Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1312/25
& AWDM/1313/25 **Recommendation: Approve**

Site: **25 Church Street, Shoreham-by-sea**

Proposal: **(1) Application to Vary Condition 1 (approved plans) to previously approved AWDM/0916/23. Amendment: Vary approved plan numbers to allow for changes to the extension design and internal layout.**
(2) Application to Vary Condition 1 (approved plans) to previously approved AWDM/0915/23. Amendment: Vary approved plan numbers to allow for changes to the extension design and internal layout.

ORIGINAL DESCRIPTION: Construction of single-storey rear extension following the removal of existing conservatory. Relocation of downpipe. Lowering of ground floor (kitchen only) and reinstatement of partition wall.

Date of Site Visit: 8 December 2025

Neighbours Checked: **Y**

Additional neighbour notification: **N**

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application relates to a Grade II listed building in the Shoreham Conservation Area, between Church Street and Middle Street. Permission was granted in 2023 for the removal of a rear conservatory construction of a new single storey extension, of deliberately contemporary appearance. Internal and external alterations are also proposed, including the relocation of a downpipe (AWDM/0916/23).

This application proposes amendments to the design of the extension. It maintains the footprint of the previously approved scheme but proposes changes to fenestration and roof design and materials. The application was subsequently amended, following comments from the Council's Heritage Consultant, to reduce the bulk of the roof so that it is no larger than the approved scheme. Zinc has been reinstated as the roof material (rather than lead) with rendered walls to match the dwelling. Fenestration has also been amended so that the doors and windows on the west elevation are equally sized in terms of width and have a more considered and rhythmic arrangement. A glazed door has been added to the north elevation at the side of the glazed link.

Work is well advanced on site.

This report considers both the planning and listed building applications.

Planning History: Various applications plus

AWDM/0915/23 & AWDM/0916/23 – Planning and Listed Building Consent for Construction of single-storey rear extension following the removal of existing conservatory. Relocation of downpipe.
Lowering of ground floor (kitchen only) and reinstatement of partition wall.

Consultations:

Adur and Worthing Councils: The **Heritage Consultant: Original Comments:**
The previously approved application was approved as the extension could clearly be read as a later addition including its contemporary palette of materials. However the previous conservation officer raised concerns regarding the proposed footprint and associated volume of the proposed extension stating 'Currently the rear of the listed building has a fairly intimate, domestic scale to its varied features. The proposal is likely to become the dominant feature to this aspect of the building. The heritage statement has remained silent on this particular impact.'
This revised proposal maintains the footprint and massing of the previously approved scheme. However, the somewhat contrasting and dominant effect of the proposed is further exacerbated by the departure of the rather rhythmic and predictable fenestration arrangement into an alternative design that is considered to hold a rather dis-joined appearance. This coupled with the already noted and not inconsiderable increase in bulk, combined with a clear departure from vernacular materiality, is seen to cause harm to the aesthetic value that underpins the significance of the designated heritage asset.
It is accepted that an approval for the previous scheme has been issued, but further harmful proposals cannot be accepted. Policy 17 of the Adur Local Plan requires applications to ensure that a listed buildings internal or external appearance or historic character is not adversely affected.
Furthermore the policy in the case of extensions and alterations require materials to be consistent with those originally used or typical of the locality.
This is further encouraged by paragraph 135 of the NPPF and best practice guidance including the National Design Guide and Advice Note 2: Making Changes to heritage assets. All of which give strong indications of the extent of contemporary addition and the relationship with prevailing context.
The proposed does not comply with these local and national policy requirements and by removal of a modern conservatory has sought to justify the construction of an alien form of considerably higher impact that by way of massing, projection and materiality has caused harm to the listed building. The amendments to the approval will cause further harm by removing a consistent elevational appearance and further promoting the dominating impact of the proposed.

As such the proposed variation of condition should not be supported

Heritage Comments on Amended Plans: The fenestration has been revised to provide a degree of predictability which has resulted in the harm being no greater than the previously approved scheme.
In reaching a conclusion, the previously approved scheme can be enacted and thus much of what is applied for within the variation is agreed in principle already. Had this been presented as a new application and not a variation of an approved scheme the recommendation would have been for a refusal. But given the principle of the proposed general appearance, massing, footprint etc is already subject of an approval, the capacity for any further objection is minimal and a refusal on this basis would be unlikely to win support of a planning inspector at appeal.
As such the variation is accepted.

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15, 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 (2024)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the historic character and appearance of the listed building and conservation area.

Visual amenity and impact on character of Conservation Area and Listed Building

The extension has a contemporary form and appearance and was reduced in size during the course of the original application from 5.5m to 4.3m in depth, which was considered to be more acceptable.

It is a contemporary addition which, at the time of the original application, was considered to not compete with the host building, with a glazed link separating the extension from the original house. It was considered to preserve the historic character and fabric of the listed building. It will not be visible from Church Street or readily visible from Middle Street and will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The currently proposed amendments have been reduced since the application was submitted following objections from the Council's Heritage Consultant and, as now proposed, are not considered to be significant. The roof form has been amended from its original design but the bulk of the roof has been reduced following the initial concerns of the Heritage Consultant.

The Heritage Consultant (who did not advise on the original 2023 application) has made it clear that had this proposal been presented as a new application and not a variation of an approved scheme he would have recommended refusal. However, as the principle of the proposed general appearance, massing and footprint has already been approved (and work has commenced on site) the capacity for any further objection is minimal and the amendments are accepted.

Residential amenity

The occupier of the attached house to the south, No. 23, had previously objected to the proposal and was concerned about the impact of the proposal on the boundary flint wall. The architect responded by stating:

"The extension will be designed in such a way that there is no need for foundations to be dug close to the flint wall. We have significant experience of building extensions in similar circumstances where we would look to construct a footing parallel to but some distance away from the flint wall.

The slab would then be cantilevered from this footing so there is minimal excavation needed around the base of the wall. Insulation etc can be accommodated by a wall stood off the flint wall so there will be little if any impact on the wall.

These matters can be adequately addressed via a party wall agreement."

The wall is not visible to the public and the extension will obstruct only a short section of it. With the assurance about construction as set out above, plus the Party Wall Agreement, it is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the wall or the neighbouring occupier.

Trees

The trees to be removed are not significant and do not have public amenity value. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer did not previously consider them to be worthy of formal protection.

A large Macrocarpa at the rear is sufficiently distant to not be affected by the proposal.

Recommendation

(1) APPROVE AWDM/1312/25

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Materials as specified

(2) **Grant listed building consent AWDM/1313/25** subject to conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. Materials as specified
3. Protect building from damage
4. Make good any damage to building and boundary wall

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 8 December 2025

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 08.12.2025