

### BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

#### PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 31 AUGUST 2011

#### COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

#### MINUTES

**Present:** Councillors MacCafferty (Chair), Hyde (Deputy Chair), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cobb, Farrow, Hamilton, Hawtree, Jones, Kennedy, Summers, C Theobald and Wells

**Officers in attendance:** Jeanette Walsh (Head of Development Control), Hilary Woodward (Senior Lawyer), Claire Burnett (Area Planning Manager (East)), Steve Walker (Senior Team Planner), Pete Tolson (Principal Transport Planner) and Jane Clarke (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

#### PART ONE

#### 47. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

##### 47a Declarations of substitutes

47.1 Councillor Jones declared he was substituting for Councillor Davey.

##### 47b Declarations of interests

47.2 There were none.

##### 47c Exclusion of the press and public

47.3 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.

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

**48. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

48.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 10 August 2011 as a correct record.

**49. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

49.1 There were none.

**50. APPEAL DECISIONS**

50.1 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.

**51. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE**

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

**52. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES**

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

**53. INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS**

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

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

54.1 **RESOLVED** – That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination of the application:

Application:	Requested by:
BH2010/03760 & BH2010/03759, The Astoria, Gloucester Place, Brighton	Development Control Manager
BH2011/01852, Cavendish House, Dorset Place, Brighton	Development Control Manager

**55. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON THE PLANS LIST****(i) MAJOR APPLICATIONS****A. Application BH2011/01120, Lawncroft, 155 Kingsway, Hove – Demolition of existing building and construction of new four/five storey, 34 bed nursing home with basement car park, widened access and ancillary staff accommodation.**

- 1) The Senior Planning Officer, Mr Walker, introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. He said that planning permission had been granted in 2010 and this application was very similar to that already granted, with a few alterations including extra units. The new application proposed an increased overhang for the building, and a staggered frontage. The basement originally included six car parking spaces, but it was now proposed to reduce the car parking to five spaces, with an increase in disabled spaces from one to two. The lounge area on the ground floor was reduced and staggered so that it did not impede the garden area, and two additional units were included on the ground floor. A new lounge/dining room was included on the first floor. At second floor level a new unit was proposed. On the third floor another additional unit was proposed. On all three floors the windows were angled to look in one direction only, and the fourth floor had also been re-configured.

Overall the building had slightly increased in height, and on the proposed north elevation three new windows were introduced. There were three main changes, including the additional units; the changes to the building in a conservation area, and the reduced car parking spaces. The effect on neighbouring amenity was assessed as similar to the previous scheme, with the additional windows being angled away from overlooking views. In terms of transport it was noted that the Transport Engineer was satisfied with the Travel Plan, which should be secured by condition. The Council required BREAM excellent standards for this application. As the build cost for the scheme had increased additional contributions were required under Council policies.

- 2) Councillor Hyde asked how many staff would be on duty at any given time, whether there was a minimum room size for care homes as she felt the rooms looked very small, and how the parking spaces had been reassessed for the new scheme. Mr Walker replied that there would be a total number of fifteen staff overall. The Principal Transport Planning Officer, Mr Tolson confirmed, contrary to the advice in the report, that residents would be eligible for parking permits. He also advised that there was no waiting list for spaces in this area. Maximum standards were given in SPG04, and the proposal for fewer parking spaces than the maximum was acceptable. The Head of Development Control, Mrs Walsh, replied there was no minimum room size.
- 3) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked how visitor parking would be dealt with, whether there were any double size units for couples, what would be done with the art contributions, whether the downstairs units were reserved for disabled residents,

whether there was any lifts available for staff transporting provisions, and how large the rooms were.

Mr Tolson replied that any resident entitled to a permit would be entitled to receive visitor permits also. Mr Walker replied there were hoists available in the building for equipment etc. The room sizes were adequate, and he believed that the whole scheme could be traversed by disabled people as it was Life Time Homes compliant. There was one lift available for disabled residents. Mrs Walsh replied that in terms of public art the first choice was to integrate the public art into the scheme, and when this was not possible Ward Councillors were consulted as to what would be appropriate for an area.

