Expiry Date - 30/04/2026
Extension of Time - 01/06/2026

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0266/26 Recommendation: – APPROVE

Site: Flat 1 17 Heene Terrace Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: (Part retrospective) Alterations in connection with repair to first floor balcony floor and replacement canopy roof (front); replacement roof to first-floor sunroom (front)

Application Number: AWDM/0267/26 Recommendation: – GRANT CONSENT

Site: Flat 1 17 Heene Terrace Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: (Part retrospective) Application for Listed Building Consent for alterations in connection with repair to first floor balcony floor and replacement canopy roof (front); replacement roof to first-floor sunroom (front)

Date of Site Visit: 19.03.2026 (with DGC Heritage Consultant)

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a first floor flat of this mid-terrace grade II Listed building.

The Listing describes Heene Terrace as follows: -

"East Mansions Heene Court Mansions Nos 6 to 10 (consec.) Nos 11 and 12 (Mayfair Hotel) Nos 13 to 17 (consec.) West Mansions TQ1402 SW 2/91 TQ 1302 14/91 12.9.75. II GV 2. 1865, possibly by G A Dean. A unified composition set back from the sea front behind a garden. 3 storeys, basement and attics. Fawn-coloured brick with stucco dressings, including bracketed cornice and drafting to basement and ground storey. Mansard slate roof. 3 windows to each home, mainly sashes but some altered. Tall dormers, across 1st storey on large scroll brackets, with decorative iron railings from which rise spiral columns supporting cyma reversa canopy, which projects forward over the porches of composite columns and pilasters supporting an entablature, which are paired except for the 2 houses at either end, and the 3 centre houses, which project somewhat and have balconies continuous with the porches (3 bays to each house). The end houses also project somewhat, have 5 windows and a central porch. Both central and end houses have a full attic storey with its own cornice. Many sections of balcony and some porches are glazed in. West Mansions and the upper storeys of No 8 are stuccoed. The chimneys vary. Many are tall with bold bracketing, others have moulded cornice. The basement areas have railings with pike finials. The rear has half-landing extensions in abutting pairs. East Mansions, Heene Court Mansions, No 6 to 17 (consec.), and West Mansions, Heene Terrace and the

Burlington Hotel, Wordsworth Road, form a group of which the Burlington Hotel is of local interest only. Listing NGR: TQ1390702197."

The site is located within the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area.

Proposal

Works initially commenced at the property in early 2026 owing to safety concerns following inspection which found the Portland stone balcony slab to have cracked and 'dropped'. The cracked balcony stone was subsequently removed and at around the same time the pre-existing timber balcony canopy was removed and a replacement softwood canopy structure installed.

The current applications have been revised in response to the comments of the Council's Heritage Adviser and now involve the construction of a replacement canopy roof to the front balcony and replacement reinforced concrete balcony slab with associated repair and reinstatement of the balcony railings, balustrade, corbels and tilework floor; plus replacement roof to the front sunroom.

The revised applications are supported by a Design and Repair Statement by Meynell & Gunton dated September 2026.

This report covers both the application for planning permission and Listed Building Consent.

Relevant Planning History:

There have been several planning and listed building consent applications in recent years relating to various external and internal repair/restoration/refurbishment works at No.17 Heene Terrace, but none directly relating to the first-floor front balcony or the sunroom.

Consultations

DGC Heritage Consultants

Initial Comments – Objection.

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.

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 affect 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 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

complementary 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. 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

Further Comment - Objection.

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.

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.

Final Comment – No Objection

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 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.

The Worthing Society: No comments received.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM23, DM24
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2026)
National Planning Practice Guidance
Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area Appraisal

Planning Assessment:

The key consideration is the effect on the historic significance of the Listed Building, its setting and features of special architectural or historic interest, and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Policy HE5 of the NPPF states that development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. It states that in assessing a development proposal it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.

Policy HE6 of the revised NPPF states when considering the potential effect of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 the any potential

effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm or total loss of significance. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset, or development within its setting.

Heene Terrace was designed as a formal and highly composed seafront terrace. Its architectural significance derives not only from the individual buildings but from the repeated and balanced use of projecting and recessed elements, balconies, canopies, ironwork, decorative brackets and faced detailing across the whole terrace.

