

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

Application Number:	AWDM/0710/26
Location:	Site Of And Land At St Marys Church Hall 25 East Street And 1 And 1A New Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex
Proposal:	Approval of Details Reserved By Conditions 3 (written scheme investigation) 4 (archaeology) 5 (cycle parking) 6 (site set up) 7 (drainage details) 8 (drainage management) 9 (materials) 10 (bin store details) 12 (sound insulation and ventilation) of approved application AWDM/0082/26.
Case Officer:	Peter 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

Comments:	In respect of conditions 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 and 12 of AWDM/0082/26. The decision notice states: 03. No groundworks of any kind shall take place until a programme of archaeological monitoring has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant, for approval by the Local Planning Authority. 04. A final archaeological report or (if appropriate) a Post Excavation Assessment report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Local Planning Authority. 05. No part of the development shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. 06. No development shall be commenced until such time as plans and details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the site set up during construction. This shall include details for all temporary contractor's buildings, plant and stacks of materials, provision for the temporary parking of contractor's vehicles and the loading and unloading of vehicles associated with the implementation of this development. Such provision once approved and implemented shall be retained throughout the period of construction.
------------------	---

07. Construction shall not begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme must prioritise the use of source control Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in consideration of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and demonstrate no increase in flood risk as a result of the Proposed Development with sufficient supporting evidence provided to support its viability including supporting calculations for the 100% AEP (1 in 1 year), 3.33% AEP (1 in 30 year), 3.33% AEP (1 in 30 year) plus climate change, the 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) and the 1% AEP (1 in 100) plus climate change critical storms. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

08. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity. The Local Planning Authority shall be granted access to inspect the sustainable drainage scheme for the lifetime of the development. The details of the scheme to be submitted for approval shall include: I. A timetable for its implementation. II. Details of SuDS feature and connecting drainage structures and maintenance requirement for each aspect including a drawing showing where they are located. III. A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include details of design life and the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. This will include the name and contact details of any appointed management company.

09. No development shall be carried out unless and until a schedule of materials and finishes to be used for the external walls, roof, railings, windows, doors, rooflights and boundary treatment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved schedule.

10. The development shall not be occupied until the associated facilities for storing refuse and waste, including for waste that can be recycled, have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

12. Notwithstanding the submitted Noise Impact Assessment, the development shall not commence until final details of sound insulation and ventilation measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the measures have been installed in accordance with the approved details.

In heritage terms, conditions 3 and 4 are directly relevant insofar as they relate to archaeological investigation, monitoring and reporting. Condition 9 is also directly relevant, as the submitted materials and finishes have the potential to affect the character, appearance and significance of the site and its wider historic context.

	Condition 6 may be relevant where the proposed construction set-up, storage, access arrangements or temporary works could affect historic fabric, archaeological remains, townscape character or the setting of heritage assets. Conditions 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 are not primarily heritage matters; however, they may require conservation consideration where the submitted details would introduce visible external works, affect historic fabric, alter the appearance of the development, or have implications for the setting of nearby heritage assets. With regard to Condition 3, the submitted Written Scheme of Investigation for an archaeological watching brief is considered acceptable in principle and there is no heritage objection to the discharge of this condition, subject to agreement from Place Services as the Council's archaeological advisor. The document sets out an appropriate methodology for archaeological monitoring during groundworks, including provision for recording, reporting, artefact recovery, environmental sampling and archive deposition. Condition 4 should remain open at this stage, as it requires the submission of a final archaeological report, or Post Excavation Assessment report if appropriate, following completion of the watching brief. This matter can therefore only be addressed once the archaeological fieldwork has been undertaken and the resulting report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. In respect of Condition 5, the submitted details indicate that the cycle storage would either be accommodated within the building or located within private rear garden areas. On this basis, and given that the external cycle storage would be secluded and out of public view, the proposed cycle storage arrangements are considered acceptable in heritage terms. No objection is therefore raised to the discharge of Condition 5 from a conservation perspective. In respect of Condition 6, the site set-up arrangements relate to temporary construction-phase activity only. Given their temporary nature, these matters are not considered to be of direct heritage relevance and no conservation objection is raised to the discharge of Condition 6. In respect of Condition 7, the submitted drainage details are not considered to be of direct heritage relevance. The only potential heritage consideration relates to the overall appearance of any permeable surface finishes associated with the drainage strategy. This matter is more appropriately considered under Condition 9, which relates to materials and finishes. No conservation objection is therefore raised to the discharge of Condition 7 subject to approval of conditions 3 and 4. In respect of Condition 8, the submitted drainage maintenance and management details are not considered to be of heritage relevance. No conservation objection is therefore raised to the discharge of Condition 8 subject to approval of conditions 3 and 4. For clarity, any groundworks associated with the approved drainage scheme should remain subject to the archaeological safeguards secured under Conditions 3 and 4. Acceptance of the drainage details from a conservation perspective should not be taken to override the requirement for archaeological monitoring during relevant groundworks, nor the subsequent submission of the final archaeological report, or
--	--

