

From: Amy Parker

Date: Wed, 26 Aug 2026 at 06:22

Subject: Re: 31 Albert Road Southwick AWDM/0903/26

To: Hannah Barker <hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Cc: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

I wish to object to this application for the proposed rear dormer at 31 Albert Road.

My principal concerns are the excessive scale and form of the proposed dormer, its impact on the character and appearance of the Southwick Conservation Area and Albert Road, and its potential impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

1. Conflict with Development Management Standard No. 2

The Council's **Development Management Standard No. 2 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings** is directly relevant to this proposal. The Council's current Local Development Scheme identifies this guidance as a **material consideration in determining planning applications**, and Policy 15 of the adopted Adur Local Plan states that applications for extensions and alterations to dwellings are expected to comply with DMS No. 2.

Paragraph 3.11 of DMS No. 2 provides specific guidance for rear dormers. It states that, where planning permission is required, dormers should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling and create a top-heavy, “box-like” appearance. It also states that they should be kept well below the ridge of the existing roof, that they should not project as far as the walls of the house, and that a large amount of the original roof should remain clearly visible.

The proposed dormer conflicts materially with these criteria.

In particular:

- the proposed dormer is exceptionally large in relation to the existing roof;
- it creates a substantial flat-roofed box within the existing pitched roof;
- on the submitted elevations, the dormer's roof appears to be at approximately the same height as the existing ridge, rather than being kept well below it;
- the proposal consequently leaves almost none of the original pitched roof visible; and
- its scale and form make it a dominant addition rather than a subordinate roof alteration.

Paragraph 3.12 of DMS No. 2 is also particularly relevant. It states that **“on older-style properties small hipped or gable roofed dormers are usually preferable to flat-roofed dormers.”** The proposal is the opposite: a single very large flat-roofed dormer.

I therefore consider that the proposal is contrary to the Council's specific guidance for dormers in terms of scale, massing, roof form and relationship to the existing roof.

2. Conflict with Policy 15 – Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm

Policy 15 of the adopted **Adur Local Plan 2017** requires development to be of a high architectural quality and to respect and enhance the prevailing character of the area in terms including proportion, form, context, massing, height, size, scale, materials and detailed design. It also requires

development not to have an unacceptable impact on adjacent residential properties, including unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight.

Policy 15 expressly states that applications for extensions and alterations to dwellings are expected to comply with DMS No. 2.

I consider that the proposed dormer's scale, height, massing and flat-roofed box-like form are disproportionate to the existing dwelling and would materially alter its established proportions and roofscape.

3. Impact on the Southwick Conservation Area and Albert Road

The property lies within the **Southwick Conservation Area**. The Southwick Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies **Albert Road as a distinct character area**, noting that although the Southwick Conservation Area is a single connected area, its individual streets possess their own unique features and distinct character.

Policy 16 of the Adur Local Plan requires the Council to conserve and enhance the historic environment and states that development affecting heritage assets must be of a high quality, respect its context and demonstrate a strong sense of place.

Policy 17 states that development should not adversely affect the setting of a Conservation Area. It further requires development within Conservation Areas to be of a high standard of design and materials so as to **respect, preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area**. The policy expressly states that Conservation Area Character Appraisals will be used to assess applications within designated Conservation Areas.

The proposed dormer would introduce a large, flat-roofed and visually prominent mass into the established pitched-roof form of the terrace. Its scale and form would be out of keeping with the established character of the property and its surroundings.

I therefore consider that the proposal would fail to preserve the established character and appearance of Albert Road and would conflict with Policies 15, 16 and 17 of the Adur Local Plan.

4. Impact on daylight and sunlight to No. 32

I am the occupier of No. 32 Albert Road, immediately to the west of the application property.

I have an existing side-return infill extension incorporating a glazed roof. This is an established habitable part of my home and is particularly dependent upon daylight entering through the roof glazing.

The proposed dormer would introduce a substantial additional mass on the pitched roof of No. 31 to the south-east of this glazed extension. The proposal therefore has the potential to obstruct low-angle sunlight and reduce the amount of sky visible from the existing glazed roof, particularly during the winter months when the sun is at a low elevation.

I am not suggesting that all loss of sunlight is unacceptable, particularly in a closely developed terrace. However, given the unusually large size and ridge-height position of the proposed dormer, I consider that the effect on daylight and sunlight to the existing glazed extension should be carefully assessed.

This is directly relevant to Policy 15, which expressly requires consideration of unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight to adjacent residential properties. It is also directly addressed by DMS No. 2,

paragraph 2.2, which states that proposals should not reduce daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent. Paragraph 2.3 states that the extent of the effect depends on the **size and position** of the extension and its **location and orientation relative to neighbouring properties**.

5. Planning history

There is also relevant planning history on Albert Road. In 2006 the Council refused an application for dormers elsewhere on the road, citing concerns about the visual effect of the dormers and their relationship with the character of the locality.

I recognise that the policies cited in that 2006 decision have subsequently been superseded. I therefore do not rely on those historic policies as current policy. However, the decision remains relevant planning history and demonstrates that the Council has previously considered dormer development on Albert Road to be capable of harming its character.

The present proposal should be assessed against the **current** policy framework, including Policies 15, 16 and 17, the Southwick Conservation Area Character Appraisal and DMS No. 2.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I consider that the proposal would:

- conflict with the Council's specific guidance for dormers in **Development Management Standard No. 2**, particularly in relation to size, scale, box-like appearance, ridge height, retention of the original roof and the use of very large flat-roofed dormers;
- conflict with **Policy 15** of the Adur Local Plan through its excessive scale, massing, height and form and its potential impact on neighbouring daylight/sunlight;
- fail to respect the established character and appearance of **Albert Road within the Southwick Conservation Area**, contrary to **Policies 16 and 17**; and
- potentially cause an unacceptable reduction in daylight/sunlight to the existing glazed side-return extension at No. 32.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.