

# 6 EARL'S COURT GARDENS, SW5






1:1,250

© Crown copyright.  
All rights reserved  
(100021668) (2009)



### Listed Buildings

-  Grade II
-  Grade II\*
-  Grade I

Property and Land Applications Team  
The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  
The Town Hall, Hornton Street, London, W8 7NX  
t44 (020) 7361 3584  
Deve.Yarwood@rbkc.gov.uk



**ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA  
REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
PLANNING AND BOROUGH DEVELOPMENT**

---

**APP NO. PP/09/02486/Q21  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 10/05/2011  
AGENDA ITEM NO. S49**

---

**SITE ADDRESS**

6 Earl's Court Gardens LONDON SW5 0TD	<b><u>APPLICATION DATED</u></b>	20/10/2009
	<b><u>APPLICATION COMPLETE</u></b>	21/10/2009
	<b><u>APPLICATION REVISED</u></b>	29/11/2010 11/04/2011

**APPLICANT/AGENT ADDRESS**

Mr T Ruddy  
Thomas Ruddy RIBA Chartered Architect  
57 Warwick Road  
LONDON  
SW5 9HB

<b><u>LISTED BUILDING</u></b>	No	<b><u>CONS. AREA</u></b>	Courtfield	<b>WARD</b>	Earl's Court
<b><u>CAPS</u></b>	Yes	<b><u>ENGLISH HERITAGE</u></b>	N/A	<b>ART '4'</b>	No

<b><u>CONSULTED</u></b>	<b><u>OBJECTIONS</u></b>	<b><u>SUPPORT</u></b>	<b><u>PETITION</u></b>	<b><u>COMMENTS</u></b>
15	8	1	0	0

---

**Applicant**                      Mr R McKeeve

**PROPOSAL:**    Formation of basement under rear garden, rebuilding and enlargement of existing half width three storey back addition at ground, 1st, and 2nd floor levels, and rebuilding and enlargement of existing conservatory type structure at rear at lower ground floor level.

RBK&C Drawing No(s): PP/09/02486 and PP/09/02486/A  
PP/09/02486/B

Applicant's Drawing No(s): 1053-21, 22, 23, 24B, 25A, 26B, and 27B.

---

**RECOMMENDED DECISION:**    Grant planning permission

## **CONDITIONS/REASONS FOR THE IMPOSITION OF CONDITIONS:**

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (C001)**  
*Reason - As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to avoid the accumulation of unexercised Planning Permissions. (R001)*
2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, 1053-21, 22, 23, 24B, 25A, 26B, and 27B. (C068)**  
*Reason - The details are considered to be material to the acceptability of the proposals, and for safeguarding the amenity of the area. (R068)*
3. **All work and work of making good shall be finished to match the existing original work in respect of material, colour, texture, and profile and, in the case of brickwork, facebond and pointing unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. (C071)**  
*Reason - To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (R072)*
4. **The windows hereby permitted shall be painted timber framed, double hung, sliding sashes, and so maintained. (C075)**  
*Reason - To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (R072)*
5. **No water tank, lift motor room, or other roof structure shall be erected on top of the roof of any part of the building, including the roof of any extensions. (C078)**  
*Reason - To safeguard the appearance of the building / terrace / area. (R077)*
6. **The roof of both the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used at any time as a terrace. (C080)**  
*Reason - To protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring property (R080)*
7. **The existing juliet balcony in front of the existing french doors at the rear at ground floor level shall be retained and not removed.**  
*Reason - To protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring property by means of preventing the roof of the conservatory type extension at the rear at lower ground floor level from being used as a roof terrace. (R080)*

8. **No additional plumbing or pipes other than rainwater pipes shall be fixed on the external faces of the building without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. (C085)**

*Reason* - To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. (R072)

9. **Full particulars of the following shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby permitted commences, and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details so approved:**

**(a) a landscaping and tree/shrub planting scheme including a new tree in the south east corner of the rear garden.**

**(C016)**

*Reason* - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory, and to safeguard the amenity of the area. (R016)

