any obstructions on the road.
- 2.2 The Council's Transportation and Highways Officer has reviewed the final CTMP in full and confirmed that:
- The vehicle scheduling is appropriate and the chosen route is acceptable
 - The method of spoil removal is acceptable
 - The method of concrete supply is acceptable
 - The hours of operation are accepted by the applicant
 - The single 5m bay parking suspension is appropriate
 - The relevant plans and drawings have been appended to the CTMP to form a standalone document

3. Consultations carried out

Comments from interested parties

- 3.1 5 additional letters were received objecting to the application, summarised as

	Comment	Response
1	<p>Width of the highway</p> <p>Unclear whether the 1.2m clear passage for wheelchair users and children's pushchairs is provided as per Council regulations. Elm Place is a two way street but does not allow 2 cars to pass at the same time. Unlikely that anyone from the Council has visited the site.</p>	<p>The widths of the road would be sufficient to accommodate the setup proposed and the tracking drawings in the revised CTMP. Even with the gantry installed there will be more than 1.2m clearance for wheelchairs and pushchairs to access. The Council's Transport Officers have visited the Street and considered the revised CTMP acceptable.</p>
3	<p>Traffic and Deliveries</p> <p>The alterations to the direction of construction traffic to which it would arrive and depart makes no difference to the original objections made.</p> <p>Impossible for vans to pull into the yellow line area easily and could cause damage to cars and collisions. This is exacerbated by using wide trucks</p>	<p>The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed and scrutinised the submitted CTMP and raised no objection to the discharge of the condition. The vehicle scheduling is appropriate and the chosen route acceptable; the hours of operation are accepted by the applicant; and the number and level of vehicle movements are acceptable.</p> <p>Vehicles can traverse the bays without encroaching, it is the angle of them that gives the illusion of over-running. None of the other nearby developments in the past few years have had a problem with Elm Place.</p>
4	<p>Parking Suspensions</p> <p>Parking Suspensions should be</p>	<p>Although the objections cite the front of the property as being more suitable, given the</p>

	<p>applied in front of 15 Selwood Place, not in front of Selwood Lodge in Elm Place, where there will be a gantry stationed onto pavement plus deliveries etc. Most of the bays suspended are not directly outside of the site along Elm Place. The Council resist the suspension of parking bays outside adjoining properties, in this case, Elm Place, yet this has been proposed which is contrary to RKBC policy.</p>	<p>applicant owns the land in question the use of Elm Place to serve the basement works to the rear of the property is acceptable in terms of highway safety. Although Selwood Place itself is wider, vehicles will still need to access via Elm Place and the manoeuvring required would mean at least three parking bays being suspended. With the setup on Elm Place and the use of the yellow line, only a single parking bay requires suspension.</p> <p>With regards to parking suspensions, these operate Monday through to Friday, with no works permitted at weekends or bank holidays, in accordance with our Code of Construction Practice. In practical terms with the proposed site setup, during the week, residents should be able to use the bays overnight, provided they are vacated by the morning.</p>
5	<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) other issues</p> <p>It remains unclear whether a skip would be required and if so where this would be placed.</p>	<p>As confirmed by Q23 of the revised CTMP, no skips would be required for the works in this instance.</p>
9	<p>Other</p> <p>No notification has been made by the applicant or the Council of this revised document to the neighbours.</p>	<p>Whilst it is unfortunate that the applicant did not notify the neighbours with regards to the revised documents, this type of application do not require any statutory public consultation to take place.</p>

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As set out in the committee report the proposal complies with the development plan in all respects.
- 4.2 The Planning Applications Committee is asked to endorse the recommendation to approve the details required by condition 3 of planning permission ref. PP/23/03872, for the reasons set out in the original report to Committee (below) with the drawing numbers and conditions as set out in that report.

COMMITTEE REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND PLACE

1. Summary

- 1.1 A Construction Traffic Management Plan (hereafter referred to as 'CTMP') has been

submitted as required by condition 3 of planning permission ref. PP/23/03872. The approved development was for Construction of basement beneath part of the rear garden; replacement and extension of rear ground floor extension. This application is solely for the discharge of the condition attached. Importantly, the Council's Highways Officer has reviewed the submitted CTMP and has raised no objection to the discharge of condition 3. Therefore, the proposal would be accordance with policy CL7(k) and CT1 of the Local Plan 2019, satisfying the reason for the condition.

- 1.2 Objections received from interested parties have been taken into consideration and are addressed throughout the report and in Section 8. Where appropriate and necessary, conditions are recommended to address the concerns raised.

