

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

35 Shermanbury Road, Worthing

First Floor Side Extension and Ground Floor Front Extension



1. Introduction

This Design & Access Statement accompanies a householder planning application for a first floor side extension and a modest ground floor front extension at 35 Shermanbury Road, Worthing. The proposal is intended to improve the internal functionality of the dwelling while respecting the character of the property, the streetscene and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

This statement has been prepared with reference to Adur & Worthing Development Management Standard No. 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings (“DMS2”), which sets out the principles the Council applies when assessing this type of application, and to the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Site and Context

35 Shermanbury Road is a semi-detached dwelling within an established suburban residential area. The street is characterised by:

- Wide plots and generous spacing between dwellings
- A mix of architectural styles
- Numerous examples of property extensions and additions
- A generally open suburban character

The property is not listed, is not within a Conservation Area, and contains no protected trees. The plot benefits from a large rear garden which comfortably exceeds the minimum standard set out in Appendix 1 of DMS2 for a semi-detached dwelling of this size.

3. Existing Property

The existing dwelling comprises:

- Ground floor living accommodation, including sitting room, living room and kitchen
- An attached garage to the side of the dwelling
- First floor bedrooms
- A deep, wide rear garden

The garage occupies the side of the plot closest to the shared boundary and already sits close to it. This existing footprint forms the basis for the proposed first floor extension, as set out below.

4. Proposed Development

4.1 First Floor Side Extension

- Forms a master bedroom en-suite over the existing ground floor garage/store
- Built above the existing garage footprint; does not extend the building any closer to the side boundary than the existing structure already is. In fact the first floor addition sits back away from the boundary.
- Pitched roof matching the existing dwelling
- Materials to match the existing host building
- One side-facing window, obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m

4.2 Front Extension

- Modest single-storey projection to the ground floor
- Subordinate to the main façade
- Matching materials and roof pitch
- Does not extend beyond the established building line of the streetscene

4.3 Internal Improvements

The proposal provides a new utility room and store at ground floor, a new first floor en-suite, and improved circulation. These changes improve the functionality of the home without increasing its visual dominance.

5. Design Approach

5.1 Scale and Massing

The extension is modest in height and footprint and remains clearly subordinate to the host dwelling. It does not alter negatively the overall scale or massing of the property when viewed from the street.

5.2 Appearance and Materials

In accordance with DMS2 paragraph 2.6, the proposal:

- Matches materials to the existing dwelling in colour and texture
- Aligns the roof pitch with the original dwelling
- Keeps window proportions consistent with the existing building
- Sets the side extension back slightly from the main front wall to create a visual break, in line with DMS2 paragraph 3.8

5.3 Streetscene Impact

The proposal maintains the established building line and the suburban character of Shermanbury Road. Both extensions are visually modest and do not alter the appearance of the street negatively.

6. Access

Access to the property remains unchanged. The proposal improves internal accessibility by providing level thresholds, improved circulation and a more functional ground floor layout. No changes are proposed to the vehicular access to the site.

7. Parking

The existing garage is converted internally to a store and utility room as part of this proposal. The existing driveway/hardstanding to the front of the property is retained and unaffected by the works, and continues to provide off-street parking for the dwelling. This is noted with reference to DMS2 paragraph 3.10, which requires any lost garage or parking space to be replaced within the curtilage.

8. Neighbouring Amenity

8.1 Privacy

The only side-facing window in the proposal is obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m, so no overlooking of the neighbouring property arises. This follows the approach set out in DMS2 paragraph 2.3, which notes that side windows can be acceptable where obscure glazing removes the risk of overlooking that would otherwise apply, and reflects the criteria in paragraph 3.9, which applies the principal-window tests at paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 to side extensions.

8.2 Daylight

DMS2 paragraph 2.3 notes that daylight loss is a particular concern for two-storey extensions.

“...a single storey extension would be less likely to have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties than a two storey extension, which would be more likely to reduce daylight to neighbouring properties...”
(DMS2, para 2.3)

The proposed extension is a single first floor element over an existing single-storey garage, with a low eaves line, rather than a full two-storey addition. No neighbouring principal windows face the extension, and daylight to neighbouring habitable rooms is not affected.

8.3 Outlook

DMS2 paragraph 2.2 confirms that a neighbour being able to see an extension does not in itself make a proposal unacceptable; the test is whether the neighbour's outlook is dominated by it.

“...the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive.” (DMS2, para 2.2)

Given its modest scale and position over the existing garage, the extension does not dominate the neighbour's outlook, and the neighbour's amenity in this respect remains unaffected.

9. Policy Compliance

9.1 General Compliance with DMS2

The proposal is consistent with the core principles of DMS2:

- High-quality design that respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and street
- Protection of neighbouring amenity
- Retention of adequate garden space
- A subordinate and sympathetic extension

9.2 Garden Standards

The rear garden significantly exceeds the 85 sqm required for a small semi-detached dwelling of up to three bedrooms, as set out in Appendix 1 of DMS2. The 11m minimum depth guideline at paragraphs 2.4 and 3.5 is also comfortably met.

10. Side Boundary Distance — Response to DMS2 Paragraph 3.7

DMS2 paragraph 3.7 recommends that side extensions be set back at least 1m from the side boundary:

“Side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two-storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a ‘terracing’ effect...” (DMS2, para 3.7)

The proposed first floor extension does not achieve the full 1m setback recommended by this guideline, and this is acknowledged openly. The following site-specific factors are put forward for the Council's consideration:

- The extension is built directly above the existing single-storey garage. It does not bring any part of the building closer to the boundary than the existing structure already is — there is no increase in the building's footprint at ground level along the boundary, and no new element is introduced at a point where none exists today. The first floor addition will be set back by around 300mm from the boundary.
- The element in question is a single first floor addition, not a full two-storey extension along the boundary, so the “terracing” effect the guideline is chiefly aimed at preventing (identical two-storey forms meeting along a shared boundary) does not arise here.
- The only window in the side elevation is obscure glazed and fixed shut, addressing the overlooking risk that a boundary-set extension would normally raise.
- The roof form is kept low, and no neighbouring principal window faces the extension, so the daylight and overbearing effects the guideline is designed to prevent (paragraph 2.2, 2.3) do not arise in this case.

DMS2 paragraph 3.1 confirms that every application is assessed on its own particular merits, and that the standards in Section 3 are not fixed rules but represent typical minimum positions developed from experience:

“...as each application must be considered on its own particular merits, compliance cannot in itself guarantee that planning permission will be granted. Any dimensions given represent minimum standards...” (DMS2, para 3.1)

On this basis, it is respectfully submitted that while the letter of the 1m guideline is not met, the specific harms it exists to prevent — a terracing effect, cramped appearance, loss of daylight and an overbearing impact — do not arise from this proposal, for the site-specific reasons set out above, and the proposal is considered acceptable on planning balance.

11. Conclusion

The proposed development is a modest, well-designed extension that:

- Enhances the functionality of the home
- Respects the character of the dwelling and the street
- Protects neighbouring amenity
- Retains generous garden space, well above the DMS2 Appendix 1 requirement
- Reuses the existing garage footprint rather than extending the building's presence at the boundary

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposal accords with the objectives of Development Management Standard No. 2 and represents an acceptable form of development at this site.