

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 6 NOVEMBER 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Hill (Chair), Littman (Opposition Spokesperson), C Theobald (Group Spokesperson), Childs, Mac Cafferty, Miller, Shanks and Yates

Officers in attendance: Nicola Hurley (Planning Manager), Mike Anson (Principle Planning Officer), Russell Brown (Principle Planning Officer), Henrietta Ashun (Principle Planning Officer), Sonia Gillam (Senior Planning Officer), Emily Stanbridge (Senior Planning Officer), Hilary Woodward (Senior Lawyer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

50 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

50a Declarations of substitutes

50.1 None

50b Declarations of interests

50.2 Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty declared an interest in item A as he has been contacted by the applicant. Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that they were not predetermined on the item.

Councillor Joe Miller declared they had been lobbied by residents on items A and F.

Councillor Daniel Yates declared they had written a letter of objection to item A and would withdraw from the chamber for this item.

All Members of the Committee have been lobbied by residents regarding item F.

50c Exclusion of the press and public

50.3 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.

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

50d Use of mobile phones and tablets

50.5 The Chair requested Members ensure that their mobile phones were switched off, and where Members were using tablets to access agenda papers electronically ensure that these were switched to ‘aeroplane mode’.

51 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

51.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2019 as a correct record having accepted the following change:

Item H – BH2019/01743 – Varndean College, Surrenden Road, Brighton – Full Planning

Public Speakers:

“Mr Colman spoke on behalf of neighbouring residents setting out their objections and those of the Green Varndean Group to the proposed scheme. The proposed scheme should be in addition to rather than a replacement for the existing biodiversity area. An additional condition ought to be required in order to protect this area which was an asset of community value.”

52 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

52.1 The Chair stated that the committee would be recorded and available for repeat viewing. The major applications will be dealt with first, followed by the minor applications. If speakers are present for an item then those items will be called first.

53 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

53.1 There were none.

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

54.1 There were none.

55 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Call Over

55.1.1 It was noted that all items on the agenda were called for discussion.

A BH2019/01272 - 1 Moulsecoomb Way, Brighton - Full Planning

Demolition of existing industrial (recycling), community and residential buildings and erection of a new development with buildings ranging from 5 to 7 storeys providing a mix of new community (Class D1) and employment (Class B1) floorspace at ground floor level and 373 student bedrooms with communal facilities on the upper floors along with landscaping, public realm improvements and public and communal open space.

- 1) It was noted that this item had been the subject of a site visit prior to the Committee meeting.
- 2) The Principal Planning Officer, Mike Anson, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List.

Public Speakers

- 3) Councillors Kate Knight and Daniel Yates spoke on the item. Councillor Knight stated that they had attended the consultation and noted that some residents felt that accommodation for families would be more appropriate for the area. The existing over crowded parking meant that there were concerns from residents regarding the lack of parking allocated in the proposed development. A robust plan for student parking was requested. Councillor Yates stated that some elements of the scheme were not being opposed as the loss of the way transfer station was not generally opposed. No issues were expressed with the design and scale. It was noted that at a public meeting concerns were raised relating to the parking for the scheme and the late list included concerns from the Highways officer. The Councillor considered that the impact on the surrounding roads could be considerable.
- 4) There were no questions from the Committee for the speakers.
- 5) Grant Leggett – Planning Consultant spoke on behalf of the applicant. It was stated that the development would be a mixed use of employment and residential. A petition in March had raised concerns about the use of HGVs in the area. A replacement transfer station has been identified in Newhaven, where new jobs are to be provided. It was noted that a wood recycle project would be included at the new location. Community use areas would be included in the development along with 370 student rooms. Access to the universities is good. With regarding to parking the student management plan would cover this matter.

Questions for the Speaker

- 6) Councillor Joe Miller was informed that the location was good for buses.
- 7) Councillor was informed that the church was to be retained.

