

Minutes of a meeting of the
Worthing Planning Committee
30 May 2018
at 6.30 pm

Councillor Paul Yallop (Chairman)
Councillor Alex Harman (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Noel Atkins
Councillor Hazel Thorpe
**Councillor Paul Westover

Councillor Jim Deen
Councillor Nicola Waight
Councillor Steve Wills

** Absent

Officers: Head of Planning and Development, Planning Services
Manager, Locum Legal Officer and Democratic Services Officer

The Chairman welcomed the new Members to the Planning committee, Councillors Jim Deen, Alex Harman and Nicola Waight.

The public were advised the committee meeting would be sound recorded, as was usual, and film recorded by one of the Members, but not live streamed.

WBC-PC/001/18-19 Substitute Members

Councillor Edward Crouch substituted for Councillor Paul Westover.

WBC-PC/002/18-19 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Noel Atkins declared an interest in AWDM/0220/18 Land North of Tesco Store, Fulbeck Way, and elected to leave the room when the item was considered.

Councillor Edward Crouch declared an interest in AWDM/0598/18, Durrington Cemetery, as Executive Member for Digital & Environmental Services, and elected to sit in the public gallery when the item was considered.

Councillor Alex Harman declared an interest in AWDM/1975/17, Columbia House, Columbia Drive, and elected to leave the room when the item was considered.

WBC-PC/003/18-19 Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 April 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

WBC-PC/004/18-19 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

WBC-PC/005/18-19 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

WBC-PC/006/18-19 Public Question Time

There were no questions raised under Public Question Time.

The meeting ended at 9:45 pm

Application Number: AWDM/1975/17	
Site:	Columbia House, Columbia Drive, Worthing
Proposal:	Construction of two additional floors on the existing building 'Columbia House' comprising 14 residential apartments (4 x 1 bedroom, 8 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 3 bedrooms) and associated works including elevation treatment of existing building, car parking and landscaping.

The Chairman reminded the Committee there were two exempt appendices included in the agenda, one for AWDM/1975/17, Columbia House, Columbia Drive and the second for AWDM/1834/17, The Downview, Downview Road, which could entail Members going into closed session.

The Chairman agreed to change the order in which the applications would be heard, as Members may agree to go into closed session. Item 1, AWDM/1975/17, Columbia House and item 3, AWDM/1834/17, The Downview would therefore be heard last.

In the interests of transparency, the Committee agreed not to go into closed session for consideration of the Columbia House and The Downview applications. However, the Chairman stated he wished to protect the Council from any legal challenge and stressed the need for the Committee to be cautious when considering the two applications.

The Legal Officer gave suitable advice to the Committee Members. The legal advice given was that the committee should go into closed session if Part B papers were to be discussed. The committee decided there was no need to discuss Part B papers and therefore agreed not to go into closed session.

Councillor Alex Harman left the room when the application was considered and Councillor Edward Crouch returned to his seat on the Committee.

The Head of Planning and Development updated Members by advising that shortly before the meeting, the applicant had submitted an appeal against the non-determination of the application which meant the Committee could not determine the application as set out in the agenda. The Officer informed the Committee they could however, consider what decision they would have reached on the application if they had been able to do so.

The applicant had been challenged as to why they had appealed on the day of the committee meeting, and the Head of Planning and Development concluded the applicants had been conscious the Committee would refuse the application as recommended by Officers.

The applicant's agents had advised they would be sending through a fresh application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site.

The Officer outlined the report, addressed some of the issues, and in conclusion, he advised the Committee Members would be able to consider and make a formal resolution on how they would have determined the application if the appeal had not been submitted.

The Committee were shown an aerial photograph of the site, and the Officer advised Columbia House was a fairly substantial 5-storey office building, which was once connected to a very large building to the rear, now occupied by Littlehampton Books. In Policy terms, the Officer stated the whole site was a key employment area, and that aspect would need to be taken into consideration by Members.