- 4) Councillor Summers referred to the proposed conditions and asked for further details regarding the pre-occupation conditions relating to BREEAM scores. Mr Walker replied that this would be covered by condition 21.
- 5) Councillor Jones asked about the balcony barrier heights on the fourth floor and asked if there were any safety issues surrounding these barriers. Mr Walker replied that this would be a matter for building regulations to ensure.
- 6) Councillor Cobb referred to the contributions regarding sustainable transport from the scheme and what this would be spent on. She also asked how the provision of parking permits was assessed, and whether the external boundary walls would be graffiti-proof. The Chair said a condition could be added for graffiti proofing the scheme. Mr Tolson replied that the transport contributions would pay for dropped curbs and tactile paving in the area. There were no plans to provide an additional crossing on the A259. He said that this application was not appropriate for a car free development, although others were in the area. Permits were only granted to those developments that were not car free.
- 7) Councillor Cobb asked how frequently the bus routes ran on the seafront and Mr Walker replied that there was a frequency of around 10-30 minutes Monday to Friday, and 30-50 minutes on Saturdays and Sundays.

#### **Debate and decision making process**

- 8) Councillor Mrs Theobald felt the underground parking provision was very disappointing. She felt that two lifts should be required for the size of the development, but felt the design was very good and believed that it suited the area well.
- 9) Councillor Cobb was disappointed regarding the incorrect information in the report and said that the Princess Marine Hotel was originally a nursing home, but had closed to become a hotel. She also requested to be included in any decisions regarding the public art contribution and felt that the car parking provision on site was disappointing.
- 10) A vote was taken and on a vote of 9 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions planning permission was granted subject to a Section 106 agreement and the conditions and

informatives listed on the report, amendments to conditions and an additional condition.

- 55.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and the policies and guidance in section 7 and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Planning Obligation Agreement and to the conditions and informatives listed in the report, and amendments and additions to read:

Amendments

1. Change references from 70% to 60% in conditions 14 and 21.

New Conditions

2. The Travel Plan submitted with the application shall be implemented and carried out in accordance with the details contained therein, and the applicant shall engage with the Council's Travel Plan Coordinator to ensure regular monitoring of the Plan takes place for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: In order to achieve the objectives of encouraging travel to and from the development by alternative modes of transport to the private car, including cycling, walking and bus, reduce reliance on the use of the private car in the interest of cutting emissions, reducing congestion and safeguarding neighbouring residential streets from overspill parking, and to comply with policies TR1 and TR4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

3. The southern (front) and western (side) boundary walls of the development adjacent to Kingsway and Princes Crescent respectively shall be treated with a graffiti-proof finish.

REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of street-facing boundary walls at a prominent road junction with the Pembroke and Princes Conservation Area, in accordance with policies QD2 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

(ii) **MINOR APPLICATIONS**

**B. Application BH2011/01932, Land East of Hove Deep Sea Anglers Club, Western Esplanade, Hove – Erection of a boat house.**

- 1) Mr Walker introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. He said that the application proposed erection of a brick boathouse that was very small in size. The club operated a wide range of water sports on the sea that required the deployment of the safety boat. The boat currently had to be transported a distance of 400 metres before it could be launched for use. This process would normally take 30 minutes. The application would give greater ease of access to the sea, and would increase the security of the boat. The development was in the coastal zone and should respect the seafront environment, protect sea views and not impact on the environment. There was already an extant permission for a storage unit. It was felt that there would be no further intensification beyond the proposed use as a result of this application, and the design would compliment

existing structures on the beach. It would not obstruct views or damage the shingle vegetation, and there was no objection from the Council's Ecologist to the proposed structure.

### **Public Speakers**

- 2) Mr Dubock, a local resident, said he objected jointly with several others, and on behalf of a resident who owned a beach hut directly opposite the proposed structure. The movement of the boat was in his view merely man-handling of a dingy on a very smooth and well paved route. This was not enough justification to build on a boathouse on the beach. The Water Sports and Angling Club could place a store in the car park that also had direct access to the beach. The Martello Tower situated near the site was a very good attraction and this boathouse would detract from it. The beach hut owners would have their views obscured and felt that a site visit was needed before any decision was made. This would make no positive contribution to the area, for residents or for tourists.
- 3) Councillor Cobb asked how far the beach huts would be away from the boathouse, and Mr Dubock replied that it would be the width of the promenade. Mr Walker clarified that this was around 20 metres from the nearest beach hut.
- 4) Mr Saul, Manager of Hove Lagoon Water Sports, said that his company had been established and using the lagoon for 18 years. Thousands of local people had used the company over the years. The problems with storage were not new, and the company was offered storage space by the Council as part of building the beach huts, but this unfortunately did not go ahead. He noted that the building was small and would allow a quick launch of the boat in an emergency situation. The materials would match the Martello Tower. He hoped to share the winch from the Deep Sea Anglers Club, so the boathouse was proposed on this site for easy access to the winch. The new system would allow more space on the lagoon for other users. There was no impact on the shingle ecology, or on sunbathers using the area. There would be no impact on noise levels in the area. The project had minimal impact on the surrounding area, and was a great example of how local businesses could share community facilities to create local opportunities and jobs.
- 5) Councillor Kennedy asked about the vegetation on the shingle, and whether this could be replanted as part of the application. Mr Saul said he would welcome this as a condition.

