Expiry Date – 22/4 ppa agreed to 5/5

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0307/20 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 17 Mill Lane, Shoreham

Proposal: **Construction of hexagonal grill cabin in rear garden. (relocated position)**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: via Google and applicant/neighbour's photos

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached interwar house on the south west side of Mill Lane opposite the junction with Northbourne Close. The site has a long rear garden which backs onto the New Shoreham Burial Ground.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to erect a garden outbuilding to be used as a grill cabin with internal seating for up to 12 people and a central fire/grill with chimney roof.

The cabin has a hexagonal footprint and a maximum floor area of 3.26 metres by 3.77 metres. It has an eaves height of 1.355 metres and its conical roof has a maximum height to chimney ridge of 3.8 metres. It is positioned 500mm off the boundary with No.15. The revised proposal pushes the building deeper into the garden such that it is now positioned 20 metres from the main rear wall of the house.

Relevant Planning History

SU/253/03 – Rooms in roof with part hipped side gable and rear dormer. Granted 30.1.04

SU/182/01 – single storey side extension. Granted 10.09.01

SU/87/88 – First Floor side extension. Granted 23.8.88

Consultations

Health: No objection.

Representations

One objection to initial letter, from No. 15. This objection was withdrawn following the re-consultation, email 16/4.
Initial objection summarised as follows:

'The building is very high, over 4 metres measured from No. 15's garden. It is only 300mm off the shared boundary, including eaves overhang. At only 11 metres from the rear wall of the house and to the west of us it will obstruct afternoon/evening light.

It is overly large and out of character for the area particularly the height and prominence of the conical roof and chimney.

We are also concerned about smoke.

We have told the applicant we may not object if sited further down the garden, beyond the hedge or if retained in the same position but reduced to a flat roof.'

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

This outbuilding is not your typical outbuilding in terms of its design and function. However, its scale overall is not excessive and its revised position, 20 metres from the back of the house and 15 metres from the back boundary ensures it will not be unduly prominent.

Neighbour amenity

At 20 metres from the back of the house and neighbouring houses the scale of the outbuilding will not be unneighbourly. Its deeper position in the garden also ensures it will be partly obscured by hedging on the boundary with No. 15.

Environmental Health officers advise it will not be unneighbourly in terms of its use as a grill cabin.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. *Approved Plans*
2. *3 years*

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 1.5.2020
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 1/5/20