

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/1906/22</b>	<b>Recommendation - To APPROVE subject to completion of a planning obligation</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>Development Site At Former Debenhams Store 14 To 20 South Street And Iceland Car Park, Marine Place, Worthing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Redevelopment of the former Debenhams Building (including site over existing Iceland Car Park) to comprise a mixed use development including commercial floor space (Use Class E) at ground, part first and part second floor level, and 80 residential 1-2 bedroom flats from first floor to upper levels including the addition of two floors above Debenhams and Iceland sites with amenity spaces including sky lounge, home-working suite, storage lockers and bike store for residents.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Craig Developments Ltd</b>	<b>Ward: Central</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>ECE Planning Limited</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>James Appleton</b>	

The Head of Planning and Development presented the application explaining how it had been deferred from the committee meeting in June 2023 as the Members required more fire safety information. The Health and Safety Executive had now given their formal response and the applicant had submitted a slightly amended plan which addressed their concerns. He confirmed that an additional flat had been added to the plans, by way of splitting a large flat into two, plus a second staircase.

The Officer outlined the contents of the addendum which contained a representation that had been submitted after the agenda had been published. The addendum also addressed concerns over viability issues. The Officer confirmed for members that, should any profit be made, over seventeen and a half percent, the Council would receive this money, subject to the financial review to be included in the s106 Agreement.

The Officer clarified the situation regarding the legal ownership of the Seaspray fire escape and confirmed that the legal dispute should not be considered a planning matter.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding the split of the £150,000 contribution from the applicant, the timing of the planned construction and the Travel Plan.

There was one registered speaker who gave a representation in objection to the application. She addressed issues such as road safety concerns and the current Seaspray fire escape being inadequate for the increase of residents that would be using it in an emergency situation.

There were two registered speakers, the agent and the applicant, who gave representations in support of the application. They explained that, despite the issue not being a planning concern, they did have legal ownership of the Seaspray fire escape and

that they had provided the documents to the council. In response to Members' concerns the applicant confirmed they would be in a position to financially complete the scheme, they responded that they had complete confidence and as a result had already bought the building and had begun stripping it down internally. Another member enquired whether the one bedroom flats that also contained a study would ever be marketed as two bedroom properties, to which the applicant replied in the negative.

During debate members concurred that despite still having concerns regarding the lack of affordable housing the application was a favourable one which sat well with the new Local Plan and to delay the start of construction any further would only put the project at an increased risk of failing due to viability.

A proposal was made to **approve** as per the revised recommendation. This was seconded and voted on with a unanimously in favour outcome.

Decision delegated for approval subject to the completion of a s106 agreement securing affordable housing and travel plan contributions and a post development viability review and subject to conditions:-

1. Development in accordance with the approved Plans...
2. Development in 3 years.
3. Use Restriction Class E.
4. Detailed drawings, including sections, of windows to be submitted.
5. Specification of Materials.
6. Detailed design of certain elements (to be identified).
7. Sectional drawings of new window reveals.
8. Opaque glass and screening to be installed prior to occupation and retained for the lifetime of the development.
9. Hours of Building Work
10. Site Waste Management Plan in line with Waste Mitigation strategy set out in sustainability report.
11. Construction Management Plan (including dust management - as per air quality assessment).
12. Flood Resilience measures.
13. SUDS design and implementation.
14. SUDS maintenance.
15. Provision of waste storage prior to occupation.
16. Provision of cycle storage prior to occupation.
17. Implementation of energy efficiency measures.
18. Details of renewable energy measures.
19. Proposals to be 'network ready' for connection to a future communal heating network.
20. Noise conditions in accordance with noise report.
21. Travel Plan (including implementation of sustainable transport strategy as set out at para 4.4 of Transport Assessment)

#### *Informatives*

Southern Water, WSCC Highways and note from Emergency Planning Officer

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0653/23</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>Shelter South Of West Buildings, The Promenade, Marine Parade, Worthing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Demolition of existing public shelter and redevelopment to provide two Use Class E(b) restaurants set over two floors.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Other Nextcolour Ltd	Ward: Central
<b>Agent:</b>	Geraint John Planning Limited	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Gary Peck	

The Planning Services Manager presented the report explaining that a permission had been granted in 2019 but this had now lapsed and so a fresh application was before the committee today.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding the safety aspects of building on the beach, heritage issues and what travel planning had been done regarding deliveries etc.

There were four registered speakers who spoke in objection to the application, including a Ward Councillor. Their representations dealt with heritage issues and how the proposed structure would be out of keeping with the character of the Worthing seafront. The shelter that would be demolished if the application was approved was circa. 1920's and as well as being listed in Worthing Borough's list of Local Interest buildings, was also one of a pair.

Objectors had concerns that the construction of these restaurants would set a precedent for more tall buildings on the beach. They considered the application to be overdevelopment of the site and contrary to DM23 and DM24 of the Local Plan.

The planning consultant spoke as a registered speaker supporting the application. He reiterated points within the report regarding the alterations to the scheme colouring and the regeneration and new investment aspects outweighing any heritage concerns.

During debate members concurred that the current shelter, although in need of some repair and restoration, was a part of Worthing's historic seascape and this project would see a significant harm to our heritage. It was noted that an application for new beach huts had, relatively recently, been rejected with the purpose of keeping a clear seascape.

A proposal to refuse the application was put forward which was seconded and voted on with a unanimously in favour outcome.

The Committee resolved to **REFUSE** the application on the grounds that the proposed development by virtue of its overall scale, design and massing would fail to enhance the character of the site and prevailing character of the area, detract from the appearance of

the seafront and Conservation Area and fail to protect, preserve and enhance the setting of heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies DM5, DM23 and DM24 of the Worthing Local Plan and paragraphs 130, 134 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/1240/21</b>	<b>Recommendation: APPROVE subject to the receipt of additional information</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>Buckingham Road, Multi Storey Car Park, Buckingham Road, Worthing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Installation of a new facade and fall-protection system and new signage to the car park building. Enhancements to the existing street level public realm beneath the car park overhang, by refreshing the decoration, lighting and flooring.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Worthing Borough Council</b>	<b>Ward: Central</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen Cantwell</b>	

The Head of Planning and Development presented the report and addressed the changes within the addendum regarding the mesh fencing design proposed for the top floor of the car park. The Officer also drew the committee's attention to some additional representations that had been received since the report publication.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding the thickness and design of the mesh fencing. The Officer clarified that the mesh was made of galvanised steel and 2 metres high to avoid anyone being able to climb up it. However, the contractors had indicated that the size of the mesh was such that it could still be climbed and therefore a cranked top was proposed to make the mesh harder to climb. The Officer felt that this cranked top was not visually acceptable for the top floor appearing like a security fence and therefore a condition was recommended to require details to be submitted. It was likely that a smaller mesh would be required to make it harder to climb.

During debate Members concurred that it was important to get the car park open again, particularly with Christmas approaching. They agreed that with the car park being closed it had become an area for anti-social behaviour and it was hoped that would cease once it was open again.

A proposal to accept the revised recommendation, was put forward, seconded and voted on in favour of unanimously. Members also asked Officers to alert the applicant to keep residents engaged throughout construction.

Revised Recommendation in the addendum agreed subject to the receipt of satisfactory information requested in this report, to **Approve** the amended application subject to the following conditions:

1. Adherence to approved final plans
2. Standard time limit of 3 years for implementation
3. Prior to the commencing work on any of the proposed mesh fencing on the top floor of the car park, precise details of the design and size of the proposed mesh and supporting framework shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the LPA. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.

