

Application Number:	AWDM/0444/26 and AWDM/0443/26
Location:	8 Warwick Place Worthing West Sussex BN11 3EU
Proposal:	Listed Building Consent and Planning Permission for replacement front porch and replacement paving to rear yard.
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:	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 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. 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 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 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:	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.
--	---

Further comment 4/6/26	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 or 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 <i>architectural and historic interest that is derived from XYZ would not be harmed as it is ABC.</i> 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.
---------------------------------------	---

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council
Date of Comment 29/5/26