DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/09/1030/FULL – 167 Brighton Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 6/05/09

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property is situated within a prominent two and half storey terrace block set off from the seafront esplanade. Displaying a strong solidity and good retained period architectural detailing, this late Victorian period building strongly contributes to the established character and appearance of the immediate street.

Facing the street, the original vertical softwood sliding sash front windows of the terrace largely remain, including those of the prominent front gable protrusions. These provide the entire terrace a coherent visual appearance and character.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as Retrospective application for replacement PVCu windows

Planning permission has been applied for:

Replacement of 4 no. ground and first floor eastern and western flank front white painted timber sliding sash single glazed windows with bottom hung double glazed PVCu windows (Windows 1)

Replacement of 4 no. ground and first floor front white painted timber sliding sash single glazed windows with bottom hung double glazed PVCu window (Windows 2)

Replacement of first floor front white painted timber sliding sash single glazed window with bottom hung double glazed PVCu window (Window 3)

Replacement of 5 no. rear and side ground and first floor white painted timber sliding sash single glazed windows with top hung double glazed PVCu window (Windows 4 and 4a)

Replacement of 2 no. ground and first floor white painted timber sliding sash single glazed side windows with top hung double glazed PVCu window (windows 4b)

Replacement of first floor wc white painted timber sliding sash single glazed window with top hung double glazed PVCu window (window 4c)

Replacement of ground floor white painted timber casement single glazed side window with double glazed PVCu casement window (window 5)

Replacement of rear ground floor white painted timber with double glazed PVCu window (window 6)

Replacement of rear firs floor bay (3 panel) white painted metal windows with top hung and side opening double glazed PVCu 3 panel bay window (window 7)

Replacement of 2 no. rear dormer white painted timber sliding sash windows (serving shower and walk-in-wardrobe) with top hung double glazed PVCu window (window 8)

Replacement of front dormer white painted metal side opening and top hung window with side opening double glazed PVCu window (window 9)

The works have been undertaken without the benefit of planning permission, so the application is therefore retrospective.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

WB/06/1047/FULL
Change of use from offices to 2 no. self contained flats
Granted Conditional Consent 30-10-2006

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

The South East Plan
BE1, CC6

Worthing Local Plan 2003
BE1

National Advice
PPS1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

None

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The principle planning concerns with this proposal is its visual impact upon the architectural interest of the building itself, and on the character and appearance of the locality.

The replacement front windows are prominent elements of the property and the terrace. The other terrace properties have retained their original windows.

There is difference in the design, profile and construction of these new windows compared to the originals. The most obvious of these being the change in means of opening to a number of the front bays. However, the majority of the replacement windows are positioned to the flanks of the

property and not conspicuously visible from public vantage point in the street. For those replacement windows that are, the set of four forward facing bay windows (the flanking windows of the front bays are discreet), the differences between the new and original windows are subtle. Overall the frames for the replacements are only minimally thicker than the originals; an increase of some 10mm, for instance. The overall design and style reflects the original style of the other windows in the terrace. From glances up and down the street and along the esplanade, the differences between the old and the new windows and between these and the remainder of the terrace windows are of such subtly so as not to be readily noticeable by passer-bys.

A variety of window forms exist in the street and modern UPVC windows can be seen in many of the surrounding buildings. Although the new fenestration subtly differs from rest of the terrace, the new windows remain sufficiently characteristic of the terrace block to which the application property belongs, to maintain its overall visual coherence. As such, a substantial adverse effect on the appearance and character of the street, terrace, and building itself is avoided.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The loss of the traditional front bay windows is regrettable because there has been a resultant dilution in the architectural integrity of the building itself, and of the terrace it sits within. However, based on the particular design merits of this development, that detrimental impact has been mitigated to an extent that what residue adverse impact remains is not sufficiently detrimental to justify withholding permission, or that approval would set an undesirable or indefensible precedent for similar development in the locality. To this extent, the proposal complies with Saved Policy BE1 of the Worthing Local Plan as well as policies BE1 and CC6 of The South East Plan.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if refused, would have some impact on the applicant's Rights. However, it is considered that the harm caused by the development outweighs these and that in the public interest the application should be refused. Accordingly it is considered that this decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998, with regard to Article 8 and Article 1

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

N/A

DELEGATED

Case Officer

Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....22/6.....

Authorising Offic
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....22.6.07.....