



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Lisa Thornley
lisa.thornley@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4745

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 31 May 2011

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Meeting to be held on Thursday 9 June 2011

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

The attached reports listed below were not circulated with the published agenda and are now submitted for consideration.

5 CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
5.1	Petts Wood and Knoll	1 - 4	5 THE CHENIES, PETTS WOOD, BR6 0ED

8 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006 AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

The Chairman to move that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the item of business listed below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

9 CONFIRMATION OF EXEMPT MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14 APRIL 2011 (PAGES 5 - 6)

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
DRR/11/047

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Plans Sub-Committee 1

Date: 9 June 2011

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: 5 THE CHENIES, PETTS WOOD, BR6 0ED

Contact Officer: Tim Bloomfield, Development Control Manager
Tel: 020 8313 4687 E-mail: tim.bloomfield@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Bob McQuillan

Ward: Petts Wood and Knoll

1. Reason for report

A second rooflight has been inserted in the front roof slope of a dwelling house in The Chenies Conservation Area which was not indicated on the previously approved plans. The owner's agent disputes the need for planning permission.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

Enforcement action be authorised to remove the rooflight.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: <please select>.
 2. BBB Priority: <please select>.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: <please select>
 2. Ongoing costs: <please select>.
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: <please select>
 2. Call-in: <please select>
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The site is a detached residence in The Chenies Conservation Area. On 18.01.2011, permission was granted for a single storey rear extension, rear dormers and alterations to the roof (DC/10/03286). The approved drawing includes one roof light in the front roof slope.
- 3.2 Complaint has been made concerning installation of an additional roof light immediately below the one approved. On 29.03.2011, a site visit confirmed that two rooflights are installed in the front roof space over the loft stairwell. The rooflights conform to conservation standards in that they are flush with the tiles.
- 3.3 At the time of the visit, the owner and the agent were advised that permission may be needed for the second roof light. The agent asserted that it is permitted development.
- 3.4 The agent was informed subsequently, that day, by telephone that details of roof lights and dormers had not been received as required under Condition 3 of the permission. Also, a letter was sent to the owner, via the agent, requesting the necessary details and an application for the additional roof light.
- 3.5 On 06.05.2011, details required under Condition 3 were received. However, the supplied documentation included no reference to the additional roof light.
- 3.6 The additional window is of similar size to the permitted rooflight and is a prominent feature on the front roof slope which is clearly visible from The Chenies. Whilst there were no objections to a single rooflight the second window appears out of proportion with the roof and detracts from the overall design and appearance of the dwelling which is otherwise unspoilt and retains much of its original character. On balance it is therefore considered expedient to take action to remove the second rooflight.

Ref DM/EN/11/00132

This page is left intentionally blank

Agenda Item 9

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank