Objection to:
Amended plans received: - Loft conversion with rear dormer with grey cladding, front rooflights. Ref: AWDM/0470/25
Application Address: 146 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex BN43 5TE

This is a full retrospective application (not 'part') that should be refused as Adur Council's regulations state; ***'Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties.'***

The applicant was advised by the council, her surveyor, etc to comply with the law, permissions and regulations. The applicant refused to engage and built this conversion without planning permission. It breached planning control, building regulations and caused considerable damage to the neighbouring property of No 148 by building into it. Filing a building notice does not give automatic planning permission. The amended plans Rev03 dated 16/07/2025 do not change this. They are evidence that the plans Rev02 dated 09/04/2025 submitted to the council were misleading. The applicant had ticked 'No' to 'Has the work already been completed without consent?' on the application signed 'true and accurate' on 10/04/2025. Construction had already been completed on 08/04/2025.

Plans Rev 3 finally reveal the rear dormer to be a boundary-to-boundary extension. The plans are still misleading, as they do not the show that this box has also been built from the ridge to the gutter. Adur Council's regulations state; ***'Rear dormers and other roof alterations. 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, ***'Outlook – the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive.'***

Plans Rev 3 are also misleading as they show the 146/148 boundary line in different positions on the two East Elevation Drawings. This is relevant because the conversion has been built so large that it crosses this boundary and has actually been built into 148. This is evident by the material layers including an RSJ visible from 148's loft. (See photograph) This is a breach of building regulations, as it is a fire hazard. The fascia etc has been bent into the roof of 148. Regulations state; ***'Class B permits B.2 (b) (ii) other than in the case of an enlargement which joins the original roof to the roof of a rear or side extension, no part of the enlargement extends beyond the outside face of any external wall of the original dwellinghouse.'*** In the notes of this regulation; ***'The enlarged part of the roof must not extend beyond the outer face of any wall of the original house.'***



Plans Rev3 do not show the ground floor RSJs the applicant had previously installed to replace an internal wall to create a kitchen/diner. The new loft conversion RSJs and supports are not shown. The number of, position of and structural calculations for all RSJs have not been disclosed. Plans Rev3 also do not have the legally required scale bar.

The applicant has admitted in her retrospective application that Adur Council had warned her that the grey weather boarding cladding she had chosen and used was non-matching materials, which was not permitted. Regulations state; ***'Class B B.2 (a) the materials used in any exterior work shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwelling house.'*** Adur Council's regulations state: ***'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.'***

Plans Rev 3 are evidence that there was no possible way to access the side of this box dormer to install the cladding without climbing onto the roof of 148. The applicant did not engage to request access from 148.

Plans Rev3 still do not show the new front roof correctly. The roof is not to plan. The applicant had used concrete ridge tiles with concrete dividers. These are not permitted, as they are non-matching materials (B.2 (a) as above) and are an incongruous feature with the rest of this terraced block. The roof is visible from the river walk opposite. Surveyors have confirmed damage was caused to 148 when this roof was installed. Left of picture – a ridge tile was left raised and window sill tiles broken. A concrete divider has been attached to 148's roof without consent.



Plans Rev3 show a ‘notional’ bathroom layout. It is already being used. To make this bathroom usable the shared soil pipe on the wall of the 148 was removed and replaced causing damage to 148’s wall. Regulations state: ***‘B.1 Development is not permitted by Class B if – (e) it would consist of or include - (ii) the installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe. C.1 Development is not permitted by Class C if – (d) it would consist of or include- the installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe.’***

Plans Rev3 dated 16/07/2025 still show a 5-bedroom property. The applicant claimed in her retrospective application the terraced house was to be converted from a 3-bedroom to a 4-property.

As stated above the applicant refused to engage, ignoring the law, permissions and regulations. Significant damage was caused, having an unacceptably adverse effect on the neighbouring property of 148. A contravention notice for breaching regulations is being served. Please refuse this retrospective application and issue an enforcement notice to remove materials and repair the damage to 148

Matt Merritt