Expiry Date - 14/07/2025
Extension of Time - 09/01/2026

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0613/25 **Recommendation: – APPROVE**

Site: **11 High Street Worthing West Sussex BN14 7NN**

Proposal: **Listed Building Consent for replacement timber windows**

Date of Site Visit: 28/05/2025 **Site Meeting:** 13/08/2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the west side of the High Street in the centre of Tarring and within the West Tarring Conservation Area. The building is grade II listed and comprises an end of terrace, two storey house previously occupied as two separate dwellings (No.11 and 13) converted to a single dwelling in 1978. The building has rendered elevations, a tile hung gable, tiled roof and single glazed timber framed windows consisting of a mix of sashes and casement windows. The property has been previously extended to the rear.

The statutory listing describes the property as follows:

HIGH STREET 1. 5406 (West Side) West Tarring Nos 11 and 13 TQ 1304 SW 15/191 II GV 2. A pair, abutting No 15. Probably early C19. 2 storeys. Rendered. 3 unevenly-spaced sash windows above, with moulded architraves and glazing bars. Below: on the left a 4-panel door; across the rest of the front a moulded cornice, probably belonging to a shop of the original date, with 4 slender pilasters, the middle 2 framing the doorway (4-panel door, top 2 glazed) and the left-hand one having lost its lower portion. The left window under the cornice fixed, the right a sash with glazing bars. Slate roof with gable chimneys. Unmoulded eaves. The George and Dragon Public House and Nos 3 to 19 (odd), including No 13a (Chippers) form a group. Listing NGR: TQ1324704095

Proposal

Listed Building Consent is sought for replacement windows to the ground floor of the building including 3 to the front elevation and 3 to the south side.

Window 1 (front) is a double hung vertical sliding sash and would be replaced with a single glazed timber frame vertical sliding sash with 4mm glazing and 16mm integral glazing bars to match the proportions, profile and detailing of the existing window and those at first floor.

Window 2 (front) is a top opening casement over a fixed bottom pane and would be replaced with timber framed sliding sash 16mm slimline double glazing with 25mm integral glazing bars.

Window 3 (front) is a fixed window with glazing bars and would be replaced with a fixed timber framed window with 16mm slimline double glazing and 25mm integral glazing bars.

Window 4 (side) is a triple casement window with top opening fanlights and would be replaced with timber framed triple casement with top opening fanlights in 16mm slimline double glazing with 25mm integral glazing bars.

Window 5 (side) is a painted shut double casement window with stained glass and would be replaced with an opening double casement timber framed window with 16mm slimline double glazing and 25mm integral glazing bars.

Window 6 – (side) is a fixed single casement with top opening fanlight and would be replaced with a timber framed single casement window with top opening fanlight with 16mm slimline double glazing and 25mm integral glazing bars.

The application has been significantly amended during consideration and the plans updated to address concerns raised with the original submission, including the accuracy of the existing drawings, revised designs to replace the more modern windows and the retention of single glazing for window 1.

Relevant Planning History:

167/78/LB - Alterations to front elevation to provide a new window in lieu of existing door, in connection with use of properties as one single dwelling
STATUS: Application Permitted 31st March 1978.

10/0523/FULL - Proposed construction of a 'goal post' steel frame to rear of building to support existing cantilevered concrete slab
STATUS: Conditional Consent 28th September 2010.

AWDM/1889/17 - Application for Listed Building Consent to remove one non load bearing wall and erect a new one to create a hallway; block one doorway up and add new doorway (bedroom 5)
STATUS: Application Permitted 20th March 2018.

AWDM/0198/21 - Garden office in rear garden
STATUS: Application Permitted 12th April 2021.

AWDM/1428/24 - Application for Listed Building Consent for the removal of one non-load bearing internal wall on the ground floor.
STATUS: Application Permitted 4th March 2025.

Consultations

The Councils **Design and Conservation Architect**

The windows need to be considered one at a time as they vary considerably in quality and significance.

Window 1.
This double hung, vertical sliding sash window, is of high significance. This window appears to match the first floor windows. The supplied photographs show the sashes are likely to be of an early date having very thin, profiled glazing bars. The "existing" drawing of this window has not drawn these correctly. Note the very slim meeting rail as well, also not as shown on the drawing. This window will not work with Slim Line double glazed units due to the extra weight and the potential changes to the appearance of the glazing bars. Secondary glazing may be the answer here.

