

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL****PLANNING COMMITTEE****2.00pm 27 AUGUST 2014****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Mac Cafferty (Chair), Jones (Deputy Chair), Hyde (Opposition Spokesperson), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Bowden, Davey, Hamilton, Littman, A Norman, K Norman, Pissaridou and Wells

**Officers in attendance:** Jeanette Walsh (Head of Development Control); Nicola Hurley (Area Planning Manager); Steven Shaw (Principal Transport Officer); Alison Gatherer (Solicitor) and Ross Keatley (Acting Democratic Services Manager).

**PART ONE****50 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS****50a Declarations of substitutes**

50.1 Councillor Bowden was present in substitution for Councillor Phillips; Councillors A. Norman was present in substitution for Councillor Cox; Councillor K. Norman was present in substitution for Councillor C. Theobald, and Councillor Pissaridou was present in substitution for Councillor Gilbey.

**50b Declarations of interests**

50.2 There were no declarations of interest in matters listed on the agenda.

**50c Exclusion of the press and public**

50.3 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Planning Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

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

**50d Use of mobile phones and tablets**

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

**51 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

51.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 6 August 2014 as a correct record.

**52 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

52.1 There were none.

**53 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

53.1 There were none.

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

54.1 There were no further requests for site visits in relation to matters listed on the agenda.

**55 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**A BH2014/00331 - Willow Surgery, 50 Heath Avenue, Brighton- Removal or Variation of Condition** - Application for variation of condition 2 of application BH2012/03818 (Demolition of existing surgery and residential accommodation and erection of new surgery and student accommodation comprising of 19 rooms) to permit internal alterations and changes to fenestration to increase accommodation to 24 rooms.

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

(2) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans photographs and elevational drawings. The application site related to a triangular piece of land in lower Bevandean, and the site was a former residential property that was currently in use as a doctor's surgery with a flat above. The surrounding area was predominately residential. Permission had been granted at appeal for the demolition of the existing surgery and erection of a new surgery with student accommodation; the reasons for the original refusal of the application by the local planning authority were listed in the report. This application now sought to vary condition 2 in relation to the number of student units on the site, and the alterations were outlined in the plans.

(3) The approval of the previous scheme at appeal established the principle of the development; the matters for consideration related to design, amenity and sustainable transport. The proposed external changes were considered minor and considered acceptable in their own right without causing additional harm to the character of the

area. In relation to amenity there would be no additional overlooking, and whilst it was considered student use had a greater potential for noise the increase in numbers would not make this material. There were no objections on the basis of sustainable transport. For the reasons outlined in the report the application was recommended for approval subject to an amendment to condition 1 and an additional condition to protect the willow tree.

### **Public Speaker(s) and Questions**

- (4) Councillor Meadows spoke in objection to the application in her capacity as the local Ward Councillor; she noted that she would not speak to the principle of the development as this had already been established; however, her concerns related to the local infrastructure and highways traffic. The corner was opposite a school; on the main bus route and also the sole access to an industrial estate. Students were likely to own cars and would park on-street causing congestion. There were also concerns that the room sizes would not be adequate and those with kitchenettes would be too cramped. Councillor Meadows asked the Committee to refuse the application.
- (5) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained by Councillor Meadows that the property was located on the route of the No. 48 bus which was 'not very frequent' and there would be problems for elderly residents if the bus was full and they had to wait for the next one.
- (6) In response to Councillor Hamilton it was explained by Councillor Meadows that it was her view policy in relation to student density had not been applied consistently in this area, and she drew example of a nearby street with approximately 60% student accommodation.
- (7) Councillor Meadows confirmed for Councillor Bowden that she had dealt with many noise problems in her ward which related to students.
- (8) Mr Bareham spoke in support of the application in his capacity as the agent; he stated that the increase number of units had been looked at and contributions adjusted accordingly by the Sustainable Transport Team. It was emphasised that the rationale behind the scheme was to provide a new doctors surgery and the student accommodation was enabling development.
- (9) Mr Bareham explained, in response to Councillor Bowden, that the s106 agreement associated with the existing permission considered matters such as the temporary provision of the doctor's surgery during construction. There were already discussions with other local community facilities in relation to potential sites to use for a temporary site for the doctor's surgery.
- (10) Mr Bareham explained, in response to Councillor Davey, that the number of GPs would stay the same, but the new surgery would be able to offer additional services with more treatment rooms.
- (11) In response to Councillor Bowden it was explained by Mr Bareham that there would no onsite wardens associated with the student accommodation; however, there would be

management plans and the accommodation would have to take on students from either of the two local universities.

