

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

**23 JULY 2003**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

Present Coucillors Carden (Chair), Forester, Hyde, K Norman, Meegan, Older Paskins, Pennington (Deputy Chair), Smith , Watkins and Wells.

Also in attendance : Mr Small, Conservation Areas Advisory Group; Mrs J Turner , Disabled Access Advisory Group

---

**PART 1**

**33A DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTES**

33.A1 <u>Councillor</u>	<u>Attending as Substitute for</u>
Meegan	Hamilton
Smith	Mrs Theobald

**33B DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

33B.1 Councillor Allen declared an interest in Application BH2003/00960/FP, 121 – 123 Havelock Road as a Ward Councillor confirming that having spoken in his capacity as a Ward Councillor that he would withdraw from the meeting and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

33B.2 Councillor Smith declared an interest in Application BH2003/01786/FP, Saltdean Reservoir given that his concerns were set out in the Officers report. He confirmed that having spoken in his capacity as Ward Councillor that he would withdraw from the meeting and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

33B.3 Councillor Meegan declared an interest in Application BH/2003/00826 – 58 Palmeira Avenue by virtue of the fact that the application site was located in the area where he lived. He confirmed that it was his intention to withdraw from the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon.

33B.4 Councillor Carden declared an interest in Application BH2003/01602/FP - 125 Graham Avenue, Portslade by virtue of the fact that both the applicant and agent were known to him. He confirmed that he would vacate the Chair, which would be taken by Councillor Pennington during consideration of this item and that he would withdraw from the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon.

33B.5 The Development Control Manager declared an interest on behalf of herself and her staff in respect of Application BH2003/01864/FP – 11 Wayland Avenue, stating that the applicant was an employee of the Council who was known to Officers. This had not however impacted upon the way in which the application had been dealt with as officers had been unaware of the applicant's identity when the application had been processed. The applicant was known by a different surname at their place of work.

### **33C EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

33C.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 and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Section 100A(3) or 1001 of the Local Government Act 1972.

33C.2 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration Item 44 on the agenda.

### **34. MINUTES**

34.1 **RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2003 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

### **35. PETITIONS**

35.1 Councillor Taylor presented a petition in respect of proposals relating to an application at 38 – 50 Carlyle Street which would be considered at a future meeting of the Sub Committee.

35.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be received.

### **36. UPDATE ON DECISIONS DELEGATED TO OFFICERS AT PREVIOUS MEETING.**

36.1 The Development Control Manager reported that the improvements to the division's performance indicators regarding the time taken in processing planning applications had continued to be sustained during the current quarter due to the sustained efforts of the officers and the additional resources that had been provided. All the targets set had been either met or exceeded except in the case of the percentage of applications dealt with by Officers under their delegated powers. This had been set at 90% by the government and a level of 87.4% had

been achieved. It was not anticipated that a level of 90% could be achieved unless the current scheme of delegations was amended. The Chair congratulated officers on the sustained improvements that had been achieved.

36.2 **RESOLVED** - That the position be noted.

### **37.1 LABURNHAM AVENUE : PROPOSED PLAY AREA**

37.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Strategy and Governance seeking approval to discharge the Section 106 Planning Agreement dated 22 February 2001 relating to Phase 2 Healthcare Development at Nevill Avenue (for copy see minute book).

37.2 **RESOLVED** - That authorisation be given to discharge the Section 106 Planning Agreement relating to planning application BH2000/01027/FP dated 22 February 2001.

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

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

<b>WARD</b>	<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>SITE</b>	<b>SUGGESTED BY</b>
Withdean	BH2003/01864/FP	11 Wayland Avenue	Councillor Norman
Goldsmid	BH2003/00826/FP	58 Palmeira Avenue	Councillor Paskins

Following consideration of the Plans List the following applications were also added : -

Regency	BH2003/01557/FP	4 Sillwood Street	Councillor Wells
Withdean	BH2003/01936/FP	17 Hillbrow Road	Councillor Norman

### **39. PLANS LIST OF APPLICATIONS, 23 JULY 2003 (SEE MINUTE BOOK)**

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

##### **Application BH2003/01550/FP - 133 Cuckmere Way**

39.1 This application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting. Having had the benefit of visiting the site Members considered that whilst the proposed pitch of the roof was not considered acceptable, they would be minded to grant permission for a roof with a similar appearance to that on a nearby property at

145 Cuckmere Way. Members were in agreement that the application should be deferred pending further discussions between officers and the applicant in order that a suitably amended application could be submitted.

