

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 29 AUGUST 2012

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Hawtree (Chair), Hyde (Opposition Spokesperson), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cobb, Davey, Gilbey, Jones, Mac Cafferty, K Norman, Robins, Shanks and Wells

Co-opted Members: James Breckell (Conservation Advisory Group)

Officers in attendance: Jeanette Walsh, Head of Development Control; Claire Burnett, Area Planning Manager (East); Shannon Waaldijk, Area Planning Manager (West), Steven Shaw, Principal Transport Planning Officer; Geoff Bennett, Senior Planner (Conservation); Alison Gatherer, Lawyer and Ross Keatley, Democratic Services Officer.

PART ONE

52. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

52a Declarations of substitutes

52.1 Councillor Shanks was present in substitution for Councillor Summers; Councillor Robins was present in substitution for Councillor Hamilton and Councillor Ken Norman was present in substitution for Councillor Carol Theobald.

52b Declarations of interests

52.2 Councillor Shanks highlighted that she had objected to Item 57F Application BH2012/01907 – 1 Withdean Crescent, and would leave the meeting during the debate and vote on this application.

52.3 Councillor Hyde explained that in relation to Item 57I Application BH2012/01652 – land adjacent to 2 Longhill Road, the applicant had attended her ward surgery to discuss the application; she had been the only Councillor present, but had not entered into discussion or debate with the applicant and confirmed herself to be of an open mind in relation to this application, and would remain present for the discussion and vote.

52c Exclusion of the press and public

52.4 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.

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

53. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

53.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chairman be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 8 August 2012 as a correct record.

54. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

54.1 The petition received at the previous meeting in relation to Medina House had been forwarded to the Economic Development & Culture Committee to receive a response at the next meeting on 20 September 2012.

55. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

55.1 There were none.

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

56.1 There were none.

57. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A. BH2012/01634 - Brighton Dome, Church Street - Advertisement Consent

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

(2) The Area Planning Manager (East), Claire Burnett, introduced application BH2012/01634 for advertisement consent and application BH2012/01635 for listed building consent and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans, elevational drawings and visualisation images provided by the applicant. Attention was also drawn to the Late List; additional representations received and a minor amendment to the plans. The application site related to a mixture of Grade 1 & 2 listed buildings with the Pavilion and the Pavilion Gardens to the south, and was located in the Valley Gardens Conservation Area. English Heritage had expressed their support for the scheme, and the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) had objected. The visualisation images were used to show the proposed position of the signage, and it was highlighted the Pavilion Theatre would be renamed. It was acknowledged that the current signage was incoherent and inadequate, and, although Council Policy advised against banners on listed buildings, it was felt that the unique nature of the buildings; difficulty in incorporation of signage to the buildings and the width of Church Street created an exceptional case. The report although concluded that the appearance of the proposed signage would not create an increased risk to highway safety. In relation to the listed

building consent the proposed changes to the internal signage were listed. The applications were recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the reports.

