Expiry: 23/12

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1360/25 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 7 Erringham Road, Shoreham

Proposal: Proposed rear single storey extension and covered side storage area.

Date of site visit: 21/11

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached inter war house on the west side of Erringham Road close to the junction with Adur Avenue. The house has been extended at the side and rear at single storey level and with front and rear dormers. There is also a pergola beyond the rear extension and tandem outbuildings on the north boundary shared with 1 Adur Avenue, which sits at right angle to the site.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site and it is not susceptible to any flood risk. Land slopes up from the south.

Permission is sought to add a further single storey rear extension, removing the pergola and first part of the outbuilding. The extension is 3 metres deep and has a flat roof 2.7 metres in height with an outside edge parapet wall 3 metres high. It is to have a rendered finish.

In addition, an open sided storage extension on the north side of the house is proposed. It lines through with the front of the porch and is 5.8 metres in depth and 1.4 metres in width. The pitched roof is to be supported on oak posts with an eaves height of 2.2 metres and a ridge height of 3.1 metres.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0006/20 – single-storey side extension. Granted.

SU/206/89 – Extension to roof and front and rear dormers. Granted 24.10.89

SU/275/04 – Single storey north side addition. Granted 4.2.05

Consultations

None.

Expiry: 23/12

Representations

3 objections, one from No. 5 and two from No.1 Adur Avenue summarised as follows:

1. Overbearing to No. 5 from their garden,
2. Insufficient space between boundaries, not clear if boundary fence to be removed disturbing plants or whether the build is up to the boundary with 5? Either way a Party Wall Notice is expected to be served.
3. Noise from parties etc.
4. View into 7's kitchen through rooflights
5. Residents at No.1 dispute the position of the common boundary shown on the proposed drawings.
6. The height of the extension and any new fencing could affect light to a study room at No.1.
7. Building works would be disruptive to use of the office at No.1
8. Demolition could damage No.1's pathway etc.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Residential amenity

No. 5 has a single storey rear extension to the same depth as the existing extension at No. 7. The proposed extension is 3 metres deep and to the north of No. 5. It will replace an existing pergola in this position. The extension will sit off the common boundary by the same distance as the existing extension, which allows for eaves line guttering without encroachment. The applicant has advised that the boundary fence in this area is to be removed and not replaced.

It will not result in any significant harm to occupiers of No. 5.

There is an existing outbuilding on the shared boundary with 1 Adur Avenue which is to be partially demolished to make way for the extension. The new extension will sit approximately 700mm off this boundary. The exact boundary is disputed by the owners of No. 1 Adur Avenue. The applicant has confirmed

he is satisfied his drawings are accurate and that there is no encroachment nor need to complete certificate A.

No. 1 has three, rear, south facing windows. The one closest to Erringham Road is a secondary window to a living room. The middle window is obscurely glazed, believed to be a bathroom and the one nearest the west end of the wall appears to have a west facing window and door also. The extension is less deep than the outbuilding to be demolished and off the boundary. No. 1 is on slightly higher ground. It is not considered that it will cause any significant harm to occupiers of No. 1.

The demolition of the outbuilding and its replacement with boundary fencing up to 2 metres in height does not need planning permission. An informative regarding the maximum height of the replacement fencing is recommended.

The side extension proposed is an open sided version of the extension approved in 2020. At the scale proposed with its low eaves line it will not be harmful to No. 1.

Boundary disputes and damage to neighbouring properties during building works are matters of civil law and not a planning matter.

Visual amenity

Considerable change has occurred to the streetscene appearance of these similar houses including double height extensions up to the boundary. The extensions proposed will not be harmful to the general character of the area.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials as specified
4. No side windows

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

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.

Case Officer:	MOK	Date: 2/12
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 2 December 2025