

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**

**26 NOVEMBER 2003**

**2.00PM**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

Present: Councillors Carden (Chair), Forester, Hamilton, K Norman, Older, Paskins, Pennington (Deputy Chair), Mrs Theobald (Opposition Spokesperson), Tonks, Watkins, Wells.

Also in Attendance: Mrs J Turner, Disabled Access Advisory Group; Mrs S Montford, Conservation Areas Advisory Group.

---

**PART 1**

**102A. DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

102A.1 There were no substitutes.

**102B. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

102B.1 Councillor Carden (Chair) declared an interest in respect of Item 106 on the agenda relating to a consultation received from Adur District Council relating to the Parcellforce Site at 79-81 Brighton Road, Shoreham and Application BH2003/02549/FP, 20 Wellington Road, Portslade (on the Plans List) by virtue of his membership of the Board of Shoreham Port Authority and indicated his intention to vacate the Chair and to leave the meeting during consideration of these items, which he duly did. The meeting was Chaired by Councillor Pennington, the Deputy Chair during consideration of both of these items. Councillor Tonks declared an interest in respect of Application BH2003/0314/FP, Fairway Trading Estate, off Moulsecoomb Way, by virtue of his letter objecting to the proposals included with the agenda. Councillor Tonks spoke in his capacity as local Ward Councillor objecting to the proposals and then left the meeting taking no part in the discussions or voting in respect of this item.

**102C. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

102C.1 The Sub-Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any items

contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the proceedings the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972.

102C.2 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item on the agenda.

### 103. MINUTES

103.1 Mrs Turner, Disabled Access Advisory Group stated that she had referred to her desire to visit the site of the development at 121-123 Havelock Road in order to ascertain that it had disabled access and the offer of the Chair to take her there and, to the fact that this had not been referred to in the minutes. The Chair agreed this should be minuted, but stated that he had been advised that it would be inappropriate to visit prior to the determination of the applications.

103.2 Council Older referred to the protocol relating to public speaking and referred to an objector who had been allowed to speak previously but had been advised that they would not be afforded that opportunity at that meeting, and to a member of the public who had been advised that they would not be allowed to speak regarding a future application to Committee. The Solicitor to the Sub-Committee advised that where an application had been considered and objectors or applicants had been afforded the opportunity to speak and had used the 3 minutes permitted, they would not be allowed to re-address the Sub-Committee should subsequent discussions result in the application being deferred. Where an application was deferred prior to public speaking taking place the right to speak for 3 minutes remained.

103.3 The Solicitor went on to explain that in order for an objector to be granted public speaking rights the person wishing to speak needed to have a clearly defined local interest e.g. as a neighbour or within the immediate locality of the proposed development or to be speaking on behalf of such an individual, in order to be permitted to speak there had to be a local connection; the protocol had always been applied in this way in the interests of efficient despatch of Committee business; this did not extend to anyone who had an interest solely as a citizen of Brighton and Hove. Applicants/agents were accorded the right to speak where there was an objector to the scheme or the officers recommendation was to refuse an application.

103.4 **RESOLVED** - That subject to the foregoing amendment (referred to in Paragraph 103.1 above), the minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2003 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

**104. PETITIONS**

104.1 No petitions were presented at the meeting.

**105. UPDATE ON DECISIONS DELEGATED TO OFFICERS AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

105.1 The Development Control Manager reported on the following:-

105.2 Amended plans had been received in respect of the application relating to 6 Court Road which were being given further consideration.

105.3 Councillors were reminded of the Members' Training session to take place on Friday 5 December 2003 on probity issues and a further session dealing with telecommunications issues was to be held on 15 January 2004.

105.4 **RESOLVED** - That the report be noted.

**106. CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON PLANNING APPLICATION IN ADUR**

106.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment regarding consultations from Adur District Council regarding an application within their area (for copy see minute book).

