... & WORTHING
SERVICES
P... AWDM/0867/12
DAT...
VALID 13 JUL 2012

7 Rosslyn Road, Shoreham-by-Sea - Planning Statement

Introduction
The proposal is a response to a need for a column-free dance/music studio of 55m2, in order for Delia Spence to carry out her work as professional music and drama coach, and for Delia Spence and Robin Spence to carry out their work as tango instructors. The need arises from the difficulty, expense and inconvenience of hiring existing studio spaces in Shoreham.

Architectural objectives
The intention is that the project should be a work of architecture of high quality, and the architectural objectives are as follows:-
- To achieve the best possible quality of light and space, and to achieve the best possible proportions for the single-storey extension.

- To design the most elegant structure for the extension and the supporting steel structure for the house by good structural design and by refinement of the details, particularly the wall and roof glazing, and structural steelwork.

- To specify materials of the best quality, in particular the new slate roofs and the solid beech strip sprung dance floor.

It can be seen from the drawings that the extension is ideally proportioned, and a reduction of 900mm as recommended by Control Standard no 3 would seriously compromise the proportions, as well as causing the extent of the north elevation glazing to be excessive for the floor area.

History of the project
In November 2005 a Lawful Development Certificate was granted for 70m3 of additional space, consisting of a rebuilt side annex and a new single-storey rear extension, within an overall height of 4m. This was subsequently reduced to 65m3 and the depth of the rear extension reduced by 300mm because of the location of a mature bay tree.

On the basis of the LDC, preparatory work was started, including upgrading the roof structure and storage loft, necessary before commencement of demolitions, site preparations, and purchase of the solid beech flooring for the sprung dance floor. By the time the legislation was amended in October 2008, £10,000 worth of work and materials had already been spent, excluding uncosted design and other work carried out by Robin Spence.

Progress was inevitably limited by the need to carry out architectural work for clients on other projects, and was unfortunately delayed at the beginning of 2009 when Robin Spence suffered a major heart attack, with the consequent time needed for recovery of health and financial affairs. After this, preparatory work resumed.

Reasons for allowing the proposals to be approved
Notwithstanding the Council's Development Control Standard no.3, which advises the limit of 3.5m for rear extensions adjacent to boundaries, I consider that the reasons for allowing the project to be approved are as follows :-
- There is a precedent for rear extensions in the north side of Rosslyn Road, most of which are more than 5m deep (house numbers 3,11,25 and 29).

- The proposals were deemed acceptable before October 2008, even though this

was in conflict with Development control Standard no.3, and there have been no changes in the physical environment since then.

- At all stages the neighbours in numbers 5 and 9 Rosslyn Road were consulted on the proposals and have supported the plans. At no time were questions of loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy raised.

- Two mature trees in the gardens of nos.5 and 7, adjacent to the shared boundary and located 3,.5m and 5m respectively from the north elevation, already overshadow the garden of no.5. Therefore the presence of the proposed extension would cause no additional adverse effects in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight, and in this case the 900mm difference between the proposed depth and that recommended by Development Control Standard no.3 would cause no loss of amenity.

- Because the gardens are to the north, there would also be no overshadowing of the gardens of nos.5 and 9 caused by the new single-storey extension.

- A large amount of work and materials (£10,000 worth) were committed to the project on the basis of the LDC granted in 2005. If the present legislation had been in force at the time, the proposals would not exist in their present form.

- The Council's Development Control Standard no.3 was in conflict with the previous rules on permitted development, and was adopted a long time ago, before the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework. It should therefore be given limited importance, particularly in view of the fact that the proposed development would cause no harm to nos.5 and 9 Rosslyn Road in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy or view.

Conclusion
In view of the precedent for rear extensions in Rosslyn Road, the need for the maximum floor area of studio space, the architectural objectives, the amount of money, work and materials already committed to the project, and the fact that the development would cause no harm to neighbouring properties, I hope that the development will be permitted.

Robin Spence. July 2012