

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0443/26 **Recommendation:** APPROVE

Site: 8 Warwick Place Worthing West Sussex BN11 3EU

Proposal: Replacement front porch and replacement paving to rear yard.

Date of Site Visit: 05/05/2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

No. 8 Warwick Place is a Grade II listed early 19th-century dwelling, first listed on 21 May 1976. The list entry describes it as a possibly c.1820 two-storey stuccoed house with a slate roof and a sash window with glazing bars, and notes the presence of the right-hand entrance porch, which is of rectangular form with posts modelled as bundles of rods, winged cherub corbels and a decorated flat hood. The building forms part of a listed group with Nos. 5 to 8 Warwick Place, reflecting the special architectural and historic interest of this short terrace and its contribution to the character of the street.

Warwick Place lies very close to Worthing seafront and town centre within a notably historic part of the townscape, where terraced historic buildings and other designated heritage assets create a strong sense of place. The listed group at Nos. 5–8 Warwick Place contributes to this established architectural grain and to the historic domestic character of the immediate area. Other buildings along the terrace possess modest Moghul styled porches and are also statutorily listed having construction dates of 1835.

Proposal

The application seeks planning and listed building consent for replacement of the flat roofed porch with a Moghul styled front porch to match the terrace and replacement paving to rear yard.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0829/13 - Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension

STATUS: Application Permitted 6th September 2013.

AWDM/0886/13 - Listed Building Consent for demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension

STATUS: Application Permitted 6th September 2013.

AWDM/0796/15 - Replace roof covering, new battens and slates using Spanish Contessa grey slates and associated lead flashing. Fix chimney cowls to three chimneys; replace plastic guttering with black cast iron guttering; remove uPVC cladding to sides of porch and render; replace rear dormer window with bespoke timber sash window and replace felt roof covering to existing dormer window. Remove single storey flat roofed rear lean to and make good. Remove brick garage from front garden.

STATUS: Application Permitted 12th August 2015.

AWDM/0797/15 - Listed Building Consent to replace roof covering, new battens and slates using Spanish Contessa grey slates and associated lead flashing. Fix chimney cowls to three chimneys; replace plastic guttering with black cast iron guttering; remove uPVC cladding to sides of porch and render; replace rear dormer window with bespoke timber sash window and replace felt roof covering to existing dormer window. Remove single storey flat roofed rear lean to and make good. Remove brick garage from front garden.

STATUS: Application Permitted 12th August 2015.

Consultations

Heritage Consultant:

The use of the Moghul style is not unusual for buildings located in seaside resorts, such architectural detailing is prevalent particularly on piers and similar seaside buildings with grand tours in the 19th century forming architectural inspiration best suited to the newly developing seaside. Whereas more extravagant examples such as the Royal Pavilion are obvious examples, this rather modest terrace has been furnished with a number of porches in the Moghul style, described as upturned boats or in the ogee style on listing descriptions.

The listing description for No8 specifically refers to its flat roofed porch, which may merely be for identification purposes rather than any inference of significance. However whereas the application may be supportable there is a distinct lack of evidence and the drawings are not of a sufficient standard.

Paragraph 207 requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. Further to this an analysis of impact should be provided.

In this instance the heritage statement details that the existing flat roofed porch is a later addition, that may be the case but there is no evidence to support that statement and no discussion as to how the existing arrangement contributes to significance or how it will be impacted, either positively or negatively.

In respect of the proposed drawings the elevations are not of a sufficient standard showing vertical lines for the roof finish, and a low level of detail in respect of the windows. Whereas it is understood the application does not propose works to the windows or roof, the drawings need to be of such a standard that it could not be construed that any additional alterations were being carried out.

The elevations of the proposed porch are not of sufficient detail and horizontal and vertical sections in 1:2 are required to ensure the overall quality of the design.

There should also be some detail as to how rainwater will be addressed given the existing rainwater goods pass through and under the existing porch wall

In respect of the rear courtyard the documentation describes the presence of crazy paving, this should be evidenced with a photograph and in respect of the proposed, the drawings show a herring bone pattern but annotations do not clearly define a laying pattern or design. No specification or sample of the proposed has been supplied.

In summary, whilst the principle of replacing the existing porch and repaving the rear yard may potentially be acceptable, the current submission does not provide sufficient information to properly assess the impact of the proposals on the significance of this Grade II listed building or its setting. In this respect, the proposal does not currently demonstrate compliance with Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023, which requires development affecting designated heritage assets to avoid adverse effects on significance and setting and, where harm may arise, to be supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment describing the significance of the asset affected, including the contribution made by its setting. Accordingly, further information is required before a robust heritage assessment can be reached, including clearer and more detailed drawings, confirmation of materials and detailing, clarification of rainwater disposal, fuller information regarding the existing and proposed rear yard treatment, and a more complete justification of the effect of the works on the significance of the listed building.

4/6 comments

The agent has provided further details, in respect of drawing 11 this had not been seen previously and is most helpful.

In respect of the rear yard, drawing 11 confirms the current appearance and a new single pattern would not constitute an issue. The use of numerous patterns would not provide any benefit, however the proposed equally when compared to the existing arrangement and concealment would not cause harm to heritage values and as such is considered to be acceptable.