### **Debate and decision making process**

- 6) Councillor Cobb asked why the site was considered to be of important archaeological value. Mr Walker replied that this application was in a general archaeological zone, but there were no objections to the boathouse from the County Archaeologist.
- 7) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked if the boathouse was directly opposite the beach huts and Mr Walker replied that it was set at a slight angle to them, and would only obscure oblique views.

- 8) Councillor Kennedy asked if a condition could be added for replanting of the shingle vegetation and this was agreed by Members.
- 9) Councillor Hawtree asked if the brickwork of the boathouse would match the nearby Martello Tower and Mrs Walsh confirmed that it would.
- 10) Councillor Hyde said that the beach huts would only suffer a small loss of oblique views, and this was a very small structure that would support sporting activities in the area. She was in support of the application.
- 11) Councillor Cobb asked if the vegetation was important enough to be replanted. Mrs Walsh replied there were patches along that coastline of important ecological value and it was entirely appropriate to replant this area with appropriate vegetation if it was disturbed.
- 12) Councillor Carden supported the application and felt it was very good for the area. He supported the activities of the club and felt the application would make use of the beach and lagoon safer.
- 13) A vote was taken and on a vote of 11 for, 0 against and 1 abstention planning permission was granted subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report, and an additional condition regarding replanting.

55.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation in the report and the policies and guidance set out in section 7 and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report, and an additional condition to read:

1. No development shall commence until a scheme for the replacement of the existing shingle vegetation displaced by the positioning of the boathouse has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences. The agreed scheme shall thereafter be implemented in the first planting season following installation of the boathouse, and in the event that any vegetation fails within the first five years, it shall be replaced in accordance with the agreed scheme unless the Local Planning Authority given written consent to any variation.

REASON: To secure adequate replanting of vegetation native to this location, in accordance with policy SU7 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

**C. Application BH2011/01825, Land adjacent to 29 Surrenden Holt, Brighton –**  
Erection of a single storey dwelling.

- 1) Mr Walker introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. He stated that the area comprised mainly large houses with gardens. There was a generally open aspect to the area. Planning permission was refused in 2010 for a two storey dwelling due to a cramped appearance of the scheme, the harm to the street scene and overlooking. The new proposal was for excavation of the land to create a single storey sunken dwelling, with a sedum roof, roof lights and photovoltaic panels.

There were 23 letters of objection and 35 letters of support. The area was generally open in aspect and this was a recognised feature in the urban characterisation study. It was the view of Officers that this application would not make a positive contribution to the area and would represent town cramming. Because the application was sunken there were no issues of overlooking or noise and disturbance issues. In terms of traffic no additional parking had been proposed. There was capacity for parking on street and so there were no parking or highway safety concerns. In terms of sustainability the scheme was required to reach code level 5 for Sustainable Homes, but this application had demonstrated it would only reach code level 4. The applicants had stated that the building was needed to provide a home for disabled occupants, but there were no particular aspects of the scheme that met specific requirements for disabled people, and so the application was recommended for refusal for the reasons given in the report.

### **Public Speakers**

- 2) Professor Couso, a local resident, said that he agreed with the objections raised by the Officers, and other residents in the area. He felt that the building was inappropriate for the area, overly dominant and unsympathetic. He noted a significant loss of green space would result from this application, and that several trees and shrubs had already been felled. The line of current buildings along the road would be broken, and a style mis-match would be created as it did not match existing architecture. There was a green corridor in this area that would be negatively impacted on. The application would set a precedent for many other applications to come forward on the large gardens in the area and he asked the Committee to refuse the application on these reasons.
- 3) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked if there was any garden area proposed, and Professor Couso indicated on his plan where the patio area would be placed.
- 4) Mr Harding, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee and stated that the application had changed somewhat due to the previous reasons for refusal, including mitigation of the loss of openness in the area, and designing the scheme to meet the need to provide a disabled property for the applicant. The plot was currently unused and difficult for the current owners to maintain. A disabled accessible, single storey bungalow would provide a familiar home for the applicant's on-going needs. The dwelling was sunken down in the site and therefore completely hidden, and there were no issues of overlooking. There were many site constraints but it was not a small site, with the proposed building covering only 33% of the area. The current design had been created with the expectation of achieving code level 5 for Sustainable Homes, but the actual level reached could only be assessed once the scheme was built.