Window 2.
This is an individual window with an opening sash over a fixed sash. The internal photograph has the internally fixed shutters closed hence we do not know if the existing drawings are accurate on this point. However the outside shot shows very slim glazing bars, and the window is likely to be of medium significance. The section drawing is inaccurate as the lower part of the frame is nowhere near 96mm, and the top of the upper opening sash is slimmer than 53mm. It is therefore not possible to compare the proposed window with the existing. I note the proposed window totally changes the format and look of the window, with heavy framing and loses the vertical emphasis of the existing panes.

Window 3.
This is a fixed window with 6 panes, and again, the shutters have remained closed whilst taking the internal photograph. The notes in the box of the "existing" window do not make sense, just repeating those of window 2. The section drawing shows 47mm of frame back to the external glass surface; this is also wrong. The proposed window is an opening fanlight over a fixed sash. This style of window doesn't even attempt to try to replicate the existing window and would look totally out of place.

Window 4.
The internal photograph shows this to be a modern window and in poor condition, hence of low significance. The subdivision pane sizes are however sympathetic to the earlier windows. The window is noted as being quite prominent in the street scene despite being on the side elevation of the property. Although we might accept a more sympathetic design in this location, the proposed drawing misses the opportunity and results in a loss of the vertical emphasis of the individual panes.

Window 5.
This stain-glass window probably dated from the 1920s/30s and could possibly be a reused window. The framing and side opening casement style is very different to other windows in the building. The proposed windows would adopt similar proportions but would also introduce a single glazed panel for each of the casement sashes.

Window 6.
This is another modern window with low significance. The drawing shows an existing sill, but the photograph differs.

The existing survey drawings are often inaccurate, and the proposed windows are often very different in their form. We need to discuss different options here.

Heritage Advisor

Initial comments 10/11/2025

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.

The application site forms a 2 storey building under a slate roof appearing as an early 19th century house. The front elevation is positioned immediately adjacent to the public footpath on the western side of Tarring High Street.

The stucco elevation hosts a series of windows of sliding sash, fixed and casement types. It is noted that the sliding sash windows appear particularly elegant, lacking horns, being multipane type and occupy positions at both ground and first floor level. A cornice/facia arrangement is also present along some 2/3rds of the elevation. The southern side elevation shows some evidence of 20th century alteration including a minor extension and a rebuilt chimney.

Tarring High Street is of notable architectural and historic interest and character hosting historic building of 16th to 19th century origins that include both polite and vernacular forms. Heavy timber framed buildings, sometimes obscured by 18th century modernisations sit comfortably beside stucco rendered and flint wall elevations. Being of a fairly consistent 2 storey arrangement the dwellings are densely arranged either side of a relatively narrow highway creating a sense of enclosure and modesty.

The proposal seeks Listed Building Consent to replace a number of windows of both historic and contemporary origin with new timber windows with various opening methods to match existing, and the use of 16mm double glazing.

The listing description briefly refers to a former use as a shop but the heritage statement provided does not assess significance or apportion significance to the windows that are proposed to be changed. Further to this the heritage statement does little to provide a suitable assessment of the building, simply referring to the listing description and a fairly generic statement regarding Tarring appearing in the doomsday book which written some 800 years prior to the construction of the building that is subject of the application and generally not relevant to the proposal.

Where it is clear that window 4 for example carries little to no historic interest, the same cannot be said for window 1. Therefore, the principle of acceptability in respect of replacing the windows cannot be ascertained.

It is noted that the use of timber will bring about a good quality item, however the use of 16mm double glazing will require increases in section size and given the extremely close proximity to the public footpath that increase in section size and glazing thickness will be clearly discernible and be of a jarring contrast with the existing arrangement on upper floors. The elegant and fine proportions so often characteristic of early 19th century joinery will be eroded in respect of original fitments. The replacement of contemporary units with modern replacements of matching pattern does not take opportunity to improve the character of the listed building or the character of the area.

Although Historic England Advice note 18 allows for more flexibility in terms of improving energy efficiency, it is not a one size fits all approach, with the retention of genuinely historic windows still being required. It is noted that the heritage statement is lacking any true analysis of each window.

From the photographs provided window 1 appears to be of early 19th century origin with window 2 being some form of modern replacement and window 3 infilling a previous door. Window 4 is a modern addition, with window 5 appearing to be of late 19th or early 20th century origin. Window 6 appears to be a somewhat altered window possibly using a mix of contemporary and historic components.

In respect of local and national policy in particular policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan, it is considered that the increase in glazing thickness, and section sizes will adversely affect the aesthetic value of the listed building and the wider setting.

