Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0099/25 & AWDM/1598/24 **Recommendation: Refuse**

Site: **Flat 4, 79 Maine Parade, Worthing**

Proposal: Planning application (AWDM/0099/25) and Listed Building Consent (AWDM/1598/24) - Replacement of timber windows with double glazed UPVC windows to the side (to both flat 4 and flat 7).

Site visit: 18.03.2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N Site notices posted 13.02.2025

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a four-storey building comprising of flats located on the north side of Marine Parade opposite the seafront. It has a three-storey rear projection.

The building is within the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area and is a Grade II listed building along with No's 77 and 78, and described as follows in the register:

MARINE PARADE 1. 5406 Nos 77 to 79 (consec) TQ 1402 SE 4/7 11.10.49. II GV 2. Early C19. 4 storeys. Terrace of 3 houses. 8 windows in all. Stuccoed, ground floor of Nos 78-79 rusticated. Curved fronts of 2 windows each. Cornice and parapet. Glazing bars intact. No 77 has a slightly lower facade than Nos 78 and 79, 2 windows only, long and short quoins, no balcony, and one ground floor window made into a door. Nos 78 and 79 are a pair, slightly larger, and have 3 windows each. Since last survey they have lost wooden balconies on the 1st floor with hoods. Stringcourses above 1st and 2nd floors.

Nos 74 to 79 (consec) form a group.

Listing NGR: TQ1455302313

Planning permission and listed building consent are sought to replace four timber single-glazed windows to the west elevation with UPVC double glazed windows. The windows relate to flat 4 and flat 7 and are at first and second floor level.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant at the site.

78 Marine Parade:

AWDM/1104/23 & AWDM/1074/23 Planning and Listed Building Consent for replacement of non-original front windows with double-glazed timber casements (Retrospective).

Consultations:

The Georgian Group has commented as follows:

Thank you for consulting the Georgian Group on the above application for Listed Building Consent to replace timber windows with double glazed uPVC windows.

The Group would like to draw your attention to page 6 and 7 of Historic England's guidance note on Traditional Windows. Within there is a section titled 'Why are plastic (PVC-u) windows unsuitable?'. I have attached a copy of this guidance above.

With reference to uPVC windows within this guidance, it states on page 6 – 'Their design, detailing and operation make them look different to traditional windows. Manufacturers have been unable to replicate the sections/glazing bars used in most timber and steel windows due to the limited strength of the material and the additional weight of the secondary glazing units.'

The use of uPVC windows is not encouraged on listed buildings owing to the impact on the character and ultimate harm that is caused to the significance of a listed building.

The **Worthing Society** has made the following comments:

Thank you for requesting our comments in respect of the above Planning Application. The proposal relates to Grade II Listed Buildings and Flats 4 and 7 within the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area. These characterful properties occupy a prominent position on the seafront.

I have now had the opportunity to discuss the application with our Heritage Team. We consider timber framed windows to be appropriate for a Listed Building. Replacement with UPVC materials will not preserve the integrity of the buildings or enhance the character of the conservation area.

In summary and for the reasons stated, the Society objects to this application.

Representations:
None received.

Relevant Planning Policies
Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM16, DM24
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to alterations to buildings within the built-up area. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality and the impact on the significance of the listed building and on character and appearance of the conservation area.

Visual amenity and impact on the listed building and on the character of the conservation area.

The NPPF states that '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.'

'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional[72].' (paragraph 213)

The NPPG advises that significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan requires that:

a) Where development affecting any designated or undesignated heritage asset is permitted, it must be of a high quality, respecting its context and demonstrating a strong sense of place.

b) Proposed development should take account of the information and guidance in Worthing's Conservation and Heritage Guide (which will be updated and periodically reviewed).

Designated Heritage Assets

c) Development should not adversely affect heritage assets or its setting (including important views that contribute to its setting). Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, the Council will refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Where a proposal

will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Where proposals may result in harm to a designated asset a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) must be submitted describing the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

d) Planning permission and/or Listed Building consent will only be granted provided that the appearance, significance, or historic character of the Listed Building is not adversely affected. The reinstatement or replication of original features such as windows or doors will be supported. Materials used must be consistent with those originally used or typical of the locality. Change of use may be supported where this secures the retention of a building of historic architectural interest where it could otherwise be lost.

e) Development in Conservation Areas will be required to be of a high standard of design and materials so as to respect, preserve and enhance the character and appearance of that area, and preserve important features. Conservation Area Character Appraisals will be used to assess applications within designated Conservation Areas and opportunities will be taken to preserve and enhance these areas, and to implement the recommendations of Conservation Area Management Plans. The importance to the local area of Buildings of Local Interest within Conservation Areas will be a material consideration in assessing an application for their demolition or development. Where, in compelling circumstances, the Council is minded to grant permission for demolition of a building in a Conservation Area, this shall not be granted until detailed plans for redevelopment have been approved.