The following sets out a summary and justification for the proposed works following revision: -

Balcony Slab

The proposed new reinforced concrete slab to replace the damaged sections of the balcony floor is justified on the basis that a like-for-like replacement replicating the original Portland stone would not represent a proportionate or appropriate conservation response. This is because the extent of opening up, temporary works, disturbance and wider disruption required to install a Portland stone slab would be likely to cause significantly greater harm to the retained historic fabric than the proposed targeted repair using reinforced concrete. The latter will avoid the need for wholesale removal of masonry, extensive propping of the façade, and disturbance to the original windows, as well as significant intervention to the internal structure of the building, whilst allowing the repair to be undertaken from the exterior of the building.

In response to the comments of the Council's Heritage Adviser the Applicant's Consultant has further clarified:

"The existing Portland stone balcony slab has suffered cracking and displacement, as recorded by the structural engineer. The proposed repair seeks to restore its structural integrity while retaining as much of the original building fabric as practicable.

The reinforced concrete solution allows most of the existing Portland stone built into the façade to remain in situ. This avoids the more extensive removal of embedded stone and disturbance to adjoining historic masonry that a replacement stone slab would entail.

The width of the proposed reinforced concrete slab has also been designed to allow the concrete tongues to enter the façade beside the existing window openings. This enables the associated pockets to be positioned away from the windows, minimising disturbance to the original windows and surrounding masonry. The slab width therefore reflects the need to locate the structural connections where they will cause least disruption to currently sound historic fabric.

The dowel connections, concrete tongues and associated pockets provide localised connections to the retained structure, avoiding wholesale removal of the stone embedded in the façade. The intervention is to be confined to the connection details shown on the submitted drawings, with surrounding historic fabric retained.

The proposed finishes, reinstatement of the tiled floor and retention and repair of the historic ironwork will also preserve the balcony's architectural appearance and its relationship with the wider terrace.

Taken together, these measures provide a proportionate repair that retains the majority of the embedded Portland stone and limits disturbance to the front elevation while addressing the balcony's structural failure."

The finished slab will be painted to match the pre-existing condition and there will be no external visible difference to the stone slab.

The cracking and deterioration of the balcony slab has damaged one of the decorative console brackets underneath the balcony and it is proposed that this will also be repaired using a lime mortar recreating the existing profiles and features.

Balcony Floor

The balcony floor is laid with coloured Victorian geometric encaustic or encaustic-style clay tiles with repeated star/floral motifs encircled by a series of decorative borders. Most of the historic balcony tiling remains in situ across the balcony surface but where the damaged section of the balcony slab was removed for safety reasons, some of the balcony tiles were also damaged and subsequently disposed of. The surviving tiling provides a clear basis for understanding the original pattern, setting out and colour range to be used to inform the repair and reinstatement strategy.

The proposal is to retain as much of the existing historic balcony tiling as possible with removal limited to those areas where the underlying stone slab must be cut back or removed to install the reinforced concrete slab. The retained tiled areas will be undisturbed. Where it is necessary to lift original tiles, these will be reinstated with replacement tiles only introduced where existing tiles have been lost or cannot be reused. The repaired areas will follow the surviving surface in its decorative motifs and border pattern, grout widths, edge condition and falls.

The specification for the replacement balcony tiles can only be informed following inspection of those original tiles which will be lifted to carry out the repairs to the slab. Thus, the final tile and reinstatement scheme, informed by the physical evidence of the lifted tiles, will need to be the subject of a condition.

Balcony Canopy

The pre-existing canopy was formed of straight pitched timber rafters, with felt-covered sarking boards supported at the eaves by a timber beam spanning the cast iron columns. This arrangement was at odds with the curved rafters of the original canopy construction which is visible on the majority of surviving canopies elsewhere on Heene Terrace. The pre-existing canopy has been removed and a replacement installed with curved timber rafters with chamfered edges. A new timber wall plate has been fixed to the main building façade, together with a new timber beam at eaves level. As a temporary measure until works to the balcony slab are completed, metal ties have been installed between the eaves beam and the main façade to provide additional support. It is proposed that these will be removed once the balcony slab works are complete, with the eaves beam then able to 'bear' on the cast iron columns (the latter

which are to be removed and reinstated as part of the balcony slab replacement works).