Moreover, both local and national policy allow for the mitigation of harm. Although Energy efficiency may be considered a public benefit in terms of tackling climate change it is noted that the same benefit can be achieved through other more sympathetic means, therefore there is no public benefit that is exclusive to this scheme.

Similarly, in relation to the loss of genuinely historic windows; this has not been adequately justified within a Heritage Statement or Heritage Impact Assessment and

based upon the limited detail provided, will cause less than substantial harm to both architectural and historic interest of the listed building with no justification.

As such the proposal does not satisfy policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan, nor satisfy paragraphs 135, 167, 207, 213 or 215 of the NPPF.

It is however noted and accepted that a scheme to either renovate and repair or indeed replace windows is required. It is suggested that the applicant thoroughly revise the application to provide:
• A suitably detailed heritage statement and heritage impact assessment including detailed photographs of existing condition. The statement should also discuss the building chronological change over time, the originality of the windows proposed for replacement.
• Revise the design of the proposed in order to maintain elegant proportions and suitable glazing thickness, and where possible provide enhancement in terms of opening method and design
• Retain and repair genuine historic windows, providing a methodology for repairs.

Further comments 20/11/2025

It is noted that the principle of replacing window 1 has been accepted by the council due to its deteriorated state. It is noted that window 1 is of historic interest and contributes to the aesthetic value of the building. The window is part of a consistent ensemble of original windows seen on the front elevation at 1st floor and ground floor. The joinery work on these windows is highly indicative of late 18th/early 19th century joinery being particularly elegant, utilising slim sections.

The applicant has provided a proposed joinery detail that utilises inaccurate section sizes and detail when compared to the existing unit. The meeting rail most notably shows an increase of some 33% in section size, but other aspects including the bottom rail and the use of an ovolo moulding rather than lambs tongue are also notable.

Although the council accepts the original windows replacement, the elegant section sizes utilised in the early 19th century are a clear point of architectural interest and these slim sections are repeated at 1st floor level creating a cohesive and consistent architectural character that contributes positively to the buildings aesthetic value. It is reasonable given the buildings historic status that replacement of existing historic windows should be accurate.

Whereas the other windows proposed for replacement are modern, the use of larger section sizes would not constitute harm but would merely have a neutral impact upon historic and architectural interest, however the replacement of a historic window with a new window of inaccurate proportions would bring about harm to architectural interest and aesthetic value by way of detracting from the early 19th century characteristics, and disturbing the cohesion and consistency across this part of the elevation.

This variation in section size will lead to harm to the architectural interest of the building, the harm although less than substantial, is not mitigated by any form of public benefit or clear and convincing justification. If such section sizes could be achieved

approx. 200 years ago there is no reason why poor replication should be accepted now, nor will the window proposed bring about any public benefit over that of one that is correctly detailed.

At this point, and in order to move to a satisfactory conclusion the applicant should be invited to provide proposed joinery details of window 1 that match the existing detailing. Should these alterations not be forthcoming a refusal of Listed Building Consent should be issued on the basis of failing to satisfy policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan, and paragraphs 135, 207, 213 or 215 of the NPPF.

Further comments following revisions 17/12/2025:

Please attach the following condition to control the profile:

Notwithstanding the approved plans, the profile and section of all rails, stiles and glazing bars in respect of proposed window no1 shall match the profile and section seen on the sash windows at 1st floor level.

Reason: To ensure a consistent joinery detail that promotes the architectural interest of the listed building and to comply with local policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan

The National Amenities Societies – No comments received

The Worthing Society – No comments received

Neighbour Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM23, DM24
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)
West Tarring Conservation Area Appraisal

Planning Assessment:

The key considerations are the effects of the proposal on the historic significance of the listed building.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states 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.

Paragraph 215 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should

be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

As noted in the Heritage Advisors comments the Heritage Statement '*does not assess significance or apportion significance to the windows that are proposed to be changed. Further to this the heritage statement does little to provide a suitable assessment of the building' and 'is lacking any true analysis of each window'* or provide adequate justification in relation to the loss of genuinely historic windows. The Heritage Statement also includes several inconsistencies; stating that *'The proposed windows have been designed as like for like replacements in terms of scale, proportions, ironmongery and finish with the addition of using a far more durable timber (Accoya) than the current.'* This is incorrect, the windows as originally proposed were not on a like for like basis, most did not replicate the existing windows in design or proportions and the use of double glazing resulted in much thicker frames and glazing bars. The submitted information was insufficient to understand the 'historic significance' of each window. This was exacerbated by the provision of inaccurate drawings which failed to show the existing windows correctly.

