

Minutes of a meeting of the
Worthing Planning Committee
29 May 2019
at 6.30 pm

Councillor Paul High
Councillor Noel Atkins (Vice-Chairman)

** Councillor Paul Baker
Councillor Karen Harman
Councillor Helen Silman

Councillor Jim Deen
Councillor Martin McCabe
Councillor Steve Wills

** Absent

Officers: Head of Planning and Development, Lawyer and Senior Democratic Services Officer

WBC-PC/001/19-20 Substitute Members

Councillor Daniel Humphreys substituted for Councillor Paul Baker.

WBC-PC/002/19-20 Declarations of Interest

Councillors Paul High and Noel Atkins declared that they were members of West Sussex County Council.

Councillor Noel Atkins declared an interest in application AWDM/0317/19 as the Ward Councillor who had called in the application.

Councillors Karen Harman and Steve Wills declared an interest in application AWDM/0416/19 as Ward Councillors for Castle Ward.

WBC-PC/003/19-20 Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 27 March 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

WBC-PC/004/19-20 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

WBC-PC/005/19-20 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

WBC-PC/006/19-20 Enforcement Report

The Head of Planning and Development presented a report to Committee, outlining a complaint in connection with graffiti/artwork on the following listed buildings:-

- 28 Warwick Street; and
- The New Amsterdam Public House

Consideration was given to whether the artwork was harmful to the listed buildings and whether the artwork set a dangerous precedent for the town.

The Committee was asked to consider whether:-

1. it was not expedient to take action;
2. the artwork should be painted over; or
3. a retrospective listed building application should be sought.

Whilst debating the matter, the Committee gave consideration to a number of issues, including:-

- how to distinguish between graffiti and artwork;
- the artwork being a tourist attraction to the town;
- did the artwork detract from the look of the listed buildings;
- had the artwork damaged the listed buildings in anyway;
- what constituted a proportionate response.

A representation was received from Susan Belton, Chairman of the Worthing Society.

Decision

The Committee agreed that it was not expedient to remove any of the artwork as it did not affect the character or the special architectural or historical interest of the buildings.

WBC-PC/007/19-20 Public Question Time

Susan Belton, a worthing resident, asked a question regarding the time allocated to speakers for major development planning applications. It was suggested that 3 minutes did not allow sufficient time to cover all the points associated with such applications but 5 minutes would.

The Chairman advised that he could use his discretion in regards to the length of time given to speakers and that he would consider allowing more time for speakers when the Committee considered major development planning applications in the future.

The meeting ended at 8:40pm

Application No. AWDM/0317/19	
Site:	Land West of 70 Parham Road, Worthing
Proposal:	Erection of detached single-storey 2-bedroom dwelling on land to west of No.70 Parham Road with associated landscaping, 2no. car parking spaces and reinstatement of existing vehicular access on land to the south. resubmission of AWDM/1377/18.

The Head of Planning and Development presented the application for the Committee, providing pictures of the site, an outline of the site plan and due consideration was given to the elevations by the Committee. The Committee was advised of a letter, which had been received from the Findon Valley Residents Association, raising concerns about the impact on adjoining properties, loss of privacy and seclusion and the width of the driveway.

Officers believed that the site was too small to accommodate the proposed dwelling and had therefore recommended that the application be refused.

Members sought clarification as to whether the driveway was wide enough to enable a vehicle to turn. Officers advised that it was not.

A representation was received from the applicant, Mr Neil Roberts.

During debate, Members considered whether there were any similar development in the locality, the footprint of the site in relation to the boundary with Durrington Cemetery, emergency service access to the site, the appropriateness of the proposed development for the site and the need for more family homes in the Borough.

Decision

The Committee agreed that the bungalow was sited and of a similar size to the application which was refused in 2018, although now proposed a two bedroom dwelling. The site was constrained and cramped and inadequate to provide a dwelling without significant harm on the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring residential properties and impact on future residents. Therefore, the Committee **REFUSED** the application on the following grounds:

1. The proposal dwelling is a piecemeal, tandem, backland development which is surrounded by residential development and sits tight in the plot and is on elevated ground. By reason of its inherent form, size, siting and location, it is a discordant, contrived and awkward form of building that relates poorly to the urban grain, plot pattern and street character, lacking any meaningful sense of place or sympathy with local distinctiveness and would be visible as such from Parham Road. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policy H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, Policies 8 and 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, the Guide to Residential Development SPD 2013 and the NPPF.

2. The proposal by reason of its siting, form and design and the topography would unacceptably harm the amenity of the neighbouring residents in terms of general noise and disturbance from domestic activities, perception of overlooking to gardens and loss of outlook, in particular 70 Parham Road. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policy H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, the Guide to Residential Development SPD 2013 and the NPPF

3. By reason of the constrained site and the resulting cramped form of development with inadequate space around the dwelling is likely to lead to unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. The site is therefore unsuitable to accommodate a dwelling and is therefore contrary to policy 8 of the Worthing Core Strategy, the 'Space Standards SPD' and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Application No. AWDM/0269/19	
Site:	Worthing High School South Farm Road Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of existing caretaker's dwelling (No.103 South Farm Road) and replacement with two-storey performing arts centre and single-storey entrance. Two-storey classroom block to replace existing single-storey classroom block to rear of school.

