
Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 5-8 April 2016

Site visit made on 12 April 2016

by John L Gray DipArch MSc Registered Architect

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 09 May 2016

Appeal Ref. APP/M3835/W/15/3100601

25-26 West Parade and 4 Grand Avenue, Worthing, West Sussex

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Roffey Homes against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. AWDM/1805/14, dated 16 December 2014, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2015.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the buildings at 25-26 West Parade and 4 Grand Avenue and the erection of 36 residential apartments (including 8 affordable homes) in a development ranging from 3 to 11 storeys in height, with associated access, parking and landscape arrangements.
-

Decision: the appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

1. The application description says 36 apartments, eight of them affordable. This was amended at the application stage to 35 apartments, with the loss being an affordable home. The refusal notice correctly says 35.
2. In addition to the accompanied site visit on 12 April 2016, I made an unaccompanied visit to the site and its surroundings on 4 April, I viewed the site in its setting from Worthing pier on 5 April and I walked the length of Grand Avenue on 6 April.

Main issues

3. There are three main issues in the appeal. The first is whether the design of the proposed development is appropriate in itself and in its townscape context in both West Parade and Grand Avenue. The second is whether the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents by reason of being overbearing or causing overshadowing or overlooking. The third relates to highways matters: whether on-site car parking provision would be adequate; if not, whether there is available on-street parking within a reasonable walking distance; and the effect of the additional traffic generated by the proposal on highway conditions in West Parade and Grand Avenue.

Reasons

First main issue – design

4. The second reason for refusal refers to the siting, height, massing and design of the proposed building as contributing to its being assertive, bulky, out of

character with surrounding development and failing to achieve the high standard of design expected of a tall building. The appellant argues that a degree of assertiveness is necessary for an appropriate design on this important corner location and that the siting, height and massing of the design seek to achieve that while respecting the differing characteristics of the adjacent buildings on three sides.

Siting

5. The objection to the siting comes from the building stepping forward of the building lines in both West Parade and Grand Avenue. There is a certain logic to stepping forward from the building line in West Parade. Firstly, there is not a uniform building line, although the façades of all of the buildings as far east as Balcombe Court are within a few metres of each other; thus, a modest step forward beyond the façade of the adjacent Regis Court would be difficult to object to. Secondly, Marine Point, on the west side of Grand Avenue, has a southerly façade significantly further forward than the buildings to the east on West Parade. Marine Point is also the westernmost of the tall buildings along the seafront. Accordingly, there could be some merit in development on the appeal site stepping out towards Marine Point, giving it and Dolphin Lodge a more integral role in the sweep of tall buildings extending eastwards along the seafront. It is therefore more a question of how the proposed design would achieve a legitimate townscape aim rather than simply whether or not the building line to the east has been broken.
6. There is less of an argument for stepping forward from the building line on Grand Avenue, which has remained consistent despite a number of redevelopments further to the north. Grand Avenue is a wide road leading down to the sea. It always had Dolphin Lodge on its east side (and later Marine Point, which steps slightly forward of Dolphin Lodge) and there is something to be said for a taller building to complement it on the east side of the road. However, given the historic purpose of Grand Avenue, still evident, of being a main approach to the seafront, there is no obvious justification for a step forward in the building line that would narrow the essential prospect of the avenue. That does not mean it is automatically inappropriate – to do so might be argued as framing the view – but it must be considered as part of the overall design.
7. It may be noted that to permit a stepping forward of the building line on either West Parade or Grand Avenue would not set a precedent for other development in the future. On West Parade, the presence of Marine Point affords a reason to step forward, if done in an appropriate manner. In either case, if a proposal for the appeal site were to cause no harm, then it could not set a precedent for something elsewhere which would.