The applicants had purchased the site and their current proposal was to demolish the existing roof plant, add two storeys above the existing five storey building, and raise the two external staircases at the rear to provide 14 flats.

The Committee were shown a number of photographs of the site and plans to assist in their consideration of the application, and the Officer referred to the Design and Access Statement submitted which looked at the wider site, and scope for further development.

The Officer felt the key issues for Members to consider were whether to accept two floors of residential above the previous office building, and whether the height, scale and massing of the proposal was appropriate in the location.

In conclusion, there were policy conflicts in terms of residential development within a key industrial location; concerns about the piecemeal form of development and the very low affordable housing contribution offered by the applicant. Therefore, the Officer's recommendation would still be for refusal, with the reasons outlined in the report.

Members raised queries on the presentation, which were answered in turn by the Officer.

There were no further representations at the meeting.

The Committee felt that, not only was the scheme not providing a sufficient affordable housing contribution but its height scale and massing was unacceptable in the context of the surrounding area and introducing residential development would be contrary to employment policies of the adopted Local Plan.

The Committee **RESOLVED**,

to contest the appeal against the non-determination of the application, which had been submitted prior to the meeting, on the grounds that,

1. The application for the partial redevelopment of the site does not provide an appropriate level of affordable housing contribution. As the proposal does not assist in meeting an identified affordable housing need it is contrary to Policy 10 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2006-2026.
2. The proposed increased height of this prominent slab building, with additional floors extending well above the existing main roof and close to existing outer walls, would lead to a significant increase in overall bulk and mass. This would greatly accentuate its impact on the skyline and its isolated and poor relationship with the prevailing character of the area, which comprises smaller scale domestic buildings and relative spaciousness. The detailed design and piecemeal approach to development of this site is not considered to mitigate these impacts. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be harmful to the appearance and character of the area and does not take reasonable opportunity for enhancement, this is contrary to Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2006-2026, Supplementary Planning Document: Tall Building Guidance adopted in November 2013, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, in particular paragraphs 56-66.
3. The site lies within a Key Industrial Estate/Business Park, as identified in the Worthing Core Strategy 2006-2026. The proposal, due to its limited scope and piecemeal approach, which comprises solely residential development, makes no contribution to the reinvestment, intensification and redevelopment of employment floorspace and is therefore contrary to Policies 3 and 4 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2006-2026, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, in particular paragraphs 18-22.

Application Number: AWDM/0297/18	
Site:	Durston House, 21 Chesterfield Road, Worthing
Proposal:	Construction of additional floor on the existing building 'Durston House' comprising 4 residential apartments (2 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2 bedroom).

The Planning Services Manager advised the Committee one further letter in objection had been received since the agenda was despatched, which had stated the committee report made no mention regarding residents' safety and appeared to have forgotten the existing building was fully occupied.

Members were shown an aerial photograph of the site, together with proposed plans which had been amended during determination relating to the design of the proposed additional floor.

The Officer included within his presentation a number of photographs to assist in Members' consideration of the application, and advised the Officer's recommendation was for planning permission to be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

A Member raised a question for clarification by the Officer, which he answered to her satisfaction, prior to the registered speakers being heard.

There were further representations from:

Objectors: Anne Romer
 Vanya Obrastsoff-Rutinsky
 Jonathan Haynes
 Ward Councillor: Lionel Harman

The Members considered the application and raised a number of issues, which included:-

- disturbance for current occupiers;
- the size and quantity of parking spaces;
- dissimilar room types being stacked;
- an over-development of the area; and
- the non-attendance at the meeting of the applicant and/or representative.

Whilst recognising there was a housing shortage in the Borough, and that additional apartments should be welcomed, the Committee were concerned with the inevitable impact the proposal would have on the current residents at Durston House. In particular, the dissimilar room types being stacked, which had been raised by the Environmental Health Officer, and use of the existing garages as parking spaces given their size.

Following debate, the majority of Members voted to defer the application, for the reasons stated below.