Questions for Officers

- (3) In response to a query from Councillor Hyde the size of the large proposed sign on the turret of the building was confirmed. The Head of Development Control, Jeanette Walsh, also highlighted that some of the visualisations submitted by the applicant had been misleading in their scale. Councillor Hyde also said that she had been approached by a member of the public who had been denied the opportunity to speak in relation to the application; in response the Democratic Services Officer, Ross Keatley explained that there had been a request to speak from a member of the public who did not fall within the remit of the protocol as they did not live in the immediate vicinity of the application site, and they wished to speak of the behalf of an amenity group who were represented on the Committee by CAG through their non-voting co-optee status.
- (4) Councillor Davey highlighted his concern that the banners could deteriorate over time and look 'tatty', and it was explained that the banners would be made of a weather treated UPVC material. Councillor Hyde also highlighted that any fixtures used should be made of 'marine grade' stainless steel. The Senior Planner (Conservation), Geoff Bennett, explained that further details on the materials were expected, and it was the normal practise that such fixtures would be made into the mortar to protect the brick of the listed building.
- (5) James Breckell stated his opinion that the recommendation was contrary to Council Policy in relation to fixing banners to listed buildings and requested more information on the justification behind the recommendation. Officers explained that the buildings were of huge importance and significance with many entrances and exits, and although alternatives had been explored, it was felt that the circumstances justified an exception to the policy.
- (6) Councillor Ken Norman asked for specific details on the materials that would be used for the signage, and in response Officers explained that this still needed to be confirmed with the applicant, but the Committee could be minded to include additional conditions in relation to the materials.
- (7) Councillor Mac Cafferty asked if there was any historic value to the canopy that was proposed to be removed on Church Street, and it was confirmed that it was not an original feature or of any historic architectural value.
- (8) Councillor Robins asked if the applications had to be considered in their entirety as he felt some aspects of the proposals were more preferable than others. It was explained that, although it was possible to issue a split decision, there was a rationale which informed the totality of the applications.
- (9) Councillor Gilbey asked if the banners would be of a stiffened finished, and it was highlighted that they were stretched taut with some flexibility.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (10) Mr Breckell explained that CAG had objected to this application due to the proposed fixing of the banners to the listed buildings, and the potential damage and impact this could have; he stated that CAG had felt it was not right to move away from the agreed Policy on this. He went on to state that CAG had not objected to the rebranding of the buildings or the co-ordinated approach to the signage at the site.
- (11) Councillor Carden highlighted the different grades of brass that were available, and stated that it was important the work was undertaken by qualified professionals.
- (12) Councillor Mac Cafferty noted his support of the application and stated it was important for increasing the legibility of the building; the application would allow the use of the buildings to evolve and assist in growing their audiences.
- (13) Councillor Jones noted his concerns in relation to some aspects of the proposals, but stated that he agreed the current configuration could be confusing for visitors; he concluded by stating that he was undecided.
- (14) Councillor Cobb stated that she liked some of the visualisations; agreed that the configurations could be improved, and noted she had concerns in relation to potential damage to the listed buildings.
- (15) Councillor Ken Norman stated that the buildings had operated for a considerable period of time and he did not believe a rebrand or redesign was necessary. He highlighted concerns in relation to damage to the listed buildings, and the size and prominence of some of the proposed signs. Councillor Wells echoed these comments and stated that he would be voting against the Officer recommendation on both applications.
- (16) The Chair noted that it was often normal practise for such historic buildings to have prominent signage and banners, and it was his view that the proposals were more modest in nature than what could be seen on other buildings here and abroad.
- (17) Councillor Gilbey noted that the site visit had helped her to put the actual size of some of the proposed signage in perspective, but she still felt there were aspects of the scheme that not acceptable.
- (18) The Head of Development Control, Jeanette Walsh, noted that the Committee had raised a variety of queries in relation to the size of the proposed signage and the materials used; there was scope to defer the item and request samples of materials and seek additional information on the rationale behind parts of the scheme.
- (19) The Chair and Councillor Hyde supported this proposal, and the Committee voted unanimously that the item be deferred.
- 57.1 **RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred to allow Officers to provide additional information on: the materials to be used in the scheme the rationale behind the scheme.

B. BH2012/01635 - Brighton Dome, Church Street - Listed Building Consent

(1) The Committee voted unanimously that the item be deferred.

57.2 **RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred to allow Officers to provide additional information on: the materials to be used in the scheme the rationale behind the scheme.

C. BH2011/02468 - 30-31 Devonshire Place - Full Planning Consent

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

(2) The Area Planning Manager (East) gave a presentation in relation to application BH2012/02468 for full planning consent and application BH2012/02469 for conservation area consent by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. An update to the Committee report was highlighted suggesting that further conditions be added in respect of the proposed balconies. The existing building was currently in use as an office; planning permission was sought for the demolition of the building and the erection of a four storey building with offices in the basement, ground floor and part of the first floor; it was highlighted that CAG had objected to the scheme. There would be a minimal net loss of office space at the site; however, this was considered acceptable as the new office space would be of better quality, and therefore not in contrary to policy. The proposal was of a modern design, and would have a rendered finish; the design and approach of the rear elevation was considered acceptable and without harm to the amenity of the wider area. The scheme did not allow for any off-road parking, and as the site was within the controlled parking zone (CPZ) a car free development was proposed. Due to previous activities at the site a desktop contamination study would be expected, and would not warrant grounds for refusal. The conservation area consent was also sought for the demolition of the existing buildings. For the reasons set out in the report the application for full planning was recommended to be minded to grant, and the application for conservation area consent was recommended for approval.

Questions for Officers

(3) In response to a query from Councillor Hyde the area at the front of the building to be tiled was confirmed, and it was also noted that the colour of the render would be agreed through an informative.

(4) Councillor Robins asked if it was a requirement that all properties on this street be painted the same colour, and in response Officers explained that there was no uniform colour in this street and the Council would not be able to impose a colour; however, he noted there was an informal practise amongst residents of painting buildings within the spectrum of the street.

(5) In response to a query from Councillor Gilbey it was explained that there was already a condition proposed in relation to the potential contamination at the site.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (6) Mr Breckell highlighted that CAG had objected to the application on design grounds, although, they favoured development of the site it was considered that there was an opportunity for a better design in this part of the city. Councillor Ken Norman agreed with these comments and said that the frontage was inappropriate and not in-keeping with the area.
- (7) A vote was taken and planning permission was granted on a vote of 8 in favour with 4 against.
- 57.3 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

D. BH2011/02469 - 30-31 Devonshire Place - Conservation Area Consent

- (1) A vote was taken and conservation area consent was granted on a vote of 9 in favour with 3 against.
- 57.4 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and resolves to **GRANT** conservation area consent subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

E. BH2012/01764 - 10 Upper Market Street - Full Planning Consent

- (1) The Area Planning Manager (West), Shannon Waaldijk, introduced the report by reference to photographs and plans. It was explained that the application sought the change of use from retail to a mixed retail and restaurant/café. The premises had two frontages which would be retained; a residential property above that was not connected with the application, and a basement that would continue to be used for cooking. The proposals were considered acceptable and in-keeping with the policies in relation to mixed use; other considerations related to noise and disturbance, but it was felt that these would be no greater than at present. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (2) In response to queries from Councillor Cobb and Councillor Gilbey the proposed opening hours were confirmed, and the extraction point from the basement kitchen was highlighted; it was noted that Officers from Environmental Health were satisfied with this arrangement.
- (3) A vote was taken and planning was granted on a vote of 10 to 1 with 1 abstention.
- 57.5 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and

resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

F. BH2012/01907 - 1 Withdean Crescent - House Planning Consent

- (1) The Area Planning Manager (West), Shannon Waaldijk, introduced this item and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The application sought the alteration and erection of a single storey side extension to the existing two storey property. The proposed development would be further from the boundary than the existing detached garage. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Public Speakers and Questions

- (2) Mr Corney spoke in objection to the scheme and highlighted that an application at this site had previously been refused, and although the scheme had been redesigned it was his opinion that this application did not address the previous reasons for refusal. The application would increase the footprint of the existing house and create a new roof line which would have an overbearing sense of enclosure on his neighbouring property. Mr Corney summarised by stating that the application was contrary to policy.
- (3) In response to queries from Councillor Robins and Councillor Gilbey it was explained that work had already commenced on site.
- (4) Mr Gearing spoke in his capacity as the applicant and explained that he had purchased the property in April 2012 and undertaken extensive works; improving the sustainability rating of the property whilst retaining the original mock Tudor design. The original scheme had been amended, and he had sought to comply with the recommendation of the Case Officer. There would be no new windows overlooking the neighbouring property; the new dormer would be largely the same as the previous one, and no trees would be affected. Mr Gearing explained that he had engaged in discussions with all neighbours before submitting the applications, and the extension would allow him to create a bedroom for his elderly parents.
- (5) In response to a query from Councillor Davey it was explained that there would a garage on the ground floor to replace the existing garage.

Questions for Officers

- (6) Councillor Davey asked questions in relation to the potential overlooking at the site, and it was explained that the proposed west elevation was 17.5 metres from the neighbouring property with no fenestration, and the whole extension would be against the backdrop of the existing boundary. It was highlighted that the previous scheme had had a much greater two storey element, and been substantially larger.
- (7) In response to a query from Councillor Wells it was highlighted that the proposed extension would be 1.2 metres from the boundary.

- (8) In response to a query from Councillor Gilbey it was confirmed that the distance to the neighbouring property was taken from the rear wall of the property; not the rear of the conservatory that could be seen on the photographs.

Debates and Decision Making Process

- (9) Councillor Wells stated that that he thought this was a well designed side extension; there were no problems with overlooking, and no loss of light and he would support the Officer recommendation. Councillor Hyde concurred that there would be no overlooking.
- (10) Councillor Ken Norman stated that he did not believe there would be any increased overlooking at the site, and he felt the proposals were an improvement over the previous application.
- (11) A vote was taken and householder planning consent was granted on a vote of 9 in favour with 2 against.

- 57.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and resolves to **GRANT** householder planning consent subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

Note: Councillor Shanks was not present during the consideration or vote on this item.

G. BH2012/01609 - 19 Onslow Road Hove (rear of 57 Shirley Dr) - Full Planning Consent

- (1) The Area Planning Manager (West) introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. Full planning permission had been granted for a detached dwelling on the site in 2003; this permission had since been implemented, and it was now considered that the principle of development at the site had been accepted. The size, proportions and distance to the boundary of the proposed building were largely similar to what had already been approved. It was highlighted that there would be no clear fenestration onto the neighbouring bungalow; only two small obscured windows. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (2) In response to query from Councillor Ken Norman the Head of Development Control explained that the applicant had protected their permission through the commencement of works; this application varied from the existing permission and it was appropriate that Officers assess the differences to form a recommendation.
- (3) Councillor Cobb noted that the sustainability code was lower than would normally be expected in this sort of development, and it was explained that it would be higher than what would be achieved through the implementation of the 2003 scheme.

(4) A vote was taken and planning permission was granted on a vote of 9 in favour with 3 abstentions.

57.8 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

H. **BH2012/01789 - 46 Freehold Terrace - Full Planning Consent**

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

(2) The Area Planning Manager (East) introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The site related to a triangular plot of land on the western corner of Freeholder Terrace; there were both industrial and residential buildings in the nearby vicinity, and immediately to the west of the site was the Brighton-Lewes railway line. The application sought the demolition of the existing building, and the erection of a mixed use development with a loading bay at the front. The applicant had sought to address the reasons for refusal of a previous scheme. The building would be four storeys and modern in appearance; there was also a reduction in the bulk and massing from the previous scheme, and it was considered there would be no loss of amenity for neighbours. All the residential units would have private amenity space; there was also a shared amenity space to the rear, and a dedicated refuse and recycling point at the front of the development. Potential contamination at the site from previous use could be adequately addressed through conditions, and the residential element would meet a code level 3 for sustainability. The application was recommended to be minded to grant for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

(3) In response to a query from Councillor Cobb the layout of the units, and the amenity space was confirmed.

(4) Councillor Hyde said that she thought this was an excellent use of the site, and welcomed the mixed use close to the Lewes Road. Councillor Hawtree echoed these comments and welcomed the improvements made to the scheme by the applicant.

(5) A vote was taken and planning permission was granted on a vote of 11 in favour with 1 against.

57.9 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and is **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

I. **BH2012/01652 - Land adjacent to 2 Longhill Road - Full Planning Consent**

(1) The Area Planning Manager (East) introduced the item and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The main considerations in

relation to this application were the planning history and the impact on the adjoining national park. An application had been granted at appeal in 2007, and details were provided of the existing permission; the proposed new design was along the same general building line. Since 2007 the adjoining land had now become park of the South Downs National Park. The design was a box-like structure and the first floor would be predominantly glazed and finished in dark timber cladding. Officers believed that the horizontal and vertical emphasis of the design would be overbearing and bulky compared to the existing permission which was for a single storey building. The surrounding properties were brick built, and the highest and bulkiest part of the development would be closest to the national park. A modern design was considered acceptable in principle, but it was felt the proposal was too bulky. The application was recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the report.

Public Speakers and Questions

- (2) Mrs Civil spoke in objection to the scheme and stated that the development was on a plot of land that had originally been part of her garden at the neighbouring property. The proposal was too big and would dominate the skyline, and the proposed dark wood cladding would be out of keeping with the area. The windows on the first floor of the property would overlook the garden of her property, and the increased size of the proposal would create more traffic, more noise, and the flat roofs were closer to her property. It was felt that the existing permission was more 'polite' to the surroundings and better aligned. In summary it was noted that the Ovingdean Preservation Society also opposed the application.
- (3) Mr Thompson spoke in his capacity as the applicant, and stated that he had aspirations for the property to become his long term family home; the current permission was too small for this. Mr Thompson highlighted Council policy to justify the application, and went on to state that the cladding would not be a dark wood, but a sweet chestnut colour to blend with the national park context. It was highlighted that the national park had not submitted any objections, and references to the bulk and massing were subjective. The application would blend into the local landscape and create a lifelong home. In summary Mr Thompson urged the Committee to reject the Officer recommendation.
- (4) In response to a query Mr Thompson confirmed that wood could be either treated or left to age naturally overtime. The Head of Development Control confirmed that there was a design and access statement in respect of this application.

Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (5) Councillor Mac Cafferty proposed a site visit to better understand the context of the site, and this was seconded by Councillor Hawtree. A vote was taken and the proposal to hold a site visit was lost on a vote of 3 in favour with 7 against and 2 abstentions.
- (6) Councillor Hyde stated that the design was too bulky and 'box-like', she went to highlight that the site was close to the rear of the field in which Rottingdean Windmill was situated; subsequently she would be voting with the Officer recommendation to refuse. Councillor Carden echoed these comments.

(7) Councillor Davey stated that he did not feel there was enough information in the images provided for him to support the application, and he would be voting with the Officer recommendation to refuse the application.

(8) A vote was taken and planning permission was refused on a vote of 9 to 3.

57.9 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set in section 11 and the policies and guidance in section 7 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out below.

- i. The proposed dwelling by reason of its design, massing, bulk, scale and materials, would result in an overly dominant and visually incongruous development that would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the setting of the South Downs National Park contrary to policies QD1, QD2, QD5 and NC8 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- ii. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its disjointed composition and form and an incoherent fenestration layout would result in a poorly designed and detailed building that detracts from the appearance and character of the site, contrary to policy QD1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- iii. The proposed dwelling, by reason of the inappropriate flat roof would result in an incongruous roof form, out of character with the prevailing roof form of the residential buildings within the surrounding area, contrary to policies QD1, QD2, QD5 and NC8 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

J. BH2012/01111 - 115 Marine Drive, Rottingdean - Householder Planning Consent

(1) The Area Planning Manager (East) introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The existing property was a two storey semi-detached building with an existing driveway and elevated front garden. Planning permission was sought for a rear extension, and the excavation of the front garden; Rottingdean Parish Council had objected to the scheme, and the main issues related to the impact on the host building. The proposed extension was simple in design, and the changes to the garden would allow for additional off-street parking. The application was considered acceptable in design terms; there would be no significant loss of daylight to the rear as this was already north facing; the proposed alterations to the front would also not cause harm to amenity. A number of objections had been received in relation to the property being used for short-term lets; additional information had been sought and Officers had confirmed that there had been some such lets in last year, but the applicant intended to move into the dwelling in September 2012, and the property had to be considered as a single residential dwelling. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Public Speakers and Questions

(2) Mr Parsons spoke in his capacity as a Rottingdean Parish Councillor and stated that the Parish Council opposed the application due to the loss of light to the neighbouring property and the impact on the existing patio. There had been noise disturbance in

March and April due to a number of short-term lets to students. It was the opinion of the Parish Council that 10 lets in 12 months was excessive, and Mr Parsons went on to state that he had found evidence to show the property was advertised for short-term lets on three different websites. He stated that the application would add additional rooms, and seemed to accommodate an increased number of people for short-term lets. He stated if the Committee were minded to grant the application then conditions should be added in relation to any commercial use.

- (3) In response to a query about the origin of the noise complaints Mr Parsons explained he could not confirm this information.

Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (4) Councillor Mac Cafferty asked for information in relation to the short-term lets, and any conditions to restrict this use. In response the Head of Development Control explained that following investigations the Council had taken the view that the property had not moved out of the residential C3 use, and there was no evidence that a change of use had taken place. Any move to change the use of the property would require permission from the Council. Following further queries from Councillor Davey it was explained that, property owners were permitted to rent out their properties within permitted rights.
- (5) Councillor Hyde asked if the Committee could remove Permitted Development rights, and in response it was explained that a condition to prevent commercial use was not considered necessary as the Council had other powers which could be used to address such concerns, and Officers recommended that this was not justified in this instance.
- (6) In relation to additional parking at the front of the property Officers confirmed that this was considered to be a turning space as vehicles could enter and leave in forward gear, but could also be used as parking. The highways authority had also not raised any objection to the turning space.
- (7) A vote was taken and householder planning was granted on a vote of 9 in favour with 3 abstentions.

57.10 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and resolves to **GRANT** householder planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

K. BH2012/02189 - 18 Tillstone Street - Householder Planning Consent

- (1) A vote was taken and the Committee unanimously agreed that planning permission be granted.
- 57.11 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation, and the policies and guidance set out into report and resolves to **GRANT** householder planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

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

58.1 There were none.

59. APPEAL DECISIONS

59.1 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.

60. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

61. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

62. INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS

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

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

63.1 **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.]

The meeting concluded at 5.22pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of