10. **All planting, seeding and turfing, forming part of the approved details of landscaping, shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the development or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the first planting and seeding season referred to above, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation. (C018)**

*Reason* - To protect the amenity of the area. (R018)

11. **The tree(s) existing on the site at the date of this permission shall be protected against damage as per the Arboricultural Method Statement of AAIS dated October 2010, throughout the period of building and other operations pursuant to this permission, including site preparation. (C020)**

*Reason* - To ensure that the trees are adequately protected and to safeguard the amenities of the area. (R020)

12. **For the duration of all works associated with carrying out the development hereby permitted, no tree within the curtilage of the site shall be lopped, topped, or felled, or root pruned, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. (C023)**

*Reason* - To ensure that the trees are adequately protected, to safeguard their contribution to the amenities of the area. (R020)

13. **A 2m high plywood fence shall be constructed across the entire width of the garden just outside the line of the raised planter prior to development commencing and shall be retained for the duration of the works, and no materials shall be stored in this area.**

*Reason* - To ensure that the trees are adequately protected, to safeguard their contribution to the amenities of the area. (R020)

14. **The development hereby permitted shall not be implemented until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement should include:**

- **routing of demolition, excavation and construction vehicles;**
- **access arrangements to the site;**
- **the estimated number of vehicles per day/week;**
- **details of any vehicle holding area;**
- **details of the vehicle call up procedure;**
- **estimates for the number and type of parking suspensions that will be required;**
- **details of any diversion, disruption or other abnormal use of the public highway during demolition, excavation and construction works;**
- **a strategy for coordinating the connection of services on site with any programmed work to utilities upon adjacent land;**
- **work programme and/or timescale for each phase of the demolition, excavation and construction works; and**
- **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, 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.**

*Reason - In the interest of highway safety and to safeguard the amenity of the area.*

15.

**The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Chartered Civil Engineer (MICE) or Chartered Structural Engineer (MI Struct.E) has been appointed to supervise the construction works throughout their duration and their appointment confirmed in writing to the Local Planning Authority. In the event that the appointed engineer ceases to perform that role for whatever reason before the construction works are completed those works will cease until a replacement chartered engineer of the afore-described qualification has been appointed to supervise their completion and their appointment confirmed in writing to the Local Planning Authority. At no time shall any construction work take place unless an engineer is at that time currently appointed and their appointment has been notified to this Authority in accordance with this Condition. (C106)**

*Reason - The details are considered to be material to the acceptability of the proposal, and for safeguarding the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. (R106)*

16.

**No development shall be carried out until such time as the person carrying out the work is a member of the Considerate Constructors Scheme and its code of practice, and the details of the membership and contact details are clearly displayed on the site so that they can be easily read by members of the public. (C109)**

*Reason - To limit the impact of construction upon the levels of amenity that neighbouring occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.*

17.

**The subterranean development hereby approved shall not be used or occupied until the entire dwelling has achieved an EcoHomes rating of Very Good with 40% of the credits achieved under the Energy, Water and Materials sections and a post construction review Certificate for the dwelling has been issued certifying that a Very Good rating has been achieved. (C110)**

*Reason - To secure mitigation for the environmental impact of the subterranean development and to comply with policy CE1 of the Core Strategy.*

18. **Notwithstanding the drawings hereby approved the basement under the front garden is not hereby permitted.**

*Reason - The basement under the front garden did not form part of the application to which this permission relates. It is noted that a basement under the front garden was permitted by virtue of the now expired Planning Permission Ref PP/09/00169 dated 20/03/2008.*

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1. I09
- 2. I10
- 3. I11
- 4. I21
- 5. I22
- 6. I27
- 7. I30
- 8. I38
- 9. I63

10. You are advised that it is the duty of the occupier of any domestic property to take all such measures available to him/her as are reasonable in the circumstances to secure that any transfer of household waste produced on the property is only to an authorised person or to a person for authorised transport purposes. This includes waste materials produced as a result of building works. You may check whether your waste carrier is licensed on the DEFRA website. (I61)

