

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL****PLANNING COMMITTEE****2.00pm 12 MARCH 2014****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Mac Cafferty (Chair), Jones (Deputy Chair), Hyde (Opposition Spokesperson), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cox, Duncan, Gilbey, Hamilton, Littman, Randall, Wealls and Wells

**Officers in attendance:** Paul Vidler (Deputy Development Control Manager); Steven Lewis (Senior Planning Officer); Kate Brocklebank (Senior Team Planner); Pete Tolson (Principal Transport Officer); Steven Shaw (Principal Transport Officer); Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor) and Ross Keatley (Acting Democratic Services Manager).

**PART ONE****160. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS****160a Declarations of substitutes**

160.1 Councillor Wealls was present in substitution for Councillor C. Theobald, and Councillor Randall was present in substitution for Councillor Davey.

**160b Declarations of interests**

160.2 There were no declarations of interests or lobbying in matters listed on the agenda.

**160c Exclusion of the press and public**

160.3 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.

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

**160d Use of mobile phones and tablets**

160.5 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'.

**161. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

161.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2014 as a correct record.

**162. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

162.1 The Chair noted that there had been a late request for a pre-application presentation on 1 April 2014 for Land at Meadow Vale, Ovingdean.

162.2 The Chair also reminded that there would be Committee Training on Tuesday 22 April 2014.

**163. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

163.1 There were no public questions.

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

164.1 There were no requests for site visits for matters listed on the agenda.

**165. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

**A. BH2013/04263 - Aldi, 7 Carlton Terrace, Portslade - Removal or Variation of Condition**

Application for variation of condition 12 of application BH2011/02857 (Application for variation of conditions 11 & 12 of application BH2010/01684) (original permission BH2006/00834)) to amend the hours of free parking at Portslade Shopping Centre from two hours to one and a half hours.

(1) The Senior Planning Officer, Steven Lewis, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The application related to the Aldi store and car park in the Boundary Road and Station Road shopping area of Portslade; the original development had been 14 flats; the Aldi supermarket and smaller separate store. The original permission had been amended in 2006 in relation to hours of use; car parking and deliveries. This application sought to vary the hours of free parking from 2 hours to 1.5 hours, and this had previous been

refused as it was felt the applicant had not addressed the impact on the vitality and viability of the shopping centre. Since the refusal additional information had been gathered by the applicant, using number plate recognition technology, to demonstrate the level of visitors that would be disadvantaged through the proposed change of hours. The data had indicated that up to 25 users could be disadvantaged each day; however, this was weighted against the greater turnover and effective use of the car park. The Transport Team had suggested this would allow for an extra 150 trips per day. The information provided by the applicant demonstrated the benefits to visitors and the wider shopping area. Whilst it was regrettable that some users would be disadvantaged it was considered that the potential for increased use would meet the aims of the original planning condition. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for approval.

### **Questions for Officers**

- (2) Councillor Hamilton asked about the spaces reserved for residents of the flats that had formed part of the original planning application. In response the Senior Planning Officer explained that as part of the application five spaces were to be allocated residents; currently two such spaces had been laid out, and a recent application to change these into use for the wider car park had been refused. It was added that the residential company was currently in dispute with the supermarket operator about the purchase of these spaces, but this was a separate matter to the application before the Committee. The Enforcement Team had investigated the parking matters had not felt it appropriate to take action.
- (3) In response to Councillor Duncan the Principal Transport Officer explained that the safe capacity of the car park would have been assessed at the time of the original application, but had not formed part of the analysis in relation to this application as it would not be material. It was added that based on the projected increased use there would be some increase in traffic.
- (4) In response to Councillor Wealls the Senior Planning Officer explained that the surveys had used number plate recognition technology to assess the arrival time and length of stay of vehicles, but there was no data in relation to how far shoppers might travel locally whilst their vehicles were parked. It was also clarified that there was a penalty fine of £70 currently if a stay exceeded 2 hours.
- (5) It was confirmed for Councillor Littman that the surveys conducted by the applicant were publically viewable as part of the planning application.
- (6) The Principal Transport Officer confirmed for Councillor Mac Cafferty that the data in relation to the increased use had been compiled from a survey of shoppers at the Aldi store, and the additional data backed up this position.

