

Expiry: 4/6

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: A) AWDM/0404/26
B) AWDM/0405/26**

Recommendations – A) & B): Approve subject to conditions.

Site: 14 West Street, Shoreham

Proposal: A) Proposed replacement single storey rear extension. Internal works and conversion of roofspace with 4 no. total conservation rooflights to rear slope only.

B) Listed Building Consent for proposed replacement single storey rear extension. Repair 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 4 no. total conservation rooflights to rear slope only. Repair and maintenance of guttering at ground floor level.

Date of site visit: 22/4

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a Grade II listed cottage on the east side of West Street in the heart of the Shoreham conservation area.

Grade: II

List Entry Number: 1193196

Date first listed: 29-Sept-1972

Cottage. Early C18. Coursed flint with red brick plinth band, quoins and dressings. Plain tiled roof with end stacks. Two storeys, 2 windows, all sliding casements, on ground-floor with segment-heads. Boarded door at extreme left.

The site is in Flood Zone 1 with no known surface water flood risk. There are no TPO's on the site. The West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) identifies the site as being within an area with potential for finds of archaeological significance.

The application has been revised since first submitted. The rear extension design has been adjusted to meet the existing roof more sensitively. The

Expiry: 4/6

staircase is to be repaired not replaced. The gable window has been removed from the application. In total 4 rooflights are proposed in the rear slope, in place of the current 2.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0633/26 – Rear garden studio. Granted

SU/94/82/TP - Application for Listed Building Consent for re-roofing, provision of inner skin & new floors incorporating damp proof membrane to prevent damp ingress. Approved.

Consultations

Heritage Consultant:

Response to SPAB's 2nd objection

I missed the PVC annotation for the shutters. You cannot approve the shutter drawing. The following condition is recommended:

Prior to manufacture and installation 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections of the shutters hereby approved shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. The shutters shall be of timber construction and the drawings shall show the relationship with surrounding fabric. Once approved the shutters shall be manufactured and installed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the aesthetic value of the listed building is preserved in accordance with policy 17 of the Adur Local Plan.

In respect of the stairs, their significance is limited being a stair of 19th century origin. To satisfy SPAB you could apply a condition:

Prior to commencement of repairs to the staircase a full methodology and schedule of repairs in respect of the staircase shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. The methodology shall include selected techniques and specify the materials proposed including species of timber to be used

Reason: To ensure the staircase is adequately preserved and to accord with Policy 17 of the Adur Local Plan.

In relation to the insulation, I'm sorry I don't agree. Yes, we do not expect the use of Celotex in listed buildings, but equally the whole roof structure is modern and of low quality. Moreover, the interior is predominantly plasterboard and as such given the prevailing context would not cause harm.

3rd set of Comments in response to latest revisions dated 17/7/26

No objection - harm is negligible or mitigated.

Further amended details have been submitted and these are considered to address the outstanding heritage concerns sufficiently to allow the scheme to be accepted subject to conditions. The previous concerns regarding the replacement rear extension, staircase repair, shutters, flooring, rainwater goods and the general principle of the roofspace conversion have largely been resolved or can now be appropriately controlled through suitably worded conditions. In particular, the building has been subject to substantial late twentieth-century alteration and the roof structure is understood to be modern.

On that basis, the proposed use of Celotex insulation within the new roof structure would not result in the loss of historic fabric and is not considered to adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, provided the final roof build-up, internal finish, ventilation and junctions with retained fabric are secured by condition

The rooflights remain the most sensitive external element of the proposal. The amended information has reduced and rationalised the extent of rooflights on the rear roof slope and, having regard to the rear-facing location, the modern roof structure, and the absence of rooflights on the principal front roof slope, the principle of rooflights to serve the converted roofspace can be accepted. However, the submitted Velux conservation rooflight detail shows a horizontal glazing bar. This is not considered to be the appropriate conservation format for this building, where a vertical glazing bar would provide the more typical traditional appearance and would better preserve the character of the roofscape.