- (12) At this point in the proceedings the legal advisor to the Committee, Alison Gatherer, highlighted that the application was for the additional 5 units; the principle of the development was already established and the mitigation measures agreed through the s106 agreement.
- (13) It was confirmed for Councillor Pissaridou that there would no loss of surgery space to accommodate the additional bedrooms.
- (14) It was explained to Councillor Jones by Mr Bareham that the applicant had considered other options as part of the development; however, the density of residential flats required to make the scheme viable was too high.
- (15) In response to Councillor Bowden it was explained by Mr Bareham that the level of parking on the site would be the same as outlined in the approved permission, and this would only be for use associated with the doctor's surgery.

#### **Questions for Officers**

- (16) In response to Councillor Mac Cafferty it was clarified that the TRO would be for double yellow lines at the junction, and the s106 funds would be used to improve the bus stop facilities around the site.
- (17) In response to Councillor Hyde the date of the inspector's decision was confirmed and it was noted that no extra weight could be placed on emerging policy now than could have been at the time that decision was taken. It was also confirmed that the shape of the building was no different from the previous approval.
- (18) In response to Councillor Hamilton it was clarified that the application had not been tested against emerging policy CP21 as the test density relating to HMO density and was not relevant in this instance.
- (19) In response to Councillor K. Norman it was confirmed that there was an additional condition to protect the large willow tree, and the local planning authority would liaise with the Arboriculturist to ensure this was enforced.

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

- (20) Councillor Pissaridou noted her view that the additional traffic would have an impact locally.
- (21) Councillor Wells noted that the area was already saturated with student accommodation, and he had concerns in relation to displacement parking caused by the new yellow lines – he stated he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (22) Councillor Bowden noted there was already parking pressure in this area – especially in relation to displacement parking associated with the Amex Stadium; he would not support the Officer recommendation.

- (23) Councillor Davey noted that he could not see any grounds on which the application could be refused, and that the application was only for an additional five bedroom spaces. He hoped that this type of purpose built accommodation could free up family homes in the city and he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (24) Councillor A. Norman noted that she would normally support purpose built student accommodation; however, she felt the points made by Councillor Meadows in relation to the bus service were valid and she was not content with the application.
- (25) Councillor Jones noted that the principle of the development had been established, and that the payback would be the provision of a new surgery. He stated he would support the Officer recommendation on the basis that a refusal of the application would not be upheld at appeal.
- (26) Councillors Hamilton and Bowden raised concerns in relation to the viability of the scheme, and the Head of the Development Control, Jeanette Walsh, explained that the local planning authority had not been made aware of any issues in relation to financial viability, and the decision to increase the number of units had been made by the applicant for their own reasons. It was also confirmed that if the application were refused that the existing permission would still stand and could be implemented.
- (27) A vote was taken by the 12 Members present and the Officer recommendation that planning permission be granted was not carried on a vote of 3 in support with 6 against and 3 abstentions. Reasons were then proposed and seconded to refuse the application by Councillors Bowden and Pissaridou. An adjournment was then held to allow the Chair, Councillor Bowden, Councillor Pissaridou, the Head of Development Control, the Solicitor and the Area Planning Manager to draft the reasons for refusal in full. These reasons were then read to the Committee and it was agreed that they accurately reflected what had been put forward. A recorded vote was then taken and Councillors: A. Norman, Pissaridou, Hamilton, Bowden, K. Norman and Wells voted that permission be refused; Councillors Mac Cafferty, Jones and Davey voted that permission not be refused and Councillors: Hyde, Carden and Littman abstained from the vote.

55.1 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation, but resolves to be **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason set out below:

- i. The proposed variation of condition to increase the unit numbers by 25% does not take into consideration the additional and cumulative impacts of increased trips, visitors and noise and disturbance to the existing amenities to the detriment of the local community contrary to TR1, SU10 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005.

**B BH2014/02105 - Toby Inn, 104 Cowley Drive, Brighton -Full Planning** - Extensions and alterations to existing building including additional floor to facilitate change of use from Public House (A4) to Hostel (Sui Generis).

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

- (2) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings; an error in the report was also noted and the correct figure of the proposed s106 agreement, £12k, was highlighted. The application site related to a large three-storey building which had been in use as a public house up until 2006 and was now only used for private events. Of particular note in the planning history was the refusal of a scheme earlier in the year for a hostel, and the reasons for refusal related to design and the impact on amenity. The application proposed an 18 bedroom hostel in sui generis use; the main considerations related to: the principle of the development; the impact on amenity; the appearance of the building; the impact on highways and the impact on sustainable transport.
- (3) Whilst policy sought to protect public houses the applicant had argued that the change of use complied with policy as the pub had suffered from a poor reputation; had ceased to operate as a public house since 2006; there was evidence that it had been unsuccessfully marketed and there were concerns in relation to its profitability. Whilst the loss was considered regrettable Officers were of the view that a pub in this location would struggle and there was evidence that the pub had historically not made a positive contribution. The hostel would be for medium to long-term stays and the supporting documentation suggested a typical stay would be months rather than days. As there was no established requirement for this type of use the application should be considered in terms of the NPPF's position in relation to sustainable development; unless material negative impact could be demonstrated.
- (4) The units would be a mixture of single, double and twin rooms and there would also be some studio flats; the standard of accommodation was considered acceptable as the accommodation was temporary. The elements of the scheme to extend the building were highlighted, and it was felt the new pitched roof extension would remove the blocky elements of the flat roof. In relation to amenity it was acknowledged that the plot already had a significant slope and the alterations would not create any more significant overlooking or overbearing than already existed – there was also a minimum distance to the rear properties of 10 metres. Whilst amenity issues had been raised through the objections it was considered that these could be controlled through conditions. The proposed development was considered acceptable with appropriate changes and necessary conditions to protect amenity. For the reasons outlined in the report the application was recommended for approval with the removal of condition 3 as this duplicated condition 6 in the report.

#### **Public Speaker(s) and Questions**

- (5) Ms Erica McKenzie spoke in objection to the scheme in her capacity as a local resident; she stated that her home was located opposite the application site, and she noted that the developer described all the rooms as en-suite and self-catering, but it was her understanding that 16 of the units would not have any cooking or washing facilities. She questioned the definition of 'temporary' and asked what measures there would be in place to stop residents becoming permanent; or to prevent sharing or subletting. She expressed concerns in relation to the management of the hostel, and felt the hostel did not offer a good standard of living. In summary Ms McKenzie

highlighted the view of Officers that there was no need for this type of accommodation in the city.

- (6) Councillor Simson spoke in objection to the scheme in her capacity as the local Ward Councillor; she stated that the premises was in a quiet residential area which was unsuited to this type of development. The Toby Inn had been a valued community asset, and the final incident leading to its closure had been as a result of poor and weak management. Since the closure in 2006 the viability of the pub had not been properly tested and this part of Woodingdean lacked facilities. There was no need for short or long term hostel accommodation in the city particularly in this non-central location away from transport and facilities. There were concerns from residents in relation to how the facility would actually operate – as well as concerns in relation to the amenity issues. Councillor Simson invited the Committee to refuse the application.
- (7) In response to Councillor Hyde it was explained by Councillor Simson that there were a lack of facilities in this part of Woodingdean and the transport was inadequate – all the community facilities were on the other side of the village.
- (8) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained by Councillor Simson that it was her view the brewery had ‘lost interest’ in the pub since the licence had been revoked.
- (9) Ms Josie Lawrence spoke in support of the application in her capacity as the agent; she stated that the last recorded nuisance incident was in 2005 and the public house had closed down in 2006 due to anti-social behaviour. It had opened in 2009 under the control of the current applicant and since then there had been no incidents as it was largely used as an events location. The applicant had been able to demonstrate that the loss of the pub was in accordance with policy and the objections to previous schemes had largely related to the loss of the public house. It was clarified that all of the rooms in the proposed scheme would be en-suite with kitchenettes and laundry facilities – the applicant also operated a similar type of facility elsewhere. There had been consultation with the Planning Officers and this had resulted in a recommendation for approval; the Committee were invited to approve the application.
- (10) In response to Councillor Jones it was explained by Ms Lawrence that the rooms would be let, for example, to people undertaking casual summer work and construction workers – the applicant had a business plan and was confident the rooms would be well used. In relation to the kitchen facilities these were highlighted in the rooms using the plans and it was confirmed that all rooms had cooking and washing facilities.
- (11) In response to Councillor Bowden the position in relation to cooking and laundry facilities was reiterated, and it was noted that these were not clear on the plans. Ms Lawrence also added that she did not have information on the length of stays at the other site the applicant operated, but she believed it was usually 3-6 months.
- (12) Ms Lawrence explained to Councillor Littman that the anticipated clientele could be students during the summer; casual workers; construction workers and individual who had split from relationships.
- (13) It was confirmed for Councillor Hyde that the applicant’s other site was in Worthing.

- (14) In response to Councillor A. Norman it was reiterated by Ms Lawrence that each unit would have its own cooking and washing facilities.
- (15) In response to Councillor Wells it was explained by Ms Lawrence that there would not be any onsite management or reception areas; the applicant managed the other site remotely and would meet new residents at the site to take them through procedures; sign tenancies and hand over keys.
- (16) In response to Councillor Pissaridou it was confirmed that there would be clear set of rules for residents and there would be out of hours contact numbers.

### **Questions for Officers**

- (17) It was confirmed for Councillor Wells that the ground floor plans did not show any reception or communal areas.
- (18) It was confirmed for Councillor Bowden that there was level access to the ground floor, and any further conditions in relation DDA compliance were not considered necessary.
- (19) The Chair noted that if the Committee were minded to grant the application then a condition could be added in relation to cooking facilities. It was also confirmed for Councillor Bowden that a condition could also be added in relation to landscaping.

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

- (20) Councillor Wells noted that he did not feel there was a need for this type of facility in the area, and made reference to a site elsewhere in the city that had closed down. He expressed concern with anti-social behaviour problems in the area, and felt the application could make these problems worse. There were no community facilities in this part of Woodingdean and the retention of the pub would be favourable. Councillor Wells stated he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (21) Councillor Hyde noted she felt very uncomfortable with this application, and had concerns in relation to length of stay and the confusion around the facilities. Reference was made to policy as the site was not well served by local community services as it was 'semi-rural' in nature. Councillor Hyde went on to suggest that amenity would not be adequately protected, and that this type of accommodation was not required in such a 'non-central' location. There was concern that the type of residents would benefit more from a central location close to services and amenities, and the whole site generally could be better developed for housing if the public house was no longer viable. Councillor Hyde stated that she would support the Officers recommendation.
- (22) Councillor Littman noted he shared some of the concerns raised by Councillor Hyde and he too would not be able to support the Officer recommendation. He referenced the lack of need for such facilities, and felt the site could be better realised for housing.
- (23) Councillor Pissaridou noted she supported the points made in the debate by Councillor Hyde, and felt that more could be done to protect the use as a public house. She stated she would not support the Officer recommendation.



- (24) Councillor Davey noted that there was degree of assumption being made in relation to the potential residents at the hostel, and he noted that the premises had been in use as a pub since 2006 and had also had its licence revoked by the Council's Licensing Committee.
- (25) Councillor Bowden noted he was not minded to support the application.
- (26) The Chair noted that he had asked Officers to look further into policy in relation to public houses; he went on to add that the loss of the pub was a shame for Woodingdean.
- (27) The Head of Development Control noted, in terms of policies HO10 and HO15, the application was not seeking to house those in special need or homeless and the use was falling in sui generis class. The Area Planning Manager also noted that there was a nearby parade of shops which had been noted during the site visit.
- (28) Councillor Jones noted that he did not feel the scheme was appropriate in this location, and he refuted the notion that there was not a need for this type of short-term accommodation in the city. He felt he was unable to reach a decision and most likely abstain from the vote.
- (29) A vote was taken by the 12 Members present and the Officer recommendation that planning permission be granted was not carried on a vote of 3 in support with 7 against and 2 abstentions. Reasons were then proposed and seconded to refuse the application by Councillors Hyde and Wells. An adjournment was then held to allow the Chair, Councillor Hyde, Councillor Wells, the Head of Development Control, the Solicitor and the Area Planning Manager to draft the reasons for refusal in full. These reasons were then read to the Committee and it was agreed that they accurately reflected what had been put forward. A recorded vote was then taken and Councillors: Hyde, A. Norman, Pissaridou, Littman, Bowden, K. Norman and Wells voted that permission be refused; Councillors: Mac Cafferty, Carden and Hamilton voted that permission not be refused and Councillors Jones and Davey abstained from the vote.

55.2 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation, but resolves to be **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason set out below:

- i. The local planning authority is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated an exception to policy HO20. Were it to be demonstrated the priority use identified in policy is for residential and mixed use schemes. This application does not fall within the preferred criteria. This application is therefore contrary to policy HO20 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP1 of the City Plan 2005.
- ii. This application does not take into consideration the cumulative impact of increased trips from occupiers & visitors, noise and disturbance to the existing amenities to the detriment of the local community contrary to TR1 SU10 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 And CP21 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document).
- iii. The site is in a non central location where there is an absence of concentrated infrastructure to support that use. There is no evidence to support the need for

this type of use within such a location. The application is therefore contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

**C BH2014/02404 - 8 Chesham Road, Brighton -Householder Planning Consent -**  
Alterations incorporating changes from rear pitched roof to mansard roof, dormer to front elevation and revised fenestration.

- (1) It was noted that the application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- (2) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The application site related to a mid-terrace property with a basement on the northern side of Chesham Road which was part of a group of four dwellings backing onto St. Mary's Place. The application was a resubmission following an earlier refusal for a mansard roof and dormer to the front. The previous decision had been refused at appeal and the decision of the inspector was material to the consideration of this application; it was also noted the inspector had considered the front dormer to be acceptable. The scale of the rear mansard roof was the same as previously proposed and the windows would align with those below. Whilst it was acknowledged there were similar rear extensions at numbers 5 & 6 there was no planning history for these and the principle of the mansard was considered unacceptable. The inspector had previously felt that rear extension would have negative impact and the shape and profile would be alien to the property. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for refusal.

**Public Speaker(s) and Questions**

- (3) Councillor Mitchell spoke in support of the application in her capacity as the local Ward Councillor; she stated that since the first refusal in 2012 the applicant had reduced the size of the proposals and improved the design of the windows and the roof. Councillor Mitchell noted her view that the previous application should have come before the Committee following the changes in relation to the Scheme of Delegation. The proposed alterations would allow the property to accommodate three separate bedrooms and allow a better use of the space within the property. The new windows would not impact on neighbouring properties and the whole scheme would be in a form that was in keeping; with materials to match the existing house. It was highlighted that no objections had been received, and the scheme would be of high quality.
- (4) In response to Councillor K. Norman it was confirmed by Councillor Mitchell that the previous scheme had received 13 letters of support.
- (5) Mr James Eyre spoke in his capacity as the applicant and stated that the scheme sought to allow the reconfiguration of one of the internal staircases which he considered to currently be a safety issue. The new roof would also include photovoltaic elements. Consultation had been undertaken with the residents to the rear in St. Mary's Place, and one of the residents whom had previously objected to the scheme had since withdrawn the objection. Attention was drawn to the similar neighbouring extensions, and it was noted that the view of new roof would be partially obscured by

trees. The scheme proposed to use much more sympathetic materials which would better match the character and appearance of the building.

### Questions for Officers

- (6) In response to Councillor Wells the Area Planning Manager noted that the cross-section of the roof would be generally similar to the neighbouring property with a mansard roof.
- (7) In response to Councillor Bowden the Head of Development Control clarified matters in relation to the changes to the Scheme of Delegation, and noted this was not material to the consideration of the application.
- (8) In response to Councillor Jones it was confirmed that the basis of the refusal related to the suitability of mansard roof supported by guidance in the SPD for householder extensions.
- (9) In response to Councillor Littman it was clarified that whilst the original materials had been changed; policy sought to protect the original roof shape which was still intact.

### Debate and Decision Making Process

- (10) Councillor Bowden stated he felt the application was appropriate, and he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (11) Councillor Wells stated he agreed with this position and noted there had been no objections from neighbouring properties; he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (12) Councillor Hamilton noted the rear mansard would hardly be visible, and he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (13) The Chair stated he usually sought to defend policy, and noted that this policy had successfully been defended at appeal; however, he felt the quality of the design was strong and any harm would be minimal.
- (14) A vote was taken by the 12 Members present and the Officer recommendation that planning permission be refused was not carried on a vote of 11 against and 1 abstention. Reasons were then proposed and seconded to approve the application. These reasons were then read to the Committee and it was agreed that they accurately reflected what had been put forward. A recorded vote was then taken and Councillors: Mac Cafferty, Jones, Hyde, Carden, A. Norman, Pissaridou, Hamilton, Littman, Bowden, K. Norman and Wells voted that permission be granted and Councillor Davey abstained from the vote.

- 55.3 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation, but resolves to be **GRANT** planning permission for the reason set out below and subject to a standard 3 years' time condition and the submission of materials for agreement prior to commencement of development:

- i. The proposed development is of sympathetic design in keeping with the locality and does not cause harm to the conservation area.

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

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

**57 INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS**

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

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

- 58.1 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.]

**59 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE**

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

**60 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES**

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

**61 APPEAL DECISIONS**

- 61.1 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 5.11pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of