Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0904/25 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 52 King Edward Avenue, Worthing

Proposal: Single storey side timber lean-to structure (retrospective)

Site visit: 30.09.2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached house located on the south side of King Edward Avenue. This is a predominantly residential area where there are other matching semi detached houses either side and opposite the site. There are commercial premises directly to the rear in Ivy Arch Road. The application dwelling has a single storey lean-to across part of the rear elevation matching others of this dwelling type and has been infilled to the west of this with a conservatory. There is a lean-to roof covering/enclosure to the east side of the house which is the subject of this application.

Permission is sought to regularise the construction of the single storey timber lean-to structure to the side (east) elevation. The structure comprises of a lean-to plastic roof covering framed in timber, approximately 10.4 metres in length and up to 2.6 metres in height (2.3 metres to eaves level) and forms a covered walkway. This infills to the east side boundary where close boarded timber fence panelling is positioned above the existing side boundary wall forming enclosure to the side of the structure. There is timber cladding to the gable section to the front where it connects to an entrance gate and fence panel and at the rear it remains open.

Relevant Planning History:
None relevant

Consultations:
None

Representations:

One representation has been received from the occupier of the neighbouring dwelling at No.54 objecting to the application on the following grounds as summarised:

- Design/appearance/materials – could affect property values, use of wood can rot or warp and would look unsightly over time
- Loss of light/enclosure to side window, impact from the height at over 2 metres

- Surface water drainage could run off onto neighbour's property during heavy rain

Relevant Planning Policies
Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM20
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to residential dwellings within the built-up area. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The structure is at the side of the house where it is visible in the streetscene and infills up to the boundary with No.54 to the east. Both dwellings have a side gate and fence panel enclosing the side access at their frontage.

A lightweight lean-to canopy covering would not be a particularly unusual feature here or a side lean-to enclosure that is set back from the frontage, and some other examples can be seen nearby. However, in this particular case the use of timber cladding to the frontage in particular gives the impression of a structure more akin to a garden outbuilding which is particularly visible where it has been positioned in line with the front wall of the house. However the cladding panel itself is a relatively small detail and it is considered that a refusal on this basis alone would not be justified.

Although it would be preferable for the structure to be set back further from the front wall of the house and positioned further behind the gate, given its overall size and the generally lightweight appearance of the roof canopy, it does not appear as a particularly dominant or excessive feature and the full extent of the structure is not readily visible in the streetscene where the front gate and fence panels, and those of the neighbouring property, partially screen the full length from view. It is also noted that the overall height sits below the line of render detailing of the frontage which is reasonably cohesive. The use of close boarded timber panels along the side boundary, although up to 2.3 metres in height, has a similar appearance to a boundary fence and would be visually acceptable in this context.

On balance, design and impact on visual amenity are considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the proposals would be to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling to the east at No.54. Other neighbouring dwellings are sufficiently remote from the development to avoid any significant impact given its positioning and scale.

To the east No.54 is a matching two storey semi-detached house. It has a lean-to at the rear with its main window in the rear (south) elevation. There are other windows in the main west side wall facing the application site including several ground floor windows which appear to serve the hallway, a store, and side door and secondary window to the kitchen. Main outlook to habitable rooms at ground floor level appears to be from the front and rear windows/patio doors.

The comments raised in the representation concerning loss of light and the height and appearance along the boundary are noted. The overall height of the structure is approximately 2.6 metres but this is set away from No.54 and with a lower eaves height where it is approximately 2.3 metres at the point closest to the boundary. It is acknowledged that this is higher than a typical boundary fence installed as permitted development although does has a similar appearance along the boundary. It is also noted, however, that a side extension could be built with an eaves height of up to 3 metres which could have a similar impact. In view of this and having regard to the original enclosure created by the relationship between the two dwellings and limited height of the structure, it is considered that a refusal on residential amenity grounds would not be justified in this instance.

The neighbour has also raised the issue of surface water run-off and it is noted that guttering and a downpipe has been installed to help deal with this issue. Guttering has been fixed at eaves level and indicated to be within the boundary.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers

Informative

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 Hincke Date: 09.10.2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 09/10/2025