

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1.00pm 10 JULY 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors: Tracey Hill (Chair), Gill Williams (Deputy Chair), C Theobald (Group Spokesperson), Fishleigh, Mac Cafferty, Miller, Shanks, Simson and Yates.

Co-opted Members: .

Officers in attendance: Nicola Hurley (Planning Manager), David Farnham (Traffic and Transport Engineer), Dr Kate Cole (County Ecologist), Chris Swain (Senior Planning Officer), Eimear Murphy (Principal Planning Officer), Wayne Nee (Principal Planning Officer), Luke Austin (Principal Planning Officer), Joanne Doyle (Senior Environmental Health Officer), Emily Stanbridge (Senior Planning Officer), Charlotte Bush (Senior Planning Officer), Jack Summers (Assistant Planning Officer), Hilary Woodward (Senior Lawyer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

10 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a Declarations of substitutes

.1 Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones stated that they were substituting for Councillor Leo Littman.

b Declarations of interests

b.1 Councillor Tracey Hill stated that:

- they had submitted a letter of representation for Item P: BH2019/00315 and would be stepping down as Chair of the meeting for that item.
- they were formerly the deputy Chair of the Housing Committee and saw the pre-application submission for Item B: BH2018/03541. They also stated that they were of a neutral mind regarding the planning application.

b.2 Councillor Daniel Yates: stated that:

- they had met with Council officers regarding Item B: BH2018/03541 in their previous role as council leader. They also stated that they were of a neutral mind regarding the planning application.
- re: item A he had met the developer as leader but gave no formal indication of support and retained an open mind; and
- re: item K he had objected and would leave the chamber.

- b.3 Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty - item A – stated that they had attended the South East Design Panel but had not determined the application and had an open mind

c Exclusion of the press and public

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

11 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- .1 **RESOLVED** – Minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2019 were agreed after the committee meeting of 10 July 2019.

12 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- .1 *This meeting is being recorded and will be capable of repeated being viewing via the online webcast.*

Welcome committee members and members of the public, to this meeting at Hove Town Hall.

13 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 13.1 It was noted that a question had been submitted from Ms V Paynter, who at the Chair's invitation, put the following question:

"I have noticed that for all Hove Majors over some time now, the CCG bats away every consultation request from BHCC concerning GP provision, including today's Sackville Trading Estate application. It's in the report!

On behalf of saveHOVE supporters I have put in responses begging for actual remaining surgeries, after many losses, to be consulted instead, even identifying two & providing contact details.

Why is no consultation of actual NHS GP group practices being undertaken?"

- 13.2 The Chair gave the following response:

“Consultation for planning applications is set by both national legislation and the Brighton & Hove Statement of Community Involvement. Consulting individual GP practices in the vicinity of any site is not identified in either the Development Management Procedure Order or the Statement of Community Involvement to be consulted and therefore is not part of our statutory duties in dealing with planning applications.

In addition, since the CCG is the co-ordinating body for the provision of healthcare services, including GP provision, they are perhaps the more appropriate body to consult on applications rather than individual GPs.”

- 13.3 Ms Paynter was invited to put a supplementary question.
- 13.4 Ms Paynter stated that they had been given to understand that surgeries in the Hove area had lists of approximately 24,000 residents. Future consultations should require facts and figures from local surgeries. Please clean up the consultation process.
- 13.5 The Chair informed Ms Paynter that residents can ask for facts and figures from surgeries individually should they so wish.
- 13.6 **RESOLVED:** That the position be noted.

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

- 14.1 There were none.

15 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- a. The Democratic Services officer read out the items on the agenda for the Committee to state if they wished to discuss each item. It was noted that Major items and those items with public speakers were automatically reserved for discussion.
- b. It was noted that the following items were not called for discussion and it was therefore deemed that the officer recommendations were agreed including the proposed Conditions and Informatives:
 - Item F: BH2019/01385 - Vardean College, Surrenden Road, Brighton
 - Item J: BH2018/00995 - 5b Station Road, Portslade
 - Item K: BH2019/00656 – 15 Norwich Drive, Brighton
 - Item O: BH2019/00908 – Flat 1, 9-10 Carlton Terrace, Portslade

A BH2018/03697- Sackville Trading Estate and Hove Goods Yard, Hove - Full Planning

1. Principal Planning officer, Chris Swain, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to:
 - The principle of re-development of the site, and type and scale of uses proposed in this location,
 - Housing: layout, mix, viability and affordable housing provision,
 - Impact on the amenity of existing neighbouring occupiers,
 - Standard of accommodation including provision of private and communal amenity space,
 - Design: including scale, form, density, materiality and impact on the character and appearance of the locality, including the setting of heritage assets,
 - Sustainable transport: parking, access and highway safety,
 - Air Quality,
 - Sustainability, biodiversity, ecology and flood risk,
 - Accessibility.

Public Speakers

2. Ms C Bennet and Ms C Graham spoke to the committee to object to the application on behalf of Artist's Corner residents which adjoins the Sackville Road industrial estate. It was stated that requests to meet the planning officers have been refused. The residents are not opposed to development but have serious concerns about the parking and traffic implications. Parking in the area is currently difficult especially in the evenings and any further parking would increase the issues. The Sackville Road junction with Old Shoreham Road is one of the most congested in the city. The single access point onto the application site will result in increased traffic issues. A second access was requested along with car free development.

