

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PLANS SUB COMMITTEE 1

Date: 4 August 2011

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

Title: 37 HIGHFIELD ROAD, BICKLEY, BR1 2JN

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

Chief Officer: Chief Planner

Ward: Bickley

1. Reason for report

A complaint has been made regarding the reduced sidespace at an extended property in breach of a condition. It is therefore necessary to consider whether it is expedient to take any action.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

No further action

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The site is a detached residential property. In 2009, permission was granted for a two storey side extension which is now complete (DC/09/02955). Condition 3 of the permission required a 1m side space between the south flank wall and the side boundary although the building is not parallel with the boundary.
- 3.2 Complaint has been made from a member of the public, who has had a similar application refused, that the side space is less than 1m.
- 3.3 The site has been inspected and it has been confirmed that the side space at the front of the extension is only 0.6m, a discrepancy of 0.4m. The side space widens to 1.9m at the rear as shown on the approved plans. Only the front section of the side space is less than 1m in breach of the condition.
- 3.4 The garage is 2.75m wide whereas the approved plans indicate a width of 2.6m. This would account for some of the reduced side space at the front of the extension
- 3.5 Examination of the boundary fence indicates that it has been erected within the property boundary by up to 0.2m nearer than the line of previous fencing. This is the gap between the fence and mortar fillets adjacent to the paving slabs at no.39). Towards the rear of the extension this gap diminishes to zero.
- 3.6 Thus the actual side space at the front of the extension is 0.8m, a discrepancy of approx. 0.2m.
- 3.7 Given that the side space is less than 1m for a relatively small section of the extension it is concluded that the breach of the condition is relatively minor. On balance it is therefore considered that it would not be expedient to take enforcement action to demolish and rebuild the flank wall of the extension in the position shown on the approved plan.

ENF/DM/11/00349