### **Debate and decision making process**

- 5) Councillor Mrs Theobald felt that a development here would reduce the green open space of the area, and that this scheme in particular would not have a great deal of open light. She was also concerned about setting a precedent for building on gardens in the area.



- 6) Councillor Hyde agreed that the application had a contrived appearance, and made no positive contribution to the area. She was also concerned that it was outside the natural building line for the street.
- 7) A vote was taken and on a unanimous vote planning permission was refused for the reasons given in the report.

55.3 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The development would result in a harmful loss of openness in this section of Surrenden Road, to the detriment of the prevailing character and appearance of the area. Furthermore the development, by reason of its siting and form, would appear discordant and contrived in relation to the prevailing pattern and layout of surrounding development and constitutes a cramped form of development. The proposal would therefore fail to respect or enhance the local context and the positive qualities of the neighbourhood, contrary to policies QD1, QD2 and QD3 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
2. Policy SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, including SPD08 on Sustainable Building Design, requires new residential development on land not previously developed to achieve Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that Level 5 for the Code for Sustainable Homes can reasonably be achieved without significant alterations to the design and appearance of the dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and the Supplementary Planning Document 08, Sustainable Building Design.

Informative:

1. This decision is based on drawing nos. 0074 L-02, 004 L-03, 004 L-04, 004 L-05, 004 L-06 received on 22 June 2011; and drawing nos. 004 L-01 Rev A and 004 L-07 received on 28 June 2011.

**D. Application BH2011/01793, 38 Walsingham Road, Hove** – Loft conversion incorporating hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer and 3 no rooflights to front roof slope (part retrospective).

- 1) Mr Walker introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. He said that application was in the Sackville Gardens Conservation Area. The application was part retrospective and some work had taken place already. The proposal was to create a hipped roof with three skylights and a large dormer to the rear of the property. The effect of the proposals on the property, the street scene and the impact on neighbouring and residential amenity were issues that needed to be considered.

In assessment of application the character statement for the Sackville Gardens Conservation Area had been used. The group of properties to which this belonged was specifically referenced in that statement, and the original gabled roofs were an

important feature of the area. Hipped gables altered the symmetry of many houses and were not normally acceptable. In this particular case, the bulk of the prominent side chimney stacks had also been concealed. Dormers were normally restricted to provide increased head room only, and to create light and openness. They should also be as small as possible, and ideally little wider than the window frame. It was felt that the proposed roof lights were too many and created an over-dominance of this aspect. There was not considered to be issues with overlooking as a result of the application.

### **Public Speakers**

- 2) Mr Wade, agent for the applicant, said that there was no reference to the need to maintain symmetry of roof style in policy or the character statement. He added there were examples of Velux windows in the area and there would be no detrimental visual impact from this application. There were instances where policies could be flexible, and he believed the policies should be flexible in this case.

Mrs Read, the applicant, said that they were originally advised, by a previous architect, that planning permission was not needed. The proposals were very consistent with the existing street scene and she had noted that dormers were allowed in other conservation areas. There would be no detrimental impact on the street scene. There were no issues of loss of light or overlooking, and as a matter of consistency and fairness, planning permission should be allowed for this small scale proposal.

- 3) Councillor Kennedy asked where the photo was taken that Mrs Read demonstrated during her talk, and Mrs Read replied it had been taken in Queens Park Rise.
- 4) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked if the approved dormers in the area were built some time ago, and noted that policies did change over time. Mrs Read replied she did not know when the other dormers had been built.
- 5) Councillor Hawtree asked if the applicant agreed that a strong feature of the area was the chimney stacks that were now being obscured by this application. Mr Wade felt this was a subjective view and the stacks could still be seen. He added that there was no symmetry of semi-detached properties along the road.
- 6) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked Mr Walker about the additional dormers along the road and he indicated from additional photos what these looked like.