In light of the inaccurate and insufficient information provided initially, a site visit to the property was conducted, with the applicants and window company in attendance, enabling officers to assess each individual window in terms of condition and significance and discuss potential options for repair/replacement. The outcome of this meeting was as follows:

Window 1 is of high significance and matches the sash windows at first floor with extremely narrow glazing bars but is in poor condition with a rotten sill, cracked glass, missing pulleys and the meeting rails out of alignment. The applicants were advised to contact specialist window repair companies to ascertain whether this window could be repaired given its high significance. Double glazing was not considered appropriate for this window.

Window 2 was considered to be of medium significance and had been previously altered but retained the slim glazing bar detail and was in moderate condition. Advice was given that a slimline double glazed window could be acceptable here but only with a design that more closely replicated the existing design and glazing pattern and not of the design initially proposed.

Window 3 was installed around 1978 infilling a door opening when the property formed two individual dwellings, but it is not certain whether this window was reused from elsewhere in the building. This window replicates the slim glazing bar details but is most likely a modern addition and in moderate condition. . Advice was given that a slimline double glazed window could be acceptable here but only with a design that more closely replicated the existing design and glazing pattern and not of the design initially proposed.

Window 4 is a modern casement window of low significance and in poor condition. Replacement of this window in double glazing was considered acceptable, but the design required amendment to replicate the existing layout, to retain the vertical emphasis of the glazing bars.

Window 5 is a 1920/30s stained glass window, different to all the other windows and in very poor condition with broken glass and a timber board to part of the exterior and is of low significance. It was agreed that the stained glass was probably beyond repair and therefore replacement of this window in double glazing could be acceptable with the addition of glazing bars to reflect the design of the rest of the windows

Window 6 is a modern window of low significance and moderate condition. Replacement of this window in double glazing was considered acceptable, but revisions were suggested to form a 4 over 8 pane arrangement instead of the existing 3 over 6 arrangement to relate to the other windows more closely and provide a more vertical emphasis.

Several amendments were made to the proposal following the meeting, to ensure accuracy in reflecting the existing window details and providing suitable amended details for the proposed windows. It was agreed that the replacement of Windows 2 to 6 would be acceptable in timber framed slimline double glazing due to the low significance, modern replacement, or poor condition of these windows. The revised details were considered to have a neutral impact on the historic character of the listed building and allowed a more cohesive overall design.

With regard to Window 1, further advice was sought by the applicants from specialist window repair companies as to whether this window could be repaired and retained. These concluded:

Midhurst Windows and Doors Limited
We would recommend contacting other refurb companies to get their opinions however as advised we feel these sashes are past the point of repair. Windowsill is rotten and needs to be replaced also.

All Things Sash Limited – concluded that the ability to repair the sashes would not be possible to confirm until various fillers, timber additions and paint were removed and recommended the use of toughened glass.

Following further consultation with the Head of Planning and Development it was agreed that based on the conclusions of the specialist window repair companies, window 1 was beyond reasonable repair and therefore a suitable replacement window could be supported. The applicants reverted to the initial double glazed design however due to the high significance of this window, it was considered important to replicate the existing window as closely as possible using single glazing and matching the very slim glazing bar detail and profile to ensure that the significance of this window was preserved, albeit using a replacement window. It was also considered important to match the windows of the same type at first floor that are retained. Further amendments were provided to show the proposed window 1 to match the existing window and the windows at first floor and the details will be conditioned to ensure these details are matched.

The slim sections of Window 1 and the matching windows at first floor contribute significantly to the architectural interest of the building, creating a cohesive and consistent character and the accurate replication of these details for replacement

window 1 would preserve this character, protecting the historic integrity of the listed building.

The larger sections of the double glazed replacement windows 2 to 6 are considered to have a neutral impact on the historic and architectural interest of the building. Opportunities have been taken to improve the design of some of these more modern additions to form a more cohesive overall design.

The replacement windows would significantly improve the thermal capacity of the building, prevent water ingress, and improve security, thereby helping to secure the long term protection of the building. The use of single glazing for window 1 was considered necessary to preserve the historic character of the listed building and would not prevent the addition of secondary glazing if required to increase the thermal properties of this window.

The proposal, as amended is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the historic features of the building or to undermine the architectural integrity of the listed building and can therefore be supported.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. LB time limit
3. Window 1 to match first floor sashes
4. Protect LB from damage
5. Any damage to LB made good

Informative

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.

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

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 07/01/26

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 08.01.2026