

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE

4.00pm 15 JANUARY 2015

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Bowden (Chair)Hawtree (Deputy Chair), Brown (Opposition Spokesperson), Deane, Mears, Morgan, Randall, Robins, Simson and Wealls

PART ONE

46 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

46a Declaration of Substitutes

46.2 Councillor Mears was in attendance in substitution for Councillor Smith. Councillor Simson was in attendance in substitution for Councillor C Theobald.

46b Declarations of Interest

46.2 There were none.

46c Exclusion of the Press and Public

46.3 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act ("The Act"), the Economic Development and Culture 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.

46.4 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item on the agenda.

47 MINUTES

47.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2014 as a correct record.

48 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 48.1 The Chair explained that although he would be referring to a few highlights as part of his communications a full text in respect of recent and upcoming events would be recorded in the substantive minutes of the meeting.

Heritage Lottery Fund Announcement

- 48.2 Brighton & Hove City Council and the Brighton Dome & Brighton Festival Trust were delighted to announce that their joint vision to revitalise the Royal Pavilion Estate had recently received a significant funding boost from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

- 48.3 The Heritage Lottery Fund had earmarked £5m to the project subject to the plans being successfully developed to the next stage and for which they had provided development funding of £176,500 upfront. This funding had been secured in addition to the recent award of £5.8m received from Arts Council England to assist these two organisations progress the first phase of a long term ambition to reconnect the historic buildings and landscape of the Estate and to create a centre for heritage, culture and the performing arts which would reflect the unique spirit of Brighton.

Royal Pavilion and Preston Manor

- 48.4 1, 550 children visited Father Christmas at the Royal Pavilion and Preston Manor when he had dropped in during the Christmas activities at these buildings.

Dance Active 2014

- 48.5 The annual community dance showcase had taken place at Hove Town Hall on 7 December 2014, this had provided the opportunity for 250 dancers of all abilities and ages to perform. The event had been organised by the council's Sports Development Team through the Active for Life project a community-based initiative working across Brighton and Hove to support people of all ages to be *more active more often*. Dance was hugely popular and the "Active for Life" dance programme allowed young people and adults alike to enjoy the benefits of dancing. Dance Active 2014 had been a great success giving as it did an amazing opportunity for groups to showcase their work and to learn about other dance opportunities that existed in the City.

Schools Games Mark Celebration Event

- 48.6 This event hosted by the Mayor had taken place at Brighton Town Hall on 10 December. A total of 29 schools achieved the Sainsbury's Schools Games Mark this year, 40 per cent of all schools in the city. The scheme acknowledged schools sporting excellence and enthusiasm and in order to gain the School Games Mark, schools needed to demonstrate they offered pupils a range of sporting opportunities including competitions, an annual school sports day and encouraging sports leadership among young people. Carden Primary and Middle Street Primary schools had both achieved the Gold Games mark, a fantastic achievement.

Withdean Sports Complex

- 48.7 The Chair stated that he wished to highlight that a year on from completing a £2.7M project to improve its facilities, visits to the Withdean Sports Complex had increased by 66% from 198,500 in 2013 to 330,000 in 2014. The number of members had also grown by 93%, from 1600 to 3100. All these extra visits and members had been able to be accommodated due to the improved facilities and a more comprehensive ult timetable.

Creative Industries

- 48.8 Statistics released by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport earlier that month, had shown creative industries nationally to be in a healthy state of growth. The Chair stated that in the light of this and in view of the success of the creative industry sector in the city, the imminent publication of the Fuse Project's report (scheduled to take place on 22 January), was welcome.
- 49.9 The Chair stated that the city's creative industries sector was growing faster than average and had added nearly 1,700 jobs to the economy between 2010 and 2013 (56.5% growth over the three years). Creative employment represented a growing share of the local labour market in Brighton & Hove. Compared to London, Brighton had a higher proportion of performing arts and a lower proportion of 'advertising and marketing' employment.