106.2 **RESOLVED** - That the Planning Applications Sub-Committee:-

(1) Notes the proposal at the Parcelforce Site, 79-81 Brighton Road, Shoreham-by-Sea;

(2) Agrees the officers' recommendation that there are no objections to the proposal; and

(3) Agrees that officers write to Adur, on behalf of the City Council to confirm this view.

[**Note:** Councillor Carden vacated the Chair during consideration of this item, left the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon. Councillor Pennington was in the Chair.]

**107. 24 REDHILL DRIVE**

107.1 The Planning officer advised that further to the preparation of the report agreement had been reached by both parties in respect of further revisions to delete the proposed east facing window to the rear first floor bedroom and construct a south facing bay window to this room. On this

basis it was agreed that officers be given delegated authority to accept these amendments.

107.2 **RESOLVED** - That officers be given delegated authority to accept these amendments as a revision to the drawings granted planning permission on 10 January 2003 and that the owners of No.24 enter into a Section 106 planning obligation with the Council requiring the construction of these amendments.

## 108. SITE VISITS

108.1 **RESOLVED** - That the following site visits be undertaken by the Sub Committee prior to determining the applications : -

APPLICATION	SITE	SUGGESTED BY
BH2003/02691/FP	Babylon Lounge, Westbourne Gardens	Agreed 15 October 2003
BH2003/02998/O A	Land R/O 13 Kenilworth Close	Councillor Mrs Theobald
BH2003/02456/FP BH2003/02523/LB	St George's Church, St George's Road	Councillor Mrs Theobald
BH2003/02237/FP BH2003/02237/LB BH2003/02237/C A	61, 63, 65 Brunswick Street West	Councillor Watkins
BH2003/03369/O A & 03442/FP	Land at Redhill Close	Development Control Manager

[**Note:** Item 110 sets out a full list of future site visits.]

## 109. PLANS LIST OF APPLICATIONS, 26 NOVEMBER 2003 (SEE MINUTE BOOK)

### (i) SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROVERSIAL APPLICATIONS OR APPLICATIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL POLICY

#### Applications BH2003/02330/FP & BH2003/02594/CA – 72 St. George's Road

109.1 The Planning Officer confirmed that the site had been used for car repairs for many years prior to which had been used as stables, an earlier application for four 2 bedroom and seven 1 bedroom flats had been refused. Councillor Mrs Theobald expressed concern regarding the fact that no on-street parking was to be provided, in her view this could have been easily provided to this mews style development. Councillor Watkins

expressed reservations regarding the apparently narrow access way to the rear of the site.

109.2 **RESOLVED** - That the Council is minded to grant Planning Permission subject to an undertaking under Section 106 to achieve a car free development, and subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/02330/FP- Fairway Trading Estate, Moulsecoomb Way**

109.3 It was noted that the application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Councillor Tonks spoke as a local Ward Councillor objecting to the proposals following which he left the chamber. Mr Cooner spoke on behalf of the applicants in support of the application. Councillors Hyde and K Norman referred to a recent High Court ruling indicating that local authorities should take health considerations into account as a material factor when considering whether or not to grant planning permission for mast applications.

109.4 Several Members referred to recent expert advice which called into question the safety of TETRA installations. The Solicitor to the Sub-Committee confirmed that whilst local authorities could consider risks to health/perceived risks to health as a material consideration, in this instance the installation conformed to ICNIRP public exposure guidelines. According to Central Government Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 (PPG8) - Telecommunications – if such a compliance notice accompanies an application it should not be necessary for local authorities to pursue health concerns further. Notwithstanding this the authority's Environmental Health Officer had considered the proposal, relevant legislation and advice and had concluded that no objection could be raised on grounds that the development could be prejudicial to health or a nuisance.

109.5 Members also expressed concern regarding the retrospective nature of the application given that the applicant had not in their view adequately demonstrated that an alternative location had been sought away from domestic dwellings, reiterated their concerns regarding health and given that the site would not be recommended for approval as a permanent site considered that it should be refused.

109.6 **RESOLVED** - That retrospective Planning Permission be refused by the Council in respect of the temporary application to install a 15m high airwave mast, 3 omni directional antennas, 1 microwave dish, 1 GPS antenna and ancillary equipment cabinet within a fenced compound on the following grounds:

1. Bearing in mind the recent High Court ruling by Justice Richards, the current uncertainty over risks to health posed by the TETRA system and the perception of health risks expressed by local residents the application is

considered to be unacceptable and contrary to policy QD23(e) in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft.

2. The proposed mast is considered to be unsightly and detrimental to the nearby residential area due to its height, siting and appearance. This is contrary to policy QD23(c) in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft.

3. Insufficient information has been submitted to provide an adequate assessment of alternative sites for such apparatus, contrary to policy QD23 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft and PPG8 - Telecommunications.

[**Note 1:** Having spoken against the application in his capacity as a local Ward Councillor, Councillor Tonks then left the meeting and took no further part in the discussion or voting in respect of this application.]

[**Note 2:** Councillors Carden, Pennington and Hamilton voted that the application be granted, Councillor Forester Abstained and Councillors Hyde, K Norman, Older, Paskins, Mrs Theobald, and Watkins voted that the application be refused and on a vote of 6 to 3 for refusal, the application was refused.]

#### **Application BH2003/02944/FP – 46-54 Old London Road, Brighton**

109.7 Councillor G Theobald spoke as local Ward Councillor objecting to the proposals on the grounds that they would be detrimental to the character and setting of Patcham Village, the bulk and scale of the proposed development in relation to the site and concerns regarding potential susceptibility of the site to flooding. Members were in agreement with the points raised by Councillor Theobald and other Ward Councillors and the Officers recommendations that the application should be refused on the grounds of over development, poor design, failure to address sustainability issues, lack of contribution to public art and off-site recreation facilities and failure to address flooding issues in the area.

109.8 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

#### **Application BH2003/092745/FP - 11 Windlesham Avenue, Brighton**

109.9 It was noted that this application had been subject to a site visit prior to the meeting.

109.10 Miss Brushneen spoke as an objector to the scheme and Mr Golding, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

109.11 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/02533/FP - Land Adjoining 10 New England Road and R/O 53 New England Street, Brighton**

109.12 It was noted that the application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. The Planning Officer referred to further letters of objection which had been received. Following the Planning Officer's presentation, Members were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Environmental Health Officer on technical issues relating to the use of Combined Heat and Power Plants.

109.13 Councillor Taylor spoke in his capacity as a local Ward Councillor as an objector to the scheme.

109.14 Members, whilst supporting the concept of a CHP system, expressed reservations regarding the proposed location of the chimneys and plant which would be intrusive in their appearance and would also be located close to residential dwellings and the setting of the listed railway bridge. Members had particular concerns that notwithstanding that the use of CHP systems reduced the level of NO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the proposed location for the plant would inevitably lead to increased levels of such emissions in an area where they were already recognised as being high given the levels of traffic flow at Preston Circus, which was close to the proposed site. If following the setting up of an air quality management area attendant on the scheme, emission levels were unacceptably high, the cost of measures to ameliorate this would need to be borne by the Council, not the developer. Several Members considered that as the CHP was intended to service the Brighton station site itself that it would be more appropriate environmentally and on a practical level for this to be situated centrally within the development site and, that consideration of the application should be deferred in order for a more appropriate location and solution to be explored.

109.15 **RESOLVED** - That consideration of the scheme be deferred to enable the applicant to provide further information regarding the following issues - justification for the peripheral location of the plant; the possibility of lowering the thermal store to reduce its visual impact; further information on solutions to reduce levels of emissions from the plant and thereby its impact on air quality levels at Preston Circus. In particular the use of technical solutions (e.g. scrubbers) and the use of alternative fuels to gas, and the use of alternative external materials to the plant.