- 11. I68

## **1.0 SITE/LOCATION**

- 1.1 No.6 Earls Court Gardens is a four storey (including lower ground floor) mid-terrace property on the south side of the eastern end of Earls Court Gardens. The rear garden of the property backs onto the rear garden of No.12 Barkston Gardens
- 1.2 The lawful use of the property is as a single family dwelling house.
- 1.3 The property is not listed, but it is within the Courtfield Conservation Area.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the formation of a basement under the rear garden, the rebuilding and enlargement of the existing half width three storey back addition at ground, 1st, and 2nd floor levels, and the rebuilding and enlargement of the existing conservatory type structure at the rear at lower ground floor level.
- 2.2 The proposals have been amended since original submission following negotiation with Officers.

## **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 Planning permission was granted in 1972 for the erection of rear extensions at lower ground and second floor levels, the erection of a conservatory at the rear at lower ground floor level, and for elevational alterations. This permission was implemented.
- 3.2 Planning permission was granted in April 2007 for an increase in height of the boundary wall to No.5 Earls Court Gardens, in connection with alterations to the existing conservatory at the rear at lower ground floor level. This permission was not implemented and has now expired.
- 3.3 Planning permission was granted in March 2008 for excavation under the existing forecourt area at the front to provide additional living accommodation. This permission was not implemented and has now expired.

## **4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 4.1 The main considerations are the impact of the proposals on the structural integrity of the application property and the neighbouring properties, on the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, on existing trees, on the amenities of neighbouring properties, and on environmental sustainability
- 4.2 The Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework for the Royal Borough was adopted on December 8th 2010, and contains planning



policies which have succeeded the majority of those in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). For the purposes of S.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the "Development Plan" now comprises the Core Strategy, the London Plan Consolidated with alterations since 2004, plus relevant "saved" policies from the UDP.

4.3 The relevant policies against which to assess this proposal are contained within the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework, as well as certain policies 'saved' from the Unitary Development Plan 2002 (as amended 28<sup>th</sup> September 2007).

4.4 The relevant Core Strategy policies are:

CL1 (Context and Character)  
CL2 (New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications)  
CL3 (Historic Environment)  
CL5 (Amenity)  
CL6 (Small Scale Alterations and additions)  
CR6 (Trees and Landscape)  
CE1 (Climate Change)

4.5 The relevant "saved" policies of the UDP are:

CD46 (Roof terraces)  
CD47 (Extensions)  
CD48 (Conservatories)

4.6 Also for consideration is 'The London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, as consolidated with alterations since 2004. In this particular instance, there are no specific Policies relevant to this application contained within this plan. The Bolton's Conservation Area Proposal Statement (CAPS) has also been given weight, as Supplementary Planning Guidance, along with the "Subterranean Development" and "Trees" Supplementary Planning Documents.

#### The proposed basement

4.7 The proposed basement would extend under most of the rear garden. It would be set under one metre of soil, and would feature five relatively small rooflights above it. In addition it would feature two windows facing into a sunken garden area immediately to the rear of the main house.

4.8 The proposed basement must be considered in relation to the Council's Subterranean Development Supplementary Planning Document adopted in May 2009. The SPD requires a Construction Method Statement to be submitted and sets out a number of considerations and issues that such a statement must address. Such a Construction Method Statement has been submitted which fulfills the requirements for such a statement. Given this, it is considered that it has been demonstrated that the proposed basement would not have

an adverse impact on the structural integrity of the application property and neighbouring properties, and therefore, that a refusal of planning permission on this ground can not be justified. Notwithstanding this it is noted that Building Control approval would in any event be required for the proposed works, and the structural integrity of the application property and neighbouring properties would be addressed more fully at that stage.