### **Debate and decision making process**

- 7) Councillor Hyde felt that these villas were outstanding semi-detached properties with beautiful features, and this proposal ruined the set pieces on this road. She very much supported the officer's recommendation.
- 8) Councillor Hawtree felt this application would set a precedent and felt the loss of the chimney aspect would be very disappointing. He also supported the officer recommendation.

9) A vote was taken and on a vote of 11 for, 0 against and 1 abstention planning permission was refused for the reasons given in the report.

55.4 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation and resolves to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. Policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan requires that all extensions and alterations are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area. Further advice is contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance on Roof Alterations and Extensions (SPGBH1). The proposal to replace the hipped roof with a gable end imbalances the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and creates a visually heavy roof to one half, to the detriment of the appearance of the properties on the street and to the wider Sackville Gardens Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies HE6 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance Roof Alterations and Extensions (SPGBH1).
2. The advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance on Roof Alterations and Extensions (SPGBH1) seeks to ensure proposed dormers are kept as small as possible, should be no wider than the windows below and should have a roof form and detail appropriate to the character of the building. Furthermore the advice states that there should be no large areas of cladding either side of the window or below it. The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its size, bulk and design, is considered to form an unacceptable alteration to the rear roof slope of the property. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and SPGBH1.
3. Supplementary Planning Guidance SPGBH1 states that roof lights should be kept as few and as small as possible and should not dominate the roof. The proposed roof lights, by reason of their excessive number, would dominate the front roof slope and would form an unacceptable addition to the property and the surrounding Sackville Gardens Conservation Area. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies QD14 and HE6, and to the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note SPGBH1.

Informative:

1. This decision is based on the unnumbered drawing and supporting documents received on 21 June 2011, and drawing no. RE/02 received on 22 June 2011.

**E. Application BH2011/02034, 11 Ainsworth Avenue, Brighton** – Erection of two storey side extension incorporating dormers.

- 1) The Area Planning Manager (East), Ms Burnett, introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. She said that an additional letter from Mrs Plant had been received regarding the application and centred on the need to care for her mother. The application was for a two storey side extension including

dormers. There had been 11 letters of support and one of objection received. A previous application had been refused in 2010. The new application was slightly larger than the previous application. A retained roof light would be moved further south, but on examination of the plans it was likely that both southern roof lights would need to be moved further south. The proposed balcony area was shown in the proposed side and floor plans, but this element was not clearly shown in the proposed roof plan. The existing chimney stack would also need to be removed to accommodate the scheme. It was not considered that the proposal would create overlooking to number 9, but it was out-of-character for the area and would be harmful to the street scene. The loss of the visual gap would be detrimental to the visual amenity to Ainsworth Avenue and the bulk and massing would be inappropriate for the area.

### **Debate and decision making process**

- 2) Councillor Wells asked if the front rooms of number 9 were bedrooms or a lounge. Ms Burnett was unsure and could not answer this.
- 3) Councillor Cobb asked to see further plans of the area and these were demonstrated to Members.
- 4) Councillor Wells asked how far set back number 9 was to number 11, and Ms Burnett replied that it appeared to be flush with the building line. Councillor Wells proposed a site visit as he felt there were houses of several different styles and sizes in the area, and the Committee would benefit from viewing the proposals in situ. Councillor Hyde seconded the proposal.
- 5) A vote was taken and on a vote of 5 for, 4 against and 3 abstentions it was agreed to defer the application for a site visit to take place.

### **56. TO CONSIDER AND NOTE THE CONTENT OF THE REPORTS DETAILING DECISIONS DETERMINED BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

- 56.1 **RESOLVED** – That those details of applications determined by the Strategic Director of Place under delegated powers be noted.

[Note 1: All decisions recorded in this list are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the planning register maintained by the Strategic Director of Place. The register complies with legislative requirements.]

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

57. **TO CONSIDER ANY FURTHER APPLICATIONS IT HAS BEEN DECIDED SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF ITEMS ON THE PLANS LIST**

57.1 **RESOLVED** – That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination of the application:

Application:	Requested by:
BH2011/03760 & BH2010/03759, The Astoria, Gloucester Place, Brighton	Development Control Manager
BH2010/01852, Cavendish House, Dorset Place, Brighton	Development Control Manager
BH2011/02034, 11 Ainsworth Avenue, Brighton	Councillor Wells

The meeting concluded at 4.10pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

