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

Simon Richard
Conservation Consultant – for Worthing and Adur District Council
Date of Comment 23/03/25