

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/1618/23</b>	<b>Recommendation - Delegate for approval subject to completion of a s106 Agreement and receipt of comments from consultees.</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>Union Place Car Park, Union Place, Worthing, West Sussex.</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Application under Regulation 3 Construction of a mixed-use development between 4 and 11 storeys, comprising 216 residential apartments (including 20% Affordable Housing), of which 6 comprise Live/Work Units at Union Place, together with commercial ground floor space at High Street, associated residential car parking, cycle parking, communal residential gardens and vehicular access from Chatsworth Road. In addition, provision of a replacement public car park accessed from Union Place, and new public realm provision.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Roffey Homes Ltd</b>	<b>Ward: Central</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>ECE Planning</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>James Appleton</b>	

The Head of Planning and Development presented the report, introducing the Planning Consultant who was attending the meeting with him to assist with responding to any Member questions. The Officer explained that there was a previous outline planning permission granted for this site in 2020 subject to the completion of a planning agreement.

The current application was submitted under Regulation 3 and the Officer clarified for Members that this meant the applicant had submitted an application but they didn't own the site as the Council was the majority landowner of the site. This revised scheme was considered an improvement on the previous outline scheme in both height, scale and massing and design.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding the loss of car parking with the removal of the NCP car park. The Officer confirmed for Members that the other town centre car parks had spare capacity, the NCP car park would be re-provided, albeit with less spaces. He also stated that the NCP car park currently gives over a number of its spaces to the post office and therefore the reduction in public spaces on the site was not significant.

In response to Members' questions regarding the affordable housing element of the scheme, the Officer explained that the scheme was required to comply with a 10% requirement for affordable home ownership (NPPF and Local Plan requirement) and this automatically increased the shared ownership aspect. However the Officer went on to say that the rented apartments would be set at local housing allowance level which would enable people from the Council's housing list to be nominated. The Officer also highlighted that to have 20% affordable on a brownfield site such as this is quite unique in

view of the viability issues of delivering affordable housing. He clarified for Members that as far as possible all affordable dwellings would be contained in the same blocks to allow for reduced service charges for the occupants.

Members also raised queries regarding the security on the site and drew attention to the police comments within the report. The Officer clarified that the public and private areas around the site were very obvious which would avoid non residents encroaching on the private areas. The Committee suggested that some of the CIL could be used to provide lighting on the footpath from Chapel Road to the service areas behind the shops.

There were two registered speakers giving representations objecting to the application. They raised concerns over the taller elements of the scheme being overbearing and impacting on the light of the neighbouring properties. The design was also of a concern to the objectors and they felt that the scheme did not reflect the heritage aspects of the area and would like to see some more classical additions to the scheme.

There were three registered speakers who gave representations supporting the application. They drew attention to the reduced scale and set back position of the taller elements of the scheme, alleviating any significant loss of light and overbearing aspect to the neighbouring properties. They explained that, rather than copy existing heritage aspects they had attempted to make a contemporary interpretation of them and demonstrated how the use of white bricks was intended to compliment the white stucco elements of St Pauls and Elm House. In response to a Member query as to why underground parking had not been considered they explained that underground car parking involves a massive cost and whilst this is a viable option on high end sea front properties it is not suitable for town centre lower value sites.

During debate Members concurred that the design and revised scheme was highly satisfactory. In addition, the amount of affordable housing offered was very favourable. Whilst there would be some impact on neighbouring properties this must be balanced with the need for homes and so a proposal was put forward to accept the Officers revised recommendation. This was seconded and voted in favour of unanimously.

**Decision - Approve the Revised Recommendation and delegate to the Head of Planning and Development to approve subject to revised plans addressing the HSE comments, the further comments of the LLFA and the completion of the planning obligation, archaeological Condition to be amended to Watching Brief and the following conditions.**

1. Standard List of Plans and documents
2. Time limit – 3 years for implementation.
3. Submission of Sustainability Plan incorporating the measures outlined in the submitted Energy Statement Report.
4. Details of an energy solution for the development which shall be designed to allow future connection to a District Heat Network if a viable solution is implemented within 3 years of the completion of the development.
5. Details of external materials.
6. Submission of a Construction Management Plan including details of hours of working, and controls to limit disturbance from noise, vibration and dust and a

- communications strategy to engage with adjoining neighbours pre and post construction activities on site.
7. Hard and soft landscaping plans
  8. Landscaping Condition – requiring replacement of trees to be lost by the development to be replaced by heavy standard trees.
  9. Tree protection details for the retained lime tree.
  10. Travel Plan details.
  11. BNG of minimum 10% net gain and management plan to secure delivery and future maintenance.
  12. Submission of external lighting strategy and management plan
  13. Archaeological Investigation and watching brief.
  14. Existing and proposed levels relative to a nearby datum point.
  15. Access in accordance with approved details
  16. Parking and cycling to be provided in accordance with the approved plan.
  17. Provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points
  18. Submission of foul and surface water drainage solution including SuDS
  19. Submission of drainage verification drawings
  20. Ground Contamination Survey and Remediation
  21. Protection of existing surface water sewers (SWA)
  22. Noise assessment and mitigation measures to be implemented to protect proposed dwellings from noise from Class E uses and existing night club.
  23. Noise assessment and implementation of mitigation measures to protect adjoining residents from noise from the proposed car park.