DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 11/0155/FULL	Recommendation – Approve Application
Site	6 Ludlow Court Brighton Road Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Installation of replacement PVCu windows

Date of Site Visit:

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified (List Addressess): N

Site and Surroundings & Details of Proposal:

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEETAPPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0155/FULL – 6 Ludlow Court 105 Brighton Road DATE OF SITE VISIT: 05/04/11 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: YADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): NSITE AND SURROUNDINGS: The application site is on a relatively busy coastal road carrying east-west traffic from the town centre to East Worthing. The area is of mixed character with a commercial parade directly opposite. A bus shelter is situated outside of the site.The application property is a flat which forms part of a modern two-storey flatted block, with facing brick walls and angled bay windows. Its land is enclosed by a low rise brick wall.PROPOSAL:The development sought for has been advertised as installation of replacement PVCu windows•Planning permission is sought for 9 replacement windowsRELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY: NoneRELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:South East Plan 2009BE1, CC6, CC1, BE16Worthing Core Strategy16Worthing Local Plan 2003BE1, H16, H18National AdvicePPS1, PPS5REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:NonePLANNING ASSESSMENT: IntroductionThe principle planning concerns with this development are its impact visually and upon the Farncombe Road Conservation Area.VisualThe building to which the windows form part of is modern and of no historic and/or architectural interest. The vast majority of original fenestration has been lost having been replaced by plastic ones over time. The replacements are of suitable method of opening and the frame proportions are of similar dimensions to those plastic windows already on the building. And so the new windows would not appear obtrusive in the street.Conservation AreaFor the same reasons set out in the visual assessment, the established character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved if the replacement fenestration were installed.ConclusionFor the reasons already detailed above there is no justification to resist the application.RECOMMENDATION:Approved, subject to the following conditions:1. Standard time limit2. Plans approvedREASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:The proposal complies with relevant Development Plan policies.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 approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

N/ADELEGATED Case

OfficerSign.....Date.....Authorising OfficerSign.....Date.....

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

Planning Assesment:

Recommendation:

Approve, subject to the condition(s):

OR

Refuse for the following reason(s)

Reasons for Recommendation:

The proposal complies/conflicts with relevant Development Plan policies.

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

OR

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?

No/Yes/NA

DELEGATED

Case Officer Sign.....Date.....

Authorising Officer Sign.....Date.....