

Minutes of a meeting of the
Worthing Planning Committee
16 December 2015
at 6.30 pm

Councillor Kevin Jenkins (Chairman)
Councillor Vicky Vaughan (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Noel Atkins
Councillor James Doyle
Councillor Nigel Morgan

Councillor Edward Crouch
Councillor Diane Guest
**Councillor Paul Yallop

** Absent

Officers: Head of Economic Growth, Principal Planning Officer, Solicitor and Democratic Services Officer

WBC-PC/050/15-16 Declarations of Interest / Substitute Members

Councillor Guest declared an interest in application number AWDM/0124/15, MGM House, Heene Road, as Ward Member. The Member advised she had spoken with the developer and residents, for and against the application, but would approach the item with an open mind.

Councillor Crouch declared an interest as a Director for Worthing Homes.

Councillor Alex Harman declared an interest in Item 7, 267 & 269 Brighton Road, Worthing as Ward Member.

Councillor Alex Harman substituted for Councillor Paul Yallop.

WBC-PC/051/5-16 Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 November 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

WBC-PC/052/15-16 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

WBC-PC/053/5-16 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

WBC-PC/054/15-16 Public Question Time

There were no questions raised under Public Question Time.

WBC-PC/055/15-16 Request to vary a s106 Agreement relating to residential development at 341 Goring Road, Worthing (former Caffyns VW site)

The Head of Economic Growth advised this application came to the Planning Committee in March 2015, with planning permission being granted in June 2015 for the erection of 17 residential dwellings, with conditions, and a completed s106 Agreement. The Agreement required 30% affordable housing units on site together with financial contributions.

He advised Members that the current application before them under Section 106BA was received at the beginning of August 2015, on behalf of the applicant, Wilmington Homes. In support of the application, an independent assessment of viability was submitted stating the development as approved was not currently viable.

Members were advised the application sought the removal of the affordable housing requirement from the Agreement. He advised legislation indicated such applications should be determined within 28 days of receipt however, Officers considered an extension of time was necessary to seek an independent view and therefore the District Valuer had been consulted.

The Officer advised the District Valuer's independent assessment of the applicant's viability appraisal had accepted that a wholly private market residential scheme would only show a small surplus of £21,912. The applicant therefore argued that not only was the scheme unable to meet the affordable housing requirements but could now only afford a fraction of the original development contributions set out in the S016 Agreement. The applicant however, was willing to increase the contributions to the County Council by £19,000 and provide a new affordable housing contribution of £45,000 to the Borough Council in lieu of the on-site provision.

The Officer explained to Members the loss of on-site affordable housing was regrettable, given the need for affordable housing in the Borough however, the additional development contribution was welcomed, together with the original development contributions sought.

There was a further representation from Mr Huw James of ECE Planning in support of the application.

The Members considered this request to vary the S106 Agreement at length, with many disappointed to receive such a proposal. However, it was acknowledged the applicant had undertaken a significant amount of work to prepare the site for development and this had highlighted the viability difficulties with the development of the site.

Decision

The Planning Committee **AGREED** to:

- (i) Vary the agreement as proposed with the removal of the requirement to provide 5 affordable dwelling units as approved; and
- (ii) Enter into a Deed of Variation to secure the additional development contributions of £19,458 for WSCC and £45,000 for off-site affordable housing.

Councillor Edward Crouch voted against this application.

WBC-PC/056/15-16 Title 267 & 269 Brighton Road, Worthing

The Head of Economic Growth gave a brief outline of this application for Members. It was a request to remove a requirement of a s106 Agreement signed in 2006 which required the conversion of a combined dwellinghouse to two separate dwellinghouses.

Decision

The Planning Committee **AGREED** the legal agreement be varied to remove the second requirement.