- 4.9 The SPD requires that any Subterranean development extends over no more than 85% of the relevant garden area, and that there is one metre of soil above it. The proposed basement under the rear garden does extend under less than 85% of the rear garden area, and there is one metre of soil above it.
- 4.10 In relation to flooding, the SPD requires that if the property is in a Flood Risk Area then a Flood Risk Assessment must be submitted, and the Environment Agency consulted. In this instance the property is not in a Flood Risk Zone, and therefore, there is no requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment or to notify the Environment Agency.
- 4.11 Turning now to the design of the proposed basement, the SPD states that the Council will aim to ensure that any features associated with the subterranean development, visible from the street or surrounding properties, are well designed and discreet. In this instance the only elements that would be visible would be the five small rooflights above it. The two windows facing onto the sunken garden area immediately to the rear of the main house would not be readily visible except from the windows in the lower floors of the application property. Given this the design guidance within the SPD is considered complied with.
- 4.12 Both the "Subterranean Development" SPD and the "Trees" SPD require existing trees to be retained. In this case there is an existing mature lime tree at the rear of the rear garden. The lime tree sits within a raised planter against which the proposed basement would abut. The Council's Arboriculture Officer states that siting a basement one metre from the tree is significantly closer than what would normally be allowed, however, that in this instance, he raises no objection, as the construction of the planter has already severed a number of the trees roots, and no further roots were found in a trial pit excavated along the proposed line of the basement. He states that, as things stand, the tree has a limited life expectancy, that the provision of the one metre of soil depth may allow the roof system to spread, and the tree may regain some vigour. He recommends Conditions to protect the tree during the building works, and to require a new tree to be planted on the other side of the rear of the garden. For these reasons the proposal is considered to comply with both the SPDs referred to, and Policy CR6 of the Core Strategy (Trees and Landscape).
- 4.13 Policy CL2 (g) of the Core Strategy addresses Subterranean Development and its requirements are considered complied with since  
(a) the proposal does not involve excavation under a listed building,  
(b) the stability of the existing or neighbouring buildings would be

safeguarded, (c) there would be no loss of trees, and (d) there would be one metre of soil depth over the proposed basement under the rear garden.

- 4.14 Policies CL1, CL2, CL3 and CL6 of the Core Strategy are also considered complied with since the only elements of the proposed basement that would be visible externally would be the small rooflights in the rear garden which given their small size are considered acceptable in visual terms.
- 4.15 Turning now to amenity considerations, it is not considered that once constructed the proposed basement would result in any harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would not result in any loss of daylight, sunlight, or privacy, or any increase in sense of enclosure or noise to neighbouring properties. Given this it is considered in accordance with Policy CL5 of the Core Strategy.
- 4.16 Policy CE1 of the Core Strategy requires an assessment to demonstrate that the entire dwelling, where subterranean extensions are proposed, meets EcoHomes Very Good Standard (at design and post construction stage), with 40% of the credits achieved under the Energy, Water and Materials sections. A pre-assessment report has been submitted showing that the entire dwelling has the potential to score a Very Good rating, with a current score of 60.65%, exceeding the minimum 40% for Water, Materials and Energy. Given this Policy CE1 is considered complied with, and therefore, there is no objection to the proposals with regard to environmental sustainability.

#### Rebuilding and enlargement of existing three storey half width back addition

- 4.17 The existing half width back addition is situated on the left hand side of the property when viewed from the rear. It has a width at ground floor level of 2.7m, and a width at 1st and 2nd floor levels of 2.3m. At ground floor level it has a depth of 2.7m, and at 1st and 2nd floor levels a depth of 2.6m. It would be demolished and rebuilt with a width at all levels of 2.6m (an increase of 300mm at 1st and 2nd floor levels), and a depth of 3.8m at all levels (an increase of 1.2m at 1st and 2nd floor levels). Its height would remain the same.
- 4.18 There are a number of three storey half width back additions in the terrace. In the immediate vicinity there are back additions of this type at Nos. 3, 4, and 5 Earls Court Gardens. The back additions at Nos. 3 and 4 have a depth of 4.0m which is greater than the 3.8m proposed at No.6. Given this it is considered that in visual terms the proposed rebuilt half width back addition is acceptable and not out of character with the surroundings.
- 4.19 For the reasons set out above it is considered that the proposed rebuilt and extended back addition is acceptable in visual terms and in accordance with Policies CD1, CD2, and CD3 of the Core Strategy. Policy CD2 Criterion (d) and (e) relate specifically to extensions and are considered complied with, since the rebuilt back addition would be



visually subservient to the parent building, and would respect the character and integrity of the original building and other buildings in the street. For the same reasons the proposed back addition is also considered in accordance with "saved" UDP Policy CD47 (Extensions).

