

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 26 JUNE 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Mac Cafferty (Chair), Jones (Deputy Chair), Hyde (Opposition Spokesperson), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cox, Davey, Gilbey, Hamilton, C Theobald and Wells

Co-opted Members: Mr Helmut Lusser (Conservation Advisory Group)

Officers in attendance: Paul Vidler (Deputy Development control Manager), Zachary Ellwood (Area Planning Manager), Christopher Wright (Planning Officer), Paula Goncalves (Senior Planning Officer), Liz Hobden (Local Development Framework Team Manager) Steven Shaw (Principal Transport Officer), Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor) and Ross Keatley (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

13. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

13a Declarations of substitutes

13.1 Mr Lusser was present in substitution for Mr Gowans.

13b Declarations of interests

13.2 Councillor Wells declared an interest in relation to Application F, 68 Crescent Drive South, Brighton as he had a family connection with the applicant and owner. He stated he would withdraw from the meeting during the consideration and vote on this application.

13c Exclusion of the press and public

13.3 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.

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

14. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

14.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2013 as a correct record.

15. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

15.1 It was noted that the Council's Food Growing Planning Advice Note had been highly commended at the South East Centre for the Built Environment Awards 2013. There would a second session of the 6 monthly mandatory training to be held on 23 July at 10 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall.

16. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

16.1 There were none.

17. TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

17.1 There were none.

18. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Major Applications

A. BH2013/00293 - Land West of Redhill Close, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition - Application for variation of conditions 8 and 13 of application BH2010/00692 (Outline application for 31 dwellings (0.62 ha) with public open space (2.11 ha) and approval of reserved matters for layout, access and landscaping) to change the wording within the condition to state that the development will achieve a Sustainable Homes Code Level 4 rather than Level 5 in respect of plots 1-14 and block 1.

(1) The Area Planning Manager, Zachary Ellwood, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. Outline planning permission had been granted in 2011, and at that time it had been conditioned that all 31 of the units would meet Code Level 5 for sustainability; this application sought to amend that condition such that 18 of the units would be able to meet a Code Level 4. It was noted that those units still able to meet Level 5 would be those with southerly facing roofs where the installation of photovoltaic panels would be most effective. It was outlined in the report that the Sustainability Officer was satisfied with the amended condition for the remaining 18 units, and it was expected that these units would achieve a high Code Level 4. The site would contain 12 affordable homes units, and 8 of these would be Code Level 5. It was explained that the detailed design of the scheme would form part of the reserved matters application. It was noted that the position of the units was set out in the outline planning permission, and a minor amendment to Conditions 8, 9, 14 & 15 was suggested to explicitly state which units

would be Code Level 5. The application was recommended to be minded to grant for the reasons set out in the report.

Public Speakers and Questions

- (2) Councillor Ann Norman spoke in objection to the scheme in her capacity as the Local Ward Councillor. She extended her thanks to the applicants for keeping the local Ward Councillors updated about developments with the application, and went on to highlight some of the concerns of local residents in relation to the access to the site from Redhill Drive, and the potential impact of visitor parking in the area. There was also some concern expressed about the potential future of the green space, and it was felt that the units should adhere to the sustainability level agreed in the original outline planning permission.
- (3) Mr Andrew Munton spoke on the behalf of the applicant, and noted the Code Level 5 for sustainability had been agreed at the outline stage; however, following work on the reserved matters application it was apparent that there was inadequate roof space on some of the units to include the necessary amount of photovoltaic panels to reach Code Level 5. The applicant had explored other sustainable system to achieve Code Level 5, but none would be as effective. The proposed changes had been fully assessed by the Council's Sustainability Officer to maximise what could be achieved on the site, and the amendment was considered acceptable.
- (4) Councillor Cox asked for information on when the applicant proposed to commence the scheme; in response the Chair advised that the commencement of work was not a material planning consideration, and pointed to the relevant conditions in the report in relation to commencement.
- (5) Councillor Hamilton asked for further information on why Code Level 5 was not achievable on some of the units, and in response Mr Munton explained that this was in relation to the orientation of the dwellings and the amount of panels that could be put on each roof that would be effective.
- (6) Councillor Hyde went on to ask if the roofs could be orientated differently, and Mr Munton explained that the citing of the units was set out in the outline permission, and the amount of roof space was limited so that only so many panels could be placed on each roof.
- (7) Councillor Carol Theobald asked for more information in relation to the orientation, and also about the provision for the Scout hut. In response Mr Munton reiterated that the problem related mainly to the amount of roof space available on each unit; he explained that part of the application sought the transfer of land in relation to the Scout hut and funds to improve the facility.
- (8) Councillor Jones asked why the problems in relation to achieving Code Level 5 had not been apparent at the stage of the application for the outline permission. Mr Munton then explained that when the site had been purchased an assessment had been undertaken and the developers were confident of achieving Code Level 5; he explained the sustainability coding was banded and it was only the exclusion of the photovoltaic panels that made the difference between Code Levels 4 & 5.

