

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 20 AUGUST 2008

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Hyde (Chairman), Wells (Deputy Chairman), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Mrs Cobb, Davey, Hamilton, Hawkes, Kennedy, K Norman, Pidgeon, Smart and Steedman

Co-opted Members Mr J Small (CAG Representative) and Mr R Pennington (Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People)

PART ONE

60. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

60A. SUBSTITUTES

60.1	<u>Councillor</u> Pidgeon Hawkes Cobb	<u>For Councillor</u> Mrs Theobald McCaffery Barnett
------	--	---

60B. Declarations of Interest

60.2 Councillor Norman declared a personal but not prejudicial interest relative to application BH00565, Stammer Park Access Road, by virtue of his attendance at Brighton & Hove Albion Football Club matches. Councillor Smart declared a personal but not prejudicial interest relative to Application BH2008/01326, 18 Bishops Road. During the site visit it had become apparent that a resident of one of the neighbouring properties was known to him but not as a close acquaintance. Councillor Davey also declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Application BH2008/01326, 18 Bishops Road. The architect associated with the project was known to him but not as a close acquaintance.

60C. Exclusion of Press and Public

60.3 The Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public

were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Section 100A (3) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972.

60.4 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items on the agenda.

61. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 JULY 2008

61.2 **RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2008 be approved and signed by the Chairman.

62. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

62.1 The Chairman explained that details relating to fire safety (including hydrants and access for fire engines) as covered by the Building Regulations (Part B of Schedule 1) had been circulated to Members for their information. This had been requested at the previous meeting of the Committee.

62.2 **RESOLVED** - That the position be noted in respect of all of the above.

63. PETITIONS

63.1 There were none.

64. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

64.1 There were none.

65. DEPUTATIONS

65.1 There were none.

66. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

66.1 There were none.

67. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

67.1 There were none.

68. NOTICES OF MOTION REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

68.1 There were none.

69. TO CONSIDER THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

69.1 There were none. However, the Development Control Manager stated that site visits would be arranged for major applications on the agenda for consideration at next scheduled meeting of the Committee on 10 September 2008.

70. PLANS LIST APPLICATIONS, 20 AUGUST 2008**(i) TREES**

- 70.1 The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendations set out in Paragraph 7 of the respective reports and resolves to grant consent subject to the conditions set out in the reports in respect of the following :

BH2008/02444, University of Brighton, Lewes Road, Brighton ;
BH2008/02387, Balfour Junior School, Balfour Road, Brighton

(ii) SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROVERSIAL APPLICATIONS OR APPLICATIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL POLICY

- 70.2 **Application BH2008/1569, The Wellsbourne Centre, Whitehawk Road, Brighton** – Demolition of derelict wing of existing Wellsbourne Centre. Construction of Primary Health Centre to accommodate two doctors' surgeries (existing Whitehawk and Broadway) and ancillary pharmacy. Extension to existing parking facilities (community car park), together with new pedestrian access (paths and graded walkway) .
- 70.3. It was noted that the application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 70.4 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation setting out the constituent elements of the scheme.
- 70.5 Councillor Kennedy requested sight of the detailed elevational drawings and confirmation regarding materials and finishes to be used. She supported the application if completed as indicated but had concerns however regarding the "unfinished" appearance of the neighbouring children's centre to white a white render finish was to have been applied. To date this work had not been carried out.
- 70.6 Councillor Steedman requested that the implementation of conditions on the Children's Centre building should be followed up. Whilst on site it had been noted that render and a green roof had not been implemented. The Planning Officer agreed to do this.
- 70.7 Councillor Wells sought confirmation regarding the proposed cladding material. At various locations in the City where cedar had been used this had not weathered well. It was explained that larch was to be used in this instance and the Chairman explained that this material which had been used in construction of the children's centre was weathering in an acceptable manner, as had been seen on the site visit.
- 70.8 Councillor Hawkes sought clarification regarding use of the sum set aside towards sustainable transport measures . The Planning Officer explained this was to be used for the provision of Kassel kerbs at the north and southbound

St David's Hall bus stops.

- 70.9 Mr Pennington, Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People and councillors Hawkes and Pidgeon queried the number of disabled parking bays to be provided (2), which seemed too few bearing in mind the potential number of patients to be covered by this new combined facility. Councillor Hawkes was of the view that this appeared inconsistent as other newly opened comparable centres, elsewhere in the city appeared to include a larger number of such bays.
- 70.10 The Development Control Manager explained that the number of spaces included fell within the standard set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance 4 (Parking Standards). This number could be amended subsequently in the light of operating experience. In answer to questions of Councillor Norman regarding whether the number of spaces could be revised by the Committee at that meeting, the Development Control Manager explained that this would be an amendment to the scheme which would require amendments to the application. In consequence the Committee was required to determine the application as put before them.
- 70.11 Mr Pennington, Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People considered it a significant failing that whilst dropped kerbs were to be provided within and at the immediate perimeters of the scheme a wider survey taking in the likely route of travel of those using the centre had not been carried out. The Highway Authority Officer explained that this was not required of the applicant relative to the size of the scheme proposed. The Development Control Manager confirmed that the scheme would be fully compliant with SPG4 and would also need to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.
- 70.12 Councillor Steedman whilst supporting the scheme considered that it would be more appropriate for a "brown or green roof" rather than green sedum roof to be provided as this would be more sustainable and would support a greater level of biodiversity. He proposed that a condition to that effect be added to any planning permission given. Members concurred in that view and agreed thereon when voting in respect of this application.
- 70.13 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that minded to grant permission be given in the terms set out below.
- 70.14 **RESOLVED** - (1) That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 the report and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Obligation to secure a financial contribution of £30,000 towards the Sustainable Transport Strategy and (to be used for the provision of Kassel kerbs at the north and southbound St. David's Hall bus stops) and to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report and to addition of the following condition and informative:

No development shall take place until details of a green roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme

shall be implemented as part of the development and shall be retained as such thereafter. Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and in accordance with policies S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 and SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Informative:

Green or Biodiverse roofs: support biodiverse vegetation and **are designed to support species-rich habitats such as chalk grassland. Brown Roofs use recycled rubble to support specialist plant communities. For more information see www.livingroofs.org**

(2) Minded to refuse if the Section 106 Obligation is not signed by all parties by 4 September 2008.

(iii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS WHICH VARY FROM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AS SET OUT IN THE PLANS LIST (MINOR APPLICATIONS) DATED 20 AUGUST 2008

- 70.15 **Application BH2008/01485, 25 The Ridgeway, Woodingdean** – addition of new first floor storey with rooms in the roof, single storey extension, front oriole windows and entrance canopy.
- 70.16 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation setting out the reasons for the Officers' recommendations.
- 70.17 Mr Hughes spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of their application displaying examples of similar treatments which had been effected in the immediate vicinity, some of them granted under delegated authority. The applicant had sought to ensure that the proposal was not detrimental to neighbouring properties and that the roof height would not read as being higher than its neighbours when viewed within the street scene.
- 70.18 Councillor Simson spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor in support of the application. She stated that it was rare for her to support a proposal which ran contrary to Officers' recommendations. However, in this instance she did not consider that the development would be too bulky or detrimental to the street scene. She considered that it needed to be considered within the context of the Ridgeway itself where there was no uniformity of building styles and infill development had taken place. A number of bungalows had been converted into two storey dwellings and this did not appear to be at variance with them. The applicant had sought to address the previous grounds for refusal and to respect the amenity of its neighbours, both of whom supported the application. She considered it was acceptable and should be supported.
- 70.19 The Planning Officer explained that one of the nearby properties referred to by the applicant's agent was currently the subject of a complaint which could result in enforcement action being taken. The Development Control Manager stated that each application had to be assessed on its individual merits, whether dealt with under delegated authority or determined by the Committee.

- 70.20 Councillors Norman and Wels stated that they considered the design and height of the proposed development to be acceptable and mirrored the height and elevational levels of other similar conversions nearby. There were a number of taller properties in The Ridgeway flanked by bungalows and in their view this was no different from any of them. They considered the application to be acceptable and that permission should be granted.
- 70.21 A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below. Councillor Carden queried the outcome of the first recorded vote. a second vote was therefore taken and agreed upon by Members and it is the outcome of that vote which is set out below.
- 70.22 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee resolves to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions.
1. standard time condition
 2. materials to match existing

Reason: the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and makes a positive contribution to its visual amenity.

[**Note 1** : A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions Members voted that planning permission be granted on the grounds set out above].

[**Note 2**: Councillor Wells proposed that planning permission be granted. This was seconded by Councillor Norman. A recorded vote was then taken. Councillors Hyde(the Chairman), Cobb, K Norman, Smart, Pidgeon and wells voted that planning permission be granted. Councillors Carden, Davey and Kennedy voted that planning permission be refused. Councillors Hamilton, Hawkes and Steedman abstained. Therefore on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out].

(iv) OTHER APPLICATIONS

- 70.23 **Application BH2008/00565, Stanmer Park Access Road (off A270 Lewes Road)** – upgrade and widening by up to 1 metre of Stanmer Park access road. To join with approved link road into Sussex University. This is an additional application to the approved Falmer Community Stadium application (ref: BH2001/02418).
- 70.24 It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 70.25 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation relative to the proposals.
- 70.26 Mr Gapper spoke on behalf of neighbours and residents of Stanmer Village who had raised objections to the scheme. It was considered that the proposal would result in a significant increase in the number of vehicles driving though the park to access the university and the football stadium on match days to

the detriment of other users. Conflicting movements by cyclists, pedestrians and other vehicular traffic would result in a greater risk of injury accidents, given that there would be blind corners and the separation of the different users would not be clearly delineated. There would be traffic build up, tail backs and congestion adjacent to the lodges and removal / cutting back of vegetation would result in loss of amenity and privacy to the residential dwellings.

- 70.27 Mr Perry spoke representing the applicant in support of their application. He explained that the proposal was a vital link in a series of measures to facilitate implementation of the community football stadium at Falmer. The existing access road to the university would be closed and this would then be the main access / egress route, and would be brought up to an adoptable standard which would be safe for use by an increased volume of traffic.
- 70.28 Councillor Smart expressed concern regarding an increased number of traffic movements at weekends when use of the park was likely to be at its greatest. The Highway Authority Officer explained that at those times and on other occasions when football matches were being played, the Club's traffic management plan would be enforced and stewarding arrangements would be in place.
- 70.29 Councillors Cobb, Davey and Steedman expressed concern that the crossing point would be delineated by dropped kerbs alone. The applicant explained that all of these traffic management measures requested by the Council had been included in the application. Councillor Davey queried whether given the level of bicycle use by those at the University whether "Sustrans" had been consulted. The Highway Authority Officer explained that "Sustrans were part of the working group".
- 70.30 Councillor Wells was in agreement that it was appropriate to close the existing access road into the university which resulted in the need for traffic to approach from a fast moving lane via a blind bend. He considered however that a suitable road surface would need to be provided and that the amenity of those dwelling in the lodges should be protected.
- 70.31 Councillor Kennedy stated that whilst she supported the Falmer location of the football stadium and whilst also not wanting a proliferation of urban street signage within the park she considered that a greater degree of separation was needed between pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicular traffic.
- 70.32 Councillor Norman stated that he considered that the proposals were acceptable and had regard to measures which needed to be in place when the road was likely to be at its most heavily trafficked. Councillor Smart concurred. Councillor Hamilton considered that the increase in traffic overall was not such that the improved road network would be unable to support it. In answer to further questions the Highway Authority Officer explained how the proposed network dovetailed with other traffic management proposals intended relative to the wider (and separate) scheme.

- 70.33 A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 4 with 1 abstention planning permission was granted in the terms set out below .
- 70.34 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendations set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the submission of satisfactory details regarding the design subject to the submission of a satisfactory details regarding the design of the proposed access road, surface water disposal, works upon the Lower Lodges listed buildings and measures to ensure availability of the footpath and cycleway for the duration of the works and subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report,
- 70.35 **Application BH2007/04674, 68 - 70 High Street, Rottingdean** – Redevelopment of site to provide 9 three bedroom town houses with integral garages, built in 2 blocks, with accommodation on four floors (Amendment to previously approved scheme BH2007/00617 omitting the 4 visitor parking spaces)
- 70.36 It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 70.37 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation and explained that notwithstanding that the previous application had been granted contrary to Officers' recommendations the current scheme which sought to remove four parking spaces, which were identified as visitor spaces was still considered to be unacceptable on the grounds set out and refusal was therefore recommended .
- 70.38 Mr Carter spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of their application . He explained that the proposed use would generate far fewer traffic movements than arose from the existing use . it was considered the development had been well designed and was not at variance with the surrounding conservation area notwithstanding that it would not be visible from outside the site itself . In answer to questions he explained which elements of the neighbouring site were in the applicant's ownership and which were not . Removal of four parking spaces was required in order to enable the neighbouring premises (fronting the High Street) to be extended by the applicant to provide a restaurant with accommodation above. This would form the subject of a separate application.
- 70.39 Mr Pennington , Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People enquired regarding the manner in which bathrooms would be configured within the development and whether the units would be fully wheelchair accessible. The Planning Officer explained that the submitted plans did not include details of the intended internal layout, although these rooms appeared to be very small.
- 70.40 Councillor Steedman queried the fact that following the previous application details of sustainability measures and relating to demolition and construction waste minimisation had not been included. Mr Carter explained that these details could be provided if requested and measures taken to ensure that a very good BREEAM / Ecohomes rating would be achieved as a minimum.