It is recommended the Committee approves the details required by condition 3 of planning permission ref. PP/23/03872.

2. Reason for committee consideration

- Three or more objections were received during the consultation period and the recommendation is to grant.
- At the request of Planning Applications Committee who determined the original application – the final CTMP is required to be brought back to Committee for consideration.

3. The site and its surroundings

- 3.1 15 Selwood Place is a Grade II listed two storey mid-terraced residential building located within the Thurloe Estate/Smith's Charity Conservation Area. The building has a single storey and a two storey rear extensions, stucco walls at the ground floor and brickwork at the upper floors on the front elevations, and white painted brickwork at the ground floor rear elevation.

4. The proposal and any relevant planning history

- 4.1 Planning permission and Listed Building Consent were granted under refs. PP/23/03872 and LB/23/03873 was granted on 12th October 2023 for the following development.

“Construction of basement beneath part of rear garden; replacement and extension of rear ground floor extension with rooflights.”

- 4.2 This permission was subject to conditions by the Planning Applications Committee and condition 3 states the following:

Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

No development shall commence until a final Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement should include:

- a) **routeing of demolition, excavation and construction vehicles, including a response to existing or known projected major building works at other sites in the vicinity and local works in the highway;**

- b) access arrangements to the site;
- c) the estimated number and type of vehicles per day/week;
- d) details of any vehicle holding area;
- e) details of the vehicle call up procedure;
- f) estimates for the number and type of parking suspensions that will be required;
- g) details of any diversion or other disruption to the public highway during preparation, demolition, excavation and construction work associated with the development;
- h) work programme and/or timescale for each phase of preparation, demolition, excavation and construction work associated with the development;
- i) details of measures to protect pedestrians and other highway users from construction activities on the highway; and
- j) where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding, position of nearby trees in the highway or adjacent gardens, pedestrian routes, parking bay suspensions and remaining road width for vehicle movements.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan. A one page summary of the requirements of the approved CTMP shall be affixed to the frontage of the site for the duration of the works at a location where it can be read by members of the public.

Reason - To minimise the impact of construction works upon highway safety and nearby residents' enjoyment of their properties in accordance with the Basements SPD and policies CL7, CT1 and CL5 of the Local Plan 2019. It is necessary for the condition to be on the basis that "No development shall commence until" as compliance with the requirements of the condition at a later time would result in unacceptable harm contrary to the policies of the Development Plan.

4.3 Officers visited the site on 18th July 2023 in the previously approved applications under PP/23/03872 and LB/23/03873.

4.4 This application seeks to approve the details required by this condition. The relevant planning history is set out below:

Reference	Description	Decision
PP/23/03872	Construction of basement beneath part of the rear garden; replacement and extension of rear ground floor extension with rooflights	Granted 12 Oct 2023
LB/23/03873	Construction of basement beneath part of the rear garden; replacement and extension of rear ground floor extension with rooflights	Granted 12 Oct 2023
CON/24/00435	Details required by condition nos. 4 (Professional management of engineering works) and 7 (Trees and landscaping – Details required) of planning permission 23/03872 (Construction of basement beneath part of the rear garden; replacement and extension of rear ground floor extension with rooflights.)	Pending

5. Main policies and strategies relevant to the decision

The development plan

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

	Local Plan
Basements	CL7, CT1

5.2 These policies can be read online at:

- Local Plan:
<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan>

5.2 The Council started a New Local Plan Review (“NLPR”) and consultation on Publication Policies (Regulation 19) closed on 22 December 2022. The Council submitted the NLPR for examination (Regulation 22) on 8th February 2023. Examination hearings were held in June and July 2023. Main modifications were discussed to make the NLPR “sound” during the hearings and there will be a public consultation on the main modifications. The Examination remains open until the receipt of the Inspector’s report.

5.3 The statutory starting point for determining this proposal remains the adopted policies in the development plan, including the RBKC Local Plan 2019, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and paragraph 001 of the National Planning Practice Guidance on Plan-making. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF outlines the weight local authorities may give to relevant policies in emerging plans. The timetable for the adoption of the NLPR depends on when the Council receives the Inspector’s report. There is no published timetable for this. The emerging Local Plan will be a material consideration but afforded limited weight at this stage.

