Design and Access Statement

34 Buci Crescent Shoreham BN3 6LB

Prepared by Shape Architecture Ltd

Proposal

Proposed Rear Two Storey Extension in lieu of existing flat roofed element with roof terrace.

Introduction

Pre-App

Prior to the preparation of this planning application a Pre-App submission was made. The details of which are as per below:

Reference: **PREAPP/0345/24**

Case Officer: Marie O'Keeffe

Date: 04/10/2024

The comments made in this report are set down below alongside our comments.

PRE-APP RPEORT WRITES

The most relevant policy is 15 of the Adur Local Plan and also of relevance is adopted 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''.

Policy 15 states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping.

RESPONSE: The neighbouring properties to the rear exhibit a wide range of architectural styles, proportion, form, materials, details and scale.

Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;

RESPONSE: A limited palette of high quality materials is proposed. Form, height and scale have been revised following comments received in the Pre-App report .

Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;

RESPONSE: In respect of privacy the existing roof terrace has been removed. The design as configured at the Pre-App stage now has a large section of the first floor of the proposed extension near the boundary removed. An accompanying daylight study illustrates over shading that is very much similar to the existing situation.

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 (DM2) "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"

RESPONSE: Please see responses below

DM2 states:

On a dwelling with a pitched roof, extensions should also have a pitched (or lean-to) roof if they are visible from the street, from a public place, or are two-storey extensions.

RESPONSE: Given that the proposed rear extension is two storeys we have introduced a pitched roof.

The closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight. On semi-detached or terraced dwellings single-storey rear extensions which abut, or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 3.5m. Whilst two-storey (or first floor) rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper that 2m, extensions abutting the boundary will not normally be permitted.

RESPONSE: A large section of the first floor of the proposed extension near the boundary has been removed. The existing rear roof terrace and the associated issues of overlooking and potential for noise disruption have been removed. We have also provided a series of daylight studies which illustrates over shading that is very much similar to the existing situation.

In my view the extension proposed has the potential to be overbearing and to result in an unacceptable loss of light to the rear of No. 36 Buci Crescent. The flat roof design is also unsympathetic to the original dwelling and would not positively contribute to local character. I cannot find planning permission for the extension at No. 38 so I would not rely on it for any kind of precedent.

RESPONSE: Please see responses above.

A replacement ground floor extension across the width of the property to the current depth with a partial first floor set away from No. 36 may be more acceptable. It would need to include a traditional pitched roof form. I cannot specify the scale of the reduction required at first floor. Any application should demonstrate the absence of significant harm using either BRE guidance and/or shadow diagrams.

RESPONSE: Please see responses above.

Ends.

Design Statement

Use

The use of the property is as a private residential house and this remains unchanged.

Amount

The proposed amount of development, being a rear two storey extension, is subservient to the host dwelling. The existing flat roofed structure and conservatory structure is removed. This also removes the extensive existing roof terrace and any issue associated with overlooking.

Layout

The layout of the property is updated to create a light filled interior and improved standard of accommodation

Scale and Appearance

We believe the proposal does not detract from the host building and is subservient to it. A limited palette of high-quality materials is proposed throughout. The neighbouring properties to the rear exhibit a wide range of architectural styles, materials, details and scale.

Access

Access to the property remains unchanged.

Aerial View



Aerial photograph illustrating varied disposition of adjacent buildings and also neighbouring property with two storey extension

Site Photographs



Photograph 01 – left side of Rear Elevation twds boundary



Photograph 02 – Centre of Rear Elevation



Photograph 03 – right side of Rear Elevation twds boundary

Ends.