

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2020

VIRTUALLY VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
65	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS (30 SEPTEMBER 2020)	1 - 14
G	BH2020/02027 -61 Ashurst Road, Brighton - Full Planning RECOMMENDATION – GRANT <i>Ward Affected: Moulsecoomb & Bevendean</i>	15 - 16

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 30 SEPTEMBER 2020

VIRTUAL VIA SKYPE

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Littman (Chair), Osborne (Deputy Chair), Childs (Opposition Spokesperson), Miller (Group Spokesperson), Fishleigh, Hill, Janio, Shanks, C Theobald and Yates

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

Officers in attendance: Jane Moseley (Planning Manager). Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor), Liz Hobden (Head of Planning), Mick Anson (Principal Planning Officer), Russell Brown (Senior Planning Officer), Emily Stanbridge (Senior Planning Officer), Michael Tucker (Planning Officer), Sven Rufus (Planning Officer), Andy Renaut (Head of Transport Policy and Strategy), David Farnham (Development and Transport Assessment Manager) and Penny Jennings (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

53 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

53a Declarations of substitutes

53.1 Councillor Hill was in attendance in substitution for Councillor Henry.

53b Declarations of interests

53.2 Councillor Fishleigh declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application C, BH2020/01756, The White House, Roedean Road, Brighton. The applicant was known to her and she did not consider herself to be of a neutral mind and

53c Exclusion of the press and public

53.3 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.

53.4 **RESOLVED** - That the public are not excluded during consideration of any item of business on the agenda.

53d Use of mobile phones and tablets

53.5 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’.

54 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

54.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2020 as a correct record.

55 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

55.1 It was noted that this meeting was being recorded and would be capable of repeated viewing via the online webcast.

Welcome Committee Members and members of the public, to this virtual meeting.

To enable the meeting to run smoothly, all presentations, questions and answers have been circulated in advance and are available online for members of the public and can be referenced by all attending the meeting. Presentations take into account that no site visits were arranged following Covid19 guidelines and have enhanced visuals showing the context of the area. The report has also been published in advance as usual.

The Chair stated that the recent changes to the Planning legislation (England and Wales) by the Government would be considered by the Planning Officers. Training will be given on the changes. Design training will also be given on three separate dates, whilst mandatory refresher training would be given in October.

56 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

56.1 There were none.

57 REQUEST TO VARY THE HEADS OF TERMS OF DEED OF VARIATION, FORMER WHOLESALE MARKET, CIRCUS STREET, BRIGHTON (CIRCUS STREET DEVELOPMENT)

57.1 The Committee considered a report prepared by the Head of Planning requesting that they consider a request to vary the Heads of Terms of the Deed of Variation to the

Section 106 Agreement dated 18 March 2016 in connection with planning permission BH2013/03461 to remove the clause requiring that 750 sq.m of the office space to be affordable flexible B1 space which should be managed by the applicants.

- 57.2 A detailed presentation was given by the Principal Planning Officer, Mick Anston, by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and floor plans detailing the scheme which related to a large development site of 0.8 ha. close to the centre of Brighton, under construction for 3 years which would provide a mixed use development. The original permission had included a requirement to necessitate 750sqm of affordable managed business floorspace pre-occupation. However, this was no longer considered viable. In the interim whilst the development was being constructed several other providers had filled that gap in the market and therefore this specific policy requirement appeared to be out of date. There had been on-going difficulties in identifying an operator and these had been delaying progress with the remaining larger element. Heads of Terms had been agreed with an occupier for the upper 4 floors in November 2019 on a pre-let basis, but agreement for occupation had not been completed due to the S106 requirement. This delay was having a negative impact and was giving rise to a significant delay in provision of a significant number of jobs and for this reason it was considered that an exception to policy was justified and that the proposed Deed of Variation was acceptable.

Questions for Officers

- 57.3 It was explained in answer to questions that the property had been marketed on a multi-tenure basis since late 2018 and that “affordable” workspace providers (such as co-working businesses and serviced office providers) had been targeted as well as more traditional local and national businesses for the wider building. An existing company had shown that it wished to expand into this entire space and given that no interest had been shown in this smaller use it was considered appropriate to sublet the entire space to one organisation.
- 57.4 Councillor Yates queried whether the variation proposed would invalidate other elements of the permission and sought clarification of the evidence of marketing which had been provided to support this proposed change. In answer to further questions, the Legal Adviser to the Committee, Hilary Woodward confirmed that all of the necessary tests attached to the original permission had needed to be met. All would remain in place with the exception of the element for which the Deed of Variation was being sought, if agreed.
- 57.5 Councillor Janio also sought clarification of the implications of the Deed of Variation on the remainder of the permission should the proposed change be agreed, also whether the recommendation required any further amendment to reflect that. It was explained that the change would impact only on allocation of the 750sqm of affordable managed floor space; all other requirements of the S106 needed to be met. It was also confirmed that the recommendation as framed was sufficiently robust and dovetailed with the original permission.
- 56.6 Councillor Osborne sought clarification regarding the precise location of the floorspace area in question within the context of the overall development and the potential impact

on it overall. The Planning Manager, Jane Moseley, explained that potential providers had been approached but had not expressed an interest in this space, the information received from the applicant was supported by the Economic Development Team. It appeared to have been marketed appropriately but that use was no longer viable as the market had moved on.

- 57.7 Councillor Childs asked whether neighbouring residents had been consulted in respect of these proposals, particularly the Turner Nursery and residents of Kingswood and Milner Flats. They had suffered from noise nuisance and other disruption during the course of the protracted building works and had not been engaged with by the developer. The Head of Planning, Liz Hobden explained local residents had not been consulted in respect of the current Deed of Variation request and that there were statutory requirements in respect of those who needed to be consulted; consideration could be given to reviewing this in future.

Debate and Decision Making

- 57.8 Councillor Yates stated that he could not support the report recommendation as he did not consider that it would not be possible to let this small office space as a separate discrete unit or that there was not necessarily a need for a small affordable space of this type citing similar space which had been required and provided within the Preston Barracks Development.
- 57.9 Councillor Childs concurred with that view stating that he was also of the view that this was a major development and that integral to community cohesion and central to that was the need to consult with and include the local community, regrettably this had not happened and when viewed in the context of Circus Street and other development in that part of the city would be detrimental.
- 57.10 Councillor Osborne stated that he considered that in view of the uncertainties and delay with progress with the larger remaining element that had arisen and the fact that this element appeared to have been marketed appropriately in this instance exception to policy was justified.
- 57.11 Councillor Theobald stated that it appeared that extensive marketing had taken place and that an end user had been found for all four floors of the building set aside for this use it seemed sensible to agree the variation suggested.
- 57.12 Councillor Janio stated that he considered that the issue was one of supply and demand, the market changed and agreeing to the Deed of Variation would remove any delay to the development.
- 57.13 A vote was taken and on a vote of 8 to 2 Members agreed to grant the Deed of Variation Requested.
- 57.14- **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** Deed of Variation to the S106 Agreement dated 18 March 2016 related to planning consent ref BH20113/03461.

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

- 58.1 The Chair explained that in line with current Central Government guidance in relation to the Covid 19 pandemic, formal site visits had not been arranged. To reflect that in depth presentation material and visuals had been circulated in advance of the meeting and had also been appended to the agenda papers published on the council website. If, however, Members considered that they required more detailed information in order to determine any application a site visit could be requested either at this point on the agenda or at any point in the proceedings. No site visits were requested at this point in the meeting.
- 58.2 It was noted however that Members had carried out a site visit in accordance with current government guidance in respect of Application A, BH2019/00964, Land at Brighton Marina Comprising Outer Harbour, Western Breakwater and Adjoining Land, Brighton Marina, Brighton.