39.2 **RESOLVED** - That consideration of the application be deferred and that the applicant be advised that the Sub-Committee (subject to the outcome of further negotiations with Officers) would be minded to grant permission for an extension which would provide a roof slope similar to that observed at 145 Cuckmere Way.

**Application BH2003/00960/FP - 121 - 123 Havelock Road**

39.4 This application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting. The Planning Officer stated that the application sought retrospective planning permission for a variety of amendments to the approved scheme referred to in the report (which had been substantively carried out).

39.5 The Planning Officer referred to additional representations which had been received. Councillor McCaffery, a local Ward Councillor had indicated that although the development was attractive and generally in keeping with the Conservation Area, she had expressed concerns regarding the bay windows to the rear of the building which were obtrusive, dominant and contrary to the original features of the building. Observations had also been received from Mrs. Smalley (a local resident), expressing concern regarding the boundary wall to the front site, particularly the wall, and the piers which had not been constructed to match the originals.

39.6 The Planning Officer explained that Mr. Garbutt, the Agent, had confirmed by email that he would be happy to accept a further condition that the front boundary wall and piers be revised to as shown on the original plans and that they should match the walls and piers of adjacent building. Since the last meeting of the committee, large scale details of the negotiated amendments to the dormer windows had been submitted and it was therefore recommended that an additional amended condition be added:

"The amendments to the rear dormer windows as shown on detailed drawings submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 19 June 2003 shall be carried out in full no later than two months from the date of this permission."

39.7 The Planning Officer confirmed that the application before Members should be judged on its merits and the fact that the original plans had not been adhered to was not in itself sufficient grounds for refusal.

39.8 Mr Fallowfield spoke as an objector to the application, Mr Simon Bareham spoke on behalf of the applicants, and, Councillor Allen spoke as a local Ward Councillor objecting to the application.

39.9 Councillor Older considered that the site visit had been useful and whilst generally the front elevation of the building were acceptable, the dormers and bays at the back of the building were overly dominant, unacceptable and

expressed concern that the architects should have been aware of the proper procedures and that no works other than those originally agreed should have been carried out without having first obtained the necessary permissions. Other Members agreed and Councillor Hyde enquired whether or not approval would have been recommended had the works not already have been carried out. The Development Control Manager responded that the Officer's recommendations would still have been to approve.

39.10 Councillor Watkins considered that the front of the building was good, but that the reconstructed pillars at the front of the site were detrimental, he was also critical of the retrospective nature of the application and the level of works carried out without proper consultation which he felt undermined the Sub-Committee's original decision.

39.11 Councillor Pennington considered that provided obscure glazing was provided to the bathrooms and given that it was intended to reconstruct the pillars at the front of the site, the application was acceptable and that planning permission should be granted; he did not consider that there were reasonable planning grounds for refusal. He did not consider it expedient to alter the works carried out and felt that a Planning Inspector might dismiss the Council's grounds for refusal should the applicant appeal.

39.12 Councillor Norman considered the dormer windows to be too large and said that the Council should take a stand against developers who considered it acceptable to build schemes not in accordance with approved drawings. Mr. Small said he considered that it would have been possible to repair the brickwork instead of rendering.

39.13 The Solicitor to the Sub-Committee reiterated that the scheme could only be considered on its own merits and that the fact that the scheme was retrospective should not influence the decision.

39.14 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused on the grounds that the rear dormer window and roof lights to the front roof slope by way of their size are considered to be obtrusive and out of character with the building and detrimental to the character and appearance of the Preston Park Conservation Area contrary to policies ENV.22 of the Brighton Borough Local Plan and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan - Second Deposit Draft and SPGH 1 – Roof Extensions and Alterations .

Informative : This decision is based on drawing nos.99031/S3/b, S4/b, S5/a 05c, submitted on 24 March 2003.

[ Note : A vote was taken and on a vote of : 3 Councillors voting for grant of Planning Permission, 7 voting that Planning Permission be refused and 1 abstention . Planning Permission was refused].

**Application BH2003/01356/FP – 1 Western Road, Hove**

39.15 The Planning Officer referred to the application site which had been the subject of a site visit before the meeting. The application was for full planning permission to convert the building into a cabaret club with live burlesque-style entertainment. The proposed use would be sui - generic (which meant it did not fall into any prescribed Use Class e.g. it was not designated as a nightclub). Issues raised relating to a potential increase in crime rates had not been substantiated by empirical evidence and other issues such as noise disturbance could be dealt with by condition. It was not considered that this use would result in more vehicles being parked in the area as users were likely to arrive either by taxi, on foot or via a courtesy bus provided.