The Head of Planning and Development presented the application to the Committee. This included pictures of the site and plans of the proposed development.

The proposed development was separated by a 7m gap from the neighbouring flats and there was a dedicated pedestrian entrance.

It was noted that an objection had been received from the occupier of 101 South Farm Road commenting that the new building would overlook their property and block receipt of natural light and affect privacy.

It was the Officers view that the proposed development would not have any detrimental impacts on neighbours amenities and the application was recommended for approval.

Members raised the following issues in relation to the application:-

- Whether an additional condition requiring a quality management plan should be included;
- What assurances had been given about sound insulation of the building;
- Concerns regarding associated noise with people leaving the building at 11.00pm at night;
- The need to undertake a ground condition survey;
- The quality of air within the building and the use of renewable / sustainable systems;
- Whether the school's travel plan would be amended to reflect the proposed development;
- The provision of site visits for larger applications.

The queries were answered in turn by Officers.

There were no further representations received at the meeting.

It was proposed that an additional condition be added to require a metal guard barrier be installed on the pavement outside the new pedestrian access onto South Farm Road to prevent children running into the road. In addition, an informative should also be added requesting the school amend its existing travel plan to relate to the new development. Officers also agreed to investigate the scope for screening along the southern boundary, adjacent to 99-101 South Farm Road.

Proposals to change the hours of use of the Performing Art Centre by outside bodies and to limit the hours of construction, were not supported by the Committee.

Decision

The Committee Members agreed to delegate to the Head of Planning and Development to **APPROVE** the application subject to no additional third party representations received by 6 June 2019 and the following conditions and informative:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Agree materials (including windows) and architectural details
4. Construction of the Performing Arts Centre shall not commence on the site unless and until a scheme for controlling noise emissions from the building has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be designed to achieve a noise level from the development of no more than 45dB(A) $Leq,1min$ at any boundary of the site.
5. Windows and doors in the auditorium and music rooms shall be kept closed at all time when these rooms/facilities are in use. No external plant shall be fixed to the Performing Art Centre unless and until an attenuation scheme has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall have regard to the principles of BS4142: 2014 and ensure there is no detrimental impact to the amenity of the nearest residential dwellings. A test to demonstrate compliance with the scheme shall be undertaken within one month of the scheme being implemented. All plant shall be maintained in accordance with manufacturer's guidance and any future plant shall also meet the specified levels within the approved scheme.
6. Full contamination condition (Performing Arts Centre)
7. Construction Method Statement and Plan
8. Hours of Construction
9. External lighting to be agreed prior to first occupation
10. Agree tree protection measures during construction (Performing Arts Centre)
11. Agree supplementary soft landscaping to South Farm Road frontage
12. Agree and implement details of new wall opening for pedestrian access. Block up existing pedestrian opening in matching materials
13. Agree and implement surface water drainage scheme
14. The use of the Performing Arts Centre and new student entrance should not commence unless and until a metal guard barrier has been installed on the pavement outside the new pedestrian access onto South Farm Road in accordance with details of its siting and design which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the local Highway Authority.

Informative:

1. The school amend its existing Travel Plan to relate to the new development.

Application No. AWDM/0416/19	
Site:	10 The Boulevard Worthing West Sussex BN13 1LB
Proposal:	Conversion of and rear extension to existing garage on side south elevation with revisions to roof design of permitted rear extension (re-submission of AWDM/1869/18).

The Head of Planning and Development presented the application to Committee, including pictures of the site, the block plan and advised that the proposed increase in height of the side extension was from 2.83m to 3.00m. It was noted that this would usually be a delegated matter but had come before committee due to objections received in regards to the proposed increase in height.

The Committee was informed that there was a requirement to sequence the completion of the rear extension (under permitted development rights) prior to construction of the side extension. Officers did not consider the difference in height merited refusal.

There were further representations from:-

In objection: Councillor Lionel Harman (Ward Councillor)
 Alan Thomson

In support: Sai Giridhaar (Applicant)

A Member raised concerns about the extension remaining ancillary to the use of the main house and that it could be used as a separate unit of accommodation instead.

Officers advised that there was nothing unusual about the approach to planning and that the increase in height, from 2.83m to 3.00m, was the matter to be considered by the Committee. In regards to the use of the extension, Members were advised that an annex would be fine but the extension couldn't become a second address.

Decision

The Committee Members **APPROVED** the application, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No windows in south flank wall of extension
5. Extension and converted garage to be ancillary to the main use of No.10 The Boulevard and not to be used as a separate dwelling

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The extension approved under AWDM/1834/18 has to be completed before works commence on the extension approved under this permission.
3. Party Wall Act standard informative

Application No. AWDM/0622/19	
Site:	Cafe Central Pavilion Beach House Park Lyndhurst Road Worthing
Proposal:	Replace existing double timber front entrance doors with aluminium double-glazed double doors to south elevation.

The Head of Planning and Development presented an application to the Committee.

There were no further representations received at the meeting.

Decision

The Committee **APPROVED** the application, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Standard Time Limit