

From: **Gill Pedler** <gill.pedler@spab.org.uk>

Date: Mon, 27 Apr 2026 at 15:38

Subject: Ramshackle Cottage, 14 West Street, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex BN43 5WG
AWDM/0405/26

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

F.A.O Marie O'Keeffe

Our ref 217127

Your ref AWDM/0405/26

Ramshackle Cottage, 14 West Street, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex BN43 5WG

Listed Building Consent for proposed replacement single storey rear extension. Repair and refurbishment of the existing staircase. Vaulting of the ground floor ceiling to align with the existing kitchen ceiling. Installation of a new hatch ladder providing access to the basement. Installation of shutters to front windows. New flooring within the sitting room. Remove existing shower room and form new staircase to convert existing roofspace to a bedroom with conservation rooflights to rear slope only. Installation of additional rooflights to rear roofslope. Formation of a small window in the side gable at second floor level. Repair and maintenance of guttering at ground floor level.

Dear Marie

Thank you for notifying the SPAB of the above application affecting this early 18th century Grade II listed building.

We note that the rear extension is of modern construction and, in principle, we do not object to its demolition or replacement. However, the application raises significant concerns due to the lack of information provided in relation to the proposals affecting the host dwelling and their potential impact on its special architectural and historic interest. In its current form, the application does not meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In particular, we draw attention to the following paragraphs of the NPPF:

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF indicates that when considering the impact of a proposed development upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

The application lacks sufficient detail to allow an assessment of significance or potential harm. We therefore recommend that it be withdrawn in order to address the following points.

The building is named *Ramshackle Cottage*, a name which may itself reflect irregular structural characteristics that form part of the building's special interest. Proposals that seek to standardise or correct historic fabric could therefore be harmful. It is essential to understand the age, condition, and significance of all elements affected by the proposals so that any impact can be properly assessed and, where necessary, robustly justified. Where poor condition is cited as justification for loss, this should be clearly evidenced, and details provided to demonstrate how historic fabric will be retained or protected wherever possible.

Specific concerns are as follows:

Staircase: No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the stair is beyond repair or that full replacement is justified. If deterioration has resulted from dampness, the underlying cause should be established and resolved. All works affecting historic fabric must be fully detailed within the application to enable proper assessment of their impact on the building's special interest.

Basement hatch: The proposed enlargement of the opening in the living room floor would result in the loss of potentially historic floor structure. Further detail is needed to understand the existing fabric and the implications of the proposal.

Dining room floor platform: The function of the raised area of floor is not explained. If historic, this feature may serve a practical purpose. Further information is required to assess its significance and the impact of its removal on both the historic fabric and character of the building.

Vaulted kitchen ceiling: Detailed drawings are required to demonstrate how the proposals would affect historic fabric. Additionally, where historic character would be affected, this may constitute harm requiring clear and convincing justification.

Rooflights: The introduction of rooflights would affect the historic roof structure and alter the character of the rear elevation. Further justification and detailed information are required to enable an assessment of their impact on historic fabric. Any rooflights should be limited to the minimum necessary to meet functional requirements and designed to be reversible where possible, with minimal intervention into historic fabric.

New attic stair: Although some first-floor partitioning may be modern, insufficient detail has been provided to establish the extent of modern fabric or to assess the impact of the proposed works on historic elements such as floors and ceilings. The effect of these alterations on the historic plan form also requires careful assessment.

Living room flooring: It is unclear whether the proposal affects only finishes or the floor structure itself. Where historic joists and floorboards survive, these should be retained. We also advise against the use of impermeable finishes, particularly given the presence of a basement, as these may trap moisture and harm historic fabric.

Shutters to front windows: No information is provided regarding the design or installation of the shutters, or their potential impact on historic fabric and character.

New window in the south gable: No detailed drawings have been submitted to describe the proposed window, nor has any assessment been provided of the age or significance of the fabric that would be removed. The introduction of a new opening within this historic elevation has the potential to cause harm, which must be clearly and convincingly justified.

Damp proofing: The drawings indicate that damp-proofing measures are proposed to the dining room walls. The cause of any dampness should first be properly investigated, and any remedial works must be informed by an understanding of the building's historic construction and materials. Modern impermeable damp-proof treatments are rarely appropriate in historic buildings and can often exacerbate damp issues by trapping moisture within the fabric. We strongly recommend that the applicant seeks advice from a suitably qualified conservation specialist to inform an appropriate approach, with priority given to the retention and protection of all surviving historic fabric.

Rear extension: As noted above, the existing structure is modern, and we do not object to its demolition. The proposed replacement appears subservient and sensitively designed, and we raise no objection to it in principle.

In summary, while the proposed replacement rear extension may be acceptable, the application as a whole fails to provide sufficient information to understand the building's special interest, the scope of the proposed works, or the impact of those works on that interest. As such, it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF.

We therefore recommend that the application be withdrawn and resubmitted once the above points have been adequately addressed.

We hope these comments are helpful.

Best wishes

Gill

Gill Pedler
Casework Officer

Phone number: 07858 798 529

Part-time hours: Monday to Wednesday

Please send all notifications of listed building consent applications, faculty applications or requests for pre-application advice to casework@jcnas.org.uk

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB)
37 Spital Square, London E1 6DY | 020 7377 1644 | spab.org.uk
Follow @spab1877 on [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter/X](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Charity no. 111 3753 | Scottish charity no. SC 039244 | Registered in Ireland 20158736 | Company no. 5743962