Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1617/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 11 Meadway Court, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: Retention of two replacement white uPVC ground floor windows (retrospective)

Date of site visit: 15.11.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application site is a ground floor flat within a purpose built building, three storeys in height on the eastern side of Kingston Lane. The building is set back from the highway with an open-planned lawned frontage. The building appears to have been built in the 1960s/70s. The windows were originally white painted timber. It is clear when viewing the building from the street that the majority of the windows have been replaced with white uPVC. There are some noticeable exceptions on the adjacent block. The current ground floor flat, no. 11 Meadway Court has a living room and bedroom window facing the highway. These windows have been replaced in uPVC without consent. Retrospective consent is sought for the replacement windows.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 – Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the replacement windows provided that they are in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building and do not impact negatively upon the visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The building is not located within a Conservation Area and it is not a listed building however the building frontage is clearly visible within the street scene. The building is uniform in style and all replacement windows have been installed in matching design with openers replicating those existing. Unfortunately one of the windows the subject

of this application is not a matching design – the side casements having been sub-divided into smaller units with a fixed top-light. In addition, the frames appear thicker than the adjacent uPVC windows with the openers having a more 'heavy' appearance.

Whilst disappointing it is not considered that these variations amount to such serious harm either to the appearance of the building, or the visual amenities of the locality, such as would justify withholding retrospective permission.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Approved plans condition

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 23nd November 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 24.11.2016