- 8) Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that the student management plan would cover the busy time of student drop off at the beginning of term and include spreading the drop off times across different days. The courtyard can be used as a drop off place and thereafter retained for community use.
- 9) Councillor Nick Childs was informed that the management plan would deal with parking issues and that supermarket drops would be on the street. It was felt that students would not want to incur the extra charge for busy times and would therefore request other drop off times and this would reduce the impact. It was noted that in the traffic assessment only 10 movements would be likely by students per day. Noise and anti-social behaviour would be taken very seriously and would form part of the management plan. The students would be encouraged to be part of the community and sensitive to other residents regarding parking. It was noted that 3 trees were to be removed from the site as part of the scheme, including an Elm tree. These would be replaced as part of the development by 25 trees.
- 10) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the Elm tree to be removed was located at the front of the scheme. It was also noted that there are 4 staff spaces included in the development and no decisions had been made regarding the use of the art funds.
- 11) Councillor Leo Littman was informed that replacement trees would be agreed by condition.
- 12) Councillor Tracey Hill was informed that the student management plan would be detailed with no loop holes regarding student car parking.

Questions for Officers

- 13) Councillor Leo Littman was informed that the Planning officer had weighed up all policies following professional opinions from the Transport Officer. It was agreed that the information provided to the transport officer was not comprehensive. A request has been made to repeat the parking survey at school term time.
- 14) Councillor Nick Childs was informed by the Transport Officer that the emergency vehicle access had been included following talks with the applicant. It was noted that the transport audit was insufficient and there were overall concerns on the road loading. The Road Safety audit had not been verified at this time. It was confirmed that 19 wheelchair spaces were included in the scheme. Mike Anson stated that wheelchair using students often stayed on campus. 5% of the rooms would be wheelchair accessible and would be used by students of all abilities if not required for wheelchair users.
- 15) Councillor Joe Miller was informed that transport was not the only consideration and that the proposed units were to modern standards and the transport to university campuses were good.

- 16) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the on-street loading bay could be used for supermarket drop offs. It was noted that other city centre developments did not have drop off bays as part of the scheme.
- 17) Councillor Nick Childs was informed that the development was more isolated than previous developments on other parts of the city and would not incur the same loss of privacy issues. The development is also set back on the site from the existing wide road. It was confirmed that no loss of capacity would result from using the waste station in Newhaven. The exact details of loading bays would be agreed in the management plan and the Transport Officer confirmed that free loading was already in the area.

Debate

- 18) Councillor Joe Miller felt the development would be good for the area as residential units would be preferred to the current waste site. It was also noted that the units would help by not increasing the number of HMOs in the city. The office space would be welcomed. The loss of three trees was acceptable given they will be replaced. The transport links are good, and the church will remain. A good application overall and will support.
- 19) Councillor Leo Littman felt the proposals were better than the existing waste station. The loss of trees was a shame but understood. The Transport officer comments were a concern.
- 20) Councillor Nick Childs felt the scheme had many positives. The environment impact seemed acceptable. The student accommodation was good and would reduce stress on HMOs. The transfer over to the waste station in Newhaven was acceptable. The drop off situation still remained an issue.
- 21) Councillor Carol Theobald was sad at the loss of any trees on the site. Overall the development was seen as a benefit to the area and Councillor Theobald would support.
- 22) Councillor Sue Shanks supported the application as there was a need for student accommodation.
- 23) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty supported the application and felt the decision to grant permission by the planning officer was well balanced. The scheme was considered good and would fulfil the need for business space and student accommodation.
- 24) Councillor Tracey Hill felt enough information was provided to make a decision and agreed that parking in the area was an issue. It was noted that there is good bus service available. Councillor Hill would support.

Decision

- 55.1 **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to **GRANT** planning

permission subject to a s106 Planning Obligation and the conditions and informatives as set out hereunder SAVE THAT should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before the 26th February 2020, the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 9 of this report.

Note: Councillor Daniel Yates did not take part in the decision vote.

B BH2018/03943 - The Old Ship Hotel, 31-38 Kings Road, Brighton - Full Planning

Remodelling of accommodation and extensions to provide an additional 54no bedrooms, leisure facilities and retail units. Works to include demolition of existing garage and erection of six storey extension on Black Lion Street, single storey mansard roof extension on Kings Road, enclosure of existing fire escape on Ship Street, swimming pool and leisure facilities (D2) in internal courtyard, 6no retail units (A1), in-house restaurants (A3), basement parking facilities, external alterations and associated works.

