

Application Number:	AWDM/0957/26
Location:	94 High Street, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5DB
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the retention of white-painted faux-stone cladding to the ground-floor front and side elevations and retractable fabric canopies above the ground-floor openings.
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

Site and Surroundings:	The application site comprises 94 High Street, Shoreham-by-Sea, a ground-floor commercial premises in use as a hair and beauty salon with upper-floor accommodation above. The property occupies a prominent corner position on the north side of the High Street, close to the junction with the adjoining side street, so that both its principal High Street frontage and return elevation are visible from public viewpoints. The site lies within the Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area and within the town's historic commercial core. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies the shopping areas around High Street, the southern end of East Street and Brunswick Road as a busy commercial area characterised by significant traffic, on-street parking and a mix of building styles and scales. The appraisal also notes that the High Street forms the heart of Shoreham's commercial activity and accommodates a variety of shops, eating places and services. No. 94 forms part of Nos. 94–96 High Street, a modern building constructed in a sympathetic style, with approval for its construction dating to 2006 under reference ADC/0260/06. The wider group of Nos. 78–96 High Street is identified in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal as an unlisted group making a positive contribution to the townscape. The appraisal describes the group as having limited individual architectural significance, but collective visual interest arising from the consistent style and irregular height of its rooflines. In this context, the contribution of No. 94 is principally derived from its scale, upper-floor form, roofline, corner position and relationship with the adjoining buildings within the High Street frontage, rather than from any evidential value as an historic building. The surrounding street scene is commercial in character and includes shopfronts of varying dates, materials, colours and forms. While the conservation area contains historic buildings and traditionally detailed frontages, this part of the High Street is not experienced as a uniform architectural composition. The appraisal specifically recognises variation in the scale and design of High Street buildings, with the difference in rooflines forming a distinctive feature of the area. The proposal is retrospective and seeks planning permission for the retention of white-painted faux-stone cladding applied to the ground-floor front and side elevations, together with retractable fabric canopies installed above the ground-
-------------------------------	---

	floor openings. The submitted application form states that the works began on 1 March 2026 and were completed on 26 April 2026. The submitted material describes the wall treatment as WallDec 'Stonehenge' style lightweight polyurethane panels painted white, and the canopies as pale pink-and-white striped, weather-resistant polyester canopies with scalloped valances supported by lightweight aluminium brackets.
Drawing Errors:	
Comments:	The application seeks retrospective permission for the retention of white-painted faux-stone cladding to the ground-floor front and side elevations of No. 94, together with retractable fabric canopies above the ground-floor openings. The building forms part of Nos. 94–96 High Street, a modern building approved in 2006 under reference ADC/0260/06. Although modern in origin, that building was designed as a sympathetic and complementary addition to the High Street streetscape, responding to the scale, rhythm and rendered character of the adjoining frontage. It is acknowledged that the wider streetscape within this part of Shoreham is varied, and that the Conservation Area Character Appraisal recognises a mix of building styles and scales along the High Street. However, this broader variety does not negate the clear visual cohesion of the immediate group. Within that group, the upper elevations are predominantly rendered and the commercial frontages are generally respectful in their proportions, subdivision and material treatment, with timber and render evident as prevailing shopfront materials. The immediate context therefore has a discernible character to which alterations at ground-floor level should respond. The installed faux-stone cladding fails to do so. Its polystyrene-based appearance, artificial relief, surface-applied form and stark white finish have no convincing relationship with the architectural character of the host building, the established shopfront language of the immediate group or the material qualities identified as contributing to the conservation area. Rather than reinforcing the carefully composed modern frontage approved in 2006, the cladding reads as an alien and poor-quality addition applied across the base of the building. It disrupts the intended relationship between the ground floor and the rendered upper elevations and introduces a material and texture that are incongruous within this part of the street scene. The Council's Shopfront Design Bulletin is clear that shopfronts should not be designed in isolation, but should be conceived as part of the whole building and assessed in relation to the wider street scene. It advises that new shopfronts should acknowledge features occurring throughout the street and on adjoining buildings, and that materials and colours should be carefully chosen with regard to the quality and texture of neighbouring buildings. The current treatment does not satisfy those principles. The faux-stone panels

	neither harmonise with the host building nor respect the character, proportions and material language of adjoining frontages. The retractable awnings are of lesser concern in principle, as awnings can be acceptable where they are properly designed, relate to the openings they serve and emphasise the structural form of the shop unit. However, that is not the case here. The awnings appear to be standard-sized units applied across openings of differing dimensions, including windows of both smaller and larger size. This conveys a lack of design consideration for the overall composition of the frontage and again gives the development a poor-quality appearance. Their scale, spacing and visual relationship with the openings and wider frontage fail to respond adequately to the host building or its immediate context. In combination with the faux-stone cladding, the completed works produce a visually discordant and poor-quality presentation to a prominent corner property within the Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area. While awnings could be acceptable in principle if properly designed, the installed scheme is not acceptable in this instance by reason of its lack of contextual relationship and consequent conflict with relevant design and conservation policy. Having regard to the statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the proposed shopfront façade, by reason of the poor-quality polystyrene-based faux-stone cladding, its artificial relief and surface-applied form, the stark and visually discordant finish, and the poorly considered relationship of the standardised awnings to openings of differing size, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area. The development fails to respond to the character of the host building, the cohesive qualities of the immediate group and the prevailing material context of the street scene. It therefore fails to accord with the Council's Shopfront Design Bulletin, Policies 15, 16 and 17 of the Adur Local Plan 2017, and the National Planning Policy Framework August 2026, including policies DP3, HE4, HE5, HE6 and HE9. The identified harm is less than substantial, but it is not outweighed by any public benefit sufficient to justify the development.
Design Review:	
Amended Plans / Additional Information Required: <i>[List the amended plans/additional</i>	1. 2. 3.

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

<i>information you are requesting, if any]</i>	
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 8/9/26