Questions for the speaker: None

3. Valerie Paynter spoke to the committee to object on behalf of the freeholder of units 1 – 4 Newtown Road trade park. The owner believes that the proximity of the proposed block C will result in curtailed use of the current lawful activities. A previous application was recommended for refusal on noise grounds. This would apply to this application. Two huge blocks of flats will create noise. When will changing offices to flats end. A second access is needed. Please refuse on CMP3 grounds and overdevelopment in excess of CP14 requirement.

Questions for speaker

4. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that Newtown Road was not properly assessed for noise issues in the speaker's opinion. The Old Shoreham Road has very heavy noisy traffic.

Ward Councillor speaker

5. Ward Councillor Samer Bagaen spoke to the committee in objection to the application. The committee were reminded that housing targets are opinion based. The buy-to-rent

market is booming. It is curious that the submitted statement concluded that the scheme could not provide any affordable housing. The Councils own policy for Community Infrastructure Levy tests the viability of the scheme. Brighton and Hove should mark out its own validations for a development of this size against metrics, such as where the water for the homes come from? Social impact is not subjective. Waste management will be a huge challenge. City Clean performance report highlights access issues due to density of parking. In London waste crews have been unable to gain access to new developments, where private contractors have then been employed. A marginal rise in costs will result in the loss of affordable housing. Let's build homes not 5-star hotels for people to live in.

Questions for speaker: None.

6. Neighbouring Ward Councillors Jackie O'Quinn and John Allcock were granted time to speak by the Chair and spoke to the committee in objection to the application. The development of the site was welcomed in principle as the city needed more housing in order to meet the government target of 13,200 homes by 2030. The height of some of the blocks is overwhelming. This style of development can lead to ghettoization of the area, with little reference from its context. 'Air brushed' views paint a beautiful picture which can be deceiving. The development is far too dense with major traffic and parking issues in the surrounding area. One access point to egress and ingress the site is not enough, gridlock will be the result. Genuinely affordable housing is needed.

Questions for speakers: None

7. James Blackley spoke on behalf MODA Living Ltd, with Jenny Baker of Markides Ltd and Dan Jestico of ICENI Projects. The applicant has worked with officers to amend and refine the scheme. It was stated that sustainability is important, and this scheme includes homes and jobs. A village hall, library, swimming pool, new trees and space for creative industries are also included. The S106 heads of terms includes affordable housing at 10%. The scheme is to open to all with no deposit required. It is noted that bird and bee spaces are provided in the scheme, along with communal lighting, photovoltaic panels, electric car charging points, car club, onsite health care etc. The scheme was supported by local groups.

Questions from Councillors to speakers

8. Councillor Joe Miller was informed further employment space is to come. 2,000 sq. metres has been allocated for jobs. Co-working has been included in the scheme.
9. Councillor Carol Theobald was advised that a bridge to Hove Station has been designed but not included in this scheme. This may be looked at in the future.
10. Councillor Mac Cafferty was informed that talks with Network Rail are ongoing regarding the bridge to Hove Station from the south east corner of the application site. A wind assessment has been included in the report. The amount of daylight to each of the units in the care home is considered sufficient given the open plan design of the units.
11. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that the 10% of affordable housing may be reviewed in the future to assess possible increase.

12. The Conservation Area Group representative was informed that a small part of the wall facing Sackville Road will be removed and the materials re-used elsewhere on the site.
13. Councillor Gill Williams was informed that the height of the scheme has been reduced following negotiations with officers. It is considered that the living wage earner could afford the rent. £354 per month for someone sharing a unit is affordable. Other expenses are given such as internet, TV, gym and wellbeing centre on site. Roughly £120/150 per month could be saved. A furniture package is available, and no deposit would be required.
14. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that the unit rental prices were £1,250 one bed, £1,600 for two beds and £2,100 for 3 beds.
15. Councillor Bridget Fishleigh was informed that the cost of the scheme would be £300 million. It is considered that build-to-rent is a long-term project.

Questions to officers

16. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that with regard to noise, Environmental Health found the scheme acceptable. It was noted that two conditions require the submission of further noise reports.
17. Councillor Joe Miller was informed that both bird and bee boxes are to be included in the scheme. The highways will not be adopted. Extra care home units have been included. Materials for the proposed balconies have not been submitted yet. It was noted that generally the balconies are to be recessed and not on street frontages. The affordable housing will be in perpetuity. Councillor Miller was also informed that S106 Heads of Terms restricted that all homes held as build-to-rent by covenant for 15 years. The 15 years could be extended; however, the 15 years came from national guidance. It was noted that a report on viability can't compare with other schemes of buying homes not buy-to-rent.
18. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that no objections had been received from City Clean.
19. Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that details regarding the protection of the aquifer will need to be submitted by the applicant. The access from Sackville Road improvements have been deemed acceptable. Higher levels of traffic movements are to be expected. City Transport have not objected to the scheme.
20. Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that traffic restrictions can be included by condition. Consultations have taken place in line with requirements.
21. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that there are no green roofs included in the scheme, however, there are green terraces across the site.
22. Councillor Bridget Fishleigh was informed that the visitor permits had not been removed and 25 per unit per year would be available.

