

Application Number:	AWDM/0037/26
Location:	St Marys Cottage St Marys Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for Listed Building Consent to change the roof tiles from the concrete to a clay tile, and change the UPVC gutters and downpipes to aluminium (cast iron imitation).
Case Officer:	Mr P Barnett

	Further Information Required
	Design Review Required
	No objection - no harm
	No objection - harm is negligible or mitigated
✓	Objection - less than substantial harm
	Objection - substantial harm
	Objection – Total Loss

Site and Surroundings:	St Marys Cottage forms a part of a building of 18th century origin located to the North of the Grade I listed St Marys Church and contributes to a historic and architecturally interesting area. The buildings that line the periphery of the church are of varying periods including the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries with the use of vernacular materiality including flint walls and clay tile roofs being prevalent. In contrast, given the context the 20th century library is considered detrimental to overall character. St Marys cottage is of flint elevations with brick quoining around window apertures, the gable end is tile hung and the 2 storey building is set under a tile roof Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when considering whether to grant listed building consent, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when considering whether to grant planning permission, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses." Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when exercising planning functions, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area." The LPA's duties are reinforced within Section 16 of the NPPF, Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the
-------------------------------	---

	quality of life of existing and future generations. As such, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Other elements held within Section 16 will also be considered as will Local Policy.
Drawing Errors:	
Comments:	The application seeks Listed Building Consent to remove the existing tile roof and replace it with a new clay tile roof, in addition, the white guttering is to be removed, and a new cast iron effect aluminium guttering is proposed. The proposal seems to be very confused in respect of what is proposed and what exists. Images of the building seem to indicate the existing is a clay tile roof and in generally reasonable order. It is not usually acceptable to remove all of the tiles and replace with new, rather removal, assessing and refixing the same tiles back on to the building is the usual approach, with any shortfall made up with new handmade tiles to match. In this instance there is no evidence that the tiles on the roof correctly are concrete and as such there is no justification for total and wholesale replacement. Indeed, to approve such a scheme would remove the patina and variation in hue and colour seen on the roof which contributes to the overall character and appearance of not only the listed building but wider conservation area. The use of bitumen-based roof felts would also interrupt vapor permeability and a breathable membrane should be used. In respect of the guttering whereas, replacement of upvc is encouraged a genuine cast iron is preferred and should be accurately specified, rather than a brochure with several options within it. The heritage statement is also considered to be inadequate and requires expansion to ensure the significance of the building is fully understood. In summary the proposal needs reviewing to accord with Historic England best practice and local and national policy. In its current guise the proposal would result in the erosion of the buildings aesthetic value, causing harm to significance with no justification and as such would fail to meet the requirements of policy 17 and paragraphs 135,210, 213 and 215 of the NPPF
Design	

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

**Architectural & Historic
Buildings Consultants**

Mob: 07909 544908
Email: info@dgc-consultants.com
Web: www.dgc-consultants.com

Review:	
Amended Plans / Additional Information Required: <i>[List the amended plans/additional information you are requesting, if any]</i>	1. 2. 3.
Conditions Required: <i>[List the conditions you are requesting, if any]</i>	1. 2. 3.

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council
Date of Comment 5/3/26