

From: **Sandra Ridgwell**

Date: Sun, 16 Aug 2026 at 22:14

Subject: To the Attn: Marie O'Keeffe. The Online Portal Form is not Working. Application

Reference: AWDM/0596/26

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

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing
Councils

[Allow sender](#) | [Block
sender](#)

Hi Marie

I'm really sorry I have tried numerous times to get my 'Comment' through on the online Planning Application portal but just keep getting Error 403 Forbidden and buffering 'Submitting' that never Submits.

This is an Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0596/26 (please see below).

The objection is from the neighbour:

Mrs Muriel Ridgwell

62 Chester Avenue

Lancing

West Sussex

BN15 8PG

Please can you confirm receipt and that the objection has been registered

Thank you very much.

Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0596/26.

Re: Proposed hip-to-gable roof extension with front and rear dormers. 60 Chester Avenue

I wish to object to the above planning application on the grounds of its scale, design and its unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property and garden.

Having carefully reviewed the submitted drawings, I am particularly concerned that this is not simply a modest loft conversion. The proposal substantially alters the existing roof form through the hip-to-gable conversion and the addition of dormer structures, creating significantly more accommodation and built mass at first-floor/roof level.

62 Chester Avenue is the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and the two properties share the existing roof structure, with the separation between the properties occurring within the loft space. Consequently, the proposed alteration will have a particularly close and direct relationship with my property:

1. Loss of privacy and overlooking.

The proposed rear dormer introduces elevated windows at a substantially higher level than the existing rear elevation.

From this elevated position there would be a much greater and more direct view across my rear garden, including areas of the garden and patio which currently have a considerably greater degree of privacy.

This is not merely a case of an additional rooflight or a small roof alteration. The drawings show a substantial new elevated rear-facing structure containing windows which will provide occupants with an elevated outlook over neighbouring land. I consider that this would result in an unacceptable increase in overlooking and loss of privacy.

This is directly relevant to the Council's Development Management Standard for Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, which states that development should not result in direct overlooking of neighbouring rooms or excessive overlooking of garden areas.

2. Loss of daylight and sunlight to my rear garden/patio.

My property and rear garden receive valuable south-westerly sunlight, particularly to the patio area.

The proposed increase in roof mass and the elevated rear dormer will introduce a substantially larger structure above the existing roof profile. This has the potential to reduce the amount of direct sunlight reaching my rear garden patio, particularly at the times of day when the south-westerly aspect is most beneficial.

I ask the Planning Officer to specifically assess the effect of the proposed roof enlargement and dormer on daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring property and garden rather than considering the proposal solely in terms of the internal accommodation created for the applicant.

The Council's adopted Policy DM5 specifically requires development, including extensions and alterations, not to have an unacceptable impact on adjacent residential properties through loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight or outlook. Given the orientation of the properties and the relationship between the proposed elevated roof structure and my patio, I consider this issue requires particular consideration.

3. Overbearing effect and loss of outlook.

The existing semi-detached bungalows have a conventional roof form which provides a relatively balanced relationship between the two properties. The proposed hip-to-gable conversion substantially changes that relationship by extending the roof volume towards the side of the property and creating a much larger usable roof space. Together with the rear dormer, this introduces a significantly greater amount of built form at roof level immediately adjacent to my property.

I am concerned that the resulting structure will appear substantially more dominant from my garden and patio and will create an overbearing and oppressive effect. This is particularly important because my property is not separated from the proposed development by a significant distance; the two dwellings are adjoining semi-detached properties.

The Council's own guidance states that an extension should not dominate the outlook of neighbouring properties to the extent that it becomes overbearing or oppressive.

4. Scale and massing of the roof alteration.

The drawings demonstrate that the proposal materially changes the original roof form rather than simply making a small alteration within the existing roof space. The hip-to-gable element increases the roof volume, while the dormers introduce additional substantial built structures above the existing roof slope.

The Council's adopted Policy DM5 requires consideration of proportion, form, massing, siting, height, size and scale, and requires extensions to respect the character of the property and the prevailing character of the area.

The Council's supplementary guidance concerning roof extensions and dormers also recognises that dormers can be highly visible and can significantly alter the appearance of a dwelling. It advises that dormers should not dominate the roof through excessive size or inappropriate form.

I therefore ask the Council to consider whether the combined hip-to-gable and dormer arrangement is genuinely subordinate to the existing dwelling or whether it represents an excessive enlargement of the roof form.

5. Particular sensitivity arising from the semi-detached arrangement.

The relationship between these two properties is important. This is not a detached dwelling with open space on all sides. The properties are physically connected and share the existing roof structure, with the division between the properties occurring within the loft. The proposed alteration therefore has a much closer relationship with the adjoining dwelling than a similar proposal on a detached property would have.

The Council's own guidance recognises the particular design considerations associated with semi-detached properties and roof extensions.

I ask that the application therefore be assessed specifically in the context of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling rather than simply by reference to whether similar loft conversions might be acceptable elsewhere.

6. Effect on the character and appearance of the pair of houses.

The existing two properties have a coherent and balanced roof form. Changing one half of the pair from a conventional hipped roof to a gable-ended roof, combined with substantial front and rear dormers, would materially alter the appearance of the dwelling and the visual relationship between the two halves of the semi-detached pair.

Policy DM5 requires extensions and alterations to respect and enhance the prevailing character of the area and specifically requires consideration of form, massing, height, scale and context. The cumulative effect of the hip-to-gable conversion and the two dormers is excessive in relation to the original dwelling and its immediate context.

7. Construction impacts.

I appreciate that construction disruption in itself is normally temporary and is not necessarily a reason to refuse planning permission. However, because this is a semi-detached property sharing a roof structure with the adjoining dwelling, I ask the Council to ensure that the practical implications of the proposed works are properly understood, particularly the extent of structural intervention required to the shared roof, the proximity to the adjoining property and the potential impact during construction.

If permission is granted, appropriate conditions should be considered in relation to construction hours, protection of the adjoining property and control of construction activities.

Conclusion.

I do not object simply because the applicant wishes to improve or enlarge their home. My objection is based on the specific relationship between the proposed development and the adjoining property and the cumulative effect of the substantial roof enlargement and elevated dormer windows.

In particular, I consider that the proposal would result in:

- . an unacceptable increase in overlooking of my rear garden and patio; loss of privacy;
- . potential loss of valuable south-westerly sunlight to my patio and rear garden;
- . an increased and potentially overbearing built form immediately adjoining my property;
- . an adverse change to the outlook from my property and garden;
- . an excessive alteration to the established roof form of this semi-detached pair; and

a development which does not adequately respect the scale, massing and character of the existing dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

These concerns engage directly with Policy DM5 of the adopted Worthing Local Plan, which requires extensions and alterations to be of appropriate scale and design and, importantly, not to have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential occupiers through loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight or outlook.

I respectfully ask the Council to refuse planning permission on these grounds. Alternatively, if the Council considers that the principle of a roof extension could be acceptable, I ask that the applicant be required to substantially reduce and redesign the proposal so that it is genuinely subordinate to the existing dwelling and does not cause unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of daylight/sunlight or an overbearing impact on the adjoining property.

