

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 8 MARCH 2023

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Littman (Chair), Ebel (Deputy Chair), Hills, Janio, Moonan (Opposition Spokesperson), Shanks, C Theobald and Yates

Co-opted Members: Jim Gowans (Conservation Advisory Group) and Mr Roger Amerena (Conservation Advisory Group)

Officers in attendance: Nicola Hurley (Planning Manager), Katie Kam (Lawyer), Don Anyium (Transport Manager), Paul Davey (Arboricultural Officer), Russell Brown (Principal Planning Officer), Marina Briggshaw (Planning Team Leader), Paul Davey (Arboricultural Officer), Steven Dover (Planning Officer), Steve Tremlett (Planning Team Leader), Wayne Nee (Principal Planning Officer), Maria Seale (Planning Team Leader), Emily Stanbridge (Senior Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

91 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

91.1 There were none for this meeting.

b) Declarations of interests

91.2 Councillor Hills declared they would be addressing the committee on planning application BH2022/01490: Enterprise Point And 16-18 Melbourne Street Brighton and would withdraw from the decision making process. Councillor Theobald declared they knew a resident near Saxon Works, however they remained of an open mind on the application.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

91.3 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.

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

92 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

92.1 **RESOLVED:** The minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2023 were accepted as a correct record.

93 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

93.1 There were none for this meeting.

94 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

94.1 There were none for this meeting.

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

95.1 There were none from this meeting.

96 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

96.1 Following the Call Over process the committee agreed to discuss the following items: A, B, C, D, F, G and H. Items E and I were not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

A BH2022/02534 - Land at King George VI Avenue (Toads Hole Valley), Hove - Outline Application All Matters Reserved

1. The Case Officer introduced the application to the committee and noted that one further objection had been received, however, no new issues had been raised.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Moonan was informed that affordable housing formed part of the entire development, not just the section being discussed under this application. The biodiversity gain off site is being investigated and talks were being held with providers in Lewes District. It was noted that the developer can only be encouraged to have the gain within the city boundary.

3. Councillor Yates was informed that it was possible to include an informative to request the biodiversity gain be provided within the city.

4. Councillor Theobald was informed that the development had not been started as reserved matters were still to be agreed. It was noted that no consultees have objected.

5. Councillor Hills was informed by the Highway Agreements Officer that no adverse effects were found, and a robust travel plan for the whole site will be provided.

6. Councillor Janio was informed that the application was considered on balance to be a sustainable neighbourhood with mixed uses under policy DA7.
7. Councillor Shanks was informed that other possible uses for this section of the whole site could not be discussed and the application should be considered as submitted to the committee.
8. The agent noted that the need for a secondary school had been in doubt for some time as the need has changed. 40% affordable housing is being provided across the whole site, the multi use pitch is much needed and it was appropriate to submit the application at this time.

Debate

9. Councillor Moonan supported the application as there was a need for housing, and not many large sites coming forward. The councillor requested that the biodiversity gain be provided within the city.
10. Councillor Shanks supported the application. The councillor considered the need for a secondary school was difficult to predict and the onsite children will need to travel to school. The councillor requested the whole site include affordable housing.
11. Councillor Yates seconded Councillor Moonan's proposal for an informative to request the biodiversity gain to be in the city. The councillor supported the application as it was felt then the rest of the site could move forward. The councillor considered an opportunity had been missed and it was the council's fault.
12. Councillor Janio stated they had been to drop-in sessions by the developers and considered it a good development overall. The councillor considered the committee should hold their nerve as the site will be sold off in parcels and they should refuse this application and then the developer would come in with a better offer. The councillor did not support the application.
13. Councillor Theobald considered the application would result in over development of the site and more family homes were needed. The councillor requested the application be deferred.
14. Councillor Littman considered there was no sound reason to defer the application.
15. The committee agreed the informative motioned by Councillor Moonan and seconded by Councillor Yates to retain the biodiversity gain within the city if possible. The wording to be agreed by the Planning Manager.

Vote

16. A vote was taken, and by 5 to 2, with 1 abstention, the committee agreed to grant planning permission.

17. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** outline planning permission subject to:

A) Completion of a Deed of Variation to the s106 Agreement attached to BH2022/00203 to include this application and secure the Heads of Term as set out at Appendix A;

B) The Conditions & Informatives set out at Appendix B **SAVE THAT** should the s106 agreement not be completed on or before 8th July 2023 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in Appendix C of the report.

B BH2021/04068 - Saxon Works, Land to the rear of 303-305 Portland Road, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Sankey considered the principle of development was acceptable, however, this was an extensive overdevelopment of the site. The proposals, on elevated land, overlook neighbours' gardens resulting in loss of privacy. The development will result in more vehicles in the area, where there have been numerous accidents. There is an absence of affordable housing. The financial viability assessment states the development is not viable, however if the development were car free, the underground car park would not be needed. Works for seven days a week would not be good.
3. Stuart Duncan, objecting to the application, stated they represented their family and other residents. They had a number of concerns regarding the development: the commercial building will be hard up to the boundary with house at 305 Portland Road and daylight will be affected with a 57% loss of light to windows including kitchen and dining room; Martello Lofts use land currently for parking and will need to get parking permits and this seems unfair; should be 39 parking spaces not 26 as proposed. The application is an overdevelopment of the site. Seven days construction working is not acceptable, please reduce to five.
4. Guy Dixon addressed the committee as the agent and stated that the proposals would regenerate a brown field site and there was a housing need under the 5 year land supply. The application has undergone many amendments reducing the scale and moving away from neighbours. The daylight and sunlight assessments found the development acceptable. The increase in employment floor space will result in more jobs. The financial viability assessment concludes the development is currently unable to support the provision of affordable housing. The development includes underground parking, eco boxes and is sustainable, and will support local jobs. The committee were requested to support the application.
5. The Planning Manager clarified the construction times would be defined by condition under the demolition plan and construction plan. Any issues on neighbouring sites and the behaviour of the developer are not to be considered by the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Yates was informed that the outline planning permission had not been granted for the larger development on Portland Road, as the S106 agreement had not been agreed.
7. Councillor Moonan was informed by the case officer that there was no parking for the commercial building as the site was a sustainable location. The commercial space would not have any permitted development rights and would need planning permission to change to housing as it is conditioned to be used for commercial. The development is 5.6m from the neighbouring property boundary and 18.5m from the windows of the property.
8. Councillor Ebel was informed that the condition 3 restricted certain elements of use class E: Condition 3 restricts the commercial areas to office use only.
9. Councillor Shanks was informed that the 'Late Stage Review' will take place once the flats are being sold. The case officer confirmed that there would be parking for retail units and there was existing parking on the industrial estate. It was considered there would be minimum trips to the site and this could be covered by existing on street parking areas.
10. Councillor Theobald was informed by the agent that the current parking on the land to be developed was informal.

Debate

11. Councillor Moonan stated they were against the application, with concerns regarding parking as people will drive to the commercial spaces. The frontage onto Olive Road overlooks the existing properties. The proposals are an overdevelopment of the site. The councillor requested a more proportionate development.
12. Councillor Theobald considered the loss of employment space an issue, as was the lack of affordable housing. The councillor considered the proposals would be higher than others in the area and very dense. The proposals were of a poor design, and it was a shame to lose the existing trees. Parking was also a concern. The councillor stated they were against the application.
13. Councillor Ebel was considered at the lack of affordable housing; however, they noted the proposals were policy compliant and therefore supported the application as the applicant would win at appeal.
14. Councillor Yates considered the transport issues were not significant as the site would be accessible by sustainable transport. The parking for the office use was not good and there was no affordable housing. The councillor considered looking at the larger site at this location would be better. The councillor was against the application.
15. Councillor Janio considered the council would lose at appeal and they did not have any concerns regarding affordable housing. The councillor supported the application.

16. Councillor Littman noted a number of issues had been raised and considered the application to be better than the existing one on this constrained site.

Vote

17. A vote was taken, and by 2 to 4 against, with 2 abstentions, the committee voted against the officer recommendation.
18. A motion to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Moonan and seconded by Councillor Yates.
19. A recorded vote was taken, and Councillors Moonan, Shanks, Theobald, Yates and Littman voted for the refusal. Councillors Ebel and Janio voted against the refusal and Councillor Hills abstained.
20. **RESOLVED:** The application be refused for the following reasons:

1) The proposal, as a result of its scale, bulk, proximity to the site boundaries and location of balconies on the residential building, would result in an overbearing impact, overlooking and loss of privacy to the Olive Road residential properties. This is contrary to policy DM20 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two.

2) The scale, bulk, and height of the proposed residential building would be out of keeping with the pattern and scale of the surrounding area. The number of proposed units and the scale of the development represents an overdevelopment of the site. This is contrary to policies CP12 and CP14 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and DM18 and DM19 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two, and SPD17: Urban Design Framework.

C BH2022/00456 - Former Dairy, 35-39 The Droveaway, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Kevin Brown addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they represented neighbours, the main issue was unit 12 and they considered the new plans to be much worse than the previous, resulting in overlooking, loss of privacy, and an increase in mass and bulk. The light levels were an issue for the kitchen window and harm was great with too much glass in the proposals. The proposed ridge height was higher than the existing 12 Mallory Road and out of keeping. The trees on the boundary should be retained. Foundations were already underway. The earlier scheme was better, please refuse the application.
3. Tim Cropper addressed the committee as the agent and stated that unit 12 would be closer to the neighbour by 2.3m, with a 7.6m separation remaining, which rises to 9m. The height of unit 12 has been reduced and is lower than the previous approval. The impact on the neighbours' secondary windows was deemed acceptable, with obscure glazing proposed. The mass of unit 12 has been reduced. The separation distance has

been reduced, with no significant impact on the existing neighbours. The scheme will include affordable housing and employment benefits.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Theobald was informed by the agent that the scheme had been carefully revised from the previous approval to improve the corner plot. The previous design had a poor relationship with the existing streetscene, and the new application is considered to have a more positive impact. A consultation process has been undertaken and Planning officers agree this is an improvement. Unit 12 will be 2.6m closer to the neighbour. The existing tree is to remain.

Debate

5. Councillor Yates did not consider the application an improvement on the previous planning permission, with the corner plot appearing to be a combination of bad ideas. The proposal does not sit well on the site, or with Mallory Road. The visual benefits are not good; however, the scheme is policy compliant and therefore acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
6. Councillor Theobald was very pleased the wall will be rebuilt and the tree would be retained, however, the move closer to the neighbour at 16 Mallory Road was not good.

Vote

7. A vote was taken, and by 7 to 1 the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
8. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out in the report and the following Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 8th July 2023 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 13 of the report.

D BH2022/01490 - Enterprise Point and 16-18 Melbourne Street, Brighton - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager Introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Gibson addressed the committee and stated the developer was waiting for planning approval to buy the site and existing property owners have expressed concerns regarding loss of light. The co-living appears to be student accommodation, and this was not good.
3. Ward Councillor Hills addressed the committee and stated that they concerned at the density of the proposals. A transient population would not be good for the community. The height of the proposals would lead to overshadowing, overlooking and impact on

the safety of the children in the school next door. The local residents are not in favour of the scheme and the councillor backed them. The councillor stated that co-living was not wanted in the city.

4. Holly Beeston addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they represented the residents of Melbourne Street, and they were concerned that the area would be saturated with students. The one way street will not cope with more traffic and the drop offs to the school will be an issue. The proposals are an overdevelopment of the site. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
5. Mike Evans addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that 3 months minimum contracts were not right for the development. There are concerns over safety. The scheme adds nothing to the community with the possibility of just student living.
6. Julian Howland wished to address the committee as an objecting neighbour, however, due to technical difficulties they were unable to speak. With the Chairs agreement Holly Beeston spoke again and stated that residents were concerned as the proposed high rise blocks proposed would be too close to neighbours.
7. Robert Shaw addressed the committee as the agent and stated that they were the representative of Cosy Co-Living and Co-Working scheme. Phase one of the development has already received planning permission on this sustainable site. The accommodation is by condition not for students, but for young professionals on 12 month leases. There will be a single monthly payment for all residents. £2.5m has been set aside as a commuted sum for affordable housing. Cosy will pay for the relocation of existing residents and propose a new playground for the school next door. The agent has worked with officers to reduce issues. There will be 24/7 on site management. The committee were requested to approve the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

8. Councillor Janio was informed by the case officer that the 12 months would be the standard time for a short lease, and it was not usual to control the length of time. A condition limiting minimum term of leases to 3 months was suggested by condition.
9. Councillor Moonan was informed by the case officer that the ground floor would be used for co-working, gym, laundry, cycle store and vehicle access with disabled parking spaces. The main areas would have individual seating, informal seating, meeting rooms, quiet rooms, tea making facilities and guest rooms. The agent noted there were also toilets and kitchen facilities on the ground floor, with a variety of open and private spaces with a 24/7 management scheme. The areas will have key card access with limited times. Daylight will enter the ground floor via windows on one side of the ground floor and rooflights. Guest rooms can be rented by residents. The case officer stated the co-working area had daylight/sunlight with level access. The roof gardens are at first floor and for residents only, with rooflights within the amenity spaces. Condition 51 clarifies the units are not for students in full time education.
10. Councillor Ebel was informed by the agent the units were 24sqm and communal areas are large. The applicant stated that they had looked at the overall market in Brighton

and Hove and considered all types of housing was needed. This new model would broaden choice. The Planning Manager confirmed that the applicant would need planning permission to change the use class by condition.

