

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 8 JUNE 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors MacCafferty (Chair), Hyde (Deputy Chair), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Cobb, Davey, Farrow, Hamilton, Hawtree, Kennedy, Summers, C Theobald and Wells

Co-opted Members Mr Philip Andrews (Conservation Advisory Group)

Officers in attendance: Jeanette Walsh (Head of Development Control), Hilary Woodward (Senior Lawyer), Steve Reeves (Principal Transport Planner), Nicola Hurley (Area Planning Manager (West)), Claire Burnett (Area Planning Manager (East)) and Jane Clarke (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

PART ONE

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1a Declarations of Substitutes

1.1 There were none.

1b Declarations of Interests

1.2 Councillor Wells declared an interest in applications BH2011/00228 & BH2011/00229, The British Engineerium, The Droveaway, Hove in that he had attended a Mayoral engagement there last year as his year as Mayor. He had not pre-determined the application however.

1.3 The Senior Solicitor, Mrs Woodward, confirmed that as Councillor Wells had an open mind and had not prejudged the applications he was able to take part in debate and vote on the applications.

1c Exclusion of the Press and Public

1.4 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Planning Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

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

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chairman be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2011 as a correct record.

3. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 The new Chairman, Councillor MacCafferty, introduced himself and welcomed the new Members to the Committee meeting. He said he was delighted to be here and to work with the Members and Officers, and he hoped to do the best for the city.

4. APPEAL DECISIONS

4.1 The Committee noted the content of the letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising of the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

5. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

6. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

7. INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS

7.1 The information regarding pre application presentations and requests was noted.

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

8.1 **RESOLVED** – That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination of the application:

Application:	Requested by:
BH2011/01152, Brighton Racecourse	Head of Development Control
BH2011/00849, 8 Locks Hill, Portslade	Councillor Hamilton
BH2010/03422 & 03423, 5 Bedford Place, Hove	Councillor Hawtree

9. APPLICATION BH2011/00358, NORTHFIELD, UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

9.1 The Committee considered a report from the Strategic Director of Place regarding application BH2011/00358, Northfield, University of Sussex, Brighton.

9.2 The Senior Planning Officer, Mr Foster, introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. Mr Foster drew attention to the items on the Late List and the comprehensive officer’s report. An environmental statement had been included as part of the application and Mr Foster advised that part of the application was within the South Downs National Park. When Members considered the application they would be acting as agents for the South Downs National Park Authority for this element of the scheme, which did not have built development on it.

The main considerations were set out in the report and included the principle of development, impact on the SDNP, highways, ecology and landscape. The scheme would meet BREEAM excellent rating and would bring forward high quality materials identical to the outline development that had already been granted permission. There was no additional parking provided with this scheme but the Sustainable Transport Team were happy with the proposals subject to disabled parking bays and secure cycle parking being provided by condition. There would be additional planting to the west to smooth transition from the SDNP to the application site. Sedum roofs and calcareous grassland with native woodland and bat boxes had also been secured through legal agreement.

Questions/matters on which clarification was sought

9.3 Councillor Hyde asked why cedar cladding was proposed as a material when Councillors had expressed their dislike of this type of material on previous applications. Mr Foster replied that the cladding would not be on any of the larger buildings, and indicated on the plans the area that would be covered.

- 9.4 Councillor Hyde noted the use of green roofs and asked if they would be made from materials that lasted well in dry conditions as the previous roofs had not been very successful. Mr Foster replied that the full details of the roof material would form part of the Section 106 Legal Agreement, but the University was aware of the problems with maintenance of the roofs.
- 9.5 Councillor Hawtree asked if solar panels had been considered for the roofs. Mr Foster replied that the University did not believe these would integrate well with the Combined Heat and Power Unit proposed. The scheme would reach a BREEAM excellent rating without solar panel use. The Head of Development Control, Mrs Walsh, stated that the Authority's duty was to consider the BREEAM rating and as the scheme would reach an excellent rating, they could not request any amendments above this.
- 9.6 Councillor Hawtree asked what the interiors of the rooms were like and whether grey water recycling had been considered. Mr Foster replied that the rooms were 14 square metres with en suites. Southern Water and the Environment Agency were satisfied with the proposed water recycling on the site.
- 9.7 Councillor Cobb asked if the doors shown on the plans would also be cedar cladding and Mr Foster confirmed this.
- 9.8 Councillor Davey asked what were included as the specific measures of the travel plan. The Principal Transport Planner, Mr Reeves, replied that the University had found it difficult to fund some of the elements of the 2009 travel plan, but wanted to improve travel links between the University and the city centre along Lewes Road. They were proactively working to reduce car usage.
- 9.9 Councillor Davey asked if the cycle parking would be secure and covered. Mr Foster replied that conditions required these details.
- 9.10 Councillor Mrs Theobald asked if the cedar cladding would be treated and whether there was any disabled parking. Mr Foster was unsure whether the cladding would be treated. Mr Reeves replied that the disabled parking provision was in line with SPG14 and all registered disabled students would be allocated a parking space.
- 9.11 Councillor Hawtree asked if there was any more building works planned for the University. Mr Foster replied that a master plan was in place, and redevelopment of existing buildings was being considered. The site was allocated for development in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, but any additional proposals by the University would emerge through discussion with the Planning Policy Team.
- 9.12 Councillor Summers asked whether the Council's Ecologist was now happy with the scheme. Mr Foster replied that mitigation measures had been proposed as part of the Environmental Statement and the Ecologist was satisfied with these and that they would be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