### **Debate and Decision Making Process**

- (7) Councillor Carden highlighted the existing traffic problems at the site and in the wider area; he stated that it could take up to 15 minutes to access the car park and park.

- (8) Councillor Hamilton noted that Aldi continued to be in breach of conditions on the original planning application. He stated that he had no strong views in relation to the application, but was concerned about the potential for additional car trips each day. He reiterated the problems accessing and exiting the site, and noted his view that the supermarket had outgrown the site.
  - (9) The Deputy Development Control Manager, Paul Vidler, noted some of the concerns in relation to enforcement matters, and provided assurance that the status of these matters could be confirmed outside of the meeting.
  - (10) In response to Councillor Duncan the Senior Solicitor, Hilary Woodward, confirmed that the enforcement history was not material to this application, and consideration should only be given to the application before the Committee.
  - (11) Councillor Hyde noted that the hours of free parking had been reduced from the initial 3 hours; however, she failed to see that this could be of benefit to the wider shopping parade, and felt that 1.5 hours would not be an adequate period of time to use both the supermarket and the shopping centre.
  - (12) Councillor Gilbey highlighted that it was already difficult to park in the area, and this was made worse by the frequency of trains which affected the level crossing nearby. She expressed concerns that 1.5 hours would not be enough time to visit shops in the centre. She went on to add that she was not satisfied enough information had been provided in relation to the benefits for the wider community.
  - (13) Councillor Wealls highlighted that the potential number of disadvantaged shoppers could in the region of 10,000 each year.
  - (14) Councillor Littman noted that the proposed changes would disproportionately impact elderly people who may take more time to shop.
  - (15) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission was not carried on a vote of 9 against and 3 abstentions. Councillor Hyde proposed reasons for the refusal and these were seconded by Councillors Duncan and Littman. A short recess was held to allow the Chair, Councillor Hyde, Councillors Duncan, Councillor Littman, the Deputy Development Control Manager, the Senior Solicitor and the Senior Planning Officer to draft the reasons in full. These reasons were then read to the Committee, and it was agreed that they reflected what had been put forward by Members. A recorded vote was then taken with the proposed reasons for refusal and Councillors: Mac Cafferty, Hyde, Cox, Randall, Duncan, Gilbey, Littman, Wealls and Wells voted that planning permission be refused; Councillors: Jones, Carden and Hamilton abstained from the vote.
- 165.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee considered the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission, but resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason set out below:
- i. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the reduced hours would allow sufficient time for combined trips by the wider community between the store and the Boundary Road/Station Road District Shopping Centre and it has not been proven that the

viability and the vitality of the district shopping area would not be unduly harmed by the hours proposed. The proposed development is not sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework as the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits.

### MINOR APPLICATIONS

#### B. BH2013/03782 - Land to Rear of 67-81 Princes Road, Brighton - Full Planning Permission

Construction of 6no two and three storey, 2no bedroom terraced houses with pitched roofs & solar panels. Provision of private and communal gardens, waste & refuse facilities & cycle store. Erection of a street level lift gate house.

- 1) The Senior Team Planner, Kate Brocklebank, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings; attention was also drawn to matters on the Late List and a verbal update to amend the wording of condition 15, but this would not impact its meaning. The application site related to a rectangular plot of land in the Round Hill Conservation Area; the site was set at a lower level and accessed via a steep slope from Princes Road. The site sloped steeply, and to the east was an industrial estate; the railway line and the waste transfer site area to the north. There was currently permission on the site for six 2-bedroom dwellings, and the current application made some alterations to the scheme – most notable the land levels; the height and the loss of one of the properties' basements. The considerations focused on the impact of the proposed changes and the increased hours at the waste transfer site. It was noted that the access for pedestrians and cyclesbikes would stay the same. Although the scheme had increased by a maximum of 1.5 metres in height it remained lower than the 2007 refusal – with the exception of one property. The application was recommended to be minded to grant for the reasons set out in the report and subject to a deed of variation of the S106 agreement.

#### Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

- 2) It was confirmed for Councillor Randall that 'easy going stairs' were low, deep steps.
- 3) The Chair highlighted that the application was a minor material amendment to an approved scheme and the principle of the development had been established.
- 4) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation that permission be granted was approved on a vote of 10 in support with 1 against.

165.2 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolved to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and a s106 agreement.

