

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

Application Number:	AWDM/0577/26 and AWDM/0578/26
Location:	9 Warwick Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 3ET
Proposal:	AWDM/0577/26: Installation of side window at basement level; and first floor rear conservatory AWDM/0578/26: Internal alterations to replace the ground to basement staircase, remove the wall between the dining area and hallway at ground floor, and install mist system. New side window at basement level and first floor conservatory
Case Officer:	Louise Prew

	Further Information Required
	Design Review Required
	No objection - no harm
	No objection - harm is negligible or mitigated
X	Objection - less than substantial harm
	Objection - substantial harm
	Objection – Total Loss

Site and Surroundings:	No. 9 Warwick Road forms part of the Grade II listed terrace at 1–15 Warwick Road, a coherent group of historic town houses which makes a strong contribution to the architectural and historic character of this part of Worthing. The significance of the building is therefore derived not only from its individual fabric and plan form, but also from its value as one element within a unified terrace, where the consistency of scale, proportions, rhythm and traditional detailing combine to create a formal and legible historic composition. The principal elevation contributes most strongly to the public appreciation of the asset, while the side and rear elements are of a more secondary and functional character, albeit still forming part of the overall historic interest of the building. The setting of the property is defined by its close visual and physical relationship with the adjoining buildings in the terrace and by the established urban grain of Warwick Road, where historic development presents a continuous and well-contained frontage. The significance of the wider setting lies in this collective townscape quality, including the repetition of built form, the enclosure of the street, and the contribution made by the terrace to the historic character of the area. Although later alterations and ancillary additions may have occurred over time, the building remains best understood as part of a larger designated heritage asset, the appreciation of which depends upon the retention of its overall form, hierarchy of elevations and relationship to the surrounding historic streetscape. The proposal seeks planning permission for Internal alterations to replace the ground to basement staircase, remove the wall between the dining area and hallway at ground floor,
-------------------------------	--

	and install mist system. New side window at basement level and first floor conservatory are also proposed. In terms of Listed Building Consent, Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a statutory duty to LPAs when considering whether to grant listed building consent, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In terms of 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 16 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 impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great 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 harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Other elements held within Section 16 will also be considered as will Local Policy.
Drawing Errors:	
Comments:	In respect of the stairs to the basement level, it was noted during the site visit that these particular stairs were later replacements and not particularly well constructed. The principle of replacing these stairs is acceptable but the drawings submitted show 2no design styles, one to match existing and another with more decorative spindles. Clarity on this matter should be sought. The proposed removal of the dividing wall that separates the hall from the lounge would result in a erosion of plan form of the building, which also appears to instigate a need for a water mist system to be installed. The mist system aside, as Historic Englands advice note

	2 states: <i>The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases (whether decorated or plain, principal or secondary) and other features are likely to form part of its significance. Indeed they may be its most significant feature. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance (particularly architectural interest) as for externally visible alterations.</i> In this particular instance the plan form has been largely retained and is still legible contributing to historic character and sense of place, when considering this against legislation the proposed removal of walls will not preserve architectural or historic interest, nor where the proposed causes less than substantial harm, is there an adequate mitigation that is clear and convincing or in the public interest. Moreover the removal of the walls could have unforeseen impacts upon the structure given that many buildings of this period are regarded as quite flimsy and no supporting report from an engineer has been provided. The installation of a water mist fire suppression system is with some merit ensuring a quick response should a fire breakout, thus increasing potential of long term preservation and decreasing the potential of loss due to a fire. However the installation details are at best limited and appear to imply the removal of historic wall finishes and the embedding of emitters in the wall, nor is there any compelling justification for the installation of such a system in a residential property where the risk of fire is not of any particularly increased level over and above what would be considered normal. The rationale for such a system maybe due to the removal of the walls in the hallway (though this is not clear) and if that is the case the harm brought about by loss of plan form is also exacerbated by the installation of the mist system. It is noted that if fire is a significant concern, smoke detection or similar early warning systems may provide a more appropriate and proportionate solution subject to further guidance from a qualified fire engineer. It is also noted the mistex survey plan shows the rear ground floor chimney as being removed. In any case the installation would bring about some harm for a potential benefit but such works should be justified as being required in isolation by a suitably qualified fire engineer and not as part of allowing the adaption of the plan form of the building. In respect of the proposed window, it is noted that the window will only serve a bathroom and building regulations do not require windows for bathrooms, as such there is no justification for the proposed window. The drawing also shows the glazing bars, rails and stiles to be disproportionate and some 62mm deep stating they are to match the existing, a photo to evidence this unusual proportionality should be provided if any form of justification for the window installation can be presented. It is also noted there is no horizontal section drawing
--	---

	There appears to be no discussion within the heritage statement regarding impact of the scheme upon the buildings heritage values, the formation of the shower room or w/c at lower ground and ground floor levels is not discussed at all, whereas this may be acceptable further detail is required. In respect of the conservatory, the proposed is considered when compared to other buildings in the terrace to be reasonable but full joinery details will be required. In summary, the proposal though reduced in scope when compared to the previous scheme still presents unjustified and unacceptable alteration that impacts the architectural and historic interest of a Grade II Listed Building. Certain aspects could be clarified and others withdrawn to create an acceptable scheme. Recommendation: Advise to amend the scheme or withdraw the application. In accordance with the details above the applicant should be invited to revise or withdraw the application. Otherwise further comment will be provided recommending refusal of LBC and PP.
--	--

Simon Richard

Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council

08/06/2026