The meeting ended at 8.10 pm

Application Number: AWDM/0124/15.	
Site:	M G M House, Heene Road, Worthing, West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of main MGM office building together with offices in Heene Place and replacement by redesigned and repositioned new part four and part five storey buildings on main part of site, arranged around central courtyard and including new block on Heene Road frontage to provide 33 retirement flats (C3) and 59 unit Assisted Living Extra Care Development (C2) communal and support facilities together with 10 affordable apartments (C3) in a two storey building by Heene Place and rearranged open car parking for 61 spaces including on south and eastern boundaries, landscaping including loss of frontage TPO tree, and alterations to access including resited Heene Road vehicular access on southern part of site.

The Head of Economic Growth briefly referred to an addendum Members had received since the papers were published.

Further representations had been received from the Waste Strategy Manager, Worthing Society and the Conservation Advisory Area Committee, raising no objection to the scheme.

Members were advised 4 further letters of objection had been received, together with an e-petition with 87 signatures urging the Council to revisit the plans of the MGM Heene Road site and save the TPO tree.

The Head of Economic Growth advised the Committee that insufficient information had been provided to WSCC Highways to enable them to make a proper assessment of the planning application. However, he felt the issues raised could be resolved by further negotiation. It was for this reason Officers were requesting the Committee defer the item hence the revised recommendation within the addendum.

The Officer advised the planning application would come back to a future Committee meeting, possible in January 2016.

The Members **AGREED** to defer the application.

Application Number: SDNP/15/04425/FUL	
Site:	Country Lodge Nursing Home, Cote Street, High Salvington
Proposal:	Extension to north-west elevation to provide 3no. extra rooms with ensuite bathrooms with link to main nursing home (one existing bedroom to be used for laundry facilities) with alternative options of pitched and flat roofs to the extension.

The Principal Planning Officer presented this application which was to extend the Country Lodge Nursing Home in High Salvington, within the South Down National Park, just outside the designated built up boundary, on the north side of the A27.

The Officer advised Members the South Downs National Park (SDNP) were the local planning authority and that the Council were acting as their agent. He stated SDNP were aware of the controversy around the application but still did not consider the application raised issues of significance for the National Park sufficient to justify calling-in the application.

The proposal was to enlarge the Nursing Home and upgrade its laundry facilities by building a single storey extension at the rear of the Home on the north side adjacent to the rear garden of 9 Cote Street.

Members were shown an aerial view of the site and proposal, together with plans and photographs. The Officer advised the Home had been incrementally expanded over the years and benefited from a large rear garden which stepped down from north to south and was laid out mainly as ornamental lawn, with patios close to the main building.

The Principal Planning Officer stated the application was unusual as it offered two options for the roof form. The original scheme was with a pitched roof which had raised concerns with the neighbour. He stated concerns over the impact on the neighbouring property at No 9 had been recognised but felt the proposal for a flat roof form would remove any such concerns as the extension would be largely invisible from No.9, despite the objections made to this option as well.

The proposal met a need and the intensification involved was marginal. Some spaciousness of the plot would be eroded but the special scenic qualities of the National Park would not be compromised. The Highway Authority raised no objections but it was important to fully reflect their recommended condition to agree and secure detailed parking plan and provision.

The Officer advised Members the recommendation was to approve the flat roof option only as the pitched roof option was un-neighbourly subject to an enhanced parking condition.

Further representations were received from:

Objectors: Mrs Alex Dickinson
Ms Marnie Williams
Mr Michael Cloake

Members considered the application at length, raising some queries with the Officer, but whilst sympathising with the neighbour, it was felt the actual proposed development in the form of the flat roofed option would have minimal impact.

The majority of Members agreed the Officer's recommendation for approval, and to fully reflect the parking requirements of the Highway Authority in the conditions.

Decision

It was agreed that the application be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Implement within 3 years
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans (flat roof form). Pitched roof rom plans not approved
3. No new windows in north elevation of extension.
4. Agree external materials and colour.
5. Agree and provide scheme of compensatory and screen planting to west and north boundaries and in car park and provide and agree rearranged car parking prior to occupation (1:100 plan) and retain thereafter .
6. Agree method statement for construction traffic access and storage of materials/equipment and parking and dust suppression.
7. Control working hours for construction to 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.