

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**2.00pm – 10 September 2008**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER  
HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

Present: Councillor Wells (Deputy Chairman acting as Chairman)); Councillors Barnett, Carden (OS), Davey, Hamilton, Kennedy, McCaffery, Mrs A Norman, Simson, Smart Steedman and Mrs Theobald

Co-opted Members: Mr J Small, Conservation Advisory Group (CAG); Mr R Pennington, Brighton and Hove Federation of Disabled People.

**PART ONE**

**76A. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

76.1	<u>Councillor</u> Mrs A Norman Simson	<u>For Councillor</u> K Norman Hyde
------	---	---

**76B. Declarations of Interest**

76.2 Councillor Mrs Norman declared a personal but not prejudicial interest relative to Application BH2008/01744, University of Brighton, Falmer Campus by virtue of her membership of the South Downs Joint Health Trust.

**76C. Exclusion of Press and Public**

76.3 The Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the 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.

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

**77. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 AUGUST 2008**

77.2 **RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2008 be approved and signed by the Chairman.

**78. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS**

78.1 The acting Chairman explained that Councillor Hyde and himself had been involved in a head on collision at Brighton Station whilst about to commence their journey to the RIBA Town Planning Summer School . Both had been admitted to hospital but subsequently released. He wished to place on record his thanks to the Planning Department for their good wishes and for the bouquets of flowers which had been sent . That gesture had been much appreciated.

**79. PETITIONS**

79.1 There were none.

**80. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

80.1 There were none.

**81. DEPUTATIONS**

81.1 There were none.

**82. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

82.1 There were none.

**83. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

83.1 There were none.

**84. NOTICES OF MOTION REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

84.1 There were none.

**85. TO CONSIDER THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS**

85.1 **RESOLVED** - That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination :

BH2007/00710, Land at New Barn Farm, Foredown Road - Visual and noise screening bund on grazing land adjacent to A27

**86. PLANS LIST APPLICATIONS, 10 SEPTEMBER 2008****(I) TREES**

- 86.1 There were none. However Councillors McCaffery, Mrs Norman and Mrs Theobald sought clarification regarding the circumstances which had led to removal of trees at the following locations and confirmation that it had proved necessary to remove all of the trees cited. They were all firmly of the view that the removal of trees should be resisted save where they were doing irreparable damage to retaining walls or the foundations of a dwelling house for example; or where a tree was in such condition that its health could not be improved.

Application BH2008/02496, 77 Springfield Road ;  
Application BH2008/02675, 61 Beaconsfield Villas ;  
Application BH2008/02565, 27 Surrenden Road ;  
Application BH 2008/02577, 31 Surrenden Road ; and  
Application BH2008/02528, Flat 2, 91 Stanford Avenue

**(ii) SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROVERSIAL APPLICATIONS OR APPLICATIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL POLICY**

- 86.2 **Application BH2008/1744, University of Brighton Falmer Campus, Lewes Road, Brighton** – Erection of new teaching accommodation set over five floors with associated plant and machinery (Revised scheme of those previously permitted under Reserved Matters Approval BH2005/05962) - Part Retrospective.
- 86.3. It was noted that the application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 86.4 The Area Planning Manager, East gave a presentation setting out the constituent elements of the scheme and detailing the changes between the scheme as originally submitted and the amended scheme which was before Members that day. He explained that the application was now recommended for grant rather than minded to grant following receipt of a completed BREEAM pre assessment indicating that the scheme would achieve a “good” rating.
- 86.5 Councillor Steedman sought confirmation regarding overall sustainability of the scheme and relative to the “green” roofing materials proposed. It was explained that a full sustainability assessment had not been required relative to this revised reserved matters application. However, besides achieving a good overall BREEAM rating it should be noted that chalkland materials were to be provided to roofs and terraces within the scheme; this supported a greater degree of biodiversity than provided by a sedum roof.
- 86.6 Mr Small (CAG) stated that a greater degree of clarity was required regarding the fenestration now proposed. Originally a bespoke option had been indicated whereas standard frames were

now proposed He did not consider that sufficient detail had been given to determine whether this solution would be adequate or not . Bearing in mind that the original option had been preferred by officers. Fenestration details were critical in his view as it represented the “face” of a building.

- 86.7 The Area Planning Manager, East explained that as this matter had previously been dealt with as a reserved matter it was not considered appropriate or proportionate to recommend refusal, given that the solution now proposed was considered acceptable. However a condition could be added seeking final approval of the details. Members agreed that this should be done.
- 86.8 Councillor Mrs A Norman expressed her support for the design and sought confirmation regarding whether the levels of parking proposed were considered to be adequate. It was noted that that the Traffic Manager was satisfied with the parking arrangements proposed and that the applicant had indicated that additional standard and disabled parking would be provided integral to continuing works on site should an additional need to identified .
- 86.9 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously to grant planning permission on the grounds set out below.
- 86.10 **RESOLVED** - (1)That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 10 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and to the following additional conditions :

13. Within three months of the date of this permission or unless agreed in writing, detailed proposals for disabled car parking associated with the development hereby approved shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local planning authority. The proposals shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. **Reason** : To ensure adequate parking provision for all users of the building and to accord with policy TR18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

14. Within two months of the date of this permission or unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, full details of the windows hereby approved to an appropriate metric scale shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details . **Reason** : To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy QD1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

**(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  
10 SEPTEMBER 2008**

86.11 There were none.

**(iv) OTHER APPLICATIONS**

86.12 **Application BH2007/03748, 58 Palmeira Avenue, Hove** – Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with 5 storey over basement block of 8 apartments with underground car parking area.

86.13 The Senior Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation relative to the proposals. Reference was made to photographs and plans showing the relationship between, and appearance of, the proposed scheme relative to blocks of flats which had been erected to the south in place of single dwelling houses and its immediate neighbours. It should be noted that the area contained a mixture of dwelling houses and blocks of flats.

86.14 Councillor Smart sought clarification regarding measures to be put in place to ensure safe storage of chlorinated water following its removal as part of the routine maintenance of the swimming pool. The Planning Officer explained that although this level of detail had not been provided standard conditions had been applied which were used when a swimming pool was included within any development. These requirements would need to be met by the applicant as would the requirements of the Environment Agency.

86.15 In answer to questions by Councillor Steedman it was explained that notwithstanding inclusion of a swimming pool, within the scheme it had been indicated that it would achieve a level 4 assessment. Councillor Steedman stated that he was unable to support the scheme as he considered that the proposed underground parking provision ran contrary to Guidance Note 13 which indicated that there was a presumption that additional on site parking was not required in developments which were well served by public transport. The application site has easy access to good public transport links and in his view to have the on - site provision proposed would encourage private vehicle use and would give rise to increased traffic congestion in the vicinity.

86.16 In answer to questions of Councillor Mrs Theobald it was explained that the dimensions of the swimming pool would be 13m by 4m and that the building would be of a brick and render finish with other detailing in order to break up its surface. The render would be off white / cream to provide a similar appearance to that used on the blocks to the south.

86.17 Councillor Mrs Theobald stated that whilst the provision of off - street parking was welcomed, overall she considered the development to be ugly too high and overbearing in the street scene. She considered that the loss of dwelling houses in Palmeira

avenue was regrettable and had spoilt the character of the area. She was unable to support the scheme. Councillor Barnett concurred in that view. Councillor McCaffery considered the scheme was ugly and was in agreement with Councillor Steedman that it was inappropriate to provide off - street parking at this location .

86.18 Councillor Smart considered that the proposal was not significantly different to others which had already and been built and he did not therefore consider it appropriate to refuse this application.

86.19 A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 to 5 with 1 abstention planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below .

86.20 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendations set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the receipt of satisfactory amendments to the side elevation; no objection from the Traffic Manager and, a Section 106 Obligation to secure :

A contribution of £4,000 towards the Sustainable Transport Strategy and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

[**Note 1:** Councillors Barnett, Davey, McCaffery, Steedman and Mrs Theobald voted that the application be refused].

[ **Note 2** : Councillor Kennedy abstained from voting in respect of the above application].

86.21 **Application BH2007/03872, Willows Surgery, Heath Hill Avenue, Brighton** – Demolition of existing doctor’s surgery and residential accommodation. Erection of a new doctor’s surgery with five self-contained flats above (resubmission of BH2006/03331).

86..22 The Area Planning Manager, East gave a detailed presentation relative to the planning history of this and previous applications including the previous application which had been dismissed at appeal. It was considered that the current application which was now of two storeys in height throughout would comply with local plan policy and that there would be an acceptable relationship between the development site and its neighbours .

86.23 Mr Bareham spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of its application stating that although there was a demand for the surgery as one which was local to residents of Moulsecoomb and Bevendean it could not be sustained by the PCT financially without the proposed enabling development. Councillor Meadows spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor setting out her concerns regarding the proposals. Whilst local residents wished to retain a doctor’s surgery on the site they had concerns that the level of enabling housing proposed would represent overdevelopment of the site . They were also concerned that the existing willow tree on

site be retained and regarding the proposed access / egress arrangements proposed bearing in mind its close proximity to a very busy highway. It was also considered that the sustainable transport elements needed reappraisal and that the Section 106 Obligation required to be renegotiated.

- 86.24 Councillor Steedman sought confirmation regarding whether or not the scheme would comply with SPD 18 . The Development Control Manager explained that the SPD had not yet been adopted for development control purposes..
- 86.25 Councillor Davey sought clarification regarding on site parking arrangements. Councillors Barnet, Carden, and McCaffery stated that they considered more parking spaces should be made available for those using the surgery . Councillors Barnett and Mrs Theobald suggested that one of the spaces currently allocated for staff parking should be designated for disabled use . Councillor Barnet considered it unrealistic to provide such limited parking , if people were visiting a surgery because they were unwell there was a likelihood they would be travelling there by car. In answer to questions by Councillor Simson the Traffic Manager explained that the applicant could not be compelled to provide additional parking on site and as the area was not included as part of a Controlled Parking Zone on street parking was available.
- 86.26 Councillor Hamilton sought clarification as to whether or not the existing surgery was to be expanded given that the current practice appeared to be to merge existing surgeries into purpose built polyclinics , as had been the case with his own surgery. It had been done in that instance and elsewhere in the city without the need for it to be funded by enabling development . In this instance it did not appear that the new surgery would have result in any significant increase in capacity.
- 86.27 Councillor Mrs Theobald considered that all possible attempts should be made to ensure that the existing willow tree on site would be retained and sought clarification regarding its present condition . The Council's arboriculturist explained that the independent consultant employed by the applicant was well respected in such matters and that her own view was that although regrettable that the tree required to be removed it was in decline and would eventually die . In answer to further questions she explained that the remaining lifespan of the tree could not be determined and that it could ultimately linger for up to 10 years, it would require replacement within that time . Only limited protection works were available bearing in mind that its root system probably extended well under the existing roadway and that it could continue for some because of the moisture and nutrients stored in its roots. Construction works were likely to hasten that pre existing decline.
- 86.28 Councillors Barnett, Hamilton and Mrs Theobald considered that the tree should be retained and protected for the remainder of its

natural life . But following debate it was confirmed that if the tree were to be removed now it would be replaced by two suitable healthy specimens with a far longer lifespan. Once the development works had been completed however, the applicant could not be compelled to replace the existing tree at an indeterminate future date.

86.29 Councillors Kennedy, Mrs Norman and Simson considered that although loss of the tree was regrettable replacement with two younger healthier specimens was appropriate. Councillor Mrs Theobald put a request that a vote be taken. A vote was proposed by Councillor Mrs Theobald and seconded by Councillor Hamilton that Condition 9 be removed and that requirements be put into place to protect the exiting tree. A vote was taken and that proposal was lost on a vote of 9 to 3. Members were in agreement however , that a specific condition be added relative to the hours during which construction works could be carried out in order to protect neighbouring amenity . The details of this are set out in the resolution below.

86.30 A vote was taken and Members on a vote of 9 with 3 abstentions planning permission be granted on the grounds set out below.

86.31 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Paragraph 8 and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Obligation to secure :

(a) A financial contribution of £5,000 towards the sustainable Transport Strategy (to be used towards accessibility bus stops, pedestrian facilities and cycling infrastructure within the area); and

(b) An off site temporary replacement Doctors Surgery for the period between demolition and the opening of the proposed facilities . (to ensure a continuity of healthcare facilities in the Bevendean area) and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and subject to the following additional conditions :

15. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, revised proposals for the on site disabled car parking associated with the development shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposals shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. **Reason** : To ensure adequate parking provision for all users of the building and to accord with policy TR 18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

16. Construction work in connection with the development hereby approved shall only take place between the hours of 0.800 – 18.00 Mondays to Fridays and 0.800 - 13.00 Saturdays . No construction work shall take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays ; **Reason** : To

Protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and to comply with policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

- 86.32 **Application BH2008/02204, 3 East Drive, Brighton** – Addition of solar thermal panels to side elevation of front gable .
- 86.33 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation explaining that refusal was recommended given that the proposed panels would be located on the front roof slope within the conservation area and would be clearly visible from Queen's Park which was listed as being a park of special historical interest.
- 86.34 Mr Hewitt spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of their application. He referred to other properties on the other side (west) of the park which were similar or identical to the application property in East Drive. Photographs of these properties were displayed. Mr Hewitt also referred to the Open Houses weekend, sponsored by the Carbon Trust which had taken place earlier in the year and to the property located at 6 Southdown Avenue in Brighton which was located in a conservation area and had received awards for its sympathetic inclusion of sustainable and energy savings measures within an older property. Councillor Fryer spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor setting out her support for the proposed scheme. Stating that in her view the proposal was acceptable and no different from other treatments to houses in East Drive. The application site was located at the extreme eastern corner of the park and she was of the view that the panel would not be highly visible either from the park itself or from the adjoining highway. In her view the rooflights which had been fitted to a number of properties were far more prominent.
- 86.35 Councillor Steedman concurred with the views expressed by Councillor Fryer stating that he did not consider that the proposal would be prominent within the street scene or any different from in its appearance from panels on properties located in West Drive or the property cited at Southdown Avenue .
- 86.36 The Senior Planning Officer responded that she was not aware of the other properties referred to the terms of any permissions given , or of any planning permissions granted in respect of them. The Development Control Manager confirmed that was the case. Councillor Smart stated that in his view the position was not clear cut as was indicated by the applicants representative . It appeared to him that on the other properties referred to panels had been fitted towards the side rear of the property rather than at the front . Councillor Simson concurred in that view. Whilst fully supporting sustainability initiatives she was unable to support this proposal given its location in a conservation area .Councillor Mrs Norman enquired whether it would be possible to erect panels to the rear and it was explained that the proposed location had been chosen in order to maximise on energy gain . Councillor Mrs Norman felt

unable to support the erection of panels at that location.

- 86.37 Mr Small (CAG) stated that irrespective of treatments elsewhere which may or may not have received planning permission this application should be considered on its merits. If it was the Council's policy to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas and to refuse provision of solar panels on prominent frontages, this was a material planning consideration.
- 86.38 Councillor Davey considered that it was vital to encourage sustainability. As energy costs were soaring and it was recognised that the carbon footprint used needed to reduce dramatically he was of the view that these matters needed to move forward. Councillor McCaffery stated that whilst there was a need to protect the City's architectural heritage, there was a need to improve sustainability. She was in agreement the proposals would be no more obtrusive within the street scene than existing rooflights.
- 86.39 Councillor Hamilton stated that in his view the apparent contradiction between the Council's support for sustainability and the issue of whether or not solar panels could be provided needed to be addressed. Given that there was a recognised need to reduce the carbon footprint of all individuals and properties it was important to address the issues raised. A balance had to be sought and it was not always possible to be a purist in respecting all architectural heritage at the expense of other overarching needs such as energy generation and conservation. Older dwellings had been altered over time, none of them would originally have had television aerials for example. Debate needed to take place and policy decisions made in respect of the issues raised by this application.
- 86.40 A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions planning permission was refused on the grounds set out below.
- 86.41 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below:

1. The proposed panels, by virtue of their size and positioning within the front roof slope would appear as an incongruous feature unrelated to the overall design of the roof and front elevation and would detract from the wider appearance of the Queen's Park Conservation Area and would harm the setting of the historic Queen's Park. As such the proposal is contrary to policies QD1, QD14, HE6 and HE11 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and to Supplementary Planning Guidance Note SPGH1 : Roof Alterations and Extensions.

Informatives :

1. This decision is based on drawing no.23.6.08Rev3 received on 25

June 2008 and drawing no. 7.7.08 Rev1 and the site location plan received on 8 July 2008, and the supporting information received on 20 June 2008 .

[ **Note 1** : Councillors Davey, Kennedy and Steedman voted that that planning permission be granted].

[**Note 2**: Councillors Carden, Hamilton and McCaffery abstained from voting].

- 86.42 **Application BH2008/01604, 4 Lenham Road, Saltdean – Roof alterations and enlargement to form two rooms in roof (retrospective)**
- 86.43 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation detailing the proposals. Details were also given relative to the two previously refused applications. The visual impact of the scheme, its effects relative to neighbouring amenity and the other grounds for the previous refusals were considered to have been addressed and the scheme was therefore recommended for approval.
- 86.44 Councillor Mrs Theobald stated that she considered the scheme to be totally unacceptable and was concerned that works had been commenced and virtually completed in advance of receiving any planning approval. She also expressed concern that the application had not been processed within the 8 week target period. Councillor Barnett concurred in that view.
- 86.45 The Development Control Manager responded stating that whilst there were target dates for processing incoming applications, the department had had to deal with many applications. The numbers currently being submitted had not reduced as a result of the current economic climate. Whilst every endeavour was made to facilitate the early consideration of applications this was not always possible within the target date which was that rather than a legal requirement. It was not a criminal offence for work to commence in advance of planning permission being granted . An applicant might choose to do so for a number of reasons. Members' unhappiness that works had been carried out without the relevant planning permissions being in place was not a material planning consideration.
- 86.46 Councillor Kennedy agreed that whilst regrettable and very frustrating for Members when works were undertaken in the absence of planning permission(s) and in the face of agreed procedures, she did recognise that this did not of itself constitute grounds for refusal.
- 86.47 Councillors McCaffery and Smart sought clarification regarding any sanctions which were available to the Council. The Development Control Manager explained that there were none except in instances where permission was refused and subsequent

enforcement action was taken. Councillor McCaffery sought information (if available) relative to the no of applications where were had commenced prior to all necessary permissions being in place and as to the number granted or refused . The development Control Manager explained that information on the number of retrospective applications submitted was not available.

86.48 A vote was taken and on a vote of 5 to 3 with 4 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below .

86.49 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report .

[**Note 1:** Councillors Barnett, Mrs Norman and Mrs Theobald voted that the application be refused].

[ **Note 2** : Councillors Davey, Kennedy, McCaffery and Steedman abstained from voting in respect of the above application].

86.50 **Application BH2008/01850, Plots 2 and 3 Land at Royles Close, Rottingdean** – erection of two new 3 bedroom houses.

86.51 The Senior Planning Officer gave a composite presentation detailing the proposals those relative to the two subsequent applications relating to land adjacent to 21 and land adjacent to 6 Royles Close and setting out the reasons for the recommendation. It was noted that extant approvals granted in 1968 in respect of all three plots could be built in the absence of any other permissions being granted. The applicant had sought to update those original permissions in bringing forward the three the applications before the Committee that day . The Planning Officer highlighted the points of difference between the earlier schemes and those that had now been brought forward. It was also explained that measures would be put into place in order to protect the existing trees and screening on site and to replace the one protected tree which would need to be removed.

86.52 Mr Thomas spoke on behalf of neighbouring residents setting out their objections and those of Rottingdean Parish Council and the Rottingdean Preservation Society to the scheme. In their view the proposed development would be of a design and massing that constituted an overdevelopment of the site. In their view the submitted floorplans were bigger than those previously approved and they queried the accuracy of the distances indicated between the development and the boundaries of existing neighbouring properties. Mrs Thomas spoke on behalf of the applicants in support of their application. It was explained that the applicant had sought to update the original applications and had sought advice both at the pre and post application stages to address the concerns of objectors and to liaise fully with officers of the planning

department in order to draw up an acceptable scheme.

- 86.53 The Planning Officer responded to queries raised by the applicant relative to distances between and relative to configuration of the plots indicating the distances involved . In answer to questions by Councillor Smart it was explained that although the widths of the garages had been reduced they would still be of an adequate single garage width .
- 86.54 Councillor Hamilton sought clarification regarding the height and configuration of the proposed development within the context of the street compared with the properties facing it from the opposite side of the road. He stated that it appeared to him, from the photographs shown that although of the same height, the properties which were opposite would appear higher within the streets scene as they were built on higher ground..
- 86.55 In answer to questions by Councillor Mrs Theobald it was explained that the additional dormer windows at first floor level would be obscurely glazed and inward opening as they related either to bathrooms or en- suites or secondary bedroom windows . The applicant had agreed to conditions to that effect in order to mitigate against any potential overlooking .
- 86.56 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that planning permission be granted on the grounds set out below.
- 86.57 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.
- 86.58 **Application BH2008/01126, Land Adjacent to 21 Royles Close, Rottingdean** - Erection of 1 detached chalet bungalow at land adjacent to number 21.
- 86.59 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that planning permission be granted on the grounds set out below.
- 86.41 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.
- 86.42 **Application BH2008/01114, Land Adjacent to 6 Royles Close, Rottingdean** – Erection of 1 detached chalet bungalow at land adjacent to 6 Royles Close.
- 86.43 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that planning permission be granted on the grounds set out below .

- 86.44 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report .

**(v) DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS DELEGATED TO THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT**

- 86.45 **RESOLVED** – Those 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 the legislative requirements].

[**Note 2 :** A list of representations, received by the Council after the Plans List reports had been submitted for printing had been circulated to Members on the Friday preceding the meeting. (For copy see minute book). Where representations were received after that time they would be reported to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and it would be at their discretion whether these should (in exceptional cases), be reported to the Committee. This in accordance with resolution 147.2 of the then, Sub Committee held on 23 February 2005].

**87. DETERMINED APPLICATIONS**

- 87.1 The Committee noted those applications determined by Officers during the period covered by the report.

**88. SITE VISITS**

- 88.1 **RESOLVED** - That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination :

Bh2007/00710, New Barn Farm , Foredown Road - Visual and noise screening bund on grazing land adjacent to A27

**89. APPEAL DECISIONS**

- 89.1 The Committee noted letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising on the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out on the agenda.

**90. APPEALS LODGED**

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

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

- 91.1 The Committee noted the information set out in the agenda relating to information on Informal Hearings and Public Inquiries.

The meeting concluded at 5.45 pm

Signed Chairman

Dated this day of 2008

