

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/1552/25
Location:	Rose Cottage 202 Salvington Road Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for Listed Building Consent for removal of chimney and insertion of an access door to East elevation
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

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

Site and Surroundings:	The site forms a 2 storey cottage of late 18th century origin to the northern end of a terraced building. The building has some record of being in commercial use up until the late 20th/early 21st century where it received consent for conversion. The building has been subject to some unauthorised work to which at this stage remain unclear. The council possesses evidence that a single chamber chimney stack was present at the rear of the site and has now been demolished without consent. Under Section 8b of the act the applicants now seek retrospective approval for the demolition of the chimney and also, under section 7 seeks approval for the insertion of a rear door. 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. 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.
-------------------------------	--

	The proposal follows a recent enforcement investigation regarding the demolition of a chimney. However the heritage statement provides no detail as to the function of the chimney and indeed what it served. It is noted that the open side of the chamber faces away from the existing building and the rear elevation of the cottage has considerable scarring, indicating a structure of some type was once present. Indeed records as late as the 1973 O/S map going back to at least 1934 record a building in what is now the courtyard. The building is no longer there, and the last remaining part of it, the chimney has been removed. Where has it gone or when did it go being perhaps more relevant. In order for the council to make a reasoned and balanced decision the applicant in accordance with paragraph 207 of the NPPF should describe the significance of the building in a proportionate manner, this allows not only the applicant but also the authority to gain a full understanding of the circumstances prior to and currently. Did the chimney serve a significant part of the building or was it an improvised addition? Is the chimney contemporary to the entire site or part of a piecemeal addition? These questions and similar through relevant historic research need to be addressed in order to understand the significance of what has been lost. It is also noted a flue is present in some photographs, is this still in place? Does this need consent. At this stage a site visit has not been conducted on the basis that the applicant must demonstrate significance and justify demolition convincingly on both counts the application is distinctly lacking and fails to satisfy paragraph 207, 213 and 215 of the NPPF. The applicant should be advised to seek professional assistance to compose a heritage statement of a sufficient standard. The picture below shows scarring on the walls, left over flashing around the chimney of a pitched roof, the open side of the chamber facing away from the building and an internal paint finish on the wall
--	--

	
Further comments 19/3/26	A revised heritage statement has been supplied that discusses the chronological development of Rose Cottage and the School House neighbouring it. Further research has been conducted, that is considered to conclude that the chimney was a later addition of little significance that most probably served an improvised outbuilding arrangement. On examining the photographic evidence further, the brick size and colour vary when compared to the host building alluding to a later development. The bricks indicate an origin of the 19th century at the earliest when industrial processes were capable of firing larger bricks, equally it would also be reasonable (based upon the evidence available on the 1951-1975 o/s maps) that the addition was 20th century in origin. Although evidence is limited it is reasonable to conclude that the greatest degree of historic and architectural interest is derived from the earlier 18th century range, its use of vernacular materiality, and its light industrial history. All of these aspects are held within the original range and informs the aesthetic, historic, and communal values of the heritage asset, these are not present within the later piecemeal chimney addition. In terms of setting the chimney possessed no active contribution to the buildings appearance when viewed from public areas such as the main road and roundabout nearby due to being lower than the ridge line. The later 20th century development around the site also has diminished the character of the wider setting of the listed building and as such an overarching historic sense of place is not apparent in the wider context. As such, on balance, it is considered that the removal of this later addition brings about

	negligible harm to the architectural and historic interest of Rose Cottage as a designated heritage asset, including its contribution to the wider group and wider setting. Further to this the insertion of a door in the rear would be in the vicinity of the former chimney site and an area of considerable alteration, therefore the harm to heritage values in respect of insertion of a door would also be negligible. Having regard to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the proposed by virtue of location, design and appearance would not cause harm to the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and is considered to comply with policy DM24 of the Local Plan and paragraph 135 of the NPPF. Conditions 1) Prior to manufacture and installation fully joinery details of the proposed door in 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections showing the relationship to the surrounding structures including apertures shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. Once approved the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter. Reason: To ensure the character and appearance of the building is preserved and enhanced and complies with policy DM24 of the Worthing LP 2) Prior to commencement of works a schedule of works including methodology shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. Once approved the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter. Reason: To ensure the character and appearance of the building is preserved and enhanced and complies with policy DM24 of the Worthing LP
--	--

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council
Date of Comment 19/3/26