Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

Application Number:	AWDM/1299/25
Location:	Development Site At Former Debenhams Store 14 To 20 South Street And Iceland Car Park Marine Place Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Discharge of conditions 5 and pursuant to **AWDM/1906/22**
Case Officer:	**Louise Prew**

✓	Further Information Required
	Design Review Required
	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:	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 former Debenhams building is a positive contributor to the character of the conservation area and possesses a modern, somewhat art deco façade with modest references to earlier classical design. The application seeks to discharge the following conditions: *Condition 5 - Design Details The following external details shall not be implemented until large scale drawings (typically 1:20 scale or larger) and cross sections where necessary of the following have been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 3 ii) of this permission.*

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	a) windows and doors, *b) balconies and balustrades / rails,* *c) roof intersections, soffits and eaves,* *d) rainwater goods* *e) decorative stonework and cappings* *Condition 6 - Specification of Materials Prior to the commencement of development, of the additional upper floors, precise details of the proposed render system and cladding for the top floor shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.*
Comments:	In respect of windows and doors (5a) many of the drawings refer to typical detail with some annotated to have varying height and width, it is also noted that the drawings do not refer to any particular area of the building with the front elevation hosting slightly canted windows and indeed flat ones. The details should be revised to be specific both in terms of form, size and appearance, and location. It is suggested a key showing the areas proposed is provided. In respect of balconies and rails (5b) the proposed does not seem to correspond to the previous approval in terms of appearance therefore elevations confirming if this is a revised appearance and once again location specific should be provided. In terms of roof intersections, soffits and eaves (5c) once again it is not clear as to where these are in relation to and should be annotated on a elevation drawing. In terms of rainwater goods there is no indication of there location on the previously approved drawings or in a sufficient way on the discharge detail. This should be clarified The columns proposed appear to replicate the slightly classical leaning of the original deco façade is considered in principle to be acceptable. It is however only assumed this refers to the area of the recently approved addition but what part? Once again the location should be annotated on a elevation drawing. Whereas most of what is proposed is likely to be acceptable this is dependent on context. The discharge details give little information regarding this. Some aspects may be out of public view or would not be placed upon the principle façade but no document is specific either in terms of location and in some instances, size, proportion or appearance. Further clarity should be sought to address this issue
Further comment:	It is noted that the proposed window detail does not match the existing pattern, particularly in respect of the western elevation where window installations of 8 panes are proposed to become 4 pane installations. There is significant concern that a reduction in glazing bars/casement pattern will erode the vertical

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	emphasis of the façade with is emphasized by the pilasters and recessed areas forming visual bays. It is noted that this design adjustment is also contrary to the approved drawings on the original 2022 submission and therefore should be amended. It is also noted that 1:20 drawings were specified but 1:50 drawings of balcony doors have been supplied. It is also noted that the same drawing refers to an aluminium finish but a true confirmation of materiality is not clear. It is also noted that some windows and doors have 'A' or 'B' detailed within the frame space with no explination, and that no sections in the horizontal plain have been supplied. There are also some annotations such as 'interbar inside glass unit' which raises doubt regarding quality and should be genuine glazing bars or at least be set over the glass Drawing 6820 shows 2no roof details with no clear indication of which type is to be located in which area. There are significant concerns that the scheme proposed for discharge will erode the modern character of the building and diminish the overall character of the conservation area and as such it is considered to not accord with either the underlying ambition of the originally approved scheme or indeed local policy. It is suggested that the proposed is revised or thoroughly clarified
Further comment 21/5/26	The supplied additional detail refers to the roof detailing only and is an amended version of drawing 3052 showing relevant excerpts from drawing 6820. The sections provided show a conventional parapet finished in white render (according to the annotations) however the elevation drawing and supporting details of the original application refer to a grey finish and appears to be a standing seam arrangement. As such the sections do not correlate to the reality of the approval. Clarification in this matter should be sought as further conditions cannot be applied to avoid variation It is also noted that no other aspect in respect of required amendments has been forthcoming.
Further comment 19/11/26	In respect of windows and doors (5a), the proposed windows identified as Types 6, 2 and 2a do not adequately reflect the existing windows in terms of the positioning and thickness of the glazing bars and the proportions of the resulting glazed subdivisions. In addition, the existing casement arrangement is not reproduced in Type 6. These differences should be addressed through revised details that accurately reflect the existing configuration and slender sightlines.