39.16 The proposed development would bring back into use a building on a prominent site which was currently in a condition of disrepair. The application was recommended for approval subject to a S106 Obligation and suitable conditions to safeguard amenity and ensure the appearance of the building was improved.

39.17 Mr. Michael Cotton spoke on behalf of objectors to the proposal. Mr Dale Evans spoke on behalf of the applicant. Councillor Paul Elgood spoke in his capacity as a ward councillor objecting to the proposal which he considered would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. He referred to the widespread concerns of local residents and to the petition which he had previously presented in relation to this application. Reference was made to the high density of dwellings in the vicinity and the large number of pubs/ clubs already located within the area, which already gave rise to disturbance / disorder and noise nuisance problems. The proposed use would serve to exacerbate existing problems. Concerns raised by the police should be given greater weight than research which had been commissioned on behalf of the applicants given that the police were familiar with the locality.

39.18 Whilst having no objections to the proposed use on moral grounds (which were not a valid planning consideration), a number of Members were in agreement that the application was inappropriate in its proposed location given the high number of residents and the proliferation of "entertainment" uses already situated in the locality, which were already detrimental to the amenity of residents late in the evening in an area that was already considered by the police to be "a high risk crime area."

39.19 Notwithstanding the sui-generis nature of the application, Councillor Pennington considered that the application site was in reality a glorified pub and that if permission were granted this could then tie the hands of another arm of the authority when considering the licensing application.

Councillor Paskins enquired regarding the applicant's ability to apply for a change of use to permit a night club use should this application be granted. The Planning Officer explained that if a change of use was proposed at a later date a fresh permission would have to be sought. It was confirmed that notwithstanding the expected age profile of members, (28 –50) , those in the 18-24 age range

could not be prevented from attending this venue. She considered that the perception of residents regarding fear of crime was a relevant planning consideration and represented a significant factor when taken in conjunction with the views of the police. Councillor Watkins also referred to the high density of residential dwellings within the area and to the inadequate CCTV provision.

39.21 In answer to questions it was noted that the applicants were prepared to contribute £10,000 towards the cost of a CCTV camera, but that the remainder of the £30,000 cost would have to be borne by the police authority. The applicants considered their contribution to be a neighbourly gesture, given, that any equipment provided would monitor the general locality rather than their premises. The applicants were confident that the measures they would be putting in place for control of their premises would not contribute to crime in the area. Although accepting that the premises themselves would be rigorously controlled, Members felt that those attending the club could act in an unruly fashion one outside and that notwithstanding the provision of a courtesy bus the use could still result in increased parking and its attendant problems within a densely populated area.

39.22 The Solicitor cautioned the Sub Committee that at two relatively recent appeals relating to other sites within the City police evidence had not prevailed over the evidence supplied by the applicants in those cases and the appeals had been upheld.

39.23 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission be refused as the proposed development was considered to have an adverse impact on crime and disorder as well as an increased fear of crime amongst local residents and is therefore contrary to advice contained within Circular 5/94 (Planning Out Crime) and contrary to the spirit of Policy SR16 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft which seeks to prevent a proliferation of nightclub uses.

[ Note : A vote was taken and with 9 Members voting to refuse Planning Permission for approval and 2 abstentions Planning Permission was refused].

#### **Application BH2003/01160/FP Land rear of 36 Cromwell Road, Hove**

39.24 The application was the subject of a site visit before the meeting. The Planning Officer stated that although an application had been refused in February 2003 (application BH2003/3390/FP) due to the adverse effect the proposed dwelling would have on the amenities of occupiers of surrounding properties by way of overlooking and loss of privacy and due to the unsatisfactory parking provision it was considered that the revised application had successfully addressed the issues raised when the application had been refused. The proposed building would be of modest height and scale and would not be unduly prominent in the street scene and would not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area or setting of the adjacent listed buildings. The Traffic Engineer also considered the submitted scheme to be acceptable.

39.25 In answer to questions the Planning Officer confirmed that it was considered that any issues of loss of privacy for neighbouring properties had been addressed by the provision of screening.

39.26 Mr N Eede spoke as an objector to the application. Mr P Burgess spoke on behalf of the applicant and Councillor Giebler spoke against the application in her capacity as ward councillor indicating that she considered that the scheme represented an over development of the site which would result in overlooking and overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

39.27 **RESOLVED** - That Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report.

