

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 8 JUNE 2022

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Littman (Chair), Ebel (Deputy Chair), Childs (Opposition Spokesperson), Moonan, Shanks, C Theobald and Yates

Apologies: Councillors Barnett, Hills and Janio

Co-opted Members: James Forbes (Conservation Action Group)

Officers in attendance: Jane Moseley (Planning Manager), Don Anyiam (Highway Agreements Officer), Russel Brown (Principal Planning Officer), Joanne Doyle (Senior Planning Officer), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Robin Hodgetts (Principal Planning Officer), Andrew Renaut (Head of Transport Policy & Strategy), Emily Standbridge (Senior Planning Officer), Jack Summers (Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

1.1 There were none for this meeting.

b) Declarations of interests

1.2 Councillor Littman stated they had advised the applicant that Planning permission would be required, however, they remained of an open mind. Councillor Moonan stated they had received emails from residents regarding agenda items, however, they remained of an open mind. Councillor Shanks stated they had been contacted by residents regarding item C, however, they remained of an open mind.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

1.3 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.

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

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 Minutes of 25 May 2022 Planning committee to be circulated separately.

3 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 3.1 Welcome everyone to today's non-special meeting of Planning Committee. As you may know, we have had two special meetings over recent months, dealing with the outline application for the development at Toad's Hole Valley. I am pleased to be able to report that, following Committee's decision a fortnight ago to grant the duplicate application, the developers have withdrawn their appeal for non-determination of the original application, meaning the public inquiry, which was due to start tomorrow, has been cancelled.

Although a significant step forward has been taken on this project, there are likely to be many more to come. We can now look forward to receiving one or more detailed applications, and, perhaps, further variations to the outline application.

I was asked at the last ordinary meeting by Councillor Moonan and Councillor Shanks in regard to policy on affordable housing, in particularly in relation to Brighton and Hove City Council taking on affordable housing where other registered providers were not prepared to do so, and item A relates to this, which is why it was asked to be put back from last time. I have received a message stating that a review has been undertaken by the cross party Housing Supply Board and they have identified the need to increase the housing supply as a high priority over the coming months. A review of the business plan and criteria and financial modelling for achieving additional council housing was endorsed at the last Housing Member Supply Board and this in conjunction with strategic housing needs assessment will lead to a long term approach which could imbed a more buying of properties into the business plan. Fundamentally the co-chairs of TECC and Housing committee have been made aware of this committee's fervent desire for the council to be more pro-active in taking up smaller quantities of affordable housing on the sites coming to this committee and has been taken up with the Housing committee Members.

Other than that, this being the first meeting since Annual Council, I can announce a change to the Committee's makeup. As a result of Cllr Mary Mears' current ill-health, Cllr Bridget Fishleigh has decided to stand down from the Committee in order to concentrate on work on behalf of residents in the ward she shares with Cllr Mears. We wish Cllr Mears a speedy recovery and thank Cllr Fishleigh for her contribution to this committee over the last three years.

In line with proportionality rules, Cllr Fishleigh's seat has been given to the Green Group of Councillors, and I am delighted to announce that Cllr Elaine Hills will be joining us. Cllr Hills cannot be with us today, as she is still reorganising her weekly schedule to accommodate Wednesday afternoon meetings. Councillor Philips was to substitute however, they were not available.

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 4.1 There were none.

5 TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

5.1 There were none for this agenda.

6 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**A BH2021/00780 - Land at Junction of Foredown Road & Fox Way, Foredown Road, Portslade - Outline Application**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Yates was informed by the Planning Manager that the 10 to 14 units proposed attracts affordable housing. The case officer stated that between the previous committee on 4 May 2022 the Housing team had agreed to consider whether to purchase the affordable housing on site. The S106 will be changed to provide on-site affordable housing and if the housing is not supplied, the fallback is the commuted sum.
3. Councillor Theobald was informed that the development was policy compliant, that details of the development were to come, and the gardens would need to be appropriate in size, which could be ensured through the reserved matters applications
4. Councillor Yates was informed that a new planning application and S106 agreement would be required if the developer wished to increase the number of units on site to 15, with the resulting increase in affordable housing requirement.

Debate

5. Councillor Shanks stated they were happy with the changes but considered that the policy needs reviewing to reduce the number of units which trigger the affordable housing. The councillor supported the application.
6. Councillor Yates considered it good to have the affordable housing and supported the application.
7. Councillor Theobald considered the triangle of land to be too small, the commuted sum would not be acceptable as affordable housing would be better and the traffic at the junction would be an issue. The councillor did not support the application.
8. Councillor Childs stated they were pleased with the amended application, considered the traffic issues at the junction needed to be looked at by Highways, the city needs housing from small sites as well as others. The councillor supported the application.
9. Councillor Littman considered it was good to have a commuted sum as a fall back and noted the issues started when the Bentham Road application was refused as the affordable housing would have been provided on that site.

Vote

10. A vote was taken, and by 6 to 1 the committee agreed to Planning permission.
11. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out below and the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before the **24th August 2022** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 13.1 of the report.

B BH2022/00670 - 9 - 12 St Catherine's Terrace, Hove BN3 2RH - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.
2. The case officer informed the committee that no objections had been received from Sussex Police or Environmental Health. An additional condition had been added requiring that only people with a connection could be housed at the site.

Speakers

3. Ward Councillor Wilkinson addressed the committee and stated they supported local residents in objecting to the application which will have a substantial adverse effect on the community. The location was never salubrious, and the condition has got worse. Many residents avoid the site following anti-social incidents. A number of emergency calls to the site have been recorded. The councillor requested that the site was changed to a less impactful use. The current use was temporary on trial for two years and the application was retrospective. The councillor has received letters objecting to the site. The change from hotel to hostel has created issues and the harm outweighs the benefits. The councillor requested the committee refuse the application.
4. Dan Olney of St Mungo's addressed the committee and stated that the site was part of the 'no second night out' project and was a rapid assessment centre where rough sleepers were re-connected or found accommodation. Some 321 persons have been moved away from rough sleeping and given support to recover from issues. 45 beds are required with 24/7 staffing. St Mungo's moved into the site last October and have a management plan agreed by the Police. There have been no reports of anti-social behaviour to the police since, with patrols and robust warning procedures. Residents can be asked to leave, and it was noted that if the residents were not here, they would be in the city, with the associated anti-social behaviour issues. The group want to be good neighbours. St Mungo's are committed to ending rough sleeping. The committee were requested to support the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Ebel was informed by the case officer that the management plan prevents congregating outside the front of the building. Dan Olney stated there was a smoking area in the large garden to the rear of the property. Staff patrol outside and request residents to come inside if they are too noisy. The case officer confirmed that this was a retrospective application and prior to the application no formal planning controls were in place. The application is to regularise the use. The management plan is enforceable and if issues occur, the enforcement team can investigate. Dan Olney stated that nothing

was in place prior to St Mungo's taking over the site in October 2021 and stated that other sites have management plan and are self-monitoring with patrols and Police call outs recorded. The management plan is regularly reviewed, and more staff are deployed if needed. St Mungo's are happy to talk to the local community and respond to any issues immediately.

6. Councillor Shanks was informed by Dan Olney that the staff are very well trained and are able to cover all aspects of the rough sleepers, who are assessed within seventy two hours of arrival. Those without local connections are connected to the relevant social services teams elsewhere. The role of the site is to support and move on.
7. Councillor Moonan was informed by Dan Olney that data regarding the length of the longest stay could be supplied, and that some people stay longer than 42 days whilst awaiting accommodation or reconnecting. The team look at the challenges with partners and providers, and persons are only asked to leave if they are in breach of the licensing condition. It was stated there is a break clause with the landlord and the building will return to the council after 2023. St Mungo's took the building last year as there was a time pressure to find a location with tight timescales to move from a previous property. Only three rooms are below space standards to a small degree, which is acceptable as a percentage of accommodation.
8. Councillor Yates was informed by Dan Olney that the average stay was 67 days, St Mungo's wanted the best size of rooms available, and it was considered that as emergency accommodation these rooms were better than the streets. Residents will be moved to larger rooms when they become available, and if necessary, given their personal circumstances. Under the management plan the crime rate has decreased since October 2021 with regular patrols and risk assessments for all residents. The percentage of residents asked to leave due to anti-social behaviour is not known. There are no residents still in the hostel who there in October 2021.
9. Councillor Theobald was informed by Dan Olney that there 18 members of staff who cover nights as well as days, with 6 on site at any one time. The number of residents who are from Brighton and Hove is not known.
10. Councillor Childs was informed by Dan Olney that the hostel only takes single persons, and the size of the hostel was not unusual. If the planning application is refused, the applicant could appeal and it was noted that it was very difficult to find this type of accommodation, and this was the only building which came up in the area.
11. Councillor Moonan was informed by Dan Olney that St Mungo's had the right to refuse entry to visitors, access was controlled at all times, there is CCTV throughout the building, men and women are accepted and the building can be zoned for gender. Rooms are allocated by needs, with the majority being ensuite. No cooking is allowed in rooms as food is provided at breakfast and dinner.
12. Councillor Yates was informed by Dan Olney that to reduce costs lunch was not provided and it allowed residents a chance to be independent. It was noted that this is not uncommon. Microwaves and ovens are provided on site.

13. Councillor Childs was informed by Dan Olney that there was zero tolerance of drugs and regular checks are carried out. The case officer noted that the management plan was supported by the council and the Police.

Debate

14. Councillor Shanks supported the application and considered the site did very important work and was vital in the city. The councillor requested the committee support the application.
15. Councillor Yates supported the application and was happy for the try out at the hostel and noted the strong management plan which would cover any upcoming issues. This was the best use of the building.
16. Councillor Theobald considered the building to be lovely and this to be a good use. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Ebel noted that hotel was empty prior to use as a hostel. The councillor had some concerns and wanted the management plan to be followed. The councillor noted that St Mungo's was working with the community and supported the application.
18. Councillor Childs considered the work done by St Mungo's to be laudable. The councillor considered the scale may lead to issues and had some concerns. It was noted that the property is lovely and there is a dire need to house the homeless. A permanent use for social housing would be better. The councillor was against the application.
19. Councillor Moonan stated their knowledge of the building included breach of conditions over many years and noted the neighbours' frustrations, and as with other hostels in the area there have been significant challenges. The number of residents in the building is too many and the three small rooms are not appropriate, with the average stay too long. The solution at the end of the short term proposed is unclear. The councillor considered the building too big with not enough support and was against the application.
20. Councillor Littman understood the concerns and noted that it meets policy and helps the most vulnerable people in the city. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

21. A vote was taken, and by 5 to 2 the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
22. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

C BH2021/04390 - 28A Crescent Road, Brighton, BN2 3RP - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Dominic Furlong addressed the committee as an objector and stated that the development was meant to be car free. In breach of the parking condition, residents are able to get parking permits. 'Rat runs' usage in the area has increased. 29 objections have been submitted. The application fails to demonstrate lack of parking in the area with no on street survey required under policy. The appeal was dismissed in September 2019. The area is 97% full and any further parking would be detrimental to free flow of traffic.
3. Colm McKee addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that they welcomed the officer's positive report, and they did not consider the parking condition appropriate and refusing the application would be contrary to national policy. Other appeal decisions have been consistent with policy. The agent requested the committee support the application.
4. Gavin Stubbs addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that one permit would be issued per unit. The applicant stated they were a professional couple living at top of Round Hill and there was plenty of space in surrounding streets to park, otherwise it was a 15 minute walk to parking. The applicant considered young families would be forced out of the area and only wanted parity with other areas.
5. The Planning Manager informed the committee that even if the application was approved and the condition removed, the Traffic Regulation Order would still require amendment to allow parking permits to be issued to the applicant.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Shanks was informed by the case officer that the Highways/Parking and Planning systems were separate, and the parking database was operated by the Highways team. The 2017 application was to discharge the parking condition; however, the database was not updated to remove the property's entitlement to parking permits. Separating the application process will help to stop errors. The legal officer confirmed that Planning will not include a car free condition as it is dealt with through the Highways regulations. The Planning Manager confirmed that the if Highways request a development is car free, then this can still be required, but directly through the Parking Service, rather than requiring Planning to contact the Parking Service.
7. The Highway Agreements Officer stated that prior to now Planning could apply the car free condition. It is proposed that previously condition required developers to contact Highways and it was incumbent on developers to inform residents if the development is car free. Now an informative would be added, noting that planners would pass the details directly to the Parking team. It was noted that the application was before the committee as residents had applied for parking permits. The policy setting out the process to secure car-free developments will be going before Environment, Transport and Sustainability (ETS) committee.
8. Councillor Ebel was informed by the case officer that one parking permit had been issued.

9. Councillor Yates considered the situation as mess, policy states car free on grounds of advice from Highways, then don't act or update data base. Policy for planning is to mitigate traffic and parking stress. The councillor was informed by the Planning Manager that it was because of these issues that they were getting the process in place to streamline, and it was not all about parking stress but also air quality. One of the mitigating factors in allowing the development was the car free element so it was still relevant to planning.
10. Councillor Littman noted that across the country Planning Inspector decisions have changed to remove the requirement for car-free conditions.
11. Councillor Moonan was informed by the legal officer that case law showed that the car free condition was not appropriate.
12. Councillor Theobald was informed by the Planning Manager that the removal of the condition would not remove the prohibition of parking permits. It was not known if there was a car club in the area.
13. Councillor Shanks was informed by the Planning Manager that informative number 2 covered no parking permits at the development, with details to be passed to the Parking team.
14. Councillor Moonan was informed by the Highways Agreements Officer that residents are not able to appeal a parking permit refusal. It was noted that car free requirements are based on parking not traffic and Highways will indicate in reports whether a development should be car free or not.

Debate

15. Councillor Yates stated they supported the application and was pleased the policy would be going to ETS committee.
16. Councillor Theobald considered it was a shame there was no parking onsite and they did not like car free developments and the site was approved with no resident parking permits.
17. Councillor Shanks considered the development should be car free and stated they were against the application.

Vote

18. A vote was taken, and by 5 to 2 the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
19. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

D BH2021/02656 - 184 Saunders Hill, Brighton BN1 9ES - Full Planning

1. This application was not discussed at the meeting, as the council chamber was flooded and will be referred to the next Planning meeting.

E BH2021/04096 - Land to the West of 149 Ladies Mile Road, Brighton BN1 8TB - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor McNair addressed the committee and stated that there three reasons to object to the application. The developer states there would be no trees lost, this is not true. The eco systems have been lost. The proposed patios are not good enough nor is one parking space at each unit. Visitors will find it difficult to park. The neighbouring properties are low level bungalows or individual dwellings, and town houses don't fit the streetscene. The proposed properties will overlook the existing neighbours. Local residents would prefer two bungalows with more off street parking. The properties should have more space and better biodiversity.
3. Robert Miles addressed the committee as an objector and stated that trees have been lost through the destruction of the existing garden and habitat. If the proposals are agreed there will be more cars parked on the road, which is already congested with traffic. Drains and other local services will be affected. Other new builds have been in keeping with the locality; however, the proposals are not. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
4. Courtney Darby addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that trees had been removed when the applicant looked at the site, which was mostly covered with tarmac and other hard surfaces. The costs of returning to the previous eco system would be high. The biodiversity of the site will be enhanced by the wild flower roofs, planters and 8 to 10 new trees. The style of the area is mixed with the south side of the road being vary varied. The applicant has been working with officers and minor tweaks have been made.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Moonan was informed that the adjoining building ceased to be used as a school in 2020 and is now in use as a nursery and the existing external space was to be retained of approximately 950sqm, which will be accessible to public and nursery children. It was confirmed that the proposals met policy requirements and the open space is sufficient for the nursery school as required by Ofsted.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that the nursery space to be retained was 1,000sqm.
7. Councillor Yates was informed that there were no Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) on the site and no breach had occurred when the trees were removed. The existing open space was considered poor quality and any development would require planning permission.

8. Councillor Theobald was informed that if there was an education covenant on the land, this was not a planning consideration.
9. Councillor Shanks was informed that no objections had been received from Highways with regards to parking and traffic.

Debate

10. Councillor Theobald stated they attended the nursery and were previously a governor of the school. The councillor considered it was a shame to lose the trees and the nursery to be left with only a strip of land. The development is out of character with the area. It was a shame to reck the nursery. The development was too dense and out of keeping. The councillor was against the application.
11. Councillor Yates considered it was the rational decision to approve more houses and they were content that there was no stress on parking. The change of front gardens into parking will harm the environment. There are a variety of buildings in the road. The councillor was pleased to see more homes in the city and supported the application.
12. Councillor Childs supported the application and considered the design to be consistent with the road. The councillor noted that homes on this type of site was better than on the city fringe land.
13. Councillor Moonan was against the application as they considered the homes were fine, it was the impact on the community space. The councillor was not satisfied that the nursery school had enough space, and they were therefore not able to support the application.
14. Councillor Littman supported the application considering that 4 bed homes were needed. The removal of the trees was a concern however nothing could be done about that. The councillor considered the development an improvement.

Vote

15. A vote was taken, and by 5 to 2 the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
16. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

F BH2021/03826 - 16 Wilbury Villas, Hove, BN3 6GD - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor O'Quinn sent a statement which was read out by the Democratic Services officer as follows: "I would like to declare that I know the developer of this property but have only seen him in passing for the last two years. He was responsible for the major re-development of one building, 15 Wilbury Villas, and the creation of an

adjacent block of luxury flats. Also, I made two errors in my on-line objection – there is only a two-storey extension to the outrigger, and I understand that the top terrace will be used, but that there is no objection to that from residents at no 18. No 16 is the developer's next project and might be welcomed were it not for the extension to the outrigger and the creation of terraces and balconies, which are very much a continuation of the style of the two previously mentioned developments but with one major difference – they have a negative impact on neighbouring properties. The main issues which residents have raised with me are noise disturbance, overlooking, over-development, loss of light and loss of private amenity. The outrigger at the back of no 16 is already very dominant and blocks light from no 18 and also from the flats at no 16. To extend it further creates significant issues of loss of light to all the flats at no 18 and it also takes away an important area of light and sky from the garden of no 18. The basement flat of no 16 is going to be extended out considerably and as a result needs additional light brought into it by lightwells. The flat on the ground floor of no 16 will thus be able to look down into the basement flat at no 16 from their terrace – thus impinging on their privacy! The basement flat of No 18 will be especially adversely affected by the extension of the outrigger, which will block light and sun in the flat and in the garden and also by the proposed screenings and the wall between the two properties. Residents at no 16 (mainly owner occupiers) feel that the terraces and balcony proposed in the application will create overlooking, noise, and disturbance. This is inevitable as the terraces look directly into bedrooms and living rooms at no 16, mainly due to their size. Juliette balconies would be more appropriate for the ground and 1st floor flats at no 16. Residents have stated that the rear of number 16 is a haven of peace and quiet at present and that it would be affected negatively by the introduction of large terraces and a balcony. Indeed, I experienced the tranquillity for myself when visiting – you would hardly know you were in a busy city with a busy main road nearby. It should be noted that despite the major refurbishment and extension of this property, no extra flats are being created. This is intended to be a high-end, top of the rental market property but at the expense of its neighbour's quality of life and by not adhering to the cities Supplemental Planning document”.

3. James Simpson addressed the committee as a representative of objectors and stated that the development would increase the noise to neighbours and have an inappropriate impact on the shared garden of number 16. The committee were asked to refuse the application on grounds of overlooking – neighbours have the right to enjoy homes respected by extensions, and daylight – proposed screens will remove natural light from number 18 particularly to the basement. The proposals to the rear of the building where a terrace exists will unbalance the rear elevation. Number 18 objects to the application but is willing to discuss.
4. Ian Coomber addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the development improves the flats, and the existing dwelling overlooks all the gardens. Obscured glazing is to be used on the privacy screens improves the area. The impact of the proposals on the rear windows of number 18 has been dealt with in the report. The development improves the standards of accommodation and will add value. It should be noted that light will pass through the obscure glazing. The design is worthy of the building. The committee were requested to agree the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. There were no questions.

Debate

6. There was no debate

Vote

7. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.

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

G BH2022/00632 - 4 Prince's Street, Brighton, BN2 1RD - Full Planning

2. This application was not discussed at the meeting, as the council chamber was flooded and will be referred to the next Planning meeting.

H BH2022/00947 - 16 and 16A Gladstone Terrace, Brighton BN2 3LB - Full Planning

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.
2. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

I BH2022/01015 - Hove Town Hall, Ground Floor Front, Church Road, Hove, BN3 4AH - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Wilkinson addressed the committee and stated that they objected to the application as the proposals will impact on the residents with loss of trees and space for the community in this greatly used area. The decking for Platform 9 will be for them only and therefore a loss to the community. The area is a public space by design, is well liked and well off for seating. The loss of the tree and planting will impact on the biodiversity of the area and the proposed new planters will not be enough. The proposal will result in an increase in noise pollution. The community space will be lost to private use at no benefit to the community. Public space should remain as such. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
3. The applicants addressed the committee. Dan Roper noted that the heritage team seemed to accept the proposals and the decking and planting will be simple. The large tree has already gone, and the existing trees and shrubs will stay. Only 1% of vegetation will be lost. Scott Currie considered the square was underused, was already a meeting place and therefore noise would not increase as a result of the proposals.

4. James Forbes of the Conservation Action Group addressed the committee and stated their groups comments were in the late list not the report. The submitted drawings were poor and missing a block plan, the planting next to the south elevation doors was also missing. It was noted that the seating was needed and the square locally listed. The group considered the festoon lighting to be detrimental to the conservation area.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Moonan was informed by the case officer that no opening hours were proposed for the decking. Dan Roper stated that the closing time would be approximately 5/6pm, and later when being used for an event. It was confirmed that the applicant has an alcohol licence.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that the silver birch tree was to remain by condition, as would be the details of the planters which included a 5 year protection requiring any plants that die to be replaced. The exact size of the decking is not known. It was thought to be slightly larger than the existing shrub bed. The maximum number of persons on the decking will be 20.
7. Councillor Ebel was informed that the decking would be fully wheelchair accessible.
8. Councillor Yates was informed by the applicants that the chairs would be removed or chained together at night and there would be no fixed seating. The applicant stated they had a duty of care for the decking and furniture. The case officer confirmed that any change of signage would require advertisement consent and this application does not cover this.
9. Councillor Moonan was informed by the applicants that local business' have supported the proposals. The Planning Manager did not consider that a 7pm closing time for the decking would be reasonable given the surrounding bars and pubs in the area.

At this point the meeting was adjourned as the council chamber was flooded by rain water.

The chair closed the meeting and stated that the discussion on the application would continue at the next planning committee meeting on 6 July 2022.

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

- 7.1 This part of the agenda was not reached as the meeting was abandoned due to flooding in the council chamber.

8 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

- 8.1 This part of the agenda was not reached as the meeting was abandoned due to flooding in the council chamber.

9 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

9.1 This part of the agenda was not reached as the meeting was abandoned due to flooding in the council chamber.

10 APPEAL DECISIONS

10.1 This part of the agenda was not reached as the meeting was abandoned due to flooding in the council chamber.

The meeting concluded at 6.10pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of