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**

	Further Information Required
	Design Review Required
X	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:	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.

Architectural & Historic Buildings Consultants
Mob: 07909 544908
Email: info@dgc-consultants.com
Web: www.dgc-consultants.com

	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

Architectural & Historic Buildings Consultants
Mob: 07909 544908
Email: info@dgc-consultants.com
Web: www.dgc-consultants.com

	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**
Further comment 15/6/26	The amended submission and revised Heritage Statement are acknowledged and are an improvement in general descriptive terms. However, the amendments do not satisfactorily address the substantive conservation concerns previously raised. The submission remains inadequate because it does not provide sufficient detail, justification or heritage assessment in relation to the works to the balcony, sunroom roof, canopy roof, tilework, railings and associated decorative features. As such, the resultant impact assessment remains incomplete and does not provide the Local Planning Authority with sufficient information to conclude that the works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, or the wider group value and aesthetic significance of Heene Terrace. Of particular concern is the proposed balcony section, which does not appear to accurately describe the existing or established structural arrangement. The drawing lacks important wall plate detail and does not clearly show how the proposed design relates to, accords with, or varies from the established constructional form along the terrace. Where the proposed arrangement differs from the established structure, this should be clearly identified, justified and assessed within the Heritage Statement. The omission is significant because the balcony and associated canopy arrangement form part of the ordered architectural composition and aesthetic value of the terrace. Any change to the canopy profile, depth, fixing, junction with the main wall, relationship with the ironwork or relationship with the balcony slab has the potential to affect the legibility, rhythm and group value of the listed terrace. The amended submission does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed balcony and canopy arrangement accurately reflects the historic or pre-existing form, nor does it justify any departure from that arrangement. Separately, the proposed altered roof form to the sunroom is a substantive heritage issue and has not been properly justified. The sunroom sits at the western bookend of the listed terrace, where its relationship with the projecting end bay and corresponding arrangement elsewhere on the terrace contributes directly to symmetry, rhythm and architectural cohesion. Any change to the sunroom roof profile, depth, pitch, curve, wall junction, eaves line or visual relationship with the adjacent balcony and canopy could disrupt that carefully ordered composition. The amended submission does not demonstrate that the proposed sunroom roof form reflects the historic or pre-existing arrangement, nor does it compare it with the corresponding bookend condition elsewhere on the terrace. In the absence of that evidence and assessment, the proposed sunroom roof cannot be assumed to be neutral; it has clear potential to cause adverse impact to the aesthetic value of the listed building and to the wider group value of Heene Terrace.

Architectural & Historic Buildings Consultants
Mob: 07909 544908
Email: info@dgc-consultants.com
Web: www.dgc-consultants.com

	The submitted information is also deficient in relation to the balcony tilework. Given that the existing tiles are to be removed and/or replaced, a clear existing and proposed balcony plan should be provided showing the tile pattern, setting-out, border detail, edge condition, falls, grout treatment and relationship with the balustrade fixings. A general statement that replacement tiles will be a close match is insufficient in this context, as the tiled balcony surface forms part of the architectural detailing of the principal elevation of the listed terrace. No adequate schedule or methodology has been provided to demonstrate how the iron railings and balustrade will be removed, protected, repaired, corrosion-treated, repainted, reinstated and fixed back into the new balcony construction. Similarly, no sufficient detail has been provided for the corbels/console brackets, including their existing condition, extent of repair, method of repair, material specification, profile, fixing and finish. These elements are not incidental; they are visually prominent features of the listed building and contribute directly to the special architectural interest and group value of the terrace. The amended Heritage Statement also fails to adequately discuss the canopy and sunroom roof works already undertaken. It does not explain what was removed, what evidence informed the replacement, how the replacement roof has been positioned and fixed, whether it accurately reflects the previous or historic form, or whether any variation in position, profile, depth or construction is now being proposed or retrospectively regularised. If the replacement differs from the former arrangement, the change must be justified and the impact on architectural composition, symmetry and aesthetic value assessed. Without this, the submission cannot demonstrate that the works preserve the building's special interest. The cumulative effect of these omissions is that the amended submission does not provide a robust assessment of the full scope of works or their potential impact despite the previous request for amendments. There is a clear potential for adverse impact upon the aesthetic value of the listed building through alteration to the balcony, sunroom and canopy arrangement, and this would also have implications for the wider architectural group value of Heene Terrace. This is especially important because the terrace derives much of its significance from its ordered composition, repeated architectural details, symmetry, decorative balcony and canopy features, and the relationship between projecting and recessed elements along the principal frontage. Accordingly, the previous objection is maintained and it is recommended that Listed Building Consent is refused. **The application has not provided clear and convincing justification for the proposed and retrospective works beyond the new balcony slab, nor has it demonstrated that the works would preserve the listed building, its fabric, architectural composition, aesthetic value or group significance. The proposal remains contrary to the statutory duties under Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and to the relevant provisions of the NPPF including paragraph 207, 213 and 215 and local policy DM24.** In the absence of the required information and assessment, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the works would avoid harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building or to the wider group value of Heene Terrace. Listed Building Consent should therefore be refused.