	Post Excavation Assessment report if appropriate, following completion of the watching brief. In respect of Condition 9, the proposed reuse of existing bricks is supported in heritage terms, as this will assist in maintaining visual continuity with the existing building and its historic context. The proposed Imperial Reclamation Weathered Soft Red brick is also considered acceptable, subject to appropriate detailing and workmanship, as its colour, texture and weathered character are considered compatible with the character and appearance of the site and its wider historic setting. The use of SSQ Del Carmen natural slate is accepted in heritage terms. The use of lead sheet for the front dormer roofs is also accepted. The use of a polymeric single ply membrane system for the rear dormer roofs is accepted, given the context of those roof elements and the distance between the building and sensitive heritage assets. The proposed conservation rooflights by The Rooflight Company are accepted in heritage terms. The use of a lime render to the East Street elevation is accepted in principle; however, further details are required regarding the lime mix to be used, the type of lime proposed, and the final finish and colour. No specific details have been provided for the proposed permeable paving, notwithstanding that its appearance has potential to affect the character and appearance of the site and its wider historic setting. Details of the proposed permeable paving, including material, colour, finish, laying pattern and edging treatment, are therefore required before this aspect of Condition 9 can be accepted. However, the proposed colour no. 5, 'Brick', is not considered acceptable for application to a rendered surface. The colour is too strong and would undermine the more cohesive relationship between the building and the neighbouring buildings which form the terrace along East Street. Given the building's position within the immediate setting of a Grade I listed building, the use of such a strong colour would give the rendered elevations an overly dominant character and would detract from the setting of that designated heritage asset. This element should therefore be reviewed and an alternative, more recessive colour proposed. It is not clear from the annotations on drawing 51 whether the existing windows are to be refurbished or replaced. The use of double glazing would not constitute a like-for-like repair, and the section shown on the drawing does not appear to accord with the elevation. While this aspect may be acceptable in principle, clarification is required before the window details can be accepted. In relation to the railings, the detail included within the submitted document is too vague to allow a proper assessment of their heritage impact. Large-scale drawings are therefore required, preferably comprising 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections showing the proposed railings and dwarf wall, including materials, profiles, junctions and fixing details. In the interests of clarity, the use of close-boarded fencing by way of concealment may be acceptable to the rear; however, there is no specific detail showing where
--	---

	such fencing would be located. There is also no clear detail regarding the proposed East Street boundary treatment. Further clarification is therefore required in respect of the boundary treatments before this aspect of Condition 9 can be accepted. In respect of Condition 10, given that the location of the refuse and waste storage facilities has already been approved, the proposed approach is considered reasonably subtle. The use of timber is appropriate in this context and the bin store details are therefore accepted in heritage terms. No conservation objection is raised to the discharge of Condition 10. In respect of Condition 12, the proposed ventilation details have not been clearly specified in terms of the location of the vents. A simple annotated roof plan identifying the position of the proposed vents would be sufficient to clarify this matter and allow the heritage implications, if any, to be properly considered. In conclusion, no conservation objection is raised to the discharge of Conditions 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10. Condition 3 is acceptable in principle, subject to agreement from Place Services, while Condition 4 should remain open until the archaeological watching brief has been completed and the required final archaeological report, or Post Excavation Assessment report if appropriate, has been submitted. In respect of Condition 9, a number of the proposed materials and finishes are acceptable in heritage terms, including the reuse of existing brick, Imperial Reclamation Weathered Soft Red brick, SSQ Del Carmen natural slate, lead sheet to the front dormer roofs, the polymeric single ply membrane system to the rear dormer roofs, and conservation rooflights. However, further information and/or review is required in relation to the proposed render colour, lime render specification, permeable paving details, window details, railing and dwarf wall details, and boundary treatments. Condition 12 also requires clarification by way of a simple annotated roof plan showing the proposed vent locations before this aspect can be fully accepted from a heritage perspective.
--	---

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council
Date of Comment 26/6/26