

Application Number: NOTICE/0017/20	
Site:	St Andrews Gardens, Church Road, Worthing
Proposal:	Application for Prior Approval for construction of one additional storey of 9no. new dwellings immediately above the existing detached block of flats (Resubmission of NOTICE/0012/20).

The Head of Planning and Development introduced the report and shared his screen to show Members aerial views of the existing block of flats, and a site plan.

The Officer reminded Members the previous application had been refused for the reasons outlined on page 3 of the committee report. He said the current application was put forward by the applicant in an attempt to address Members' concerns.

The current proposal was still the same height, but adjustment had been made to fenestration and the top roof structure in an effort to reduce visual impact. In design terms, Officers felt the appearance was slightly better than the previous proposal however, Officers were still concerned about the overall scale, bulk and massing of the additional floor and its external appearance in the context of other buildings surrounding the site in Tarring.

Concluding his presentation, the Committee Members were shown a number of photographs to assist in their consideration of the application. Officers felt it was an unacceptable proposal and would adversely affect the character of the area hence it was recommended to refuse the proposal.

Some Members raised queries for clarification with the Officer and these were answered in turn.

The Chairman advised there was one registered speaker, Councillor Martin McCabe, a Tarring Ward Councillor, who was unable to join the meeting. Before the Head of Planning and Development read out the representation, he requested the Senior Lawyer explain to the rest of the Committee Members and members of the public the reasons why the Ward Councillor would be unable to speak in person. The Senior Lawyer updated the Committee that the Constitution provides that where an Ordinary Member has a substitute at a meeting, in this instance Cllr Thorpe substituting for Cllr McCabe, the Ordinary Member is required to be absent from the whole meeting. Accordingly, Cllr McCabe was advised that his representation would be read out.

The Head of Planning and Development read out Councillor McCabe's representation in objection to the application.

During debate, all Committee Members agreed there had been little change to the proposal since the previous application was refused at the September committee meeting, and felt it remained an unacceptable scale in the area.

The Committee Members voted unanimously to refuse the application for the reason outlined below.

Decision

That the planning application be **REFUSED** Prior Approval for the reason below:-

The proposed development would, by reason of its unacceptable scale, massing, form and design, represent an overdevelopment of the site, relating poorly to the scale and appearance of the recipient building, and would therefore appear as an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the building. As such, it is concluded that the proposed development would be contrary to policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Application Number: AWDM/1393/20	
Site:	Open Space adjacent Esplanade, New Parade, Worthing
Proposal:	Installation of a cycling public art stone monolith 0.2m x 2.88m x 1.98m high on a concrete foundation.

The Head of Planning and Development introduced the report and shared his screen to show Members an aerial photograph of the area and advised the proposal was for a public art installation to be located in the central part of the open space in front of the terrace of properties, New Parade.

Members were shown a number of photographs of various views, which included the proposed positioning of the art installation and a Computer Generated Image (CGI) of the stone, which would celebrate the benefits of cycling.

The Officer advised it was an application made by the Council on public open space and had been considered appropriate to carry out public consultation in connection with the proposed public art installation.

A number of residents in New Parade had raised concerns as to the proposed location of the stone as they felt it would have an adverse impact on the area of open space and had suggested alternative locations. The Officer advised that given those concerns, the applicant had been willing to consider alternative locations. He stated one possible location could be on the adjoining Bayside development, near the beach cafe, private land, managed by Roffey Homes, and early discussions had been held with them.

The Officer advised Members that funding for the public art had been raised following the tragic death of Don Lock by the cycling club of which he had been an active member. He said the family of Don Lock had shown a preference for the siting of the stone to be at the Bayside development.

The Officer suggested that, given the concerns by the residents of New Parade, Members may wish to defer the matter for consideration of an alternative site.

Following the presentation, the Chairman suggested Members combine any questions on the presentation with their debate on the matter.

Some Members agreed with the Officer's suggestion to defer the matter to hold further discussions on alternative sites however, others felt it was important to listen to neighbouring residents' points of view and come to a decision.

The majority of Members expressed the view the alternative siting of the stone close to the cafe on the Bayside development would act as a meeting point for cyclists and therefore a preferred site.

Following debate, a vote was taken by roll call. The first proposal, to defer the application for consideration of an alternative site, failed.

For: Councillors Jim Deen & Helen Silman

Against: Councillors Noel Atkins, Paul Baker, Paul High, Hazel Thorpe, Paul Westover & Steve Wills

Abstentions: 0

There followed a proposal to give the Head of Planning and Development delegation to secure satisfactory amended plans to relocate the public art installation on the Bayside development, and subject to no adverse comments being received in connection with the revised siting, approve the application and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Noel Atkins, Paul Baker, Paul High, Hazel Thorpe, Paul Westover & Steve Wills

Against: 0

Abstention: Councillors Jim Deen & Helen Silman

Decision

The Committee Members resolved to delegate the decision to **APPROVE** to the Head of Planning and Development, subject to the receipt of amended plans relocating the installation to the new open space area being created at the adjoining Bayside development and conditions set out below. During the delegation period neighbours were to be reconsulted, and if any adverse comments were received, the matter would need to be reconsidered by the Planning Committee.

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Submission of long term management plan.