## **(ii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS LIST DATED 23JULY 2003**

Save as reported in parts (iii) and (iv) below, the recommendations of the Director of Environment were agreed.

## **(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 23 JULY 2003**

### **Application BH2003/01557/FP – 4 Sillwood Street**

39.28 The Planning Officer explained that notwithstanding concerns regarding the design of the mansard roof extension and its impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, he had been mindful of the conclusion of the Planning Inspector in allowing an appeal for an identical proposal in 1997, the only material change since the decision had been the adoption of SPGBH1 on roof alterations and extensions, it was not considered that a refusal to the current application could be justified. The Inspector's earlier decision represented a planning material consideration.

39.29 Mrs. Holt spoke as an objector to the scheme expressing her concerns regarding the degree of overlooking and intrusion which would result from the proposals.

39.30 Mr. Smith spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application confirming that the application was identical to that which the Inspector had allowed on appeal in 1997.

39.31 Members expressed concern regarding the degree of overlooking of the sun terrace, basement and other rooms within the property which had been extensively refurbished following the Inspector's original decision. Given the level of works proposed Members' considered that a site visit would be beneficial.

39.32 **RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for a site visit.



**Application BH2003/01936/FP – 17 Hillbrow Road**

39.33 The Planning Officer referred to the application site by reference to photographs. The site comprised a 1930's bungalow with a north facing frontage to Hillbrow Road. The dwelling had been significantly altered from its original design. Due to the topography of the site which slopes considerable to the rear, the dwelling had a single storey to the front and double storey to the rear.

39.34 Mr. Wickham spoke as an objector to the scheme which he considered represented over-development of the site.

39.35 Given the complexity of the application site in view of the level of additions that had already been affected to the property Members were of the view that they would obtain a better appreciate of the site after a site visit.

39.36 **RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for a site visit.

**Application BH2003/01864/FP – 11 Wayland Avenue**

39.37 Members considered that in view of the significant development that had taken place at the application site in the past that it would be beneficial to obtain a better appreciation of the overall context of the site in relation to neighbouring properties by means of a site visit.

39.38 **RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for a site visit.

**Application BH2003/01517/FP- Holy Cross Church, Tamworth Road, Hove**

39.39 The Planning Officer recommended that consideration of the application be deferred to enabled further consultation to take place with adjoining residents on the amended plans.

39.40 **RESOLVED** - That the application be deferred.

**Application BH2003/01534/FP – 13 Braemore Road, Hove**

39.41 The Planning Officer reported that following submission of revised drawings the application was now recommended for full planning permission.

39.42 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted by the council subject to the use matching materials for the following reason :-

Reason : In the interests of residential amenity and to comply with policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Borough Plan.

**(iv) OTHER APPLICATIONS****Application BH2003/00826/FP – 58 Palmeira Avenue**

39.43 As the property represented a modern building for the site Members considered it would be beneficial to visit the site in order to appreciate its wider context within the street

39.44 **RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for a site visit.

**Application BH2003/01786/FP – Saltdean Reservoir**

39.46 The Planning Officer confirmed that the application related to the existing mast at the Saltdean Reservoir site, which fell just outside of the Sussex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but could be clearly seen from within the AONB.

39.47 Councillor Smith spoke in his capacity as a Ward Councillor seeking assurances that should the current application be approved in addition to the two recent approvals at the site that it was not intended to implement all three approvals as this would result in an over proliferation at the site. The Planning Officer confirmed that he did not consider that it was the applications intention to implement the temporary permission already granted should the current application be agreed and that confirmation would be sought from the applicant to that effect.

39.48 **RESOLVED** – That authority be delegated to the Development Control Manager to grant permission provided she shall have obtained prior clarification that only 1 of permissions BH2002/01875/FP; BH2003/01031/FP and the application BH2003/017861/FP be implemented and secured such restriction on development by way of a S106 Planning Obligation should she consider it necessary.

**Application BH2003/01428/FP – 5-6 Regent Street, Brighton**

39.49 The Planning Officer confirmed that the application site was included in the Jubilee Street Regeneration Project, the building (known as 6a in the overall project) formerly used by a reclaimed timber business, would provide affordable housing as part of the redevelopment scheme.

