

ADDENDUM TO WORTHING PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

MEETING DATE - 13th January 2016

The following agenda item has updates to the original Committee report.

Application Number: AWDM/0124/15

**Recommendation – Approve
subject to legal agreement to
secure affordable housing**

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.

**Applicant: McCarthy and Stone
Retirement Lifestyles Ltd**

Ward: Heene

Case Officer: Peter Devonport

Revised Plans

Revised plans, photomontages and Design and Access Statement have been received to update generally and consolidate many of the refinements to the scheme negotiated over the past weeks. These include the changes to the north, west and eastern elevation of the front block heralded and welcomed in the last Addendum.

Plans showing the relationship between the new development and the adjacent residential properties, including Heene Terrace, Heene Place and Bowers Court, have also been supplied, showing distances and natural light guidelines and comparisons between the new proposal and existing building footprint and profile.

For the avoidance of doubt, the applicants have clarified the scope of the application by providing the following amplification to Q18 in the application form which describes the existing floorspace provided on site.

In respect to Q18 on the planning application forms, the inclusion of all floorspace as B1 use is considered to be correct. The building to the rear of 95 Rowlands Road is 250sqm. It was not included in the land subject of the recent permitted development application to convert the existing MGM house and training building to residential apartments. Notwithstanding its absence from that prior approval application, it could be subject to such an application in its own right.

The building has been owned by MGM since the 1970s and has always been used as an ancillary building to the B1 office use from the two principle buildings on the site. The building has been historically used by MGM for stationery and marketing documentation. Since 2005 the building has been used as archive for paperwork and files and some stationery material. In light of this I confirm that this building is considered to be an ancillary B1 office use as part of the planning units established by MGM.

In addition a brief Daylight & Sunlight impact assessment report has been received the summary of which states;

I have concluded that all neighbouring residential buildings will continue to benefit from good daylight and sunlight and there would be no adverse effect. In most locations, I have been able to reach this conclusion because the BRE guidance states:

"If any part of a new building measured in a vertical section perpendicular to a main window, wall or an existing building, from the centre of the lowest window, subtends an angle of more than 25° to the horizontal, then the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected."

However, care has been taken to ensure that the proposed buildings stand far enough away from neighbouring buildings and would be of such a height that the angle of 25° would not be subtended and an adverse effect would not occur.

I believe there is the very occasional location where, when measured in a two-dimension cross-section, the angle of 25° would just, but only just, be subtended. However, the large quantities of light received from the open sky either side of the building would more than balance this effect.

I am satisfied that proper consideration has been given to each and every neighbour's daylight and sunlight, and there would be no adverse effect.

The applicants have further indicated that their preference for a replacement holm oak is in the central square of the development, some 30 ms to the NE of the existing TPO'ed holm oak and visible from the street.

They are also *"proposing that the footpath (running between Heene Rd and Brunswick Rd currently shown on the plans) is gated at each end and will be open through office hours (08.30-18.00) Monday – Saturday. It will be locked during the*

night and on Sunday's. The gate will be controlled by the estate staff at the proposed development. Hopefully, this is a good compromise for all local residents."

Finally, the agent reports that *"In respect to the issue of financial contributions towards public realm, I have discussed with my Client and they are agreeable to pay a sum of £50,000 towards improvements in the local area...for the purposes of Wednesday's committee."*

Representations

In terms of representations, these now total at 39 including follow up representations and one subsequent letter of support.

The e-petition has received 136 signatures.

Planning Assessment

The design refinements are welcome and the additional documentation should provide further reassurance over the neighbour amenity impact of the proposal.

The amplification as to the status of the building to the rear of 95 Rowlands Road underscores officers' views in the substantive report that this building is ancillary to the B1 office use.

The promotion of a replacement holm oak sited in the central square is welcomed.

The compromise solution for the footpath is sensible, retaining accessibility but also minimising the risk to security.

The above should be reflected in revisions to the recommended conditions.

The offer of the £50,000 towards landscape improvements in the local area will help mitigate the loss of the 3 TPO trees including Holm Oak and could integrate with the seafront improvements secured from the recent redevelopment of the Beach Hotel just to the east of Heene Terrace. This may be secured by broadening the scope of the proposed legal agreement.

Changes to Recommendation

THAT THE DECISION IN THIS CASE BE DELEGATED TO THE HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES TO AWAIT THE COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT TO SECURE THE REQUISITE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMPENSATORY LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS WITH A VIEW TO PLANNING PERMISSION BEING GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Conditions otherwise as in substantive report but amended as follows;

Amend condition 4;

Reserve details of elevation and layout of north block prior to development above slab level. .

Add new condition 24;

The pedestrian route running between Heene Rd and Brunswick Rd shall be gated at each end and shall be locked shut outside of the times 08.30-18.00 Monday – Saturday, except for emergency purposes.

Application Number: AWDM/1589/15

Site: Land south of Northbrook College, Bohunt School, 65A
Broadwater Road

Proposal: Application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 for variation of conditions 2, 4, 9 and 11 of Planning permission WSCC/031/15/WB for alterations of the site layout including revision to access and car parking arrangements and an additional hard play area plus design changes to cycle storage, refuse store and substation as part of the construction of the new Bohunt School.