- 1) Senior Planning Officer, Sonia Gillam, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List.

Questions for Officers

- 2) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the assembly rooms, which do not form part of this application, were listed not the remaining building. It was noted that the use of the public art funding or the transport contributions had not been agreed.
- 3) Councillor Carol Theobald noted that the site had been the subject of a number of planning permissions and was informed that planning permissions could not be forcibly implemented.
- 4) Councillor Leo Littman was informed by the Transport Officer that not all the information required was available and surveys had not been submitted along with the delivery statement for Black Lion Street.

Debate

- 5) Councillor Nick Childs supported the application which was considered to create more employment and increase the number of badly needed hotel beds.
- 6) Councillor Carol Theobald stated support for the scheme.
- 7) Councillor Leo Littman supported the scheme. It was noted that the lack of information for the Transport Officer was a concern and that the area needed some care and attention.
- 8) Councillor Joe Miller supported the application as the application would create jobs and attract visitors. Councillor Miller agreed that Black Lion Street needed improving.

- 9) Councillor Daniel Yates felt that the predicted 35% increase in visitors and the proposed gym which would also attract visitors, was to be supported. It was felt that a precedent had already been set by the granting of the previous application. The removal of the garaging in Black Lion Street was seen as an improvement to the area.

Decision

- 55.2 **Resolved:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to GRANT planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out hereunder, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before 26 February 2020 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11 of the report.

C BH2019/01422 - Cemex, Brighton Plant and Wharf, Basin Road, North Portslade - Full Planning

Alterations to layout at existing wharf, incorporating demolition of existing office building and erection of two storey office/welfare buildings, installation of new feed conveyor, hopper and storage bays, repositioning of weighbridge and erection of new weighbridge office and alterations to car parking, boundary wall and access.

- 1) Planning Officer, Henrietta Ashun, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List.

Questions for officer

- 2) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the portacabin, which would replace the existing brick building was suitable for the site. The portacabin was considered more efficient use of the space would reduce the office floor space.
- 3) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the development would not change the use of the site during construction and the stock bays would be more efficient. It was noted that West Sussex County Council had agreed the application which falls in both authorities' jurisdictions.

Debate

- 4) Councillor Carol Theobald supported the proposals.
- 5) Councillor Leo Littman supported the proposals.
- 6) Councillor Joe Miller felt that economically the proposal is good as concrete is needed and a local supplier will be better for area.
- 7) Councillor Tracey Hill felt that the site visit had been a benefit to understand the heights of the development and supported the application.

Decision

- 55.3 **Resolved:** The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the officer's report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the officers report.

D BH2019/00732 - 25 York Villas, Brighton _ Full Planning

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three storey mixed use development, comprising 5no commercial units (B1) at ground floor, and 1no one bedroom, 4no two bedroom and 2no three-bedroom flats at first and second floor.

- 1) Principle Planning Officer, Luke Austin, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List. It was noted that the ground levels were inaccurate, and revisions had been made to the elevational drawings.

Questions for officer

- 2) Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that the commercial use of the existing site has evolved over many years. It was noted that the proposal is mixed use and some employment will be retained. The existing B1 use for catering could be retained in the commercial units, it was noted.
- 3) Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that the traffic measures are for the commercial traffic. It was noted that Car Club could be operated and would be available for all.
- 4) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that there was a bus stop nearby, some 55m from the development and the nearest building was 14.6m away.

Debate

- 5) Councillor Leo Littman stated support for the proposal and noted that report paragraphs 5.3 – parking demand estimate and 5.6 – arboriculture department trial excavations, have been resolved.
- 6) Councillor Carol Theobald noted that the height of the proposed development was significantly higher than the existing structure. The proposals feel cramped on the plot and car parking may be an issue in the area arising from the commercial units.

Decision

- 55.4 **RESOLVED:** The Committee took into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolved to **GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement and the recommended Conditions and Informatives, as set out in the report, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on

or before, 26 February 2020, the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11 of the report.

E BH2019/01986 - 22 Crescent Road, Brighton - Full Planning (Retrospective)

Change of use from single dwelling-house (C3) to 5no bedroom small house in multiple occupation (C4).