**Note: Councillor Duncan was not present during the consideration and vote on this application.**

#### C. BH2013/03528 - 54 New Church Road, Hove - Full Planning Permission

Alterations to boundary wall, formation of terrace with canopies and additional play structures.

- 1) The Senior Team Planner, Kate Brocklebank, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The site related to a two-storey detached property with accommodation in the roof space. Permission was sought for a retrospective application for alterations to the boundary wall and external terrace, canopies and play structures. It was noted that some of the structures protruded over the boundary wall, but it was felt that impact on the Sackville Gardens Conservation Area was limited and they were acceptable; it was also felt that the alterations to the wall were carefully and well executed. There were conditions in relation to managing the play activities and the application was recommendation for approval for the reasons set out in the report.
- 2) A vote was taken and the eleven Members present voted that unanimously that planning permission be granted.

166.3 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolved to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

**Note: Councillor Duncan was not present during the consideration and vote on this application.**

**D. BH2013/03658 - 17 Dean Court Road, Rottingdean, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent**

Demolition of existing detached garage to rear and erection of detached double garage to side elevation incorporating revised driveway and installation of timber entrance gate. (Amended plans).

- 1) The Senior Team Planner, Kate Brocklebank, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The application site related to a two-storey detached chalet bungalow property fronting onto Dean Court Road with access from Northfield Rise. Permission was sought for a detached double garage and the removal of the linked extension. It was noted that the mature hedge on the east elevation helped screen the proposed garage, but it could not be secured in perpetuity and could be removed at any time. It was felt that the application had not addressed the reasons for refusal in a similar application, and the garage would be in a prominent position and would harm the street scene.

**Public Speaker(s) and Questions**

- 2) Ms Christina Harrison-Flynn spoke in support of the application in her capacity as the applicant. She stated that she had lived in the property for over 10 years, and the neighbours had all supported the application. The application sought to provide additional security. It was noted that there was very little rear garden and the proposed site of the garage was currently difficult to use. The original 1950s conservatory had been replaced, and new flint walls and terraces had been installed at the front. It was

argued that the proposal would be in-keeping with the street scene and provide additional security.

- 3) The applicant confirmed in response to Councillor Hyde that the garage would be stepped back further than the existing wall.

#### **Questions for Officers**

- 4) In response to Councillor Wells the Senior Team Planner confirmed that approximately 0.5 metres of the forward projection of the existing wall would be lost, and the height of the garage would be approximately 0.6 metres higher than the existing wall.
- 5) In response to Councillor Duncan it was explained that only a solid boundary treatment could be conditioned; in this instance additional planting could be secured through a landscaping condition dictating that the vegetation be replaced within five years if it died. It was noted that such a condition could be added if the Committee were minded to grant the application. This was then put to the vote and the Committee unanimously agreed to add this condition if the application were recommended for approval.
- 6) In response to Councillor Gilbey it was explained that the building line was usually a matter of judgment, but would take a point from the main bulk of the building, rather than the protruding conservatory in this case.

#### **Debate and Decision Making Process**

- 7) Councillor Cox noted that the householder had made great efforts to improve the property, and the neighbours had not expressed opposition to the scheme. The neighbours on Northfield Road would have an improved outlook, and it was highlighted there had been no comment from the Parish Council or the Local Ward Councillors; with all this in mind he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- 8) Councillor Wells stated that it been apparent from the site visit that the wall protruded at the front of the property, and if the garage were built it would not be visually damaging as it would follow the building line. He stated that he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- 9) Councillor Duncan stated that he noted the support from the neighbours, and he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- 10) Councillor Randall stated that the application seemed reasonable if the hedge was retained, and he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- 11) Councillor Hyde stated that it was her view there was already a protrusion at the front with the location of the conservatory; she agreed with the comments made by others and would not support the Officer recommendation.
- 12) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission was unanimously not carried. Councillor Hyde proposed reasons for the approval and these were seconded by Councillor Cox. These reasons were then read to the Committee, and it was agreed that they reflected what had been put forward by Members. A

recorded vote was then taken with the proposed reasons for refusal and Councillors: Mac Cafferty, Jones, Hyde, Carden, Cox, Randall, Duncan, Gilbey, Hamilton, Littman, Wealls and Wells voted that planning permission be granted.

- 166.4 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into account the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission, but resolves to authorise the Head of Development Control to grant planning permission for the reason set out below, subject to the imposition of such conditions as she considers appropriate but which will include a landscaping condition which shall be approved in consultation with the Chair, Deputy Chair and Opposition Spokespersons.

Reasons for Approval:

- i. The proposed development by reason of its scale and siting would not affect the street scene detrimentally and would therefore comply with policies QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 and SPD 12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

**E. BH2013/03968 - St Andrews Day and Resource Centre, St Andrews Road, Brighton - Full Planning Permission**

Demolition of existing single storey building and garages and erection of 4no three bedroom houses and 3no two bedroom houses with associated car parking.

- 1) The Senior Team Planner, Kate Brocklebank, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings; attention was also drawn to matters on the Late List. The application site related to a narrow strip of land which was currently the site of a single storey detached building with vehicular access to the south of the site; it was also noted the land levels differed on the site. Permission was sought for the erection of seven 2-storey dwellings and associated parking; the application followed the refusal of two previous applications for similar type schemes. The most recent appeal had only been dismissed for reasons in relation to the neighbour impact from the three properties at the rear. In order to address these concerns the existing boundary wall had been retained in this application, and the bulk at the rear would be contained below this boundary wall. There were conditions set out in the report in relation to spot heights and a method statement for the retention of the existing walling. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for approval.

**Public Speaker(s) and Questions**

- 2) Ms Cathy Mason spoke in objection to the scheme in her capacity as a local resident; she stated that when the previous application had been refused the developer had mentioned that they would work with the local community; however, she had not any such contact to help address residents concerns. She noted that in the inspector decision particular attention had been paid to the group of properties at the front of the site, but she was of the view that the same level of attention should be equally paid to all the proposed properties. The new height of the wall and the ridge of the roof would create a sense of cramping and feel overbearing. The boundary wall and the new walls would be close to the bottom of the gardens of the existing properties, and the



proposed bay windows would compromise privacy and impact on light. Whilst effort had been made to provide cross sections this had not been undertaken for all parts of the site, and this was representative of the impact on the existing buildings.

- 3) In response to the Chair it was confirmed by Ms Mason that she objected to the handling of the plans; the issues surrounding the boundary wall and the loss of light.
- 4) In response to Councillor Jones it was clarified by Ms Mason that she had directly approached the developer herself, and that the proposed development would impact on her back garden.
- 5) Mr Paul Burgess spoke in support of the application in his capacity as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant. The application would provide much needed family housing and would contribute towards housing in the city; the application was also supported by the Heritage Officer. In relation to the appeal of the previous refusal it was reiterated that the Inspector had raised no objection to the principle of the development; the layout or the design. Since then the scheme had been amended to address the sole reason for refusal in relation to neighbour amenity, and this had been achieved through the retention of the boundary walls which prevented the development being overbearing. The dwellings would also be dug down into the site, and the roof pitch had been moved further away from each boundary. It was felt that the application would help preserve the amenity, and the Committee were invited to approve the application.
- 6) In response to the Councillor Wealls it was confirmed that there was a small alleyway that went behind the first two houses, and the projected bays had been designed with views looking forward and back to protect amenity.
- 7) Councillor Jones asked the application about the communication with local residents; in response it was explained that the agent had attended the Inspector's site visit and discussed matters with residents at this time. It was also added that there had not been any request from residents to meet with the application.

#### **Questions for Officers**

- 8) In response to Councillor Randall the Deputy Development Control Manager, Paul Vidler, confirmed that conditions in relation to access and lifetime homes standards had been included in the report and recommendation. Councillor Randall stated it was satisfied with the response from the Officer and he would support the recommendation.
- 9) It was confirmed for Councillor Duncan that the application was too small to request S106 contributions.
- 10) Councillor Littman asked about the visual impact on the conservation area and the Senior Team Planner explained that work had been undertaken to look at the acceptable standard for the loss of the historic building; the new buildings would not be expected to reflect the existing character, but should be subservient and the palette complimentary.

- 11) It was confirmed for Councillor Hyde that the proposed materials would be painted render and zinc roof cladding.
- 12) In response to the Councillor Gilbey it was confirmed that the existing access would be retained, and there was a redundant cross over that would have the kerb reinstated as part of the application.
- 13) In response to Councillor Wealls the Senior Team Planner confirmed that a daylight study had not been deemed necessary, but the developed had passed the standard '25 degree' test.

### **Debate and Decision Making Process**

- 14) Councillor Duncan stated that he would support the Officer recommendation, but it was a shame no contributions for S106 monies could be secured.
  - 15) Councillor Wells stated that this was a good use of the site, and he welcomed family type houses being built; for these reasons he would be supporting the Officer recommendation.
  - 16) Councillor Cox noted he agreed with both of the previous speakers; he has sympathy for the local resident who had spoken in objection, but felt that this type of development was necessary in the city to meet housing targets. He stated that the Inspector's position was quite clear on the matter and for these reasons he would support the Officer recommendation.
  - 17) Councillor Randall stated that the scheme was reasonable, and the applicant had gone to lengths to ensure it was not overbearing.
  - 18) Councillor Jones stated he had sympathy with the local objectors, but he felt it was appropriate for the site to be developed, and it was become increasingly necessary for developers to look at these types of sites. He noted the local concerns, but stated he would support the Officer recommendation.
  - 19) Councillor Hyde stated she would support the Officer recommendation, but she stated her general dislike of zinc roofs as they did not weather well and were unsightly.
  - 20) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to approve planning permission was granted on a vote of 11 in support with 1 abstention.
- 165.5 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolved to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

### **F. BH2014/00073 - 73 Balsdean Road, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent**

Erection of single storey infill extension to front with pitched roof.

- 1) The Senior Team Planner, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The application site related to a three

bedroom detached predominately single property with a garage on the lower ground floor. Currently there was an existing terrace to the front of the property, and permission was sought for an extension to infill this area. The application followed two previous refusals and the latest had been dismissed at appeal; the Inspector had set out that the character was varied in the street, but most of the properties had an 'L' shaped feature at the front; removing this would also create a sense of overbearing and affect the rhythm of the street. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for refusal.

- 2) It was noted that the listed public speaker in support of the application, Mr Dieter Haslam, had not attended the meeting.

### **Debate and Decision Making Process**

- 3) Councillor Wells stated that the site visit had showed that the application would improve the property, and he did object to the loss of the 'L' shape.
- 4) Councillor Hyde stated that she would not be supporting the Officer recommendation as she had not agreed with the view of the Inspector.
- 5) Councillor Wealls stated he would not support the Officer recommendation as he felt the site visit had demonstrated that the impact on light and amenity would be negligible.
- 6) Councillor Gilbey stated that she had agreed with the view of Inspector from the undertaking the site visit and she would support the Officer recommendation.
- 7) Councillor Randall stated he agreed with the views of Councillors Hyde and Wells and he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- 8) Councillor Littman stated he could not identify any harm that would be caused by the application. He also noted that both neighbours directly either side supported the application.
- 9) The Deputy Development Control Manager, Paul Vidler, highlighted that there had been very strong comments from the Inspector which is was important the Committee take into account, and officers had not felt the small amendment to create a recess was sufficient to recommended approval.
- 10) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission was not carried on a vote of 4 in support with 7 against. Councillor Hyde proposed reasons for the approval. These reasons were then read to the Committee, and it was agreed that they reflected what had been put forward by Members; the Deputy Development Control Manager also recommended conditions in relation to a three year implementation period; listing the submitted drawings and matching materials. A recorded vote was then taken with the proposed reasons for refusal and Councillors: Mac Cafferty, Hyde, Cox, Randall, Littman, Wealls and Wells voted that permission be granted and Councillors: Jones, Carden, Gilbey and Hamilton voted that permission be refused.

- 166.6 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the Officers recommendation to refuse, but resolves to **GRANT** permission for the reason set out:

Reasons for Approval:

- ii. The proposed front extension by virtue of its form would not disrupt the rhythm of the immediate properties in the street and is therefore in accordance with policies QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005.

**Note: Councillor Duncan was not present during the consideration and vote on this application.**

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

- 166.1 There were no further requests for site visits for matters listed on the agenda.

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

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

**168. LIST OF APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS OR IN IMPLEMENTATION OF A PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISION (INC. TREES MATTERS)**

- 168.1 That the Committee notes the details of applications determined by the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing under delegated powers.

[Note 1: All decisions recorded in this list are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the planning register maintained by the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing. 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.]

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

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

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

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

**171. APPEAL DECISIONS**

171.1 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 4.41pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of