This record relates to Agenda Item 52

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: FEES & CHARGES 2015/16 -

ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE

DIRECTORATE

AUTHOR: IAN SHURROCK

THE DECISION

RESOLVED – (1) That the committee approves the fees and charges for the Royal Pavilion for 2016/17 in Appendix 2 to the report with consideration and decision in respect of all other fees and charges to be reserved for discussion at Budget Council on 26 February 2015.

Note: The committee agreed that with the exception of the proposed fees and charges for the Royal Pavilion for 2016/217 as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, consideration of all other fees and charges be deferred for discussion at Budget Council.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The fees and charges for services are reviewed annually in line with the Corporate Fees and Charges Policy. The council's Financial Regulations require that any proposed increases in fees and charges over and above inflation are agreed by the council. They also state that it is good practice to report on fees and charges that are rising by inflation only. This combined report presents a review of fees and charges across six service areas: Libraries, Royal Pavilion and Museums, Seafront, Sports Facilities, Venues and Outdoor Events and it was intended that the changes would be implemented from April 2015 unless otherwise stated.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The rationale for the proposed increases in the fees and charges are indicated in the body of the report.

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

(i) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,

(ii)	the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.		

This record relates to Agenda Item 53

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF PARKING STANDARDS

FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING

DOCUMENT (SPD)

AUTHOR: STEVEN SHAW

THE DECISION

RESOLVED – (1) That the committee notes the outcome of the issues and options consultation undertaken prior to the development of new parking standards for new development;

- (2) That the committee authorises the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing to undertake formal public consultation on the draft Parking Standards SPD, attached at Appendix 1, and request that a report on the results is brought to a future meeting of this committee; and
- (3) That the committee requests that the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing prepares a best practice guidance document which shall include parking design and layout and that a draft document is brought to a future meeting of this committee.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

When considering new development proposals as part of the planning application process, the city council as both Planning and Highway Authority will consider the transport provision and implications of the proposal. This will include the amount and standard of parking provision for vehicles and bicycles. An initial and consistent assessment is made by comparing proposals with existing policies. These include the council's current Supplementary Parking Guidance Note 4 (also known as SPG4) on parking standards for new development, which was originally approved/adopted in 2000.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The current parking standards for new development proposals in the city were previously approved in 2000, and therefore need to be brought up to date to reflect existing national and local policies, principles and circumstances.

The opportunity to identify and/or propose alternative options has been available through the consultation on the issues and options associated with updating the parking standards. Officers have taken the responses received from consultees into account when preparing the draft SPD.

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

(iii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,

(iv) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 54

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF SECTION 106 DEVELOPER

CONTRIBUTIONS TEMPORARY

RECESSION MEASURES

AUTHOR: DEBRA MAY

THE DECISION

RESOLVED - That the Committee agrees not to renew the Section 106 Developer Contributions Temporary Recession Measures and that they no longer apply after 31st January 2015.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The report (the 5th annual review) informs the Committee on the current practice of prioritised and reduced section 106 developer contributions. This year the recommendation is that the measures are not renewed. If agreed the City Council would revert to the guidance and processes in the approved Developer Contributions Technical Guidance.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

An alternative option would be to extend the temporary s106 measures until January 2016. This might affect the level of supporting infrastructure or mitigation provided on future development

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (v) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (vi) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 55

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: LOCAL AGGREGATE ASSESSMENT

FOR EAST SUSSEX AND BRIGHTON &

HOVE

AUTHOR: STEVE TREMLETT

THE DECISION

RESOLVED – That the Local Aggregate Assessment 2013/14 for East Sussex and Brighton & Hove be approved and published

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The report sets out to the Committee the outcome of the joint Local Aggregate Assessment 2013/14 for the Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) of Brighton & Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

None considered appropriate.

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (i) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (ii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 56

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX - LISTED

BUILDING HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP

AGREEMENT

AUTHOR: TIM JEFFERIES

THE DECISION

RESOLVED – That the Committee approve the draft Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement (LBHPA) for land use at the University of Sussex, for the purposes of public consultation.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

New legislation came into force in April 2014, under the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 (the ERR Act), which introduced new optional powers for listed building control. These include the power to make Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreements to manage alterations to major listed buildings or groups of listed buildings in the same ownership.1.2. This report seeks approval for statutory consultation on a draft Listed Building Heritage Partnership for the eight grade I and grade II* listed buildings at the University of Sussex campus. This would be one of the very first such agreements to be made nationally under the new powers.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The only alternative option would be to continue with the current arrangement whereby a non-statutory set of guidelines is in place and the University would have to continue to apply for individual Listed Building Consent to address issues as and when they arise in each case. The University currently makes several such application annually (for which no fee is payable to the Council) and the LBHPA would therefore be a more cost effective solution for both the Council and the University (and for English Heritage as a statutory consultee).

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (vii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (viii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 57

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: DESIGNATION OF

NEIGHBOURHOOD/BUSINESS AREA AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM -

BRIGHTON MARINA

AUTHOR: REBECCA FRY

THE DECISION

RESOLVED - That consideration of the designation of a Brighton Marina Business Neighbourhood Area as a business area neighbourhood area within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 be deferred in order for further dialogue to take place with the relevant and interested parties, to form the subject of a further report for consideration by the committee in due course.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The purpose of this report is to determine two neighbourhood planning applications. One relates to the designation of Brighton Marina as a Business Neighbourhood Area. The other application is linked to the area application and relates to the designation of the neighbourhood forum for Brighton Marina. These designations are part of the neighbourhood planning provisions introduced by the Localism Act 2011. Once designated they will enable the forum to prepare a neighbourhood development plan for the area.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The appropriateness of the proposed area and its boundary need to be considered first because if amendments are to be sought the make up of the forum is also likely to need amending. This is a statutory procedure and non designation or the seeking of an alternative boundary without justification could lead to legal challenges. As raised in 3.4 and 4.4 above the city council must designate some or all of the area applied for. Paragraph 4.3 above and Appendix 2 set out the key factors that should be taken into consideration.