59 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- 59.1 The Democratic Services Officer read out Items on the agenda. It was noted that all Major applications and any Minor applications with speakers were automatically reserved for discussion.
- 59.2 It was noted that the following items were not called for discussion and it was therefore deemed that the officer recommendation(s) were agreed including the proposed Conditions and Informatives and any additions / amendments set out in the Additional / Late Representations List:
- B, BH2020/01899 – 4 Tandridge Road, Hove;
 D, BH2020/01823 – Garages 2a Lowther Road, Brighton;
 E, BH2020/0180 – 39 Guildford Road, Brighton

A BH2019/00964 - Land At Brighton Marina Comprising Outer Harbour, Western Breakwater And Adjoining Land Brighton Marina, Brighton -Part Full Part Outline Planning

Hybrid planning application for the phased residential-led mixed-use development of Brighton Marina Outer Harbour. Full Planning Permission for Phase Two of the development comprises: 480no. residential units (C3) in 3 buildings ranging from 9-28 storeys plus plant levels, 761 sqm of flexible commercial floor space (A1-A4, B1, C3 Ancillary, D1/D2), works to existing cofferdam, undercroft car and cycle parking, servicing, landscaping, public realm works and infrastructure (harbour wall) works. Outline Planning Permission (all matters reserved apart from access) for Phase Three of the development comprises: up to 520no residential units (C3) in 6 buildings ranging from 8-19 storeys, up to 800 sqm of flexible commercial floor space (A1-A4, B1, C3 Ancillary, D1/D2), construction of engineered basement structure to create a raised podium deck over Spending Beach, installation of Navigation Piles, undercroft car and cycle parking, servicing, landscaping and public realm works. | Land At Brighton Marina Comprising Outer Harbour, Western Breakwater And Adjoining Land Brighton Marina Brighton

- (1) It was noted that this application had been the subject of a site visit in advance of the meeting. This had taken place in line with current Government Guidance.
- (2) The Planning Manager, Jane Moseley, stated that to notice that morning that unfortunately certain representations on behalf of the local highway authority had not been made available on the council website, this had now been rectified.
- (3) An in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development. Given the complexities of this scheme a further presentation was also given at the Committee meeting itself. Of those representations the final comments of the highway authority were considered to be particularly material in informing the officer's report. These had been e. mailed to all Members of the Committee in advance of the meeting in addition to being posted on the council website. If Members considered that they had had insufficient time to consider those representations members had the option of deferring consideration of the application to enable those comments to be appraised. It was agreed that Members would hear and consider the officer presentation, representations made and responses to any questions they had and would then consider whether they wished to defer the application.
- (4) it was clarified that an appeal against non-determination of this application had been lodged by the applicant on 17 September 2020. The decision on the application therefore now sat with the Planning Inspectorate and the report sought a view from the Committee on the decision they would have made, had the decision remained with them. The constituent elements of the scheme were explained in depth and it was noted that this was a hybrid application. The principle of the proposal was acceptable as it was in general accordance with Policy DA2 which supported the proposed mix of uses (primarily commercial and residential) and was consistent with the approved 2006 scheme. The principle of a mixed use development of the site was acceptable, it was the acceptability of this particular scheme which needed to be assessed. In doing so it needed to be acknowledged that there was an extant permission, so the principle of developing the site within the approved parameters had already been accepted.
- (5) This scheme was, however, fundamentally different to the approved scheme in terms of its height, scale, massing and layout. With regard to height the extant permission it ranged from 6 storeys in height to a 40 storey tower which was slender in form. The current application ranged from eight storeys in height to a maximum of 28 storeys. Further, the extant permission allowed 853 units across Phases 1, 2 and 3 (of which 195 units had already been built), while the current application sought permission for up to 1,000 dwellings across both Phases 2 and 3 (i.e., 1,195 dwellings across all phases). If permitted, the current application would therefore result in an additional 342 dwellings compared with the extant permission, though full permission was sought for 480 dwellings in Phase 2 and 520 dwellings in Phase 3 so there was a discrepancy regarding the final figure. Overall, the scheme failed to meet a number of principles and policies. There were concerns in respect of overshadowing of neighbouring properties, sunlighting and daylighting, in terms of height, bulk and massing of the proposed form of development, lack of suitable amenity space.

