Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0470/25 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 146 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Loft conversion with rear dormer with grey cladding, front rooflights. (Part retrospective)

Date of Site Visit: 9th June 2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey terraced dwelling house on the eastern side of Old Shoreham Road. The street comprises many properties of similar design. Many of which have been extended with loft conversions commonplace. There are examples of rear, flat roof dormers within the vicinity of the site.

Retrospective consent was sought for a loft conversion with rear flat roof dormer and front rooflights. Work had commenced prior to the submission of the planning application as the applicant was constructing the dormer under permitted development. However due to the proposed cladding, grey weatherboarding being used for the rear dormer and this not being a material matching or similar to the existing roof, then planning permission was required. The volume of the dormer was within the maximum volume allowed under permitted development. The only matter here for consideration is therefore the impact of the proposed materials used. The scale and structure could be constructed under permitted development, this would be the fall back in this case.

Amended plans have been received and readvertised as it was considered that the plans did not represent the development which had been built. The dormer was slightly wider than that shown. It is considered that as far as the planning officers are aware the latest drawing represents what has been built, the applicant has verified this.

Representations: - Representations received from the owner/occupier of no. 148 , 144 Old Shoreham Road and occupier of Dartford, Kent, making the following comments: -

- The plans do not represent what has been built.
- Substantially larger than the plans show.
- The dormer is built boundary to boundary, encroaching on my roof.
- Volume calculation is small.
- The front elevation does not show the roof dividers that are installed and not finished.
- Too large to be permitted development.

- Roof materials have been replaced.
- Party Wall Act
- Damage to property
- Issues with construction methods.
- RSJ visible in loft.
- Objections should be valid on any ground.
- Enforcement action should be authorised for corrective work in relation to encroachment, roof divides, repairs and damage.
- Sound proofing issues.
- Are the planks fire safe.
- Colour of the cladding is out of keeping.
- Ridge tiles unfinished
- Exposed wood, repairs necessary.
- Contrary to Development Management Standards
- To large to be permitted development

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

There are other issues which have been raised by the adjacent objectors. These will be addressed below however are not considered to be planning matters and would not preclude planning consent being granted in this case. However, notwithstanding this, other legislation must be adhered to and civil matters should be discussed between the applicant and the adjacent occupiers and legal advice could be sought if required, separate from any planning permission granted. The development may not comply with other legislation separate to planning such as Party Wall Act and Building Regulations.

Visual amenity

The dormer is to the rear of the dwelling house. It is not visible from the property frontage onto Old Shoreham Road. The front roof lights would have no adverse impact and there are many other roof lights on neighbouring properties.

The dormer is visible from the gardens of neighbouring properties, adjacent and to the rear in Connaught Avenue it is a prominent feature, however there are other similar dormers nearby with the same impact. Consideration must be given to the fall

back here that a dormer of the same scale could be built under permitted development with matching materials. The use of the weatherboarding does not give rise to visual harm. The dark finish is similar to the colour of the roof tiles and almost matches the colour of the adjacent dormer with a grey slate finish. The site is not within a Conservation Area and there would be no justification to refuse such a development in terms of visual amenity.

The objector refers to the dormer not meeting Development Management Guidance. Each case is judged on its own merits within the context of the existing site. Looking at the permitted development fall back and the surrounding built environment the development can be supported here.

Residential amenity

The dormer overlooks the rear gardens adjacent and beyond to the east. However there is no greater overlooking than already exists from the first floor windows. As stated above a dormer built under permitted development would have the same impact. Therefore there would be no justification for refusal in terms of residential amenity.

Other matters

The matter of encroachment has been raised with the applicants. They have been advised by their surveyor that there is no encroachment and the replacement tiles on the boundary bisect the boundary as was originally the case. “The roofer has installed new artificial slates on their side to ensure a watertight connection in line with best practice.”

If the objector (and their surveyor) disagrees with this opinion then it is open to them to seek legal advice and to contact the applicant to resolve this issue. This is not a matter which would impact upon the planning consent. These matters can be followed up separately if necessary.

Similarly the neighbouring occupiers refer to damage to the internal roof space with the RSJ visible through the roof. This matter will need to be addressed through building regulations approval (which is separate legislation to planning) and may or may not be approved and/or resolved. This again would not preclude planning consent being granted. A private company, not Adur District Council Building Control, are responsible for the building regulation relating to this development. The planning officer has seen correspondence stating that there has been contact with the applicant’s surveyor to address the outstanding matters with the neighbouring occupier. The surveyors can liaise in relation to this, separate from planning. The applicants have indicated that their intension is to resolve all outstanding matters relating to damage and building regulation.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 26th August 2025

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 August 2025