Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0750/15

Site: **8 Western Close, Lancing**

Proposal: **Extend garage by 2m to west side**

Date of site visit: 18 August 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a detached bungalow located on the southwest side of Western Close at the head of the cul-de-sac. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of similar detached and semi-detached bungalows in the immediate streetscene. There are commercial/industrial buildings to the north of the site set beyond strip of vegetation and trees.

Permission is sought for an extension to the existing detached garage which is positioned to the south of the bungalow and adjacent to the boundary with No.7. The extension would measure 2 metres in depth and with a hipped roof, continuing the line of the existing eaves level.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
None relevant

Representations
Lancing Parish Council – no objection

One representation received from the occupier of the neighbouring bungalow at No.7 objecting to the application on the grounds of loss of light to the kitchen, utility and patio area and resultant loss of heat from the sun.

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity
The extension would be to the rear of the garage and not readily visible in the streetscene. Nevertheless the extension to the garage would be sympathetic in terms of its scale and design and the use of matching materials would help it blend well with the existing building.

Residential amenity

The garage is to the south side of the bungalow and so given the scale of the proposed extension the main impact would be to the occupiers of No. 7 to the south east.

The comments made in the representation are noted. During the summer months when the sun sets north of true west the neighbouring occupier enjoys the benefit of capturing a glimpse of the sun set between the applicants existing garage and the boundary hedge. The neighbour notes a period of between 7.30pm and 8.30pm when the sunset is visible from their side kitchen window which faces approximately north west and from the patio area to the north of that. The neighbour also has a utility room which has a rear (southwest) facing window which is closest to the existing garage. It is acknowledged that the proposed garage extension would block this particular view of the setting sun for the hour noted in the representation, and consequently the benefit of direct sunlight and heat on clear summer evenings after 7.30pm would be lost from the side kitchen window and patio area, based on the information provided in the representation.

The neighbour's side kitchen window is not the main window to this room and so there is no significant impact to any main window of habitable rooms. Main outlook is towards the rear, although it is acknowledged that part of the kitchen is in a recess and so would benefit from daylighting from the side window. Nevertheless, given the scale of the extension proposed and the separation distance it is considered that the loss of sunlight and daylight is not to an extent that would warrant refusal of the application. The use of the patio area may be limited by the loss of heat from the sun in the summer months after 7.30pm, however the scale of the proposals would not cause unreasonable overshadowing to this area particularly given the site orientation in relation to the neighbour, where for most of the year the sun would not set in this location.

Recommendation

Approve
Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No side windows (southeast side)
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Unnumbered site location plan, block plan, floor plan, elevation drawings and photographs deposited 7 July 2015.

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.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 21 September 2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 September 2015