Questions for Officers

- (9) Before the Committee asked questions the Area Planning Manager confirmed that the roof space of the units was already set by the outline permission, and could not be altered, and the completion timescales were set out in Condition 1 of the report.
- (10) Councillor Davey asked for more information in relation to the banding of the sustainability codings, and in response the Senior Planning Officer. Paula Goncalves, outlined how the levels were banded, and explained that the proposal outlined would be for a high Code Level 4.
- (11) Councillor Cox asked about the dates in the report for the commencement of the scheme, and Officers explained that the commencement would be the same as in the outline permission; this was set nationally for outline consents.
- (12) Councillor Carol Theobald asked if it would be possible for the scheme to achieve a Code Level 5 for all of the units; in response the Sustainability Officer explained that this would be possible with a different design or set of circumstances, but Officers considered the scheme put forward was a reasonable compromise.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (13) Councillor Carol Theobald stated the issues in relation to the achievability of the Code Level 5 should have been worked out in advance of the outline planning permission.
- (14) A vote was taken and planning permission was granted on a vote of 8 to 1 with 1 abstention.

18.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 of the report and the policies and guidance in section 7 of the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to: the variation of the Section 106 Obligation dated 13 May 2011 to refer to the current application, the Conditions and Informatives set out in section 11 of the report; the amended conditions set out below and the additional informative set out below.

8. No residential development pursuant to plots 15-22 (inclusive) or Block 2 (plots 27-31) shall commence until a Design Stage / Interim Code for Sustainable Homes Certificate demonstrating that development achieves Code Level 5 for these residential units has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. A completed pre-assessment estimator will not be acceptable.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and to comply with policy SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document SPD08 Sustainable Building Design.

9. No residential development pursuant to plots 1-14 (inclusive) or Block 1 (plots 23-26) shall commence until a Design Stage / Interim Code for Sustainable Homes Certificate

demonstrating that development achieves Code Level 4 for these residential units has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. A completed pre-assessment estimator will not be acceptable.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and to comply with policy SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document SPD08 Sustainable Building Design.

14. Plots 15-22 (inclusive) and Block 2 (plots 27-31) shall not be occupied until a Final / Post Construction Code Certificate issued by an accreditation body confirming that these residential units have achieved a Code for Sustainable Homes rating of Code Level 5 has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and to comply with policy SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document SPD08 Sustainable Building Design.

15. Plots 1-14 (inclusive) and Block 1 (plots 23-26) shall not be occupied until a Final / Post Construction Code Certificate issued by an accreditation body confirming that these residential units have achieved a Code for Sustainable Homes rating of Code Level 4 has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and to comply with policy SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document SPD08 Sustainable Building Design.

Additional informative:

- i. In respect of conditions 9 & 15 of the permission hereby granted, the Local Planning Authority expects the residential units on Plots 1 to 14 (inclusive) and Block 1 (plots 23-26) to achieve a minimum of 76 points overall in the Code for Sustainable Homes assessment.

Note: Councillors Littman and Wakefield were not present at the meeting.

Minor Applications

- B. BH2013/00848 - The Hyde, 95 Rowan Avenue, Hove- Full Planning Permission -** Construction of 5no. four bedroom houses and access road off Rowan Avenue with associated works including car parking.