Other local strategies or publications

5.4 The main relevant supplementary planning documents adopted by the Council are:

- Basements
- Transport and Streets

These documents can be read online at:

Conservation Area Proposal Statements and Conservation Area Appraisals:

<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/heritage-and-conservation/conservation-areas/conservation-area>

Other documents:

<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents-and-guidance>

6. Evaluation

6.1 The acceptability of the development of the site has been established in principle, through the original planning permission (ref. PP/23/03872). This application relates to the details of the CTMP which are required by condition 3 only.

6.2 When granting permission, the Planning Applications Committee on 10th October 2023 requested that the final CTMP (required under condition 3), was heard and determined at committee and not under delegated authority. The reason for the condition was:

"To minimise the impact of construction works upon highway safety and nearby residents' enjoyment of their properties".

- 6.3 The decisive issue is:
- i Whether the submitted CTMP would be acceptable and if the proposed methodology would have any adverse impact upon local parking and traffic.
- 6.4 In the assessment of the original planning application, a draft CTMP was submitted in support of the application. It was decided that the draft methodology was acceptable for the safe management of construction traffic subject to clarification with regards to the routing of vehicles, in Q8 of the draft CTMP pro-forma. As such, a pre-commencement condition was recommended to secure the submission of a final CTMP for approval by the Local Planning Authority. A final CTMP has now been submitted to discharge condition 3, which is the subject of this application.
- 6.5 In order to consider this fully, the Council's Transportation and Highways Officer has reviewed the final CTMP in full and confirmed that:
- The CTMP is well considered and the applicant has demonstrated good neighbour engagement
 - The vehicle scheduling is appropriate and the chosen route acceptable
 - The hours of operation are accepted by the applicant
 - The method of spoil removal is acceptable
 - The method of concrete supply is acceptable
 - The number and level of vehicle movements are acceptable
 - The parking suspensions are appropriate
 - The relevant plans and drawings have been appended to the CTMP to form a standalone document.
- 6.6 In response to objections received during the consultation period, Although the objections cite the front of the property as being more suitable, given the applicant owns the land in question the use of Elm Place to serve the basement works to the rear of the property is acceptable in terms of highway safety. Despite Selwood Place itself is wider, vehicles will still need to access via Elm Place and the manoeuvring required would mean at least three parking bays being suspended. With the setup on Elm Place and the use of the yellow line, only a single parking bay requires suspension. The width of the road would therefore be sufficient to accommodate the setup proposed and the tracking drawings in the CTMP show the body of the vehicles over-running the footway, not the wheels. Given the CTMP proposals and vehicle sizes, the CTMP is acceptable.
- 6.7 With regards to parking suspensions, these operate Monday through to Friday in the week, with no works permitted at weekends or bank holidays, in accordance with the Council's Code of Construction Practice. In practical terms with the proposed site setup, during the week, residents would still be able to use the bays overnight, provided they are vacated by the morning. CTMPs which are approved are enforceable documents and infractions may be reported to the Construction Management Team and/or the Council's Planning Enforcement Team.
- 6.8 Although the objections cite the front of the property as being more suitable, given the applicant owns the land in question the use of Elm Place to serve the basement works to the rear of the property is acceptable in terms of highway safety. Despite Selwood Place itself is wider, vehicles will still need to access via Elm Place and the manoeuvring required would mean at least three parking bays being suspended. With the setup on Elm Place and the use of the yellow line, only a single parking bay requires suspension. Concerns relating to the swept paths over-running the parking bays are inaccurate as it is clear from

the use satellite images the vehicles are able to traverse the bays without encroaching, it is simply the angle of them that gives the illusion of over-running. None of the other nearby developments in the past few years have had a problem with Elm Place. In terms of highway safety and transport, the restricted hours (and also that high impact works are controlled by the CoCP) the CTMP is acceptable.

Issues and balancing

- 6.9 The submitted Construction Traffic Management Plan ('CTMP') for condition 3 of ref. PP/23/03872 is acceptable and satisfies the reason for the condition. The Council's Transportation and Highways Officer has reviewed the final CTMP in full, giving due weight to objections, and recommends approval. The CTMP helps manage rather than fully mitigate the construction impact of the development, as far as possible under relevant planning legislation.

7. Community Infrastructure Levy

7. If permitted and built, the proposal would not require a payment towards funding additional infrastructure under the Borough's Community Infrastructure Levy and a payment towards funding Crossrail under the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy.