- (6) The benefits which the scheme could deliver needed to be balanced against significant concerns over the density and form of the development and its unacceptable design, as well as the cumulative impacts of both phases which would result in unacceptable impacts on the townscape, heritage features and the setting of the South Downs National Park. The lack of private amenity space and poor quality of communal space would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupiers, as would the lack of light to parts of the residential blocks, lack of children's play space and the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy. Insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate why the affordable housing levels to be provided would not meet the requirements set out in the development plan. Also, the development did not include sufficient cycle parking, or access for cyclists across the breakwater to meet the need for sustainable transportation, for all of the reasons set out in report officers recommended that the Committee resolved that had the application come before the Committee for determination it would have refused planning permission.
- (7) It was also noted that prior to the introduction of CIL in October 2020, the development would have provided a S106 contribution of £1, 942, 351.92 to be spent on open space and recreation in the vicinity of the site. After October 2020 and the adoption of CIL such a contribution could not be secured through the S106 nor would any CIL monies be available given the nil CIL rating of the site.

Public Speakers

- (8) Councillor Mears spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor setting out her objections to the proposed scheme and those of local objectors. She had expressed concerns in respect of the previous scheme for which there was extant permission, however, this scheme would have a significant negative impact in terms of its height and bulk loss of light and lack of amenity not only for those already living in the Marina, those living in residences above the cliff top but also for future residents of the development. This scheme would result in massive overdevelopment. Traffic generation would also be an issue as the area already became gridlocked with the existing traffic generated.
- (9) Mr Dunlop spoke in objection in his capacity both as a local resident and Secretary General, Climate Parliament. In addition to the points raised by Councillor Mears he stated that in view of current climatic changes and rising sea levels and incidence of exceptionally high surge tides, due to global warming, it was problematic to consider building in locations so close to the sea/in an outer harbour, such locations would carry a very level of flood risk and would also be susceptible to other climatic/environmental factors. Mr Dunlop cited areas of the world where these factors had already had already resulted in significant problems, similar issues were likely to be experienced at this location.
- (10) Councillor Fishleigh asked if Mr Dunlop considered that building to this height would give rise to and exacerbate any potential problems and he confirmed that he considered that it would. Councillor Fishleigh asked whether Mr Dunlop was aware of any similar developments anywhere else in the world.

- (11) Councillor Shanks asked whether Mr Dunlop's views related specifically to this proposed scheme or the principle of development of this part of the site. Mr Dunlop responded that he was surprised that building was proposed so close to the outer harbour/breakwater.

Questions for Officers

- (12) Councillor Shanks sought clarification on this issue as if she had understood correctly, the principle of development had already been established, as there was an extant permission for a development which could be built, the first phase had been erected and the Committee were being asked to consider this hybrid application and to decide what their decision would have been had an appeal for non-determination not been lodged and the decision had remained with them. It was confirmed that was so.
- (13) Carl Griffiths, the Consultant who had carried out work for the Council confirmed that an environmental assessment had been made and factored in. It was confirmed traffic/congestion issues had been assessed had been factored in and were included in the report.
- (14) Councillor Fishleigh enquired regarding the level of service charges and fees which would be applicable. She was aware that these were very high in respect of existing properties within the Marina development. In many instances these were astronomical a large number were not occupied by or affordable to local residents and were company/holiday lets.
- (15) Councillor Miller queried whether any additional reasons could be added to any grounds for refusal. He had concerns in respect of potential additional traffic generation. He was also concerned that the applicant appeared to have failed to meet and pay their contractual obligations and wished to know whether there was the ability to seek to recover those.
- (16) Councillor Theobald asked whether the Black Rock footbridge appeared had been removed and in respect of removal of balconies and amenity space. It was confirmed that as a result of enabling works and provision of a walkway along the sea wall that element of the scheme had been removed. Balconies had been removed as the applicants had advised that they considered them to be unsafe. Officers did not concur in that view and also had concerns relating to the poor quality of amenity and play space provision.