The canopy roof will be completed with a Code 5 lead sheet roof finish which will provide a more faithful and historically appropriate roof finish than the former felt roof covering.

Sun-room Roof

The area now enclosed as the sunroom originally formed part of an extended balcony canopy over the covered porch/portico entrance below. Similar arrangements are present above the entrances to each of the properties within the terrace. These extended canopies appear originally to have been open, but most have now been enclosed. Whilst the sunroom enclosure at No.17 is not understood to be original it is likely to be historic. The sunroom had the same felt roof finish as the above-mentioned balcony canopy. Internally it has a plastered lathe ceiling which in comparison to the remainder of the terrace suggests is likely not original. It is expected the original would have been open to the underside of the sarking boards consistent with the surviving open canopy structures on the terrace.

The felt roof covering of the sunroom has been removed to reveal rotten timber rafters along with substantial areas of rotten eaves timberwork. The poor condition of the existing roof structure means that it is not suitable for retention and will need to be replaced with new timbers to match the existing curved roof profile. It is proposed that rotten areas of the eaves timberwork will be replaced on a like-for-like basis. The existing plaster ceiling will be removed since it is considered that the lack of ventilation may have contributed to the deterioration of the existing roof timbers. Instead, the repaired roof structure will be expressed internally as an open timber boarded canopy structure consistent with the likely original canopy arrangement elsewhere on the terrace. The Code 5 lead roof to the balcony will be extended across the sunroom roof as for the balcony canopy.

Ironwork

The ironwork balustrades and canopy supporting posts form part of a consistent decorative treatment across Heene Terrace. These will need to be temporarily removed to allow the balcony slab repair to be undertaken. It is explained that the removed components will be labelled, stored in a dry, ventilated condition and protected against impact, distortion and water ingress. In due course, loose paint, scale and corrosion will be removed using the least abrasive effective method (i.e. no shotblasting, acid dipping or hot-dip galvanising). Localised defects will be repaired using techniques appropriate to the original metal (i.e. cast iron or wrought iron or steel) with any missing sections locally replicated to match. Following preparation, the metal will receive a compatible proprietary external coating system with the final colour and sheen to match the surviving historic ironwork and adjacent railings within the terrace. The repaired ironwork will be reinstated in its recorded original position, alignment and configuration with new fixings to be concealed and corrosion resistant.

Conclusion

It is considered that the revised proposals represent a proportionate and conservation-led response to the undertaking of necessary remedial works and are now supported

by the Council's Heritage Advisor. The proposals allow for repairs to be completed in a manner that is more coherent and historically appropriate than both the current interim position and the pre-existing arrangement whilst avoiding significantly greater disturbance to the historic fabric that would result from a full like-for-like replacement of the balcony slab in Portland stone.

This loss of historic tiling to the balcony floor is acknowledged, having occurred in the area where the failed stone slab was removed for safety reasons. Although this loss of original fabric has resulted in some harm to the significance of the Listed Building it is limited to a small area and can be satisfactorily remediated by the proposed repair and reinstatement strategy.

Recommendation:

AWDM/0266/26

APPROVE subject to condition(s): -

1. Approved Plans
2. All works for repair and restoration for which permission is hereby granted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the materials, working methodologies and details described within the submitted Design and Repair Statement Ref: 2273 Heene Terrace, and as shown on the approved drawings.

GRANT CONSENT subject to condition(s): -

1. Approved Plans
2. All works for repair and restoration for which consent is hereby granted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the materials, working methodologies and details described within the submitted Design and Repair Statement and as shown on the approved drawings.
3. 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 balcony tiled floor shall thereafter be reinstated within 6 months of the date of this consent using the approved tiles and in accordance with the approved specification details.
4. Upon completion of the repair and reinstatement of the cast iron columns supporting the balcony canopy, 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.
5. At all times during the progress of the work hereby granted consent, adequate measures shall be taken to protect the remaining part of the Listed building from collapse or structural damage.

6. Upon completion of the work for which listed building consent is hereby granted, any damage caused to the fabric of the building which is not addressed in the submitted Design and Repair Statement or shown on the approved drawings, shall be made good within 2 months in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Informative

Pro Active Amendment

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 19.10.2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 19 October 2026