Objection to: Planning Permission application for AWDM/0470/25 – Loft Conversion with rear dormer with grey cladding, front rooflights. (Part retrospective)
At 146 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex. BN43 5TE

This isn't a 'proposal' for a loft extension being amended, this is one set of misleading plans for a completed build being withdrawn and replaced with another, that still isn't entirely accurate regarding the true size of this build. This is also an entirely retrospective application and should not be passed.

The newly submitted amended plans show this loft extension is substantially larger than the applicant originally claimed on her previous plans. Why though did she submit a set of misleading plans in April 2025, when her loft extension was already built by the time she submitted them? Why do her new plans state this larger version of the extension is 'proposed'? It is already built. See photo below. It is in the middle of the photo. My house 148 (without an extension, to the right, 144 on the left is tile hung and smaller despite being end of terrace).



As previously stated this extension is too large and complex for PDR. The applicant should have put in for full planning permission before building work began, not simply added new plans to a non-matching cladding amendment, as she does not have planning permission to begin with. The new plans show two bedrooms in the extension. Ms Edwards' accompanying application states there's one. The application does not even match the new plans.

The issue of the not-to-plan new front roof is not addressed. The out of

keeping new ridge tile roof with dividers on the boundaries is also non-matching materials. It is not on even the new plans and the neighbours have not agreed the dividers. My previously watertight roof has been left damaged by 146's building work.



Please note by its huge size this extension breaks Adur Council's own regulations:

Please note: in Adur Council's own 'Development Management Standard Two' it clearly states:
2.6

- *Extensions should generally respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.*
- *External construction materials should usually match in colour and texture the materials of the existing dwelling.*

Neither of these criteria has been met. The plank style cladding is out of keeping with any in the area and its colour is non-matching with any house in the surrounds. A new loft conversion nearby which has been built since this one was finished, is tile hung like those on other properties in the road.

Adur Council's 'Development Management Standard Two; also states:

3.11 Rear dormers and other roof alterations like hip to gable extensions may be able to be carried out as permitted development. Where permission is required, they should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top-heavy "box-like"

appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible.

And

Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

Again – none of these criteria have been met.

The applicant has built a top-heavy over-sized box which covers virtually their entire back roof (more so than on even on the latest plans), the work is finished, the scaffolding down and yet they're still calling this overlarge design 'proposed' and part retrospective.

Has building control checked the calibration of the RSJs is correct? There are no figures to show their capacity. Were they calibrated to the original plans or these amended ones for a larger, heavier extension, build boundary to boundary (and beyond).

Is this extension even safe? Judging by the cracking visible in my bathroom adjacent to the party wall, I have concerns it may be making my home unsafe let alone 146. See photo below.



I still have an RSJ from 146 visible in my loft (photo below), encroachment and other damage recorded by the PW surveyors. The private building control inspector responsible for this build is issuing a contravention notice re: the RSJ and building regulation compliance, giving the applicant three months to rectify this contravention. In the meantime they cannot be granted retrospective planning permission because of this serious breach of building regulations.



Why did the applicant first submit a set of misleading plans to the council as part of her planning application in April 2025, when the extension had by then been built and was substantially larger than admitted?

The extension was completed in April 2025 and the application is wholly retrospective.

Much of the damage caused to my house (including the encroachment onto my roof and the RSJ in my loft) have occurred because it has been built boundary to boundary (and on my side over the boundary), and not to the plans for a smaller loft conversion which were submitted to the council in April 2025 and to me with a PW notice in 2024. Photo showing encroachment onto my roof.



Please note: The new plans also still do not show the full size of this extension which encroaches over the boundary onto the roof of 146 and reaches almost to the top of the roof and down to the bottom.

The dimensions for the dormer given in red on the plans seem optimistic.

Much of the damage to my house (recorded by the surveyors) is unlikely to have occurred if this extension had been built to the original plans and planning permission applied for before the build. It is far too large, too heavy and has cracked the party wall, damaged my roof and bathroom etc.

146's vast blue grey loft extension clad in planking is out of keeping with the area and it makes the house look top heavy. If others could clad their extension correctly why couldn't this applicant?

Please refuse this misleading application for a still not to plan overlarge dormer, unsympathetically clad and the out of keeping, not to plan new front roof. Please take enforcement action to restore this build to something that is legal, non-encroaching and to plan.

Judy Upton
148 Old Shoreham Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5TE