

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/0267/26
Location:	Flat 1 17 Heene Terrace Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for Listed Building Consent for alterations in connection with proposed repair to first floor front balcony; replacement roof to first-floor sunroom (front)
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

X	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:	Heene Terrace in Worthing is a striking Victorian seafront development built in 1865 as part of the ambitious plan to establish West Worthing as an elegant, self-contained resort. Designed to attract affluent visitors, the terrace formed a centrepiece of this new district alongside The Heene (now the Burlington Hotel). Its long, continuous façade, raised position above the promenade, and formal front gardens gave it a commanding presence on the coastline. The area around it, once known as Little Heene, quickly transformed from a rural parish into a fashionable suburb as the town expanded westward. Architecturally, the terrace showcases classic mid-Victorian seaside grandeur, with stuccoed elevations, tall sash windows, decorative iron and stone balconies that are covered and supported by large ornate console brackets. The porticos have possess a larger covered area immediately adjacent to the balconies and in the case of No17 has been infilled to form a sun room, the infill is most probably Edwardian. The terrace utilises 3 distinct architectural elements to convey a strong cohesive symmetrical character. It is noted the centre of the terrace projects forward and forms a frontispiece section, consistent terracing emerges either side of the frontispiece section slightly recessed back, where each end of the terrace terminates a ‘bookend’ arrangement of projecting forward buildings form the termination point at each end of the terrace. The ‘book ends’ are emphasised by the use of stucco quoining detail to the corners of the projecting elements. Today, Heene Terrace is primarily residential, with many of its grand original homes now converted into flats that retain their period character and direct access to the seafront. The terrace still conveys a considerable aesthetic value and contribution to the streetscape. The application seeks listed building consent for a number of works in relation to the balcony and balcony roof at Flat 1 17 Heene Terrace. Including the replacement of the balcony roof, replacement of the broken portland stone balcony slab with a reinforced concrete and further amendments to the sun room.
-------------------------------	--

	The balcony slab has failed and on conducting a site visit it was found that the roof to the balcony had already been replaced and scaffolding was in place around the balcony. The applicant is strongly reminded that Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 prohibits the demolition, alteration, or extension of a listed building in any manner affecting its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, unless such works are authorised. It is clear that the works undertaken are without authorisation and do effect historic and architectural interest and would therefore constitute an offence under Section 9 of the Act. Whereas it is understood that the propping of the balcony and scaffold would constitute emergency works, the LPA was not informed of the emergency works and the work to replace the roof structure goes far beyond what is the minimum necessary. It should be noted that the balcony and associated summer room are situated at the junction between a projecting book end element at the western end of the terrace and the consistent row moving east towards the frontispiece section. The general appearance of the terrace is relatively consistent but the projection and the recession of the facades lead to variations in design details. 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. 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. In respect of the Portland stone slab/balcony it is noted that a neighbouring balcony may have had a reinforced concrete replacement in the past with signs of air pockets being present during casting visible. Whereas the details provided appear to provide a viable solution in structural terms there is no detail as to why a replacement Portland stone slab cannot be installed, nor is there any narrative explaining the works carried out to the balcony roof canopy. The heritage statement is distinctly lacking in any assessment of any particular note, merely referring to a schedule of structural repair and the listing description, this is wholly inadequate and fails to meet the requirements of paragraph 210. In connection with this the sunroom area is also part of the proposal, with some conversation during the site visit for a greater flat area than currently existing. Having reviewed the entire terraces form it is noted that the position of the sunroom and associated balcony is unique to the western side and mirrors a similar arrangement at the eastern bookend section. As such it will not be possible to amend the roof configuration unless evidence of a previous form or adopting exactly the same form as the eastern side is proposed, with the scaffolding up and the roof out of view it is hard to ascertain if the forms vary. Nevertheless, it is not appropriate to compare the sunroom roof covering with any other part of the terrace. Alteration may in the current arrangement create a mismatch in terms of symmetry and would cause harm to aesthetic quality and heritage value. In terms of what is proposed an existing elevation and proposed elevation of the sunroom and balcony is required as is full sections of the canopy and sunroom roof at 1:5 showing the relationship with the main structure of the building and the associated ironwork. The newly installed balcony roof replicates the gentle curve seen along the terrace and the applicant stated it replaced a simple straight rafter detail that was not complimentary to the architectural quality of the wider terrace. That may be the case, but applicants should demonstrate this adequately within the heritage statement. The new canopy roof also includes a rather rudely installed piece of 6x2 that has been rather unceremoniously bolted to the front elevation. There is no detail of this balcony canopy replacement or any suitable heritage assessment or narrative to accompany any proposed plans for this element. In summary the proposal is both inadequate and unjustified due to a distinct lack of detail which is unacceptable. The applicant should be strongly reminded that the works carried out have impacted architectural and historic interest and the 'like for like' approach utilised in respect of the balcony roof is not detailed within the act in any way, nor is it accurate in this instance as there have been considerable changes. There is no detail regarding the repair or reinstatement of the metal work or tile work which is clearly damaged and in need of attention. At this stage the applicant is advised to make considerable amendments to the proposed.
--	--

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

	In relation to both local and national policy the proposed is contrary to DM24 and paragraphs 135, 210, 213 and 215 of the NPPF. It is suggested they engage the services of a historic building consultant and provide revisions within 1 month to the LPA. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN ENFORCEMENT ACTION
--	--

Simon Richard

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

Date of Comment 26/3/26