Height

8. The objection to the height of the building is because it would be significantly taller than Marine Point to its west or the several nearer buildings to its east along West Parade. The Tall Buildings Guidance SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) uses the same definition as CABE and English Heritage (as they then were): “Tall buildings are those that are substantially taller than their neighbours and/or which significantly change the skyline”. In the local context, the SPD defines a tall building as 7-10 storeys high and a very tall building as 11 or more storeys high.

9. Marine Point is eight storeys tall plus a recessed and subordinate top storey; Regis Court is six storeys tall, again plus a recessed and subordinate top storey; the appeal building would be eleven storeys tall with the stair core extending higher. That makes it a tall building by one definition, a very tall one by the other. The tower would be four storeys (plus the stair core) higher than the neighbouring Regis Court – in fact, more than half as high again – which is clearly “substantially taller”. The difference would very likely be perceived as greater, for a combination of reasons.
10. The building line of the eastern ‘shoulder’ would step forward from Regis Court and, although the 6-storey parapet line would be the same, the seventh storey of the appeal proposal would appear a much more integral part of the building than the recessed top storey of Regis Court; the effect would be to make the proposed building appear taller, or at least bulkier, than its neighbour. The tower would be very prominent, because, as well as the four additional storeys, its building line would be significantly forward of the shoulder. The recessed balconies of the two top storeys, while having the effect of giving the tower a ‘cap’ above its ‘base’ and ‘body’, would not noticeably reduce the overall visual impact because of the way in which the columns and balcony floors continue upwards the expression of the building’s structural frame. The building might appear to fit in with the general skyline in longer views, for example from the pier, but, from closer to the east, it would clearly be the tallest and most prominent building on West Parade.
11. Nor would the building appear any less prominent when approaching from the west. Marine Point, standing much closer to the road, would obscure views from the esplanade from more than around 250m away. However, the top of the tower would become visible above the 8-storey parapet of Marine Point before the façade came into view beyond that building. The effect of perspective might be argued as reducing the visual impact of the proposed building from the west – but simply the number of storeys would define it as a very tall building and the comparison with Regis Court beyond would, also because of the effect of perspective, be even more marked than from the east.

Massing

12. The objection to the massing appears to stem from the approach taken in the SPD, because of the way it seeks to sub-divide tall buildings into “townscape buildings”, “tower buildings” and “slab blocks”. The proposed building seems to be the first of those, though it has to address a corner rather than a street. It was described as a “hybrid” at the inquiry – not a true tower but also not a slab (in the same way as Marine Point or Regis Court). That may not be an unfair description – but it should not be taken to imply criticism. In principle, what the design seeks to achieve is entirely legitimate – to stand between, and to respect, the (generally) 7-storey buildings to the east, the taller Marine Point to the west and the domestic scale of development on Grand Avenue, while also turning the important corner from West Parade into Grand Avenue.
13. Massing in relation to West Parade is effectively considered above under height. The massing along Grand Avenue presents a much more difficult townscape problem. Having a tall building in the context of the West Parade frontage means that it then has to step down dramatically to fit with the traditional domestic character of the adjacent buildings in Grand Avenue (visually two storeys, although most have rooms in the roofspace). That is something Dolphin Lodge does not attempt to do – but at least Hythe Road

acts as a break between it and the traditional dwellings to its north (and, of course, Dolphin Lodge was built first, in effect as part of a grander scheme that did not come to fruition).

14. Looking solely at the proposed building, the steps down from eleven to six to three storeys along Grand Avenue appear appropriate in design terms. However, the 3-storey element, which continues the design approach to the taller parts of the building, has floor levels and storey heights greater than the traditional pitched-roof dwellings immediately to its north. The first floor level would be higher than the sill height of the first floor windows of 6 Grand Avenue, the second floor level would be about half way up the roof pitch and the top of the building would be higher than the ridge line. The top of the 3-storey building would be roughly twice as high as the eaves line of no. 6. It would be further from no. 6 than is the existing no. 4 (2.0m instead of 1.0m). Even so, to have a flank wall over 12.0m deep and nearly 10.0m high so close to a traditional pitched-roof house, on slightly lower ground, with eaves and ridge heights of about 5.0m and 9.0m, can only be an uncomfortable juxtaposition.

