

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 14 MAY 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

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

Officers in attendance: Paul Vidler (Deputy Development Control Manager); Nicola Hurley (Area Planning Manager); Jason Hawkes (Planning Officer); Sue Dubberley (Senior Planning Officer); Steven Shaw (Principal Transport Officer); Alun Cance (Environmental Health Officer); Di Morgan (Arboriculturalist) Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor) and Ross Keatley (Acting Democratic Services Manager).

PART ONE

196. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

196a Declarations of substitutes

196.1 Councillor Robins was present in substitution for Councillor Hamilton.

196b Declarations of interests

196.2 Councillor Cox referenced application (D) BH2014/00178 – 8 Richardson Road, Hove and stated that as the local Ward Councillor he had been lobbied both for and against the application; however, he was of an open mind and would remain present during the debate and vote on the application.

196.3 Councillors Cox and Mac Cafferty and the Deputy Development Control Manager, Paul Vidler, all noted for the record that there were members of the ‘Campaign for Real Ale’ in respect of application (D) BH2014/00178 – 8 Richardson Road, Hove, but felt this did not amount to an interest that would preclude from their relevant roles during the consideration of that item.

196.4 The Deputy Development Control Manager, Paul Vidler, referenced application (A) BH2014/00697 – Dorothy Stringer High School, Loder Road, Brighton and stated that he would withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of that item as his

daughter attended the school. The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, would assume the role of Lead Officer at the meeting during the consideration of the item.

196c Exclusion of the press and public

196.5 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.

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

196d Use of mobile phones and tablets

196.7 The Chair requested Members ensure that their mobile phones were switched off, and where Members were using tablets to access agenda papers electronically ensure that these were switched to ‘aeroplane mode’.

197. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

197.1 The Acting Democratic Services Manager highlighted a mistake that he had been alerted to at paragraph 185.1, and that the final four words of the paragraph should be omitted and replaced with the words ‘a drafting error’.

197.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2014 as a correct record.

198. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

198.1 There were none.

199. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

199.1 There were none.

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

200.1 There were no requests for site visits in matters listed on the agenda.

201. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A. BH2014/00697 - Dorothy Stringer High School, Loder Road, Brighton - Full Planning - Installation of an artificial turf pitch with associated fencing and floodlighting, incorporating landscaping works.

(1) The Planning Officer, Jason Hawkes, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings – reference

was also made to matters in the late list. It was noted that this was a revised scheme for a new pitch at Dorothy Stringer School; the site was surrounded by residential properties and particular attention was drawn to two mature elm trees and a group of semi-mature elm trees. The previous application had been refused by the Committee for reasons in relation to the loss of the two mature elm trees and insufficient information submitted in relation to the impact of the proposed pitch on the adjacent properties. The proposed pitch in the amended scheme was smaller, and the scheme would require excavation works; the relocation of the butterfly havens, and the removal of some of the semi-mature trees on the site.

- (2) The pitch would primarily be used for football and would accommodate up to 9-a-side [adult capacity]. It would mainly be used during the day by the school, and for community use during evenings and weekends. The application required a landscaping scheme, and this included the location of the new trees; butterfly havens and grass banks. The applicant had sought to address the previous reasons for refusal by reducing the size of the pitch and the Council Arboriculturalist was now satisfied that the mature elm trees would be protected during the construction – the application was also the subject of a method statement. In relation to the noise and lighting there was now a full acoustic assessment and the noise assessment had been undertaken using a similar site in Tunbridge Wells. It was considered there would be no significant noise impact on the houses to the north of the site, and there would be some acoustic fencing constructed. Subject to this provision there was no objection from Environmental Health.
- (3) The proposed hours were deemed acceptable, and this scheme was considered to address the issues in relation to glare in two ways. Firstly the scheme now proposed 12 lamps instead of 16, and the secondly the hours of operation had been reduced such that they were now deemed acceptable. Two additional conditions in relation to the use of the site, hours of operation of the floodlighting and the butterfly havens were recommended, and with these additions the application was recommended for approval.

Public Speaker(s) and Questions

- (4) Mr David MacDonald spoke in opposition to the application in his capacity as a local resident. He stated that he lived directly opposite the proposed pitch and both his children attended local schools. Whilst he and other residents accepted the efforts that had been made to protect the elm trees, it was believed that the pitch was unnecessary and would change the nature of the neighbourhood. Mr MacDonald believed that only 5% of staff and students supported the scheme, and there were already another five pitches located across the wider campus. The noise levels would constantly breach acceptable levels and the minimal standards in relation to noise would not be met. The pitch would open until 2100 hours during weekdays and until 1800 hours at the weekend; these hours were considered excessive and residents would not have adequate respite from the impact. It was considered that the removal of the existing copse could be mitigated if the location was moved to the west, and there should be full details – by way of condition – for the butterfly havens. The Committee were invited to refuse the application for matters in relation to noise, light, habitat and the lack of landscaping details.

- (5) Councillor K. Norman spoke in his capacity as the Local Ward Councillor, and stated that he was representing the overwhelming number of residents against the proposals; he had also been contacted by residents in the neighbouring ward who would be affected by the scheme. It was difficult to justify the need for the scheme, and he considered that this would be one pitch too many on the campus. In relation to mitigation measures it was considered that this would not stop the impact of the additional car use and access from Loder Road. Residents were very concerned about light pollution from the pitch, and it was disappointing that some of the trees to be removed were those that had been conditioned in a previous application for the sports hall.
- (6) In response to Councillor Mac Cafferty it was explained by Councillor K. Norman that his objection did not relate to the principle of the scheme, but rather the specifics of this scheme due to the number of residents that would be affected.
- (7) Mr Richard Bradford and Ms Ros Stephen spoke in support of the application in their capacity as the Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher at the school respectively. Mr Bradford stated that the school was now in a position to reduce the size of the proposed pitch which would protect the mature elm trees; whilst it was acknowledged that there would be some loss of trees to the north it was unlikely that these would mature. The smaller pitch would require less lighting and the height of the lights would be three metres lower. It was believed that the school would still benefit from the smaller pitch as the school was oversubscribed and the facility much needed. The land was unsuitable for sports use for much of the year due to poor drainage and other local schools would also benefit from use of the pitch. It was highlighted that the pitch would not be used for intense commercial activity and the pitch would be a community facility.
- (8) In response to Councillor Cox it was explained by Mr Bradford that the school had held consultation evenings to discuss the proposals, and had discussed the landscaping features with neighbours. Councillor Cox went on to ask about the objection from the Fiveways Local Action Team and Mr Bradford explained that the use of the pitch would not be limited for students and this would provide an important winter sports facility for the school. The pitch would be used all day during for lessons and in the evenings for after school clubs; it was also noted that many of these clubs drew their membership from students at the school.
- (9) Mr Bradford confirmed for Councillor C. Theobald that the pitch could be in use for practise as early as 0700 hours, and there would be school practise classes before and after school.
- (10) Councillor Hyde asked about the hours of operation and Mr Bradford explained that a reduction in the proposed hours had been considered, but a minimum potential operation of 87 hours each week was required for the school to secure the necessary funding.
- (11) Mr Bradford confirmed for Councillor Jones that the material would be porous and grass based.
- (12) Mr Bradford confirmed for Councillor Robins that the pitch would be 9-aside for adult use, and would accommodate 11-aside for under 14 teams.

- (13) Councillor Gilbey asked about the trees that would be planted to replace those being lost, and Mr Bradford explained that it was the intention to plant a line of elm trees along the drive to the school and use trees of a similar size to those being removed to do this.

Questions for Officers

- (14) In response to Councillor Hyde the locations of the acoustic fence were clarified. The materials and distances from the residential properties were also confirmed.
- (15) Councillor Hyde went on to ask about the floodlights and asked what assurance the Committee could be given that the light spillage would be reasonable; she made particular example of another pitch at Blatchington Mill School. In response the Environmental Health Officer, Alun Cance, explained that the illumination levels at the proposed site would be half of that of those at Blatchington Mill. In relation to glare it was explained that there were no standards to measure this, but it was also noted that the light levels were lower for football specifications and the site now proposed 8 lamps instead of 12.
- (16) In response to Councillor C. Theobald the Arboriculturalist, Di Morgan, explained that the semi-mature trees were recorded as 'native planting' and not the subject of tree preservation orders.
- (17) Councillor Davey asked for more information in relation to the community use agreement and it was explained that this was a standard condition and Sport England would be consulted in relation to its suitability.
- (18) In response to Councillor Jones the Case Officer clarified that the pitch would be grass type and suitable for all weather conditions
- (19) Councillor Robins asked about the weight that could be given to letters of support or objection that were some distance from the site; in response the Senior Solicitor explained that this did not reduce the weight that could be given and the Committee should consider the content of the letters when they gave consideration of what weight to attach.
- (20) In response to Councillor Gilbey the Environmental Health Officer explained that there would not be any glare from above for the properties that looked down onto the site, and whilst there would be some light spillage this would not be significant.
- (21) In response to Councillor Hyde it was confirmed there were standard conditions on the application to prevent the disturbance of nesting birds.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (22) Councillor Hyde noted she was torn in relation to the decision and there were many good reasons to support the scheme, but she sympathised with the concerns of residents. She was more assured about the issues relating to light spillage as the nearest houses were some distance away; she added that when the light would be in

use it would be dark outside and this was normally when residents would have their curtains closed.

- (23) Councillor Carden noted he would be supporting the Officer recommendation, and such facilities were an important means to help young people stay healthy.
- (24) Councillor Davey stated that he believed the applicant had made efforts to address residents' concerns, and he welcomed the planting of new trees.
- (25) Councillor Jones noted he had been unable to support the previous scheme, but he now believed the school had gone a long way to address concerns and there was a real need for better sports facilities in the city. The pitch would be a community facility as well used by the school
- (26) Councillor Duncan noted he would support the Officer recommendation, and agreed that the previous scheme was too large for the site. The changes proposed addressed the previous reasons for refusal and he hoped that there could be more positive communication between the school and the local action team.
- (27) Councillor C. Theobald noted that she was pleased the mature elm trees had been retained, but she still had concerns in relation to the loss of the semi-mature trees and the hours of operation. She also expressed concerns in relation to light pollution, but recognised what a good facility this would be.
- (28) Councillor Gilbey stated that she would support the application, but she recognised the concerns of residents as she lived in close proximity to a similar site herself. On balance she felt the impact was minimal and the sports facilities were much needed.
- (29) Councillor Littman noted that he agreed with the comments made by Councillor Hyde, and felt on balance he would support the Officer recommendation and he felt the school had taken adequate steps to protect the residents.
- (30) Councillor Robins stated that he agreed with the comments made by Councillor Carden, and noted that he would support the Officer recommendation.

201.1 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

Note: The Area Planning Manager, Paul Vidler, was not present during the consideration and vote on this application.

B. BH2014/00310 - Woollards Field, Lewes Road, Brighton - Full Planning - Construction of a 2no storey Ambulance Make Ready Centre (MRC) building incorporating the provision of 82 car parking spaces, 5no disabled car parking spaces (total of 87 spaces) and 34 ambulance bays including access works, landscaping and other associated works.

- (1) The Senior Planning Officer, Sue Dubberley, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings, and drew

attention to matters on the Late List. It was also confirmed that a revised landscaping plan had been received. The application site was located on the southern side of Lewes Road and was adjacent to the new regional records office – known as The Keep. The application sought permission for a two-storey ‘make ready’ centre with 87 car parking spaces. The function of the centre was a base for the ambulance service to begin and end shifts, and to prepare for service. The site would also include storage for medical supplies and office space for 246 staff; however, it was clarified that the site would not be a base for emergency calls and there would be no blue light or siren call-outs from it. The ‘make-ready’ site was a means to consolidate 6 existing sites around Sussex.

- (2) In relation to the height the highest point of the proposals would be still be lower than The Keep, and lower than the surrounding tree levels. The application had been the subject of consultations, and whilst the centre would be a departure from policy the report identified several reasons why this was considered acceptable. The site was designated for office use; however, there was a lack of demand for this in the location and the provision of the site would retain employment in the city. The need for the facility was also a consideration and the lack of alternative sites within the city. The design and landscaping were considered acceptable and there would be little impact on amenity as the nearest residential properties were some distance from the site.
- (3) There had been some concern in relation to the proposal of a generator at the site; however, it was considered this could be properly mitigated through condition. In relation to the high number of parking spaces on site it was noted that this was acceptable given the 24 hour operation of the site and the 8 or 12 hour shifts patterns of staff; the high number of spaces reflected the unique nature of the model of operation. In relation to ecology there was a presence of reptiles in the area and since the construction of The Keep there had been an exclusion fence which would be maintained along with the reptile habitat area. The building would have BREEAM ‘very good’ and it was noted the rating was restricted by the 24 hour nature of operation and the level of staff parking. Policy made reference to this type of beneficial development for both the city and the wider region, and the application was recommended to be minded to grant for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers

- (4) In response to Councillor Duncan the Case Officer explained that there were no objections from the traffic engineer; the application sought contributions for sustainable transport and there would be a travel plan.
- (5) In response to Councillor C. Theobald it was clarified that the single objection to the site was in relation to traffic and noise pollution, insufficient parking and overlooking of the nearby park.
- (6) Councillors Robins and Gilbey and the Chair made reference to the materials used on the site, and it was suggested that the materials be agreed by the Head of Development Control in consultation with the Chair, Deputy Chair and Opposition Spokespersons.

- (7) Councillor C. Theobald noted the concerns raised by the Fire Authority, and it was confirmed that these related to Building Control matters which formed a separate regime.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (8) Councillor Cox welcomed the innovative approach by the Ambulance Service and was pleased that such a service would be located in the city.
- (9) Councillor C. Theobald also noted that she would support the Officer recommendation; the use was appropriate and would be fully fit for purpose.
- (10) Councillor Hyde noted this would be a 'first-class' facility.
- (11) Councillor Duncan noted that he fully supported the application, and like Councillor Cox he welcomed this in the city.
- (12) Councillor Carden stated that he fully supported the Officer recommendation, and was in favour of good emergency services.
- (13) In response to the Chair it was explained that the removal of conditions, as outlined on the Late List, was due to the late comments received by the County Archaeologist and Arboriculturist.
- (14) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation that the Committee be minded to grant the application was unanimously carried.

201.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a S106 agreement, conditions and informatives and with details of materials to be agreed by the Head of Development Control in consultation with the Chair, Deputy Chair and Opposition Spokespersons.

C. BH2013/04082 - Land Rear of 4-34 Kimberley Road, Brighton - Full Planning Permission - Erection of 4no two storey dwellings (C3) with off-street parking, associated landscaping works and re-surfacing of access road.

- (1) The Area Planning Manager Nicola Hurley introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The area was located south of the terrace at Kimberley Road, and had previously housed 34 garages. Permission had been granted in 2010 for 4 dwellings, and since the approval the permission had lapsed. The application was the same as the previous permission. There would be no undue loss of light; the design was considered appropriate as well as the materials and the standard of the accommodation. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Questions for Officers, Debate and Decision Making Process

- (2) In response to Councillor Duncan the Senior Solicitor, Hilary Woodward, explained that comments made by the East Sussex Fire & Rescue about the access related to matters of Building Control which formed a separate regime to planning. The requirements of the Building Control regime would have to be satisfied as part of the build process.
- (3) A vote was taken on the Officer recommendation that the Committee be minded to grant planning permission and this was carried on a vote of 11 in support with 1 against.

201.3 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and, as amended, accurate plans had been received, resolved to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

D. BH2014/00178 - 8 Richardson Road, Hove - Full Planning - Change of use from retail (A1) to public house (A4).

- (1) The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to plans, photographs and elevational drawings. The application site related to a retail unit on Richardson Road; the surrounding other shops were predominantly in retail use and permission was sought for the change of use to a public house. There was a supporting statement with the application which outlined that micro-pubs had no food service; no gambling and 'pub bar' in the traditional sense. The development did not propose any external alterations other than the addition of a flue. Change of use was permitted where criteria were met, and there was no policy objection to the change of use. There were close by residential units on the floors above the unit, and there would be some additional use based on the hours of change, and it was considered noise could be controlled through conditions. Subject to the imposition of such conditions the application was recommended for approval.

Public Speaker(s) and Questions

- (2) Ms Louise Etheridge spoke in opposition to the application in her capacity as the resident living direct above the unit. She stated that she represented other residents and traders in the immediate area that also objected to the proposals. An aspect of the area was the commercial activity by day – all of which largely ceased (with the exception of the off-licence) by the evening. Whilst the rationale of a micro-pub was conversation it was considered that the customers would still be loud whilst they were drinking. There would be soundproofing, but the impact of this would not be felt if customers were outside the premises smoking and making noise, and regardless of the type of customer there was always a risk of anti-social behaviour. There would be an air-conditioning unit which would also make noise. There was some concern that the hours within the application were inconsistent and most of the objections were from the properties in the immediate vicinity. Ms Etheridge also expressed concern of the impact on her daughter's education as she would take her GCSEs the following year.

- (3) In response to Councillor Cox the objector confirmed the location of her flat, and stated she had lived there between 8 and 9 years, and lived 15 years in the immediate area. The applicant had undertaken a local letter drop and also held a public meeting about the proposals.
- (4) In response to the Chair it was explained by Ms Etheridge that there was concern the micro pub would change the nature of the area in the evening as people would not be able to have windows open due to the noise and there would be increased noise from people coming and going.
- (5) The applicant Mr David White spoke in support of the application and stated that this would be the first micro pub in the city, and whilst they understood the concerns of residents the additional of the micro- pub would not impact negatively on residents. The applicants were themselves local people, and noted that other businesses in the parade and mews had been closed or vacant for some time. The design of the micro-pub would fit into this sort of setting and add to the existing offer of facilities.
- (6) In response to Councillor Hyde the applicant explained that they had contacted local residents in December about the application through a leaflet drop and held a public meeting. There had been additional meetings with the owner of the units about how residential amenity would be protected. In response to a further query it was explained that there would be a small service area to dispense drinks and the hours of operation, as set out in the report, were clarified. The applicant also confirmed they had not yet applied for a licence through the licensing regime.
- (7) In response to Councillor Cox it was explained that the applicant intended to install high quality sound proofing and would have to consider if this provision impacted on the viability of the business. The applicant also confirmed that they would not allow customers to smoke directly outside the premises, and instead they would be asked to smoke further away.
- (8) In response to Councillor Robins the applicant explained the premises would sell only traditional beers and a very limited wine selection.
- (9) Councillor Gilbey asked about the air-conditioning unit and the applicant explained that they had visited five other sites and looked at silent air-conditioning units. A feature of this type of micro- pub would be to have the stillage displayed. There would be no extractor fan; only an outlet for the warm air.

Questions for Officers

- (10) In response to Councillor Littman Officers confirmed that it was acknowledged there would be some additional noise caused by the premises, but this was not considered to be significant.
- (11) In response to Councillor Duncan it was explained that there was nothing in the use class to distinguish micro- pubs; restricting the use to a micro-pub had been considered, but Officers had not felt this would meet the test of reasonableness. However the use was restricted through conditions and these could not be amended

unless through the usual application. It was also clarified that the opening hours were conditioned in the report.

- (12) The Deputy Development Control Manager confirmed that the hours of application were those stated in the report.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (13) Councillor Wells noted the applicant had made real attempts to consult with local residents, and were offered measures such as sound proofing. In a climate where many pubs were closing a new pub was welcomed and Councillor Wells concluded he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (14) Councillor Davey stated that he knew the area very well and agreed that some of the shops had struggled in recent times, and areas such as this need to change in order to survive. He stated he would support the Officer recommendation and was convinced that the applicant would be sensitive to the local residents.
- (15) Councillor Hyde stated that she echoed the comments already made in the debate and had been reassured by the applicant. It had been apparent at the site visit that the area was 'buzzing' and this would add to the offer. Councillor Hyde noted that she understand the concerns of residents, but also added that the licensing regime would add appropriate conditions to protect residential amenity.
- (16) Councillor Littman noted that he did not agree with the comments made by colleagues, and felt that this type of shopping parade would be permanently changed with this type of application and cause more noise and disturbance. Whilst he acknowledged the area was struggling this option would not be right for residents.
- (17) Councillor Jones stated that he was mindful of the residents' objections, but he had been impressed with the level of research the applicant had undertaken. He noted there would be further controls through the licensing regime, and on balance he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (18) Councillor Robins noted that he agreed with the comments made by Councillor Littman, and the original intention was for these shops to be owner occupied. He could not support the Officer recommendation.
- (19) Councillor Cox stated that the community were fairly divided in relation to the application; with those in the immediately vicinity more likely to be against the scheme. The conditions would need to be stringent to protect residential amenity as there was concern that this could unsettle the community of long-term tenants. He could see the applicants had been commendable in their efforts, and hoped that if the application were approved every effort be made to accommodate the concerns of residents.
- (20) Councillor C. Theobald stated it was unusual to see a new pub, and she welcomed the new type of venue, but remained undecided due to the potential impact on the residents.

(21) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation that planning permission be granted was carried on a vote of 8 in support in 4 against.

201.4 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolved to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

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

202.1 There were no further requests for site visits.

203. INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS

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

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

204.1 That the Committee notes the details of applications determined by the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing under delegated powers.

[Note 1: All decisions recorded in this list are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the planning register maintained by the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing. The register complies with legislative requirements.]

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

205. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

206. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

207. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

The meeting concluded at 4.16pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of