Brighton Centre

- 48.10 In the past three months bookings for a number of events in the medium/longer term had been confirmed for the Brighton Centre:

National Union of Teachers multi-year deal:

29 March - 03 April 2018 – 800 delegates

09 - 14 April 2020 – 800 delegates

Bringing an estimated total of £3m of economic benefit to the City

World Irish Dance Association multi-year deal:

30 Mar – 3 Apr 2016 – 2500 competitors

19 Apr – 23 Apr 2017 – 2500 competitors

Bringing an estimated total of £4m of economic benefit to the City

British Association of Psychopharmacology

17 - 20 July 2016 – 500 delegates

Bringing an estimated £0.7m of economic benefit to the City

British Orthodontic Society

22 - 25 Sept 2016 – 600 delegates

Bringing an estimated £0.8m of economic benefit to the City

Total economic benefit of events confirmed in the past 3 months would equate to £8.5m. Holiday On Ice would be returning for a short run after a 2 year break, this event sold in excess of 18,000 tickets..

National Libraries Day

- 48.11 National Libraries Day on Saturday 7 February would be celebrated in Jubilee Library with a second showcase event for the Evolving in Conversation project. There would be an interactive day of talks and activities for every age group including a performance and conversation with John Agard and workshops led by South East Dance and featuring an exhibition of final writing work by participants' from Portslade and Whitehawk, alongside commissioned pieces from John Agard and four emerging artists. To watch the short film of the first showcase day visit <http://vimeo.com/bhlibraries> or <http://www.mixcloud.com/BHLibraries> to listen to the three talks in more detail.

Dressed for Success 2014

- 48.12 Funding from the council had enabled 29 independent shops receive one-to-one tuition from a visual merchandising specialist during the Autumn of 2013, aimed at helping them attract more customers and boost sales in the run up to Christmas. Following the training sessions, the council took photographs of the shop windows and launched a public trail and competition which saw over 2,000 votes cast in December. Winners in seven categories were to be announced at a special awards event on 20 January. Retailers from Portslade to Kemp Town had participated in the scheme, and it was hoped that they could reapply their skills to create fantastic and inviting windows time and time again.

Blockbuilders Event

- 48.13 Resurgence of the London Road was continuing, thanks to a number of regeneration projects and partnerships in which the council was heavily involved. One project, run by a local company called "Blockbuilders", had encouraged local children to re-imagine London Road. The children's designs for London Road had been printed in 3D and had been unveiled at an exhibition at the Alcampo Lounge on 11 January, where attendees had also been able to 'walk through' the street using virtual reality headsets. The project had been funded through a £1,000 arts grant from the London Road Portas Pilot.

Donna Close

- 48.14 The Chair referred to the fact that, Donna Close who had worked for the authority for many years and had had a leading role in developing arts and culture in the city had left the council just before Christmas. He wanted to take the opportunity to place on formal record the Committees' thanks to Donna for her work in Brighton and Hove. Donna had played a key role in many innovative developments over her time at Brighton and Hove, the White Night projects and Brighton and Hove Film City to name just two of them.

48.15 **RESOLVED** – That the contents of the Chair’s Communications be noted and received.

49 CALL OVER

49.1 All items on the agenda were reserved for discussion.

50 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

50a Petitions

50.1 There were none.

50b Written Questions

50.2 There were none.

50c Deputations

50.3 There were none.

51 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

51a Petitions

51.1 There were none.

51b Written Questions

51.2 There were none.

51c Letters

51.3 There were none.

51d Notices of Motion

51.4 There were none.

52 FEES & CHARGES 2015/16 - ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE DIRECTORATE

52.1 The Committee considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive representing and seeking approval to the review of fees and charges across six service areas: Libraries, Royal Pavilion and Museums, Seafront, Sports Facilities, Venues and Outdoor Events. The changes would be implemented from April 2015 unless otherwise stated.

52.2 The Assistant Chief Executive explained that Fees and charges for services were reviewed annually in line with the Corporate Fees & Charges Policy. As a minimum, all fees and charges were increased by the corporate rate of inflation which had been set at

2.0%. This was the same percentage by which income budgets would be increased. For the Sports Facilities Contract there was a formula to calculate the inflationary price increase linked to the All Items Retail Prices Index Excluding Mortgage Interest Payments (RPIX). The increase calculated for 2015/16 was 2.63%.

