

Minutes of a meeting of the
Worthing Planning Committee
25 July 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: Planning Services Manager, Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

WBC-PC/013/18-19 Substitute Members

There were no Substitute Members.

WBC-PC/014/18-19 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Hazel Thorpe declared a personal interest in Item 5.2, AWDM/0297/18, Durston House, 21 Chesterfield Road, Worthing, as she was acquainted with one of the registered speakers and associated with Field Place Residents' Association, but stated she had not predetermined her decision on the application.

Councillor Paul Westover declared a pecuniary interest in item 5.3, AWDM/0097/18, 31A Marine Parade, Worthing, following the Officer's presentation on the item, as he was the electrical contractor for the Seaspray flats above the Cow Shed and elected to leave the room while the remainder of the item was considered.

WBC-PC/015/18-19 Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 27 June 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

WBC-PC/016/18-19 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

WBC-PC/017/18-19 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

WBC-PC/018/18-19 Public Question Time

There were no questions raised under Public Question Time.

The meeting ended at 9:15 pm

Application No: AWDM/1518/17	
Site:	22 Lyndhurst Road, Worthing
Proposal:	Demolition of existing building and erection of three to four-storey block of 30 flats comprising 4no. one-bedroom, 24no. two-bedroom and 2no. three-bedroom units all with balconies with provision of bin and cycle storage and undercroft access to car parking area, new vehicular access onto Lyndhurst Road and removal of trees and associated landscaping.

This application was deferred at the March Committee meeting for further negotiation to seek to resolve design/bulk/massing concerns.

A supporting statement had been submitted by the agent outlining the changes to the previously submitted scheme.

The Planning Services Manager reported a further consultation response had been received from the Council's Conservation Architect since despatch of the agenda and reports. The Officer read out their statement for the Committee Members consideration.

In summary, the Conservation Architect had advised the original planning report considered at the March Committee meeting had identified concerns regarding height, massing, setting, form and detailing of the development scheme and the impact on the local character and townscape, including the Farncombe Road Conservation Area. The Conservation Architect stated the applicant had responded by making a small number of alterations to the design however, the height had remained unchanged. The applicant had also provided six images showing a Serial Vision Sequence to demonstrate the potential relationship between the proposed building and 22 Farncombe Road however, the views were of limited benefit due to the close proximity of the buildings. The Conservation Architect concluded the revisions to the scheme had not overcome objections to the development.

The Planning Services Manager also referred to Page 15 of the report regarding the temporary use by the Worthing Churches Homeless Project and clarified the context for Members.

Members were shown a block plan of the site, on the corner of Lyndhurst Road and Farncombe Road, together with the proposed ground floor plan and the Officer drew Members' attention to the numbered parking spaces. WSCC Highways continued to raise no objection to the proposal.

The Officer ran through the changes that were made to the scheme by showing Members before and after photo montages of the original scheme from various viewpoints. A Serial Vision Sequence had also been submitted by the applicant to give an idea of views from Farncombe Road which were of particular concern at the last meeting. The Officer concluded his presentation by showing previous and proposed elevations, and a number of photographs which Members had been shown at the last Committee meeting.

The Officer advised the recommendation was to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the report.

A couple of Members raised queries on the presentation which were answered in turn by the Officer to their satisfaction.

There were further representations from:-

Objectors: Susan Belton
Scott O'Connell

Supporter: Ben Cheal

Despite the changes made to the previously submitted scheme, the Committee Members still found the proposal overbearing in such an important and sensitive site and therefore unanimously agreed to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the report.

Decision

That the application be **REFUSED**, for the following reason:

1. The proposal would by reason of a combination of its siting, height, massing, footprint and form and prominence of the site appear unduly large and over-dominant in the street scene, particularly in relation to the corner and crossroads and Victorian villas in Farncombe Road. The detailing, additionally, unsympathetically relates fail to the character and appearance of the Victorian villas in Farncombe Road. As such, the proposal fails to achieve the quality of design expected on such an important and sensitive site and would harm the appearance and character of the Conservation Area as a heritage asset and wider townscape, contrary to Core Strategy Policy 16 and National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

Application No: 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).

