

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 14 DECEMBER 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors MacCafferty (Chair), Hyde (Deputy Chair), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cobb, Davey, Farrow, Hawtree, Summers, C Theobald, Wells and Robins

Co-opted Members

Officers in attendance: Jeanette Walsh, Head of Development, Nicola Hurley, Area Planning Manager (West), Hamish Walke, Senior Team Planner (East), Kate Brooklebank, Senior Planning Officer, Hilary Woodward, Senior Lawyer and Ross Keatley, Democratic Services Officer.

PART ONE

102. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

102a Declarations of substitutes

102.1 Councillor Robins was present in substitution for Councillor Hamilton. It was noted that apologies had been received from Councillor Kennedy.

102b Declarations of interests

102.2 There were none.

102c Exclusion of the press and public

102.3 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.

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

103. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

103.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chairman be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2011 as a correct record.

104. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

104.1 The date for the special meeting to consider the regional hospital planning application, known as 3T's, had been arranged for Friday 27 January 2012 at 2 p.m.

104.2 It was noted that an e-petition had been received by the Council in relation to application BH2011/02417, 94 – 103 London Road, Brighton (The Former Co-op Department Store) requesting that the façade of the building be preserved.

105. APPEAL DECISIONS

105.1 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.

106. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

107. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

108. INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS

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

109. TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

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

Application:	Requested by:
BH2011/03093 Land rear of 25 Dyke Road Avenue	Councillor L Hyde
BH2011/03358 Maycroft and Parkside, London Road 2 – 8 Carden Avenue Brighton	Head of Development Control
BH2010/03739	Head of Development

9-16 Aldrington Basin/Land south of Kingsway Basin Road North Portslade	Control
BH2011/03227 11B (Former Ice Rink) and 11 Queens Square Brighton	Head of Development Control
BH2011/02824 Portslade Aldridge Community Academy (PACA) Chalky Road Portslade	Head of Development Control

110. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON THE PLANS LIST :14 DECEMBER 2011

(i) MAJOR APPLICATIONS

A. Application BH2011/02417, 94 – 103 London Road (Former Co-op Department Store) – Demolition of existing building and erection of a new building ranging from 3 to 6 storeys providing 407 units of student accommodation (sui generis) and 4no. retail units (A1) at ground floor level with new service area vehicular access from Baker Street and landscaping works.

(1) It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

(2) The Senior Planning Officer, Kate Brooklebank, gave a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to plans and elevated drawings, and digital images showing the scheme in the context of the surrounding area. The applicant had addressed the provision for convenient cycle parking and reason for refusal number 6 of the report recommendation was amended to read remove the reference to policy TR14 on cycling.

(3) The proposals were considered to be over-development of the site, in poor relation to the surrounding area and would create increased loss of light and over-shadowing to surrounding properties. Furthermore the access to the service yard was inadequate and the applicant had failed to justify the loss of the existing building which, although not a protected building, was sought for retention as part of the London Road Central Master Plan, for these reasons refusal was recommended.

Public Speakers

- (4) Ms Ashdown spoke on behalf on local residents in objection to the scheme and she stated it would create a loss of sunlight for residents on Baker Street and Kingsbury Road. Concern was also expressed in relation to potential noise nuisance and it was felt that the addition of so many students would change the nature of the local area.
- (5) Councillor Deane spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor setting out her objections to the scheme. She highlighted that any proposed development should try to maintain the façade of the existing building and questioned the suitability of student accommodation to the London Road area, particularly in relation to the economic and potential nuisance impacts. She had not been able to clarify if any of the proposed 407 rooms could be of double occupancy.
- (6) Mr P Gillespie, the agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. It was highlighted that during the design and consultation process, over the last 12 months, the proposed development had reduced in size and scale. It had been considered that retention of the existing façade was not viable and the developers would seek to use the appropriate materials and pallet to complement the London Road area. Only residents in numbers 10-11 London Terrace would experience a loss of light but it was felt this would be unnoticeable.