**Application BH2003/02672/FP - 1 Dyke Road Place, Brighton**

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

109.17 Mrs Bessant spoke as an objector to the scheme and Mr Fenne spoke on behalf of the applicants. It was noted that the applicants had

expressed a willingness to provide additional screening in order to address objectors concerns. Councillor K Norman considered that the proposal would have a severe impact on the neighbouring property and Councillor Mrs Theobald considered that the differing levels of the site would result in a reduction of light to the neighbouring property. Councillor Older considered that the cream brickwork proposed would be inappropriate. Councillor Paskins also expressed reservations that the scheme would be overly dominant.

109.18 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions set out in the report.

[**Note:** Councillors Norman, Older, Paskins and Mrs Theobald wished their names recorded as having voted against the scheme].

#### **Application BH2003/03025/FP - 19a Third Avenue, Hove**

109.19 It was noted that this application had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. The Planning Officer referred to an additional informative to be added to the decision notice should permission be granted. The fenestration had been improved for the plans as originally submitted and the balcony was to be of timber construction.

109.20 Mr Scott spoke as an objector to the proposals and Mr Thorn spoke as the applicant in support of his application.

109.21 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council as set out in the report and with the addition of the following informative to ensure that the architectural detailing on the existing property should be replicated on the extension.

[**Note:** Councillor Older wished her name recorded as having voted against the application].

#### **Application BH2003/02549/FP - 20 Wellington Road**

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

109.23 Councillor Hamilton sought confirmation that once the development had been completed all floors would be interconnected and the Planning Officer confirmed that this would be so.

109.24 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions set out in the report.

[**Note:** Having declared an interest in the application by virtue of his Membership of Shoreham Port Authority, Councillor Carden vacated the



Chair during consideration of this item and left the meeting, taking no part in the discussions or voting thereon. Councillor Pennington took the Chair during consideration of this item.]

**Application BH2003/02020/FP - Gala Bingo Hall, Portland Road**

109.25 The Planning Officer referred to an additional letter of objection that had been received in respect of the site.

109.26 Councillor Kemble spoke as a local Ward Councillor opposing the scheme. Mr Bendinelli spoke on behalf of the applicants.

109.27 Councillor Mrs Theobald referred to the current building which was in a poor condition, welcoming the proposals and suggesting that a suitable recreation/leisure facility could be provided nearby. Councillor Hyde welcomed the proposed housing which would be located close to local shopping facilities and with easy access to public transport; considering that an element of affordable housing should be sought elsewhere rather than rigorously applied to this particular site. Councillor Wells was in agreement considering that the proposed site would not lend itself to a mix of owned/affordable housing and that this criteria should not apply. Councillor Hamilton referred to the need to seek a percentage for recreation/sport when appropriate in line with recent recommendations of OSOC. In this instance a replacement recreation facility should be required of the applicants. Councillor Older expressed support for the scheme which would make effective use of a large site.

109.28 In answer to questions, the Planning Officer confirmed that "affordable" housing could also be deemed to be shared ownership, but that the applicants had not submitted any "affordable" element at all despite being requested to do so.

109.29 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused by the Council for the reasons set out in the report.

[**Note:** Councillors Hyde, K Norman, Mrs Theobald and Wells requested that their names be recorded as having voted against the recommendation that Planning Permission be refused.]

**(ii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS LIST DATED 26 NOVEMBER 2003**

109.30 The recommendations of the Director of Environment were agreed with the exception of items reported in parts (iii) and (iv) below and items deferred for site visits as set out in the agenda items before and following the Plans List.

**(iii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS WHICH VARY FROM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AS SET OUT IN THE PLANS LIST (MINOR APPLICATIONS) DATED 26 NOVEMBER 2003**

**Application BH2003/03169/FP - Land immediately North of Brighton Marina (Behind Traffic Sign)**

109.31 Councillor Smith spoke as a local Ward Councillor opposing the proposals. A number of Members were in agreement that the proposals were inappropriate and overly dominant in the proposed location, given the special scientific significance of the site, its geological interest and the close proximity of archaeological remains. The highly visible cliff top location proposed was considered unacceptable and, Members were of the view that the applicants had failed to demonstrate that alternative solutions such as mast sharing or an alternative location had been sought. Several Members considered that if the mast was primarily intended to cover the Marina, a location within the Marina ought to be sought. Reference was also made to potential perceived health risks associated with the proposed location.

109.32 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused by the Council on the following grounds:

1. The Local Planning Authority does not consider the information supporting the site selection process is adequate justification for the site applied for. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy QD23 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft and PPG8 - Telecommunications.

2. The proposal has a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the locality by virtue of its bulk and height, and results in further loss of amenity due to the perception of increased health risks associated with this type of development. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy ENV1 of the Brighton Borough Local Plan Second Deposit Draft.

3. The excavation works associated with such development, and the introduction of this pole and cabinets in this location, is considered to have a detrimental impact to this sensitive site, which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest, an Archaeologically Sensitive Area and a Regionally Important Geological Site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies ENV56 and ENV43 of the Brighton Borough Plan and NC2, HE12 and NC4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft.

[**Note:** On a Recorded Vote Councillors Carden, Forester and Hamilton recommended that the application be granted; Councillors Hyde, K Norman, Older, Paskins, Mrs Theobald, Tonks, Watkins and Wells voted that the application should be refused. Therefore on a vote of 8 to 3 it was

agreed that the application should be refused. Councillor Pennington abstained.]

**Application BH2003/03101/FP - Court Farm Barn, Devils Dyke Road, Hove**

109.33 The Planning Officer confirmed that the application represented an amendment to the recently approved application (15 August 2003) and that the application site was alongside a large agricultural barn adjacent to the A27 and Devils Dyke Road.

109.34 Councillor Mrs Theobald stated that having voted against the application when it was smaller and less intrusive she considered this larger mast application to be unacceptable even on a temporary basis. Members considered that the application would be overly dominant within the South Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and should therefore be refused particularly given that the structure was not considered suitable as a permanent form of development.

109.35 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused by the Council on the grounds that the proposed temporary mast would be overly dominant and detrimental to the setting of the adjacent South Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

[**Note:** Councillors Carden, Forester, Hamilton and Pennington voted that the application should be approved. Councillors Hyde, K Norman, Older, Paskins, Mrs Theobald, Tonks, Watkins and Wells voted that the application should be refused. On a vote of 8 to 4 the application was refused.]

**(iv) OTHER APPLICATIONS**

**Application BH2003/03304/FP - 3 Newark Place, Brighton**

109.36 The Planning Officer referred to the planning history of the site explaining that it was considered that the concerns that had resulted in the previous approval had now been satisfactorily addressed. Mr Ancell spoke as an objector to the application.

109.37 In answer to questions the Planning Officer explained that this and similar live-work units were only permitted for B1 use and that there were powers under existing environmental health legislation that could be invoked in the case of any noise nuisance.

109.38 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/03124/FP - 2 Newlands Road, Rottingdean**

109.39 The Planning Officer informed the Sub-Committee that this application had been withdrawn.

**Applications BH2003/02224/FP & BH2003/02226/LB - Basement Flat, 31 Sussex Square, Brighton**

109.40 The Planning Officer explained that following receipt of further amended plans there were a number of issues that required further clarification and it was therefore recommended that consideration of the application be deferred.

109.41 **RESOLVED** - That consideration of the application be deferred pending further clarification in relation to the amended plans.

**Application BH2003/01765/FP - 14A West Street, Rottingdean**

109.42 The Planning Officer reminded Members that consideration of this application had been deferred at their meeting on 15 October 2003 pending receipt of additional information regarding the impact on neighbours at the rear of the site. The Planning Officer explained that following further discussion the objections had now been withdrawn.

109.43 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to a Section 106 obligation requiring a contribution towards sustainable transport and to the conditions set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/03216/FP - 2 Dale Crescent, Brighton**

109.44 Mr R Merrington spoke as an objector to the application. Councillor Older stated that a compromise that was acceptable to all parties should be sought. However Councillor Hyde and others considered that the objections received had been addressed.