- 70.41 Councillor Steedman also enquired why two separate applications were to be submitted. It was explained that the scheme relating to the proposed restaurant had not been worked up at the time the previous application had been made.
- 70.42 Councillor Kennedy stated that she was of the view that the submitted drawings were poor, lacked detail and the development was not of a design appropriate to its proposed location. Notwithstanding that the recommendation for refusal had been overturned relative to the previous application; she considered that this application should be refused in accordance with the Officers' recommendations.
- 70.43 Mr Small (CAG) stated that although the Group's comments had not been included, they had been submitted with the earlier report. CAG remained of the view that the application should be refused on the grounds of its design and location within a conservation area. In his view none of the Group's previous objections had been overcome
- 70.44 Councillor Hamilton stated that as the extant permission was already in place it could be built as per that permission. As the only element of difference related to the removal of four car parking spaces it was on that basis that the application needed to be considered. In his view the four visitor should be retained as they formed an integral part of the scheme. He concurred with the views submitted by Rottingdean Parish Council set out in the report.
- 70.45 Councillor Wells stated that he considered the proposal to be acceptable as Rottingdean was of high density and the development would be no more closely spaced with its neighbours than properties elsewhere in the village. As there was a public car park nearby he did not consider the loss of four parking spaces to be significant .
- 70.46 A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 3 with 2 abstentions planning permission was refused on the grounds set out below.
- 70.47 **RESOLVED** - That the committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation and resolves to refuse planning permission for the following reasons :
- (1) The proposed development, by reason of design, layout, excessive scale, limited separation to boundaries and between terraces, dominance of vehicle manoeuvring area and garage doors, and lack of landscaping would be prominent over development of a poor design that would have a detrimental relationship with and be out of character with surrounding development and the Rottingdean Conservation Area . The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies, QD1, QD2, Qd3, QD15, H04 and HE6;
- (2) the proposed development would result in extensive overlooking between the two terraces, and the end houses would be exposed to overlooking from users of the neighbouring school property, which is elevated above the application site level. The small rear gardens would not provide adequate

usable amenity space for future occupiers, and the high boundary walls and limited separation between the terraces would result in an overall sense of enclosure. The proposed development would therefore provide poor living conditions for future occupiers, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies QD£, QD27, HO4 and HO5;

(3) The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing commercial site, which in the absence of demonstration to the contrary, is considered suitable for continued employment use. The loss of this commercial use would be detrimental to employment and economic opportunities, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy EM3;

(4) The proposed development would result in enclosure and overlooking of No 56 High Street, causing detriment to the living conditions of that residential property, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy QD27 ;

(5) The proposed development, by reason of excessive height and scale and unsympathetic design, would be overbearing on the neighbouring Grade II listed buildings and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of these listed buildings, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies QD, QD2 and HE3 ;

(6) The applicant has failed to submit any information with respect to achieving a minimum of very good BREEAM/Ecohomes rating or equivalent and as such the proposed development would therefore fail to meet the minimum requirements of Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy SU2 and demonstration of efficiency in the use of water, energy and materials, and SPGHB Note 16 : Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Developments ;

(7) The proposed development has failed to provide adequate detail of demolition and construction waste minimisation measures, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy SU13 and RG P - W5 ; and

(8) The application excludes parcels of land that appear to be part of the overall site and, in the absence of justification to the contrary, it appears that this has been done to circumvent policies and requirements related to the provision of affordable housing, and contributions towards educational facilities and the recreational open space contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies HO2 and QD28 and Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 9 "A Guide for Developers on the Provision Of Recreational Space".

Informatives :

1. This decision is based on the unnumbered plans of existing floor layout and elevations, block plan showing proposed site layout, floor plans and elevations submitted on 20 December 2007.

