

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

1 SEPTEMBER 2004

2.00PM

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Carden (Chair); Councillors Mrs Cobb, Forester, Hamilton, Hyde, Mallender, K Norman, Pennington (Deputy Chair), Smith, Tonks, Watkins and Wells.

Co-opted Members: Mrs J Turner, Disabled Access Advisory Group (DAAG); Mr J Small, Conservation Advisory Group

PART ONE

52. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

52A. Declarations of Substitutes

52.1	<u>Councillor</u>	<u>For Councillor</u>
	Mrs Cobb	Older
	Mallender	Paskins
	Smith	Mrs C Theobald

52B. Declarations of Interest

52.2 Councillor Tonks declared a personal interest in Applications BH2004/00657/LB & BH2004/00656/FP, The Lodges, Marine Parade/Madeira Drive, as he knew one of the applicants.

52.3 Councillor Mallender declared a prejudicial interest in Application BH2004/01819/FP, 2a Osborne Road, Brighton, as he had spoken against the application as ward councillor at the last meeting. He would leave the room during consideration of the application and would take no part in the discussion or voting.

52.4 Councillor Smith declared a personal interest in Application BH2004/01696/FP, Land adj. 198 Warren Road, as his sister's home backed on to the property.

52.5 Councillor Forester declared a personal interest in Application BH2004/01688/FP, Watts Building, University of Brighton, Lewes Road, as she was employed by the University of Brighton.

52.6 Councillor Carden (the Chair) declared a prejudicial interest in Application BH2004/02100/FP, Acorn Nursery, The Rise, Portslade by virtue of his position on the Board of Governors of Portslade Community College, stating that he would vacate the Chair, would leave the meeting during consideration of the application and would take no part in the discussion or voting. Councillor Pennington would take the Chair during consideration of this item.

52.7 Councillor Carden further declared a personal interest in Application BH2004/01946/AD, Age Concern, 29-31 Prestonville Road, Brighton, as he was a committee member of Age Concern.

52.8 Councillor Pennington declared an interest in Applications BH2004/00657/LB & BH200400656/FP, The Lodges, Marine Parade/Madeira Drive.

52C. Exclusion of Press and Public

52.9 The Sub-Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Section 100A(3) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972.

52.10 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item appearing on the agenda.

53. MINUTES

53.1 **RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 August 2004 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

54. TO RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS FROM WARD COUNCILLORS

54.1 The Sub-Committee received a petition from Councillor Taylor relating to Application BH2004/02302/AD, Community Base, 113 Queens Road, Brighton, in the following terms:-

"We the undersigned, who live or work in the Queens Road area of Brighton, believe that Brighton & Hove City Council should allow Community Base to display advertising on its North Wall. We believe such advertising is entirely in keeping with the feel of the area and improves the look of the area rather than degrades it.

We are particularly concerned that Brighton & Hove City Council is displaying and charging for commercial advertising along the length of Queens Road while potentially denying this local charity the right to do the same on its own premises."

(208) signatures

54.2 **RESOLVED** - That the contents of the petition be received and noted. It was agreed that the contents of the petition could be referred to when considering the application.

55. ACORN NURSERY, THE RISE, PORTSLADE, PLANNING APPLICATION BH2004/02100/FP

55.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment detailing amendments to the proposed conditions to the Planning Permission in respect of the Acorn Nursery (for copy see minute book).

55.2 **RESOLVED** - That the proposed amendments be agreed.

[**Note:** Councillor Carden vacated the Chair, and left the room during consideration of the application. Councillor Pennington chaired the meeting during consideration of this item.]

56. UPDATE ON DECISIONS DELEGATED TO OFFICERS AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS

56.1 The Development Control Manager reported that further to minute 48.15, relating to Application BH2004/01503/FP, 27 and 27a Sackville Road, Hove, the case officer had written to the applicant and applicant's agent to see if an agreement had been reached which would satisfy the neighbours. She had not yet had a reply, and the Sub-Committee would be kept informed of the situation.

56.2 The Development Control Manager informed the Sub-Committee that further to minute 48.62, relating to Application BH2004/01780/FP, Dragons Health Club, officers were still waiting for clarification of outstanding issues. The application would be considered at a future meeting.

56.3 With regard to minute 48.78, relating to Application BH2004/01693/OA, Reservoir Site, Freshfield Road/Pankhurst Avenue, Brighton, the Development Control Manager advised that she would be having a meeting with the applicant and agent and representatives of Southern Water Authority on 2 September.

56.4 Councillor Hyde requested information on the progress of the Characterisation Study. The Development Control Manager undertook to arrange for a written reply.

56.5 Members were informed that a seminar on design had been held on 31 August 2004. The next seminar in the series would be held on 21 September 2004 at 4.00 p.m. when Professor Andrew Miller would give a talk on Sustainable Design and Construction.

56.6 **RESOLVED** – That the position be noted.

57. TO CONSIDER THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

57.1 **RESOLVED** - That the following implemented site visits be undertaken by the Sub-Committee:-

57.2 The Development Control Manager suggested that there should be an implemented site visit at the new house on the corner of Vere Road and Ditchling Road.

57.3 Janet Turner requested an implemented site visit to the new flats in the Lewes Road, near Coombe Road. It was however agreed that the issues she raised would be better addressed by a separate meeting between Mrs Turner and the developer and officers undertook to make the necessary arrangements.

[**Note:** Item 59 sets out the full list of future site visits.]

58. PLANS LIST APPLICATIONS, 1 SEPTEMBER 2004 (SEE MINUTE BOOK)

(i) SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROVERSIAL APPLICATIONS OR APPLICATIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL POLICY

Application BH2004/01717/FP, 2 College Mews, Brighton

58.1 This application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting.

58.2 Miss Bridges spoke as an objector to the application. She informed the Sub-Committee that the proposal would lead to loss of daylight in her garden and the back rooms of her house. It would further lead to a

reduced outlook and sense of enclosure. She believed the proposed extension to be an overbearing development.

58.3 Mr J Wigham addressed the sub-committee on behalf of the applicant. He informed the meeting that there was a right of access to 1B, College Gardens. Great attention had been paid to overlooking. The loss of view was of a private rear yard belonging to the applicant. There would be no loss of light in the scheme and the use of slate would echo the use of slate in the courtyard. There would be no change of use. Mr Wigham confirmed that the upper part of the roof light could be opened.

58.4 Councillor Hyde informed the meeting that although she had considered the application acceptable at the site visit, she had been concerned when she had visited 1B College Gardens. There was a sense of oppression and enclosure. There would be a great loss of amenity space on the applicant's site and the neighbour would be affected. The proposal was overbearing for the neighbour.

58.5 Councillor Forester considered that as 1B College Gardens was a double fronted, double sided house, it would reduce the impact of the loss of outlook from the rear. She did not think the proposal would be detrimental to the objector's property. She suggested that the high wall be painted white to cause reflected light and that the slate should match existing slate.

58.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Sub-Committee is minded to grant Planning Permission subject to officers negotiating further revisions to extend the areas of white-painted wall and reduce that of the slate.

Application BH2004/01688/FP, Watts Bank, University of Brighton, Lewes Road, Brighton

58.7 Mrs J Turner expressed concern that there were only six units for disabled students.

58.8 Councillor Cobb expressed concern at the design of the building and that the disabled students were placed on different floors. Councillor Wells and Mrs Turner also questioned why these units were not on the ground floor.

58.9 Councillor Mallender was disappointed that there was no cycle connection through to the Preston Barracks and the Railway station. He was further concerned at the use of UPVC windows.

58.10 Councillor Watkins felt the application was a vast improvement from the previous submission but considered it a great shame that the building had not been extended over the car park.

58.11 Councillor Hyde also considered that the accommodation should have been built over the car park. She was concerned at the impact of the proposal on the Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI). Councillor K Norman concurred and stated that wildlife area should be left totally intact. He and Councillor Smith raised concern over the appearance of the aluminium curved roof.

58.12 Mr Small was concerned that the application made no mention of materials and that the drawings gave a very frail idea of what the development would look really look like.

58.13 The Development Control Officer reported that planning officers had suggested that the development be built over the car park. The applicant had chosen not to, as they did not consider this to be an economical option. The officer's recommendation was that the application was acceptable. The Architects Panel had discussed the design of the building and had raised no objections. Curved roofs generally required less maintenance than flat roofs. There would be six specially designed study bedrooms for students with different disabilities. These bedrooms were placed on separate floors in order to ensure disabled students' full integration into student life. Officers had fully considered the wildlife issues and the Council's ecologist was satisfied with the scheme, subject to the proposed S106 obligation. The pedestrian/cycle link had been discussed with the applicants who had been reluctant to provide this link as they were concerned that it would compromise security at the site.

58.14 Mr Mallinder from the University of Brighton was permitted to speak in support of the application and answer questions. He confirmed that the curved roofs would have a blue or grey non-reflective finish, which could be controlled by condition. The elevations would be cedar clad in part and that there were some flat roofed areas that would be sedum. The development costs of building over the car park would be £800,000, which would increase rents by £7 to £8 a week.

58.15 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused by the Council on the grounds that the proposal lies within a proposed Site of Nature Conservation Importance and will adversely affect the nature conservation features. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal cannot be located elsewhere without adverse effect on nature conservation. Therefore the proposal does not satisfy the tests set by policy NC4 in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft.

[**Note 1** : On a vote of 6 to 5 with 1 abstention the application was refused].

[**Note 2** : Councillor Hyde proposed that the application be refused on the grounds set out above. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Cobb. On a recorded vote Councillors Cobb, Hyde, Mallender, K Norman, Smith and Wells voted that the application be refused. Councillors Carden (Chair), Hamilton, Pennington, Tonks and Watkins voted that the application should be granted. Councillor Forester abstained. Therefore the application was refused].

[**Note 3**: Councillor Forester declared a personal interest in Application BH2004/01688/FP, Watts Building, University of Brighton, Lewes Road, as she was employed by the University of Brighton.]

Application BH2004/00657/LB, The Lodges, Marine Parade/Madeira Drive, Brighton

58.16 This application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting.

58.17 Councillor Hyde made reference to the neighbours concerns over vehicular access and security. They were concerned that the parking of vehicles on the open areas adjacent to the lodges would result in damage to the character of these listed buildings and this part of the conservation area and requested a condition to prevent this, should permission be granted.

58.18 The Development Control Manager reported that as the areas adjacent to the Lodges were not included on the application site it would not be legally possible to impose such a condition.

58.19 Councillor Mallender suggested a further condition that there should be a further condition to ensure the retention of a painted sign in the tunnel.

58.20 **RESOLVED** – That listed building consent be granted by the Council subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and contained in the late representations list, and to a further condition to ensure the retention of a painted sign in the tunnel.

[**Note 1**: Councillor Tonks declared a personal interest in this application, as he knew one of the applicants.]

[**Note 2**: Councillor Pennington declared an interest in this application.]

Application BH2004/00656/FP, The Lodges, Marine Parade/Madeira Drive, Brighton

58.21 This application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting.

58.22 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and contained in the late representations list.

[**Note 1:** Councillor Tonks declared a personal interest in this application, as he knew one of the applicants.]

[**Note 2:** Councillor Pennington declared an interest in this application.]

Application BH2004/01819/FP, 2a Osborne Road, Brighton

58.23 This application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting.

58.24 Councillor Forester informed the meeting that she considered the application to be an ingenious response to a need. She considered that the shape and configuration of the windows would have a minimal impact on the houses in Preston Drove.

58.25 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

[**Note:** Having declared a prejudicial interest in the above application Councillor Mallender left the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting.]

Application BH2004/01573/OA, Varndean Sixth Form College

58.26 Mr Sharp spoke as an objector to the proposal. He was concerned that the proposal was linked to the Special Needs Unit, without which Varndean Sixth Form College would not secure funding. His primary objection related to the loss of open space. Meanwhile, the council had not carried out an open space survey. Mr Sharp was worried that if the council granted this application it would lead to further piecemeal development.

58.27 Mr A Jenkins, Principal of Varndean Sixth Form College spoke in support of the application. He stated that both the Special Needs Unit and this application would add to the quality of education in the city. The application would address the level of overcrowding and allow a limited degree of expansion. There would be improved specialist facilities and indoor sports facilities and existing temporary buildings could be removed. None of the existing pitches would be affected.

58.28 Councillor Smith supported the outline application, but was concerned that there had been no mention of a contribution towards sport and recreation.

58.29 Councillor Tonks supported the application, which was the solution to great educational needs. The College was highly regarded and the loss of space was minimal. Councillor Mallender agreed and was pleased that the college would have sports facilities with community use.

58.30 Councillor Hyde considered it to be an excellent application and supported Councillor Smith's comments, as did Councillor Pennington. The Chair and Councillor Forester also supported the scheme.

58.31 **RESOLVED** – That the Sub-Committee is minded to grant Planning Permission subject to a S106 Planning Obligation to secure the implementation of a Travel Plan for Varndean College and the Special Needs Centre, a contribution towards mitigation for parking problems within surrounding streets and a contribution towards public art and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and in the late representations list.

Application BH2004/01708/FP, 9 & 11 The Upper Drive, Hove

58.32 Mr Taylor spoke as an objector to the scheme. He considered that the only alteration to the application was to the block opposite number 13. He believed the design to be out of keeping and would ruin the character of the road. The proposal would affect No 13 who which would have an outlook of two blank walls. The children of this property would be affected by the noise from the vehicles.

58.33 Mr L Russell spoke on behalf of the applicant. He informed the Sub-Committee that the Architects Panel had supported the scheme. The proposal complied with sustainability considerations and there were a high number of affordable units. The apartments were close to public transport and were designed using high quality materials. They would be positioned to avoid overlooking.

58.34 Councillor Giebeler spoke as Ward Councillor to object to the proposal. She considered that the proposal was not very different to the refused application at the 13 April meeting of the Sub-Committee. She considered the application to be overdevelopment. No 13 still looked on to a concrete wall. This was a Human Rights issue as it would affect a disabled child. She was concerned that the doctor's surgeries were full

and schools oversubscribed. Meanwhile a characterisation study was still not completed.

58.35 The Council Lawyer advised that under the Humans Rights legislation, it should be a consideration that the occupants of No 13 had sensitive children living in the property. However, this should be weighed against the advantages of the scheme.

58.36 Councillor Tonks supported the scheme and was pleased that 16 of the 41 flats would be affordable housing.

58.37 Councillor Hyde objected to the scheme and stressed that the loss of family homes was against council policy. The proposal was out of character with the surrounding properties.

58.38 Councillor Forester stressed that the houses were not listed or in a conservation area. She did not consider the houses to be of any merit and the proposal was reasonable. However, she requested the retention of the attractive wall along the frontage. She was informed by the Planning Officer that a front boundary wall featured on the plans and would be covered by a condition.

58.39 Councillor Smith was concerned that there was mention of Percent for Art rather than Percent of Sport.

58.40 The Development Control Manager undertook to report to the next meeting on the issue of contributions for sport and recreation and progress on the Urban Characterisation Study. She informed the Sub-Committee that Percent for Art was a long established policy. Developer contributions for sport and recreation was a more recent matter and the policy and guidance was not yet in place. Councillor Hamilton reported that he would request that Percent for Sport is implemented at the Overview and Scrutiny Organisational Committee on 13 September 2004.

58.41 **RESOLVED** – That the Sub-Committee is minded to grant Planning Permission subject to a S106 Planning Obligation to secure the provision of 16 units of affordable housing, contributions to Percent for Art and sustainable transport initiatives and to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

(ii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS DATED 1 SEPTEMBER 2004

58.42 The recommendations of the Director of Environment were agreed with the exception of those reports in parts (iii) and (iv) below and items deferred for the site visits as set out in the agenda below and following the Plans List.

(iii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS WHICH VARY FROM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AS SET OUT IN THE PLANS LIST (MINOR) APPLICATIONS) DATED 11 AUGUST 2004

Application BH2004/02220/FP, 96 Longhill Road

58.43 Professor P Lister spoke as an objector to the application. His concerns related to the size and bulk of the proposed dormer which would overlook his garden and rear rooms, and those of his neighbours. The property also had seven large velux style windows which had a significant effect on his privacy. Professor Lister requested no windows on the rear elevation at top floor level. He further requested a site visit to assess the impact on his and his neighbour's properties.

58.44 The applicant, Mr P James spoke in support of the application, stating that the dormer had obscured glass and was not as large as had been stated in objections. Mr James had carried out the work before receiving planning permission as he had received complaints about the scaffolding and wanted to remove it as soon as possible.

58.45 Councillor Smith reported that the neighbours required clarity about the application. The two velux windows at the back of the property were not included in the drawing and should be deleted.

58.46 **RESOLVED** - That consideration of the above application be deferred pending a site visit prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Sub-Committee.

Application BH2004/01973/FP, R/o 128 Kings Road

58.47 Councillor Smith asked for clarification about the relationship of this application to the proposal for the main house. The Development Control Manager explained that planning permission had been granted for the building on the front unit. She believed that the work was out to tender.

58.48 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report, and that should the ownership of the mews be the same as the main house to the front, there should be the a condition that this scheme shall not be implemented or occupied until planning permission for the main house has been implemented.

Application BH2004/02302/AD, Community Base, 113 Queens Road

58.49 The Planning Officer set out the reasons for the Council's recommendation to refuse planning permission. A further reason for refusal

and an addition to informative no.2 and amendment to Section 6 Planning Policies were set out in the late representations list.

58.50 Mr Chalmers spoke in support of the application. He stressed that Community Base were trying to improve a bleak wall by having advertising that reflected their charitable nature. The proposal had local support and would fit in with the character of the area. At present, the grey wall was not sympathetic to the adjacent conservation areas. The illumination would only be turned on in the early evening and Mr Chalmers was willing to compromise on that issue. There would be stringent health and safety requirements when the banner sign was erected.

58.51 Councillor Williams spoke as a local Ward Councillor, in support of the application. He considered that a large colourful advert would enhance the street. The local community associations had no objections and he considered that the traffic and road safety arguments were mistaken. He strongly urged the Sub-Committee to accept the application and suggested a condition stating that permission only be granted subject to Community Base occupying the building.

58.52 Councillors Mallender, Wells, Hyde and K Norman all concurred and considered that the wall was an appropriate site for such an advertisement.

58.53 Councillor Forester considered the proposed site was in a sensitive area and she supported the officers' recommendation to refuse the application.

58.54 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the Council subject to standard advertising conditions and to the following conditions:-

- (i) That the consent is for no more than three months in any calendar year.
- (ii) That there shall be no illumination after 10.00 p.m. or before 7.00 a.m. in the morning.
- (iii) That if appropriate, planning permission be subject to a personal consent for a five year period.

[**Note 1** : On a vote of 9 to 2 with 1 abstention the application was granted].

[**Note 2**: Councillor Pennington proposed that the application be granted on the grounds set out above. This was seconded by Councillor Mallender. On a recorded vote Councillors Cobb, Hyde, Mallender, K Norman, Pennington, Smith, Tonks, Watkins and Wells voted that the application be

granted. Councillors Carden (Chair) and Forester voted that the application should be refused. Councillor Hamilton abstained. Therefore the application was granted].

[**Note 3:** The Sub-Committee had received and noted a petition supporting this application under minute 54.2]

Application BH2004/02283/TA, SE Corner of Dyke Road Avenue & Tongdean Lane

58.55 Councillor Pennington informed the Sub-Committee that he supported the application. He considered that the health risks were not as high as had been suggested and had been covered by the certificate submitted by the applicant stating that the proposal would meet the International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines.

58.56 Councillor Tonks considered that the neighbour's concerns were valid. Councillor Mallender suggested that the application be refused on the same grounds as the previous application.

58.57 **RESOLVED** - That prior approval for removal of existing 12.5 metre slimline monopole and installation of 12.5 metre slimline monopole with 3 antennas and equipment cabinet is required and be refused on the grounds that the proposed monopole would not only be unsightly and located in an area with a large number of masts in the near vicinity, but by virtue of its height be visibly obtrusive in the surrounding area, contrary to policies Env.1 and ENV26 of the Brighton Borough Local Plan and QD23 of the Brighton & Hove Local Deposit Plan Second Draft.

[**Note 1 :** Councillor Tonks proposed that prior approval is required and should be refused. This was seconded by Councillor Smith? On a vote Councillors Mrs Cobb, Hyde, Mallender, K Norman, Smith, Tonks, Watkins and Wells voted that prior approval was required and that the application should be refused. Councillors Carden (Chair), Forester, Hamilton and Pennington (Deputy Chair) voted that prior approval was not required. On a vote of 8 to 4 it was determined that prior approval is required and be refused].

(iv) OTHER APPLICATIONS

Application BH2004/00890/FP, Old Mill Works, 45 Highcroft Villas

58.58 Some concern was expressed about the loss of an industrial site. The Planning Officer confirmed that the plot was not designated in the Local Plan for industrial use. He further confirmed that cycle parking was included in the conditions.

58.59 **RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee is minded to grant Planning Permission subject to a S106 Planning Obligation to secure three affordable residential units within the site and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

Application BH2004/01874/FP, 13 York Villas

58.60 Mrs Boseley spoke as an objector to the scheme. Her concerns related to the light reflection off the side wall and an increase of shadow in her garden. The height of the solid windowless wall would dominate the garden and not be pleasant to look at.

58.61 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

Application BH2004/01792/OA, Rear of 10 Hove Park Road

58.62 Mr A Smith spoke as an objector to the scheme. He stated that he was objecting on legal grounds as all the properties in Radinden Road were governed by a covenant stating that no building or erection should be placed on the land without the permission of the Stanford Estate. The Sub-Committee report stated that Radinden Road was an adopted road. Mr Smith had proof that it was not an adopted road. Other objections related to the size of the house and plot, which were not in keeping with the road. Mr Smith was also concerned that the proposal could set a precedent.

58.63 The Council Lawyer explained that any covenants were a private matter and were not relevant to planning concerns.

58.64 Mr D Barling spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He stated that there had been numerous precedents for similar sites. The residents had been misdirected by concerns not relevant to planning. The house was a modest size and was not unreasonable.

58.65 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

(v) TREES

DECISIONS

58.66 **RESOLVED** – (1) That permission to fell the trees which are subject to the following applications be refused for the reasons set out in the report:

BH2004/02428/TPO/F – Stamford Lodge, Cumberland Road, Brighton
BH2004/02214/TPO/F – The Plough, The Green, Rottingdean

(2) That a decision on Application BH2004/02513/TPO/F, 2 Colebrook Road, be deferred in order for a Arboricultural Officer to carry out a site visit with Councillor K Norman who considers that the tree is still alive.

DELEGATED

58.67 **RESOLVED** - That details of the applications determined by the Director of Environment under delegated powers be noted.

[**Note 1:** All decisions recorded in this minute are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the Planning Register maintained by the Director of Environment. The register complies with legislative requirements.]

[**Note 2:** A list of the representations, received by the Council after the Plans List reports had been submitted for printing was circulated to Members (for copy see minute book). Representations received less than 24 hours before the meeting were not considered in accordance with resolutions 129.7 and 129.8 set out in the minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2002.]

59. SITE VISITS

59.1 **RESOLVED** - That the following site visit be undertaken by the Sub-Committee prior to determining the applications:-

<u>APPLICATION</u>	<u>SITE</u>	<u>SUGGESTED BY</u>
BH2004/02220/FP	96 Longhill Road	Councillor Carden

Note: The Development Control Manager stated that subject to the following schemes being sufficiently complete for a visit to be appropriate she would endeavour to arrange a site to one or both of the following implemented sites prior to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee:-

New dwelling corner of Vere Road and Ditchling Road;

New flats in the former Endeavour Motor site, Preston Road.

60. PROGRESS ON CURRENT APPEALS

60.1 The Development Control Manager circulated a sheet giving details of forthcoming planning inquiries or appeal hearings.

61. APPEAL DECISIONS

61.1 The Sub-Committee noted letters from the Planning Inspectorate advising on the results of Planning Appeals, which had been lodged as set out in the agenda. Five of the seven appeals had been delegated decisions.

62. APPEALS LODGED

62.1 The Sub-Committee noted the list of Planning Appeals, which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

The meeting concluded at 6.07pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2004