Questions, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (7) Councillor Davey sought clarification on the main reason for objection from local residents, it was confirmed this related largely to the scale and bulk of the proposed development. It was also noted that when the building had previously been occupied deliveries had been made through London Terrace.
- (8) Councillor Hawtree asked for further explanation of how the development had been designed to echo buildings in the Brighton area. It was explained that the proposals had been designed with a sense of rhythm and proposed materials and colours already in use.
- (9) Councillor Mrs Theobald enquired regarding the privately contracted collection of refuse. It was explained that this was the normal practise in buildings managed by the applicants to prevent any accumulation of refuse. It was also confirmed that the students would be a mix of under-graduate, post-graduate and overseas.
- (10) Councillor Davey enquired regarding covering the service yard and the rationale used to justify access from Baker Street. It was explained that covering the yard had not previous been put to the developers but this could be considered. In relation to the access it was explained that the use of Baker Street, and the provision for delivery vehicles to turn in the service yard, had been agreed by Highways Officers.
- (11) Councillor Mrs Theobald relayed her concerns about the numbers of students moving into and out of the proposed development at the start and end of academic terms. It was explained that this was staggered to minimise disruption.

- (12) Councillor Davey asked officers to confirm the situation in relation to disabled parking and it was explained that a contribution would be expected from the developers and blue badge users would be able to park near to the site.
- (13) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked for clarification on the height of the proposals in comparison to existing building.
- (14) Councillor Summers asked if a police report had been submitted and Officers confirmed that this had not been done nor was it a requirement of the submission process.
- (15) Councillor Mrs Theobald highlighted that a preferred development should try to protect the façade of the existing building and encourage a large commercial use of the site. Councillors Mrs Theobald and Hyde were of the view that the height and bulk constituted overdeveloped of the site.
- (16) Councillor Wells noted his agreement with the Officers recommendations.
- (17) Councillors Hawtree, Summers and Davey all referenced the importance of the development to the London Road area and the importance of the building's façade.
- (18) A vote was taken and the 11 members present voted unanimously that planning permission be refused.

RESOLVED – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in this report, with an amendment to reason 6 to remove references to cycling, and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by reason of its design, bulk, height and massing, would be an overdevelopment of the site that would relate poorly to development in the surrounding area, causing harm to the character of the surrounding street scenes and failing to emphasis and enhance the positive qualities of the neighbourhood. The development is substantially larger in scale than the predominant development which surrounds the site and would appear out of scale and overly dominant in the street scene and constitutes town cramming. Harm will also be caused to the framed views from Preston Circus and the New England Quarter where the proposal's substantial height, bulk and scale will obscure views of the predominant ridgelines. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies QD1, QD2, QD3, QD4, QD5 and HO4 Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

2. The development would have an awkward relationship with the neighbouring property No.93 London Road. The service entrance on Baker Street is out of scale, resulting in a large area of inactive frontage, whilst failing to provide passive surveillance. The main student entrance appears too functional and is considered to fail to provide the desired visual interest or strong sense of arrival to the building. Cumulatively, these elements are considered to result in a poor standard of design which would cause harm to the character of the street scene contrary to policies QD1, QD2, QD3, QD5 and QD7 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

3. Insufficient information has been submitted to make a full assessment of the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring amenity and in particular impact on sunlight and daylight levels to neighbouring dwellings. The increased scale and bulk is considered to result in an unneighbourly form of development which in the absence of evidence to the contrary is considered likely to have an adverse effect on neighbouring amenity by way of loss of light/overshadowing and resulting in an overbearing impact contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
4. The proposed roof terraces will cause adverse overlooking to neighbouring dwellings and in the absence of information to the contrary could result in adverse noise disturbance to existing and proposed residents contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed open service yard will not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity through noise disturbance and impact on outlook contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
6. The applicant has failed to address the need for disabled parking contrary to policy TR18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and SPGBH4 – Parking Standards.
7. The applicant has failed to present a scheme which in design and streetscape terms justifies the principle of the loss of the existing building, which is a non-designated heritage asset of special significance to the local community due to its architectural and historic interest. The proposed replacement building does not make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment and the Urban Design Analysis and PPS5 Statement fails to adequately assess the significance of the existing building, contrary to policy HE7 of PPS5 and the London Road Central Master Plan SPD10.

Informatives:

1. This decision is based on drawing nos. PL_000 Revision A, PL_001 Revision A, PL_002 Revision A, PL_003 Revision A, PL_004 Revision A, PL_005 Revision A, PL_006 Revision A, PL_007 Revision A, ST_001 Revision A, EL_001 Revision A, EL_002 Revision A, EL_003 Revision A, EL_004 Revision A, EL_005 Revision A, EL_007 Revision A, EP_001, EP_002, EP_003, EP_004, EP_005, EP_006, EL_006 received on 19 September 2011, EL_008, EL_009, EL_010, EL_011, EL_012 received 26 September 2011, 04 Revision B, 05 and 06 received 16 August 2011, 'Daylight Assessment August 2011.
2. The applicant is advised that the 'Sustainability Statement' and 'Energy Statement' have been assessed against a 2008 pre assessment version which has been superseded. Schemes which could have achieved an 'Excellent' rating under previous BREEAM scheme PLANS LIST – 14 DECEMBER 2011 assessments may now only achieve 'Very Good' against a more recent version.
3. In relation to fire safety, the applicant is advised that the plans do not show satisfactory access for firefighting vehicles and firefighting personnel to the proposed development, in particular the requirement for firefighting vehicles to approach to within 45 meters of any point within each proposed flat dwelling.

4. The applicant is advised that there are a number of inaccuracies in the plans submitted – drawing no. PL_002 revision A shows the majority of rooms with no windows and drawing no. PL_001 revision B shows a number of the en-suite bathrooms in incorrect locations. Drawing no. PL_001 revision B does not form part of the application as it would require public consultation and fails to address outstanding issues in relation the application.

Note: The Chair stated that he would be recommending to officers that the former Co-op Department Store building should be placed on the Council's list of buildings of local interest

(ii) **MINOR APPLICATIONS**

B. Application BH2011/00635, 12 Meeting House Lane - Application to extend time limit of previous approval BH2007/02518 for the conversion and extension of existing 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor residential unit to form 5no flats and 1no retail unit at ground floor levels.

(1) It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

(2) Nicola Hurley, the Area Planning Manager (West), gave an update detailing the scheme by reference to photographs and site plans. At the previous meeting concern had been expressed in relation to cycle parking and subsequently Condition 9 had been amended to provide cycle storage elsewhere on the site. The application was recommended for approval.

Questions, Debate and Decision Making Process

(3) Councillor Wells asked for clarification as to the exact location of the cycle storage on the site. Officers explained that this had not currently been agreed and, if granted, the proposed location would be agreed by delegated authority to the Head of Development Control in consultation with the Chair and Deputy-Chair.

(4) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked if the driveway to the side of building would be affected and Officers confirmed that it would be retained as the footprint of the site was unchanged.

(5) Eleven of the members of the committee were present and on a vote of 9 with 2 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below.

110.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Section 7 of the report and resolved that it was minded to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

C. Application BH2011/00652, 12 Meeting House Lane - Application to extend time limit of previous approval BH2007/02608 for the conversion and extension of existing 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor residential unit to form 5no flats and 1no retail unit at ground floor levels.

- (1) Eleven of the members of the committee were present and on a vote of 9 with 2 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below.
- 110.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Section 7 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

D. Application BH2011/02570, Land rear of Regency Court, London Road - Erection of 9no single garages.

- (1) Nicola Hurley, the Area Planning Manager West, gave a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to photographs and site plans. The construction of the garages would be of the same design and proportion of the existing ones and the application was recommended for approval.

Questions, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (2) Councillor Mrs Theobald enquired regarding a turning circle for vehicles on the site and it was confirmed that there was not one.
- (3) Councillor Hawtree suggested that more work should be undertaken to look at mitigating the environmental effects of garages.
- (4) Councillor Hyde enquired regarding who would have use of the garages and if residents of nearby blocks would be given first refusal. Officers confirmed that had no further information on this and highlighted that right of residents to use existing garages would be defined in their lease.
- (5) Councillor Hyde went on to note that although Officers in Sustainable Transport had highlighted there was adequate displacement parking for residents this was not sufficiently close and suggested an additional condition that the garages be offered to residents on a first refusal basis. Councillor Mrs Theobald agreed with Councillor Hyde and stated that it was her belief the Committee had agreed similar conditions in the past. Hilary Woodward, Senior Solicitor, advised the Committee that a condition to this effect would be neither necessary nor reasonable as there was adequate provision on the surrounding highway network and the committee had no information on the detail contained in residents leases in relation to the right to park on the site.
- (6) Councillors Cobb and Hawtree noted problems elsewhere in the where city garages were sold to commercial companies however Officers confirmed that the proposed conditions prevented any commercial use of the garages.
- (7) An additional condition was proposed by members that ‘the use of the garages should be solely in association with the residents of Regency Court and Park Manor’. A vote was taken and of the eleven members present the additional condition was rejected on a vote of 5 to 3 with 3 abstentions.

- (8) Eleven members of the Committee were present when the vote was taken on the Officers original recommendation set out in the report and on a vote of 8 to 3 listed building consent was granted on the grounds set out below.

110.3 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out therein and the policies and guidance in Section 7 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

Note: Councillors Mrs Theobald and Cobb voted that the application be refused.

E. Application BH2011/02138, 70-72 Church Road - Change of Use from licensed restaurant (A3) to mixed use restaurant and bar (A3/A4) with revised opening hours of Monday -Tuesday 10:00-00.30, Wednesday - Saturday 10:00-02:30 and Sunday 12:00-00:00 (Part-retrospective).

- (1) Nicola Hurley, Area Planning Manager West, gave a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to photographs and site plans. Permission was currently in place for mixed use as a restaurant and bar, the main concern expressed in objection to the application was potential noise and disturbance. The majority of the premises was run as a restaurant and a condition had been proposed to minimise vertical drinking. There was a terrace to the side of the premises that was in use from 0700 to 2300 and Officers in Environmental Health had raised no objections. For these reasons the application was recommendation for approval.

Public Speakers

- (2) Mrs Mulholland spoke in objection to the application. She stated she had lived in the area for 23 years and had not experienced any problems in relation to noise nuisance until the premises had recently been granted permission to operate until 0230. It was her belief that the premises was currently operating until 0230 without the appropriate planning permissions. A photograph of the outside of the premises was shown to the Committee, picturing customers outside of the premises and it was confirmed that it was taken at approximately 0000.
- (3) Ms Cattell, the agent for the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. She stated that the current permission allowed the premises to operate until 0230 in restricted areas and the application was to harmonise these arrangements across the whole premises without any extension to the current hours of operation. The nature of the business was aimed at fine dining and the owner operated other successful premises in the city.

Questions, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (4) Councillor Hawtree enquired regarding the withdrawal of the objection from Councillor Wealls. It was explained that he had been satisfied with the proposed condition that 75% of the restaurant would be for seated dining.

- (5) Councillors Hyde and Mrs Theobald both stated that local residents would be able to make complaints to Environmental Health if any noise issues arose as a result of the recent extension to the hours.
- (6) Councillors Hawtree and Cobb both made references to the Licensing regime and the experience of the applicant as a licensee. Jeanette Walsh, Head of Development Control, reminded members that they should not rely upon the licensing regime to assist with making a decision and they should make a decision independently of that regime.
- (7) Councillor Mrs Theobald asked what measures the premises were taking to prevent noise nuisance from customers smoking outside. It was explained that the exits were monitored by security staff and the number of people allowed to go outside to smoke at any one time was restricted.
- (8) In clarification the Area Planning Manager West highlighted that the proposals would impose restrictions on the entirety of the premises and add a condition that 75% of the premises be used for seated dining. Councillor Hyde noted that this would impose conditions with control above what was already in place.
- (9) Councillor Davey requested further information on the history of any noise complaints and Officers stated they did not have further details available to them.
- (10) Councillor Hawtree noted there had been a gradual change in the commercial use of Church Road, with an increase in the number of restaurants and bars, some of which operated later hours.
- (11) Councillor Hyde noted she was satisfied with the report and the Officers' recommendations but she would prefer to have the terrace closed at 2300 to reduce any noise nuisance.
- (12) The Senior Solicitor suggested amending condition 4 so that the restricted times for which the balcony on Third Avenue could be used also apply to the frontage of the premises on Church Road. This would be subject to confirming that the frontage was in the ownership or control of the applicant. In response to a query from Councillor Cobb it was explained that this would not prevent customers smoking outside on the public highway.
- (13) A vote was taken on the Officers' recommendations with the amended condition 4 and of the eleven members present planning permission was granted on a vote of 9 to 1 with 1 abstention.

