DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ ADDRESS: WB/09/0344/FULL Kingsway Hotel 117-119 Marine Parade

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 18 May 2009

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED : Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is part of an attractive four storey terrace located on Marine Parade to the west of its junction with Queens Road. The site is within the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area.

The site forms the 'Kingsway Hotel'. This section of the building has not generally retained its original windows and in many places aluminium windows have been installed. An infill panel has been constructed to the curved detailing at the top of the windows to allow for a more standard rectangular shaped framework to be installed. To the east elevation there is a row of bow windows and although these appear to be painted shut, these timber windows have retained their original form. To the front elevation there are two examples of replacement PVCu doors to the balcony areas.

PROPOSAL:

Permission is sought to replace all windows and for the installation of canopies to the front elevation over each opening on the ground and first floors. Alterations are proposed to the main entrance porch including the insertion of new windows between the infilled columns.

Top opening white PVCu windows are proposed to all openings with the exception of the seven bow windows to the east elevation which appear to be proposed as non-opening.

No specific details have been provided in terms of the detailed appearance of the windows and there appear to be discrepancies in the drawings as to the positioning of some windows.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None relevant

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

Saved Worthing Local Plan policy BE1, H16 and H18
South East Plan policies CC6, BE1 and BE6

REPRESENTATIONS & RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The **Conservation Area Advisory Committee** has commented as follows:

The proposal to replace the windows throughout so that there is uniformity is regarded as a desirable option. The committee would prefer that the material used should be powder coated aluminium, which would give a lighter appearance than PVCu having thinner sharper glazing bars. Canopies on the ground floor only are acceptable provided that the material used is of good quality durable cloth.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The assessment of the design of the windows is problematic due to the poor level of information that has been provided. The intention is for PVCu windows to be installed and it is unlikely that this could be carried out in such a way as to avoid any significant impact on the character and appearance of the building and the application has failed to demonstrate otherwise.

The impact of using PVCu would be very apparent for the side bow windows. The existing windows are timber and the detailing has not been replicated in the submitted drawings. Despite the similarities shown in the drawings, much of the detail and character of the windows has not been shown on the drawings and so it is considered that the PVCu windows proposed would detract from the character and appearance of the building.

Although the applicants statement suggests the windows would be replaced on a 'like for like' basis, there is no clear supporting information that demonstrates this. With lacking information, specifications and inaccuracies in the drawings it is not clear exactly what the detailed appearance of the windows would be. The existing aluminium windows are slender and lightweight in appearance and any PVCu windows are likely to have a much more bulky and heavy appearance. There is no dimension given to show the precise width of the framework to the top opening window and this is the section where the bulk would be most apparent.

There is an opportunity to improve the appearance of the entrance with replacement doors, new glazing and removal of the box sign. Although some alterations are proposed to remove the panels between the columns and replace with glazing, the narrowness of the glazing proposed combined with the bulk of PVCu framework is unlikely to give a satisfactory appearance and given the exposed positioning of the building, the door canopy is likely to deteriorate very quickly.

There are other examples of PVCu windows on this terrace, most appearing to be bottom opening. Immediately adjacent at No. 120, recent replacements have been installed retaining the curved feature to the top of the window with the top of the framework concealed. Having regard to the extent of the frontage at 117-119, representing half of the building frontage fronting Marine Parade, any alterations will be highly visible and can impact upon the terrace as a whole. On the basis of the limited information available any judgement based on the submitted information is severely limited and does not demonstrate that the proposals are visually acceptable

and that there would be no significant impact on the integrity of the building or the character of the area in general.

The installation of canopies to the ground and first floor of the building is not considered to be visually appropriate and it is questionable as to what purpose they serve other than advertising. The positioning of the canopies over windows would conceal much of the detailing around the windows and they appear to be fixed over the cornice detailing. The size, positioning and number of window canopies is considered inappropriate and harmful to the character of the building giving a cluttered appearance to the facade.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Refuse

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

On the basis of the limited and conflicting information available, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposed windows would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the recipient building and the visual amenities of the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area in general. Furthermore the size, number and positioning of canopies on the building would represent an incongruous feature detrimental to the appearance of the building and the streetscene in general, and would therefore be detrimental to, and not preserve or enhance, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Saved Policies BE1and H16 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 and policies CC6, BE1 and BE6 of The South East Plan 2009.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER(S) OF REPRESENTATION? N

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....25/6/09.....

Authorising Officer sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....26·6·09.....