

**Decision Maker:** **PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 3**

**Date:** **Thursday 1 May 2014**

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

**Title:** **TREESWAY, LODGE ROAD, BR1 3ND**

**Contact Officer:** Philip Spiteri, Planning Enforcement Officer  
Tel: 020 8461 7751    E-mail: Philip.Spiteri@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Chief Planner

**Ward:** Plaistow and Sundridge;

---

1. Reason for report

Following complaints that the development permitted under DC/13/00074/FULL6 was not being carried out in accordance with the approved submitted plans. As a result of these complaints the premises was visited on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2013 by the planning enforcement officer, at this time the construction appeared to be following the plans for the submitted application, further complaints were received and a further visit made on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2013 where it was established that a number of changes had been made which included the window configuration on the roof on the second floor.

The complainant also alleged the side space between the building and Blackthorns was substantially less than shown on the approved. Further visits have been made and other alterations including the addition of three roof lights windows to the roof have been made none of which were shown on the approved plans. The most recent being on the Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 That Members recommend enforcement action to ensure that the unauthorised changes to the approved submitted plans DC/13/00074/FULL6 be removed and only those changes shown in the said plans be implemented in order to deal with the issues raised in the grounds for refusal under DC/13/03887/FULL6.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable
  2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  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: None:
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
- 

### 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 dwelling house located on the East side of Lodge Road .The surrounding locality is predominantly residential in nature, characterised by detached dwellings set back from the highway by substantial front gardens with many mature trees which gives a semi –rural appearance. From the road the land rises to the East and to the West; houses to each side of the road are in an elevated position.
- 3.2 The road is unadopted and the land to the rear is designated as Metropolitan Open Land .The access road to Sundridge Park Manor is to the rear of the site.
- 3.3 On 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2013 following a complaint regarding the installation of six adjoined skylight windows on the second floor roof adjacent to Blackthorns, there was an additional separate skylight window to this elevation, there was a similar configuration of windows on the other side of the building adjacent to the The Jimmies. The approved plans show 3 skylight windows to each side. The side space between the new extension and the boundary with Blackthorns was also less than shown on the approved submitted plans.
- 3.4 Further visits were made to the site these identified additional changes to the submitted plans namely a further roof light on the inward facing roof slope on the second floor and three elevated roof lights to the flat roof on the second floor. There were also alterations to the approved garage design.
- 3.5 A planning Application was submitted to show the changes made to the original approved submitted application ref DC/13/03887/FULL6.
- 3.6 This application was refused at Plans Sub Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2014. The reasons for refusal were:
1. The development gives rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity to the occupiers of adjacent properties thus contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.
  2. The protruding roof lights, by reason of their size design and projection above the ridge line, result in a discordant feature to the dwelling and are detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
  3. The proposed revisions to the approved garage design would result in a bulky feature to this front extension and an undesirable feature in the street scene detrimental to the amenity of future occupiers thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 3.7 The applicant was further advised that the Council had noted that the drawings accompanying the application do not accurately represent the Southwest elevation, as built, to the extent that a door and window to the ground floor have not been formed and have been replaced by air conditioning units which are subject to a separate retrospective application ref DC/14/00682 FULL 6.
- 3.8 As a result of a further complaint regarding roof lights being installed in the roof of the side extension adjacent to Blackthorns the site was visited on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2014 and four roof lights had been installed on the roof of the extension adjacent to Blackthorns , the owner advised these were in place of the two windows and a door shown on the original submitted approved plans DC/13/00074/FULL6 .A further three roof lights had been inserted in the roof of the side extension adjacent to the Jimmies. These were not shown on any Planning application.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	POLICY IMPLICATIONS, FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS, LEGAL IMPLICATIONS, PERSONNEL IMPLICATION
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	NA