Debate and decision making process

- 9.13 Councillor Kennedy welcomed the provision of extra accommodation for students on campus as there was a need to bring family accommodation back into use for families in the city centre.
- 9.14 Councillor Mrs Theobald also welcomed the accommodation for students.
- 9.15 Councillor Hyde asked for an extra condition for pre-treatment of the cedar cladding.
- 9.16 Councillor Hamilton noted the comments from the SDNP and on this basis was happy to support the application.
- 9.17 Councillor Davey asked for an amendment to condition 14 to ensure that the cycle parking would be secure and covered.
- 9.18 A vote was taken and on a unanimous vote minded to grant planning permission was granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, no further new objections raised that are not addressed within the report and amendments to conditions to provide for the pre-treatment of the cedar cladding and secured and covered cycle storage.
- 9.19 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee considers and agrees with the overall reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure a Habitat Creation and Management Plan for the site and the variation of existing Section 106 Agreements dated 6 August 2009 and 3 September 2009 pertaining to the site, the expiry of the publicity period with the receipt of no further objections raising new material planning considerations that are not addressed within this report and the conditions and informatives listed in the report. Also that amendments to conditions are made to provide for the pre-treatment of the cedar cladding and secured and covered cycle storage.

10. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON THE PLANS LIST**(i) MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

- A. Application BH2011/00228, The British Engineerium, The Droveway, Hove –**
Erection of two storey extension to existing workshop and new single storey building to house exhibition hall. Creation of new underground exhibition area below existing car park. Alterations to provide disabled access facilities including ramps and lift. Installation of solar panels to roof of new workshop.
- (1) The presentation for this application was taken together with Listed Building Consent application BH2011/00229, The British Engineerium, The Droveway, Hove.

- (2) The Senior Planning Officer, Mr Everest, introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. He drew Members attention to the Late List and noted there had been an additional 3 letters of objection received, and comments from the Conservation and Design Team to say that the materials and colours now specified were appropriate to the site. As the exhibition unit was mostly below ground and was screened by existing boundary treatments the choice of materials was considered acceptable. There was a primary Badger Sett on site, with a subsidiary Sett identified. An ecology method statement would be needed detailing how to deal with these Setts, but the Ecologist was happy if this was provided. There would be 3 on site disabled parking bays provided and parking for 30 vehicles off site.

Questions/matters on which clarification was sought

- (3) Councillor Hyde raised concern about the choice of materials and asked why they weren't matching for both buildings. Mr Everest explained that because the exhibition hall was much lower it was not felt there was a need to match the materials.
- (4) Councillor Farrow asked if the Ecologist was present at the meeting and the Head of Development Control, Mrs Walsh, replied that although he could not attend this meeting, he had given clear advice that there was nothing in the application that would contravene the Protection of Badgers Act and he had not raised an objection.
- (5) Councillor Hawtree asked for more images of the buildings, and whether food composting for the restaurant had been considered. Mr Everest did not believe food composting had been considered, but suggested a condition might be added to the recommendation.
- (6) Councillor Hawtree asked why the number of visitors was not anticipated to increase following development. Mr Everest replied that an assessment of visitor numbers had taken place and no increase in numbers was predicted. The parking provision was therefore felt appropriate. The visitor numbers were subject to a yearly review as part of the management plan.
- (7) Councillor Cobb asked why the materials presented at the Member's briefing were different to the ones presented with the application and Mr Everest replied that the materials had continued to be discussed following the site visit by Members as officers felt the originally submitted materials were not appropriate. Mrs Walsh added that the new materials could be approved in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to ensure Members views on materials were taken into account.
- (8) Councillor Carden was very concerned by the Badger issues, which he did not feel had been resolved properly. He felt the building work on site would be intolerable for the Badgers and asked why the local Badger Assessment Group had not been invited to make their own assessment of the Setts. Mr Everest replied that the Ecologist was satisfied with the information submitted and the conditions proposed. In addition, an informative was recommended.

- (9) The Senior Solicitor, Mrs Woodward, added that the applicant would also need to apply for a Licence from Natural England and satisfy the requirements of this to ensure that the Protection of Badgers Act was not contravened.
- (10) Councillor Hawtree asked if the materials were guaranteed for 30 years and Mr Everest replied that this was the recommended guarantee time from the manufacturer.
- (11) Mr Everest presented the colour palette and sample materials to Councillors.
- (12) Councillor Farrow was very disappointed that the Ecologist was not present to allay any concerns the Members had regarding the Badger Sett. He felt that Members needed more information regarding the Badgers and proposed deferral for a report to be produced covering the concerns of Members regarding the Badgers. He asked in particular to know how far the tunnelling for the two Setts extended under the site, how far the tunnelling extended under the area to be built on, how old the Setts were on site and how the Badger Setts would be made safe during construction.
- (13) Councillor Davey seconded the proposal and said that Members needed to feel confident and reassured that the Badgers would be relocated successfully.
- (14) A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 for deferral and 5 abstentions the application was deferred.

B. Application BH2011/00229, The British Engineerium, The Droveaway, Hove -
Erection of two storey extension to existing workshop and new single storey building to house exhibition hall. Creation of new underground exhibition area below existing car park. Alterations to provide disabled access facilities including ramps and lift. Installation of solar panels to roof of new workshop.

(1) The presentation for this application was taken together with application BH2011/00228, The British Engineerium, The Droveaway, Hove.

(2) A vote was taken to defer this application.

C. Application BH2011/00035, The Elms, The Green, Rottingdean – Proposed
external alterations and extensions to existing dwelling to form a separate dwelling including reinstatement of existing cellar and boundary wall and erection of new outbuilding to garden.

(1) The presentation for this application was taken together with application BH2011/00036, The Elms, The Green, Rottingdean.

(2) The Area Planning Manager (East), Ms Burnett, introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. She drew Members attention to the report setting out the considerations in relation to these applications, and referred to comments on the Late List. Ms Burnett noted a missing reference in the report to a previous application in 2006 that had been refused.

The building was a grade II listed building in the Rottingdean Conservation Area. A cellar had been discovered on the site that pre-dated the house. Letters of objection and support had been received, including objections from Rottingdean Parish Council, Rottingdean Preservation Society and the Conservation Advisory Group.

The subdivision of the plot was considered acceptable and as the new building would be subordinate to the existing house and in a traditional design, this was also considered acceptable. Flint would be used on the new wall to match the adjacent walls. A visual impact assessment had been submitted to show that the subdivision would not be apparent. The nearest neighbours were 12 metres away and so it was felt there was no significant impact on neighbouring amenity. The scheme would achieve Code Level 3 for Sustainable Homes.

Questions/matters on which clarification was sought

- (3) Councillor Kennedy asked why a higher code of sustainable homes could not be achieved and Ms Burnett replied that given the historic context this could not be achieved.
- (4) Councillor Hawtree asked where the new entrance would be site and Ms Burnett replied it would be through the existing garage.
- (5) Councillor Hyde asked whether there were any other objection letters, and whether the previous alterations to the building had been before its listing or afterwards. Ms Burnett replied there were no further objection letters. The Design and Conservation Manager, Mr Dowty replied that it was likely the building had been listed in 1971 and the alterations had been made after this date.
- (6) Councillor Hawtree asked if the flint wall would extend to the eastern side of the site, and asked what the building was on this side. Ms Burnett stated that the wall would not extend further, and the building indicated was ancillary to the use of the main building.

Public Speakers

- (7) Mr Collins spoke on behalf of the Rottingdean Preservation Society and Rottingdean Parish Council and stated that this was a character-changing backyard development. The Elms was the most prominent and famous building in Rottingdean and was significant because Rudyard Kipling had written there. Policy guidance and conservation advice supported refusal of the application, and national guidance regarding building such as this was unsupportive of changes. Guidance issued in 2010 encouraged Councils to resist backyard development, and a scheme with similar issues had recently been refused in Hangleton. There was no support from neighbouring properties around The Green for this development, and both Rottingdean Parish Council, and Rottingdean Preservation Society, which represented the views of hundreds of residents, supported refusal of the application.
- (8) Councillor Davey asked why there had been no objections from private residents and Mr Collins replied that they may not be immediately affected by the proposals, and therefore did not feel compelled to write in to object.

- (9) The agent for the applicant, Mr Moore, spoke in favour of the scheme and stated that the applicant had presented a strong and robust case with proposals set in the context of policies. The application complied with all of the relevant criteria and several meetings had taken place with officers to ensure the scheme was acceptable. The application did not encroach onto the garden of The Elms and the plans addressed the previous concerns from CAG. The building did have historic importance and this application would enhance the dwelling by restoring the cellar and flint wall. The application had also received positive comments from English Heritage.
- (10) The Chairman of CAG, Mr Andrews, asked for historic evidence of the flint wall that was to be rebuilt. The applicant stated that the wall had been shown on survey plans for 1813, 1873 and 1898.

Debate and decision making process

- (11) A vote was taken and on a vote of 8 for, 3 against and 1 abstention planning permission was granted subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report.
- 10.1 **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 listed in the report.
- D. Application BH2011/00036, The Elms, The Green, Rottingdean** – Proposed external alterations and extensions to existing dwelling to form a separate dwelling including reinstatement of existing cellar and boundary wall and erection of new outbuilding to garden.
- (1) The presentation for this application was taken together with application BH2011/00035, The Elms, The Green, Rottingdean.

Debate and decision making process

- (2) A vote was taken and on a vote of 8 for, 3 against and 1 abstention listed building consent was granted subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report.
- 10.2 **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 listed building consent subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report.

E. Application BH2010/03333, 40 – 40A Bristol Gardens, Brighton – Demolition of existing building and erection of 5no three storey, three bedroom houses and detached two storey office building with lower ground floor.

- (1) The presentation for this application was taken together with application BH2010/03334, 40 – 40A Bristol Gardens, Brighton.
- (2) Ms Burnett introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. She drew Members attention to the report and referred to the Late List comments, noting that the Kemptown Society objected to the scheme. The applicant had demonstrated that the property had been unsuccessfully marketed since 2009 for office space. The proposals would exceed the numbers of people expected to be employed on site with the current building, and as it had a mix of office and residential development it was considered acceptable. The current building had little architectural use or merit. The proposed building would be subordinate to the listed buildings in the area and was considered appropriate in scale and height. There was private amenity space in the form of balconies and terraces and this would not constitute grounds for refusal. The application was in controlled parking zone H and there was no waiting list for permits. The scheme was lifetime homes compliant, would reach Code Level 3 for Sustainable Homes and was rated as BREEAM very good. Contributions to sustainable transport would be made.

Questions/matters on which clarification was sought

- (3) Councillor Kennedy asked if condition 20 was a standard condition and what measures were used for bio-diversity. Ms Burnett replied that this was a standard condition, and would include things such as bat boxes.
- (4) Councillor Hyde asked if there would be any impact on privacy for 32 Sussex Square from the balconies and terraces. She also asked why a driveway or garage had not been included and was no parking was an acceptable solution here. Ms Burnett replied that 32 Sussex Square was the nearest property to the application and this was 33 metres away. The Principal Transport Planner, Mr Reeves stated that whilst no parking was provided with this scheme, the carriageway would be reinstated as part of the scheme providing 6 extra on street parking spaces.
- (5) Councillor Mrs Theobald noted that this application was three storeys high and asked what other buildings were adjacent to it. She also noted that a resident had indicated there was a waiting list for parking permits. Ms Burnett replied that there was a mix of different heights and styles in the area. Mr Reeves said that zone H had recently been extended to include more roads and because of this there was now no waiting list.
- (6) Councillor Hawtree raised concern over the impact on the eastern side of the development. Ms Burnett replied that there would be some additional fenestration as a result of the application. However the office block would restrict some of these views, and there were considerable distances between neighbours on this side.

Debate and decision making process

- (7) Councillor Wells felt that the proposals would enhance the area and welcomed the application.
- (8) Councillor Davey asked if a condition could be placed on the decision to prevent the office unit from being converted into residential units in perpetuity. Mrs Walsh replied that this could be secured as part of the Section 106 Legal Agreement.
- (9) Councillor Mrs Theobald was not keen on the design of the application. She also felt that the lack of car parking provision was particularly bad. Councillor Mrs Theobald believed that the pavement needed to be re-laid and that this was an issue across the city that developers should be made to rectify.
- (10) Councillor Hawtree agreed that the application was un-inspiring.
- (11) A vote was taken and on a vote of 8 for, 2 against and 2 abstentions the Committee was minded to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement (with the additional Head of Term as suggested by Councillor Davey) and the conditions and informatives listed in the report.

10.3 **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 it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement (with the additional Head of Team as suggested by Councillor Davey) and to the conditions and informatives listed in the report.

F. Application BH2010/03334, 40 – 40A Bristol Gardens, Brighton – Demolition of existing building.

- (1) The presentation for this application was taken together with application BH2010/03333, 40 – 40A Bristol Gardens, Brighton.

Debate and decision making process

- (2) A vote was taken and on a vote of 8 for, 2 against and 2 abstentions conservation area consent was granted subject to planning permission being granted under application BH2010/03333 and the conditions and informatives listed in the report.

10.4 **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 it is minded to grant Conservation Area Consent, subject to planning permission being granted to develop the site under application BH2010/03333 and subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report.

G. Application BH2010/03422, 5 Bedford Place, Brighton – Erection of railings around rear second floor roof terrace and reduction in size of roof terrace.

- (1) This application was deferred for a site visit.

H. Application BH2010/03423, 5 Bedford Place, Brighton – Erection of railings around rear second floor roof terrace and reduction in size of roof terrace. Erection of replacement railings to top floor roof terrace.

(1) This application was deferred for a site visit.

I. Application BH2011/00849, Land at the rear of 8 Locks Hill, Portslade – Erection of single storey 3no bedroom detached residential dwelling incorporating rear dormer and associated landscaping.

(1) This application was deferred for a site visit.

J. Application BH2011/00954, Cinderford, Cornwall Gardens, Brighton – Replacement of existing timber front door and side window with timber effect door and double glazed UPVC side light (retrospective).

(1) The Area Planning Manager (West), Ms Hurley, introduced the application and presented plans, photos and elevational drawings. She stated that the existing coach-house was being converted from a previously approved application in 2005. The main considerations were impact on the character and appearance of the property, and on the wider conservation area. The use of UPVC was not incongruous to the design of the building and as there were examples of use of this material in the area, it was felt there would be no significant harm to the conservation area.

Questions/matters on which clarification was sought

(2) Councillor Davey asked if there was any national guidance regarding the use of UPVC and Ms Hurley replied that this was a 1950s bungalow that was not significant to the character of the conservation area and so it was felt that UPVC here was acceptable.

(3) Councillor Hawtree asked why UPVC was acceptable for a 1950s building and Ms Hurley replied that the conservation area related to the Edwardian villas located in the area. The property in question did not contribute to the character of the conservation area, and so UPVC was acceptable.

(4) Councillor Kennedy felt concerned that this decision would set a precedent for use of UPVC in the area. Ms Hurley replied that the decision made a clear distinction between this property, which did not add to the conservation area, and other properties that did, and therefore would not set a dangerous precedence.

Debate and decision making process

(5) Councillor Kennedy was not generally in support of UPVC as a material, especially in conservation areas. As such, she was unable to support the application and would abstain from voting.

(6) Councillor Hawtree felt that a door was often one of the most important parts of a house and its nature was therefore important. He did not understand why the building was included in the conservation area when it was not worth conserving.

(7) A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 for, 0 against and 6 abstentions planning permission was granted subject to the informatives listed in the report.

10.6 **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 informatives listed in the report.

K. Application BH2011/00992, Upper Dene Court, 4 Westdene Drive, Brighton –
Erection of 2no one bedroom flats to rear of existing block of flats.

(1) This application was deferred for additional consultation to take place.

11. TO CONSIDER AND NOTE THE CONTENT OF THE REPORTS DETAILING DECISIONS DETERMINED BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

11.1 **RESOLVED** – That those details of applications determined by the Strategic Director of Place under delegated powers be noted.

[Note 1: All decisions recorded in this list are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the planning register maintained by the Strategic Director of Place. The register complies with legislative requirements.]

[Note 2: A list of representations received by the Council after the Plans List reports had been submitted for printing was circulated to Members on the Friday preceding the meeting. Where representations are received after that time they should be reported to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and it would be at their discretion whether they should in exceptional circumstances be reported to the Committee. This is in accordance with Resolution 147.2 of the then Sub Committee on 23 February 2006.]

12. TO CONSIDER ANY FURTHER APPLICATIONS IT HAS BEEN DECIDED SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF ITEMS ON THE PLANS LIST

12.1 **RESOLVED** – That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination of the application:

Application:	Requested by:
BH2011/01152, Brighton Racecourse	Head of Development Control
BH2011/00849, 8 Locks Hill, Portslade	Councillor Hamilton
BH2010/03422 & 03423, 5 Bedford Place, Hove	Councillor Hawtree

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of