

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/1462/25
Location:	Southwold House 13 Park Crescent Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Listed Building Consent for removal the existing hidden gutter behind the parapet wall at top floor and replacement gulley and new hopper, alterations to the rainwater goods to connect the new gulley and hopper to the existing downpipe, render repair works and painting, removal and reinstatement of slate tiles, window repair including new leadwork to surrounds and painting, new flashing to party walls
Case Officer:	Finlay Gardner

	Further Information Required
	Design Review Required
	No objection - no harm
	No objection - harm is negligible or mitigated
X	Objection - less than substantial harm
	Objection - substantial harm
	Objection – Total Loss

Site and Surroundings:	Park Crescent is a Grade II* listed terrace of 14 Georgian houses in Worthing, England, designed in 1829 by Amon Henry Wilds, son of the architect Amon Wilds and constructed between 1831 and 1833. AH Wilds had previously worked on other large projects including the Kemp Town estate in nearby Brighton. Arranged in a serpentine shape, the terrace overlooks thickly planted grounds of Amelia Park. Construction started on Park Crescent in 1828 and work stopped abruptly in 1833 due to an economic slump leaving the western half of the Crescent, the western Gateway and some villa's unbuilt. The Crescent is graced with a triumphal arch and splendid monumental entrance which was designed for horse drawn carriages, with smaller arches flanking it for use by pedestrians. Each arch has four carved busts. Those on the main arch are all large bearded males while those on the pedestrian arches are smaller female heads. These were all cast using "Imitation Stone" a new improved material which can be found in Brighton Pavilion, Buckingham Palace and Windsor Castle. The terrace is constructed over 3 storeys under a slate roof with parapet. Various decorative adornments are present over the façade of the building which makes for an architecturally interesting composition. The elevations recess and projects at regular intervals with features such as Corinthian order pilasters framing large multi pane sash windows and facias possessing swag and festoon details set at regular intervals. First floor level possesses consistent ornate Juliette balconies set in traditional ironwork. The architectural symmetry of the terrace is still clearly legible despite the development having
-------------------------------	--

	never been fully completed with a clear consistent appearance being present along the development. The proposal seeks listed building consent for the removal the existing hidden gutter behind the parapet wall at top floor and replacement gulley and new hopper, alterations to the rainwater goods to connect the new gulley and hopper to the existing downpipe, render repair works and painting, removal and reinstatement of slate tiles, window repair including new leadwork to surrounds and painting, new flashing to party walls. 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. Where it is understood that some elements may require periodic maintenance or indeed replacement the proposal brings about significant concern regarding the relocation of the down pipe. Downpipes on the building are currently set into corners in order to avoid any visual conflict with the architectural detailing of the façade, being very functional and not points of obvious architectural note. The proposed seeks an alternative down pipe location which will transverse over the festoon/swag detailing seen on the facia area directly below. This will result in a glaring erosion of architectural consistency and bring about harm. The rationale for the proposal is to reduce the likelihood of blockage and reduce maintenance, which is considered to not
--	---

	be a convincing rationale. The aim of the legislation at an overarching level is to preserve architectural and historic interest, with harm only be accepted by way of clear and convincing justification or public interest. Simply put there is no justification for the proposed scheme that is adequate when simply regular maintenance of the existing using a cherry picker for example will ensure proper functioning of the rainwater goods which is considered to be fairly routine for most buildings regardless of there listed status. As such the proposal will cause harm to a listed building and should be refused listed building consent. Having regard to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the proposal by virtue of design and appearance would not preserve the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and as such fails to satisfy policy DM24 of the Local plan and paragraphs 135,213 and 215 of the NPPF
--	--

Simon Richard

Conservation Consultant for and on behalf of Adur and Worthing District Council

Date of Comment 12/3/26