

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**2.00pm 29 JANUARY 2014**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Mac Cafferty (Chair), Jones (Deputy Chair), Hyde (Opposition Spokesperson), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cox, Davey, Gilbey, Hamilton, Littman, C Theobald and Wells

**Co-opted Members:** Jim Gowans (Conservation Advisory Group)

**Officers in attendance:** Paul Vidler (Deputy Development Control Manager); Nicola Hurley (Area Planning Manager); Clare Simpson (Senior Planning Officer); Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor) and Ross Keatley (Acting Democratic Services Manager).

**PART ONE**

**136. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**136a Declarations of substitutes**

136.1 There were no declarations of substitutes.

**136b Declarations of interests**

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

**136c Exclusion of the press and public**

136.3 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.

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

**134d Use of mobile phones and tablets**

134.5 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 'airplane mode'.

**137. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

137.1 Councillor C. Theobald referenced minute 117(D) paragraph (4) and stated that it was her request that an informative be added in relation to the blue plaque to commemorate the location of the original Hannington's Department Store, and she would like this reflected in the minutes.

137.2 **RESOLVED** – That, with the above addition, the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2013 and the meeting held on 8 January 2014 as a correct record.

**138. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

138.1 There were no Chairs Communications.

**139. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

139.1 There were no public questions.

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

140.1 There were no additional requests for matters on the agenda to be the subject of a site visit.

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

**Major Applications**

**A. BH2013/03816 - BHASVIC 205 Dyke Road, Hove - Full Planning** - Construction of a new 3no storey teaching block located on the existing upper car park between College House and the main building on Dyke Road, provision of a new service area to provide access for deliveries and refuse vehicles located to the north of College House on Dyke Road, refurbishment of the existing refectory and staff room in the Link Building, installation of CCTV cameras and creation of a new landscaped area.

(1) The Senior Planning Officer, Clare Simpson, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The college provided further education for approximately 2000 students, and the main building was locally listed; was on a prominent corner and had a strong street presence. Planning permission was sought for a three storey building on the site of one of the existing car parks, and 7 of the 29 spaces would be retained elsewhere on the site. There would also be a linked walkway between the existing building and the new building. The new scheme sought to address the previous reasons for refusal and the proposed building line now corresponded to the line of the main building. There would also be solar

thermal and photovoltaic panels of the roof of the new building, and it would achieve BREEAM level excellent.

- (2) The previous application had been refused by the Committee for reasons relating to design, prominence and the materials. The new scheme now had stronger lines and a horizontal emphasis as well as using red brick and bronze copper colourings. The plant equipment on the roof of the building had been reduced in its visibility through screening, and neither the Heritage Team nor the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) had objected. The Committee were shown some comparisons between the new scheme and the previous and it was added that the site could accommodate the building without it being overbearing. The colour match on the red brick had been agreed with the Heritage Team and the type of copper cladding used would be weather treated. There would also be more planting at the back of the highway to soften the impact. Overall the scheme was considered acceptable and was recommended to be minded to grant subject to the S106 agreement and for the reasons set out in the report.

### **Speakers and Questions**

- (3) Councillor Brown spoke in support of the scheme in her capacity as the local Ward Councillor, and stated that the application would benefit existing and future students in the city. The college had been rated outstanding, but the current accommodation was very cramped, and a recent OFSTED inspection had highlighted that this remained an issue. The new accommodation would only allow for an additional 188 students, and its primary purpose was to make the site fit for the current number of students. If the scheme did not commence soon then the college could potentially lose the capital grant funding for the scheme. It was added that this application had sought to address the previous reasons for refusal, and the height was comparable with the other buildings on the site. The building would also perform well in terms of sustainability and energy performance. In summary Councillor Brown urged the Committee to support the application.