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

Further comment 13/9/2026	The revised Design and Repair Statement and accompanying drawings represent a substantial improvement and respond to most of the deficiencies identified in the previous consultation response. The submission now distinguishes between the pre-works, current interim and proposed conditions; provides detailed sections through the balcony canopy, sunroom roof and balcony slab; explains the evidence informing the curved canopy profile; and includes generally appropriate methodologies for retaining, repairing and reinstating the historic ironwork and surviving balcony tiles. The reinstatement of curved timber rafters and a lead roof finish would provide a more sympathetic and coherent relationship with the wider terrace than the pre-works straight-rafter and felt-covered canopy. The retention of the established curved form of the sunroom roof is also welcomed. The justification for using reinforced concrete in place of complete Portland stone replacement is now considerably clearer. The proposed approach retains the stone embedded within the principal elevation and limits disturbance to the façade, original windows and occupied building. Subject to confirmation that the structural design, dowel locations, concrete tongues and associated pockets represent the minimum intervention necessary, this element is capable of being accepted as a proportionate repair. The tilework and ironwork methodologies establish suitable conservation principles, including recording, careful dismantling, maximum reuse of historic fabric, compatible repair and reinstatement in the recorded arrangement. As the final replacement tile specification cannot reasonably be confirmed until the existing tiles have been carefully lifted and examined, the outstanding tile samples, condition schedule, detailed setting-out, edge treatment, falls, grout and waterproofing junctions could be secured by condition before reinstatement. No objection is raised to the revised proposals, subject to the submission and written approval of a detailed specification and representative samples of the replacement balcony tiles to be used in reinstating the tiled floor. The approved tiles shall match the surviving historic tiles in material, dimensions, thickness, profile, colour, pattern and finish, and the tiled floor shall be reinstated in accordance with the approved details. All other materials, repairs and working methodologies shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details described within the submitted Design and Repair Statement and accompanying drawings. Having regard to sections 16 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the proposals, by retaining and reusing significant historic fabric, reinstating the established curved canopy and sunroom roof forms, employing compatible leadwork, timber, ironwork and repair methodologies, and limiting intervention to that necessary to secure the failed balcony structure, would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and conserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposals therefore accord with Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and the national historic-environment

Architectural & Historic Buildings Consultants
Mob: 07909 544908
Email: info@dgc-consultants.com
Web: www.dgc-consultants.com

	decision-making policies in Chapter 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework, including policies HE4–HE7. Accordingly, there is no objection, subject to the tile specification and samples identified above and compliance with the submitted Design and Repair Statement. **1)** Prior to the reinstatement of the balcony tiled floor, a detailed specification and representative samples of all replacement tiles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The specification shall include the proposed manufacturer and product reference and shall demonstrate that the replacement tiles match the surviving historic tiles in material, method of manufacture, dimensions, thickness, profile, colour, pattern, surface finish and edge treatment. The tiled floor shall thereafter be reinstated using the approved tiles and in accordance with the approved details. All other materials, repairs and working methodologies shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the submitted Design and Repair Statement and approved drawings. **Reason:** To ensure the architectural interest and aesthetic value of the Grade II Listed Building is reserved in accordance with policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan. **2)** Upon completion of the repair and reinstatement of the supporting columns, the temporary metal ties, metal angle sections, brackets and all associated temporary fixings shall be removed in full, and any resulting fixing holes or disturbed finishes shall be made good using materials and finishes to match the adjacent historic fabric. The works shall be carried out in accordance with drawing 2273-40(000)-A. **Reason:** To ensure that the temporary structural supports are removed once no longer required and that the completed canopy and balcony retain an appropriate appearance that preserves the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, in accordance with Policy DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan.

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council
Date of Comment: 13/9/2026