- 52.3 The council's Financial Regulations required that any proposed increases in fees and charges over and above inflation were agreed by the council. They also stated that it is good practice to report on fees and charges that are rising by inflation only.
- 52.4 It was stressed that the proposals also needed to be viewed in the context of the very challenging financial position facing the council, with an estimated £102m savings requirement by 2019/20. A range of the proposals in the report to increase fees and charges above the inflation rate sought to increase income and achieve budget savings with increased income targets.
- 52.5 The Chair, Councillor Bowden explained that discussions in relation to the report recommendations which had taken place with the opposition spokespersons had indicated that they considered it appropriate for discussion and approval of recommendations 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to be reserved for the meeting of Full Council on 26 February 2015-at which the Budget for 2016/17 would be agreed. If the Committee agreed to this, it would be necessary however, for the proposed fees and charges for the Royal Pavilion and Preston Manor for 2016/17 to be agreed at that meeting. This was necessary in order that that this information could be provided for trade/tourism and other relevant publications which were prepared a year in advance.
- 52.6 Having agreed to this approach Members had the opportunity to ask questions and Councillor Mears requested supporting information in respect of the proposed arrangements and charges for Saltdean Library. It was agreed that the Head of the Library and Information Service would provide this information to the Committee independently of the meeting.
- 52.7 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the committee approves the fees and charges for the Royal Pavilion and Preston Manor for 2016/17 set out in Appendix 2 to the report with consideration and decision in respect of all other fees and charges to be reserved for discussion at Budget Council on 26 February 2015.

Note: The committee agreed that with the exception of the proposed fees and charges for the Royal Pavilion for 2016/217 as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, consideration of all other fees and charges be deferred for discussion at Budget Council.

53 REVIEW OF PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)

- 53.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing seeking approval to undertake formal public consultation on the draft Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 53.2 It was explained that it was intended that formal consultation would be undertaken for a six week period and would seek the views of stakeholders, developers, Councillors and residents. The report also sought committee support to undertake preparation of a best

practice guidance note on parking design and layout which could take the form of a Planning Advice Note (PAN) and could be produced at a later date.

- 53.3 When considering new development proposals as part of the planning application process, the city council as both Planning and Highway Authority considered the transport provision and implications of the proposal and this would include the amount and standard of parking provision for vehicles and bicycles. An initial and consistent assessment was made by comparing the proposals with existing policies including the council's current Supplementary Parking Guidance Note 4, SPG4 on parking standards for new development. The current document had been approved/adopted in 2000. The current standards in SPG4 needed to be updated, especially in the context of the current Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which indicated that local authorities were responsible for setting local parking standards and outlined matters that should be taken into account when doing so.
- 53.4 Councillor Brown stated that although she agreed that zoning was appropriate her group's preference was that the figures given should set a "minimum" rather than a "maximum". Councillor Brown stated that she could not support the concept of a maximum figure being applied. She also considered that there was a lack of clarity in relation to outlying areas of the city which were not well served by public transport and where individuals and families were more reliant on the ability to use their own transport, she feared that as framed parking could overspill from areas which were zoned into those where it was not, thus creating greater pressures on the available spaces in neighbouring areas. Councillor Brown stated that whilst understanding that the standards could operate differently in different areas, she was disappointed that examples of how the formula had been/would be applied had not been provided, as this would have been of assistance to the Committee.
- 54.5 The Principal Transport Planning Officer explained that a flexible approach would be adopted and used on a case by case basis. It was also anticipated that some amendments would be made as a result of the consultation process.
- 54.6 Councillor Wealls stated that although he understood the rationale in broad terms he considered that the models and terminology were very complex, some of the uses appeared to be very fluid and he was in agreement that this could be very confusing, particularly in relation to areas away from the city centre and the manner in which different use classes could be more or less restrictive. In answer to questions it was explained that officers had also looked at the bench marks which were by other local authorities.
- 53.7 Councillors Mears and Simson concurred and Councillor Mears stated that she hoped that it would be possible to simplify/ explain some of the more technical language used or to provide a summary as part of the consultation process. If it was difficult to understand that could result in a low response rate.
- 53.8 Councillor Bowden, the Chair, stated that the points made had been noted and would be taken on board in so far as it was practicable to do so.