- (1) It was noted that this application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

- (2) The Case Officer, Christopher Wright, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The proposals related to a plot of land to the rear of no.57 to 81 Rowan Avenue, and the plot was accessible from an extended roadway. Historically the land had belonged to the nearby sports and social club; this had been demolished leaving behind a former playing field and the surface car park. The properties proposed on the site would be of a traditional form with pitched roofs; the fenestration would be aluminium, coloured grey and there would be painted render walls. Each of the properties would have refuse and cycle storage at the back which could be accessed by a gate, and none of the properties would have side windows to mitigate any overlooking. There would also be tall boundary planting between the site and the rear gardens that abutted it. The majority of the site was greenfield and the applicant had offered a Code Level 5 for sustainability. It was the view of the Officers that the applicant had made a satisfactory case for residential development on the site, and the form and scale of the proposals was appropriate given the location. It was also considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, and the impact of the transport was acceptable. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers

- (3) Councillor Davey asked for more information in relation to the boundary between the site and the existing residential properties behind, and it was explained that the application proposed additional planting on the western boundary, and there was a condition that the landscaping be submitted and approved.
- (4) Councillor Jones asked for more information on how the developer proposed to meet Code Level 5 for sustainability, and in response it was explained that it was a policy requirement on this kind of site; the site plan also showed that the north to south orientation of all the houses allowed for effective use of photovoltaic panels.
- (5) Councillor Hyde asked specific questions about the amount of parking on the site, and it was explained that the amount of parking set out in SPG 4 was a maximum requirement, and as what was proposed here was less than the maximum it was deemed acceptable.
- (6) Councillor Gilbey asked more information about the access way and footway for the site. In response it was explained that the report recommended this be widened to 1.3 metres. Councillor Hyde had further queries, and it was explained that some of the carriageway was currently not in an adoptable condition, and the report addressed this matter through condition.
- (7) It was confirmed for Councillor Carol Theobald that there would be sufficient space on the site to allow cars to enter and exit in forward gear.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (8) Councillor Hyde expressed concerns about the potential overflow of parking from the site, but went on to state that the development was appropriate; would provide family

homes; there would be no overlooking and she would be supporting the Officer recommendation.

- (9) Councillor Jones noted that the site was 'awkward' but he welcomed this kind of development where there was minimal impact on wildlife, and it was a good use of the land.
- (10) Councillor Carol Theobald noted that the proposal was 'neat' and would be an improvement on what was currently there.
- (11) A vote was taken and planning permission was unanimously granted.

18.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 of the report and the policies and guidance in section 7 of the report and resolves it is **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to the section 106 Obligation, Conditions and Informatives set out in section 11 of the report.

Note: Councillors Littman and Wakefield were not present at the meeting.

C. BH2012/04035 - 43 Russell Square, Brighton - Full Planning Permission - Change of use from single dwelling (C3) to House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis) on upper floors and 1 no. one bedroom basement flat. Alterations including increased roof height of rear extension and provision of slate roof. (Part Retrospective).

- (1) This application was deferred.

D. BH2013/01366 - 35 Uplands Road, Brighton - Full Planning Permission - Change of use from single dwelling (C3) to House in Multiple Occupation (C4).

- (1) The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. It was noted that this was the first application since the introduction of the new Article 4 Direction to come before the Committee. The proposals included the creation of a fourth bedroom on the ground floor. The application had been extended to the side, and it was noted that there was off street parking, and the area was not part of a controlled parking zone (CPZ), but there was some concern from local residents in relation to parking. The small front garden was also considered appropriate for storage of refuse and recycling; there was also potential space on the site for secure cycle storage, but full details of this would be necessary before occupation. The application had been assessed against policy CP21 from the emerging City Plan as the adopted Local Plan was silent on the matter of HMOs; the policy sought to prevent over intensification, and it had been demonstrated that an HMO in this location was in line with policy. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers

- (2) It was confirmed for Councillor Davey that there would be no physical alterations to the outside of the building.

- (3) It was confirmed for Councillor Gilbey that the location of refuse and recycling storage would be secured through condition before occupation.
- (4) Councillor Hyde stated that she was of the view that the policy had sought to protect family homes from being turned into HMOs, but it was instead being used to justify the introduction of a small HMO. In response Officers explained that the policy sought to control the number of HMOs and give the Council an opportunity to assess the proposals.
- (5) It was confirmed for Councillor Gilbey that the application would allow no more than six people to live in the premises.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (6) Councillor Carol Theobald stated that she thought the application was step backwards, and the property should be retained as a family home.
- (7) A vote was taken and planning permission was granted on a vote of 8 to 1 with 1 abstention.