39.50 Mr. Small, CAAG, sought clarification regarding the differences between the elevational drawings of the scheme as originally submitted and the amended scheme. Mrs. Turner, requested that the applicants be requested to provide units at ground floor level which were fully accessible and adapted for use by those who were disabled.

39.51 **RESOLVED** - That the Council is minded to grant Planning Permission subject to the applicants entering into a Deed of Variation of the existing S 1096 Obligation to secure affordable housing on the site and to the conditions set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/01384/FP – One Stop, 84 – 86 Denmark Villas, Hove**

39.52 Mrs Turner representing the Disabled Access Advisory Group requested that it be made a condition of the grant of planning permission that the ATM complied with the Disability Discrimination Act, particularly in relation to wheelchair users particularly in regard to the provision of "knee holes" which would facilitate full access to the ATM. The Lawyer to the Sub Committee explained that although included in the informative this could not be made a condition of grant of planning permission under current legislation. However, she agreed that this matter would be researched further to see what means would be at the council's disposal to ensure that the requirements of the Act were met once it came into effect on 31 October 2004.

39.53 Councillor Giebeler queried the statement contained in the report that the proposed shop front would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and the Development Control Manager confirmed that it would have been more appropriate to indicate that the proposal would have a neutral effect.

39.54 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in the report an informative to ensure the applicant is aware of the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act, especially for wheelchair and partially sighted users.

#### **Application BH2003/01602/FP – 123 Graham Crescent, Portslade**

39.55 The Planning Officer explained that amended plans had been received on 22/703 giving further detail on the proposed extension in relation to 125 Graham Crescent.

39.56 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions :

1. 00.01 Full Planning.
2. 00.03 Matching Materials

**Reason :** To comply with policy Qd14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan Second Deposit Draft.

[Councillor Carden vacated the Chair during consideration of this item, withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon].

#### **Application BH2003/01408/FP – 185 New Church Road, Hove**

39.57 The Planning Officer explained that following further negotiations both of the objectors had written to the council formally withdrawing their objections to the application.

39.58 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Application BH2003/01359/FP & BH/2003/01526/LB – 2 St. John's Place, Hove**

39.59 The Planning Officer explained that the site plan circulated with the Plans List was incorrect but that the correct plan had been circulated with the "Additional Representations" document.

39.60 Mr. Austin spoke as an objector to the application. Mr A Bell spoke on behalf of the applicant.

39.61 **RESOLVED** - That planning permission and Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**(v) TREES**

39.62 Councillors Allen and Meegan did not consider that the tree was of particular merit in its location, notwithstanding that it was a healthy specimen and considered that it would be appropriate for it to be felled. Councillor Watkins disagreed considering that as the tree did have any adverse on the property and pre-dated it, it should be retained, particularly as it constituted a feature a feature of the locality in which it was situated, rather than just the individual property concerned. The Development Control Manager confirmed that when considering applications for trees to be felled, they were assessed at in the context of their overall health and, amenity to an area.

39.63 **RESOLVED** – (1) That permission to fell the mature sycamore tree, application BH2003/01854/TPO/F be refused as at present the tree appears to be in good condition and there does not appear to be any justification to fell it. Due to the amenity value of the sycamore, its loss would be significant.

(2) That the decisions on tree works delegated to the Director, Environment, as set out in he Plans List dated 23 July 2003 be noted.

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

39.64 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.

2. A list of 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 resolution 129.7 and 129.8, set out in the minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2002.]

**40. FURTHER SITE VISITS**

40.1 Further site visits were agreed as a result of discussions arising from consideration of applications are set out at Item 39 above. In total the following site visits were agreed prior to the next meeting of the Sub Committee :-

<b>WARD</b>	<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>SITE</b>	<b>SUGGESTED BY</b>
Withdean	BH2003/01864/FP	11 Wayland Avenue	Councillor Norman
Withdean	BH2003/01936/FP	17 Hillbrow Road	Councillor Norman
Goldsmid	BH2003/01936/FP	58 Palmeira Avenue	Councillor Paskins
Regency	BH200301557/FP	4 Sillwood Street	Councillor Wells

**41. PROGRESS ON CURRENT APPEALS**

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

**42. APPEAL DECISIONS**

42.1 The Sub Committee noted letters from the Planning Inspectorate advising the results of planning appeals as set out in the agenda.

**43. APPEALS LODGED**

43.1 The Sub Committee noted a list of planning appeals, which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

**SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONSIDERED UNDER PART 2****44. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE MEETING : 2 JULY 2003**

The Chair was authorised to sign the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2003.