Debate

23. Councillor Bridget Fishleigh stated their support for Councillor Bagaeen and went on to say that good design was wanted, and the number of affordable homes was not enough.
24. Councillor Joe Miller felt that the design was good, however, not enough employment space had been created. It was noted that the 15 years covenant should be changed to perpetuity. The amendments, retail and residential mix are good. It was stated that the proposed S106 terms were good. Balconies should be conditioned.
25. Councillor Carol Theobald would like to see the site developed and felt that the care community element was good. The access and height issues are not good. The overall feeling was that the scheme was too much in general.
26. Councillor Daniel Yates felt that this was a key site for delivering housing in the city. The sharing of flats to make the rent achievable was not good. The homes need to be genuinely affordable. The Councillor felt the cost of homes was very high and would not support the scheme.
27. Councillor Gill Williams expressed density concerns and was open to a re-design to include a high ratio of affordable homes.
28. Councillor Dee Simson liked parts of the scheme, however the access from Sackville Road is a problem. The height of the development is an issue in the long views of the site from the surrounding area. This is a good site, but a bad scheme. The Councillor would not be supporting.
29. Councillor Sue Shanks felt the rents were high, however young professionals want to rent, not buy. The Councillor would be supporting the scheme.
30. Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty felt the scheme provided what Brighton and Hove needs. The amount of daylight into units, noise and the impact on Hove Station are issues. The overall design is not in keeping with the area and transport is an issue for the area. Please come back with something better.
31. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones felt the scheme was a good use of a brownfill site. The density of the scheme was a good idea; however, the viability was not good and would not be supporting.
32. Councillor Tracey Hill shared concerns relating to viability and felt that the benefits did not outweigh the harm to the heritage sites and the surrounding area. The scheme is too dense and would not support.
33. Councillor Joe Miller proposed the following amendments: Materials to be approved at Committee chair meeting; balcony materials to be approved by condition; and to change 15 years on covenant to perpetuity. Councillor Daniel Yates seconded the motion.
34. The Committee were invited to vote on the above amendments.

Vote: For = 9, Against = 0, Abstentions = 1. The amendments are carried.

35. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission.

Vote: For = 2, Against = 8, Abstentions = 0.

36. Councillor Tracey Hill proposed a motion to refuse the application on the grounds of housing mix, heritage harm, lack of employment space, daylight issues, lack of amenity and lack of affordable housing, seconded by Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones.

The meeting was adjourned for the Chair to seek legal and planning advice.

37. The meeting reconvened 15 minutes later. The Chair advised that a reason on the grounds of lack affordable housing was no longer being proposed.

38. The committee were invited to vote on the motion to refuse the application for the reasons proposed by the Chair and authorise the Planning Manager to word the refusal on the reasons proposed and that were the application to go to appeal, the S106 Planning obligation, heads of terms set out in the report are agreed.

Vote: For = 9, Against = 1, Abstentions = 0.

Recorded Vote: Councillors for: Hill, Williams, Hugh-Jones, Theobald, Fishleigh, Mac Cafferty, Shanks, Simson and Yates. Against: Miller.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be REFUSED for the reasons proposed by the Chair and the amended conditions proposed by Councillor Joe Miller.

B BH2018/03541- Land to the East of Coldean Lane, North of Varley Halls, South of the A27, Brighton - Full Planning

1. Principal Planning Officer, Eimear Murphy, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the principle of development on this site outside the city's development limits, in the countryside, carrying and falling within and adjacent to designated heritage assets and landscapes and the impact thereon. The site is identified as an Urban Fringe Site with the potential for residential development.
2. Considerations relate to the character and appearance, density, scale, mass and form of the development; the relationship with its context and surroundings including designated landscapes and heritage assets; standard of accommodation; amenity for future occupiers; housing mix; the proposed access and related traffic implications, air quality and noise; loss of open space; arboricultural; ecology and sustainability impacts.
3. Concerns also relate to financial viability and affordable housing provision, as well as the provision of S106 Planning Obligation contributions that may be required as mitigation.

4. The Committee were informed that the application has evolved from pre-application to committee. Amendments have been made to the scheme including the re-siting of the blocks of development from the original settings, the removal of one floor off one of the southern blocks, the accommodation of water run-off, and the breaking up of parking areas by planting with raised beds between car spaces and pedestrian areas. The application is basically acceptable with materials to be negotiated and S106 agreement to be resolved.

Public Speakers

5. Becky Hobbs spoke against the application to the committee. Ms Hobbs stated that many creatures rely on the site, which needs to be looked after. The Ecology survey was not considered to be good. A two-year consultation would be better to assess the true situation on the site, a truly vital wildlife corridor. It was noted that hedgehogs did not appear in the County Ecologist's report. The large number of badgers will be upset as will be the fox population in the area and the reptiles indigenous to the site. It was stated that Hyde Housing have a bad track record and some badger setts? in the area have been dug up already. More homes in the city would be better than on this site where they are not needed.

Questions for the speaker: None

6. Guy Dixon spoke as the applicant's agent. The site is allocated in the city plan for development and the applicant has accommodated issues raised on the site and noted that badgers had been taken into consideration. The badgers' foraging areas will remain, whilst some outlying setts will be moved. Licenses will be required to move and protect the badgers. It was stated that the scheme is for much needed affordable housing made up of 50% shared ownership and 50% discounted market rent at living wage level. The amenity spaces are to be retained and maintained. Rhys Daniels (Hyde Housing) stated that 242 units will be constructed in the scheme.

Questions from Councillors

7. Councillor Gill Williams was informed that the closing of badger setts would be addressed under licence, the tree planting and landscaping measures will help badgers and the ecology of the site. The site will always be supervised.
8. Councillor Joe Miller was informed that amendments to the scheme to reduce the height and relocate the development were to reduce the impact on the landscape. Many adjustments have taken place following negotiations with officers.
9. Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the land was designated in City Plan Part 2 as land where the potential of residential development was allowed. The site originally formed part of the wider Stanmer Park and a wildlife site. Following further questions Councillor Miller was informed that an extensive dormouse survey had been carried out and the appropriate condition removed. Outside lighting is to be kept to a minimum to reduce the impact on any bats in the area. Parking for match days at the Falmer stadium was not taken into consideration as the roads will not be public highways and parking will be for residents only. The scheme has been designed with sustainable transport measures, including extending the rental bike scheme to the site.

10. Councillor Bridget Fishleigh was informed that fewer homes on the site had been considered. The numbers have been driven by recognising housing need in the city and to optimise the site potential.
11. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that affordability does not affect the design of the scheme and the national space standards have been used. Following a further question Councillor Simson was informed that the shared ownership and rental properties will be mixed to obtain the best balance on the site.
12. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that the site is residential with no retail units.

Councillor questions for Officers.

13. Councillor Joe Miller was informed that the joint venture was not only Brighton and Hove City Council and was a separate company to the authority. Under the S106 agreement the contributions to education have not been lost. Woodland walks will remain. The highway speed limit is to be extended up the hill towards the development. New access with visibility splays with crossing points will be implemented. The balance of rental and shared ownership is to be considered, as is the viability statement.
14. Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the site previously formed part of Stanmer Park, the historic status of which was reduced by the creation of the A27. The site is not National Park, conservation area or currently public open space, though walkers are commonly allowed. Various species are found on the site. A woodland management plan can be added by condition. The County Ecologist stated that the wildlife surveys were carried out with best practice, with the bat survey was broadly in accordance. If any protected species are harmed works can be stopped.
15. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the number of trees to be removed has been reduced and the landscaping plan will include the planting of more trees. The access to the site will be via the existing highway. The S106 agreement funds will be for the site only. The play area is to be woodland materials only in consideration of the site. The existing bus stop will benefit from a real-time display.
16. Councillor Gill Williams was informed that legally bats, badgers, reptiles and hedgehogs are protected. Protection for these animals is to be implemented with a method statement to be submitted by condition. There are eight badger setts on the site, seven in use. The outlying sets are to be closed. The sets are to be protected by fencing during construction works. The woodlands are to be managed and the chalk grasslands kept.
17. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that the roads are to be private with little impact on match days at the Falmer Stadium.
18. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that the impact on the National Park were assessed with reference to the design. Pitched roofs were not considered appropriate. The proposed materials are to reflect the colours of the area. The design and materials of the proposed balconies are to be approved by condition.

19. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that wheelchair access has been included in the scheme and that the travel plan has been accepted by the transport officer.
20. Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that pavements are to be included in the scheme and will be separated from parking areas, whilst existing paths and rights-of-way will be retained.

Debate

21. Councillor Joe Miller welcomed the number of new homes. The S106 needs to be revised and education looked into. The objection from the National Park is a concern, as is the design. More like the adjoining Varley Halls design would have been better. The seven storey buildings are not right for the site. Transport is considered an issue.
22. Councillor Carol Theobald welcomed the new homes. The seven-storey design seems too high for the site, five storeys would have been better. Councillor Theobald had wildlife and tree concerns and stated that loss of trees was not good.
23. Councillor Sue Shanks welcomed the much-needed housing and felt the woodland site was good. On balance the scheme was much needed.
24. Councillor Daniel Yates welcomed the use of space and housing on the site. The housing being much needed in the city. We need to learn to live in the countryside with managed landscaping. The scheme is considered sympathetic.
25. Councillor Gill Williams felt the scheme was a good use of the space, but not perfect. The protection of wildlife was good for the community.
26. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones welcomed the 100% affordable development, although more work on traffic management and the environment is needed, supported the scheme.
27. Councillor Phelim MacCafferty welcomes new homes but we need to protect the environment. On balance with scheme is supported. A woodland management plan by an additional condition was moved and seconded by Councillor Shanks. It was also requested that materials are approved in consultation with members attending Chair's Meeting.
28. The Committee were invited to vote on the additional condition and materials to the Chair's meeting.

Vote: All Agreed.

29. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission.

Vote: For = 7, Against = 3, Abstentions = 0.

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 and the conditions and informatives set out in the report, SAVE THAT should the S106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 30 October 2019 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report. Condition 37 is to be removed. Additional condition for a Woodland Management Plan is to be added. Materials are to be approved in consultation with members attending Chair's Meeting.

C BH20188/03798 - 35-39 The Droveaway, Hove - Full Planning

1. Principal Planning Officer, Luke Austin, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the dilution of the existing B Class employment use, the impact upon the character and importance of the locally listed heritage asset, the proposed residential units including the affordable units, the proposed commercial uses, impacts upon neighbouring amenity, transport, sustainability, landscaping, ecology and trees.
2. The Committee were informed that a previous application had been refused and an appeal has commenced. The scheme presented under this application has been amended following officer comments. The amendments to reduce the impact on the neighbouring residential properties include the removal of the ground floor integral garages in the proposed terrace to northern side of the site, to allow the change of living space to ground floor from first floor and the introduction of two parking spaces outside each property. Cycle storage has also been amended.

Questions for Officer

3. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the three existing openings onto the highway would be used with no changes to the existing front boundary wall which is to be retained.

Debate

4. Councillor Daniel Yates considered the new design a sensible approach to the site and felt that the amenities of the neighbours were better protected under this scheme. Councillor Yates stated his support for the application.
5. Councillor Gill Williams felt that the four affordable units and the reductions in height were good improvements.
6. Councillor Joe Miller felt that the scheme was much improved, and the garage removal was a good idea.
7. Councillor Carol Theobald liked the design and the improved scheme. It was noted that the S106 Agreement seemed a lot of money. The committee were informed that the proformas and guidance had been used to calculate the developer contributions.
8. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to be MINDED TO GRANT Planning Permission.