Debate and Decision Making

- (17) Councillor Yates stated that the reference in paragraph 1.2 should be to "them" rather than "her". He wholeheartedly supported the officer recommendation, considering that this scheme was totally unacceptable, it was of very poor design and the element of affordable housing had been removed and no cogent rationale for that had been given.
- (18) Councillor Miller stated that he agreed wholeheartedly that the application represented gross overdevelopment. He hoped that in the event of an overturn that it would come back to Committee.

- (19) Councillor Childs considered that this scheme failed on many levels. There had been a total disregard for the context of the site, lighting levels and amenity would be poor and the need to provide any affordable units had been ignored, there had been complete to address the requirements of the earlier permission, this was risible.
- (20) Councillor Janio stated that he considered that the scheme was acceptable. The blocks would be in close proximity to sea with a number of the units having direct sea views, and would be in very close proximity to the beach this had an amenity value in itself. The development would provide a large number of units which would appeal to some buyers.
- (21) Councillor Hill stated that on balance she would have been minded to vote in support of the application and against the officer recommendation. The development would provide a substantial number of dwelling units, if refused, it could result in even fewer affordable units and the city's housing needs would continue to be unmet.
- (22) Councillor Shanks was also in agreement that the scheme was acceptable. The principle of development was established and although this would be configured differently it would provide for housing need in the city and amenity space would be provided in addition to that provided by the beach itself.
- (23) Councillor Fishleigh stated that she totally disagreed that the proposed scheme would do anything to solve the housing crisis in the city. Currently only around 10% of the units in the Marina were in owner occupation and there was no reason to believe that this scheme would be any different.
- (24) Councillor Littman, the Chair, stated that planning was a matter of balance and that Members could weigh the information and come to different conclusions. He could remember the Marina being built, having been conceived as one thing it had subsequently morphed into something else. He had significant concerns in respect of this proposed scheme, the report had analysed its constituent elements in depth and was in agreement that it was unacceptable overall. The lack of green space, amenity space that was small and over shadowed and spacing between blocks which could make them wind tunnels were also concerns.
- (25) Members took a vote on whether in light of the additional information provided referred to in paragraph (3) above whether to defer consideration of the application in order further consider it. On a vote of 7 to 2 Members voted that they considered that they had sufficient information to confirm how they would have determined the application had it come before them for decision.
- (26) Members then voted on how they would have determined the application had it come before them for decision and voted 7 to 3 that they would have been minded to refuse permission.
- 59.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves that had the planning application come before the Committee for determination it would have refused it for the reasons set out in the report.

MINOR APPLICATIONS**B BH2020/01899 - 4 Tandridge Road, Hove - Full Planning**

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection and erection of 2no two storey semi-detached dwelling houses.

- (1) This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

59.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives also set out in the report.

C BH2020/01756 - The White House, Roedean Road, Brighton - Full Planning

Demolition of existing dwelling house (C3) and erection of 3no three storey detached dwelling houses (C3) with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking, revised access and vehicle crossover.

- (1) It was noted that an in-depth presentation had been provided by officers in advance of the meeting and was included on the council website detailing the scheme by reference to site plans, elevational drawings and photographs which also showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
- (2) The application site comprised a two story detached property in use as a single dwelling house on the northern side of Roedean Road. It was well set back within the site with a large front lawn which sloped down towards the long curved driveway. Access onto the road was shared with the Ocean Heights development to the east. The proposal would provide three new dwelling houses of a good standard of accommodation which were considered to be well designed and to contribute towards creating a sustainable neighbourhood with improved biodiversity and ecology without having an adverse impact on the national park, neighbouring amenity, highways or archaeological assets, approval was therefore recommended.

