

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMITTEE****2.00pm 19 NOVEMBER 2014****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

Present: Councillors Mac Cafferty (Chair), Hyde (Opposition Spokesperson), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Bowden, Cox, Davey, Gilbey, Phillips, Robins, C Theobald and Wells

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

Officers in attendance: Jeanette Walsh (Head of Development Control); Nicola Hurley (Area Planning Manager); Kathryn Boggiano (Major Projects Officer); Adrian Smith (Senior Planning Officer); Steven Shaw (Principal Transport Officer); Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor) and Ross Keatley (Acting Democratic Services Manager).

PART ONE**98 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS****98a Declarations of substitutes**

98.1 Councillor Bowden was present in substitution for Councillor Littman, and Councillor Robins was present in substitution for Councillor Hamilton.

98b Declarations of interests

98.2 Councillor Cox declared an instance of lobbying in respect of Application B – BH2014/02412 – 168 Old Shoreham Road, Hove. He explained that the listed objector, Mr Hughes, had attended his Ward surgery; however, Councillor Cox explained that his Ward colleague, Councillor Cobb, had provided the advice. He also confirmed that he remained of a neutral mind and would remain present during the discussion and vote on the application.

98.3 Councillor Davey declared a personal interest in respect of Application B – BH2014/02412 – 168 Old Shoreham Road, Hove. He explained that he knew the agent personally and as such would withdraw from the meeting during the consideration and vote on the application.

98c Exclusion of the press and public

98.4 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.

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

98d Use of mobile phones and tablets

98.6 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’.

99 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

99.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 29 October 2014 as a correct record.

100 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

100.1 The Chair noted the 7 January 2015 meeting had been cancelled.

101 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

101.1 There were none.

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

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

103 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A BH2014/02417 - Robert Lodge, Manor Place, Brighton - Council Development -
Construction of two new 3 storey blocks of flats consisting of 8no one bed flats, 1no one bed wheelchair accessible flat and lift in the Southern block and 4no one bed flats and 2no two bed flats in the Northern block together with associated works including solar panels on the roofs of both blocks and the re-routing of the public footpath within the site.

(1) It was noted that the application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

(2) The Senior Planning Officer, Adrian Smith, introduced the report and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans, and elevational drawings. Robert Lodge comprised purpose built flats on either side of the site with public gardens in the

centre; there had also been a pre-fabricated office to the south of the site that had now been demolished. The application sought permission for two new 3-storey buildings to create 15 new units for social rent. The new northern block would be located on currently undeveloped land, and would be the same height as the western buildings of Robert Lodge – the proposed brick work of both blocks would match Rugby Place. The proposed southern building would be on the site of the former housing office, and there would be six parking bays, and the southern elevation would be largely rendered.

- (3) The plans also included the diversion of the public footway around the western side of the southern building. The application was for 15 units for social rent, and the buildings broadly complimented the existing ones on the site and were considered an improvement to the previous arrangement with the housing office. The application had been the subject of daylight and sunlight studies, and the greatest impact had been identified on the northeast and southeast corner. The room in the existing unit that would be most impacted had a secondary aspect, and the impact was considered acceptable. The six parking spaces would be for use by residents only, and any additional demand on the nearby network was not considered significant. The application was recommended to be minded to grant subject to conditions and the signing of the S106 agreement.

Public Speaker(s) and Questions

- (4) Councillor Morgan spoke in opposition to the application in his capacity as one of the Local Ward Councillors. He stated that the depth of feeling in relation to the application was clear due to the number of objections that had been received. The residents did not support the construction of the northern block as it took away too much outside space and they felt the southern block should be reduced. Lighting and design needed to be taken into account to help reduce the risk of anti-social behaviour – should the Committee be minded to grant the application residents asked that the construction be limited to Mondays to Fridays to reduce disruption, and it should be conditioned that construction vehicles not use Rugby Place. There was already heavy congestion in the nearby streets, and it was requested that the Committee refer the application back for consideration to take on board these views. Whilst there was a need for new housing in the city the schemes had to be appropriate when they were infilling Council land.
- (5) Lucy Skelton spoke in opposition to the scheme in her capacity as a local resident, and stated that she and her family had lived in Rugby Place for the last 10 years. She was speaking on behalf of residents, but wished to note that there was general support for the Council's position to build more housing. The proposed northern block would be built on much loved open space and close to living rooms and windows. The southern block would be 3-storey – replacing the previous single-storey building. The design was inappropriate and did not compliment Rugby Place; the residents of Rugby Place were also concerned about the loss of privacy, and asked that the block be reduced by 1-storey. It was also felt that there was no justification for having a south facing balcony, and it would make more sense to turn the balconies round to give a view over the garden – this would not create a loss of light. Residents were also seeking assurances that Rugby Place would not be used by construction vehicles, and that works would be limited to Mondays to Fridays. In summary the Committee were requested to refuse the application, and residents would welcome the opportunity for a better design to come forward.

- (6) Sam Smith spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant [the Council]; he stated that this was one of the first schemes to come forward as part of the Council's New Homes for Neighbourhoods initiative – which aimed to bring forward 500 new homes on Council owned land. The use of sites like this would be fundamental to the initiative, and the scheme was one of the few that was 100% affordable rented housing. The application had been the subject of consultation, and changes had been made in response to residents' views to include: a reduction in the size of the southern block and footprint; the introduction of planting into the scheme and on-site parking. There was also a commitment to work closely with the Robert Lodge Residents.
- (7) Councillor Phillips asked about the rationale for the south facing balconies and Mr Smith explained that in order to move the balconies to the north the living rooms would also have to be moved creating much darker flats to the detriment of the living space.

Question(s) for Officers

- (8) In response to Councillor Hyde it was confirmed that a construction management plan was submitted with the application, and the delivery point was conditioned within the recommendations – as well as the hours of construction and the storage of materials.
- (9) In response to Councillor C. Theobald the height difference between the southern block and the buildings on Rugby Place was clarified, and the location of the bin and cycle storage was also confirmed. Officers went on to clarify that the narrowest distance between the existing buildings and the new ones would be 5.5 metres.
- (10) Councillor Robins asked question about the car parking spaces and the Principal Transport Officer, Steven Shaw, explained that there were six, and the likely potential overspill was not a reason for refusal. Consideration had been given to data at Ward level and this had been narrowed down to the location – rather than look at the city as a whole. It was also noted that the development was for 1 and 2 bedroom flats as such it was considered there would be less demand for parking, and the area was also served very well by public transport.
- (11) In response to queries from Councillor Gilbey it was clarified that the new location of the footpath would not allow for any direct views into the windows of properties. In terms of the loss of light to the most affected property it was clarified that the light would fall just short of the recommended threshold, but there was a secondary window to help reduce excessive enclosure.
- (12) In response to Councillor C. Theobald it was confirmed that it was proposed that 2 of the 6 parking bays would be for disabled use as there was one wheelchair accessible unit, and to allow for visitors.
- (13) In response to Councillor Davey it was confirmed that the footprint of the proposed southern building would be smaller than that of the demolished housing office, and the northern building site would cover 8% of the total communal garden space.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (14) Councillor Hyde stated that the site visit had been very useful, and the majority of her concerns related to the most affected flat in terms of the loss of light. She felt the design was good, and it would not be appropriate for it to try and replicate the Victorian style of property in Rugby Place, but there would be some attempts to tie this in with the brickwork. She favoured the provision of balconies, and noted that as they did not overhang the properties they overlooked would be afforded greater privacy, and from the site visit she was of the view that there would actually be no overlooking. She welcomed the proposal from the applicant for 500 new homes on land owned by the Council, and felt this was the appropriate way forward. She welcomed the improved facilities on the green space at the site, and she agreed the parking was adequate given the location and type of accommodation. Councillor Hyde went on to note that amendments had been made during the life of the application, and she would support the Officer recommendation as she was not of the view that the potential harm warranted refusal.
- (15) Councillor Wells noted that the city was desperate for new affordable homes, and the proposed blocks would fit in well with the rest of the site. The Officers had worked well with residents to bring forward an appropriate scheme. He agreed that the gains outweighed the potential harm, and noted that parking would not be an issue in this location.
- (16) Councillor C. Theobald stated that she supported increasing the city's housing stock, but she was concerned about the northern block - particularly the close proximity of the pathway. She felt the scheme would be better if it had formed two separate applications.
- (17) Councillor Davey stated that he heard the resident's concerns and the points made by Councillor Morgan, but he felt that the applicant had worked to address these and the proposals were modest in scale – for these reasons he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (18) Councillor Gilbey stated that she was less concerned about the balconies, but felt that residents should be restricted from using them to dry laundry. She felt that the new blocks would be too close to existing housing, and noted that the secondary window of the most affected property looked out onto a bank. Whilst she acknowledged the need for new housing in the city she felt that a better scheme could come forward on this site.
- (19) Councillor Robins stated that the Committee were broadly in support of new housing at this location, but there were concerned about the southern block – in response it was clarified that the Committee could only consider the scheme before them in its entirety.
- (20) Councillor Cox stated that there was need for more social housing in the city, and the Committee had a responsibility to show leadership and support this scheme.
- (21) The Chair stated that his concerns had been addressed at the site visit, and he felt secure about the future amenity at the site. He stated that he would be voting in

support of the Officers recommendation, and it was important that the Committee support appropriate housing schemes in the city.

(22) A vote was taken and the Officer recommendation that permission be minded to grant was approved by the 11 Members present with 8 in support and 3 against.

103.1 **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 be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to the S106 agreement and the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

Note: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting.

B BH2014/02412 - 168 Old Shoreham Road, Hove - Full Planning - Part change of use of ground floor from offices (B1) to residential (C3) with the erection of a single storey rear extension with associated external alterations to create 1no one bedroom flat (Part Retrospective).

(1) It was noted that the application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

(2) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. There was already permission in place for a change of use that had been granted earlier in the year. The main considerations related to the principle of the change of use; the design; the impact on the characteristics of the area; the standard of the accommodation; sustainability and transport matters. It was explained that the site had been the subject of two previous applications – the first being refused and the second receiving approval. Policy sought to protect the employment space, but there had been no serious interest in the premises since July 2012, and it was considered that the office space was redundant. The proposed extensions were well designed and had been reduced in size to an acceptable width. It was not considered that there would be any harm to neighbouring amenity, and the standard of accommodation was acceptable.

Public Speaker(s) and Questions

(3) Mr Colin Hughes spoke in objection to the scheme in his capacity as a local resident. He stated that he had recently been refused permission to his property next door for 'tilt and turn' windows that he had sought for emergency access. He felt the addition of the building would significantly impact on his home, and noted that the applicant was not of residence in the area and he was of the view the scheme was for profit making purposes. There would be three flats in the property when the works had been completed, and no 'right to light' study had been undertaken despite his requests. The scheme included patio doors over the roof terrace, and it would also seriously impact on the amount of sunlight in his neighbouring garden. In summary he added that the original form of the building should be left intact.

(4) In response to Councillor Cox the objector confirmed the proposed location of the 'tilt and turn' windows on his property.

- (5) Mr David Chetwin spoke in support of the application in his capacity as the agent. He stated that the scheme only requested modest changes, and gave assurance that the flat roof would not be used as a terrace as it would have a roof light and no balustrading would be installed. It was not his view that there would be issues with daylight and sunlight, and every effort had been made to reduce the impact of the extension. The design was highly sustainable; in line with policy and would provide new homes.

Questions for Officers

- (6) In response to Councillor C. Theobald it was confirmed daylight and sunlight studies were not normally requested on schemes of his size – the Officer recommendation also reflected the view that there would be no impact.
- (7) In response to Councillor Cox it was clarified that the scheme at the neighbouring property had been refused due to concerns with the detailing of the windows at the front of the property, and not simply for the ‘tilt and turn’ window at the rear. Any new change to the neighbouring property would have to form the subject of a new application, but similar changes within the street would be a material consideration. In response to further queries from Councillor Robins it was explained that the neighbour’s refused application had also been dismissed at appeal.
- (8) It was confirmed for Councillor C. Theobald that there was already a proposed condition to restrict the use of the flat roof as a terrace, and future permitted development rights had been removed.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (9) Councillor Cox stated that he had some unease in relation to this application, and he understood the objector’s reservations – the Chair added that enforcement action could be taken if the conditions were not complied with.
- (10) A vote was then taken by the 10 Members present and the Officer recommendation that permission be granted was carried on a vote of 6 in support; 3 against and 1 abstention.

103.2 **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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

Note: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting. Councillor Davey was not present during the consideration and vote on the application; see minute 98.3.

C BH2014/03227 - 4 Barrowfield Close, Hove - Full Planning - Erection of 1no four bedroom detached dwelling (C3).

- (1) A vote was taken by the 11 Members present at the meeting and the Officer recommendation that permission be granted was carried on a vote of 10 in support with 1 abstention.

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

Note: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting.

D BH2014/02503 - 75 - 105 Kings Road Arches, Brighton - Full Planning - Demolition of arches and erection of new arches with new brick façade with timber doors. Replacement railings to upper esplanade level. Change of use from storage to mixed uses comprising retail (A1), café (A3), storage (B8) and beach huts. (Part retrospective).

(2) A presentation was given by the Senior Planning Officer, Kathryn Boggiano, with reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings, and attention as also drawn to the amended Condition 6 that had been laid round for the Committee. The site comprised 31 Victorian arches to the east of the i360 development – the associated railings were listed and subject to a separate application that had to be determined by the Secretary of State. The arches had been redeveloped due to them being structurally unsound. The scheme proposed 33 new arches all of equal size and depth – there would also be greater detailing and the brick column would extend to the floor. Each arch would have bespoke wooden doors, and there would be stones installed to hide the guttering. It was noted that the brick façade to the front of the subway needed to be finalised, but it could not currently be surveyed due to the works to the i360.

(3) The scheme proposed to use 19 of the arches as beach huts; there would be storage units each using 3 arches, and some flexible use units that could be cafés or retail units. The letters of objection had mostly referred to the commercial use and the suitability in this area, but Officers considered that the impact of this additional commercial would be very minimal and fell below the threshold for retail assessment. The railing detail would be exact replicas, but the posts had been raised to meet building regulations. This change had in turn created issues with the space at the bottom of the railing, and to overcome this a concrete curb would be installed and this would be similar to the historic raising of the railings that had been lost as the pavement had been raised over the years. To conclude the scheme was high quality and recommended for approval subject to the conditions in the report.

Questions for Officers

(4) In response to Councillor C. Theobald it was explained that the materials of the new railings would match the old and the life expectancy was 125 years.

(5) It was clarified for Councillor Hyde that the concrete block below the railing would not be visible from below as the coping would hide this from view.

(6) It was confirmed for Councillor Wells that the works did not constitute refurbishment works.

(7) It was explained to Councillor Bowden that the proposed uses had been led by the Seafront Team.

- (8) In the response to the Chair it was explained that the linking parts at the ends of the scheme would have a consistent approach.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (9) Councillor Cox stated he was pleased to see the height of railings changed to make them safer.
- (10) Mr Gowans noted that the CAG welcomed the scheme.
- (11) Councillor Bowden welcomed the additional beach huts and the attention to detail in the works.
- (12) Councillor Wells welcomed the works, and noted that they would be an improvement.
- (13) Councillor Carden welcomed the scheme.
- (14) Councillor C. Theobald welcomed the additional commercial units.
- (15) Councillor Davey congratulated the Structural Engineer that had worked on the scheme, and welcomed the attention to detail.
- (16) A vote was taken by the 10 Members present at the meeting and the Officer recommendation that permission be granted was unanimously carried.

- 103.4 **RESOLVED** –That the Committee has taken into consideration the recommendation and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions and informatives, and the amended Condition 6 set out below:

Condition 6

Notwithstanding the submitted plan, within six months of the date of this permission, details of brick façade to the subway area to the west of arch number 76 Kings Road arches to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being first occupied.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the brick façade of the arches and to comply with policies QD1, QD2 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Note: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting, and Councillor Robins had left the meeting at this point.

- E BH2014/03103 - 88 Waldegrave Road, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent -** Replacement of existing timber sash windows with UPVC sash windows to the front elevation.

- (1) The Area Planning Manager gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevational drawings. The site was located in the Preston Park Conservation Area

where there were restrictions to changes at the front of properties, and much of the road had retained the original sash windows. The application sought to replace the windows with UPVC windows, and the main considerations related to the appearance of the windows and the impact on both the host building and the wider conservation area. Whilst there were examples of UPVC windows in the street these had no planning history, and the timber sash windows should be protected. Policy stated that within conservation areas such applications were likely to be refused. Attention was also drawn to a recent refusal of a similar scheme on Clifton Street by the Committee earlier in the year which had also been upheld at appeal.

Public Speaker(s) and Questions

- (2) Mr Martin Szczerbicki spoke in support of the scheme in his capacity as the agent. He stated that the applicant was extremely respectful of planning policy, and the proposed UPVC windows would be indistinguishable from sash windows – as such they were in compliance with the NPPF as the authority would need to prove they would cause material harm. It was felt that the strictness of the policy should only be applied to listed buildings and was disproportionate for buildings in conservation areas. The UPVC windows would reduce energy bills and maintenance costs for the occupiers, and the Committee were invited to approve the application.
- (3) In response to Councillor Davey the speaker confirmed that the works had not yet been undertaken.
- (4) In response to some of the points raised by the speaker the Area Planning Manager clarified that the authority had evidence to show that the thermal quality of timber framed windows was as good as UPVC windows. The guidance was not applying that which would be used for listed properties, but policy for conservations areas. The Heritage Team had also considered the proposed windows and noted that the top and meeting railings were set further forward which had the visual effect of increasing the depth of the meeting rails. The use of different materials also had a different light reflecting quality and gave a different finish.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (5) Councillor Davey noted the decision of the Committee and the appeal at Clifton Street.
- (6) A vote was taken by the 11 Members present at the meeting and the Officer recommendation that permission be refused was carried on a vote of 9 in support with 2 abstentions.

103.5 **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 **REFUSE** permission for the reasons set out below:

- i. The replacement windows to the front elevation, by virtue of their material and detailing, represents a harmful alteration that fails to preserve the character or appearance of the building or wider Preston Park Conservation Area. The proposal is thereby contrary to policies QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and

Supplementary Planning Document 9 Architectural Features, and Supplementary Planning Document 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

Informatives

- ii. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

Note: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting.

F BH2014/02826 - 24 Hythe Road, Brighton - Full Planning - Erection of 3no four bedroom dwellings, conversion of stable block to four bedroom dwelling and enlargement of garden to existing dwelling.

- (1) It was noted that the application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- (2) The Area Planning Manager, Nicola Hurley, introduced the application and gave a presentation by reference to photographs, plans and elevations drawings. The application site related to a former car repair garage and associated workshop; the site abutted the Preston Park Conservation Area, and also included a 2-storey historic stable block. Planning permission had been refused for a similar scheme earlier in the year, and the details of this were highlighted to the Committee. Planning permission was now sought for the demolition of all the structures on the site, and the retention of the 2-storey stable block. There had been changes during the life of the application to amend the roof windows at the rear of the properties and the changes were highlighted to the Committee.
- (3) The main considerations related to the change of use; the historic setting of the conservation area; the impact on amenity; the standard of the accommodation and transport matters. Whilst no marketing evidence had been produced to justify the change of use a structural survey had evidenced that the buildings were in an extremely poor condition and dangerous in places – they were considered to be beyond financial viability. The current light industrial use was also considered harmful given the wider residential area, and there were an adequate number of other B1 use units in the area. The current appearance of the buildings was considered harmful, and they formed a gap in the street scene that was uncharacteristic of the wider area.
- (4) The application also retained the original stable block, and this would have features to reflect those in the wider street scene, and would relate positively to the area. The stable block pre-dated the majority of the houses in the area, and the Heritage Office had indicated that the retention of it was favourable. The separation distances would also be similar to those in the wider area; it was acknowledged that residents had benefited from the units being unused from some time, but it was noted that the new use was all residential. The scheme was considered acceptable in terms of sustainability and transport, and for the reasons outlined in the report it was recommended for refusal.

Public Speaker(s) and Questions

- (5) Sarah Bussey spoke in objection to the application in her capacity as a local resident. She stated that she was speaking on behalf of the 20 residents that had objected to the scheme, and noted that she had a petition of 77 signatures with her. The scheme would be overdevelopment of the site, and lead to a loss of amenity creating a significant impact on residents. The addition of the new four bedroom properties would create more noise, and existing buildings would be overlooked. There were already significant parking pressures in the area, and use of cars was greater in more “affluent” areas such as Fiveways. The credibility of the letters of support was also questioned, and it was noted that 5 of the 20 objectors were those with properties immediately adjacent to the stable block. It was felt that some of the previous reasons for refusal still applied, and the increased noise and pressure on parking were reiterated.
- (6) In response to Councillor Robins it was explained by the objector that there would be increased noise as the site was currently vacant.
- (7) Councillor Kennedy spoke in objection to the scheme in her capacity as one of the Local Ward Councillors. She stated that the petition highlighted by the resident speaking was evidence to the strength of feeling in the area. Residents were not fundamentally opposed to the development of the front of the site, but the proposals for the stable block were not acceptable, and it would have been preferable if the application had been considered in two parts separately. Residents were concerned about the use of the stable block, and the impact of this aspect of the scheme should be enough to warrant refusal. The impact on parking and traffic were highlighted, and the validity of the letters of support was again queried.
- (8) Councillor Kennedy responded to Councillor Cox that an alternate use for the stable block was a matter for the applicant to put forward.
- (9) Mr Starley spoke in support of the application in his capacity as the applicant, and explained that he was also a resident and his father had been born on the street. He had worked very closely with his architect on the design, and the scheme had developed in response to consultation with local residents. The stable block was a heritage asset, and its conversion would assist in maintaining it, and the wider scheme would return much of the plot to garden. Mr Starley stated that he was aware of the parking issues in the area, but noted that the stable block had its own disabled parking bay – there would also be additional parking created through the removal of the drop kerbs for the repair garage. He hoped the Committee could approve the plans before them to improve the area.
- (10) In response to Councillor Davey it was explained by Mr Starley that residents’ concerns should be alleviated as the principle garden for the stable block would be located to the side – rather than at the rear.

Questions for Officers

- (11) In response to Councillor Davey it was confirmed that the stable block was being converted, and would not be enlarged.

- (12) In response to Councillor Wells it was confirmed that the repair garage could revert to its permitted use, but the buildings were in a very poor state of repair.
- (13) It was confirmed for Councillor Gilbey that the height of the stable block would not be changing.

Debate and Decision Making Process

- (14) Councillor Wells stated that he welcomed the improvements, and he did not see any issues with the changes to the stable block. He stated he would support the Officer recommendation.
- (15) Councillor Hyde stated that the scheme had improved during the life of the application, and she felt that the design was appropriate. She stated the current structure was an “eyesore”, and the proposals would be an improvement for the street. The loss of the B1 use was acceptable, and the stable block was already on the site and the works had been designed to minimise overlooking. In terms of amenity Councillor Hyde stated that this would not be significantly different from that currently as the properties were residential – she added that parking would also be gained through the removal of the drop kerbs. For these reasons she would support the Officer recommendation in the report.
- (16) Councillor Gilbey stated that she agreed with Councillor Hyde in relation to overlooking, and added that the addition of the garden space would improve the area.
- (17) Councillor C. Theobald stated that the buildings were currently derelict and ugly, and this scheme would be a welcome improvement; she would support the Officer recommendation.
- (18) The Chair stated that he had been struck by the tight urban grain on the site visit, and the site was an exception in the area. He felt that the scheme reflected policy and he would support the Officers recommendation.
- (19) A vote was then taken and the Officer recommendation that permission be approved was carried unanimously by the 11 Members present at the meeting.

103.6 **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: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting.

G BH2014/03008 - 6 The Spinney, Hove - Householder Planning Consent - Remodelling of existing chalet bungalow to create a two storey 5no bedroom house with associated alterations including erection of first floor extensions to sides and rear and creation of rear terrace.

- (1) It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

- (2) Councillor C. Theobald noted the scheme would improve the property.
- (3) A vote was taken by the 10 Members present at the meeting and the Officer recommendation that permission be granted was unanimously carried.

103.7 **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: Councillor Jones was not present at the meeting, and Councillor Robins had left the meeting at this point.

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

104.1 There were no further requests for site visits.

105 INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS

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

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

106.1 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.]

107 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

108 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

109 APPEAL DECISIONS

109.1 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 5.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