- 1) Principle Planning Officer, Luke Austin, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List.

Questions for officer

- 2) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the second-floor terrace to the rear of the property was existing and only accessible from one bedroom and no other rooms. It was noted that there is already overlooking harm to the amenities of the neighbours and this would not be increased.
- 3) Councillor Sue Shanks received confirmation that the balcony and terrace referred to in the report were the same thing, and this was the only outside space. It was noted that the retrospective application did not require condition no.2 – commencement within 3 years.
- 4) Councillor Nick Childs was informed that the property had been a family home in the past. It was noted that Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) are plotted on a map to prevent overcrowding in one area. If an HMO did not have a licence, it would not appear on the map.
- 5) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the fire escape routes were through other rooms and windows were deemed low enough to escape from. It was noted that HMOs require a licence as well as planning permission. The Councillor was also informed that there is no cycle parking on the site and sound proofing was not a requirement.
- 6) Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that previously planning permission was granted in the 1980s for the property to be split into two flats. It was not known if this permission was implemented as planning permission would not be required to return the property to one unit. It was stated that it was not known if there were any enforcement records relating to the terrace.

Debate

- 7) Councillor Daniel Yates noted that the terrace could be used by any occupants if the dwelling were a family home and the access was through one bedroom only. It was felt that use would not necessarily increase if the property were an HMO. The Councillor felt that there could be excessive use of conditions regarding the use of the terrace.

- 8) Councillor Nick Childs had concerns of over development, increase in noise and vehicle movements outside property. The Councillor commented that they felt the terrace would become a party area and increase the possibility of noise pollution.
- 9) Councillor Carol Theobald noted the large number of letters of objection and felt that there was a possibility of increased noise pollution. The Councillor felt that HMOs require restrictions to prevent negative interactions with the existing community.
- 10) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty commented that overlooking from the terrace could be mitigated by inserting screening by condition.
- 11) A vote was held to add a condition to the recommended conditions to add screening to the terrace to reduce harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

5 = Yes. 2 = No. 0 = Abstentions. It was agreed that a condition would be added should the application be granted planning permission.
- 12) A vote was held to determine the application.

3 = Yes. 4 = Against. 0 = Abstentions. The Application was REFUSED against the officer recommendation to grant permission.
- 13) Councillor Yates proposed to reject the application on the grounds that the application would have a harmful impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties by way of increased noise pollution, increased waste and anti-social behaviour in a conservation area. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Nick Childs.
- 14) The Committee voted to REFUSE the application for the reasons given above.

Decision

55.5 **REFUSED:** The proposed development would be contrary to Policy QD27, being harmful to the amenity of neighbours by reason of noise and disturbance both from within the property and from the terrace due to the intensification of the use.

F BH2019/02158 - 15 Caburn Road & 203 Dyke Road, Hove - Full Planning

Change of use from nursing home (C2) at No.15 Caburn Road and Sui Generis HMO at No.203 Dyke Road to 20no bedroom short term accommodation & services for the homeless (Sui Generis). Alterations to form single building, replacement ground floor windows & door to west elevation and associated works.

- 1) Senior Planning Officer, Emily Stanbridge, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List. It was noted that a large number of late representations had been received, including from Ward Councillor - Jackie O'Quinn.

Speakers

- 2) Councillor Jackie O'Quinn spoke as Ward Councillor in objection to the application. The Councillor considered that a public meeting would have been of benefit so local residents could ask questions and receive responses. Locals would have had a voice. In planning terms, the Councillor considered that there were too few communal spaces, which could lead to socialising outside the building. This would then have an impact on the area and maybe a security issue. The needs of the residents should be heard, and a consultation is needed.

Questions of the Speaker

- 3) Councillor Sue Shanks was informed that a branch of a school is located opposite the application site.
- 4) Councillor Leo Littman was informed that Councillor O'Quinn had received the Running List of planning applications. It was noted that Councillor Littman had been contacted by a number of residents regarding the application.
- 5) Councillor O'Quinn stated concerns regarding notification of the application. It was noted that residents had been notified by the Planning officers in July and August and public notices had been displayed outside the property.