Decision

That planning permission be **DEFERRED**, to investigate room stacking and whether it would be appropriate to count the existing garages as parking spaces given their size, i.e. below the minimum requirements for a parking space.

Application Number: AWDM/1834/17	
Site:	The Downview, Downview Road, Worthing
Proposal:	Conversion and alterations to former public house to provide 9no. residential units comprising 7no. 1-bedroom and 2no. 2-bedroom apartments with bin and bike storage to rear (south) and retention of commercial use of part of ground floor for Use Classes A1 (retail), A2 (professional services) or B1(a) (business). Erection of new terrace of 4no. 2-bedroom houses on land to south with parking on frontages.

Councillor Alex Harman returned to the meeting to consider the application for The Downview.

The Planning Services Manager presented the report and Members were shown an aerial view of the site, site plan, proposed and existing elevations, and a number of photographs of the application site.

The Officer stated the building had been identified as a building of local interest and one of the more attractive in the location.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

There were no further representations at the meeting.

A Member raised a couple of points on the presentation for clarification by the Officer. They requested condition 3 be strengthened to include the requirement to install a linear drain across the front of the four new houses to prevent water being shed on to the highway.. Secondly, the Member referred to the Environmental Health's comment regarding the existence of a basement room which appeared to have no natural light, or ventilation and only accessed through the garden.

The Officer agreed condition 3 be strengthened and an informative added regarding the Environmental Health's suggested action about the room at the basement.

During debate, a Member was saddened to hear the pub had ceased trading, but agreed it was a fine building and certainly one of the more attractive in the area. However, he felt it had the potential to be restored and become a more attractive contribution to the street scene.

Another Member was concerned about the lack of parking availability within the area however, the Officer advised WSCC had raised no highway objection.

A Member referred to the exempt appendix and felt it was unfortunate that under Policy 10 of the Core Strategy viability studies could not be published and looked forward to NPPF changes so they can be published in the future. The Member again referred to the need for the Committee to receive training on those studies.

In conclusion, the Committee felt it was important to ensure retention of the building even though it did affect the ability to secure suitable affordable housing payments.

Decision

That planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to amendment of condition 3 to reflect Technical Services comments, the addition of an informative regarding Private Sector Housing comments, and the following conditions:-

- 01 Approved Plans
- 02 Full Permission
- 03 Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul and surface water sewerage disposal have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water. Requirement to install a linear drain across the front of the four new houses to prevent water being shed on to the highway.
- 04 Construction work shall not commence until a scheme for protecting the proposed noise sensitive development from noise and vibration from the railway has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. All works, which form part of the scheme, shall be completed before any part of the noise sensitive development is occupied. The scheme shall have regard to the principles contained within the World Health Organisation community noise guidelines and achieve the indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings specified in BS8233:2014. Following approval and completion of the scheme, a competent person employed by the developer shall undertake a test to demonstrate that the attenuation measures proposed in the scheme are effective and protect the residential unit from noise.
- 05 Hours of construction should be restricted to Monday - Friday 08:00 - 18:00 Hours, Saturday 09:00 - 13:00 Hours and Sundays and Bank Holidays - no work permitted
- 06 Emissions Mitigation Assessment
- 07 Dust Suppression details during construction

- 08 No part of the development shall be first occupied until visibility splays of 2.4m metres by 45m metres have been provided at the proposed site vehicular access onto Downview Road in the leading direction as it is a one way street. These should be in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once provided the splays shall thereafter be maintained and kept free of all obstructions over a height of 0.6 metre above adjoining carriageway level or as otherwise agreed.
- 09 No part of the development shall be first occupied until pedestrian visibility splays of 2 metres by 2 metres have been provided either side of the proposed site vehicular access onto Downview Road in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions over a height of 0.6 metre above adjoining carriageway level or as otherwise agreed.
- 10 No part of the development shall be first occupied until the car parking has been constructed in accordance with the approved site plan. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated purpose.
- 11 No part of the development shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- 12 No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not necessarily be restricted to the following matters:
- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
 - the method of access and routing of vehicles during construction,
 - the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors,
 - the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
 - the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
 - the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
 - the provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),
 - details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works.
- 13 Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-
- (1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:- all previous uses; potential contaminants associated with those uses; a conceptual model of the

site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

(2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) above to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

(3) The site investigation results and the detailed risk assessment (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

(4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved above and, prior to commencement of any construction work (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), a Verification Report demonstrating completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a 'long-term monitoring and maintenance plan') for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan, and for the reporting of this to the Local Planning Authority.