Accordingly, the rooflights should be controlled by condition to require a true conservation-type rooflight, flush fitted within the roof slope, finished in a dark recessive colour, and incorporating a vertical glazing bar rather than the horizontal glazing bar shown on the submitted detail. Subject to this control, the amended scheme is considered acceptable.

The replacement extension would represent an improvement over the existing rear addition and would not harm the special interest of the listed building, subject to detailed control of materials, flintwork, brickwork, mortar, joinery and rainwater goods. The internal works would largely affect modern fabric and are acceptable in heritage terms. The repair-led approach to the staircase is also welcomed. Overall, and having special regard to Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and special attention to Section 72 in respect of the conservation area, the amended proposals are considered to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area, subject to conditions

In reaching this conclusion, regard has been had to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires the decision-maker, when considering whether to grant listed building consent, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

In this instance, the works would largely affect modern fabric or areas of limited historic significance, while the elements with the greatest potential to affect the external character and appearance of the building can be appropriately controlled by condition. The amended scheme is therefore considered to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

The scheme also accords with national and local heritage policy. It satisfies Section 16 of the NPPF by conserving the listed building in a manner appropriate to its significance, with the most sensitive details secured by condition. It also satisfies Adur Local Plan Policies 16 and 17 by preserving the historic character of the building, using materials and detailing appropriate to the locality, and ensuring that the alterations do not adversely affect the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Conditions

1) Materials

No development above slab level in respect of the replacement rear extension shall take place until samples and/or full specifications of all external materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include brick, flint, mortar mix and finish, leadwork, roof finish, rainwater goods and any external finishes. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the architectural and aesthetic value of the designated heritage asset is preserved and enhanced in accordance with local and national policy.

2) Joinery

Prior to installation, detailed drawings of all new external joinery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections showing frames, glazing bars, cills, heads, reveals, opening method, materials, finish and the relationship with surrounding fabric. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the architectural and aesthetic value of the designated heritage asset is preserved and enhanced in accordance with local and national policy

3) Rooflights

Prior to installation, full details of the proposed rooflights shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The rooflights shall be flush-fitted conservation-type units, finished in a dark recessive colour and incorporating a vertical glazing bar. The submitted details shall include manufacturer's specification, 1:10 elevations and 1:2 sections showing the external profile, glazing bar arrangement, flashing, set-in from the roof plane and relationship with the roof covering. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Expiry: 4/6

Reason: To ensure the architectural and aesthetic value of the designated heritage asset is preserved and enhanced in accordance with local and national policy.

Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) – 2nd comments

We are grateful for the further information provided, which addresses a number of our previous concerns. Having reviewed the additional material, we offer the following observations and comments.

Staircase: *The Heritage Statement refers to a stair drawing, which we have been unable to locate. However, the description of the works states that existing timber will be reused in order to regularise the staircase. We object to this approach, as it would result in the unnecessary loss of historic fabric and harm the building's historic character. We reiterate our previous concerns regarding the regularisation of historic fabric, as irregularities are often fundamental to a historic building's significance and character. No evidence has been provided to support the assertion that the stairs are currently unsafe. We therefore recommend that a detailed assessment of the staircase be undertaken and that a repair strategy be developed which prioritises the conservation of historic fabric. Replacement of historic timber should only be considered as a last resort where repair is demonstrably not feasible.*

Shutters to front windows: *The additional information indicates that the proposed shutters would be constructed from uPVC. We object to the use of plastic materials in this context, as they would be harmful to the building's historic character. Furthermore, as an impermeable material, uPVC has the potential to trap moisture against the historic front elevation, leading to condensation, mould growth, and the deterioration of historic fabric.*

New window in the south gable: *The Heritage Statement does not refer to the introduction of a new window opening in the south gable elevation; however, it continues to be shown on Drawing 02B. Clarification is therefore required. We would not support the introduction of a new window opening due to the unnecessary loss of historic fabric.*