- 4.20 In amenity terms the proposed rebuilt and extended back addition is also considered acceptable. It is not considered that it would result in any significant loss of sunlight, daylight, or privacy to neighbouring properties, or any harmful increase in the sense of enclosure. Given this it is considered to comply with Policy CL5 (amenity) of the Core Strategy, and therefore, that a refusal of planning permission is not considered justified on these grounds.

Rebuilding and enlargement of existing conservatory type structure at rear at lower ground floor level.

- 4.21 The existing structure features a solid flat roof over the part nearest the parent property, and a sloping glazed roof over the part facing the garden. It is proposed to rebuild the structure such that it would feature a wholly flat roof, that would be mainly solid, with two flat full width glazed elements. The elevation facing the garden would be higher than the existing, and would feature sliding French doors with a fixed glazed panel above. The party boundary wall with No.5 Earls Court Gardens adjacent would be raised by approximately 600mm at one point to accommodate the wholly flat roof.
- 4.22 In visual terms the proposed rebuilt and enlarged structure is considered acceptable. It would continue to read as a lightweight structure, visually subordinate to the parent property, and in accordance with Policies CD1, CD2, and CD3 of the Core Strategy, and "saved" Policy CD48 of the UDP (conservatories).
- 4.23 In amenity terms the proposed structure is also considered acceptable. The raising of the party boundary wall would have some impact in terms of sunlight, daylight, and sense of enclosure, however, it is not considered that the impact would be significant or harmful. It is noted that the raising of the party boundary wall to the same extent was proposed in the 2007 permission which has now expired.
- 4.24 On original submission, the application proposed a roof terrace above the rebuilt and enlarged conservatory type structure. Access onto the roof terrace would have been gained via the existing French doors at the rear at ground floor level, and a glazed balustrade was proposed around the perimeter of the roof terrace. The roof terrace was not considered acceptable by Officers due to the overlooking of the neighbouring garden that would have resulted, along with noise disturbance. Given this the roof terrace has been removed from the proposals and a Condition is recommended to prevent the flat roof from being used as a roof terrace. In addition the existing Juliet balcony in front of the French doors at ground floor level would be retained to prevent access onto the flat roof.

## Conclusion

- 4.25 In conclusion it is considered that the proposals would not harm the structural integrity of the application property or neighbouring properties, the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, existing trees, or the amenities of neighbouring properties, and that they would be acceptable in respect of environmental sustainability. Given this it is considered that relevant policies are satisfied, and therefore, that the proposals are acceptable.

## **5.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Fifteen neighbouring properties were notified (Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 24 Earls Court Gardens, and Nos. 6, 8, 10, and 12 Barkston Gardens). To date eight letters of objection has been received, along with one letter of support.

- 5.2 The main points made in the letters of objection are:

- 5.2.1 The proposed subterranean development under the rear garden is out of character with the area and would set an unfortunate precedent. The rooflights would look unsightly and allow light pollution at night. It would have profound structural implications for neighbouring properties, and a harmful impact on drainage, and would result in major disturbance during the construction works. It would also result in the loss of the mature lime tree at the rear of the garden, and the existing garden walls which are proposed to be demolished.**

In response, and as stated in the main body of the report, it is not considered that the proposed subterranean development would be out of character with the area or set an unfortunate precedent. Once complete only the small rooflights would be visible, and it is not considered that any significant light pollution would result. In relation to precedent since the proposed basement is considered in accordance with the Subterranean Development SPD and the relevant policies of the Core Strategy it is not considered that there is any justification for a refusal of permission in this instance. Any future application for a similar proposal at other properties in the terrace would need to be assessed on its merits in relation to the same policies and guidance, or any future policies and guidance that may be relevant at the time.