- 18.4 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 of the report and the policies and guidance in section 7 of the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in section 11 of the report.

Note: Councillors Littman and Wakefield were not present at the meeting.

- E. BH2013/01106 - 40-42 Upper St James's Street, Brighton - Full Planning Permission** - Erection of a two storey extension creating additional second and third floors. Creation of 2no flats at second and third floor levels.

- (1) The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The property currently comprised a Thai Restaurant with a residential flat above, and the shop frontage wrapped around the corner. The application sought to add two additional storeys to create a three bedroom flat and a two bedroom flat; it was also noted that the third floor would be inset to allow it to better protect neighbour amenity, it was noted that the proposals matched the building height that was present generally in the area, and the proposed stepping up feature had also been used to mirror similar nearby features in the Conservation Area. Planning permission had been granted in 2004 for a similar scheme, but had since lapsed. In relation to neighbour impact it was noted that the only affected windows were secondary or non-habitable, and there was a reasonable level of light due to the existing distances between buildings. It was also noted that two storey buildings were not the normal feature along this stretch of road. The Heritage Team were satisfied that the design was sensitive and would mirror existing features, and the previously approved scheme was a material consideration. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers

- (2) It was confirmed for Councillor Hyde that the distance between the flank walls would be 2.9 metres.
- (3) It was confirmed for Councillor Davey that the flat on the second floor would be a three bedroom, and the one of the third floor would be a two bedroom unit.
- (4) It was clarified for Councillor Cox that CAG were of the view that the application should be refused.
- (5) Councillor Carol Theobald asked about the impact on Wyndham Street, and Officers stated that this was considered a reasonable transition in the area.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (6) Mr Lusser explained that CAG had discussed the application at length, and they felt it should be refused. He explained that there was a mixture of height and styles in the area, the row of terrace houses in Wyndham Street created an unbroken line of approximately eleven Grade 2 listed buildings, and it was the view of CAG that the character of these side streets should be protected. It was felt that the addition of two storeys would be out of character and excessive in terms of the impact on Wyndham Street.
 - (7) Councillor Carol Theobald stated that the development was one storey too many; would be out of proportion with Wyndham Street, and she would be voting against the Officer recommendation.
 - (8) A vote was taken and planning permission was granted on a vote of 9 to 1.
- 18.5 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 of the report and the policies and guidance in section 7 of the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in section 11 of the report.

Note: Councillors Littman and Wakefield were not present at the meeting.

F. BH2013/01482 - 68 Crescent Drive South, Brighton - Full Planning Permission - Erection of front and rear extensions, loft conversion incorporating raising of ridge height, hip to gable roof extension, installation of rear balcony and rooflights.

- (1) It was noted that this application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- (2) The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The application sought extensions to a bungalow to create a two storey property which would have a gable to the front and rear to accommodate two bedrooms both with en-suite facilities. Currently the front of the property had a low level hipped roof, and the proposal would be higher than the line of the existing pitched roof; adding additional bulk. The existing single storey conservatory at the rear would be replaced with a single extension to bring out the gabled roof further. It was considered that the application would create a huge

amount of increased bulk to form the substantial two-storey property. It was noted that the neighbouring property at no. 74 had also been extended, the building was larger and the extended roof was hipped away from the road; whereas the proposed extension would not follow the existing roofline. The properties on the other side of the street were much more substantial but they were of a different design; more set back and not read as part of the streetscape including the application property. Officers were of the view that the application would change the property so fundamentally it would be detrimental to the character of the street scene. The principal of some extension might be acceptable but it was felt the potential impact of this application was unacceptable in terms of the impact on the street scene because of the high gable. There had also been a previous application for a very similar scheme with more rooflights that had been refused under delegated powers, and was currently the subject of an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate. The application was recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the report.