70.48 **Application BH2008/01574, Hove Rugby Club, Recreation Ground, Shirley Drive, Hove** – Extensions to clubhouse to provide additional changing rooms, new clubroom and entrance porch,

- 70.49 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation explaining that confirmation had been obtained from the applicants relative to the actual size of the hard standing around the clubhouse and revised plans had been submitted reflecting this. Reference was also made to further late objections and photographs from Councillors Bennett and Brown relative to illegal parking of taxis and private cars believed to be associated with events taking place at the Rugby Club.
- 70.50 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that permission be granted.
- 70.51 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.
- 70.52 **Application BH2008/01326, 18 Bishops Road, Hove** – First floor extension and alterations to convert bungalow to two - storey house (re-submission)
- 70.53 It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting .
- 70.54 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation setting out the proposals in detail . The main concern related to loss of aspect to one window of the neighbouring property at no 20. This was not however of such significance to warrant refusal.
- 70.55 Councillor Steedman stated that should permission be granted it would be appropriate for a green roof to be provided of materials which would support biodiversity
- 70.56 A vote was taken and on a vote of 9 to 1 with 2 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below .
- 70.57 **RESOLVED -** That the committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to Conditions and Informatives set out in the report and to the following amendment/additions.

Condition 5: Amend the word “sedum” to “green”

Add a new condition:

No development shall take place until details of the green roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and shall be retained as such thereafter. Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and in accordance with policies S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 and SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Add an informative:

Green or Biodiverse roofs: Support biodiverse vegetation and **are designed to support**

species-rich habitats such as chalk grassland. Brown Roofs use recycled rubble to support specialist plant communities. For more information see www.livingroofs.org.

- 70.58 **Application BH2008/01813, 20 Tivoli Crescent, Brighton** – partial change of use from residential basement (C3) to community use (D1) to allow x4 weekly pre- school music classes (retrospective).
- 70.59 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation detailing the proposals and setting out the reasons for the recommendation.
- 70.60 Councillor Smart sought clarification regarding configuration of the site, and that the property dropped down to basement level at the rear. Councillors Norman and Wells whilst supporting the use in principle had concerns regarding the need to ensure health and safety requirements relative to the ratio / number of adults and children on site when the basement was used for music classes.
- 70.61 Councillor Hawkes considered that it was important that adequate toilet facilities were provided and that this resource complied with similar standards to those to be met elsewhere across the City for example at the Council's own events run in libraries etc. councillor Hawkes was also of the view that it was important for the relevant Officers of the Council to be made aware of this resource which would also enable information regarding this facility to be included on their data base.
- 70.62 The Development Control Manager explained that matters relative to health and safety requirements were not a planning consideration but that an informative could be added to any planning permission granted. She also agreed to write to the relevant department/ officers of the Council on the Committees' behalf making them aware of this resource . Councillor Cobb expressed concern regarding noise levels generated by the use, which although faint and intermittent appeared to be impacting adversely on neighbouring residents .
- 70.63 Councillors Carden , Kennedy and Smart expressed their support for the proposal .
- 70.64 A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 1 with 2 abstentions planning permission was granted.
- 70.65 **RESOLVED** - That the committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

(v) DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS DELEGATED TO THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT

- 70.66 **RESOLVED** – Those details of the applications determined by the Director of Environment under delegated powers be noted.

[**Note 1:** All decisions recorded in this minute are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the Planning Register maintained by the Director of Environment. The register complies with the legislative requirements].

[**Note 2 :** A list of representations, received by the Council after the Plans List reports had been submitted for printing had been circulated to Members on the Friday preceding the meeting. (For copy see minute book). Where representations were received after that time they would be reported to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and it would be at their discretion whether these should (in exceptional cases), be reported to the Committee. This in accordance with resolution 147.2 of the then, Sub Committee held on 23 February 2005].

71. DETERMINED APPLICATIONS

71.1 The Committee noted those applications determined by Officers during the period covered by the report.

72. SITE VISITS

72.1 There were none. However, the Development Control Manager stated that site visits would be arranged for major applications on the agenda to be considered at the Committees' next scheduled meeting on 10 September 2008.

73. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

74. APPEALS LODGED

74.1 The Committee noted the list of Planning Appeals, which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

75. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

75.1 The Committee noted the information set out in the agenda relating to information on Informal Hearings and Public Inquiries.

The meeting concluded at 5.55pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of