Vote: All Agreed.

9. **RESOLVED:** That the committee took 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 Planning Obligation and the conditions and informatives set out in the report, SAVE THAT should the S106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 2 October 2019, the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11 of the report.
- 10.

D BH2018/00937 - 239 - 243 Kingsway Hove - Full Planning

1. Principal Planning Officer, Wayne Nee, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the principle of development, financial viability and affordable housing provision, the impact on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, the proposed access arrangements and related traffic implications, and the impact on neighbouring properties' amenities.
2. The Committee were informed that the scheme is for 37 flats comprising 33 x 2 bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom flats, with 4 affordable housing units and the site is not in a Conservation Area. The scheme has been amended so that the building line along Braemore Road is maintained. The balconies now have a curved design with a setback on the fifth floor. 6 metres separate the development from the first property in Braemore Road. 26 parking spaces are to be created, which is two more than the 24 spaces suggested. The committee were informed the Parking Survey found that the maximum occupancy of on street parking had not been reached overnight in the area.

Public Speakers

3. Mrs Urpi spoke to the committee on behalf of Braemore Road and Berriedale Road Residents Association in opposition to the scheme. There is precedent for larger scale buildings along the seafront, however these cover the entire block and are narrow in plan form. This proposal will adjoin the existing neighbour to the west and would set a new overbearing precedent along Kingsway. There are serious concerns relating to scale, siting and massing. The 6-metre gap to the first property in Braemore Road is unacceptable. The report contains arbitrary statements regarding impact on neighbours. The proposal is not considered to comply with policy QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. The health of the occupiers of first property in Braemore Road when using the garden is a major concern.
4. Mr Coley stated to the committee that there was an overwhelming concern regarding the overbearing and dominant nature of the proposal which is to be forward of the original building line. The proposal would eclipse neighbours' properties and reduce privacy to zero. The stepping out of the building line will ruin the sweep of the seafront aesthetic. The 8-storey block will overbear the two storey houses that will be in shadow. The remaining two houses will give a 'missing tooth' appearance to the seafront.

Questions for speakers

5. Councillor Phelim MacCafferty was informed that the 6-metre gap seemed unfair as other developments have been sited further away.
6. Councillor Joe Miller was informed that the proposal would look into adjoining properties with the outside space overlooked. The Committee were informed that the entrance to the car park to the rear of the development was a concern for the health of children in the neighbouring gardens. The loss of light from the development and the overbearing impact are considered unacceptable.
7. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that the scheme will be attached to the existing property to the west.
8. Councillor Gill Williams was informed that the principle was not being objected to, just this scheme as the current form was not suitable for this small site.
9. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that external walls of the currently adjoining neighbouring property to the west will be rebuilt following demolition of the existing properties.

Ward Councillor speakers

10. Councillor Robert Nemeth and Councillor Garry Peltzer Dunn echoed the residents' issues. It was highlighted that other developments are set back from the front and this should be the same for this scheme. The design of having half the block stepped down is an ugly feature, as well as the link to the existing adjoining house. It is considered that the proposal will result in overlooking and loss of sunlight to the neighbouring properties to the rear of the site and the 6-metre gap between them is too small. It was also considered to be detrimental to lose the existing gardens. Roof gardens and other vegetation would be beneficial to the scheme.

Questions to Ward Councillors

11. Councillor Joe Miller was informed that the Ward Councillors agreed that the proposal would be overbearing in height and proximity to the first property in Braemore Road.
12. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that the proposal's front building line would be forward of the existing.

Speaker for the Applicant

13. Mr Wood, the applicant's agent, spoke to the committee in support of the scheme. The committee were informed that the feedback on the scheme had been taken onboard and the final design is high quality, improving Hove's seafront. It is noted that Brighton and Hove City Council need more homes. The scheme has been amended to reflect residents' concerns by removing the side windows and thereby overlooking of neighbours. The scheme is respectful of the seafront setting and is not considered to be dominating but to enhance the setting. 10% affordable housing, equivalent to 4 units and S106 Planning obligation have been included.

Questions for the speaker

14. Councillor Joe Miller was informed by Jamie Barrett (also from the agent), that the design with a step down on the side was preferred by the local societies and believes this design to be good.
15. Councillor Gill Williams was informed that the local residents have been consulted and considered, and the scheme has been adjusted to reflect the consultations.
16. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that the scheme is aligned with the properties in Braemore Road. The front building line has been pushed forward following analysis of the overall curve of Kingsway.
17. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that the energy efficiency of the scheme has been found to be acceptable. A green roof could be included in the scheme.

Questions to Officers

18. Councillor Sue Shanks having asked if the site was a brownfill site was informed that the principle of development was acceptable as the land use would be the same.
19. Councillor Joe Miller having expressed concerns regarding the streetscene was informed that the step down in the design would accommodate the balance in the streetscene against the three remaining houses facing Kingsway.
20. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that a condition had been added to the application regarding the making good the side elevation of the currently attached property to the west of the proposal.
21. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that following the demolition of the three dwellings on the site that there would be a 1 metre gap between the remaining westerly neighbour and the development.

Debate

22. Councillor Dee Simson felt the design was good overall. Concerns were expressed relating to the streetscene and how the frontage would look with the scheme at one end of the block between Berriedale and Braemore Roads.
23. Councillor Joe Miller did not find the 'drop down' a good design with an adverse effect on the seafront streetscene. A scheme covering the entire block would be better. The curved nature of the Kingsway was understood in relation to the building line. The scheme was considered to be overbearing with overlooking issues for the surrounding properties with loss of sunlight. It was felt that the impact of the car park was an issue.
24. Councillor Carol Theobald considered the loss of light for neighbouring family homes to be a concern, as well as the forward building line and the cramped appearance of the scheme in relation to the site.

25. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to be MINDED TO GRANT permission.

Vote: For = 3, Against = 7, Abstentions = 0.

26. Councillor Joe Miller proposed a refusal, Councillor Daniel Yates seconded, on the grounds of the impact on streetscene, overbearing impact on the properties to the west, the height and massing at the back of the proposal, loss of sunlight for neighbours and the over development of the site.

27. The meeting was adjourned for 4 minutes whilst legal and planning advice was sought by the Chair. Upon recommencement Councillor Miller agreed to remove the loss of sunlight from the proposed reasons for refusal.

28. The Committee were invited to vote on the motion to refuse the application against the officer's recommendation for the reasons proposed by Councillor Miller and to authorise the Planning Manager to word the refusal on the reasons proposed. Should the application go to appeal the committee agreed that the S106 heads of terms be accepted as set out in the report.

Vote: For = 7, Against = 3, Abstentions = 0.

Recorded Vote: Councillors For: Williams, Theobald, Fishleigh, Miller, Shanks, Simson, Yates. Against: Hill, Hugh-Jones, Mac Cafferty.

RESOLVED: That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its footprint, forward projecting building line, height and mass in relation to the neighbouring properties would result in an incongruous addition that fails to respect the streetscene and prevailing pattern of development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One and QD5 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
2. The development, by reason of its height, massing, forward projection would result in an overly dominant development that would have an overbearing and unneighbourly impact. The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site. In addition, the positioning of balconies and the height and scale would result in overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One and QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.

E BH2019/00199 - The Astoria, 10 Gloucester Place, Brighton - Removal or Variation of a Condition

1. Principal Planning Officer, Stewart Glassar, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the minor design changes to the elevations and the re-instatement of a larger basement area to provide ancillary space to the approved retail / café use at the ground floor level.

It was noted that two new staircases were included in the application and the Section 106 agreement included increased payments to transport.

Questions for officer

2. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that the 'x' on p.319 of the report was 8.17.
3. Councillor Joe Miller requested that materials come before the chairs pre-meeting?? but was advised that the materials were already agreed.

Debate

4. None
5. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission.

Vote: All Agreed.

RESOLVED: 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 Deed of Variation to the S106 agreement dated 8 December 2016 and the conditions and informatives set out in the report, SAVE THAT should the S106 Deed of Variation Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 2 October 2019, the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 8.17 of the report.

F BH2019/01385- Varndean College, Surrenden Road, Brighton -Full Planning

1. The application was not called for the Planning Committee to discuss, the officer recommendation to GRANT Planning Permission 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.

G BH2018/02440,Foredown Woods,Foredown Allotments,Thornbush Crescent, Portslade - Full Planning

1. Matthew Gest, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the principle of the change-of-use, the impact on the character and appearance of the site and local area, the effect on the amenities of residents and the highway implications.

Speakers

2. Councillor Peter Atkinson presented a speech to the committee via the Democratic Services officer. The Councillor stated that they had been involved with the 'Bee in the Woods' and its director, Lucy Collins for some time. In 2017 the BHCC Parks Department granted a licence to Lucy to run a forest school. The site has been transformed. The Forest School and Forest Kindergarten have worked with community organisations and schools. The benefits have been many. Lucy has been mindful of residential neighbours by adjusting activities and establishing an ongoing dialogue. Councillor Atkinson has also acted as a facilitator.

Questions for the speaker

3. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that a management plan was requested by condition. It was also noted that numbers were restricted to 16, also by condition.
4. Councillor Sue Shanks was informed operating a business on public land was not a planning consideration.

Debate

5. Councillor Daniel Yates considered the improvements to the land to be good. Pre-school education on sustainable land is much needed in the city. It was noted that the acoustics will need to be right to ensure there is little impact on the residential properties.
6. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to GRANT planning permission.

Vote: All Agreed (Councillor Joe Miller not present).

RESOLVED: The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation and resolves to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

H BH2018/02667-Land to the rear of 17 Springfield Road, Brighton- Full Planning

1. Matthew Gest, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the development and the impact on the wider area, the standard of accommodation provided, the impact on the amenities of the neighbours and the transport and sustainability issues. It was noted that this was a car free proposal.

Questions for officer

2. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that the extra floors would require planning permission as Permitted Development rights had been withdrawn by condition.
3. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the proposed dwelling would have both front and rear gardens. Objectors who live near the application site are noted more than those who live further away.

Debate

4. Councillor Carol Theobald considered that this backland development would affect lots of neighbours and was not positive about the proposal.
5. Councillor Daniel Yates considered the proposal to be good with little impact on the neighbours.
6. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones noted the neighbours to the east of the site are commercial properties with residential above.
7. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to GRANT planning permission.

For = 7. Against = 1, Abstentions = 0. (Councillor Joe Miller and Phelim Mac Cafferty not present).

RESOLVED: The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation and resolves to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

I BH2018/02703-2 Old Shoreham Road, Hove- Full Planning

1. Stewart Glassar, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the impact of the proposed development on the appearance of the streetscene and amenities of the neighbouring properties. Transport and sustainability are also assessed. It was noted that the application had been amended following concerns relating to impact and appearance.

Speakers

2. Mrs Hallam spoke as an objector to the scheme. Mrs Hallam stated that they represented the residents of both Cissbury and Montefiore roads. The proposed dormer windows in the existing roof are considered to be out of scale, not in keeping and visible from Old Shoreham Road. The proposals will result in overlooking issues for neighbours. The design appears cramped and out of keeping with the area. The conversion of the loft will reduce the number of first floor bedrooms with noise being an issue from the newly created loft room. The proposed ground floor skylight is a noise issue.

Questions for speaker

3. Councillor Yates was informed that the property was end-of-terrace.
4. The applicant's agent, Mr Bareham, spoke to the committee. The application process had been long with many amendments made to reduce the impact on neighbours. The

roof extension of three dormers conforms to national space standards. It is not considered that the development will increase noise as sound insulation will be used. The application includes 7 cycle spaces

Questions for speaker

5. Councillor Dee Simson was advised that the single storey ground floor infill section of the development would be attached to the neighbouring property.
6. Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the Permitted Development rights would be withdrawn as the property would now be subdivided. The dormer windows are not considered to overlook the neighbours as they are set back from the roofline of the property.
7. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the proposed garage demolition had been withdrawn from the application, therefore the large garden tree in the neighbouring property would not be affected by the proposals.

Questions to officer: None

Debate: None

8. The Committee were invited to vote.

All Agreed to GRANT permission in line with the Planning Officer's recommendation. (Councillors Joe Miller not present).

9. **RESOVLED:** 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.

J BH2018/00995-5B Station Road, Portslade -Full Planning

The application was not called for the Planning Committee to discuss, the officer recommendation to GRANT Planning Permission was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

K BH2019/00656- 15 Norwich Drive, Brighton - Full Planning

The application was not called for the Planning Committee to discuss, the officer recommendation to GRANT Planning Permission was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

L BH2019/0105- 26 Brentwood Crescent, Brighton- Full Planning Consent

1. This application was deferred to a future meeting.

M BH2018/02579 - Patcham Service Station, Patcham By Pass, London Road, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition

1. The Principal Planning Officer, Luke Austin, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the impact of the additional opening hours on the amenity of neighbouring residents and the impact of the proposed 3 metre boundary fence on the appearance of the local area and the neighbour's amenities. It was noted that the service station had been granted planning permission on appeal and was adjacent to a Conservation Area.

Speakers

2. Councillor Lee Wares spoke to the Committee as Ward Councillor. Councillor Wares stated that the service station noise impact has been constant and extended hours would have an impact on the neighbouring properties. It was considered that the noise assessment should have monitored noise nearer to the neighbouring residential properties. The extended hours would allow alcohol to be sold in the later hours if permission is granted. It was noted that the appeal restricted the hours to reduce light and noise pollution. The application will increase noise and light pollution as it would create a late-night take-away and off licence.

Questions for speaker: none

3. The applicants' representative, Mr Baker spoke on behalf of the applicant. It was noted that no complaints have been launched regarding noise or light pollution relating to the service station. Any noise from the on-site car wash has been remedied by the current operator, who is also dealing with the trees to reduce impact on the neighbours. It is considered that there would be minimal impact from the extended hours and the proposed fence will shield neighbouring residents from the forecourt. It was also noted that currently alcohol is only 5% of sales.

Questions for speakers

4. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the proposed fence would be acoustic, and this had been agreed with officers.
5. Councillor Siriol Hugh-Jones was informed that sound measurements had been taken from the residential property to the rear of the site.

Questions for officers

6. Councillor Bridget Fishleigh was informed that the fence is to reduce the noise impact that may result from the service station and the extended hours.
7. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that condition 3 – no motor vehicle shall be displayed for sale on site, formed part of the previous conditions and that all conditions would need to transfer to the new permission that would be granted if the application were to be approved.
8. Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that the planning permission granted at appeal restricted sales of alcohol.

9. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that the timber fence would be 3m from the ground level of the service station forecourt.
10. Councillor Siroil Hugh-Jones was informed that the fence was considered to have no significant loss of daylight to the neighbouring properties.

Debate

11. Councillor Dee Simson considered the proposed fence to be intrusive and impactful on the neighbours.
12. Councillor Carol Theobald considered the busy road to be less noisy at night. It was noted that youth related issues have been reported in the nearby park. The extended hours to sell alcohol were a concern. The high fence is considered to have an impact on the neighbours.
13. Councillor Daniel Yates considered that the proposed fence would give 24-hour protection to neighbours and would not reduce sunlight or affect the amenities of the nearby residents. The extension to opening hours was a concern.

14. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer recommendation to Grant permission.

For = 4, Against = 5, Abstentions = 0.

15. Following the overturn of the officer's recommendation Councillor Carol Theobald proposed a vote to refuse the application on the grounds of light pollution, public nuisance and noise. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Sue Shanks and it was proposed that the final wording of the reasons for refusal was to be agreed by the Planning Manager).

For =5, Against = 4, Abstentions = 0. (Councillors Joe Miller and Phelim Mac Cafferty not present).

Recorded Vote: Councillors: For: Hugh-Jones, Theobald, Fishleigh, Shanks, Simson. Against: Hill, Williams, Mac Cafferty, Yates.

RESOLVED: That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the reasons proposed by Councillor Theobald.

