

Application No. AWDM/0256/20	
Site:	<b>88 Salvington Hill, Worthing</b>
Proposal:	Proposed two-storey 2no. bedroom house with attached garage to rear garden of 88 Salvington Hill with access onto Firsdawn Road. Including associated landscaping and bin store.

The Head of Planning and Development shared his screen and ran through the presentation. Members were shown an aerial photograph of the site and advised the proposal was for a detached 2 bedroom dwelling within the rear garden of 88 Salvington Hill.

The Officer indicated the application site on the aerial photograph and the row of mature leylandii trees along the southern boundary, and produced further photographs to assist Members in their consideration of the application.

The Officer indicated the location of the neighbouring bungalow, 'Sunrise', mentioned in the report, immediately to the east, on the corner of Firsdawn Road and Firsdawn Close and its relationship with 88 Salvington Hill and the proposed two bedroom property.

A more detailed layout plan was shown to Members and the Officer advised the proposal would be set five metres back from the road, with a new crossover providing access to a garage immediately next to the substation.

The Officer referred to the various trees on site, and advised some existing shrubbery on the eastern boundary would be removed to make way for the proposed dwelling. With regard to the leylandii trees along the frontage of the site, a number would be removed to be replaced with a mixed border, the detail of which would be covered in a landscaping condition.

The Officer concluded his presentation by showing a first floor plan of the proposal and proposed elevations. He referred Members to the refused application considered in 2004, which was for a larger proposal, and the reasons as outlined in the report. The Officer stated the key issues for Members to consider were whether the revised scheme addressed the previous grounds for refusal.

Members raised queries with the Officer on the presentation for clarification and these were answered in turn by the Officer.

There was a further representation from an objector who had elected to join the meeting.

The Chairman opened the debate and Members raised a number of issues, which in summary included:-

- the Design and Access Statement - the lack of a commitment to carbon reduction through energy efficiency and sustainability;
- landscape condition to maximise biodiversity and air quality;
- comparison with previously refused scheme; and
- car parking safety.

Following debate, a vote was taken by roll call. The first proposal to defer the application to allow the applicant to submit a revised Design and Access Statement which amongst other things would include a commitment to build to UK Passivhaus standards failed.

For: Cllrs Jim Deen, Paul High & Helen Silman

Against: Cllrs Noel Atkins, Paul Baker, Martin McCabe, Paul Westover & Steve Wills

Abstentions: 0

There followed a proposal to reject the application on environmental and biodiversity grounds and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Baker, Deen, High, McCabe, Silman, Westover and Wills

Against: 0

Abstention: Councillor Noel Atkins

## **Decision**

The Officer's recommendation to approve the application was overturned and **REFUSED** on environmental and biodiversity grounds.

Application No. AWDM/0286/20	
Site:	<b>Flat 1, 12 Warwick Gardens, Worthing</b>
Proposal:	Retention of a timber bike shed in west front garden (Retrospective Application) (Re-submission of AWDM/1537/19).

*Cllr Jim Deen had requested the application come before the committee.*

The Head of Planning and Development introduced the report which was a proposal by way of a retrospective application to retain a bike shed in the front garden of 12 Warwick Gardens. Members were shown an aerial photograph of the site, together with a number of photographs to assist Members in their consideration of the matter.

The Officer stated the key issue was the proposal's effect on the character and visual amenities of the conservation area. There had been a previous refusal in 2019 for retention of the bike store.

The Officer referred Members to the final paragraph on page 17 of the report which he advised should be corrected to state - conservation areas are areas of special architectural or historical interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve and enhance.

The Officer's recommendation was to refuse the application.

There was a further representation from the applicant who had elected to join the meeting.

Some Members raised queries on the speaker's representation for clarification.

Following discussion, the Committee Members agreed to delegate the decision to the Head of Planning and Development to approve the application once the height of the bike store had been reduced.

A vote was taken by roll call. The proposal put forward was to delegate the decision to the Head of Planning and development to approve the application and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Atkins, Baker, Deen, High, McCabe, Silman, Westover & Wills

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

## **Decision**

The Officer's recommendation to refuse the application was overturned and Members agreed to delegate **APPROVAL** to the Head of Planning and Development to secure amended plans reducing the height of the cycle store to the minimum required to store 2 bikes (1.2 to 1.4 metres high). Any enforcement action to be delayed to ensure that the existing structure on the site can be altered to accommodate the Committee's requirements.