

From Rob Roberts:

Hi Eve,

I was provided your contact details as the Case Officer for the above planning application. I am the applicant/property owner, and the Agent is Stephen Bromley Associates.

I would just like to provide my comments in response to the neighbour objection submitted by Mrs Amanda Petts. My property (No. 25) and Mrs Petts property (No. 23) are not attached and are divided by a rear block-built boundary wall which is 7ft in height.

Privacy

-Mrs Petts objects based on “unacceptable overlooking of my property”. The 1st floor rear dormer will be built within the existing roof structure (as per the plan), meaning the dormer rear will not extend out further than the base of the existing gable roof. The rear of the dormer will sit further back or possibly level with the rear of her property. All dormer windows will be west facing. Therefore, it would not be possible to see into their property, and it will not directly face or overlook their rear garden.

- Mrs Petts states “in addition to our property at least four other property gardens will become overlooked”. Again, based on the above points, I am unable to identify 5 property gardens (at least) which will be overlooked by the dormer.

- Mrs Petts states “all neighbouring properties are single storey which offers total privacy”. This is incorrect. No. 19 Shingle Road (2 properties from No. 23) is a 2-storey property with 1st floor front and rear gable with windows in both and front and rear dormer with windows in both. This appears to have been permitted in 2011 under ADC/0027/11. Prior to this I assume No. 19 was a single storey bungalow the same as my property.

Light

-Mrs Petts states “due to the size, height, and proximity of the proposed building, the development would lead to a loss of natural light to my home and garden, which would negatively affect residential amenity”. The proposed plan for the loft conversion is moderate and standard in size. The raised gable end will remain the same height as the ridge of the existing gable roof and (as stated above) the rear dormer will be within the existing roof structure.

The proposal will in no way lead to loss of light. No. 23 is to the south of No.25. The sun follows a path of east to west across the south sky, so I’m not able to understand how any part of a property to the north could lead to loss of light to her property.

Noise

-Mrs Petts objects based on potential increased noise and disturbance of the build. Any noise from the build will be temporary and I would ensure that the builder works within the agreed hours and with consideration. I have already discussed this with the builder who is in agreement to ensure consideration is given regarding noise levels. I had a recent conversation with Mr Petts (who does work night shifts) and we agreed that any noise early in the day would be minimised where possible to allow him to sleep undisturbed. He was appreciative of this. Noise is likely to be minimal anyway as this is a loft conversion with no ground works involved.

Design

-Mrs Petts states the proposal “would negatively affect the reasonable enjoyment of my property and may reduce its value”. I see no reasonable explanation for how a moderate loft conversion to an unattached neighbouring property would reduce the value of another property. Loft conversions to bungalows in the Shoreham Beach area is highly common, and, along with the ongoing much larger property developments happening in the area, this would be more likely to increase general property value. I don’t believe this is a material or valid reason for objection.

Overdevelopment

-Mrs Petts states the proposal “is not in keeping with the scale, design, and character of the surrounding properties and would constitute overdevelopment. All the neighbouring bungalows have stood unchanged at single storey level since originally built”. As commented above, No. 19 is no longer single storey since 2011 and several other properties in Shingle Road are 2-storey. The scale of the proposal is moderate, and the design is a standard loft conversion (with no front dormer proposed like many others). Based on the commonness of bungalow loft conversions in the Shoreham Beach area I don’t agree that the proposal could constitute overdevelopment.

I hope that my comments can be considered in the context of the neighbour objection with the request that the application is assessed only on valid considerations. You are welcome to conduct a visit to the property at any point.

Kind regards,

Rob Roberts