DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 10/1055/FULL	Recommendation – Approve Application
Site	3 Christchurch House 32 - 34 Christchurch Road Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Replacement of aluminium frame windows in timber surround with 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/10/1055/FULL – 3 Christchurch House 32-34 Christchurch Road DATE OF SITE VISIT: 06/04/11 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: YADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): NSITE AND SURROUNDINGS: The application site is on a corner site some distance from Worthing Central train station and Worthing town Hall car park. The surrounding buildings are largely late Victorian Villa style properties. There is a large Church to the west of the site.The application property is a two-storey Victorian property that has been extensively extended originally yellow brick faced. Some of this remains on the principal gabled section but the remainder of the building has been inappropriately smooth rendered. This gives the building a PROPOSAL:The development sought for has been advertised as replacement of aluminium frame windows in timber surround with PVCu windowsThe proposal consists of: Replacement of 7no. first floor windows including front bayRELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY: NoneRELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:South East PlanBE1, CC6, CC1Worthing Core Strategy16Worthing Local Plan 2003H16, H18Government AdvicePPS1REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:PLANNING ASSESSMENT: IntroductionThe principle planning concerns with this development is its impact visually.Visual The majority of the new windows are on the modern extension to the host building. These replicate the design and style of the methods of openings of the existing windows, and the frame proportions are very similar.The frame proportions of the new bay windows are notably thicker than the existing. But this is balanced against the reintroduction of a traditional method of opening – that being vertical sliding sash. These replace unoriginal existing window with bottom hung method of opening. As such the replacement windows are sufficiently integral to the cohesiveness of the building to an extent that does not render them obtrusive in the street scene or to harm visually the amenity of the area.ConclusionFor the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon identified amenities. RECOMMENDATION:Approve subject to:-1. Standard time limit2. Plans as 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..... [redacted] .....Date.....23/5/11.....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.....23/5/11.....Date.....[redacted].....

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