This application was deferred by Members at the May meeting of the Committee for the following reasons:

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.

The Planning Services Manager advised there had been three further letters of objection since the report was written on the grounds of overdevelopment; the disregard of parking restrictions in the area; the inability for the foundations to support the additional building proposed; the existing garages being undersized; inadequate parking in the area and increased noise disturbance from the proposed balconies.

The Officer advised the proposed plans were unchanged from those previously shown at the May committee meeting however, he ran through them again for the sake of completeness. The Members were also shown a number of photographs of the subject building, the surrounding area and car parking to assist in their consideration of the application.

The Officer stated the application was deferred for investigation into room stacking and the existing garages being classed as parking spaces. He referred Members to the further consultation responses from the Environmental Health Officer and Highways within the report and advised the Officer's recommendation was to grant permission.

Some Committee Members raised a number of queries with the Officer, which included clarity on room stacking and possible noise impact on existing residents. These were answered in turn.

There were further representations from:-

Objectors: Vanya Obrastsoff-Rutinsky
Adil Sigantoria

Anne Romer

Ward Councillor: Cllr Lionel Harman

Following the registered speakers, Members began their debate on the proposal and fully sympathised with the existing residents' concerns. They felt the residents had been treated appallingly by the developer and were disappointed the developer had made no representation at either meeting.

During the debate, the Chairman referred the Committee Members to the 'material planning considerations' and advised that when making a decision on a planning application, only certain issues could be taken into account in terms of the reasons for refusing permission.

The Officer stated that as neither of the two authorities consulted had raised any objection, and having regard to Government policy, a refusal from the Committee in this instance would be hard to substantiate. However, a Member suggested the addition of extra planning conditions may mitigate some of the residents' concerns.

At the conclusion of the debate, the majority of the Members agreed the Officer's recommendation to grant permission, subject to amendments to condition 4, working hours to be 09:00-17:00 hours, with no working to include Saturdays; condition 6 to require public engagement on any scaffolding proposals before the development is implemented and an additional dust suppression condition.

Decision

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

1. Approved Plans
2. Development to commence within 3 years
3. Agree external materials prior to the commencement of development
4. All works of demolition and construction, including the use of plant and machinery and any deliveries or collections necessary for implementation of this consent shall be limited to the following times.

Monday Friday

09:00 -17:00 Hours

Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays no work permitted.

5. Construction work shall not commence until a scheme for protecting the proposed noise sensitive development from noise from the railway and station 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 test shall be carried out and the result submitted to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate compliance with the scheme.

6. 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,
 - public engagement on any scaffolding proposals before development is implemented.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the area.

7. Communal aerial
8. Sound insulation testing should be carried out between all dissimilar rooms to confirm compliance with Approved Document E specifications for new buildings.
9. Hard and Soft Landscaping
10. Parking area in accordance with approved plans and to be retained for occupiers of Durston House only
11. Dust suppression scheme.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.20pm and reconvened at 8:25pm.

Application No: AWDM/0097/18	
Site:	31A Marine Parade, Worthing
Proposal:	Provision of external seating area at front of premises consisting of 8 tables and 32 chairs together with 7 no. removable barriers/windbreaks.

This application was deferred at the April meeting of the Committee to seek the views of the Access & Mobility Forum on the proposals owing to concerns expressed by Committee Members about the slight camber of the built-out pavement area and the potential implications for people in wheelchairs and with other mobility problems having to use this section of the pavement as a result of the proposed tables and chairs being sited on the level section of existing pavement closest to the premises frontage.

The Planning Services Manager advised one further letter of objection had been received since despatch of the papers and summarised the content for Members.

The application site was shown on the aerial photograph and the Officer produced plans and photographs to assist in Members' consideration of the application.

The Officer advised a member of the Worthing Access Forum had visited the site and had objected to the proposals hence the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons given in the report.