When all relevant factors are taken into account, including the community response and submitted forum membership data, it is considered reasonable and rational to accept the submitted neighbourhood area as being appropriate.

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (ix) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (x) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 58

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: CONSERVATION STRATEGY REVIEW

AUTHOR: TIM JEFFERIES

THE DECISION

RESOLVED – That the committee approve the revised Conservation Strategy set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The current Conservation Strategy was adopted in 2003 to clarify the council's responsibilities and reaffirm its commitment toward the conservation of Brighton & Hove's historic built environment. It includes a programme of action for the management of the city's heritage assets. This Strategy has been largely very successful but is now due for review.

This report gives details of the review of the current Strategy, including the response to consultation, and seeks approval for the adoption of a revised Conservation Strategy for the city for the next ten years.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The only alternative option would be not to review the Conservation Strategy. This would result in the absence of an up-to-date, long term strategic view on the city's historic environment, which is a key factor in attracting visitors and investment. The failure to retain and conserve heritage assets could lead to their eventual loss and could result in significant adverse publicity for the council.

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (iii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (iv) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 59

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: ST AUBYNS PLANNING BRIEF

AUTHOR: CLARE FLOWERS

THE DECISION

RESOLVED - That the Economic Development & Culture Committee approves the St Aubyns Planning Brief as a material planning consideration in the assessment of development proposals and planning applications relating to the site

REASON FOR THE DECISION

Date: 16 January 2015

The report seeks formal approval for a planning brief that has been prepared for the former St Aubyns School, Rottingdean and which has been subject to a public consultation exercise that has informed the final brief. The former school site boundary includes all land which falls within the curtilage of the Grade II listed school building situated within Rottingdean Conservation Area with its ancillary playing field to the east.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

An alternative option is to "do nothing" i.e. not to produce a planning brief. This option has been discounted because of the recognised need to address the future redevelopment of the vacant site in a comprehensive manner which befits its heritage sensitive and central location within Rottingdean Village. This has highlighted the need for planning guidance to provide clarity to developers regarding the appropriate scale of development, potential land uses and other material planning issues with regard to any future proposals and planning applications for this site.

The planning brief does not preclude the future use of the site for educational purposes, although discussions were held with the council's Head of Education Planning and Contracts who confirmed that the St Aubyns site is unlikely to be called upon to make up for any shortfall in local authority school place provision further to the agreement by Children & Young Peoples Committee in Oct 2014 to expand Saltdean Primary School to meet an increase in the primary school places required in the wider local area.

English Heritage supports the planning brief as a 'very useful framework for managing future change at this site'. Removing heritage objectives to allow for a more comprehensive site redevelopment would therefore be inappropriate to the heritage assets present within and around the site.

Proper Officer:

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (v) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (vi) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 60

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: DCLG CONSULTATION: PROPOSED

CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT FOR TRAVELLER SITES

AUTHOR: SANDRA ROGERS

THE DECISION

RESOLVED - That the officer responses set out in Appendix 1 to the report be confirmed as the Council's response to the consultation exercise and that Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) are notified to this effect.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The purpose of this report is to confirm the council's response to the Government's consultation on proposed policy changes to the Planning Policy Statement for Traveller Sites.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The council could consider not responding to the government's consultation on the proposed changes to the Planning Policy Statement for Traveller Sites. However, some of the issues raised in the consultation could have implications for the council's current approach to addressing Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs through the preparation of the City Plan Part One and actions identified in the 2012 Traveller Commissioning Strategy. As indicated above, some of the proposed changes warrant the council's support but some raise concerns regarding equalities implications and it is considered that these should be addressed by a response from the council.

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- (xi) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

This record relates to Agenda Item 61

RECORD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE DECISION

SUBJECT: HOUSING STANDARDS REVIEW

CONSULTATION 2014

AUTHOR: REBECCA FRY

THE DECISION

RESOLVED - That the Committee approves and endorses the officer response to the Government's Housing Standards Review Consultation 2014 set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

The report seeks the approval and endorsement of the officer response sent on behalf of the council in response to the recent government consultation on the Housing Standards Review.

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The report advises the Committee of the main proposals contained in the technical consultation document published by the DCLG, and the council officers' response covering the areas of support, potential implications and concerns. Approving and endorsing the response which was sent on 7 November in order to meet the deadline helps to ensure the response from the council is taken into consideration by the government. The proposals may have a significant impact upon planning in Brighton & Hove and limit its ability to be one of the pioneers in respect of sustainability and water efficiency, which is important in an area of water stress. Not to have commented on the proposals would have failed to provide DCLG with a reasoned response on what is welcomed and the areas of concern in respect of its proposals. It would have failed to give this council a voice on these significant proposals.

The committee has the option to either endorse the comments sent as recommended; seek to revoke them, or; seek to amend them

Proper Officer:

Date: 16 January 2015 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

(xiii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,

the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

(xiv)