Applicant: WSCC Executive Director of Residents' Services **Ward:** Gaisford
Case Officer: Paul Pennicott

UPDATES

Consultations

The Highway Authority comments that,

"West Sussex County Council, in its role as Local Highway Authority, has previously issued comments on this proposal dated the 3rd November and 23rd December 2015. Additional information has now been presented to the LHA. The LHA would offer the following further comments.

The LHA's remaining concerns related to the assumptions applied within the Transport Assessment Addendum to forecast potential additional car parking demands during the PM picking up period. These assumptions related primarily to the non-use of the on school drop off area during the PM pick up time. It has previously been discussed and agreed as part of the approved TA, for reasons of highway safety due to the limited capacity that this area would not be made available. Revised car parking assessments have been undertaken for the PM period, which do not include the on school drop off area.

The TA Addendum also included a number of trips being made by park and stride. Elsewhere within the TA Addendum however it was stated that park and stride was only being trialled. The exact status of this was unclear. Whilst the school may well adopt park and stride, given the reliance upon the use of 3rd party car parks, the future of this could not be secured via condition. For the purposes of the assessment trips by park and stride have been assumed to take place as single passenger car trips. It is accepted that this approach will over estimate parking demands as some of these trips will take place by alternate modes.

With the above revised assumptions, during the PM picking up period the school is forecast to generate the demand for 198 car parking spaces, with a maximum peak (that is forecast to last approximately 10 minutes) demand of 91 spaces during this period. The on-street car parking surveys undertaken indicate an availability of a minimum of 97 on-street car parking spaces during the PM period. The LHA recognise that the car parking surveys will include parking demands resulting from the existing school. As such, a number of the parked vehicles included within the survey would be related to the school.

It is also noted that the parking assessment does not take account of the potential use of the 20 public spaces that will be retained within Queen Street car park. The availability of these spaces cannot be guaranteed, hence there is justification, again for robustness, to these not being included.

Based on the information available, the peak car parking demands can be accommodated on-street within the area surveyed and without relying on the Queen Street car park. It is accepted that the assumptions are robust with the number of single passenger car trips, and therefore parking demands, over-estimated.

The LHA accept that during the PM picking up time that demands for parking as well as the number of vehicle movements would be significantly increased. Such matters have already been accepted as part of the initial approval and would be short term as per any other school. There are already existing enforceable waiting restrictions in place to prevent parking taking place in locations that would be detrimental to highway safety. As the number of pupils at the school increases, parking demands should continue to be monitored through the travel plan in association with the WSCC School Travel Planning team. Additional measures and initiatives may then need to be implemented accordingly.

No objection would be raised to the variation of condition 2."

Planning Assessment

It is recommended that no highway objections are raised to the proposals following the results from the beat survey which the Highway Authority accepts as demonstrating that there is capacity on street for dropping off and pick-up parking, and, that the school can function satisfactorily for afternoon pick-ups without the use of the hard area in front of the teaching block which was excluded from use for this purpose in the planning permission for the school as granted by the County Council.

Regard should also be paid to the fact that the school is currently operating for 195 students and 24 staff without serious problems and without dedicated on-site parking and dropping off facilities.

There is also additional potential for use of some of the 20 public spaces in the Queen Street car park plus use in the early morning of some spaces at Northbrook College before it opens as being available, although these have not been formally

included in the applicant's calculation of available spaces. Whilst, the Academy or WSCC do not own Queen Street Car Park discussions have been underway in connection with a lease to the Academy which would also secure 20 public car parking spaces.

The availability of park and stride has also been under calculated due to its uncertainty and its potential has been under assessed as single student trips when these may more probably include shared student trips. Furthermore, these car trips may not occur at times of more favourable weather conditions when students would walk or cycle. Therefore it is concluded that there is sufficient flexibility and over accounting for the Highway Authority to take comfort in the submitted transport assessment and accordingly supports the revised travel plan.

There is some concern about larger vehicles and coaches accessing the site off Broadwater Road as these cannot park in front of the entrance gates away from the highway. However, the Academy has stated that this will be managed and gates opened in advance to accommodate larger delivery vehicles and coaches visiting the site.

Finally, the age of the students is also an important factor with older students being able to demonstrate greater independence in travelling to and from school which reduces the number of car trips. So as the school grows the number of car movements is unlikely to grow proportionally with the most substantial changes occurring in the early years. Additionally, once the school has reached its full capacity students will adjust their travel habits accordingly in line with parking and access availability on a daily basis until a reasonable balance for all users is achieved.

With regard to other matters, the Highway Authority raises no objection to the variation of condition 2 which relates to amendments to the approved plans as referred to in the report. It also raises no objections to the avoidance of bell mouth improvements to Queen Street car park on the basis that they are not significant and would not represent a material improvement to visibility. It is therefore recommended that requirement no. 5 is excluded from the recommendation.

Recommendation

On the basis that the Highway Authority raises no objections and recommends no further conditions it is recommended that the conclusions of the committee report are unchanged apart from the exclusion of requirement no. 5.

Director of Economy 12.01.16