110.4 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee resolved to delegate to the Head of Development Control authority to grant planning permission, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair, subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the Report save that condition number 4 was to be amended to restrict use of the outside terrace areas at both the Third Avenue and Church Road frontages between the times stated in the condition. Insofar as the amended condition could only be imposed if both frontages were in the ownership or control of the applicant, should, on investigation by officers,

this not proved to be the case the application would return to the Committee for decision.

F. Application BH2011/03093, Land rear of 25 Dyke Road Avenue - Erection of new two storey four bedroom detached dwelling house with basement.

110.5 **RESOLVED** – That consideration of the above application be deferred pending a site visit.

G. Application BH2011/03058, 3 St James's Street - Application for variation of condition 2 of application BH2002/02810/FP (Change of use from A1 (shop) to A3 (restaurant) (resubmission following refusal BH2001/02411/FP) including restriction of opening hours to between 08.00 and 24.00 hours on any day) to allow opening hours between 07.00 and 05.00 the following day, Monday to Sunday.

(1) Hamish Walke, Senior Team Planner, gave a presentation detailing the scheme by reference to photographs and site plans. A letter had been included in the late list from Councillor Duncan in support of the application. The proposed extension of hours had been received objections by both Environmental Health Officers and the Police. The current operational hours gave a balance between the conflicting demands of the commercial and residential nature of the area, it was felt allowing the premises to open throughout the night could lead to increased levels of crime and disorder and subsequently the application was recommended for refusal.

Public Speakers

(2) Dr Thomas, representing the Kingscliffe Society and local objectors, spoke in objection to the application. She highlighted that the normal terminal hours for similar takeaway restaurants was 23.30 and expressed concern that if granted this could set a precedent for later applications for later hours of operation from other premises.

(3) Mrs Ahmed, the applicant, spoke in support of her application. She explained the applicant sought to mitigate nuisance by employing a member of security staff, they would also have CCTV covering both the inside and outside of the premises and ensure litter outside was collected. She had received more support than objection from local residents and also had support from all three of the local Ward Councillors. The premises was located on a busy thoroughfare and close to areas of tourist interest in the city and the premises would not serve hot food after 00.00.

Questions, Debate and Decision Making Process

(4) Councillor Hawtree enquired how this application differed from those that had been refused in the past. In response the applicant confirmed that they had sought measures to mitigate noise nuisance that had not been offered by previous applicants.

(5) Councillor Cobb stated that it would be difficult for the premises to ensure that customers did not cause nuisance and disturbances further away from the premises after they had left. In response the applicant explained that the road was already busy as there were other bars and pubs. The security staff would ensure that customers were moved on from the premises and not able to loiter causing nuisance.

- (4) Councillor Robbins highlighted that despite the applicant's claims the premises was located close to areas of tourist interest these would closed during the extension of hours being sought. In response the applicant explained that many visitors to the city stayed longer than just the day.
- (5) Councillor Hyde explained that she supported the Officer's recommendations and was surprised that Ward Councillors had supported the application.
- (6) Councillor Hawtree highlighted his view that the signage at the front of the premises was unauthorised and hoped this matter could be considered separately by Officers.
- (7) A vote was taken and the 11 members present voted unanimously that planning permission be refused.

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

1. This area experiences high levels of crime, disorder, noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour causing disturbance to residents in the locality. The significant extension to the opening hours proposed would result in additional disturbance and increase the fear of crime at a late hour when nearby residents would normally be sleeping, to the detriment of neighbouring amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SU9, SU10 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Informatives:

1. This decision is based on the drawings and supporting documentation received on 24 October 2011, and the location plan received on 18 October 2011.

111. TO CONSIDER AND NOTE THE CONTENT OF THE REPORTS DETAILING DECISIONS DETERMINED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY INCLUDING DELEGATED DECISIONS

111.1 **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.]

112. 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

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

Application:	Requested by:
BH2011/03093 Land rear of 25 Dyke Road Avenue	Councillor L Hyde
BH2011/03358 Maycroft and Parkside, London Road 2 – 8 Carden Avenue Brighton	Head of Development Control
BH2010/03739 9-16 Aldrington Basin/Land south of Kingsway Basin Road North Portslade	Head of Development Control
BH2011/03227 11B (Former Ice Rink) and 11 Queens Square Brighton	Head of Development Control
BH2011/02824 Portslade Aldridge Community Academy (PACA) Chalky Road Portslade	Head of Development Control

The meeting concluded at 4.45pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

