Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

Application Number:	AWDM/1169/25
Location:	11 Bedford Row, Worthing
Proposal:	division of rooms, damp proofing and pavers
Case Officer:	**Louise Prew**

	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:	11 Bedford Row is a large Regency style building set over five floors and forms part of a terrace of buildings that are situated close to Worthing Town Centre. Much of the terrace has been converted to form multiple flats within each building and as such the Terrace has varying degrees of survival both externally and internally .It is noted that a infill development of Victorian origin appears to be located midway along the Terrace.
Drawing Errors:	
Comments:	A Listed Building Consent application has been made in respect of the basement apartment within 11 Bedford Row and comprises of remedial works to address issues of damp, laying of new paving slabs and the forming of additional partitions to create a separate bedroom and revised internal layout. The interior of the apartment is particularly lacking in any aspect of special architectural and historic interest having been converted to form apartment some time ago it appears much of any interior decor that may have been in place has been lost with walls largely comprising of plasterboard and all doors having been changed to regulation fire doors. The area of damp proposed for remedying situated to the far rear of the building in a room that currently forms a bathroom, where a plaster boarded panel (drylining) wall that is believed to be fixed via battens to a solid wall has signs of some form of damp. Further damp proofing works

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	are also proposed to a currently drylined wall where there appears to be no signs of damp but is proposed nevertheless. The revision of the layout will involve the partitioning of the existing bedroom to form a second room. Having reviewed the documentation it is noted that there is no heritage statement or analysis of the listed building and as such fails to comply with the requirements of paragraph 210 of the NPPF. It is noted that during the site visit the owner inferred to the reinstatement of plan form but there is no evidence of original layout and that that such a reinstatement would occur. Turning to the proposed damp works the use of damp metres have only limited effectiveness, they simply measure the electrical resistance over a surface, a damp surface will create a higher reading. Given the use as a bathroom, lack of insulation, the dry lining of the walls and so on, the potential for penetrating damp is remote, the high readings are more likely to be associated to the condensing of water vapour (particularly in the bathroom) on cold surfaces. There appears to be no sign of damp symptoms in the bedroom. The use of an injected damp proof course is proposed which is unsuitable and frankly will not work. Bearing in mind the subterranean nature of the apartment any penetrating damp through the wall will not be stopped by a layer of randomly injected silicone round the base of the wall. Whereas the use of plasterboard would not cause further detriment to architectural and historic interest, it will inhibit evaporation. The use of a drylining system (as existing) creates a required cavity but a form of vapour permeability and insulative quality would be required to address the issue. In respect of the slabs, it is acknowledged that the paving bricks are in varying states and some are broken. However paving bricks are a vernacular materiality that is prevalent across Worthing and the wider South Downs area, therefore removal and replacement with a sandstone would cause detriment to architectural interest.

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	At this stage it is suggested that the applicant thoroughly review the application and consider appointing professional assistance such as a heritage consultant or surveyor with experience in dealing with historic buildings. In its current guise the proposal would fail to meet policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan and Paragraphs 210, 213 and 215 of the NPPF
Further comment:	The applicant has advised the withdrawal of a number of elements of the proposed and has provided detail of the previous layout to be replicated. Unfortunately the layout referred to is a layout of unauthorised works that were reversed and the drawings held within application AWDM/0956/16 show the original plan form of the room and layout of existing cloakroom along side. These elements are later additions therefore the proposed would not bring about heritage benefit by reinstatement of a layout. Rather cause a low degree of harm by further dividing the plan form, it is also of some concern as to whether the overall size of the proposed second bedroom would be adequate. Considering the degree of change that has occurred and lack of perceivable historic interest internally, the planning officer could consider whether public benefit such as an improvement to living standards or provision of a viable 2 bedroom unit would provide a suitable mitigation for the low level of less than substantial harm caused. Other aspects within the application are supportable but the approved documents should be reflective of the amended scheme that omits the damp proof works.
Amended Plans / Additional Information Required: *[List the amended plans/additional information you are requesting, if any*]	1. 2. 3.
Conditions Required: [L*ist the conditions you are requesting, if any*]	1. 2. 3.

Simon Richard

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

Conservation Consultant
Date of Comment 25/11/25