There were further representations from:-

Objectors: Patricia Poole
Mandy Rice

Supporter: Sarah Christian

Councillor Paul Westover left the room at 8.35pm due to his pecuniary interest.

The Planning Services Manager advised Members that the speakers in objection had included within their representations, matters on the current use of the property and that enforcement investigations had recently commenced. The Officer reminded Members that those investigations should be treated as a separate matter to the planning application before them.

Following further discussion, some Committee Members were unsure whether the slight camber of the built-out pavement area would cause mobility problems however, the majority of Members felt expert advice from the Forum should not be dismissed and therefore voted to agree the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

Decision

That the application be **REFUSED**, for the following reason:-

The siting of the proposed external seating area on the level section of footway would be likely to cause an obstruction causing inconvenience for pedestrians, particularly those with mobility difficulties, interrupting the free-flow of pedestrian traffic at this point and unacceptably detracting from highway safety contrary to Strategic Objective 2 and Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Application No: AWDM/0676/18	
Site:	12 Hurston Close, Worthing
Proposal:	Proposed 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with 2 dormers to east elevation. Access off Hurston Close between no. 4 and 5. Associated parking and landscaping.

Councillor Paul Westover returned to the meeting.

The Planning Services Manager included within his presentation an aerial photograph of the application site, block plan and photographs and commented the site was an irregular-shaped 'backland' plot comprising part of the rear gardens of 12 Hurston Close and 66 Findon Road, now separately fenced off and unused.

The application had been the subject of negotiations with Officers and the recommendation was for approval.

A Member queried with the Officer whether a sprinkler system should be required and the Officer agreed to investigate this further.

There were no further representations at the meeting.

The Committee Members unanimously accept the Officer's recommendation to approve the application.

Decision

That the application be **APPROVED**, subject to confirmation that a sprinkler system would not be required due to the distance to the road, and the following conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Agree external materials and finishes
4. Agree and implement hard and soft landscaping scheme
5. Agree and implement boundary treatment
6. Agree surfacing materials for driveways, paths and patios
7. Agree finished floor levels of dwellings
8. Remove 'permitted development' entitlements for extensions and alterations (including roof extensions)
9. Agree and implement surface water drainage details

10. Use of garage restricted to parking of vehicles and cycle incidental to domestic use of property
11. Vehicle access, parking and turning provided prior to occupation
12. Agree and implement surface water drainage
13. Agree and implement construction method statement
14. Hours of work
15. No first-floor windows, rooflights or other openings inserted into north, west and south walls/roof slopes

Application No: AWDM/0494/18	
Site:	Chester House, 2B Longlands, Worthing
Proposal:	Retrospective application to remove condition 16 of previously approved AWDM/1425/13. Amendment to allow four first floor rear facing windows on the west side to be clear glazed and openable to new dwelling Chester House, 2B Longlands.

The Committee Members were shown an aerial photograph of the application site together with plans, and the Officer indicated the windows that were the subject of concern. The applicant had submitted photographs at the time of the application which were also shown to Members.

For the reasons set out in the report, the Officer felt there was no justification for the condition remaining and therefore recommended approval.

Two Members raised queries with the Officer which were answered in turn.

There were further representations from:-

Supporters: Stephen Cranford
 Barry Cranford

The Committee Members unanimously agreed the Officer's recommendation.

Decision

That the retrospective planning application be **GRANTED**, subject to:-

1. Approved Plans

Application No: AWDM/0779/18	
Site:	Grafton Multi Storey Car Park, Augusta Place, Worthing
Proposal:	Change of external finish from brickwork to white painted render on south elevation.

The Planning Services Manager advised the item had to be considered by the Planning Committee as the application had been submitted by the Council.

Members were shown an aerial photograph of the site, together with further photographs to identify the proposed works.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

Decision

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

1. Standard time
2. Approved Plans

On a separate matter, Members requested that an application be submitted to review the art installation on the car park which faced the seafront, as the Chairman believed it was to be a 3 month temporary installation. The Officer agreed to take the matter forward.