14. Prior to the commencement of work, the asbestos register for the site, and any remedial strategy should asbestos be present, shall be submitted to and approved where necessary by the Local Planning Authority.
15. Approval of Materials
16. Details of boundary screening
17. Hard and Soft Landscaping
18. Refuse and Recycling details
19. Removal of permitted development rights to new terraced dwellings

Informatives

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. To initiate a sewer capacity check to identify the appropriate connection point for the development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove

House Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk

Minor Highway Works

The applicant is advised to contact the Highway Licensing team (01243 642105) to obtain formal approval from the highway authority to carry out the site access works on the public highway.

There does not appear to be any natural light or ventilation to the basement room and only accessed through the garden. It is likely action would be necessary under the Housing Act 2004 in respect of this room if it is intended to be used for habitation.

Application Number: AWDM/0444/18	
Site:	The Wheatsheaf, Richmond Road
Proposal:	Demolition of existing public house and redevelopment to provide 3-storey building plus mansard roof consisting of commercial use (Class A1, A2, A3 or A4) on ground floor and partial basement and 8no. residential flats (1 x studio, 3 x 1-bedroom, and 4 x 2 bedroom units), all with private amenity terrace on upper floors above.

The Planning and Development Manager began his presentation by showing Members an aerial photograph of the site. The Committee were advised the public house was currently unused and had been recently boarded-up.

The proposal was to demolish and replace the Wheatsheaf with a taller mixed-use building on a larger footprint and would comprise a commercial space at basement and ground floor level for Class A use and 8 new flats across four floors.

Members were shown a number of photographs and a computer-generated image by the Officer to assist in their consideration of the application.

Officers not only felt the proposal was an inappropriate design for the site but also made no provision for a contribution to affordable housing, and therefore the recommendation was for refusal, for the reasons outlined within the report.

Members raised queries on the presentation, which the Officer answered in turn to their satisfaction.

There was a further representation from Paul Russell from Russell & May Associates.

The majority of Members welcomed development on the site, within a sustainable location, however, felt the proposal was out of place for the area due to its size, position and design. After further discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to refuse the application and agreed the Officers' reasons outlined within the report.

Decision

That planning permission be **REFUSED**, for the reasons:-

Reasons:

