

Application Number: AWDM/0632/20	
Site:	Site at Former Canteen at Northbrook College, 1 Carnegie Road
Proposal:	Demolition and removal of the former College refectory building and construction of a two, three and four storey residential apartment block consisting of 23no. residential apartments (C3 use Class) (7 affordable) with vehicle parking, secure cycle storage, bin storage and landscaping; and the rationalisation of the existing staff parking and access arrangements at Northbrook Metropolitan College.

Before the Head of Planning and Development ran through his presentation, he reminded Members the application had been deferred at the meeting held on 26 August 2020 for the applicant to review the design and scale/massing of the proposed development.

The Officer referred Members to an addendum which had been circulated since the agenda and reports had been published. He outlined the contents, which included additional neighbour representations; objections raised by the local MP, Tim Loughton; and confirmation from WSCC Highways that they raised no objection to the proposal.

As the Committee Members were familiar with the previous application, the Officer concentrated on key changes to the scheme since the Planning Committee meeting held in August 2020. The Officer produced a number of photographs, existing and proposed plans and CGIs to assist Members in their consideration of the application.

One of the proposed changes to the scheme was the reduction in the size of the top floor, which the Officer highlighted to Members on the plan. He advised the top floor had been set in by a further 1.5 metres from the eastern side, and also confirmed that the applicants had specified only the rear south-facing amenity areas would be used by the top floor flat residents, not the other green areas which were indicated on the plan.

The applicant had also reviewed the design of the building due to Members' concerns over the prominence of the top floor, and the revisions were indicated on the CGIs by the Officer.

In addition, to mitigate overlooking, obscure glazing was proposed to projecting bays at first and second floor level facing north to a minimum of 1.7 metres, together with an increased parapet height and separation distances from Carnegie Gardens.

Officers believed the proposed changes addressed Members' concerns over the design, scale, bulk and massing of the building.

The Officer concluded his presentation by advising Members that Officers had no objection in policy terms to the loss of educational land, it was a decision for the college. He also referred to the publicity in the last couple of weeks regarding financial issues the college had been experiencing however, Members were advised as usual they needed to consider whether the scheme was an appropriate form of development on the site and whether the parking, density and layout were acceptable, particularly for neighbouring residents.

Members raised no queries on the presentation for clarification purposes.

There were further representations from an objector, a Ward Councillor and supporter who had all elected to join the meeting. Another supporter had joined the meeting to answer any questions from Members on the scheme. However, Members raised no questions.

The Committee began their debate on the application and in summary, the majority of Members felt the proposed scheme would be overbearing for the area and did not feel a reasonable attempt had been made by the applicant to address the concerns of Committee or from neighbouring residents.

The Head of Planning and Development reminded Members of the national housing crisis and that this had prompted the Government to recently introduce permitted development rights for up to two additional floors on to existing properties and flats. He said the emerging Local Plan recognised the need to increase density which in turn would mean higher developments for the town. The Committee was also advised that as the Council did not have a 5 year supply of housing in line with the NPPF there was a tilted balance in favour of sustainable development, such as this scheme, to address the towns future housing needs.

Before Members voted on the application, the Senior Lawyer suggested the Head of Planning and Development may want to refer to the matter of costs incurred should the matter be refused and go to appeal. The Officer confirmed the applicant was entitled to make an application for costs which might be defended, but he agreed it was a risk given the lack of a 5 year supply of housing and that the Inspector would be following NPPF advice.

A vote was taken by roll call to refuse planning permission on the grounds the proposal's height, scale, bulk and massing would be overbearing in the street scene and represent an overdevelopment of the site and be detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies of the Local Plan, and the vote was as follows:

For: Cllrs Atkins, Baker, Deen, Harman, High, and Silman

Against: Cllr McCabe

Abstain: Cllr Wills (*due to being absent for parts of the agenda item due to connectivity issues*)

Decision

The Committee Members overturned the Officer's recommendation to approve the application, and **REFUSED** planning permission on the grounds the proposal's height, scale, bulk and massing would be overbearing in the street scene and represent an overdevelopment of the site and be detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies of the Local Plan.

Application Number: AWDM/1334/20	
Site:	Southern Pavilion, Worthing Pier, The Promenade
Proposal:	Application for Listed Building Consent for installation of fire sprinkler system.

The Head of Planning and Development outlined the application for Members, showing plans and photographs in support.

There were no questions from Members on the presentation, and no registered speakers.

The Committee Members voted unanimously to agree listed building consent.

Decision

That listed building consent be **GRANTED**, subject to the following conditions:-

- 01 Approved Plans
- 02 Full Permission
- 03 Approval of pipework details to be agreed prior to installation
- 04 Upon completion of the work for which listed building consent is hereby granted, any damage caused to the fabric of the building shall be made good in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: *To preserve the building having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy.*

Application Number: AWDM/1508/20	
Site:	Site of 274 Goring Road and 292-312 Goring Road
Proposal:	Replacement of existing guarding to communal first-floor walkway and staircases to rear (north) with galvanised metal railings 1100mm high.

The Head of Planning and Development outlined the application for Members, showing plans and photographs in support.

There were no questions from Members on the presentation, and no registered speakers.

The Committee Members voted unanimously to approve planning permission.

Decision

That planning permission be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit