

Design and Access Statement

Single storey side and rear extension

128 Albert Road, Epsom, Surrey, KT17 4EL

This statement has been prepared with reference to Epsom and Ewell's Supplementary Planning Guidance document and more specifically clauses 2.21 to 2.25 pertaining to single storey side extensions to 2 storey houses.

Clauses 2.1 and 2.2 require the extension to be subservient to the original dwelling, by setting it back from the front elevation. In this instance the guidance is exceeded, in that the forwardmost wall of the extension is set back in excess of 2 metres. The width of the extension is also significantly less than half that of the principal elevation facing the highway.

Clause 2.3 concerns the roof design. The roof is pitched as is preferred and whilst a number of alternative configurations were examined, the simple gable ended design shown on the submitted drawing is considered to provide the best outcome. A roof pitched to the side was considered, but due to the disparity between the depth of the present rear extension and the proposed side extension, the shallow roof pitch and the eaves height of the existing rear extension, no satisfactory outcomes could be achieved. Whilst the eaves height at the rear is governed by the present rear extension, the opportunity has been taken (facilitated by the gable design) to lower the eaves height at the front of the proposed extension. This in turn results in the ridge height of the extension also being reduced so the roof is as low as possible. As the extension projects only marginally beyond the ground floor rear elevation of the adjoining property and is set in 900mm from the side boundary (the adjoining property has no ground floor windows facing the boundary) no loss of light should occur. The modest additional height of the top of the crown of the gable (less than 1 metre above rear extension eaves level) is not considered to be excessively overbearing (certainly less so than a Permitted Development extension on the boundary).

Clause 2.4 concerns side windows and although the flank wall is marginally closer to the boundary than the guidance suggests, this is mitigated by the complete absence of ground floor windows in the flank wall of the adjoining property and no loss of privacy is anticipated as a consequence of this. It should also be noted that the existing side elevation contains similar door and window openings. These have a flanking view of the neighbouring garden which will actually be reduced as a consequence of the extension windows being nearer the boundary.

Clause 2.5 concerns the merits of maintaining access to the rear garden, which in this case have been fully acknowledged with 900mm wide external access to the side of the extension being maintained. Refuse storage facilities are provided with simple access from the kitchen and to the street, via a gate to the front and retrieval of bicycles from storage at the rear is also still viable.