Public Speakers and Questions

- (3) Miss Lucy Clifton-Sprigg spoke in support of the application in her capacity as the applicant and explained that the application sought to enlarge her family home to provide more space. The first application had been refused and the number of rooflights had been reduced to address the reasons for refusal. It was possible to create a large extension to the property under permitted development rights, but this option had not been pursued as it was felt it would lead to an unsightly property. The existing streetscene was varied; with a combination of large properties and smaller bungalows, and several of the bungalows had been extended in a similar way to what was set out in the application. Miss Clifton-Sprigg also explained that she has consulted neighbours and received no objections, and the application did not create any over-looking or loss of daylight for neighbouring properties. The application had been mindful of Planning Policy, and it felt the proposal could work within it.
- (4) Councillor Hyde referenced the visual aids provided by the applicant during her presentation, and sought clarification on the location of the extended properties shown.

Questions for Officers

- (5) Councillor Hyde asked for more information on the large extension to the neighbouring bungalow, and it was explained that the extension had been granted permission in 2003, and the decision predating the currently adopted Local Plan and the policies contained within it.
- (6) Councillor Gilbey noted that the road was not as flat as it appeared in the photographs, and the difference in ridge height between the proposed scheme and the extended property was clarified.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (7) Councillor Hyde stated that she did not agree with the recommendation, and there were a number of examples in close proximity where the roofs had been raised; there was also a block of flats a few properties further along the street. She acknowledged that the proposed roof was large, but felt that this was still appropriate given the

context of similar extension in the street. She stated that she would be voting against the Officer recommendation.

- (8) Councillor Carol Theobald noted that there were already examples of this sort of extension in the street; she noted there were no objections from neighbours and she could see no problem with the scheme.
- (9) Councillor Mac Cafferty explained that he agreed with some of what Councillor Hyde had mentioned; acknowledging that there were different roof forms in the street, but also noting that the policies used to justify refusal were successfully upheld at appeals.
- (10) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse was not carried on a vote of 4 to 4 with 1 abstention; as the vote was tied the Chair exercised his casting vote to defeat the Officer recommendation. Councillor Hyde proposed reasons for approval and these were seconded by Councillor Carol Theobald; a short adjournment was then held to allow Councillor Mac Cafferty, Councillor Hyde, Councillor Carol Theobald, the Deputy Development Control Manager, the Senior Solicitor and the Area Planning Manager to draft the reasons for approval in full. These reasons were then read to the Committee, and it was agreed they reflected what had been put forward by Members. A recorded vote was then taken with the proposed reasons for approval and Councillors: Mac Cafferty, Hyde, Cox and Carol Theobald voted that planning permission be granted; Councillors: Carden, Davey, Gilbey and Hamilton voted that planning permission be refused and Councillor Jones abstained from the vote; as the vote was tied the Chair exercised his casting vote to carry the motion and the application was granted.

18.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration the Officer recommendation to refuse, but resolves to **GRANT** planning permission for the reasons set out below:

Reasons For Approval:

- i. The proposed development is in a locality which has a mixed form of development in terms of styles, size and design and a variety of building lines. The proposed development does not cause material harm to the street scene.

Conditions:

- i. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions.

- ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Existing Floor Plan, Elevations and Sections. Location and Block Plans.	1312012/01		15/03/2013
Proposed Ground/First Floor	1312012/02		15/03/2013

Plans and Elevations.			
Proposed Sections AA & BB and Street scene Elevation.	1312012/03		15/03/2013

- iii. No development shall take place until samples of all materials (including colour of render, paintwork and colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policies QD1 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

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

- 19.1 There were none.

20. APPEAL DECISIONS

- 20.1 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.

21. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

22. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

- 22.1 The Committee noted the information regarding informal hearings and public inquiries as set out in the planning agenda.

23. INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS

- 23.1 The Committee noted the position regarding pre application presentations and requests as set out in the agenda.

24. LIST OF APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS OR IN IMPLEMENTATION OF A PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISION (INC. TREES MATTERS)

- 24.1 That the Committee notes the details of applications determined by the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing under delegated powers.

[Note 1: All decisions recorded in this list are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the planning register maintained by the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing. The register complies with legislative requirements.]

[Note 2: A list of representations received by the Council after the Plans List reports had been submitted for printing was circulated to Members on the Friday preceding the meeting. Where representations are received after that time they should be reported to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and it would be at their discretion whether they should in exceptional circumstances be reported to the Committee. This is in accordance with Resolution 147.2 of the then Sub Committee on 23 February 2006.]

The meeting concluded at 4.05pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of