



# Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 1 and 2 July 2009

Site visit made on 2 July 2009

by **P W Clark MA MRTPI MCI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government**

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
30 July 2009**

## **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/09/2097917**

### **Gala Bingo Hall and adjacent car park, Portland Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 5JB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Downland Housing Association Ltd against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2008/02586, dated 30 July 2008, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2008.
- The development proposed is demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site to provide a new GP surgery at part ground, part first floor, a new D1/D2 unit at ground floor and 38 (revised to 37) residential units above in a part 3, part 4 and part 5 storey building, including 16 affordable units (40%) (revised to 42%) with surface car parking and landscaping at rear.

### **Application for costs**

1. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Downland Housing Association Ltd against Brighton & Hove City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### **Decision**

2. I dismiss the appeal.

### **Procedural matters**

3. As submitted, drawing P07D indicates a proposed A1/A2/A3 use. Both parties agree that this is an error. In consequence, the eleventh reason for refusal is withdrawn.
4. Amended drawings P06C, P07E, P08E, P10D, P11E, P12E, P13E, P14B and P20A were submitted during the course of the appeal with a request that these be substituted for those originally submitted. They correct the error and make further changes. They reduce the number of flats by one and so increase the proportion of affordable units to 42% but otherwise the description of development would be unchanged. Together with other changes to the building, surface car parking would be decreased in extent and landscaping increased in extent. The omission of 24 cycle spaces from the revised landscaping area on drawings P06C and P07E is acknowledged to be an error.
5. The amendments reduce the quantity of development by a few percentage points, so are minor. They give rise to no new points. The appellant has notified the amendments in good time to all who might be expected to be

interested. Therefore, nobody would be prejudiced by the substitution and so I have considered the case and based my decision on the revised drawings.

### **Main issues**

6. There are five main issues, several with component parts. These are the effects of the proposal on;
  - the living conditions of potential future occupants, with particular reference to outdoor recreation space, amenity space, privacy, noise and air quality;
  - the living conditions of neighbours in terms of noise, privacy, light and outlook;
  - local infrastructure, in terms of indoor recreation, community facilities, education facilities and transport. Outdoor recreation also figures as part of this issue but I consider the point as part of the first issue;
  - energy consumption in terms of its use of internal bathrooms; and
  - the character and appearance of the area in terms of its scale, bulk, height, form, position, mix of uses and public art.

### **Reasons**

#### ***Potential future occupants***

##### *Outdoor recreation space*

7. Brighton and Hove Local Plan policy HO6 requires housing development to benefit from three kinds of outdoor recreation space; children's equipped play space, casual or informal play space and adult or youth outdoor sports facilities, to be provided on site, where practicable. No provision would be made on site for equipped play space or for adult or youth outdoor sports facilities. After deductions for overflow car parking and for cycle spaces inadvertently omitted from the drawings, the scheme would only provide about 50-60% of the requirement for casual or informal play space at ground floor level. This would be supplemented by two separate areas of casual or informal play space on rooftops to reach approximately the total required for casual or informal play.
8. Although the total amount of casual or informal play space approximates to the Council's quantitative requirements, its division into three separate pieces would reduce its utility. The largest space, at ground floor level, would be placed between the car park of the adjoining site and the car parking proposed for the doctor's surgery on site. Access to it, from all flats, would require crossing the surgery car park and, for the majority of flats, would also require a circuit of the building on the public highway around the site. It could not be placed on site further away from the majority of flats it would be intended to serve.
9. The quantity and layout of open space on site would be the result of a three-way balance between the footprint of the building, the footprint of the car park and the footprint of the open space. The car park is proposed to have a single-

sided layout. This is inherently inefficient, consuming a disproportionate area of the site for any given number of parking spaces.

