Expiry Date - 30/05/2011

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 11/0032/FULL	Recommendation – Approve Application
Site	Flat 2 1 West Avenue Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Installation of PVCu replacement 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/11/1032/FULL – Flat 2 1 West Avenue DATE OF SITE VISIT: 23/05/11 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: YADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): NSITE AND SURROUNDINGS: The application site is on a large corner site just off the busy Mill Road, occupied by a detached 1930s two-storey property. It has been previously divided into 2 no. self contained flats.PROPOSAL:The development sought for has been advertised as installation of PVC replacement windowsThe proposal consists of replacement of 8 no. First floor windows RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY: NoneRELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:South East PlanBE1, CC6, CC1Worthing Core Strategy16Worthing Local Plan 2003H16, H18Government AdvicePPS1REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:NonePLANNING ASSESSMENT: IntroductionThe principle planning concerns with this development is its impact visually.Visual The replacement windows all reasonably follow the design and style of the methods of openings of the existing windows. Whilst the frames proportions of the new frames are slightly thicker than the originals they are reasonably similar as not to appear overly clunky - especially as the application property is set back off the street and partially hidden from public view by trees and shrubs.As such the replacement windows retain the continuity and cohesiveness of the block of flats 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 25 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..... [redacted] .....Date.....23/5/11.....

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