109.45 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/03110/FP - 17 Old London Road, Brighton**

109.46 Mr Dunkerton spoke as an objector to the application and Mr McCabe spoke on behalf of the applicant.

109.47 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Applications BH2003/03005/FP, BH2003/03006/FP, BH2003/03007/FP, BH2003/03101/FP & BH2003/03008/FP - 121-123 Havelock Road, Brighton**

109.48 The Planning Officer confirmed that following deferral of this and four other applications relating to this site, clarification had been received regarding alterations to the front boundary wall and regarding works to the pillars and pillar caps fronting the site to ensure uniformity and that they complied with the original permission.

109.49 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Applications BH2003/02237/FP, BH2003/02237/LB & BH2003/02237/CA – 61, 63, 65 Brunswick Street West, Hove**

109.50 It was agreed that consideration of the application should be deferred pending a site visit.

109.51 **RESOLVED** - That consideration of the foregoing application be deferred pending a site visit.

**Application BH2003/0281/FP - 18 Benfield Way, Portslade**

109.52 The Planning Officer explained that the proposed structure was not considered harmful in terms of design and materials and would include uPVC windows to match those used elsewhere on the property; it would not be visible from the road and would not have any effect on the street scene. Mr Young spoke as an objector to the scheme.

109.53 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be granted by the Council subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**(v) TREES**

109.54 **RESOLVED** - (1) That permission to fell the trees which are the subject of the following applications be granted as set out in the report:-

BH2003/03355/TPO/F - Varndean Park Estate (with conditions as set out in the report)

BH2003/03352/TPO/F - 21 Woodlands, Barrowfield Drive (with conditions as set out in the report)

BH2003/03188/TPO/F - 63 Rugby Road (with conditions as set out in the report)

(2) That permission to fell the tree which is the subject of the following application be refused as set out in the report:-

BH2003/03274/TPO/F - 74 Mile Oak Road, Portslade

(3) That decisions on tree works delegated to the Director of Environment, as set out in the Plans List dated 26 November 2003, be noted.

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

109.53 **RESOLVED** - That the decisions of the Director of Environment on other applications using her delegated powers be noted.

[**Note 1:** All decisions recorded in this minute are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the Planning Register maintained by the Director of Environment. The register complies with legislative requirements.

**Note 2:** A list of the representations, received by the Council after the plans List reports had been submitted for printing, was circulated to Members (for copy see minute book). Representations received less than 24 hours before the meeting were not considered in accordance with resolutions 129.7 and 129.8 set out in the minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2002.]

#### **110. SITE VISITS**

110.1 The following list contains details of site visits agreed during consideration of items 108 and 109 above, any additional site visits in respect of applications currently being processed by officers, and sets out the total number of site visits agreed prior to the next (or a future) meeting of the Sub-Committee.

110.2 **RESOLVED** - That the following site visits be undertaken by the Sub-Committee prior to determining the applications:-

<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>SITE</b>	<b>SUGGESTED BY</b>
BH2003/02691/FP	Babylon Lounge, Westbourne Gardens	Agreed 15 October 2003
BH2003/02998/O A	Land R/O 13 Kenilworth Close	Councillor Mrs Theobald
BH2003/02456/FP BH2003/02523/LB	St George's Church, St George's Road	Councillor Mrs Theobald
BH2003/02237/FP BH2003/02237/LB BH2003/02237/C A	61, 63, 65 Brunswick Street West	Councillor Watkins
BH2003/03369/O	Land at Redhill Close	Development Control

APPLICATION	SITE	SUGGESTED BY
A & 03442/FP		Manager

**111. PROGRESS ON CURRENT APPEALS**

111.1 The Development Control Manager circulated a sheet giving details of forthcoming planning inquiries or appeal hearings.

**112. APPEAL DECISIONS**

112.1 The Sub-Committee noted letters from the Planning Inspectorate advising on the results of Planning Appeals as set out in the agenda.

**113. APPEALS LODGED**

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

The meeting concluded at 6.10pm

Signed (Chair)

Dated this day of 2003