Conclusion on design

15. There is no compelling objection to the architectural treatment or detail of the proposed building. The design of the tower follows the principles of having a clearly discernable base (two storeys), body (seven storeys) and cap (two storeys). The treatment overall is neat and crisp and an appropriately respectful 21st-century interpretation of the general style of the nearby (architecturally uninspiring) 20th-century buildings along West Parade. (Those buildings have a generally horizontal emphasis but with significant balancing vertical features; the appeal building would have a predominantly vertical emphasis, because of the tower, but with the strong horizontal expression of the floor levels.)
16. That said, various things relating to siting, height and/or massing go against the acceptability of the proposal. There is no need for a building this tall, either to mark the junction with Grand Avenue or to complement Marine Point. That does not automatically render a tall building inappropriate; however, the eleven storeys of the tower would appear disproportionately taller than either Marine Point or Regis Court, something that would be emphasised by the tower being forward of the shoulders of the building on both West Parade and Grand Avenue. In relation to Regis Court, the shoulder of the building would appear taller, or at least more bulky, because of the step forward and because the top storey would seem to be more an integral part of the building than clearly subordinate. On Grand Avenue, the step down from eleven storeys to six to three might be reasonable in itself but would result in an inappropriate contrast between the scale and style of the 3-storey element and the traditional domestic style of 6 Grand Avenue so close to it.
17. Thus, while a degree of assertiveness might be appropriate on this important corner site, the proposed design would be unduly assertive because of its siting (coming forward of the building lines on both West Parade and Grand Avenue), its height (significantly taller than its neighbours) and its massing (in relation to both Regis Court and the dwellings on Grand Avenue).

Second main issue – residential amenity

18. The appellant and the Council agreed at the inquiry that this issue could be resolved in relation to 6 Grand Avenue – if the impact for its occupiers would

be unacceptable, then the appeal would be dismissed; if it would not, then any harm to other nearby residents would be still less. The Protect Worthing Seafront Campaign Group and others took a wider view. As part of my site inspection, I visited not only no. 6 but also 49 and 53 Bath Road, Apartment 28 in Dolphin Lodge and the penthouse apartment in Regis Court.

6 Grand Avenue

19. Using the 45° rule of thumb, the appeal scheme would, with two exceptions, have no effect on living conditions inside no. 6. The first exception is the view directly south from the side windows in the 2-storey bay at the front of the house. The 3-storey part of the proposed building, immediately adjacent to no. 6, would stand marginally (less than 1.0m) forward of its façade and thus be visible to anyone standing in the projecting bay; given its 3-storey height, it would be an obvious and substantial presence. About 15m from the bay, where the proposed building would rise to seven storeys, it would step forward by 2.4m; a further 12.5m away, where it would rise to eleven storeys, it would step forward by a further 1.1m. The increases in height would probably not be noticeable if there were no steps forward (the 3-storey part of the building would largely obscure views of the taller parts beyond) but, as proposed, they would clearly add to the perceived bulk of the building. On the other hand, in terms of outlook, views towards the sea from the bay window would be only modestly diminished. Given that one would have to be standing within the bay to notice the proposed building, the harm to internal living conditions would be insufficient to warrant dismissal of the appeal.
20. The second exception is the impact of the 3-storey element of the proposed building on the outlook from the southerly east-facing bedroom window. The bulk of the building would significantly reduce the quality of the outlook from the room and the first floor and second floor bedroom windows would, at the very least, have to be obscure-glazed to prevent harmful loss of privacy.
21. In the front garden of no. 6, the whole of the proposed building would become more noticeable. Even so, the seaward outlook would still be only modestly diminished. The 3-storey element, closest to no. 6, would be the most dominant part of the proposed building; the 7-storey and 11-storey elements, because they would be further away, would tend to have a lesser impact. Consistent with the conclusion on the design of the proposals, it is the 3-storey element that would have an overbearing and inappropriate impact.
22. In the rear garden, the 3-storey element of the proposed building would have most impact, primarily because of its proximity. In addition, the shoulders and tower of the building would combine to reduce significantly the existing perception of openness in the arc to the south and south-west. At my visit on 12 April, it appeared that no part of the proposed building would impede sunlight into no. 6's garden. The Anstey Horne addendum Daylight & Sunlight report shows no material loss of sunlight in the back garden on 21 June or 21 December but does show a significant loss after midday on 21 March, which appears to be caused by the 3-storey part of the building.
23. With regard to 6 Grand Avenue, therefore, the 3-storey element of the proposed building would have a noticeable impact on the outlook from both the 2-storey bay at the front of the building and the southerly first floor bedroom window at the rear. It would have a seriously overbearing impact for someone standing in either the front or back gardens. Both it and the higher parts of the building would reduce the existing sense of openness in the back garden

and would inappropriately reduce the amount of sunlight reaching it in March, even though not in summer or winter. On balance, these factors combine to render the impact of the 3-storey part of the proposed building unacceptably harmful. However, simply reducing the height of that part of the proposal might not resolve the matter as the taller parts of the building would then become more visible and potentially more harmful in their impact.

Bath Road

24. At 49, 51 and 53 Bath Road, the proposed building would bring a significant change to a scene in which the gap between the tall buildings of Regis Court and Marine Point hints at the presence of the sea beyond. It would be at a sufficient distance, however, not to be unduly overbearing or noticeably to diminish the sunlight reaching those properties.

Dolphin Lodge

25. Looking out from apartment no. 28 in Dolphin Lodge, the proposed building would effectively obscure oblique sea views. It would have the same effect for the apartments above, below and to the north of it. Given the views directly east, however, the outlook from these apartments would remain one of openness and spaciousness. The apartments to the south of no. 28 would have the proposed building more directly opposite but would retain oblique views towards the sea – the further south the apartment, the wider the view.

Regis Court

26. The Regis Court penthouse has its main lounge window looking west over a patio. The seventh floor of the proposed building would be about 6.0m from the patio, 10.0m from the lounge window; the tower would be about 17.5m away, the stair core 14.5m. The seventh floor would extend some 4.0m to the south of the patio (with a balcony beyond that) but there would still be a wide view to the south. The close proximity of the seventh floor would appear overbearing from within the penthouse; and the proposed large areas of glazing would mean an unacceptable loss of privacy for its occupiers.

Conclusion on residential amenity

27. On this second issue, therefore, the proposed building would unacceptably diminish the level of amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of 6 Grand Avenue. It would be overbearing, in the front and back gardens and in some parts of the house; it would curtail the outlook to the south from the gardens; it would reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the rear garden, albeit only at certain times of year; and, without changes to the window location or design, it would cause unacceptable loss of privacy. In addition, the 7-storey shoulder would be inappropriately close to the penthouse apartment in Regis Court and, as presently designed, would lead to unacceptable overlooking of it.
28. There would be significant changes in outlook for the occupiers of dwellings in Bath Road, in particular nos. 49, 51 and 53, though the distance between those properties and the proposed building would be sufficient for that change not to be unduly harmful. This conclusion bears in mind that the existing context is one of tall buildings along West Parade and that the Council is not averse to a much more intense development on the appeal site. A similar assessment applies to 8-16 Grand Avenue. The occupiers of a number of the apartments in Dolphin Lodge would effectively lose their oblique outlook towards the sea but would retain an open outlook eastwards; others would retain sea views but

would have the proposed building in easterly views; in neither case would the outlook from Dolphin Lodge be unduly harmed.

29. It may be noted that these conclusions are not unrelated to some of the conclusions on the first main issue. On the other hand, the Council and some local people are amenable to a much more intense form of development on the appeal site than presently exists. It might be difficult to resist at least part of such a development being as tall as is Regis Court. Accordingly, the impact of the proposed development is assessed above against what would be a generally acceptable residential environment, not against what exists.

Third main issue – parking and traffic

Parking

30. The Transport Statement of December 2014 relied on similar Roffey Homes developments in Worthing to support the proposed provision of 34 car parking spaces and argued that, if more than 34 were required, there was available on-street parking in the vicinity outside any parking control zone. The Committee report on the application notes that West Sussex County Council, as Highway Authority, was content with that, even though the normal requirement, using its own Parking Demand Calculator, would be 46. From the Committee report, the assumption seems to have been that, were 34 spaces to prove insufficient, any additional demand would be for visitor parking, not resident parking. There is, though, no alternative evidence on residential parking demand to suggest that 34 is not an appropriate figure.
31. The parking survey by the appellant was carried out on a morning and evening hour on one day (30 September 2014), which the highway authority considered adequate as an indication of day-time and night-time parking. It identified, easily within a 400m walk of the proposed site access, a minimum of 167 available on-street parking spaces in the morning, 166 in the evening. The Campaign Group questions the appellant's survey because it is not thought properly to reflect local issues, including the seasonal, even daily, nature of demand; it also considers 250m a more reasonable distance for a resident to walk to and from a car.
32. Five things may be said. Firstly, I acknowledge that, when I visited the site and its surroundings (twice between 18:00 and 19:00, the third time at the accompanied site visit), there was very little on-street parking available in Bath Road, in Hythe Road close to Grand Avenue or in Grand Avenue itself, between Rowlands Road and West Parade. Secondly, the number of parking spaces proposed in the appeal scheme is expected to satisfy demand, in which case there would be no additional pressure on on-street parking. Thirdly, if it did not cater for demand, 400m is not an unreasonable walking distance (taking, on average, about five minutes). Fourthly, the Campaign Group's comments do not assist unduly – they assume an "influx of 18 cars" when the appeal scheme is proposing 12 less than the calculated requirement; they suggest a loss of 24 on-street spaces in the vicinity but the appeal scheme would have a broadly neutral effect and it is not clear why other losses will arise, save from potential bus stop improvements; and they estimate a demand of between 60 and 106 for 93 spaces, suggesting that on-street parking is as likely as not to be available. Lastly, therefore, if one extends the Campaign Group's 250m walking distance to 400m, into an area where on-street parking is more easily available, then any overspill from the appeal scheme (were it to arise) could more easily be accommodated.

Traffic

33. The Transport Statement used TRICS data (as one would expect) to estimate 128 weekday vehicle movements for 36 apartments, of which 16 would be in the morning peak hour (08:00-09:00) and 15 in the evening peak hour (17:00-18:00). No reduction was made for the five existing dwellings. It cannot be compellingly argued that the addition of that amount of traffic (one vehicle every four minutes or so), even so close to the junction of Grand Avenue with West Parade, would make any noticeable difference to the free flow of traffic on the highway, or to highway safety.

Conclusion on parking and traffic

34. Accordingly, there is a three-part conclusion on this main issue. Firstly, the proposed on-site car parking provision is likely to prove adequate. Secondly, any additional demand for on-street car parking, were that to arise, would not unduly harm the level of amenity presently enjoyed by residents in the area. Thirdly, neither the additional traffic generated by the proposed development nor any additional on-street parking demand would, even taken together, have any noticeable impact on the free flow of traffic or on highway safety.

Other matters

Heritage assets

35. There are no designated conservation areas sufficiently close that their significance could be affected by the appeal building coming with in their settings. There is only one listed building fairly close to the appeal site, Black Nest Hall, but it is a barn imported from its original location in Surrey and re-erected as a dwelling; as such its present setting plays no part in its significance. Heene Terrace and the Burlington Hotel, both listed in grade II, stand some distance along the seafront to the east; the intervening buildings mean that the appeal building would play no material part in their setting.
36. Dolphin Lodge and Marine Point are designated as Buildings of Local Interest. Indeed, Dolphin Lodge's historical interest stems from the time when Grand Avenue was intended to have much greater importance than now, leading directly from Worthing West railway station, intended then as a terminus, to the seafront. Any impact on the setting of these undesignated heritage assets is not, however, itself an issue; it is instead a direct result of the design and townscape quality of what is proposed for the appeal site – if it were an appropriate addition to the townscape, then it would not detract from the setting of Dolphin Lodge or Marine Point; if not, even if it could be argued that the setting of those buildings would be harmed, their significance would be undiminished.

Housing need and land supply

37. The Borough Council acknowledges that it cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and, accordingly, that a housing proposal which would be sustainable development should be granted planning permission unless the adverse impacts of so doing would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In this case, the conclusions on the first two main issues indicate that the proposed development would fail the environmental role of sustainability. Accordingly, the balance in paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should not apply.

Space around the building

38. There was criticism that the frontage space around the building on West Parade and Grand Avenue would appear cluttered because of the bin stores, cycle store and sub-station. The brick boundary wall would be 1.35m high with piers 1.65m high. The bin store on West Parade would have brick walls 1.65m high, the same as the piers. The bin store on Grand Avenue would be a timber-clad enclosure the same height. The cycle store beside it would be a simple open structure, also same height. The sub-station, which is apparently not needed but was included to "future-proof" the development, could be sunk partially into the ground so that its brick enclosure was also no higher than 1.65m. While the potential for clutter might be thought to be there, it would be avoided by the integrated design of the different elements within an overall landscape design approach that would be appropriately formal.

Wind

39. Concern about wind speeds around a tall building is understandable, especially in an exposed coastal area. The conclusion of the appellant's environmental wind assessment – that the overall massing would be similar to other nearby buildings and the impact of wind along the seafront could be expected also to be similar – seems entirely reasonable. The conclusion goes on to note that interaction with the tall buildings on the west side of Grand Avenue (Marine Point and Dolphin Lodge) might cause increased wind speeds in Grand Avenue. While objectors may argue that the massing would not be similar, there are also features of the proposed design which ought to help reduce wind speeds at the base of the building – in particular the shoulders east and north of the tower and the breaks in the façades achieved by the balconies. The style of the proposed landscaping would also assist in reducing the outward spread of wind at ground level, as would the replacement of the trees to be lost along Grand Avenue. Overall, there is no clear cause for objection.

Benefits

40. Emphasis was placed on the appeal scheme's contribution to the supply of much-needed housing, including affordable housing, but various other economic, social and environmental benefits were also contended for. Most of those would be expected of any housing proposal, on the appeal site or elsewhere within the Borough, and cannot make acceptable what, on the conclusions to the first two main issues, is an unacceptable proposal.
41. Only a few of the contended benefits are site-specific or development-specific. The site is well-located for public transport and is within a reasonable walking distance of the town centre, though perhaps only just. Regeneration or redevelopment of what is a brownfield site would clearly be a benefit but it is the design of any proposal that determines whether it would improve the appearance of the area – and that is the subject of the first main issue.
42. On housing, the net increase in the number of dwellings on the site would be 30. Affordable housing would amount to about 30% (of the 35 proposed dwellings), to be provided partly on-site and partly by a financial contribution or, if a registered social landlord were not found, wholly by way of contribution. (The executed section 106 obligation caters for both possibilities.) While the housing need in the Borough is undeniable, the contribution of the appeal scheme towards meeting it would be very small. There is no doubt that the site could be developed more intensely than at present without causing the problems raised by the appeal proposal; comparison with such a scheme

would render the benefit of the appeal scheme still smaller – and insufficient to outweigh the conclusions on the first two main issues.

Overall conclusions

43. On the first main issue, the proposed development would be inappropriate in design terms because of a combination of its siting (forward of the building lines on West Parade and Grand Avenue), height (significantly taller than its neighbours) and massing (in relation to both Regis Court and the dwellings on Grand Avenue). That conflicts with adopted Core Strategy Policy 16, saved Local Plan Policy CT3, the Tall Building Guidance SPD and design policy in the NPPF. On the second main issue, the siting and bulk of the building would unacceptably diminish the level of residential amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of some neighbouring dwellings, which conflicts with saved Local Plan Policy H18 and the provisions of the NPPF. None of the other matters considered above or raised at the inquiry can outweigh these conclusions. Neither can the suggested conditions or the provisions of the executed section 106 obligation overcome them. Accordingly, the appeal must be dismissed.

John L Gray

Inspector

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Stephen Whale of Counsel	instructed by Caroline Perry, Adur & Worthing Legal Services.
He called	
Ian Moody BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Principal Planning Officer, Directorate of Economy, Worthing and Adur District Councils.
Judith Livesey BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Associate Director, Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, London.
Richard Small BA(Hons) DipArch MSc IHBC	Design & Conservation Architect, Directorate of Economy, Worthing and Adur District Councils.
Peter Devonport BA(Hons) MRTPI	Team Leader, Development Management, Directorate of Economy, Worthing and Adur District Councils.

FOR ROFFEY HOMES

James Pereira QC	instructed by ECE Planning Limited, Brooklyn Chambers, 11 Goring Road, Worthing, BN12 4AP.
He called	
Stuart Eatock BA(Hons) DipArch RIBA	Director, ECE Architecture, Worthing.
Mark Sanderson BA(Hons) MA IHBC	Director, The Heritage Advisory, London.
Liz Simes BA(Hons) DipLA DipUD CLMI	Senior Technical Director, fabrik (Landscape Design, Landscape Planning and Urban Design).
Chris Barker BA(Hons) MATP MRTPI	Director, ECE Planning Limited, Worthing.

INTERESTED PERSONS

Phil Abbott	}
Robina Every	} Joint presentation for the Protect Worthing
Chris Waran	} Seafront Campaign Group.
David Clark	}
Sue Lazzarini	6 Grand Avenue, Worthing.
Sir Peter Bottomley MP	
Stuart Field	Local resident.
David Sawers	The Worthing Society.
Neil McIntosh	Local resident.
David Chilvers	Local resident.

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Plan showing viewpoints of photographs from Bath Road.
- 2 Plans of Parkhurst Gardens, Islington (appeal APP/V5570/A/14/2227656).
- 3 Footprint and floorspace ratios of existing nearby buildings and of a 7-storey building on the appeal site.
- 4 Timeline for the emerging Worthing Local Plan.
- 5 Sue Lazzarini's statement.
- 6 Protect Worthing Seafront Campaign Group's PowerPoint presentation.
- 6a Plan (from Anstey Horne assessment) showing sunlight in the back garden of 6 Grand Avenue, as existing and with the appeal scheme, on 21 March.
- 6b Plans (from Anstey Horne assessment) showing overshadowing at 2-hour intervals in the back garden of 6 Grand Avenue on 21 March.
- 6c Summary conclusions by Mr Abbott for the Campaign Group.
- 7 Statement by the Worthing Society (David Sawers).
- 8 Written representations from Helen Butchart (local resident).
- 9 Stuart Eatock's PowerPoint presentation.
- 10 Written representations from Duncan Heath (local resident).
- 11 Additional statement on wind effects from Roffey Homes.
- 12 Additional statement on car parking from Roffey Homes.
- 13 Executed section 106 obligation.
- 14 Drawings 5934/113/A and 111/A showing sunken electricity sub-station.