10. It was explained that this layout was chosen to have a close relationship between the car park and the surgery it would serve and to avoid a break in the street frontage which might result from a differently configured car park placed partly under the building. Whilst recognising the desirability of a continuous street frontage, I observe that the current proposal would anyway result in a considerable break at ground floor level caused by the combination of residential entrance, car park entrance and cycle, refuse and recycling store.
11. Whatever the reasons, the layout chosen would result in inadequate, poorly located, casual play space. The implications for living conditions would be both practical in terms of access to play space and visual, in that an outlook for the majority of flats, over a main road in one direction and a car park in the other, would have little relief. Although the development would achieve the greater intensity sought by government policy set out in Planning Policy Statements 1, *Sustainable Development* and 3, *Housing* (PPSs 1 & 3) and by local plan policy QD3, it would not achieve the efficient and effective use of the site required by that policy and so, through an inadequate provision of casual play space, would not achieve the quality of life for residents also sought by PPSs 1 & 3.
12. There is existing off-site provision of outdoor recreation space at Stoneham Park, Davis Park and Wish Park, too far way for casual use but with potential for supplying the other components of local plan policy HO6. The Council was unable to supply me with the evidence of its Open Space Sport and Recreation Study because it was not yet completed. Its summary conclusions described in the material before me relate only to city-wide figures so cannot contradict the appellant's view that the three local parks would satisfy the other two components of local plan policy HO6 in respect of this site.
13. Even if their enhancement were required, as the Council contests, there is no current proposal to do so, so any financial contribution made through a s106 obligation could not be shown to remedy any deficiency. The appellant does not propose to make one in the absence of any demonstrable need. Although I saw that Stoneham Park was well used at the time of my visit, the same was not true of Davis Park and Wish Park, so I am not convinced that there is a deficiency in the local area of open space to serve two of the three components of policy HO6. Part (i) of policy S1 of the recently adopted South East Plan would also be satisfied in so far as this requires community access to amenities such as parks, open spaces and physical recreation activity. However this finding does not override the unacceptable inadequacies of the scheme in relation to the first component of HO6, casual or informal playspace.

*Private amenity space*

14. In terms of private amenity space, the revised scheme was shown to provide a balcony for each flat capable of accommodating a table and chairs. The Council accepted, and I concur, that this would be sufficient to meet the requirements of local plan policy HO5 which requires a usable quantity of private amenity space.

*Privacy*

15. The scheme would include some bedroom windows opening on to a communal walkway at first and second floor levels. The revised scheme includes obscure glazing to the lower half of these windows, which could be secured by condition. This would provide adequate visual privacy without preventing a complete loss of outlook which would be unacceptable in a habitable room. It would thus avoid nuisance or loss of amenity to proposed residents and so in that respect meet one of the requirements of local plan policy QD27.

*Noise*

16. The site lies on a main road carrying frequent buses. However there is no information by which to classify the site within the noise exposure categories set out in the government's planning policy guidance *Planning and Noise* (PPG24). The appellants considered that the effect of the development in providing a noise barrier against Portland Road would benefit residents of Marmion Road behind the site. As that demonstrates awareness that noise from Portland Road is a problem, I am not convinced by both parties' lack of concern for the effects of traffic noise from Portland Road on the residents of the development itself, reliant on natural ventilation and on balconies on the Portland Road frontage for private amenity space.
17. There would be no plant within the scheme likely to cause internally-generated noise. Modern construction methods can achieve noise reduction. Although not specifically discussed at the Hearing, these could be secured by condition to comply with the part of local plan policy SU10 which requires potential occupants to be protected against noise, so my concerns do not amount to a reason to dismiss the appeal.

*Air quality*

18. The site lies within an Air Quality Management Area with excessive concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide expected at ground floor level. Air pollution levels at first floor level and above are expected to be acceptable for residential accommodation. The proposal contains no residential properties on the ground floor so would not give rise to unacceptable living conditions on that count.

*Occupants' living conditions - conclusions*

19. As PPS3 advises, good design is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing, which contributes to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities. Particularly in the revisions to this scheme, ingenious design skills would ensure acceptable conditions for potential future residents in terms of air quality, privacy and private amenity space. A satisfactory noise environment could be ensured by condition.
20. The local area is provided with equipped children's play space and outdoor sports facilities for adults. However, the layout of the site would provide casual play space inadequate in both size and location. In consequence of the latter, most flats would also have a poor outlook. PPS3 emphasises the importance of ensuring that there is good provision of well designed, safe, secure and stimulating recreational areas, including informal play space, particularly where family housing is proposed. I conclude that in this respect, the proposal would

not achieve the high quality of living conditions for future residents which is sought by PPSs1 & 3. It would therefore not comply with local plan policies QD3 and HO6.

### **Neighbours**

#### *Light*

21. Loss of light to neighbouring properties is not one of the Council's reasons for refusal, but is raised by third parties. The extensive bulk of the existing building on site is placed close up against the northern boundary and so causes considerable light restriction to the rear of the properties in Marmion Road. Nevertheless, whereas the previous development occurred before the planning system was in place, what is now proposed is a redevelopment requiring planning permission. Previously unacceptable or undesirable situations should not necessarily be replicated.
22. The developer's daylight analysis is not challenged by any party. It examines the effects of the scheme as originally submitted. Its methodology is intended to highlight unacceptable deteriorations in daylighting but it is also possible to identify locations where an existing outcome would not be acceptable by today's standards. These are to the ground floor rear windows of numbers 70 to 82 (even) Marmion Road.
23. In most cases the proposal would result in an improvement to daylighting to acceptable levels because the extent of building on the boundary would be so much less. In a few cases deterioration is recorded but so small that it would not be noticed in practice. The test of the Building Research Establishment Guidelines, which are commonly used for assessing daylight impacts, would be passed. However, this test only measures deterioration. From the figures supplied it would appear that the existing constrictions on daylight would be perpetuated but made no worse in respect of the ground floor windows of number 82 Marmion Road. Some restriction on daylight would continue at numbers 76 to 80 Marmion Road but at an improved level. The benefits to numbers 70 to 74 would be unequivocal.
24. The revised scheme would narrow the width of the fourth floor of the wing projecting towards Marmion Road. However, no further calculation of the effects on daylighting have been made, so it is not possible to quantify any further benefit of this change on daylighting.
25. The development would recreate inadequate daylighting conditions to certain properties in Marmion Road and so harm the living conditions of their occupants. This would be contrary to local plan policy QD27 which seeks to protect neighbours' amenities. On its own this would not be a sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal because the daylighting to most properties in Marmion Road would benefit from the demolition of the existing bingo hall which is proposed as part of this development. I dismiss the appeal for other reasons in any event, so it is a contributory reason but no more than that.

#### *Outlook*

26. In part, consideration of the outlook from neighbours' property parallels the consideration of their daylight. The existing building, positioned close on the
-

- boundary with properties in Marmion Road, is oppressive over an extensive length. The width of the School Road wing of the proposal is much less, so many properties would benefit from the demolition of the existing building.
27. The rear garden of numbers 80 and 82 Marmion Road together with their rear alleyway (known locally as a twitten) is about 10 metres. It would be normal, in a built up area, for the flank of another two storey house to rise in that position and for that outlook to be acceptable.
28. In this case, however, what is proposed would not be far short of twice the depth of a house. A house would normally comprise two storeys plus a gable end whereas the proposal would be four storeys in height, discounting the minor set-back above the ground floor. There would be a further storey, albeit more significantly set back. For these reasons, the outlook from numbers 80 and 82 would be harmed by the new development in much the same way as is their outlook to the existing building and so would be contrary to local plan policy QD27.
29. To the east of the site, houses in Marmion Road face the rear of existing terraces in Portland Road with a comfortable effect on outlook. In that case, their upper floors are at least 31 metres away and their top floors are contained within pitched roofs. For the most part, the Portland Road wing of the new building would be between 25 and 28 metres away from the rear façade of the Marmion Road properties. The outlook to the three storey part would therefore be a little less comfortable than to those terraces to the east but, in my view, still tolerable as the projection and recession of walkways and the varied treatment of the pavilions either side of the walkways would provide interest to the façade.
30. The four storey element to the west commands the narrowest part of the site. The very shallow pitch of the roof would not be visible, so the termination against the sky would appear block-like. The elevation of the same block to Portland Road, which is a wider space than that to the rear of Marmion Road, would have its top floor set back so as not to appear oppressive in the street scene. By contrast, to the rear, although there would be a change in cladding at the fourth storey, it would be vertically hung, in line with the wall below. The metal cladding, in conjunction with windows wider than those on floors below, would give it a top-heavy appearance. This characteristic, in the narrower space to the rear, would present an oppressive outlook for the houses in Marmion Road and so would be contrary to local plan policy QD27.

#### *Noise*

31. In the site as previously used, there are 15 car parking spaces abutting 7 residential properties. In the revised scheme as proposed there would be 17 car parking spaces and cycle storage spaces abutting 9 residential properties. Nevertheless, whereas the previous use commenced before the planning system was in place, what is now proposed is a redevelopment requiring planning permission. Previously unacceptable or undesirable situations should not necessarily be perpetuated. A condition could require the provision of an acoustic fence specified to reduce any noise from the car park to acceptable levels. With such a condition in place, the parts of local plan policy SU10 which
-



require a new development not to cause undue noise to neighbours would be satisfied.

32. There is concern that the first and second floor walkways would lead to residents socialising on them and so causing nuisance to the neighbours in Marmion Road. There are four separate walkways, two serving six flats each, two serving four flats each, so the potential for socialising is not great. If it occurred, it would cause no more noise nuisance than neighbours chatting in the street or across a garden fence.

#### *Privacy*

33. The amended scheme would provide louvred screens attached to each walkway. Their provision could be required by condition. These would prevent views down whilst allowing light to pass through to the rooms fronting on to them. Other windows in the rear of the main body of the proposal would directly face windows of living rooms in Marmion Road at distances varying from 28metres in plots 12 and 28 at the eastern end to 25 metres in plots 1, 17 and 33 at the western end.
34. Local plan policy QD27 contains no measurable standards by which to judge the possibility of overlooking. The CABI publication *By Design, Better Places to Live* recognises that a minimum face to face distance of 20 metres is a well established rule of thumb. Whilst acknowledging that a greater distance is sometimes sought for buildings over two storeys in height, the distance would be adequately exceeded in this case.
35. The amended scheme would contain no principal windows to habitable rooms in the northern elevation of the wing along School Road. All windows in this elevation are proposed to be glazed in obscured glass, which could be required by condition, so no issue of overlooking would arise. There would be habitable room windows in the eastern elevation of this wing. These would be more than 15 metres from the rear window of any house in Marmion Road and angled away at slightly more than a right angle, conditions which are normally accepted as providing privacy in an urban situation.

#### *Neighbours' living conditions - conclusion*

36. Notwithstanding the acceptable effects of the proposal on neighbours' privacy, which could be secured by conditions, and its acceptable effect on their living conditions in terms of noise, which could also be secured by conditions, I conclude that the proposal would have unacceptable effects on their outlook and, to a lesser extent, on their daylight. It would therefore be contrary to local plan policy QD27. Policies QD1 and QD2 referred to in the Council's reasons for refusal do not appear to have a bearing on this issue.

#### **Infrastructure**

##### *Indoor recreation*

37. The parties dispute the relevance of local plan policy SR21. This seeks to prevent a reduction or loss of indoor recreation or sporting facilities. Although the justification to the policy concentrates on sporting facilities, the words "indoor recreation or" in the policy indicate that sport is not its sole interest. Both the common dictionary definition of recreation and the definition of sport
-

and recreation in the annex to the government's Planning Policy Guidance 17: *Planning for Sport and Recreation* (PPG17) confirm that the term recreation should not be used narrowly so I take the view that policy SR21 applies to the bingo hall which is proposed to be demolished in this case.

38. The national decline in demand for bingo and evidence of other facilities within Brighton and Hove confirm that there is an excess of provision within the catchment area of the facility. This evidence satisfies the requirements of South East Plan policies S1(i) and S5 for access to cultural facilities. Another, modern, improved, flat floor bingo hall has been provided elsewhere in Brighton which can replace the facility previously provided on the appeal site. A number of previous users of the appeal site have joined the new facility which indicates that it is as close as practicable to existing and potential users and readily accessible by a choice of transport modes.
39. Unlike local plan policy HO20, which governs the loss of community facilities and which states that the needs for all other types of community use must be considered when entertaining the loss of any one type of facility, there is no similar requirement within local plan policy SR21 to consider the needs for other types of sport and recreation facility when considering a proposal to lose one specific type. In any event, the condition of the building, its inflexible form and the reported presence of asbestos have dissuaded the providers of other types of facility from pursuing an interest. The conditions set by policy SR21 for permitting a loss of the bingo facility are therefore met.

#### *Community facilities*

40. The bingo hall provided a luncheon club for older people and so is regarded as a community facility. It was previously a theatre and cinema, both of which are included in a list of the types of community facility whose loss is resisted by local plan policy HO20. The policy includes a list of circumstances, any one of which would justify the loss of a facility.
41. Although the building has a larger capacity, for a number of decades only a proportion of its total floorspace has been in use for its authorised purpose. For the reasons set out in previous paragraphs there is now no need for that use. The replacement development would provide a very similar quantity of floorspace for the GP surgery and for a supplementary D1/D2 use. This would accord with the provisions of policy S2 of the South East Plan which seeks the provision of primary care facilities. The proposed uses are within the same list of community uses which local plan policy HO20 seeks to retain. Most of the site area would be retained in that community use. Therefore, the conditions set out in local plan policy HO20 are met.

#### *Education facilities*

42. Both parties accept that all schools in the local area are full. The development would give rise to a need to provide additional facilities to serve the needs of its future residents. Although the local planning authority has no specific proposal to remedy the deficiency, I was informed of a strategy to develop a proposal to do so. I have no reason to disbelieve the local authority's good faith, so in this case I am confident that a financial contribution from the developer would be applied to a relevant solution in a timescale appropriate to the needs of the development as required by local plan policy QD28.



43. A contribution has been calculated by reference to the numbers of children likely to be resident in the development, so I am satisfied that it is proportionate to the needs of the development. It has been included in a s106 undertaking which would therefore resolve any objection to the development resulting from its impact on educational infrastructure as required by local plan policy SU15. Policy S6 of the South East Plan requires coordination between development and essential infrastructure provision, with particular priority for health and education. The proposals, including the s106 contribution, would therefore comply with that policy.

*Transport*

44. The residential component of the development has been designed to be car free. This is consistent with local plan policy HO7 which provides for car free housing in locations with good access to public transport. A car club is proposed, to be secured by condition. Parking surveys show that there remain on-street spaces within the local controlled parking zone sufficient to serve the needs of the development. The Council confirms that there is a surplus of available residents' car parking permits, so there is no need to seek the exclusion of the scheme's residents from the controlled parking zone.
45. A limited number of parking spaces would be provided on site for the GP surgery. A travel plan in accordance with local plan policy TR4 would ensure that the travel needs of staff would not exceed the capacity of the car park. This could be secured by condition. The appellant's parking survey was not challenged by the Council. It demonstrates that notwithstanding the pressures of parents at school pick up times, sufficient on-street spaces would be available at the times needed by patients of the GP surgery.
46. Both parties expect the proposal to be less dependent than the previous use on the provision of car parking and more dependent on walking, cycling and public transport to serve its transport demands. The development would provide on street cycle parking, to be secured by condition, in accordance with local plan policy TR14. Some local transport facilities, such as the westbound bus stop serving the site, and local cycling facilities would need upgrading to serve the development's needs in accordance with local plan policies TR5 and TR15 and with policy S1 of the South East Plan which amongst other things seeks the incorporation of healthier forms of transport in planned developments.
47. The Council has specific, costed proposals for these improvements in its Local Transport Plan. A s106 obligation provides for a proportionate contribution to their provision and so would provide for the travel demand created by the development in accordance with local plan policy TR1. With this, and the conditions already noted, in place, objections to the scheme's impact on transport infrastructure would be overcome.

*Local infrastructure - conclusions*

48. For the reasons set out in earlier paragraphs, I conclude that the proposal will not have an unacceptable effect on local infrastructure through the loss of recreation or community facilities. A combination of section 106 obligations and planning conditions can ensure that its effects on other items of local infrastructure would be neutralised. The proposal would therefore comply with

local plan policies TR1, TR4, TR5, TR14, TR15, SU15, SR21, HO7, HO20 and QD28 and with South East Plan policies S1, S2, S5 and S6.

### ***Energy consumption***

49. The amended scheme would reduce the number of bathrooms dependent on artificial ventilation and light. Although a number of internal bathrooms would continue to require artificial ventilation which would consume energy, I was informed that compliance with the Building Regulations would require mechanical ventilation in any event, so I conclude that the number of remaining internal bathrooms would not be inconsistent with the Council's local plan policy SU2 which seeks efficiency in the use of energy.