N BH2019/01136- 24 Montpelier Street, Brighton-Householder Planning Consent

1. Stewart Glassar, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation by reference to site plans, photographs and elevational drawings detailing the proposed scheme. The main considerations for this application relate to the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the application dwelling, the Montpelier and Clifton Hill Conservation Area, the nearby grade I listed Church of St Michael and All Angels and the amenities of the local residents.

Speakers

2. Mr Farrow, the applicant, spoke and stated that they disagreed that the proposal would be visually prominent as the proposal would not be visible from the road, as the current Butterfly roof cannot be seen either. The proposed sunroom will be 50cms above the existing parapet. Mr Farrow commented that other properties nearby, including opposite the application site, have removed the Butterfly roofs and created terraces.

Questions for the speaker

3. Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that other properties in the street have been developed in similar ways some with dormer windows on pitched roofs and others with terraces.
4. Councillor Bridget Fishleigh was informed that the proposal would not include side or rear window openings, with doors onto the terrace only, thereby reducing the possibility of noise to neighbours.
5. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the other developments quoted were more than 15 years old.
6. The Planning Officer stated that other properties were changed some time ago and had not been considered under current case law and policy.

Questions for officers

The Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) officer noted that the last two buildings in the terrace are a pair.

7. Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that the current context of the area is taken into consideration and the loss of the Butterfly roof is considered to be detrimental to the area having been judged under current planning policy.

Debate

8. Councillor Daniel Yates noted that roof terraces may have been allowed in the past, the impact on the Conservation Area and the neighbours would not be positive. Views from above are also noteworthy.
9. Councillor Sue Shanks expressed concerns regarding the setting of a precedent and would not support the application.
10. Councillor Dee Simson noted the need to retain the historical Butterfly roofs in the Conservation Area.
11. A vote was undertaken to support the officer's recommendation to refuse the application:

Vote: For = 7, Against = 0, Abstentions = 1. (Councillors Joe Miller and Phelim Mac Cafferty not present).

12. **RESOLVED:** To REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:
1. The proposed alterations, by virtue of the loss of the historic roof-form and addition of an incongruous and visually prominent extension would detract from and cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, wider Montpelier & Clifton Hill conservation area and the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St Michael & All Angels. This harm is considered contrary to policies QD14, HE3 and HE6 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One.
 2. The proposed terrace, by reason of it having the potential to create activity and visual clutter at rooftop level in a historically sensitive location, would appear as an unsympathetic feature that detracts from the historic character and appearance of the wider streetscene within the Montpelier & Clifton Hill conservation area. This harm is considered contrary to policies QD14, HE3 and HE6 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One.

O BH2019/00908- Flat 1, 9-10 Carlton Terrace, Portslade- Full Planning

The application was not called for the Planning Committee to discuss, the officer recommendation to GRANT Planning Permission was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

P BH2019/0031-126 Wolseley Road, Brighton - Full Planning

1. Change of use from existing single dwelling (C3) to a six-bedroom small house in multiple occupation (C4) including installation of rear decking and alterations to fenestration.
2. The main considerations relate to the principle of the change of use, the standard of accommodation which the use would provide, impact on the neighbouring amenities and transport issues.
3. The Members of the Planning Committee are requested to consider the application for change of use even though the applicant has submitted an appeal as the Committee's view on the application will inform the Council's case.

Pubic Speakers

4. Council Tracey Hill, having stepped down as Chair of the meeting for this item, spoke to the committee. Ms Hill stated that the previous application had been refused and gone to appeal. The inspector considered the dormer window and rooflights to be excessive. This scheme seems very similar. The dormer would allow two rooms in the loft space and enable the C4 use. Please refuse as before.

Questions for Officers

5. Councillor Dee Simson noted that the dormer window had been constructed under Permitted Development and had been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness.

6. Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that a family residence is allowed to construct under Permitted Development.
7. Councillor Dee Simson was informed that there would be 3 toilets, 2 baths/shower rooms with a ground floor communal space. The internal layout would be conditioned to ensure that the floor space of each room conformed to standard. It was noted the property would house seven persons.
8. Councillor Carol Theobald was informed the accommodation in the?? roof was of a good standard.
9. Councillor Gill Williams was informed that the application site was a terrace property with family homes adjoining.

Debate

10. Councillor Simson considered that the impact on the neighbouring terrace properties would be considerable, and the loss of a family home is not good.
11. The Committee were invited to vote on the officer's recommendation to GRANT planning permission.

Vote: For = 0, Against = 6, Abstain = 1. The officer recommendation was overturned. (Councillors Joe Miller, Phelim Mac Cafferty and Tracey Hill were not present).

Councillor Dan Yates proposed the application would have been refused, Councillor Dee Simson seconded, on the grounds of loss of amenity to neighbours, potential traffic impact; parking impact and material nuisance.

1. The Committee were invited to vote on the motion that it would have refused the application against the officer's recommendation for the reasons proposed by Councillor Yates and to authorise the Planning Manager to word the refusal on the reasons proposed.
12. Following the vote to refuse the officer recommendation, a vote that the Committee would have refused the application was held.
13. Vote: For = 6, Against = 0, Abstention = 1. (Councillors Joe Miller and Phelim Mac Cafferty not present).

Recorded Vote: Councillors: For: Williams, Theobald, Fishleigh, Shanks, Simson, Yates. Abstention: Hugh-Jones.

RESOVLED: The application WOULD HAVE BEEN REFUSED for the reasons proposed by Councillor Yates.

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

16.1 There were none.

17 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

18 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

The meeting concluded at 9.17pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of