

<b>Application Numbers:</b>	<b>i) AWDM/1847/22 ii) AWDM/1848/22 LBC</b>	<b>Recommendations - i) Refuse planning permission ii) Approve Listed Building Consent</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>14 Ambrose Place, Worthing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<p><b>i) Demolition of existing garage and construction of new two-storey pitched roof garage building with solar panels and roof lights to the East and West (Side) roof slopes. Proposed installation of new windows, installation of glass frameless balustrade over light well to the rear and new rear dormer with roof lights to existing Grade II Listed dwelling house.</b></p> <p><b>ii) Application for Listed Building Consent for proposed demolition of existing garage and proposed internal alterations, installation windows, installation of glass frameless balustrade over light well to the rear and new rear dormer with roof lights to roof slope to Grade II listed dwelling house.</b></p>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Mr A Coombes</b>	<b>Ward: Central</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Saville Jones Architects</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Marie O’Keeffe</b>	

The Head of Planning and Development presented the report explaining to Members the reasons for the recommendation of refusal. He stated that the applicant was keen to connect to the planned District Heat Network and once this happened the Air Source Heat pumps proposed in the application would not be needed.

There were two speakers who gave representations in support of the application, the applicant and the agent.

The applicant stated he had worked with renewable energy for many years in his career and was keen to encourage communities to think long term regarding balancing retaining our heritage assets whilst using more sustainable energy solutions. He explained how a single storey unit would not allow the PV panels to provide enough power during the winter months. Once the heat network had arrived the house would still require phenomenal energy consumption to negate its heritage deficiencies so the PV panels would still be needed.

The Architect explained how the design of the application was a direct response to the climate emergency. He assured the Committee that they were happy to use reclaimed bricks in the interest of retaining the heritage aesthetics of the area.

During debate the Members acknowledged the difficulty of balancing the benefits of supporting the use of greener energy against the perceived harm to heritage assets.

Some considered that, in comparison with the current unattractive garage building, the proposal would improve the streetscape although it was thought that there were still some design changes desired to blend it in with the old wall that fronted Richmond Road. It was agreed that heritage houses needed to be brought into the 21st century to be maintained. It was discussed that granting permission for this application did not set a precedent for further 2 storeys buildings on the same road as any application would be considered on their individual merits. Members also had regard to the rather unattractive flank wall of the adjoining building and that the current driveway and garage affected the setting of the listed building.

A proposal to approve the application, grant planning permission and delegate back to officers to ensure the appearance of the structure blended as seamlessly as possible with the rest of the heritage streetscape. This was seconded and voted on with an outcome of 5 votes in favour, 2 votes against and 1 abstention.

**i) AWDM/1847/22** - Recommendation overturned, decision to be delegated to Head of Planning to secure design improvements to the front elevation (based on extending the existing boundary wall in line with the recently approved single garage and reducing the size of the proposed roller shutter door) and amended plans showing the revised location of air source heat pumps. Note to applicant to be added to encourage future connection to the District Heat Network).

Members felt that the benefits of providing renewable energy for this important listed building outweighed the harm to its setting. In reaching this decision Members felt that it would not set a precedent as the current gap in the wall and view of the flank wall of the adjoining two storey building were relevant mitigating factors. In addition the level of harm to the setting of the listed building was at the lower end of less than substantial as the loss of views to the rear of the listed building were limited and this was a secondary elevation (compared to the grandeur of the south elevation).

The recommendations to approve listed building consent was voted in favour of with a unanimous vote.

**ii) AWDM/1848/LBC** - Recommendation agreed decision to be delegated to Head of Planning to clarify LBC description and ensure amended plans delete elements withdrawn (removal of the ceiling, boxing in of chimney breast and loss of rear sash window).