ADDENDUM TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

MEETING DATE - 23RD JUNE 2009

WB/09/0328/CCR3 VALE FIRST AND MIDDLE SCHOOL VALE AVENUE

UPDATES

Over thirty additional objections from local residents have been received raising similar concerns to those reported earlier. A request from a resident for a bat survey has been declined by West Sussex County Council's Ecologist as unnecessary.

West Sussex County Council have submitted the following statement in respect of choice for location for the Child and Family Centre

The catchment area for the proposed Findon Children & Family Centre was created using Super Output Area data and working alongside the boundaries of existing children and family centres in West Sussex. Once we had established the catchment area we quickly started to consider locations. When considering location options for a centre we start with sites which are within the ownership of WSCC for two reasons:

1.Grant funding and timescales are limited so we try to remove the need to pay rent for third party accommodation and the time needed to negotiate a legal agreement

2. One of the key aims for these centres is the foundation stage of a child's learning - birth through to their first year at school and therefore we will always consider a primary school location as the preferred site. However, in the case of the Findon Children & Family Centre, we considered three options - Findon library (WSCC owned): Vale First and Middle School (WSCC owned and a primary deemed school) and Findon Baptist Church. The library option was ruled out because of space limitations and this left the church and the school. The church was the least favourite of the two options for the following reasons.

- *Third party legals complicated and possibly outside the timescales.*
- *Considerable remodelling of the building would still only have given us shared use.*
- *Did not have the advantages of transition for children.*
- *There are complications when working with churches. Children and family centres are non-denominational.*
- *Parking would have been raised as an issue by residents as there is no space to increase parking -pre school in the church and traffic already overflowing from Health Centre / Library car park*

For the school

- *It was a freehold site - no legals faster time scales*

- *Transition for children and families better*
- *The school governors approached us with the offer*
- *The school project has enabled us to enhance other facilities in the school for children with additional needs*
- *The children centre will have a positive impact on the school in many ways.*

Once we had established this and sought the approval from the Governing Body to progress with the proposal, we had no need to consider further options in the Findon area.

West Sussex County Council also reports that Stuart Fairweather will be attending the meeting to speak on behalf of the applicants regarding Children & Family Centres. He is a Children & Family Centres Area Manager and also has the responsibility as strategic lead on these centres.

OFFICER COMMENTS

None.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

WB/09/0386/FULL WOODLANDS DURRINGTON HILL

UPDATES

An error in the description of the proposed development as set out on page 22 of the green agenda papers has been corrected. This description should read as:

Erection of 9 No. 2, 3, and 4 bedroom houses together with associated car barns, car parking and landscaping (new application following planning approval WB/08/0230/FULL Woodlands and Whits End)

The Environment Agency's comments have been received and it raises no objections, subject to a suitable condition on surface water drainage. It also offers advice on flood risk, demolition/sustainability, and pollution prevention.

The Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety reports that a complaint about vegetation waste on the site has been received, the owners notified and advice given that this should not be burnt to avoid causing a smoke nuisance.

The Strategic Housing and Planning Manager comments that there are no objections that would make a material difference from the original application. She notes, however, that, in terms of the residential mix on the site, the recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that flats should not be the principal form of

residential construction in the Borough. There is a need for more family housing in Worthing and this application would comply with this evidence.

At the time of writing no comments from **the Highway Authority** have been received.

OFFICER COMMENTS

In the absence of Highway Authority comments and a specified figure for the required development contribution towards upgrading local transport facilities to accommodate the additional pressure on the network generated by the development, it has not been possible to advise the applicant on the required sum. Consequently, the applicant has not been able to supply the required unilateral undertaking to secure the relevant financial contribution. The absence of the requisite unilateral undertaking would normally justify refusal on such grounds but, in view of the circumstances, this would not be appropriate. An informative attached to the Decision Notice explaining the situation and the requirement to provide a suitable undertaking as a part of any future approval would, however, be appropriate.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Add informative on the lines of the above.

WB/09/0211/FULL 36 ALINORA CRESCENT

UPDATES

5 additional reps received from Goring-by-Sea Residents' Association and occupiers of No. 3 Parklands Avenue and Nos. 34, 55, and 59 Alinora Crescent making the following points in addition to the points already in the agenda report:

i) More parking space could be provided in the front garden.
ii) Visually, the plans now proposed are preferable to the original plans
iii) Prefer option 2 from a design point of view.
iv) The option that generates the least surface water would be preferable.
v) The roof of the rear extension on the north elevation should also be reduced in scale because it too is of excessive size, design, and is overbearing.
vi) Regardless of the height of fences and trees the extension will still cause loss of light and be overbearing to neighbours.
vii) The architect has not identified the lake in Courtlands as being within 50 metres of the development.
viii) We object to any extension that would be visible above the 2 metre high fence at No. 3 Parklands Avenue.
ix) We are not satisfied with the soakaways situation.
x) We object to the possibility of legal disputes that may arise and proposals requiring a party wall agreement.
xi) Better use of the internal space was not considered as an alternative.
xii) We raise queries regarding the terminology used in reports and letters.
xiii) We query the selectiveness of what you use in your report and its relevance.
xiv) The committee share a number of our concerns.

xv) The mention of a fine for refusing the application on grounds which could be resolved at a later stage heavily influenced the Committees judgment.
xvi) The screening of any development should not rely on neighbours planting and gardening expertise, nor should reference be made to the construction materials of a neighbouring structure.