Speakers

- (3) Councillor Mears spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor setting out her objections and those of local objectors. In her view the proposed development would be gross overdevelopment of the site, would be bulky, covering the width of the plot and would cause overshadowing and would be too close to the boundary with Roedean Road. The level of on-site parking provision was considered to be too low and it was also considered that there would be a serious safety issue as a result of traffic using access to the site on a blind bend.
- (4) Ms Sheath spoke on behalf of the applicants in support of their application explaining that this application had been put forward following lengthy pre and post application discussions with officers, The development would have no negative impact on neighbouring development or the national park. Access arrangements had been

assessed but were considered appropriate for the level of development proposed given that access issues referred to already existed.

Questions of Officers

- (5) The Senior Planning Officer, Russell Brown, clarified the position in respect of hedges/screening on site.
- (6) Councillor Janio referred to the location of trees including any which were protected on site and this was clarified.
- (7) Councillor Theobald sought clarification of the size of the garden area for each dwelling unit and whether this site was under the control of the same developer as the neighbouring one. Confirmation of the amenity space provided was given and it was also confirmed that the two sites n
- (8) The Chair, Councillor Littman, referred to the access arrangements to the site, whether they were in the ownership of the applicants and whether it would be appropriate for further improvements to be required including provision of a footway. It was explained that the existing substantial verge formed part of the adopted highway and that to require further improvements in view of the size of the development was considered to be disproportionate.

Debate

- (8) Councillor Theobald stated that in her view the proposed scheme represented overdevelopment of the site. The resulting dwellings would be bulky, covered the whole site and would be built right up to the boundary, she was unable to support it.
- (9) Councillor Miller concurred agreeing that too much was proposed for the size of the site and would result in loss of amenity and overlooking.
- (10) Councillor Childs stated that he was of the view that the three dwellings proposed were acceptable and would make a contribution to the city's housing supply.
- (11) Councillor Yates stated that on balance he considered the proposed scheme was acceptable and that he would be voting in support of it.
- (12) A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 9 planning permission was granted.

59.3 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives also set out in the report.

Note: Having declared a prejudicial interest in the above application Councillor Fishleigh withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the debate or decision making process.

D **BH2020/01823 - Garages at 2a Lowther Road, Brighton - Full Planning**

Demolition of existing garage and storage sheds and erection of a three storey to form 3no one-bedroom flats (C3).

(1) This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

59.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

E BH2020/01808 -39 Guildford Road, Brighton - Full Planning

Change of use of the ground floor fish and chip shop (A5) to office (B1) and alterations and single storey extensions to the rear of the building to create a studio flat (C3) (Part Retrospective).

(1) This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

59.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

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

60.1 In line with current Central Government guidance in relation to the Covid 19 pandemic, no formal site visits been arranged except in relation to Application A referred to above. No further site visits were requested during the course of the debate and decision making.

61 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

62 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

62.1 The Committee noted there was nothing to report to this meeting.

63 APPEAL DECISIONS

63.1 The Committee noted that there was nothing to report to this meeting.

The meeting concluded at 4.48pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

Cllr. Dan Yates
BH2020/02027 – 61 Ashurst Road

12th August 2020:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Because of the Additional Traffic
- Noise
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The impact of this HMO on the surrounding residents, community and properties could be significant due to the nature and intensification of occupation on this site:

- Potential for noise and other environmental disturbance including waste management issues
- Inadequate provision of parking and consequential impact to on street parking.
- Impact on community resources such as schools and health facilities due to the loss of family accommodation

It would also be helpful if the officer report could outline the impact of this being granted would have on the councils ability to meet its commitments within city plan part one, especially the requirements and the council's ability to meet its housing needs assessment. I would ask that officers check the current and previously held licensing registers to check their impact on the 10% rule is properly taken into consideration.

Should the recommendation on this application be to approve I would like this application to come to committee please. Should the committee be minded to approve this application I would ask them to consider the removal of permitted development rights to ensure that any subsequent enlargement or alteration be fully considered before being approved for development on this site.