In relation to the structural implications of the proposed subterranean development on neighbouring properties and the impact on drainage in the immediate area, as stated in the main body of the report since the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of the Subterranean Development SPD in relation to both these considerations a refusal of permission on these grounds is not considered justified.

In relation to the impact on the mature lime tree, as stated in the main body of the report the Council's Arboriculture Officer raises no

objection to the proposed development given that the raised planter appears to have contained the tree. Notwithstanding this he recommends Conditions requiring the protection of the tree during building works and the planting of an additional tree. In light of this a refusal is not considered justified on this ground.

In relation to disruption during construction, as stated in the main body of the report a refusal of permission is not considered justified in this instance.

In relation to the boundary walls, permission is not required for their demolition and rebuilding. However, notwithstanding this, given that the walls are likely to be party boundary walls, agreement with the neighbours would be likely to be required.

**5.2.2 The proposed extensions to the three storey back addition would result in loss of sunlight, daylight, and privacy, and an increased sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties, and it would extend further into the rear garden than the other rear additions with the exception of Nos. 3 and 4.**

In response, as stated in the main body of the report it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in any significant loss of sunlight, daylight, or privacy, or any harmful increase in sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties that would justify a refusal of permission. In relation to the back additions in the immediate vicinity, as also stated in the main body of the report the proposed back addition would have a greater depth than at that at No.5, but a lesser depth than those at Nos. 3 and 4. It is considered that the proposed back addition would read as visually subservient to the parent property, and that it would comply with the relevant Core Strategy and "saved" UDP policies. Given this it is considered that a refusal of permission is not justified.

**5.2.3 The proposed roof terrace at the rear at ground floor level would result in both overlooking of, and noise disturbance to, the neighbouring property, No.5, and the associated raising of the boundary wall would result in the loss of sunlight and daylight, and an increased sense of enclosure.**

In response, as stated in the main body of the report the proposed roof terrace has now been deleted from the proposals following negotiation with Officers. The raising of the boundary wall is still proposed, however, as stated in the main body of the report it is not considered that it would result in any significant loss of sunlight or daylight, or any harmful increase in sense of enclosure, that would justify a refusal of permission



## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 Grant planning permission.

**JONATHAN BORE**  
**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND BOROUGH DEVELOPMENT**

### **List of Background Papers:**

**The contents of file PP/09/02486 save for exempt or confidential information in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.**

**Report Prepared By: JS**  
**Report Approved By: EL/DT**  
**Date Report Approved: 20/04/2011**

**PSC05/11/JS.REP**

27/04/2011 08:25:55

**Formation of basement under rear garden, rebuilding and enlargement of existing half width three storey back addition at ground, 1st, and 2nd floor levels, and rebuilding and enlargement of existing conservatory type structure at rear at lower ground floor level.**

**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR DECISION**

You are advised that this application was determined by the Local Planning Authority with regard to Development Plan policies, including relevant policies contained within the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework, the London Plan, as well as policies 'saved' from the Unitary Development Plan, and was considered to be in compliance with the relevant policies. In particular, the following policies were considered:

- CL01 (Context and Character)
- CL02 (New Buildings, Extensions & Modifications to Existing Build
- CL03 (Historic Environment)
- CL05 (Amenity)
- CL06 (Small-scale Alterations and Additions)
- CE01 (Climate Change)
- CR06 (Trees and Landscape)
- CD46 (resist roof terraces in specified situations)
- CD47 (to resist extensions in eleven specified situations)
- CD48 (to resist conservatories in four specified situations)

The London Plan was taken into consideration. No policies were considered of particular relevance to this application.

Weight was also given to relevant local Supplementary Planning Guidance and Statements, including the **Courtfield** Conservation Area Proposals Statement. This document was prepared in line with Government guidance and adopted following public consultation.

The material circumstances of the case, including site history, location, and impact on amenities were considered.

In addition, consideration was given to the results of public consultation.

It was concluded that there was no impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, or upon the character or appearance of the area, that would justify a refusal in this case.

The full report is available for public inspection at the Planning Information Office, Ground Floor, Town Hall, Hornton Street, London, W8 7NX.