OFFICER COMMENTS

None.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

WB/09/0326/FULL 20 UPLANDS AVENUE

UPDATES

Additional comments received from occupiers of No. 22 Foxley Lane with reference to the revisions to the proposal on the amended plans, summarised below:

i) Even if roof is lowered there would be three bedroom windows overlooking the entirety of my rear garden and the children's rooms.

Additional comments received from High Salvington Residents' Association with reference to the revisions to the proposal on the amended plans, summarised below:

i) The only material alteration to the original application is to lower the ridge height of the main roof by a few centimetres.
ii) This minor alteration has no positive material effect on the overall impact of the proposed extension. We wish our objection to stand on all counts set out in our original letter dated 1th May 2009.

Additional comments received from occupiers of No. 18 Uplands Avenue with reference to the revisions to the proposal on the amended plans, summarised below:

i) We were notified of new drawings on Saturday and in the letter we were told we had 3 working days to respond. We have not been granted the right to view digest and comment.
ii) Design and Access Statement is full of carefully selected communication.
iii) Scheme is so large. It doubles floor area.
iv) Photo-montage is misleading and not proportionally accurate.

Additional comments received from occupiers of No. 22 Uplands Avenue (who objected to the initial submission) with reference to the revisions to the proposal on the amended plans, summarised below:

i) Surprised at period of time allowed to make observations.

ii) Have been assured by applicant the property will be built as photomontage. Also the width and size will be no greater than that of No. 18 Uplands Avenue.
iii) Provisions will be made for 'off street parking' and planting and fencing to ensure privacy.
iv) Pleased some reduction in roof height has been made. If all the assurances are as stated we feel much happier with the proposed amendments.

Additional comments received from occupier of No. 128 Warren Road with reference to the revisions to the proposal on the amended plans, summarised below:

i) The personal content of the Design & Access Statement is totally unacceptable, unprofessional, inappropriate and irrelevant. Dispute statements within it, including those made on pages 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 19 - 33. Correspondence is personal attack and aggressive in tone.
ii) Photo montage is not proportionally correct. It is easy to confirm this by measuring the photo. It doesn't give a true indication of how the building will look in reality.
iii) Notes were dropped through the doors of neighbours asking if they wished to view the plans. I have not asked neighbours to sign my letter of protest. No-one was put under any pressure. The applicants' designer broke copyright law. I am a fully qualified architect and in over 15 years working in this field. My drawing accuracy has never been challenged.
iv) The roof now looks very out of proportion. The reduced pitch of 30 degrees below the 35 degree minimum acceptable for plain clay tile

OFFICER COMMENTS

Revised plans show the ridge height of the upper storey extension roof lowered by some 0.8 metres to 7.7 metres (from some 8.5 metres in the initial submission). The scheme's footprint and first floor rear windows are unchanged.

The orientation of the application property to the properties along Foxley Lane, together with screening provided by trees and shrubs along shared boundaries, ensures oblique overlooking onto No. 22 Foxley Lane would not be adverse. The size and scale of the development will not adversely impact upon identified amenities.

The content of the Design and Access Statement accords with Department of Communities and Local Government Circular 01/2006 *'Guidance on changes to the Development Control System'*.

The photo-montage street scene is illustrative and not drawn to a scale. Measurements cannot be taken from it.

Neighbour notifications were sent out in accordance with Worthing Borough Council Code of Practice. The letter advising of the submission of revised plans was sent out in the post first class on Thursday 11th June, providing 8 days for submission of further representations.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

None

WB/09/0370/OUT 126 BROADWATER STREET WEST

UPDATES

An additional plan has been received showing the location of existing trees and hedges and in particular the location of two fruit trees which are proposed to be removed.

Consultation Responses:

The **Highway Authority** has commented as follows:

Highways
This proposal is acceptable in principle and from an inspection of the plans alone, there is no apparent visibility issue at the point of access onto Broadwater Street West. The proposed access improvements shown on plan EC1 would enhance the driver's view when emerging from the access.

The proposed garage is an adequate size to provide the 3 cycle parking spaces required. Plan EC2 shows sufficient turning space for the garage and single parking space. However, if the applicant were to add in another space (as mentioned in the design and access statement), this would significantly reduce the turning space and would exceed the WSCC maximum parking standard, which is 2 spaces for a 3 bed dwelling. It would be difficult to control the use of the space but it is advised that the applicant does not add any additional parking spaces to the proposal to avoid the possibility of vehicles reversing onto the busy road.

Archaeology
No comments

West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service have commented that on the basis of the details provided, the development would fall outside of the current fire safety regulations but with the inclusion of a sprinkler system would comply.

OFFICER COMMENTS

One parking space and one single garage is shown on the illustrative plan and a condition has been recommended in the main report to ensure that the details of parking and turning space are submitted and agreed prior to occupation.

The comments of the Fire and Rescue Service are noted and the requirement for a sprinkler system would be dealt with under the Building Regulations but would be drawn to the applicant's attention by an informative.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

WB/09/0381/FULL BROOKS STUDIO 2 HEENE ROAD

UPDATES

Consultation Responses:

The **Highway Authority** has raised no objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

None.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

WB/09/0120/FULL THE SWALLOWS RETURN TITNORE LANE

UPDATES

None.

OFFICER COMMENTS

None.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

Worthing Borough Council 19th June 2009