11. Councillor Yates was informed by the agent that Cosy Co-Living leases states the resident should not be in education. The intention is to attract those living in house shares and others coming out of education. The case officer confirmed the tenancy agreement was not a planning matter. Council Tax would be included in the monthly charges.
12. Councillor Shanks was informed that the relocation of existing occupants was not a planning consideration.
13. Councillor Theobald was informed by the agent that the existing tenants will be relocated. The existing building is substandard. A similar scheme exists in London, and the style of living was growing fast.
14. Councillor Moonan was informed that the design fulfilled a particular need for those in flat shares and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).
15. Councillor Littman was informed by the case officer that the previous application had been refused as it was not suitable for the site, and the standard of accommodation was not good enough. The current scheme of co-working and co-living suited planning policy. The new scheme improves the layout and amenities. During the pre-application process amendments have been made, with the higher elements reduced to six floors, not 7/8 as before. The blocks have been relocated further away from the neighbours. Block D is half a floor higher, however, the impact on Shanklin Road is considered acceptable.
16. Councillor Ebel was informed by the Highway Agreements Officer that a loading bay was included in the scheme and a travel plan was required by condition. It was noted that demand for parking was to be reduced and not exceeded. A traffic management plan would be required.

Debate

17. Councillor Yates considered the development to be an intense use of the site. Co-living was not new and already existed in the city. Concerns related to no students or children. A mix of tenants would be better. The inclusion of council tax in the monthly payments was good. The councillor considered that the Housing committee should come up with a co-living policy for guidance. The numbers of residents would be very large in one place and HMOs are not together and in one place.
18. Councillor Ebel considered the impact on the area and neighbours. Flat sharing would be better financially. The councillor considered that the developer may put in a planning application to change use to AirBnB or similar. The councillor was against the application. The impact on Shanklin Road would be great and the councillor was not reassured about the potential traffic issues.

19. Councillor Theobald considered there were some good points to the scheme as the design was good, however the height of the proposed blocks was an issue.
20. Councillor Moonan considered there were some good arguments for co-living spaces, however the bulk and scale was an issue on this confined site with limited access. 75% of the scheme would be better.
21. Councillor Janio considered the scheme was better than flat sharing and they supported the application, with sympathy for the residents.
22. Councillor Littman considered the model to be fine and was not similar to HMOs. The size and height were close to neighbours and boundaries. The bulk of the design was too big for the site. The councillor was against the application.
23. Councillor Janio proposed a condition restricting tenants to at least 3 months and was seconded by Councillor Yates. The committee agreed to the additional condition.

Vote

24. A vote was taken, and by 2 to 4 the committee voted against the officer recommendation.
25. Councillor Ebel proposed a refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment, impact on neighbours, loss of privacy/amenities, traffic issues, scale and intensification of site.
26. A vote was taken, and the following Councillors voted for the refusal: Ebel, Moonan, Shanks, Yates and Littman. The following Councillors voted against the refusal: Janio and Theobald.
27. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
 1. *The intensification of the development, by reason of the scale and bulk of the development and the intensification of uses and large number of units proposed in the development would represent an overdevelopment of this constrained site. This is contrary to policies CP12 and CP14 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and DM18 and DM19 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two, and SPD17: Urban Design Framework.*
 2. *The development by reason of excessive scale and bulk and close proximity to neighbouring occupiers would result in an unneighbourly development resulting in overshadowing and loss of privacy. This is contrary to policy DM20 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two.*

E BH2022/03823 - 54 Waterloo Street, Hove - Full Planning

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

2. **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 set out in the report.

