Planning Statement

36 Old Shoreham Road Lancing BN15 0QT

Rear Extension and Alterations

PLANNING STATEMENT

In support of planning application for single storey rear extension and alteration of rear dormer at 36 Old Shoreham Road, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 0QT

Heritage

1. The site is not within the National Park or a Conservation Area, no 36 is not a listed building and is not part of the setting of a listed building.

Flood Risk

2. The site lies in a Flood Zone 3 area, a separate Flood Risk Assessment is submitted with the planning application.

3. The floor level of the proposed extension is therefore set at the same ground floor level as the chalet bungalow to meet the mitigation requirements of the FRA, at 225mm above external patio and ground level.

Planning History

4. Originally one of a pair of semi detached chalet bungalows, subsequently used together with no 38 as a doctors surgery with associated living accommodation, planning consent was granted in 2018/2019 for the conversion back to two separate chalet bungalows, no 36 and no 38 (AWDM/0084/18). The consent has been implemented and the two properties have been in separate ownership since 2019.

Parking and Bin Storage

5. No alterations to existing parking spaces is required and the proposed extension will not generate any further parking requirement. Parking for no 36 is on plot at the front, as is parking for no 34. The properties have a shared access between them leading to their main entrances and former rear garages, neither of which have been in use as garages for many years.

6. Although no 36 bins tend to be stored in the set back towards the rear of the shared access, there is ample room for the no 36 bins to be stored near the front of the shared access should consent be granted for the rear extension.

Planning Policy

7. The proposed rear extension is beyond the 3m depth limit from the rear wall to fall under permitted development rules (PD), although the proposed eaves height of 2.4m above existing patio and garden level at the boundary and the maximum roof height of 3.2m would generally meet PD rules.

8. Although the proposed extension may have been able to have been considered under a prior approval application, the detail design and drawings necessary for such an application and neighbour consultation would have been very similar to those required for a full planning application, and therefore a full planning application has been submitted.

9. Local Plan policies and the NPPF seek to support sustainable development, including alterations and extensions to dwellings, providing there will be no significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbours or any intrinsic character of the area.

10. Adur and Worthing Council have also published supplementary planning guidance (SPG) for the design of residential extensions which focus particularly on the impact of extensions on the amenity of immediate neighbours.

Impact on amenity of neighbours

11. Although SPG initially sets a depth limit of 3m from the back wall for rear extensions as a distance that is unlikely to have any significant loss of daylight or sunlight experience for neighbour rear windows, this is a starting point, after which further assessment of loss of daylight and sunlight needs to be made for extensions of greater depth, related to the particular conditions at a specific site.

12. A further consideration may also need to made for any potential that an extension may have to create an 'overbearing' experience for neighbours, with some proposals.

13. As there is a clear separation between 36 and 34 and the former garage outbuildings extend 10m beyond the rear walls of the properties, there will no adverse impact on 34 from the proposed extension in terms of daylight, sunlight, shared access or noise.

14. The proposed depth of the extension, at 6m from the rear wall of 36, will however have some impact on the experience of daylight and sunlight to the glazed sliding/folding doors to the living/dining space at the rear of 38.

Assessment of impact on daylight and sunlight experience at 38

15. The SPG uses the 45 degree rule (from the BS guide to daylight and sunlight in buildings) as the basis for initial assessment.

16. The submitted plans, rear elevation and section at the boundary with 38, show the application the 45 degree rule in plan and in elevation, using the centre line of the glazed sliding/folding door opening horizontally and vertically.

17. The rule is not met in plan, by some way, but is very comfortably met in elevation.

18. In essence this means that there is unlikely to a significant loss of daylight experience as this derives from having a reasonably unobstructed 'view' of the sky, in this case this will still be experienced fully from east to south west and from south west to west over the top of the proposed single storey extension.

19. There will however be a loss of sunlight directly entering the living/dining space at 38, but only after around 3pm, during the early spring/winter/late autumn months when the height of the afternoon sun is lower in the sky, as the orientation of the rear is almost directly south facing.

20. There is also an existing 1.7m height timber boarded fence on the boundary with 38 which has a similar, but somewhat less, impact on direct sunlight entering the living/dining space.

21. The proposed eaves height of the extension at 2.4m, is higher than the fence height, but the impact on sunlight and daylight experience at 38 is lessened by the introduction of a perimeter pitched roof rather than vertically extending the external wall to the greater height required to form a full flat roof to the extension.

22. In SUMMARY, the levels for daylight and sunlight in habitable rooms recommended in the BS for new dwellings are likely to be met in 38, with the 6m deep single storey rear extension along the boundary, as proposed, (external wall built on the 36 side), because of the predominant southerly orientation, relatively open aspect at the rear and existing daylight and sunlight levels that are higher than BS requirements for new dwellings. (see 24.)

Assessment of potential for sense of 'overbearing' at 38

23. Because of the width of the plot at 38, the extended lengths of the gardens, the relatively open aspect at the rear and the perimeter pitched roof detail, it would be challenging to argue that the proposed extension would be experienced as 'overbearing' at 38, which in planning decision making remains more of a subjective opinion than a defined policy or guidance.

SUMMARY

24. On neighbour amenity, the Applicant accepts that a loss of direct sunlight during mid to late afternoon for some months of the year is likely to be experienced by neighbours at 38 and is open to considering a reduction in the depth of the proposed extension, if this is significant to them, or the planning authority, in the spirit of neighbourliness.

25. In a similar spirit, the external wall, roof eaves and gutter as proposed in the planning application, is positioned entirely on the 36 side of the boundary, up to the boundary, but the Applicant is willing to consider positioning the wall on the boundary, if this is a neighbour preference (perhaps becoming the separating wall if the neighbour is planning a rear extension in future)

Should planning consent be granted, 36 will have to serve a Party Wall Notice on 38 as this is required under that Act for building up to boundary, as well as on a boundary (not a material planning consideration).

26. The Agent considers that any modifications arising from 24. and 25. are likely to minor design amendments that can be submitted to AWC during the planning application determination period.