8. Consultations carried out

Comments from interested parties

- 8.1 The application was advertised in the Gazette on 5th January 2024.
- 8.2 No letters were received supporting the application.
- 8.3 7 letters were received objecting to the application, summarised as:

	Comment	Response
1	<p>Width of the highway</p> <p>The width of the roadway is disputed where there is no 3m clear roadway when one of the construction vehicles is in place. The parking bays on the opposite side of the road may not be accounted for. The construction vehicles would be wider than a private car and would not fit into a standard parking space and would encroach onto the roadway. There could be potential damage to cars on the road due to deliveries.</p>	<p>The widths of the road would be sufficient to accommodate the setup proposed and the tracking drawings in the CTMP show the body of the vehicles over-running the footway, not the wheels. Given the CTMP proposals and vehicle sizes, the CTMP is acceptable.</p>
2	<p>Method of Spoil Removal</p> <p>Some kind of temporary structure outside the narrow entrance to the site must be envisaged to support the overhead gantry proposed to remove spoil from the site onto waiting skip or other vehicles. Such</p>	<p>The Council's Highways Officers has scrutinised the method of spoil removal and has reviewed objectors concerns and considered the method of spoil removal proposed is acceptable.</p>

	<p>structure would impinge on pedestrians as this would occupy the pavement. This may block access to the front door of Selwood Lodge and would cause great inconvenience.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>Traffic and Deliveries</p> <p>All work should be conducted from the front of the property, not next to 8 Elm Place from the rear garden.</p> <p>This is a narrow street with blind right angle junctions just beyond Selwood Lodge. This would be untenable during weekdays for nearby residents to use this road</p> <p>This would be dangerous for pedestrians and cars for Selwood Place and nearby roads.</p> <p>The route should avoid residential side streets wherever possible and vehicles should approach the site from the left hand side of the road in 2 way streets. The proposed route would require all vehicles to pull over to the right hand side of the road, and pull out from the wrong side of the road when leaving. This would be against Council policy where it requires vehicles to cross over the flow of traffic twice on each visit and is unnecessary dangerous.</p> <p>No details on how the concrete will be transported onto the site across the footpath. Concrete lorry is in situ 2 hours at a time with 15 concrete lorries per week for a 4-week period.</p> <p>Site access and the placement of a skip should be kept to from the front of the property at 15 Selwood Place.</p> <p>The CTMP does not include the detailed accurate to scale numbered and dated site plan as required by the Council. The drawings are vague and do not provide the information required. The indicative vehicle movements to and from the site is excessive given the impact on pedestrian safety</p>	<p>The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed and scrutinised the submitted CTMP and raised no objection to the discharge of the condition. The vehicle scheduling is appropriate and the chosen route acceptable; the hours of operation are accepted by the applicant; and the number and level of vehicle movements are acceptable.</p> <p>It is clear from the use of satellite images the vehicles are able to traverse the bays without encroaching, it is simply the angle of them that gives the illusion of over-running. None of the other nearby developments in the past few years have had a problem with Elm Place.</p> <p>The applicant will be required to adhere with the Council's Code of Construction Practice. Should there be any disturbance, residents are advised to contact the Construction Management Team to report a breach. Residents should be assured that CTMPs which have been approved, are enforceable documents and infractions may be reported to the Construction Management Team.</p>

	<p>and traffic.</p> <p>Needs a robust estimate of maximum number of vehicles visiting the site (daily or weekly) per vehicle type during each major phase of work. Maximum dwell time for each construction vehicle type should be specified. Does not include maximum dimensions with and without wing mirrors as required.</p>	
4	<p>Parking Suspensions</p> <p>Parking Suspensions should be applied in front of 15 Selwood Place, not in front of Selwood Lodge in Elm Place, where there will be a gantry stationed onto pavement plus deliveries etc. The Council resist the suspension of parking bays outside adjoining properties, in this case, Elm Place, yet this has been proposed which is contrary to RKBC policy.</p>	<p>Although the objections cite the front of the property as being more suitable, given the applicant owns the land in question the use of Elm Place to serve the basement works to the rear of the property is acceptable in terms of highway safety. Although Selwood Place itself is wider, vehicles will still need to access via Elm Place and the manoeuvring required would mean at least three parking bays being suspended. With the setup on Elm Place and the use of the yellow line, only a single parking bay requires suspension.</p> <p>With regards to parking suspensions, these operate Monday through to Friday, with no works permitted at weekends or bank holidays, in accordance with our Code of Construction Practice. In practical terms with the proposed site setup, during the week, residents should be able to use the bays overnight, provided they are vacated by the morning.</p>
5	<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) other issues</p> <p>The revised CTMP does not seem to have been changed significantly in any way in consideration to the strong concerns expressed by local residents and have ignored objections made by the residents.</p> <p>The CTMP does not include a drawing as per Council requirements.</p> <p>The CTMP has not accounted for the existing situation. No. 14 Selwood Place was granted permission to convert the garage into habitable accommodation and</p>	<p>The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed and scrutinised the submitted CTMP and raised no objection to the discharge of the condition.</p>