F BH2022/03139 - 30 Bennett Drive, Hove - Householder Planning Consent

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Madeleine Grinyer addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that Bennett Drive curves and many properties do not have solar panels, therefore the impact will differ. Numbers 30 and 32 are close together, the sunlight assessment did not take this into account. The development will have a detrimental impact on the light and amenity of rooms near the neighbour and solar panels. The scaffolding will also affect the solar panels. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
3. Julia Mitchell addressed the committee as the agent and requested that the committee support the officer recommendation. The previous planning permission was not implemented. This application reduces the effect on the neighbours. The sunlight/daylight assessment found the proposals acceptable. The ridge height is to be increased by 0.3m and the area has many similar height extensions.

Debate

4. Councillor Yates considered the 4% reduction in sunlight to be acceptable and supported the application.
5. Councillor Theobald considered the design to be fine and supported the application.

Vote

6. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
7. **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 report.

G BH2022/03474 - 36 Gorham Avenue, Rottingdean - Householder Planning Consent

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Tim Hodgson addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they were not against the principle of development, however the proposals were overshadowing with loss of light, stopping the winter sun which provides heat. The neighbouring family included a child with special needs, and it was considered that the loss of light would have a significant impact. The speaker requested that the

development be on the other side of the house. The proposals will be 110cm away from the neighbouring property.

3. Gill Greenhalgh addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that upstairs accommodation was very small with one bathroom to serve three bedrooms. The proposals include solar panels to be more energy efficient. The proposals have been carefully designed to minimise the impact on the neighbours with no side windows. A cat slide roof will face the neighbour and should not lead to loss of light. The plans would offer an ensuite bathroom, three further bedrooms, and a family bathroom, all on the first floor. Concessions have been made and it is proposed that works are restricted to 8.30am to 4.30pm, with no loud music or parking across driveways.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Janio was informed that the neighbouring properties have extensions. The agent confirmed that the lounge windows are part of the original house, not the extension, with two facing south.

Debate

5. Councillor Yates stated that the approval of the parish council did not carry a lot of weight. The councillor considered the development proportionate and support the application.
6. Councillor Shanks considered the proposals to be reasonable.

Vote

7. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
8. **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 report.

H **BH2022/03066 - Land to the East of The Vale, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Fishleigh addressed the committee and stated that the developers appeared to remove trees against the law. The mature trees on the site were a wildlife corridor, and this has gone for ever. The committee were requested to condition the application to include 15 year old tree planting. The councillor considered that if the committee agreed permission, they would be setting a precedent.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

3. Councillor Moonan was informed by the case officer noted tree works had already been agreed to trees with Ash die-back and 5 additional damaged trees. The application is to amalgamate all the works into one. Twenty two trees are to be removed in total and 22 are to be planted. The Enforcement team Manager stated that the applicant had been asked for tree protection measures to be put in place. However, the Planning Manager noted that the protection measures were not conditioned by the Planning Inspector when the appeal was allowed. The application before the committee was to mitigate the damage that has been done.
4. Councillor Littman was informed by the Enforcement Manager that the application before the committee would have no effect on the current enforcement investigation.
5. Councillor Janio was informed that the investigation details could not be discussed.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed by the council Arboriculturist that the developer had been requested to provide evidence and it was noted that the tree roots had been severed and the trees had no long term viability.
7. Councillor Ebel was informed that if the committee refused permission the applicant could appeal, or another way forward would need to be found.
8. Councillor Shanks was informed by the Arboriculturist that a condition to have trees of 20/25cms girth was attached, and these would cost in the region of £600/800 each.

Debate

9. Councillor Moonan noted the original application was refused at committee and granted at appeal. The tree roots have been damaged and this was noticed by the vigilant neighbours and Ward Councillor. The councillor stated they wanted the biggest replacement trees possible, then they would support the application.
10. Councillor Yates considered it was partially the council's fault. The councillor noted some trees had Ash die-back and others have been lost, and these were not good. The councillor stated that supporting the application before the committee was the best option for the site and to mitigate the loss of the trees.
11. Councillor Littman was informed the replacement trees would be eleven Red Maple and eleven Field Maple.
12. Councillor Moonan was informed there was a watering condition attached.

Vote

13. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
14. **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 report.

I **BH2022/02689 - 126 Gloucester Road, Brighton - Full Planning**

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.
2. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out in the report and the following Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 8 July 2023 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 13 of the report.

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

97.1 There were none from this meeting.

98 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

99 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

99.1 None for this agenda.

100 APPEAL DECISIONS

100.1 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 6.55pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of