The application site is within a terrace of three listed buildings and continuing to the east beyond New Street where No.74-76 are also listed buildings forming a group. The proposals relate to windows in the west elevation of no.79, where, despite being sited towards the rear of the building, they are visible from various vantage points in Augusta Place to the north. Augusta Place is also within the conservation area.

The existing windows are timber vertical sliding sashes matching others on the building. Some of the outer framework is concealed. Traditional windows and their glazing make an important contribution to the significance of the heritage asset.

The applicant's Design and Access Statement has cited issues of maintenance, security and energy efficiency as to the reason for their proposed replacement in UPVC. The Heritage Impact Assessment also points towards energy efficiency benefits of double glazed windows aligning with the overarching policies of the NPPF. It states that: '*The mostly like-for-like design not only accords with relevant legislation from a heritage and/or design perspective (i.e. s.7, s.16, & s.66 of the Act), wherein special interest would in no way be affected and preservation would be achieved, but further accords with relevant policy. This would include para. 190 of the NPPF, which directs the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, putting them to*

viable uses consistent with their conservation, and recognises the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation in the historic environment can bring.'

Historic England's guidance 'Traditional Windows Their Care, Repair and Upgrading' emphasises that surviving historic fenestration is an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved and repaired whenever possible. It is considered that the applicant's HIA does not provide any clear or convincing justification for the alterations proposed.

In terms of the proposed windows, there are discrepancies in the details provided in terms of the detailed design of the existing and proposed windows and with no accurate scaled external elevations provided. Nevertheless the details provided show that the proposed windows would not match the existing windows. Issues such as a much heavier framework proposed could be further exacerbated in practice given the extent of concealed framework within the existing window placement. The proposed bedroom windows also appear to consist of three framework parts joined together rather than a bespoke window comprising of three sections, resulting in a particularly heavy framework and apparent join to these parts. Glazing bars also appear to differ in terms of their arrangement. In addition, although a through-horn is shown on the technical window detail sheet, a clear comparison cannot be made between the existing and proposed elevations where those details are internal and existing details such as the deep bottom rail and horns have not been included.

The applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment states that: '*The only aspect of departure from the form of these non-original windows, is their double rather than single glazing which obviously has slight implications for the dimensions of glazing bars etc.,however, such implications are considered negligible and, again, replacement windows are in any case of a far greater quality and state of repair than their predecessors.'*

However the proposed replacement windows will result in a loss of important features of this listed building and any differences in the proposed windows would be particularly noticeable in the context of the other remaining timber windows, resulting in a high level of harm to the building and the conservation area.

The application details have provided two other examples of nearby replacement windows at No.78 and 80 Marine Parade. At No.80 the building in question is a modern building and not listed as at the application site, constructed following planning permission in 2000 (WB/00/01057/FULL) and contains matching sliding sash windows. At No.78, the window identified was approved as a replacement double glazed timber window to replace a non-original window on the basis that these windows were always a different style and configuration to the others in the terrace due to the original balcony (now removed) and the approved replacement windows closely replicated the windows they replaced. Neither of these examples are not considered to be directly comparable to the application proposals.

It is acknowledged that the proposed windows may provide some benefits in terms of energy efficiency of the building, but this would not outweigh the harm to the special qualities of the listed building and within the group setting and to the wider conservation area.

Residential amenity.

Given the scope of work proposed, relating to replacement windows, there would be no significant impact on residential amenity as a result of the proposals.

Recommendation
AWDM/0099/25 & AWDM/1598/24

Refuse for the reasons:-

The proposed development would result in the loss of the existing windows which are important features of the listed building and their proposed replacement would fail to replicate the design of the existing windows and would detract from the historic and architectural integrity of the listed building amounting to a significant and harmful impact to the Listed Building, its setting and on the character and appearance of the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policies DM5 and DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan, and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority offers a pre-application service in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 08.04.2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 08/04/2025