

FURTHER REPRESENTATION: OBJECTION TO REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION

AWDM/0696/26 | 66 Buckingham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea

64 Buckingham Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5UD

11 August 2026

Development Management
Adur District Council
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
BN43 6PR

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application Reference: AWDM/0696/26 | Planning Portal Reference: PP-14965613
Proposal: First floor extensions above existing ground floor side and rear extensions; new unified roof form; garage conversion; and new front porch - Revised Scheme July 2026
Location: 66 Buckingham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5UD

We write as the owners and occupiers of 64 Buckingham Road, the immediately adjoining property to the south of the application site. We previously objected to this application in our representation dated 3 July 2026. We have now reviewed the revised scheme, notification of which was received by us on 29 July, and wish to make the following further representations.

We acknowledge that the revised scheme removes the previously proposed first floor side extension to the south. This directly addresses one of our two grounds of objection, and we welcome that response. However, our concerns regarding the overall scale and massing of the development, and in particular the roof extension and rear dormer, remain. We maintain our objection on those grounds, developed further below with reference to Adur's Development Management Standard No.2 (DMS2).

1. Scale and Massing: The Roof Extension and Rear Dormer

DMS2 Section 3.11 states, critically, that '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.'

The revised scheme does not propose a dormer to an existing roof. It proposes a replacement roof form that is itself substantially enlarged, incorporating a full floor of habitable accommodation within it, served by a large rear dormer to the east elevation. The new roof is not a rationalisation of an existing roofspace — it is a purpose-built second floor constructed within a new and significantly taller roof. In these circumstances, the dormer is not adding light to existing roof space; it is providing the primary means of outlook for an entirely new floor of accommodation.

DMS2 Section 3.14 further states that 'the cumulative effect of a combined roof extension and dormers is unlikely to be acceptable since the resulting works would probably be out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling.' This is precisely what is proposed here: a substantially enlarged replacement roof incorporating habitable accommodation, combined with a rear dormer of significant scale. The cumulative effect is a building that is materially larger in scale and massing than the original dwelling, and we submit that DMS2 Section 3.14 directly weighs against approval.

2. The “Whole-Dwelling Remodel” Argument Does Not Displace Policy

The revised Design and Access Statement argues at length that the scheme should be assessed as a “whole-dwelling remodel” rather than a conventional extension, and that extension policies therefore apply with reduced force or do not apply in the usual way. We respectfully submit that this argument is not sound in planning law.

Our understanding is that Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, per Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. DMS2 is adopted supplementary planning guidance that forms part of the material policy framework applicable to this application. The way the agent chooses to characterise the scheme — as a remodel rather than an extension — does not alter the fact that this is a proposal to extend and alter an existing dwelling, to which DMS2 applies in full.

The agent notes that Adur has previously accepted deviations from DMS2 at 54 and 69 Buckingham Road. We note that this assertion is made without citation of specific decision notices or officer reports.

3. Absence of Local Precedent for a Dormer in an Enlarged Roof

The agent claims that the approach adopted has precedent in the local context, citing properties on Buckingham Road where upper floor accommodation has been created through the enlargement and rationalisation of roof forms. We wish to draw the case officer’s attention to an important distinction.

To our knowledge, there is no existing example in the immediate area of dormer windows serving habitable accommodation within an enlarged replacement roof of the scale proposed here. Dormers do exist in the area, but they serve existing roofspaces — they do not serve purpose-built second floor accommodation within a new and substantially enlarged roof form.

4. Conclusion

We acknowledge the applicants’ willingness to revise the scheme in response to the first refusal, and particularly the removal of the southern first floor extension. That concession is welcomed. However, the revised scheme retains a roof extension and rear dormer combination that we consider to be contrary to DMS2 Sections 3.11 and 3.14, and which represents a step-change in the scale and massing of the dwelling that is not proportionate to the original building or the character of the surrounding area.

We remain available to discuss these concerns with the case officer at any time.

Yours faithfully,

Mr G and Mrs P Anderson
The Owners and Occupiers
64 Buckingham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea