

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 10 JUNE 2020

SKYPE MEETING

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Hill (Chair), Henry (Deputy Chair), Littman (Opposition Spokesperson), Miller (Group Spokesperson), Fishleigh, Janio, Shanks, C Theobald, Yates and Osborne

Officers in attendance: Nicola Hurley (Planning Manager), Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor), David Farnham (Development & Transport Assessment Manager), Matthew Gest (Planning Team Leader), Wayne Nee (Principle Planning Officer), Russell Brown (Senior Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

1.1 Councillor Osborne attended as substitute for Councillor Mac Cafferty

b) Declarations of interests

1.2 Councillor Janio declared they would not take part in the debate for item D BH2020/00699 20-22 Gloucester Place. Councillor Hill declared they had received emails regarding item A and item H and they remained of a neutral mind. Councillor Yates declared they had received emails regarding item A and item H and they remained of a neutral mind.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

1.3 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Planning Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

1.4 **RESOLVED:** That the public are not excluded from any item of business on the agenda.

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

- 1.5 The Chair requested Members ensure that their mobile phones were switched off, and where Members were using tablets to access agenda papers electronically ensure that these were switched to 'aeroplane mode'.

2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- 2.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meetings held on 6 May 2020 and 20 May 2020 as a correct record following the changes listed below to the 20 May 2020 minutes:

Councillor Theobald requested the following change to paragraph 19:

"There should be some kind of art component incorporated into the scheme without the £98,000 allocated in the s106 for art. The University of Sussex used to be a lovely sylvan setting with plenty of green spaces, trees and the famous Sir Basil Spence buildings. Now it will look more like a built up town."

3 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 3.1 The Chair welcomed all present to this virtual meeting which was also being webcast and would be capable of repeated future viewing. In order for the meeting to run smoothly all presentations have been sent to the committee and Members have had time to ask questions of the Planning officers. The presentations are also online for viewing by members of the public. Addendums are also available for public viewing. Presentations have in general taken into account that no site visits have taken place. To confirm, a Members site visit has taken place to Black Rock – item A.

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 4.1 There were none.

5 ANSTON HOUSE, 137 -147 PRESTON ROAD, BRIGHTON - REQUEST TO VARY HEADS OF TERMS SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

- 5.1 The report asked the Committee to consider a request to vary the Heads of Terms of the Section 106 agreement dated 30th October 2017 in connection with planning permission BH2016/02499 to allow conversion of the approved development to a Build to Rent development.

Questions for the Officer

- 5.2 Councillor Littman was informed by the case officer – Luke Austin (Principal Planning Officer) that the s106 agreement is due to expire on 2 November 2020.
- 5.3 Councillor Fishleigh was informed that by the case officer that the District Valuer Service (DVS) report was completed in March 2020 before COVID-19 lockdown. To request a new report to reflect post COVID-19 costs would delay the commencement of the development.

- 5.4 Nicola Hurley (Planning Manager) informed the Committee that there was the review mechanism in the agreement would look at costs.
- 5.5 Councillor Miller was informed by the case officer that the discrepancies referred to in the report have been now been resolved. The bedroom types have not changed since the original permission was granted the mix of bedrooms to be rented would remain the same across all rents.
- 5.6 Councillor Theobald was informed by the case officer that 5% of the development would be wheelchair accessible.

Debate

- 5.7 Councillor Shanks felt the mix of affordable housing was good and found the scheme acceptable and should be passed by the Committee.
- 5.8 Councillor Miller felt the affordable housing was important and the committee should agree the application.
- 5.9 Councillor Yates welcomed the application and hoped it would go ahead as the site has been a blot on the landscape for many decades. Build to rent was considered the best way forward.
- 5.10 Councillor Theobald felt the building was ugly and the scheme not ideal and the 2016 scheme was better, however the development should go ahead.
- 5.11 Vote: The Committee voted unanimously agreed to the request to vary the Heads of Terms of Section 106 Agreement in connection with planning permission BH2016/02499.
- 5.12 **Resolved:** That the S106 Head of Terms with regard to Affordable Housing be varied in order to allow for a Build to Rent development, as set out in the report.

6 TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

- 6.1 The Chair explained that in line with current Central Government guidance in relation to the Covid 19 pandemic, formal site visits had not been arranged. To reflect that in depth presentation material and visuals had been circulated in advance of the meeting and had also been appended to the agenda papers published on the council website. If, however, Members considered that they required more detailed information in order to determine any application a site visit could be requested either at this point on the agenda or at any point in the proceedings.

No site visits were requested at this point in the meeting.

7 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS - CALLOVER

- 7.1 The Democratic Services Officer read out Items 7 A to K. It was noted that all Major applications and any Minor applications with speakers were automatically reserved for discussion.
- 7.2 It was noted that the following item(s) were not called for discussion and it was therefore deemed that the officer recommendation(s) were agreed including the proposed Conditions and Informatives and any additions / amendments set out in the Additional / Late Representations List:

- **Item C:** BH2020/00947 – Vardean College, Surrenden Road, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition
- **Item G:** BH2020/00206 – Hove Park Nevill Campus, 38 Nevill Road, Hove - Full Planning
- **Item J:** BH2020/00235 – Flat 39 Guildford Road, Brighton - Full Planning
- **Item K:** BH2020/00791 – 47 Eley Drive, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent

A BH2020/00442 - BLACK ROCK SITE AND SURROUNDINGS, MADEIRA DRIVE, BRIGHTON - FULL PLANNING

1. Wayne Nee (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report and informed the committee that following finalising of the report, the Environment Agency (AE) had submitted further comments and further letters of objection had been received relating to highway issues. Some minor changes to the conditions have been made available to the committee via addendum to the agenda. The officer commented that the PowerPoint presentation slides 4, 5 and 6 showed the proposed block plan not the existing. The AE comments related to the sea wall design. The County Ecologist comments agreed with the table top assessment that had already taken place. The letters of objection expressed concerns the proposed access to Black Rock via the marina would encourage access to the ASDA car park.
2. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. The main considerations in determining the application related to the principle of development, and the impact on the visual amenities of the public areas, the listed buildings, the street scene and the wider Conservation Areas, as well as the setting of listed buildings within the locality of the site. Other main considerations include the impact on highways, changes of use, ecology, trees, neighbouring amenity, and sustainable drainage.

Questions for Officers

3. Councillor Littman was informed that the new conditions related to the sea wall design. The Reading Rooms use will be flexible with further clarification coming from the applicant. The consideration of the wildlife site formed a significant part of the decision process. The loss of the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) is an issue and extensive discussions were held at the pre-application stage. A very thorough assessment was held. The replacement site was considered on balance to be acceptable. The LWS will be supported in the new location. Condition 9 of the report relates to the submission of a

Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), with condition 8 relating to the need for a Ecological Design Strategy assessment.

4. David Farnham (Development and Transport Assessment Manager) informed Councillor Littman that the Black Rock design team has submitted an Approval In Principle (AIP) document to the Council's Highways Structures team to agree on the results of the assessment and any remedial works going forward. This has been submitted and is being looked at. No conclusions or adoptions have been reached.
5. Councillor Theobald was informed that the Volks railway being extended into the Marina did not form part of the scheme. The improvements to access would be for pedestrians and cyclists. The application allows Black Rock to be used for temporary events and changes to the coach parking are not proposed. The Development and Transport Assessment Manager stated that changes may come at a later date in order to allow safe crossing points for pedestrians. It was also confirmed by the case officer that the Kemptown slopes would have improved landscaping as part of the proposed scheme.
6. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that cost of the new nature area did not form part of the application as it was not a planning consideration. The case officer commented that the landscaping conditions 8 & 9 covered this important element of the scheme. It was also noted that the multi use games area included in the scheme will be temporary to start with. The Development and Transport Manager informed the Councillor that the construction traffic routes to and from the site have not been agreed yet. They commented that under Condition 3 no development, including demolition, shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP will need to include construction traffic movements.
7. Councillor Janio was informed by the Development and Transport Manager that the information provided by an applicant needed to be proportionate to the scheme submitted. For this application this did not include a model for the all the traffic issues created by developments across the city. The scheme has submitted information relating to traffic issues around Dukes Mound junction with A259 only.
8. Councillor Osborne was informed that the late list conditions included a scoping report submitted to the Environment Agency (EA). The applicant's agent, Alex Williams, stated that the sea wall condition in the late list related to how the wall would be set back on the beach. They also stated that the Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment was not needed. The case officer confirmed that the EA had no further comments as the assessment was not needed.

Debate

9. Councillor Janio commented that the Council should look at all the traffic and transport issues across the city. The Councillor stated they supported the scheme.
10. Councillor Fishleigh expressed concerns regarding the effects of scheme on the traffic on A259, as previous and ongoing construction works have had a big impact on the city. The Councillor proposed two conditions be included in the recommendation: 1. Any

changes to the A259 road layout would require traffic lights and 2. Construction traffic routes should not be through the city centre.

11. The Planning Manager stated that with regard to No.2, the issues were already covered in the conditions of the officer recommendation. For No.1 the Members should consider the application before them. The Senior Solicitor agreed with the comments made by the Planning Manager and confirmed that an informative regarding construction traffic not going through the city centre was possible if the committee wished.
12. Councillor Fishleigh noted the comments and expressed further concerns as the A259 Action Group were worried about the impact of construction traffic on the road.
13. Councillor Miller supported Councillor Fishleigh's comments regarding highways. Councillor Miller also felt that the proposed development was a great scheme and a good investment in the city as the site had been empty a long time. The committee were asked to support the proposal and to be careful of temporary uses suggested in the scheme.
14. Councillor Theobald felt the scheme was complicated and it was a shame that the Volks railway would not be extended. The improvements to pedestrian and cycle ways were welcomed. Overall a good scheme for the Black Rock area.
15. Councillor Shanks did not feel a condition relating to highways was necessary and wished the scheme to voted on as it stood.
16. Councillor Hill requested a proposer and seconder for an informative relating to highways.
17. Councillor Fishleigh proposed an informative to the scheme stating that construction traffic should not pass through Brighton city centre.
18. Councillor Miller seconded the proposal.
19. The Chair invited the committee to vote on the proposal and by a vote of 5 to 2, with 3 abstentions the new informative was agreed.
20. The Chair invited the committee to vote on the application with the additional informative and by a unanimous vote planning permission was granted.
21. **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the officer's report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a Unilateral Undertaking and the Conditions and Informatives laid out in the officer's report, **SAVE THAT** should the Unilateral Undertaking Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 2nd September 2020 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in Section 11 of the report.

B BH2020/00325 - AVON COURT, DALLINGTON ROAD, HOVE - FULL PLANNING

1. Russell Brown (Senior Planning Officer) introduced the application and stated there were no new updates for the committee. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and included on the council website details of the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of development, the design of the extensions, their impact on neighbouring amenity, on highways and the proposed standard of accommodation.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Peltzer-Dunn spoke to the committee and noted that neighbours to the site had expressed concerns regarding the proposals. The property has a checkered history and is located on a sloping site. The neighbours have raised concerns about over-looking, which is considered to increase by 150% above the current situation. It is noted that design is not a Planning issue, however, the noise and disturbance created by the development would be. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn asked the committee to refuse the application.

Questions for Officer

3. Councillor Theobald was informed that the distance between the proposed dormer to the neighbour's dormer was 11 metres.
4. Councillor Littman was informed that dormers on front elevations were allowed under certain circumstances and there are other dormers in the area. The proposal is considered acceptable under Policy SPD12 – Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.
5. Councillor Shanks was informed that the application is not considered to set a precedent and each application is taken on its own merits. The design is considered to be high quality and to comply with Policy guidance.

Debate

6. Councillor Littman thanked the officer and commented that they felt unhappy about the proposals as the design would interrupt the continuity and they were against the officer recommendation to grant Planning permission.
7. Councillor Theobald had visited the site and felt the development would spoil the road which is very narrow. The dormers proposed for the rear elevation would create an overlooking issue and they were against the officer recommendation to grant Planning permission.
8. Councillor Miller agreed with others and stated they were against the officer recommendation to grant Planning permission.
9. Councillor Yates agreed with Councillors Miller and Littman and stated they were against the officer recommendation to grant Planning permission.

10. Councillor Janio stated they had made a site visit and had no problems with the development and supported the application.
11. The Chair invited the committee Members to vote.
12. With a vote of 5 to 5, the Chair cast an additional deciding vote and Planning permission was granted.
13. **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the officer's report.

C BH2020/00947- Varndean College, Surrenden Road, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

D BH2020/00699 - 20-22 GLOUCESTER PLACE, BRIGHTON - FULL PLANNING

1. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to principle of the development, the impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, conservation area and on the setting of nearby listed buildings, neighbour amenity, highways and sustainability issues.

Questions for Officers

2. Councillor Theobald was informed that it was not known if the brass plaque that had been removed would be replaced.
3. Councillor Littman was informed that the application had been called into committee by the Conservation Area Group (CAG) opposition.

Debate

4. Councillor Henry stated they supported the application.
5. Councillor Theobald felt the proposals were better than the existing and would be voting for the application. The Councillor requested that the plaque be kept.
6. The Chair invited the committee to vote: on a vote of 9 to 1 Planning permission was granted with a new informative: The brass plaque to the front of the building shall be retained and protected throughout the works to the building.
7. **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to **GRANT** planning

permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the officer's report and agreed at Committee.

E BH2020/00187 - 29 WOODBOURNE AVENUE, BRIGHTON - REMOVAL OR VARIATION OF CONDITION

1. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. The main considerations in determining the application related to the impact of the retention of the cladding to the side gable on the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

Speaker

2. Ward Councillor Wares addressed the committee and stated they supported the application which the officer has recommended for refusal. The area has hundreds of homes with differing architectural designs all of which are very different. In the area there are many designs and many finishes with dormers on front, back and side elevations and many Velux windows. There is also a number of properties with parking in the front garden. The Councillor felt that the application could not be harmful in this very varied area and on balance the committee should grant permission.

Questions for Speaker

3. Councillor Miller noted from a digital mapping website that the area was very varied with dormers on other properties. Councillor Wares informed the Councillor that in their opinion there were others in the area that were far less sympathetic to the street scene and this application was not out of keeping.

Speaker

4. Ian Coomber addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant and wanted to underline Councillor Wares comments. Properties in the area are very varied some with cladding. It is understood that cladding would be an issue in a Conservation Area, however, this property is not in a Conservation Area. Many changes have taken place in the area and careful consideration needs to be taken of the context and character of the area. It was considered that the variety of designs has added to the area. The committee were asked to overturn the Planning officer's recommendation and approve the application.
5. Matthew Guest (Planning Team Leader) noted the many styles in the area and felt that many would not get approval under current policies. The general approach now was that materials should match on the property and side gables should relate to the whole property.

Debate

6. Councillor Miller agreed with Councillor Wares and considered the application to be a minor change and they were against the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.
7. Councillor Theobald stated they had visited the site and the additions did not look like a dormer and it was not very visible in this varied area. Councillor Theobald stated they were against the officer's recommendation.
8. Councillor Janio stated they wanted policy to be applied evenly and they were against the officer's recommendation.
9. Councillor Hill agreed with other Members and felt they had been swayed by the speakers and stated they were against the officer's recommendation.
10. The Chair invited the Committee to vote.
11. On a vote of 9 to 1 the officer's recommendation was turned down.
12. The Chair requested a proposer for an alternative recommendation.
13. Councillor Miller proposed the application be approved on the grounds that the proposal would not harm the appearance of the property and does not relate poorly to the dwelling. Councillor Shanks seconded the proposal.
14. The Chair invited the committee to a recorded vote.

Councillors Hill, (the Chair), Henry, Theobald, Fishleigh, Janio, Osborne, Miller, Shanks and Yates voted that Planning permission be granted. Councillor Littman voted that planning should not be granted. Therefore, on a vote of 9 to 1 planning permission was granted.

15. The Senior Solicitor requested that the Planning Manager should agree the wording of the approval. This was agreed by the committee.
16. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be Granted and the final wording of the decision to be agreed by the Planning Manager in consultation with the proposer and the seconder.

F BH2019/00694 - 105 WOODLAND DRIVE, HOVE - FULL PLANNING

1. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to:
 - The principle of the development;
 - The impact on the appearance of the site and the conservation area;
 - Impact on trees/ecology;

- Standard of living accommodation;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Sustainable transport/highways issues and;
- Sustainability.

2. Matthew Gest (Planning Team Leader) updated the committee that some of the trees on slide 21 of the presentation were to be retained and slide 19 was still correct. An additional condition to protect trees during development had been added and further letters of objection have been received including from Ward Councillor Bagaeen.

Questions for Officers

3. Councillor Littman was informed that there were no Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) on the site and there were several landscaping conditions attached to the report.
4. Councillor Shanks was informed that the trees to be removed were Cypress trees.

Debate

5. Councillor Theobald stated they had visited the site and noted the house would be prominent on the site. Councillor Theobald expressed concerns that tree roots would be damages during construction works and noted that the existing garden was very small, CAG had opposed the application and surrounding area would be affected by the proposal. Councillor Theobald stated they were against the application.
6. The Planning Team Leader reiterated the number of floors to be 3 not 4.
7. The Chair invited the committee to vote: on a vote of 5 to 3 and 2 abstentions Planning permission was granted.
8. **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following Conditions and Informatives:

G BH2020/00206 - HOVE PARK, NEVILL CAMPUS, 38 NEVILL ROAD, HOVE - FULL PLANNING

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

H BH2020/00724 - 2 DYKE CLOSE, HOVE - FULL PLANNING

1. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. The main considerations in determining the application related to the impacts of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and wider streetscene, and the impacts on the amenities of local residents. Also, of consideration are the impacts on the adopted highway and existing biodiversity.

Speaker

2. Ian Coomber (Planning Agent) addressed the committee on behalf of the objecting neighbours and stated that there was no opposition to extending the property, however, this proposal was too big. Applications have been submitted for the site previously and refused at appeal for overlooking issues and harm caused to No.1 Dyke Close. The sustainability of the scheme is applauded, however, it requested that the application be refused, and a less harmful application submitted.

Questions for Speaker

3. Councillor Fishleigh was informed by the speaker that the close neighbour to the north east of the application site has permission to install a large window to the rear elevation of a room currently used as a children's play room. Should this window be installed the application at No.1 would cause harm to the neighbouring property.

Speaker

4. Ward Councillor Bagaeen addressed the committee and stated their support for the application. The Councillor noted that the ground map in the report was wrong and they had visited the site last summer. The committee were invited to look at digital mapping online to see if there were any overbearing impact on the cul-de-sac location. The recommendation to refuse was not good for the Planning department and applications should be dealt with even-handedly. Application outcomes are very important. It was noted that the neighbouring window has not been implemented. The committee were invited to permit the application.

Speaker

5. C Barker addressed the committee as the applicant's representative and noted that a refusal on the grounds of overbearing impact would be subjective and the application should not be considered to affect No.1 Dyke Close. The scheme refused at appeal did not affect sunlight to the neighbouring property and neither does this application. It was noted that the neighbours have not implemented the rear elevation window that might be affected by the proposal. No.1 has large outside areas and only 3.3% would be affected by the proposal. The pool in the rear garden is more than 20 metres from the proposal and there would not be an overbearing or harm caused by the scheme. No.1 would not be impinged by the development.

Questions for Speaker

6. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the proposal would not overlook the pool at No.1 Dyke Close.

Questions for Officers

7. Councillor Theobald was informed that the proposal included the removal of one chimney stack and no trees.

Debate

8. Councillor Shanks supported the scheme and felt it should go ahead.
9. Councillor Miller supported the scheme, which they felt was an improvement and stated they were against the officer recommendation to refuse.
10. Councillor Theobald stated they had visited the very large site and noted there could be overbearing and overshadowing impact on No.1 Dyke Close. The Councillor felt the proposal may be too big, however, they were not sure.
11. The Chair invited the committee to vote: on a vote of 7 to 3 planning permission was refused in line with the officer's recommendation.
12. **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the officer's report and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in the report.

I BH2020/00776 - 6 PRINCES CRESCENT, HOVE - FULL PLANNING

1. It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the demolition/dismantlement and subsequent development; the design and appearance of the proposed dwellinghouse and the impact it would have on the historic significance of heritage assets in the vicinity; and the impact on the amenities of local residents. Consideration is also given to the potential impact on the adopted highway and on local biodiversity.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Appich addressed the committee and stated that the applicant had struggled to remain within Planning guidelines and could have built the previously approved scheme. The new design appears to deal with neighbour's objections. The committee were requested to grant permission for the application.
3. The Planning Manager informed the committee that the report contained an error at paragraph 8.13 which should read Conservation Areas not Listed Building.
4. The Senior Solicitor confirmed that the affect on the nearby listed building was still relevant.

Questions for Officers

5. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the dormer windows would have obscure glazing as they serve hallways only.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the policy relating to demolition did not apply to the application. The case officer and the Heritage Team received confirmation of the

justification for demolition from applicant as materials were to be used in the new building.

7. Councillor Theobald was informed that the cobbled wall will be replaced as part of the proposed conditions.

Debate

8. Councillor Henry stated they were against demolition; however, they were comforted by the report and Heritage work undertaken.
9. Councillor Theobald agreed that the demolition of the existing building was a shame, however, they supported the application.
10. The Chair invited the Committee to vote: On a vote of 8 to 2 Planning permission was granted.
11. **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the officer's report.

J BH2020/00235 - FLAT, 39 GUILDFORD ROAD, BRIGHTON - FULL PLANNING

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

K BH2020/00791 - 47 ELEY DRIVE, BRIGHTON - HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING CONSENT

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

8 TO CONSIDER ANY FURTHER APPLICATIONS IT HAS BEEN DECIDED SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. There were none.

9 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

1. The Committee noted the new appeals that had been lodged as set out in the planning agenda.

10 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

1. There were none.

11 APPEAL DECISIONS

1. The Committee noted the content of the letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising of the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

The meeting concluded at 5.43pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of