Insulation: *We note the comments of your Conservation Consultant regarding the proposed use of Celotex insulation. While this intervention may affect only modern fabric, the information provided is insufficient to fully assess the implications of the proposed works. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that this matter could potentially be addressed through appropriately worded planning conditions.*

In summary, while the majority of the proposals appear acceptable in principle, we recommend that the Local Planning Authority seeks clarification on the matters outlined above prior to determining the application. Although certain matters may ultimately be addressed through planning conditions, it is preferable that as much relevant information as possible is submitted at this stage to enable a fully informed assessment.

SPAB's initial comments

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.

Expiry: 4/6

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.'

Essex CC Archaeology

The application is for Proposed replacement single storey rear extension. Internal works and conversion of roofspace with conservation rooflights to rear slope only. Formation of a small window in the side gable at second floor level.

The West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) shows that the proposed development site is located within an area with the potential for significant archaeological remains to survive.

The site is located within the historic medieval core of Shoreham, as it was prior its expansion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and denoted by an Archaeological Notification Area (HER DWS8591).

Archaeological works undertaken immediately to the east of the proposals have uncovered multi-period remains, including prehistoric and early Roman ditches, and medieval remains dating to between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, including a possible structure. Eighteenth and nineteenth century activity was also recorded (HER MWS9139).

The groundworks associated with the proposals have the potential to impact on significant archaeological deposits relating to the historic settlement activity identified in the vicinity, and the development of the town since the twelfth century.

Expiry: 4/6

Accordingly, I recommend a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording is carried out during groundworks associated with the proposals, to record any significant remains or finds that are impacted.

To understand the potential for, and significance of, archaeological deposits impacted by the proposal, a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording is being recommended in line with paragraph 218 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Adur Local Plan Policy

17. A recognised team of professionals should undertake the archaeological work. The archaeological potential beneath the site needs to be further understood by a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording; this could be outlined in further detail by a brief from this office to inform a Written Scheme of Investigation.

In view of the above, I recommend that the following conditions are placed on any permission:

RECOMMENDATION: Archaeological Monitoring and Recording

- (1) No development or preliminary 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.**
- (2) The applicant will submit a final archaeological report or (if appropriate) a Post Excavation Assessment report for approval by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be submitted within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Local Planning Authority.**

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2, 15, 16 and 17
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Shoreham by Sea Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Strategy (ADC 2008)
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Alterations to listed buildings or within their curtilages will be acceptable in principle subject to satisfying the statutory test of preserving the architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building. Development within a conservation area should preserve or enhance it. Works to dwellings otherwise located within the built up area can be supported in principle having regard to the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.

The plans have been revised since first submitted, including the Heritage Statement and are now acceptable in principle.

Heritage – Listed Building/conservation area

Although acceptable in principle, the revised proposal is still lacking in detail and given the significance of this heritage asset further submissions will be required. Conditions are therefore necessary to control the specific details of the works. Subject to careful consideration of the reserved details the revised scheme will protect the integrity of the listed building and preserve the appearance of the conservation area.

Archaeology

This site is within an area identified as being of archaeological significance. As such the conditions requested by Essex CC are attached.

Residential amenity

The replacement rear extension which is 3 metres deep and 2.5 metres in height will not be harmful to neighbour amenity.

Recommendation

A) Grant subject to conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Details of materials
4. Details of joinery
5. Details of rooflights
6. Details of shutters
7. Details of methodology/schedule of staircase repair
8. Programme of archaeological works
9. Details of final archaeological report

B) Approve subject to conditions

- 1) Approved Plans
- 2) 3 years
- 3) LB protected
- 4) Damage made good

Expiry: 4/6

Is recommendation contrary to letters of representation? Y

A + B

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

A) 2. SuDS drainage

Case Officer: MOK Date: 6/8/26

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 August 2026