Planning Statement

38 Fircroft Avenue, Lancing, BN15 0NW

This Planning Statement is submitted as part of and supporting the Planning Application for a proposed first floor extension to 38 Fircroft Avenue Lancing. It is to be read in conjunction with the deposited plans.

The Site

The site is an end of terrace two storey dwelling within North Lancing, located in a residential road with other dwellings of similar size and style.

Proposal

It is proposed to construct an extension at first floor level over part of an existing single storey extension to the rear of the property. The extension will accommodate an additional bedroom with en-suite bathroom.

The rationale behind the extension is to provide additional and necessary habitable space for the current occupants and to improve the function of the property by providing an additional bathroom. An adverse characteristic of this house design is the lack of depth which restricts the future adaptability and expansion. There is also a lack of sufficient headroom within the roof space to facilitate a loft conversion, and so extensions are necessary to any adaptation.

Planning issues identified

Reference has been made to the following documents:

- Adur Local Plan: Planning Policy AH7
- Development Control Standard 3: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings
- BRE Digest 209: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight

With reference to Planning Policy AH7 and Development Control Standard 3, the following effects were identified as being possibly relevant to the proposed extension:

1. Overlooking
2. Loss of natural light
3. Scale of extension

This planning statement will explain how each of the above effects were attempted to be overcome with the design of the extension.

1. **Overlooking**
   The bedroom and en-suite bathroom both show new windows facing to the rear.

   Proposed solution
   The en-suite bathroom window close to the side boundary with adjoining property No 40 has been shown as obscured.

The level of overlooking from the bedroom window has been attempted to be minimised by aligning with the existing ground floor window below and positioning it more towards the eastern side of the property and away from adjoining property No 40. There is also good natural screening to the western boundary through existing trees and bushes within the garden of No 40, helping to reduce overlooking further.
As there is no glazing to the western elevation of the detached dwelling to the east facing onto No 38, and that this property has been extended at least four metres beyond the rear of the existing extension to No 38, it is felt that the overlooking aspect is sufficiently dampened.

2. Loss of natural light

Whether the extension reduces daylight to neighbouring properties, in particular adjoining property No 40 to the west.

Proposed solution

With reference to BRE Digest 209, the 45 degree angle rule was applied. This states that a line should be drawn from the nearest ground floor window of a habitable room towards an extension to assess whether the extension cuts through the line. Because there is an existing single storey extension to the rear of No 40 which is not affected by the extension, a 45 degree line has been shown on plan 2017-101 from the first floor habitable room window closest to the boundary with No 38 towards the extension. The portion of the extension for the en-suite bathroom towards the boundary with No 40 has been set back from the bedroom extension in order to not cut through the 45 degree line. Due to the proposed roof design over the extension the bedroom extension does clash slightly with the line by roughly 100mm, but this is seen as a minor obstruction to light to No 40.

To explore the aspect of shadowing caused by the extension a 3D Sketchup model was drawn of No 38 and the neighbouring dwellings. To provide accurate shadowing the model was geographically located using Google Earth and correctly orientated to north. Plan 2017-103 shows the shadowing for January and plan 2017-104 shows the shadowing for June. Because of the height of the existing roof over the terrace No 38 sits within along with the north elevation the extension sits on, levels of direct sunlight to this side of No 38 and neighbouring properties is naturally restricted.

Plan 2017-103 shows the shadows cast from sunrise to sunset in January. Large shadows are cast from the terrace as a whole to the north due to the low winter sun, with the north elevation receiving little direct sunlight. Overall levels of sunlight and daylight are low, but the extension does not appear to worsen the daylight due to the low sun.

Plan 2017-104 shows the shadows cast from sunrise to sunset in June. Adjoining property No 40 appears to be affected by shadows from the extension between sunrise and roughly 11am. From 12pm noon the sun is directly overhead and the shadows from the extension are past No 40. The northern elevation of both No 38 and 40 are shown in shade, but as mentioned earlier this seems to be caused by the lack of direct sunlight these areas generally experience.

From 2pm onwards the shadows from the extension are shown cast onto the roof of the property to the east and not over the rear garden or habitable room windows.

3. Scale of extension

The depth of the extension is larger than that recommended in Development Control Standard 3. The extension for the new bedroom has been taken out to the depth of the single storey extension below. The rationale behind this is to enable straight forward construction off the cavity walls below. Pulling the extension back towards the main house will introduce substantial loadbearing beams and masonry piers which will compromise the internal layout within the kitchen and necessitate fussy detailing at the external junction points. This will produce a less successful design and create points for future weather intrusion from failure of the external finishes and flashings.

In order to reduce the overall scale of the extensions the en-suite extension has been pulled back to avoid being overbearing to adjoining No 40. It is not felt that the extensions are overbearing to the property to the east as there are no windows which have a view onto the rear of No 38.

The design of the proposed extension is comparable in design and scale to other extensions given planning approval to similar properties in Fircroft Avenue, in particular nos 46 and 48 to the west.

Summary

It is felt that the design of the extension does overcome the planning issues identified within this planning statement to satisfy granting it planning approval.

Overlooking from the extension has been addressed by specifying an obscured window to the en-suite bathroom and by moving the window to the bedroom away from the boundary with No 40. Natural screening to No 40s garden and the extended design of the property to the east help to further limit overlooking and retain privacy.

By adopting the 45 degree line rule and analysing the shadowing from the extension, it is felt that the extension does not overly restrict or reduce the levels of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties due to the staggered design and the natural restrictions caused by the northerly aspect the extension is sited on.

It is also felt that the scale of the extension is appropriate for the property when compared to other extensions in Fircroft Avenue.