In respect of the proposed porch, the agent has made a reasonable case as to its acceptability but slightly misses the point being made. There is little doubt that the existing porch is a modern intervention and the proposed would certainly contribute to a cohesive streetscape, but there is no evidence that the building ever had a moghul porch of any kind. Whereas this may not lead to the proposal as being unacceptable, it would strengthen the case significantly if some evidence could be supplied of a previous form, perhaps a historic photograph? If it is not possible a case as to why heritage values would not be harmed would be required even if evidence is lacking. This would act as a form of justification to detail that architectural and historic interest that is derived from XYZ would not be harmed as it is ABC.

Drawing 18 is useful confirming the rainwater detail and rebates but there is still issues regarding overall drawing quality and a vertical section has not been provided.

There is little doubt that the intention is for a good quality addition to the listed building which is welcomed, however the lack of detail does not reassure the council of the quality of what is proposed, moreover without such detail the council would not be able to ensure the quality of the proposed works and as such revised further information is required before a robust heritage assessment can be reached, including clearer and more detailed drawings of the elevations and vertical section, confirmation of materials and detailing (is it lime render?).

The applicant is reminded that listed buildings form a very small proportion of the built stock in the UK and are afforded great weight in respect of their conservation and indeed tight controls over their alteration. As such further clarification is required.

18/6/26

The additional drawings submitted comprise Drawing 19, a vertical section through the proposed ogee arch, and Drawing 20, a detailed cross section through the arch. These provide useful further clarification of the proposed arch construction, identifying a reinforced concrete arch with 8 mm diameter reinforcement bars, 20 mm minimum cover, a masonry paint finish, and, on Drawing 19, 100 mm dense concrete blocks with render and masonry paint finish. The drawings therefore address the previously identified absence of vertical section information and give a clearer indication of the intended constructional build-up.

However, the drawings also confirm that the principal decorative arch element would be formed in reinforced concrete and finished with masonry paint, rather than through a more traditional or breathable material specification. While this is not necessarily fatal to the proposal, it is a relatively modern constructional approach for a prominent addition to a Grade II listed building and does not fully resolve the earlier concern regarding material quality and detailed execution. No evidence has been supplied to justify that particular approach and why vapour permeable materials have not been specified or indeed what impact would arise from the use of such materials in their place.

The additional drawings, whilst seeking to address the previously requested vertical section and constructional detail, do not provide further evidence that No. 8 historically possessed a Moghul or ogee porch, nor is there any supporting case or narrative that materially expands the heritage justification for introducing such a porch in the absence of that evidence, which was previously requested. The proposal may still be supportable on the basis that the existing porch is a modern intervention and that the proposed form would better respond to the character and rhythm of the listed terrace; however, the justification remains somewhat limited.

At this stage the council should consider either a refusal of listed building consent or requesting further written details that:

- Justify the use of modern concrete materiality
- Evidence the reinstatement or detail a case for the insertion of the porch

The applicant/agent is reminded once again that the requirement of paragraphs 207 is to describe not only significance, but the impact of the proposal upon the significance

through desktop study and other research. By simply providing a drawing with no explanatory details does not fulfil the requirement to assess impact or indeed suitability. This extends beyond appearance to material usage and compatibility. Explanation is required which has been repeatedly requested and remains outstanding.

2/7/26

Further amendments have been received, comprising a drawing detailing the construction of the proposed porch hood. This now indicates an oak core with a rendered finish applied over EML (expanded metal lath), while the walls either side remain formed from concrete blocks.

The amendment remains confusing and is unsupported by any meaningful heritage justification or explanatory narrative for the selected materiality, construction method, or design response. The use of oak as a concealed structural core for a rendered porch hood would be unusual in this context, particularly where the finish appears to rely on an unspecified render and masonry paint system.

The specified materiality raises further concerns regarding long-term performance and compatibility with the listed building. Oak is known to shrink and move as it seasons and matures, which is likely to increase the risk of cracking and failure of the render finish. This concern is particularly acute at the junctions between the oak core, EML, render and concrete blockwork. The submission does not demonstrate vapour permeability, does not justify the use of cementitious or non-breathable materials, and does not explain how the proposed construction would avoid harm to historic fabric or ensure an appropriate quality of execution for a prominent addition to a Grade II listed building.

The agent has still not provided a satisfactory narrative or assessment justifying the proposal in terms of context, originality, material compatibility or impact on significance. No evidence has been supplied to demonstrate that No. 8 historically possessed a Moghul or ogee porch, nor has a sufficient heritage case been advanced to explain why the insertion of such a porch would preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building in the absence of such evidence. The material approach has not been justified, and no adequate discussion has been provided regarding the existing materiality of the principal elevation or the implications of introducing the proposed constructional build-up. The Council has acted constructively and has made repeated requests for further clarification, but the submitted amendments have not resolved the substantive heritage concerns.