1. The proposed building, by reason of its combined height, mass, design (by virtue of factors including its complex series of rooflines, intersections; the range of window/opening sizes, proportions and their placings; the uneven series of tiers; the steeply pitched 'crown-top' roof and large areas of brickwork) and prominent location well forward of neighbouring buildings and on a much narrower site than its neighbours, would appear cramped and harmful to the character and spaciousness of the street and public footways. This is also harmful to the setting of the conservation area, which adjoins the site and includes listed buildings and buildings of local interest. It is therefore an overdevelopment of the site, contrary to policy 16 of the Worthing Borough Core Strategy 2011, and paragraphs 56 and 135 of the NPPF 2012.
2. The proposal is not considered to provide for a reasonable standard of amenity for proposed occupiers. Proposed balconies and windows to habitable rooms are variously separated from windows of the neighbouring office building and public library and from the large protected tree to the rear, by short intervening distances. This leads to a significant degree of overlooking and poor light penetration. The proposed small rear terrace is also likely to be overshadowed by the proposed and existing buildings, boundary walls and the protected tree and is only directly accessible to one flat. Furthermore on the basis of available information, there is risk that external air moving ducts and plant, if needed, may lead to risk of noise and vibration. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 17 and 120 of the NPPF 2012 and the Worthing Borough Space Standards Supplementary Planning Document, February 2012.
3. The proposal would require substantial crown reduction to the large oak tree which is close to the northern boundary of the site and which is subject of a tree preservation order. The tree is prominent and important within the surrounding public realm and adjoins the conservation area. Pruning and future pressure for further pruning would lead to a heavily unbalanced appearance and involve cutting back to large boughs, giving a misshapen appearance, possibly also reducing overall longevity. On the basis of the submitted information and constrained nature of the site, there is also concern about the practicality and effectiveness of proposed tree protection and that the construction and groundwork would lead to damage, including to its roots. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to policy 16 of the Worthing Borough Core Strategy 2011, and paragraph 118 of the NPPF 2012.
4. In the absence of provision for a suitable financial contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing, proposal is contrary to policy 10 of the Worthing Borough Core Strategy 2011, and paragraph 50 of the NPPF 2012.
5. The proposal, due to its height and location of large windows and balconies serving habitable rooms at upper levels, would introduce an increased degree of overlooking to the rear of neighbouring homes and gardens in Ambrose Place. This is contrary to saved policy H18 of the Worthing Borough Local Plan 2003.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.45pm and reconvened at 7.47pm.

Application Number: AWDM/0220/18	
Site:	Land North of Tesco Store, Fulbeck Way, Worthing
Proposal:	Relocation of New Life Church from Salvington Road to corner of Fulbeck Avenue and Fulbeck Way to provide new place of worship comprising 250 seat auditorium, chapel and ancillary accommodation, 40 car parking spaces, motorcycle and cycle parking.

Councillor Noel Atkins left the room while the item was being considered.

The Head of Planning and Development began his presentation by showing Members an aerial photograph of the site and advised the application site comprised of a triangular parcel of land located directly to the north of the Tesco superstore and West Durrington District Centre.

Permission was sought by New Life Church to develop the site with a place of worship, associated facilities, together with 42 car parking spaces, pedestrian footpaths and landscaping.

The Committee were shown a number of photographs to assist in their consideration of the application, together with proposed site layout plan.

Officers considered the proposal would be a suitably distinctive high quality landmark building for the surrounding residential community and therefore the recommendation was for approval.

A Member raised a query with the Officer regarding the possibility of an overflow car park at a later date. The Officer advised that as the proposed building would be within the local community, Officers would encourage the applicant, through the Travel Plan, to promote alternative means of transport. The Member was satisfied with the Officer's response.

There were further representations from:

Supporters: Philip Amos
Paul Hammond

During the debate, some Members were still concerned as to the lack of parking on site as the new place of worship had a 250 seat auditorium, but only 40 car parking

spaces. The Officer believed the provision was appropriate to meet the likely demand, without compromising the local highway network.

As to a Member's query regarding potential noise from the church, the Officer referred Members to condition 21 at the end of the report and reiterated the residential properties were some distance away and therefore felt a good location for the proposal.

However, Members were in agreement the design was of a high quality and complemented the area. The Members therefore unanimously agreed the Officer's recommendation to approve, subject to the conditions outlined below..

Decision

That planning permission be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved Plans.
2. Standard time limit.
3. Agree external materials and finishes.
4. Agree architectural details (including windows and doors).
5. Hours of use restricted to between 07.30 and 22.30hrs on any day.
6. Agree surfacing of car park, footpaths and forecourt areas.
7. Agree and implement tree protection scheme.
8. Agree and implement hard and soft landscaping including seating area.
9. Agree and implement ecology measures.
10. Agree external lighting scheme (to building and car park).
11. Agree surface water drainage scheme, including discharge to existing watercourse where practicable.
12. Agree and implement sustainable design measures to achieve minimum BREEAM 'Very Good' standard.
13. Provide access, vehicle parking and turning.
14. Agree and implement secure covered cycle parking.
15. Agree and implement surfacing of Public Right of Way prior to first occupation.
16. Agree and implement Travel Plan prior to first occupation.
17. Agree and implement details of protection of buffer zone to adjacent watercourse.
18. Agree and implement Construction Method Statement and Plan.
19. Hours of Construction.
20. Development shall not commence until details of the building services plant associated with the development together with the calculated cumulative noise level 1m from the nearest residential facade has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be designed to achieve a noise levels specified within the Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited Noise Assessment (dated September 2017). A test to demonstrate compliance with the scheme shall be undertaken prior to the development being commissioned. No external plant other than as agreed.
21. Construction work shall not commence until a scheme for protecting the surrounding residential dwellings from amplified speech, amplified music and/or live music from the proposed development has been submitted to and

