

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Worthing Planning Committee
23 August 2023
at 6.30 pm**

Councillor Andy Whight (Chair)
Councillor Ödül Bozkurt (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Helen Abrahams
Councillor Noel Atkins
Councillor Russ Cochran

Councillor Samuel Theodoridi
Councillor Rosey Whorlow
*Councillor Dan Coxhill

*Absent

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

WBC-PC/22/23-24 Substitute Members

Councillor Nigel Morgan substituted for Councillor Dan Coxhill.

WBC-PC/23/23-24 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Noel Atkins declared an interest as an elected member of West Sussex County Council in relation to any issues that may affect West Sussex. In relation to Item 8, the appeal update regarding 113 Salvington Road, he declared he was a Ward Councillor of Salvington and a member and deacon of The New Life Church.

WBC-PC/24/23-24 Public Question Time

There were no pre submitted questions received from the public.

WBC-PC/25/23-24 Members Questions

There were no pre submitted questions from Members.

WBC-PC/26/23-24 Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 12 July be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

WBC-PC/27/23-24 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

WBC-PC/28/23-24 Planning Applications

Application Number:	AWDM/1664/22	Recommendation - APPROVE
Site:	Chatsmore House, Goring Street, Worthing	
Proposal:	Installation of a hydraulic lift to both buildings as well as alterations to the site with 12 parking spaces, a new bin store and new bike stores.	
Applicant:	Mr Martin Nathan	Ward:Goring
Agent:	Mr Ian Knight, Knight Architectural Design	
Case Officer:	Rebekah Hincke	

The Planning Service Manager presented the report explaining that there had been no further representations since the agenda had been published. The Officer highlighted an amendment on page 14 of the report, where it stated the class was AD, it should have read class A, the difference being that the impact upon neighbouring premises could also be taken into account.

Members enquired how many of the residents had objected and the Officer clarified that residents in fourteen of the eighteen residences had submitted objections.

There were three registered speakers present who gave representations in objection, one resident and two Ward Councillors. In addition there was a statement from a third Ward Councillor that was read out by the Officer.

All four representations voiced concerns that the additional twelve parking spaces proposed would reduce the visual amenity of the residents. It was also raised that, as these spaces were not planned to be allocated parking, there would be very little deterrent to non-residents parking in them. An additional concern was that adding twelve parking spaces was not in line with the council's policy of encouraging sustainable travel, particularly considering that the property was close to both the train station and bus routes. The planned cycle racks were a cause for disquiet as they could encourage non-residential use and were to be sited extremely close to a window of one of the flats, resulting in a loss of light and privacy for that resident. The lift shaft within the plans was thought to also detract from the visual amenity of residents.

One Ward Councillor addressed the areas of the Local Plan that he and the objectors felt the application did not align with, those being DM5 (Adversely affecting amenity), DM15 (Overprovision of parking), DM18 (Not increasing biodiversity) and DM19 (trees not being replaced on a greater than 1:1 basis).

There was one registered speaker, the agent, who gave a representation in support of the application. He explained to members that this application was a precursor to a future plan of adding two floors on top of the existing blocks, providing much needed two bedroom homes in the area. He described that the proposal also added an eighteen cycle storage rack where none existed currently, EV charging points and additional landscaping with a potential for adding up to 40% biodiversity. In addition the applicant planned to add electrification to the

current garages via solar panels. He clarified that the installation and future maintenance costs of the lift would only be borne by the residents of the twelve additional flats.

In response to Members queries regarding the parking allocation the agent explained that the West Sussex County Council prescribed one space per residence in this area. He also clarified that although none of the spaces were allocated as disabled parking some of them were of a disabled provision size.

Members were concerned about any possible noise and vibration caused by the lifts and the agents explained that the planned lifts were to be of a hydraulic system, which produced no noise and the doors would have a whisper system, which, again, was virtually silent. The applicant had advised that the installation of the lift would reduce the light in that area by 10% and had confirmed that disturbance from the construction would be minimal as much would be built offsite and lifted onto the existing building. He concluded by suggesting that the upgrades were estimated to add value to existing flats of approximately £50,000.