In accordance with section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In respect of the associated planning application, section 66 of the same Act requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting. On the information submitted, the proposal has not demonstrated that the special interest of the listed building would be preserved.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting, with sufficient detail to understand the potential impact of the proposal on that significance. It also requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The repeated absence of a robust assessment of significance, impact and justification means that the proposal has not satisfied the requirements of paragraph 207 of the NPPF, nor has it demonstrated that the conservation of the designated heritage asset has been given the required great weight.

The proposal is also considered to conflict with Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023, which seeks to ensure that development affecting designated heritage assets avoids adverse effects on their significance and setting and is supported, where necessary, by appropriate heritage impact assessment. The current submission does not provide sufficient evidence, analysis or material justification to demonstrate that the proposed works would preserve the significance, special interest or setting of the Grade II listed building.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent

The proposal, by reason of the inadequate heritage justification, unresolved material and constructional concerns, absence of evidence for the proposed porch form, and insufficient assessment of impact upon the significance of the Grade II listed building, fails to demonstrate that the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building would be preserved. The proposal is therefore contrary to sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, including paragraph 207 and the requirement to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023.

18/9

Following the submission of revised drawings and further discussion with the applicant and case officer, the proposal has been reassessed.

The original conservation concerns related principally to the lack of a sufficiently robust heritage statement and the absence of convincing documentary evidence demonstrating that the proposed porch constitutes an accurate restoration of a previously existing historic feature. Whilst reference has been made to historic photographs and the presence of similar ogee-arched porches within Warwick Place, the submitted information falls short of providing conclusive evidence that the proposed porch formed part of the historic development of No. 8. Consequently, the proposal cannot be regarded as a faithful reconstruction of a lost historic feature.

Notwithstanding the above, the revised design has been simplified and improved during the course of the application. By virtue of its scale, form and appearance, and owing to the presence of similar porch structures elsewhere within the terrace, the proposal is not considered likely to result in harm to the architectural or historic significance of the Grade II listed building or the character and appearance of the conservation area.

It is acknowledged that aspects of the detailed construction remain unresolved and that the applicant has indicated that specialist design and construction details will be

prepared following the grant of consent. In this instance, it is considered that the principle of the development can be accepted subject to conditions requiring the submission and approval of detailed scale drawings, elevations, sections, construction details and specifications of all external materials prior to commencement of the relevant works. These details should thereafter form the basis of the implementation of the approved porch.

Accordingly, whilst the application has not been supported by the standard of heritage justification that would ordinarily be expected for works to a listed building, the revised proposal is considered capable of being supported on a pragmatic basis subject to suitable conditions securing the final detailing, construction methodology and materiality.

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent subject to conditions.

Subject to conditions securing detailed drawings, construction methodology and external materials, the proposal is considered capable of preserving the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, its setting, and the character and appearance of the conservation area. On this basis, the proposal would accord with sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Chapter 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework August 2026, in particular policies HE4, HE6 and HE9, and Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023.

The Worthing Society

Thank you for requesting our comments in respect of this Grade II Listed Building. The Heritage Team have no objection, in principle, to the new porch which could be an improvement. It appears smaller in scale to the present porch, which is not original, and will complement the proximate Listed Buildings. Some of the cottages in Warwick Place still retain the original 'boat porches' which are an historic feature of this part of Worthing. One further point we have observed is that the downpipe will need to be suitably enclosed. Regarding the paving, we suggest that reclaimed bricks or cobbles are used and that this should be a 'condition' if the application is approved.

Neighbour Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM24
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2026)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Planning Assessment:

There is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to residential dwellings within the built-up area. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity including impact on the listed building

In relation to Planning Permission, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when considering whether to grant planning permission, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when exercising planning functions, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

The LPA's duties are reinforced within Section 20 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 potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance. Other elements held within Section 20 will also be considered as will policy DM24.

Listed building

The proposal is to replace the existing porch with an ogee or moghul porch similar to those to the other houses in the terrace. As set out in the conservation comments above, although the intention is for a good quality addition, the application has consistently been let down by a lack of adequate drawings and acceptable heritage statement. There has been an absence of convincing documentary evidence demonstrating that the proposed porch constitutes an accurate restoration of a previously existing historic feature.

Whilst reference has been made to historic photographs and the presence of similar ogee-arched porches within Warwick Place, the submitted information falls short of providing conclusive evidence that the proposed porch formed part of the historic development of No. 8. Consequently, the proposal cannot be regarded as a faithful reconstruction of a lost historic feature.

Notwithstanding the above, the revised design has been simplified and improved during the course of the application. By virtue of its scale, form and appearance, and owing to the presence of similar porch structures elsewhere within the terrace, the

proposal is not considered likely to result in harm to the architectural or historic significance of the Grade II listed building.

The ogee porch would by virtue of its design, mirroring an established and consistent architectural feature would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In this case it is therefore felt that on balance, the proposed porch can be supported provided that details prepared by a specialist contractor prior to construction are submitted.

Residential Amenity

The porch will be in the place of an existing porch and will not have any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

Recommendation:

APPROVE householder permission subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit

APPROVE listed building consent subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Drawings to be approved
4. Paving and porch approved only

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Louise Prew Date: 18/09/2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 18 September 2026