approved by the local planning authority. The scheme should ensure the noise level from the development does not exceed 45dB LAeq5mins 1m from the nearest residential facade and should be ensure all doors and windows are kept closed during times of amplified music/speech or live music. Within three months of implementation, a test shall be carried out and the result submitted to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate compliance with this noise level.

22. The use hereby permitted shall not be carried on unless and until details of a suitable system for the extraction and disposal of cooking odours (including details of the extract fans, filters, fan units and ducting together with method of noise abatement, as well as details of grease traps and extraction hoods) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment approved under this condition shall be installed before the use hereby permitted commences and thereafter shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
23. Remove 'permitted development' entitlements for all walls, fences, gates and other means of enclosure.
24. Restrict use to Class D1 (Non-residential institution).
25. Agree and implement bin store.

Application Number: AWDM/0320/18	
Site:	Land North of 80 High Street, Worthing
Proposal:	Installation of non-illuminated 48-sheet advertisement hoarding with wooden framing and backboard (measuring 6m wide by 3m high).

Councillor Noel Atkins returned to the meeting.

The Planning Services Manager advised there was nothing further to add to the report and briefly outlined the application for Members. The Committee were shown an aerial photograph of the application site, together with photographs of the surrounding area.

The Officer believed the advertisement hoarding due to its size and siting would adversely impact the area and therefore the Officer's recommendation was to refuse the application.

There were further representations from:

Objectors: Jasmina Daniel
 Sam Baars
 Darren Gearing

Members unanimously agreed the Officer's recommendation to refuse advertisement consent for the reason outlined in the report.

Decision

That planning permission be **REFUSED**, for the following reasons:-

1. The advertising hoarding sign by reason of its size and siting would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area in general and would impact on the character of the Little High Street Conservation Area especially with regards to important open spaces, TPO trees, the siting and setting of adjacent listed buildings and a building of architectural merit. The proposal would therefore be contrary to H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Application Number: AWDM/0598/18	
Site:	Durrington Cemetery, Findon Road, Worthing
Proposal:	Change of use of existing field to burial area in connection with an extension to existing cemetery including associated roadways, footpaths and associated features and services.

Councillor Edward Crouch sat in the public gallery when the application for Durrington Cemetery was considered.

The Planning Services Manager outlined the application for Members' consideration, advising further consultation responses had been received since despatch of the agenda.

The Environment Agency (EA) raised no objection, subject to three conditions; groundwater monitoring to take place, the location of burial to be outside the groundwater protection zone and the management burial spacing plan be agreed. Southern Water had raised no objection at the application stage, and the West Sussex County Council archaeologist raised no objection, subject to a suitable programme of mitigation works which the Officer stated could also be secured by condition.

Members were shown an aerial view of the site, together with photographs and advised the Officer's recommendation was to grant permission, to include the additional conditions outlined.

Decision

That planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to the following 5 conditions and additional conditions 6 to 9 agreed by the Committee:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Full Permission
3. No development approved by this permission shall commence until full details for the disposal of surface water has been approved by the Planning Authority, and the Environment Agency
4. Hard and Soft Landscaping
5. Approval of Materials
6. Groundwater monitoring
7. Location of burial outside the groundwater protection zone
8. Management burial spacing plan
9. Programme of archaeological mitigation