During debate Members discussed their concerns regarding the unsustainable aspects of the extra parking planned and the lack of adherence to the Local Plan. Despite the application being a precursor to the future expansion plans, policy prescribed that the application before them must be looked at independently. Members concurred that, on balance, the benefits to current residents did not outweigh the disadvantages.

A proposal to refuse was forwarded. This was seconded and voted on with a unanimous outcome.

Decision - **REFUSE** for the following reasons -

1. The proposed development by virtue of its siting and layout of the parking areas and cycle stores would adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring properties and the visual character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.
2. The proposed level of car parking would fail to prioritise sustainable modes of transport and would result in an over provision of car parking. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy DM15 of the Worthing Local Plan.
3. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that an acceptable level of biodiversity net gain can be achieved nor that the level of replacement tree planting is acceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM18 and DM19 of the Worthing Local Plan.

Application Number:	AWDM/0732/23	Recommendation - APPROVE
Site:	100 - 108 Montague Street, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 3HG	
Proposal:	Proposed extension to accommodate new dwelling with mansard roof with flat roof dormers and glass balustrade	
Applicant:	Mr Tom Collingwood	Ward: Central
Agent:	SAACT Ltd	
Case Officer:	Jacqueline Fox	

The Planning Services Manager presented the report explaining that this was a largely retrospective application but reminded Members that this fact should not be taken into account when considering the application. The Officer also clarified that there had been a change to the condition number two prescribing that the fence that had been erected be removed and replaced with obscured glazing as per the application.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding what maximum height of the screening could be prescribed by the committee. The officer responded that 1.8 (6 ft) would be a reasonable requirement.

There was one registered speaker who gave a representation in objection to the application. He raised concerns regarding the already overstretched parking in the area and the overlooking and noise aspect of the balcony.

During debate Members concurred with the Officers that the screen already erected was unacceptable and must be replaced with an obscured glass screen as well as be set back further from the edge of the roof as the application illustrations showed.

It was also suggested that constructing double skinned sides to the balcony could be assist in reducing noise

A proposal to accept the Officers recommendation, subject to the variance of the conditions, and approve the application was put forward. This was seconded and voted on with an outcome of 6 in favour, 0 against and 2 abstentions.

Decision - **APPROVE** and delegate to the Head of Development to amend condition 2 to require the removal of the existing unauthorised balcony screen and to require further details of the proposed balcony - these details shall include a minimum height of 1.8 metres and screening and the provision of non-glazed walls to the side to reduce noise impacts and the following Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans.
2. The obscure glazed balustrade to be provided prior to occupation.
3. Ventilation details.
4. Noise Assessment.
5. Bins provided.
6. Cycle storage.
7. Hours of work.

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. New Address
3. Formal application to Southern Water for connection to sewerage system
4. CIL

WBC-PC/29/23-24 Appeals Update

The appeals decisions were noted by members.

With regards to the Chatsmore Farm appeal update, Members unanimously agreed with the recommendation to oppose any further appeal on the following grounds, subject to any further comments from Counsel and to attach an additional refusal reason relating to Biodiversity Net Gain/infrastructure requirements.

1. The proposed development is outside of the built-up area as defined by the Worthing Local Plan (2023) and does not comprise development essential to the countryside nor does it comprise development of entry level exception sites. The proposed development also and would have an adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent South Downs National Park and therefore is contrary to paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy SS4 of the Worthing Local Plan.

2. The proposed development comprises development in a designated Local Green Gap which would undermine the physical and visual separation of Goring and Ferring therefore compromising the integrity of the gap. Further, the proposed development by virtue of its scale would fail to conserve and enhance the benefits and services derived from the area's Natural Capital nor maintain the site as part of a cohesive green infrastructure network. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy SS5 of the Worthing Local Plan (2023).

The meeting ended at 21.05 pm

Chair