Expiry Date - 06/11/2014

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1147/14 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 7 Edwin Close Sompting Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Replacement garage.

Date of site visit: 12.09.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a bungalow in the north west corner of a cul-de-sac of similar properties in the suburbs of Sompting. The property has a garage on the northern side and there is a footpath at the eastern boundary and gap along the northern boundary with 18 Osborne Close the nearest property to the north.

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension to the west elevation of the bungalow within the parameters of the General Permitted Development Order (as amended) and a 3.7m high x 5.5m deep rear (west side) extension to the garage to adjoin the dwelling. The publicly visible portion of the garage would be under a hipped roof, the western minor portion under a flat roof. Materials would match the dwelling comprising brick elevations and tiles roofing with upvc rear door frames. The garage door would become a double width door.

Consultations: Sompting Parish Council have supported the application.

Representations:

One received from 18 Osborne Close citing concerns over effect on boundary enclosure**,** security during building works, and stating that permission is not given for work from this property.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Expiry Date - 06/11/2014

Planning Assessment

The permitted development element of the application is not for consideration and the only part of the application that shall be assessed is the replacement garage element.

Main considerations

The main considerations are visual amenity and neighbour amenity.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension would be visible from the close and the footpath. The hipped form of the roof on the more publicly visible part of the build, a proportion of the garage being concealed along the northern flank of the bungalow, together with its subservient scale would ensure that the garage would be in harmony with and not disproportionate to the host dwelling. There would thereby be no material harm in terms of the street scene.

Residential amenity

The neighbouring property that would mainly be affected by the proposal is to the north at No. 18 Osborne Close. The garage would be sited partly along the access and parking yard to the north and partly near the boundary with no. 18. There is a narrow gap between these plots along this boundary. The outbuilding of no. 18 would screen most of the build from the point of view of the dwelling on this site. The modest scale and partially obscured position of the garage relative to no. 18's dwelling would mean that there would result no material loss of light or impression of dominance for the purposes of this neighbouring property's occupiers. Whilst there would be French doors facing west down the host property's garden, there would be adequate distance of separation between the properties' respective windows as to prevent undue loss of privacy especially given the intervening boundary vegetation and enclosures. No other neighbouring property is close enough to be affected in any material way.

With regard to the representations, the plans submitted with the application show the build would not be on the boundary line with no.18. Also, the question of the fence would be subject to Party Wall Act provisions and not a material planning issue. Finally, the means of construction would be a matter between respective interested parties.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Time Limit
2. materials to match

3. approved plan drawing no. 7/1.B received 11/9/14.

Informative

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The applicant is advised that no part of the garage building (including the eaves or guttering) should overhang or encroach the site boundary.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: L Simmons Date: 15thth October 2014

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 17.10.2014