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	The elegant sightlines and distinctive glazing bar configuration are strong contributors to the building's interwar character, reinforcing the rhythm and vertical emphasis of the façade, its pilasters and recessed bays. This character is complemented by the similarly interwar character of the arcade buildings opposite, together contributing to the character and appearance of the streetscape. The window profiles, glazing bar positions and casement arrangements are therefore important architectural details; their alteration risks coarsening the appearance of the windows and eroding the character of the building and the conservation area. Horizontal glazing bars are also evident in the existing windows corresponding to Types 6, 2 and 2a. Although these were not depicted on either the existing or proposed drawings accompanying the original permission, AWDM/1906/22, they nevertheless contribute to the building's character and appearance. These horizontal subdivisions should be reinstated within the replacement window scheme, accurately reflecting their existing positions, profiles and sightlines and their relationship with the vertical glazing bars. No direct comparison between the proposed windows and the previously existing fitments has been provided to demonstrate that suitable proportions, elegant profiles and slender sightlines would be maintained in the new design. There is significant concern regarding the generally bulbous appearance of the profiles shown in the limited sections supplied. Comparative details are required to establish that the replacement frames, casements and glazing bars would not appear unduly bulky or compromise the character of the original fenestration. The picture below indicates missing glazing bars and mismatches of pattern or opening method 

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	To avoid further rounds of clarification, a complete set of comparative horizontal and vertical sections at 1:2 scale is required for each window type, including all variants, and for the balcony doors. These should show the original and proposed profiles side by side, with dimensions sufficient to compare frame and casement thicknesses, glazing bar profiles, glazed proportions and visible sightlines. The proposed replacements should match as closely as possible the appearance and proportions of the original fitments and replicate their opening methods and casement configurations. Where previously fixed lights need to become opening lights, this will be acceptable provided that the proposed design retains the overall character, proportions and sightlines of the original windows. No further details have been provided in respect of the balcony doors, and the matters previously raised therefore remain outstanding. Location-specific elevations at 1:20 scale or larger should be supplied, together with the comparative horizontal and vertical sections at 1:2 scale required above, to establish the proposed frame and glazing bar profiles, sightlines, opening arrangements, materials and finish. These details should demonstrate how the balcony doors relate to the window scheme and the architectural character of the building. The windows and doors element of condition 5 cannot be supported for discharge on the information currently provided. In respect of roof intersections, soffits and eaves (5c), balconies and balustrades / rails (5b), and rainwater goods (5d), the details shown on drawing 3264 P01 address the concerns previously raised and are satisfactory in respect of the western elevation shown. Although the proposed railing is somewhat uncharacteristic of the established façade, its visibility will be limited by the height at which the additional elements are located. The simplicity of the design and its consistent treatment across the façade weigh in its favour. In respect of rainwater goods (5d), it is acknowledged that none are proposed on the front (western) elevation. The submitted information is limited to the western elevation. It is agreed that this is the most prominent elevation; however, the condition does not distinguish between elevations and its requirements are not confined to the principal frontage. Although the details on other elevations may have no adverse impact, the case officer should be satisfied that this is the case, having regard to both longer-distance and immediate views of the building.

Conservation Officer Comments
Amended Plans or Further Details

	Summary The roofing, balcony and railing details and rainwater goods arrangements shown on drawing 3264 P01 satisfactorily address the previous concerns in respect of the western elevation. No rainwater goods are proposed on that frontage. The case officer should nevertheless be satisfied that the relevant details on all other elevations are acceptable in both longer-distance and immediate views. Windows and doors (5a) remain unresolved. Revised designs are required to reflect the original proportions, slender sightlines, glazing bar configuration and casement arrangements, including the horizontal glazing bars to Types 6, 2 and 2a. Comparative horizontal and vertical sections at 1:2 scale are required for every window type and variant, including the balcony doors, together with the outstanding location-specific elevations, material and finish details. The limited exception allowing fixed lights to become opening lights is subject to retaining the original overall character, proportions and sightlines. Discharge of condition 5 in full cannot therefore be supported on the information currently provided. Partial discharge of conditions 5b,c and d may be considered if the officer is satisfaied the for the purposes of Section 72 of the Act and compliance with local policy that only the western elevation would be relevant. Condition 6 however may be discharged

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant – for Worthing and Adur District Council
Date of Comment 21/05/25