Expiry Date - 01/07/2025

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0566/25 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 22 West Street Worthing West Sussex BN11 3HD**

**Proposal: Single-storey rear extension and the part removal of the chimney stack (retrospective)**

**Application Number: AWDM/0567/25 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 22 West Street Worthing West Sussex BN11 3HD**

**Proposal: Listed Building Consent for a single-storey rear extension and the part removal of the chimney stack (retrospective)**

**Date of site visit:** 13/05/2025 + SN

**Neighbours checked:** Y

**Additional neighbour notifications**: N

**Site and Surroundings**
The site is located on the eastern side of West Street. The property contains a two-storey mid-terrace building in use as a house. The building is Grade II listed with the following listing:

"WEST STREET 1. 5406 (East Side) Nos 16 to 26 (even) TQ 1402 SW 2/94 II GV 2. Early C19 terrace of cottages. 2 storeys and attic. Stuccoed (painted cobbles to rear). One window to each (some sashes of Victorian type, others modern). Right-hand doors of stable type. Brick modillion eaves cornice. Mansard tiled roof.

Nos 14 to 26 (even) form a group, of which No 14 is local interest only."

The site is within Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area.

**Proposal**

The proposal for a single-storey rear extension and the part removal of the chimney stack; these works are retrospective.

**Relevant Planning History:**
None relevant

**Consultations:**
**Conservation architect:** *The unauthorised works that appear to have been undertaken to this listed building are the removal of a "lean-to" rear offshoot,*

*followed by the erection of a longer single storey flat roofed extension, and the partial removal of the central chimney stack. Although the drawings show two separate chimney stacks, suggesting the front one was later removed, none of the other properties in this terrace have two separate chimney stacks. The chimneys from the front and rear rooms of the original house would join together within the roof space, and then terminate in a single, central chimney stack.*

*The Design, Access & Heritage Statement erroneously states that as the LPA's Listed Building Officers have visited the property, whilst advising on applications for the removal of an internal wall and a replacement window, and raised no objections or concerns regarding the currently applied for, unauthorised works, this indicates a longstanding de facto acceptance of the works. The object of the site visits were to ascertain the merits/harm of the works applied for at that time; the chimneys and building offshoot in the rear garden would not have formed any part of the considerations. However, as the owner was apparently aware that the chimney and rear offshoot had been altered during the previous ownership of the property, they obviously should have applied for these works whilst applying for the unauthorised internal wall removal.*

*Looking at the historic OS maps, this row of cottages were first constructed without any rear offshoots. By 1909, the maps show all of the terrace had rear offshoots of varying lengths, and as such formed part of the changing social history of the buildings. Looking at the variety of rear offshoots that currently exist, the unauthorised footprint is noticeably longer, although the kitchen and the utility areas are differentiated by different window head heights.*

*Turning to the chimney stack, as I mentioned earlier, this still exists, just in a curtailed form. This is not ideal, but at least the chimney has not been totally removed.*

*The application informs us that these works were carried out at unknown dates, but prior to 2000. Although both these features have some level of significance, we have no records of these features prior to alterations, hence it would be difficult to enforce against. In the circumstances I shall not raise any objections to this application.*

*Note, that if LBC is granted to retain works which have already been carried out, it is not "retrospective", that is, it does not absolve the owner from liability to criminal prosecution for the fact that consent was not obtained in the first place.*

*The photos and current sales particulars show me enough detail of the applied for works, so no I don't need a site visit.*

**Representations:**
None received

**Relevant Planning Policies**
Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM11, DM24
National Planning Policy Framework (2023)
National Planning Practice Guidance

**Planning Assessment**

**Listed building consent**

Works were undertaken to this listed building without authorisation. The applicant indicates that they took place prior to 2000. The application is to formalise the acceptability of the current arrangement of the site. The applicant has provided the following justification:

*"The rear utility extension was already in place over two decades ago and has continued to support everyday domestic use without compromising the building's architectural integrity, heritage value, or contribution to the conservation area. The chimney stack to the front elevation had also been removed prior to 2000. Its absence was clearly apparent during subsequent planning applications, including those where conservation officers made site visits and raised no objections.*

*Its removal did not disrupt the roofline or diminish the group value of the terrace and is understood to have been necessary for structural reasons.*

*Taken together, these elements demonstrate a stable and consistent form over time — implicitly accepted through repeated officer engagement and planning activity. They continue to make a positive contribution to the listed building and have caused no harm to its significance."*

As noted by the Council's conservation architect of the variety of rear offshoots to this terrace that currently exist, the unauthorised footprint is noticeably longer, although the kitchen and the utility areas are differentiated by different window head heights.

The chimney stack still exists just in a curtailed form. This is not ideal, but at least the chimney has not been totally removed.

Although both these features have some level of significance there records of these features prior to alterations, hence it would be difficult to enforce against.

Following no objection from the council's conservation architect the works are considered to be acceptable.

**Full application**
**Impact on Conservation Area and visual amenity**

The proposal has a small impact on the conservation area with a large proportion of the works being located to the rear of the site. Single storey rear

extensions are not out of character with the properties along this row of houses. A number of them are visible from within the alley to the rear of the site. As such it is not considered that there would be a significantly detrimental impact on the conservation area through the retention of the single storey rear extension.

With the retention of part of the chimney there is a reduced impact from the removal of part of the chimney. Whilst it is not ideal that the front aspect of the chimney has been removed the retention of the rear aspect allows for the character to be preserved slightly to not significantly detract from the conservation area.

**Neighbouring Amenity**

The single storey rear extension will impact the neighbouring properties to both the north and south of the site. The neighbours both have their own single storey rear extensions. The neighbour to the north (No.24) has their own full width rear extension that mitigates the overbearing or overshadowing of the property to the north. This paired with the separation distance from the neighbour of 2m will ensure that there is no significantly detrimental impact to the neighbouring property.

No 20 to the south has got an extension of their own which leaves a small gap between their own extension and that of the host site. This will create some sense of enclosure of the space; however, it is not considered to be detrimental in this instance due to the depth of the garden and the relationship which is commonplace throughout the terrace. The extension is to the north of the neighbour’s garden which ensures the development doesn’t overshadow the neighbour’s garden.

The windows and door in the side elevations of the site do not provide views that would be unacceptable due to their location looking into the garden and at the blank wall on the neighbouring properties outrigger.

With the nature of the works to the chimney it is not considered to impact the neighbouring properties amenity space.

As such it is considered that the impacts on residential amenities would be acceptable on the whole.

**Recommendation**

**Listed building consent - APPROVE** subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers

**Full application - APPROVE** subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers

Expiry Date - 01/07/2025

**Informative**

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Finlay Gardner Date: 07/07/2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 09/07/2025