	<p>the Council removed the yellow no parking area outside it for residential parking bays. This is dangerous as it does not allow two cars to pass side by side given the narrow street as existing. Although after intervention the bays were not reinstated, this decision would allow parking at that part o of the road for access would result in traffic congestion and safety issues.</p> <p>If allowed, this would not comply with the Council's own rules.</p> <p>The CTMP is impractical.</p>	
6	<p>Principle of Development Vehemently oppose this plan</p>	<p>The principle of development were assessed as part of the original planning application where the principle of development at this site was established and considered to comply with Local Plan Policy CL7. The application was approved at Planning Applications Committee on 10th October 2023. This application focuses solely on the approval of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).</p>
7	<p>Health Concrete lorry is in situ 2 hours at a time with 15 concrete lorries per week for a 4 week period. As the concrete lorries needs to keep running this would result I adverse noise and air pollution for the houses near the loading area for at least 30 hours a week for 4 weeks.</p>	<p>Whilst the concerns regarding demographics and impact on health are noted and acknowledged, these would not be material planning considerations for the purposes of determining this conditions application. The application is for the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and so focuses on the impact on the local highway network. The conditions attached to the parent permission go as far as possible to reduce the impact of the construction process, in line with Policy CL7 of the Local Plan 2019.</p>
8	<p>Noise, Dust and Pollution Noise and pollution caused by construction traffic would have an adverse noise impact for neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Whilst it is appreciated that construction works can be disruptive, the noise generated by excavation or construction works would not warrant a reason for refusal. The Council's Code of Construction Practice is used to minimise disruption to surrounding neighbours as far as practicable and other relevant legislation exists outside of planning.</p> <p>The Council's Construction Management Team are able to monitor the works and should the applicant not adhere to the Code of Construction Practice, the CMT can be contacted. The expectation is that all construction sites in the Borough meet the requirements and best practice set out in the Code, reducing disruption for residents. Further information can be viewed via the</p>

		Council's website: https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/environment/advicebuilders/code-construction-practice
9	<p>Other</p> <p>Every rule and regulations made by the Council seems to be violated if this scheme is to be granted</p> <p>The owners at 15 Selwood Place chose to carry out internal renovations prior to starting the basement works should not be a barrier to the Council requiring access to the site must be through the house.</p> <p>This scheme only benefits one family and not the wider neighbourhood.</p> <p>The applicants intention to live on site is not a reasonable ground to grant a dispensation from the rules and guidelines in place for construction works. This is unfair on the adjacent residents as the owners are not inconvenienced themselves. Such disruption should have been accounted for during the works and should not have planned to move in before all works were complete.</p>	<p>The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed and scrutinised the submitted CTMP and raised no objection to the discharge of the condition. The vehicle scheduling is appropriate and the chosen route acceptable; the hours of operation are accepted by the applicant; and the number and level of vehicle movements are acceptable.</p> <p>The principle of development were assessed as part of the original planning application where the principle of development at this site was established and considered to comply with Local Plan Policy CL7. The application was approved at Planning Applications Committee on 10th October 2023. This application focuses solely on the approval of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).</p> <p>The applicant's intention to live on site is not material planning consideration in this instance.</p>

Other consultees and organisations

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Director of Transportation and Highways	<p>No objection is raised to the CTMP under the RBKC consolidated local plan and I recommend the condition is discharged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CTMP is well considered and the applicant has demonstrated good neighbour engagement • The vehicle scheduling is appropriate and the chosen route acceptable • The hours of operation are accepted by the applicant • The method of spoil removal is acceptable • The method of concrete supply is acceptable • The number and level of vehicle movements are acceptable • The parking suspensions are appropriate 	Sections 6.1-6.8

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The relevant plans and drawings have been appended to the CTMP to form a standalone document | |
|--|--|--|

9. Recommendation

- 9.1 Approve the details submitted pursuant to condition 3 of planning permission ref. PP/23/03872.

Background papers:

Documents associated with the application (except exempt or confidential information) may be viewed at www.rbkc.gov.uk/CON/24/00063. Access to computers is also available in the Customer Service Centre at the Town Hall.

Contact officer:

Mr. J. Kwok

Telephone: 07808-879-011