### ***Character and appearance***

50. The commercial section of Portland Road is characterised by lengthy terraces comprising commercial and retail uses on the ground floor, residential on an upper floor, surmounted by steeply pitched roofs containing a third floor. The length of the terraces is broken up by occasional three storey gables symmetrically placed, frontispieces and the dormers in the roofs. Little of distinction breaks the relentless east-west progress of the road other than the tower of St Peter's Church and that of the bingo hall.
51. The proposal would comprise a lengthy mixed use terrace like others in Portland Road but would adopt a different approach to massing and articulation. It would rise asymmetrically in three blocks from one mimicking the two storeys plus steeply pitched roof of other terraces in Portland Road to a five storey block reaching near to the height of the tower of the bingo hall at the junction with School Road. The elevation in School Road would swiftly descend as a series of linked pavilions.
52. The approach which the development takes is not inappropriate in view of the termination of commercial activity on the north side of Portland Road at this point and the break in its continuity represented by West Hove Infant and Junior Schools. Although the form of the development would take a different approach from that of other terraces in Portland Road, it has the endorsement of the South East Design Review Panel, supported by CABE. As the only objective evidence produced by either party, it is particularly compelling.
53. The provision of public art as a part of the scheme remains a feature of the revised proposals. It can be secured by condition and so does not require any payment to the Council by way of planning obligation in order to secure its completion in compliance with local plan policy QD6
54. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with local plan policies QD1 and QD2 which require high standards of design, taking into account local characteristics.

### ***Summary, conclusions and other matters***

55. A high standard of design is not just good aesthetic appearance, though the external elevations to Portland Road and School Road would have that. There is also a high standard of design shown in the ingenious solutions to a number of problems such as privacy and private amenity space. Infrastructure

---

objections are either unsubstantiated or can be overcome. But although these aspects of the scheme would be acceptable, or even good, they do not compensate for, or outweigh, its deficiencies.

56. The demolition of the bingo hall would improve neighbours' quality of life to an extent but the replacement development would still infringe current planning standards to an unacceptable degree and would impose its own oppressive presence on neighbours' outlook. The layout of the site resulting in a poor outlook for most flats, an inefficient and disproportionate allocation of land to parking, and an inadequacy of casual play space would not produce the high quality of life for potential future residents which government policy expects.
57. The building's good or acceptable features would ensure it would have little adverse impact on the world at large and so would not be noticed or would be taken for granted by the wider public. In contrast, its adverse factors would determine the unavoidable daily experience of a number of people living in and around the development and so would be more intensely felt. For that reason I attach great importance to them.
58. PPS3, paragraph 71 states that where local planning authorities cannot demonstrate an up to date 5-year supply of deliverable sites they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to other policies in the PPS, including paragraph 69. The Council cannot demonstrate an up to date 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. However, the development fails two of the five bullet points in paragraph 69 of PPS 3, in that it would not achieve high quality housing for the reasons explained above and it would not use its site effectively and efficiently. For those reasons I am not able to give it the favourable consideration sought.

*P. W. Clark*

Inspector

## DOCUMENTS

- 1 Consultation letter on amended scheme dated 21 May 2009
- 2 Appeal decision APP/Q1445/A/08/2092613
- 3 E-mail, newspaper article and website extract concerning air pollution
- 4 Extract from PINS website; Demonstrating a 5 year supply of deliverable sites
- 5 E-mail from Cllr Maria Caulfield to Derek Rist
- 6 Timetable, bus route 7
- 7 Photograph, partially-obscured glazing
- 8 Photograph, balconies over footpath
- 9 Consultation on ice rink building
- 10 Corrected Appendix K, Council's statement
- 11 Core Strategy – proposed amendments paper
- 12 Core Strategy – revised preferred options
- 13 Extracts from South East Plan
- 14 Balcony detail drawing
- 15 Extracts from websites – CABE regional panels
- 16 Two photographs, traffic conditions in Marmion Road
- 17 Copy of petition to use site as a playing space
- 18 Letter dated 17 June 2009 from Brighton & Hove City Council to Robinson Escott
- 19 Pair of s106 agreements