Sue Forrest – Commissioning & Performance Manager, attended for applicant – Brighton and Hove City Council.

Questions for the officer.

- 6) Councillor Daniel Yates was informed that the accommodation will be used for one-to-one support for the homeless. The occupiers may have issues relating to drugs, alcohol and mental health issues, but not exclusively or necessarily. Each person will be supported on a case by case basis. It was noted that this site would not be used as a drug rehabilitation centre.
- 7) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that users of the accommodation would be limited to 28 days for assessment. Following the assessment, the homeless will move on. It was noted that other buildings vary greatly and are not comparable to this site. Most others do not have facilities on every floor. Complaints relating to assessment accommodation are dealt with by the Community Safety team who work closely with the service provider. Any anti-social behaviour is dealt with.
- 8) Councillor Sue Shanks was informed the accommodation would be for mixed single people, over 25 years old.
- 9) Councillor Leo Littman was informed that the assessment centres need to be spread across the city and this site was chosen for the good location – outside of city centre and standard of property.
- 10) Councillor Nick Childs was informed that other assessment centres are located near to schools and no issues have arisen.

- 11) Councillor Tracey Hill was informed that a consultation will take place should the Planning permission be granted.

Questions for the Officer

- 12) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that the existing rooms were of a good standard and would not be reduced in size.
- 13) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the local residents can contact the staff at the site if they have any concerns once the accommodation is up and running. It was noted that an management scheme could include contact information for local residents.

Debate

- 14) Councillor Sue Shanks felt the accommodation was needed and noted that nearby residents would be anxious.
- 15) Councillor Daniel Yates also felt the service was needed and noted that accommodation would only be occupied for 28 days. Councillor Mac Cafferty felt that residents should not fear the application and noted that anyone can be homeless for many reasons. The dispersment of accommodation across the city was a good thing. The site offered good facilities and transport links. It is noted that the management plan needs to be tight. Queuing outside the property would need to be restricted. The integration needs to be successful and supported.
- 16) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty understood the concerns of the local residents from experience in their own ward. It was felt that the management of the property should be robust. It should be noted that good and bad behaviour can come from homeless and long-term residents.
- 17) Councillor Leo Littman felt that accommodation should be where there are good transport links to avoid ghettoization in the city.
- 18) Councillor Tracey Hill noted that other properties had not experienced problems and Sussex Police were not concerned. The Councillor noted that reaching out to residents may have been better first, before submitting the planning application and that lines of communication should be kept open. The accommodation is needed and would not necessarily be problematic.

Decision

- 55.7 **RESOLVED:** 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 contained in the report.

- G BH2019/02411 - Flat 2, 33 Adelaide Crescent, Hove - Full Planning**
Creation of roof terrace over existing flat roof at rear with balustrade and glazed screening and associated alterations.

- 1) Principle Planning Officer, Luke Austin, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List.

Questions for the officer

- 2) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty was informed that the proposed balcony would rendered. It was noted that the glass to be used in the proposal would be approved by Planning officers.

Debate

- 3) Councillor Phelim Mac Cafferty expressed concerns that the proposal may set a precedent.

Decision

55.8 **RESOLVED:** The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the officers report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives contained in the report.

H BH2019/010145 - Brittany Lodge, 32 Brittany Road, Hove - Full Planning

Conversion of existing nursing home (C2) to 2no. 3 bedroom and 2no. 2 bedroom residential flats (C3). Comprehensive remodelling of site, with proposals incorporating: the erection of a single storey rear extension; alterations/additions to fenestration; the demolition of a garage; and associated works.

- 1) Principle Planning Officer, Russell Brown, introduced the application with a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans, site plans, photographs, elevational drawings and aerial views showing the site and its boundaries. Reference was also made to the additional representations received detailed in the Late/Additional Representations List.

Questions for the officer

- 2) Councillor Carol Theobald was informed that there were trees on the site that would prevent overlooking to the rear of the property.

Decision

55.9 **RESOLVED:** The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the officers report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives contained in the officers report.

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

56.1 There were none

57 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.

58 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.

59 APPEAL DECISIONS

- .1 The Committee noted the content of the letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising of the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

The meeting concluded at 6.20pm
Signed

Chair