### **Questions for Officers**

- (4) In response to Councillor C. Theobald it was highlighted that 7 spaces would be retained of the 29 that be lost at the upper car park site. In relation to matters raised by East Sussex Fire & Rescue it was confirmed that these related to Building Control matters outside the remit of the Committee.
- (5) In response to Councillor Wells it was explained that the S106 obligation was the mechanism to achieve the 20% level of local labour; Officers in Economic Development held databases of local labour sources and the Council would assist the developer in achieving this.
- (6) In response to a further query from Councillor C. Theobald it was explained that there was a condition for a travel plan to be submitted that would help to mitigate the loss of the staff parking on the site.

**Debates and Decision Making Process**

- (7) Councillor Carden noted that he welcomed the scheme; he felt his previous objections to the colour had been properly addressed.
- (8) Councillor Hyde highlighted the inappropriate nature of the previous scheme, but noted that this scheme was much more appropriate in particular in the context of the locally listed building. She felt that this was an example of positive planning as the Committee had refused an inappropriate scheme, and in response a much more appropriate one had been put forward.
- (9) Councillor C. Theobald stated that she agreed with the comments made by other Members, and, whilst she was still disappointed about the loss of parking, she felt this scheme was much more appropriate.
- (10) Councillor Jones noted that he agreed with the other comments in the debate; the scheme was much improved and the colour palette fitted in much better, and he was grateful to the applicant for the new scheme.
- (11) Councillor Littman stated that the decision to refuse the previous application had been the right one as the objections had been taken on board and he was happy to support the new scheme.
- (12) Mr Gowans added that the CAG had not objected, but felt the design was 'bland.'
- (13) Councillor Hamilton noted that this was an excellent educational establishment, and he would support the application.
- (14) Councillor Mac Cafferty noted that he understood why this new application was better in the view of Committee Members, and welcomed the improvement of the facilities at the college.
- (15) A vote was taken and planning permission was unanimously granted by the 11 Members present.

- 141.1 **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 at the meeting.

**Minor Applications**

- B. BH2013/03492 - Top Floor Flat, 18 Clifton Street, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent** - Replacement of existing timber single glazed windows with UPVC double glazed windows (Retrospective).
- (1) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The

application site related to a three storey terrace property in the West Hill Conservation Area, and planning permission was sought retrospectively for the installation of UPVC windows. The main issues related to the impact of the windows on the street scene and the conservation area. There were other examples of UPVC windows in the street; however, these had no planning history, and the majority of windows in the area were of traditional style. Policy stated that timber windows should be protected as original features, and UPVC windows were unlikely to be permitted. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for refusal.

### **Public Speakers and Questions**

- (2) Mr Morse spoke in support of the application in his capacity as the applicant. He stated that Members who attended the site visit would have seen the quality of the windows, and noted that their height above the street made them indistinguishable from other timber framed windows. He stated that the majority of residents he had spoken to were not of the view that the windows were harmful to the street scene, and the differences were only visible on close inspection. Mr Morse stated it had not been his intention to 'flaunt' the restrictions of the conservation area, but he had not been aware of them.
- (3) In response to Councillor Jones it was stated by Mr Morse that he believed windows only had to replicate the style, and he had used the UPVC type for better heat efficiency in the flat.
- (4) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained by Mr Morse that he understood the property was located in a conservation area, but he had not understood the specific restrictions in relation to the windows. Mr Morse went on to explain that he had not sought advice in relation to the windows and he had been assured they were acceptable by his builder.

### **Questions for Officers**

- (5) In response to Councillor Hyde it was explained that double glazed timber sash windows could provide similarly levels of heat efficiency to the UPVC ones.
- (6) In response to Councillor Gilbey it was explained that there could be some instances where UPVC windows could be acceptable, such as on more modern buildings, but they were not usually acceptable on this type of traditional property.
- (7) In response to Councillor Davey it was clarified that that the area had been designated as a conservation area in 1977 and extended in 1989 and 1995; the property also did not have permitted development rights to change the windows as it was a flat and the article 4 direction specifically targeted window alterations. It was also noted that the adopted policy and guidance contained in SPD9 Architectural Features had been through consultation and a decision to allow the windows would be contrary to the policy.

**Debate and Decision Making Process**

- (8) Councillor Wells stated that he had not noticed the difference with the windows when he attended the site visit, and there were other examples in the street of which were not harmful; with this in mind he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (9) Councillor Hyde noted that the other similar alterations in the street were not permitted, and the article 4 was in place to protect the heritage of the area. If the Committee were minded to approve the application then they could risk setting a precedent. She added it was important the Committee adhere to policy otherwise they ran the risk of undermining it. She concluded that she would support the Officer recommendation.
- (10) Councillor C. Theobald stated that she agreed with Councillor Hyde and felt that the original features should be protected in line with policy; any contrary decision would send the wrong message, and for these reasons she would support the Officer recommendation.
- (11) Councillor Gilbey added that the difference with the UPVC windows was distinguishable and out of keeping.
- (12) Councillor Jones noted that he sympathised with the applicant, but that policy was clear on the matter.
- (13) Councillor Davey stated that the policy had been in place for some time, and stated that he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (14) Councillor Littman added that he sympathised with the applicant, and noted that the other examples on the street did not have proper planning permission or history.
- (15) Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the purpose of the conservation area was to preserve, and it was important the Committee defend the policy; with this in mind he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (16) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission was carried on a vote of 8 in favour with 2 against and 1 abstention.

141.2 **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 **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason set out below:

Reasons for Refusal:

- i. The UPVC windows, by virtue of their form and material finish incorporating the loss of original timber sash windows, represent a harmful alteration to the character and appearance of the building, terrace and wider Conservation Area, contrary to policies QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and the guidance in SPD09 & SPD12.

Informatives:

- ii. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

**Note:** Councillor Duncan was not present at the meeting.

**C. BH2013/03774 - Portslade Town Hall, Victoria Road, Portslade - Council Development** - Alterations including ramped access to East, West and South elevations, two storey extension enclosing new staircase to South elevation, change of use of first floor living accommodation to open-plan office.

- (1) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The application site related to Portslade Town Hall which was a large 'T' shaped building that also contained the Victoria Road Housing Office on the same site. The application was for access to the second storey open-plan office, and ramped access for disabled users. The main considerations were in relation to the principle of the loss of the single residential unit; the appearance and the transport impact. Whilst policy sought to protect residential accommodation the residential unit was at the first floor of the property and had no independent access; the unit had only previously been used for the caretaker and it was no longer considered practical to retain it in a commercial property. The main hall would be retained and the housing office would be moved into the building. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

**Debate and Decision Making Process**

- (2) Councillor Hamilton noted that he had previously objected to the scheme, but since then his reasons for objection had been addressed, and he was of an open mind in relation to the application.
- (3) Councillor Gilbey noted that the loss of parking had been of concern to all the Ward Councillors in the Portslade area.
- (4) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to approve permission carried on a vote a 10 in support with 1 abstention.

- 141.3 **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 at the meeting.

**D. BH2013/03702 - 17 Hill Drive, Hove - Full Planning** - Erection of 4no bedroom house with garage to replace existing bungalow.

- (1) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The application site related to a detached bungalow, and it was noted that permission had been refused in August 2013 for a detached dwelling for reasons relating to design and scale. Permission was sought for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the creation of a new house. The new house would be flat roofed with a garage at the lower ground floor and living accommodation across the ground and first floors. The main considerations related to the impact of the proposed development on the street scene and adjoining occupiers and transport and sustainability matters. The setting was not so sensitive as to prevent a contemporary design, but the provision of the flat roof against the predominant pitched roofs in the area upset the rhythm in the street. The design relied on fenestration and would give undue prominence to the property – unlike the rest of the area – creating an overbearing and visually intrusive design. The development was also considered to have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for refusal.

**Public Speakers and Questions**

- (2) Mr Phillips spoke in support of the applicant in his capacity as the architect. He stated that the planning report was generally positive and was well considered. Most of the reasons for refusal related to architectural design, and Mr Phillips added that there was no longer an Architect's Panel to advise the Council. Where developments sought to be more energy efficient this could often be best achieved through a flat roof. It was considered a flat roof design 'looked to the future' and the Committee were invited to approve the application as good architecture.
- (3) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained by Mr Phillips that the scheme largely followed the footprint of the existing property and no part of the two storey house was above the garage.
- (4) Mr Phillips confirmed for Councillor Carden that the normal life expectancy of a flat roof was at least 20 years.
- (5) In response to Councillor Hyde it was explained by Mr Phillips that flat roofs increased the potential photovoltaic panel coverage.

**Questions for Officers**

- (6) In response to Councillor Gilbey it was clarified that the predominant character of the area was pitched roofs.
- (7) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained that the footprint projected back further at the rear, and the additional storey increased the bulk which contributed to the reasons for refusal.



**Debate and Decision Making Process**

- (8) Councillor C. Theobald stated that the reasons for refusal related to scale and dominance, and the sense of enclosure at the rear; for these reasons she would support the Officer recommendation.
- (9) Councillor Hyde added that the proposed development had no characteristics of the surrounding architectural features, and would be overbearing in relation to the prominent location of the site on the junction. She felt the flat roof would be harmful to the character of the area, and the impact on the neighbouring properties was hard to overcome.
- (10) Councillor Mac MacCafferty stated that he had no problem with the design, but appreciated matters in relation to the character of the area.
- (11) Councillor Davey stated that he was minded to support the scheme as it had some merits.
- (12) Councillor Gilbey expressed her concern with the flat roof and the scale and bulk; she added that it failed to contribute positively to the character of the area.
- (13) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse permission was carried on a vote of 6 in favour, with 3 against and 2 abstentions.

141.4 **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 **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason set out below:

Reasons for Refusal:

- i. The development by reason of its design, scale and detailing would appear unduly dominant and create a contrast and sense of bulk which, in relation to adjoining properties and the wider surrounding area, would harm the existing character and appearance of Hill Drive. The development therefore fails to respond sufficiently to the character and appearance of the existing built environment, and is contrary to policies QD1 and QD2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- ii. The development by virtue of the bulk and form projecting significantly to the rear curtilage of the property would be visually intrusive and cause an increased sense of enclosure for occupiers of no.19 Hill Drive and is contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Informatives:

- i. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

**Note:** Councillor Duncan was not present at the meeting.

**E. BH2013/03477 - 15 Eaton Place, Brighton - Listed Building Consent** - External alterations including installation of metal staircase with glass balustrading and metal handrail, replacement of timber casement window with door at first floor level to the rear.

- (1) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings in relation to BH2013/03477 for listed building consent and BH2013/03478 for householder planning permission and stated that the application property was divided into a flat and maisonette and was Grade II listed. Permission was sought for the installation of an external staircase and the replacement of a window with a door for access. The main considerations related to the character of the listed building and the impact on neighbour amenity and the wider conservation area. Two previous applications had been refused for similar schemes; both for reasons relating to the appropriateness of the scheme and the harm to the character of the listed building. The applicant had sought to address these reasons for refusal; whilst the relocation of the steps would retain the rear elevations there would still be an adverse impact on the listed building and conservation area and the staircase would reduce the basement flat amenity and be unneighbourly and overbearing. For the reasons set out in the report the application was recommended for refusal.

#### **Public Speakers and Questions**

- (2) Councillor Mitchell spoke in support of the application in her capacity as the local Ward Councillor; she stated that the application sought to allow the applicant access their rear garden. The applicant had carefully considered the reasons for refusal and sought to sensitively design the staircase; during the application process 14 neighbours had been consulted and none had raised objections, and it was felt the objection from the Heritage Team was in relation to the principle of the staircase. It was hoped that some flexibility could be exercised to give access to the garden.
- (3) In response to Councillor Hamilton it was confirmed by Councillor Mitchell that the balcony was obscured from most of the neighbours, and was only visible from one other rear garden.
- (4) It was confirmed by Councillor Mitchell in response to Councillor Carden that the main access to the building was from the front and the staircase was not intended as a fire escape.
- (5) Mr Lipton spoke in support of the application in his capacity as the applicant; he stated that that he had lived in the property since 1971 and he owned both the maisonette and the flat – renting out the latter. Currently the rear garden was only accessible through the ground floor flat, and this was now the third attempt on their part to gain access to the garden from their home. The staircase would be fully reversible and only visible from two other back gardens. It was felt that the outlook from the basement was unchanged by the application and the glass balustrades sought to mitigate this. The applicant had taken efforts to preserve the original character of the house and prevent

it being further subdivided into flats; currently they were being denied access to their rear garden.

- (6) In response to Councillor Hamilton it was confirmed by Mr Lipton that the garden could only be accessed through the ground floor flat.
- (7) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained by Mr Lipton that the ground floor had only recently been let out and there had been periodic access to the garden since they had purchased the property.

**Questions for Officers**

- (8) In response to Councillor Hamilton it was explained that there had been an application for a basement extension in 2008 and 2009, but it was not known if this included the glazed roof that would be overlooked. In relation to the glass roof it was also confirmed for Councillor Gilbey that there would be inter looking created from it and the staircase.
- (9) In response to Councillor Jones it was stated that Officers could not say for certain under what circumstances an application for access to the rear garden could be acceptable, but it seemed unlikely this type of scheme could be achieved given the planning history.
- (10) In response to Councillor Gilbey it was explained that the removal of the original masonry to create the new door would be contrary to the guidance contained in SPD09.

**Debates and Decision Making Process**

- (11) Councillor Wells stated that he did not object to the application, and he did not feel it was incongruous, and could only be viewed from one other property; for these reasons he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (12) Councillor Hyde stated that she understood the applicant's desire to access their garden, but she agreed with the comments raised by the Heritage Officer, and had concern in relation to the overlooking into basement flat; with all this in mind she would support the Officer recommendation.
- (13) Councillor Hamilton noted that he was less concerned as the application related to the rear of the building, and he did not feel it would cause harm or was unsightly. For these reasons he would not support the Officer recommendation.
- (14) Councillor Mac Cafferty noted that he agreed with Councillor Hyde, and noted that whilst there were other examples these did not have planning history; he added that the Committee should not be considering the harm that had already been caused elsewhere but the harm that this specific application would cause.
- (15) Mr Gowans noted that the application had not been considered by the CAG, but drew the Committee's attention to the listing as the key issue.

(16) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse consent was carried on a vote of 8 in favour and 3 against.

141.5 **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 **REFUSE** listed building consent for the reasons set out below:

Reason for Refusal

- i. The proposal, by reason of design, scale and detailing would constitute an incongruous and uncharacteristic element to the rear, resulting in a detrimental impact to the character and appearance to the listed building and the wider listed terrace. The proposal is contrary to policy HE1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Informatives:

- i. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

**Note:** Councillor Duncan was not present during the meeting.

**142. BH2013/03478 - 15 EATON PLACE, BRIGHTON - HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING CONSENT** - Installation of metal staircase with glass balustrading and metal handrail, replacement of timber casement window with door at first floor level to the rear.

(1) The application was presented and considered with Item E.

(2) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation to refuse was carried on a vote of 8 in support and 3 against.

141.6 **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 **REFUSE** planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

- i. The proposal, by reason of design, scale and detailing would constitute an incongruous and uncharacteristic element to the rear, resulting in a detrimental impact to the character and appearance to the listed building and the wider East Cliff Conservation Area. The proposal is contrary to policies, QD14, HE1, and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- ii. The proposal, by reason of its siting, design and scale would result in an unacceptably overbearing impact, a sense of enclosure and a loss of outlook to the rear of the ground and basement floor flat, 15A Eaton Place. As such the proposal is contrary to policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (SPD012).

Informatives:

- i. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

**Note:** Councillor Duncan was not present at the meeting.

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

- 143.1 There were further applications recommended to be the subject of site visits.

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

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

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

- 145.1 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.]

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

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

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

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

**148. APPEAL DECISIONS**

148.1 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 3.58pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of