- 53.9 Councillors Deane and Randall welcomed the recognition that had been given to the role that car clubs could play and awaited the results of the consultation process with interest.
- 53.10 In answer to questions by Councillor Morgan, it was confirmed that the results of the consultation process would be reported back to the Committee in due course.
- 53.11 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the committee notes the outcome of the issues and options consultation undertaken prior to the development of new parking standards for new development;
- (2) That the committee authorises the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing to undertake formal public consultation on the draft Parking Standards SPD, attached at Appendix 1, and request that a report on the results is brought to a future meeting of this committee; and
- (3) That the committee requests that the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing prepares a best practice guidance document which shall include parking design and layout and that a draft document is brought to a future meeting of this committee.

54 REVIEW OF SECTION 106 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS TEMPORARY RECESSION MEASURES

- 54.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing seeking approval not to renew the Section 106 Developer Contributions Temporary Recession Measures and that they would no longer apply with effect from 31 January 2015.
- 54.2 It was noted that it was proposed that Paragraph 3.7 the report be amended and that after the last sentence the following wording be added:
- For clarification the seeking of financial contributions under SPDs 08, Sustainable Building Design and SPD 11–Nature Conservation and Design will remain suspended until the adoption of the City Plan.
- 54.3 The rationale for the proposed amendment was that under recession matters no financial contributions were to be sought under SPDs 8 and 11 until the City Plan had been adopted. As the Committee was being asked not to renew the recession measures, unless amended as suggested, full implementation of the measures in SPD 8 and SPD 11 would be required even though the City Plan had yet to be adopted. The proposed amendment sought to clarify this point.
- 54.4 Councillor Mears supported the report recommendations and requested further information regarding the number of planning permissions granted during any given year. The Head of Planning and Development agreed to provide this information to Councillor Mears following the meeting and the Chair, Councillor Bowden agreed that it would be appropriate for this information to be circulated to all Members of the Committee.

54.5 In answer to questions, the Head of Planning and Development explained that the proposals would pave the way towards charging developers for pre-application advice, although it was intended that this would continue to be provided to householders free of charge. This would be taken forward as part of the budget process at the appropriate time.

54.6 Councillor Deane welcomed the proposals, as Developers could make significant sums from major projects in the city. Councillor Deane considered it was appropriate that they would ultimately be commensurate with the high standard of professional officer advice available to them. It was also important that Section 106 contributions were sought when this was appropriate. Councillors Hawtree and Randall concurred in that view.

54.7 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the Committee agrees not to renew the Section 106 Developer Contributions Temporary Recession Measures and that they no longer apply after 31 January 2015; and

(2) The Committee is asked to note that the seeking of financial contributions under SP08 - Sustainable Building Design and SPD 11 – Nature Conservation and Design will remain suspended until the adoption of the City Plan.

55 LOCAL AGGREGATE ASSESSMENT FOR EAST SUSSEX AND BRIGHTON & HOVE

55.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing setting out the outcome of the joint Local Aggregate Assessment 2013/14 for the Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) of Brighton & Hove City Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.

55.2 It was noted that the National Planning Policy Framework required MPAs to produce an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) to assess the demand for and supply of aggregates in their area. The LAA was based on the Plan Area for the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan which had been adopted in February 2013. The Plan Area covered the administrative areas of East Sussex and Brighton & Hove including those parts which lie within the South Downs National Park.

55.3 Councillor Hawtree welcomed the report which he considered was important as it highlighted the importance of the marine element and the level of dependence on marine landings and dredging.

55.4 Councillor Mears stated that she had also read the report with interest, considering that this would form a crucial part of ensuring that there was the ability to support major developments which came on stream across the city.

55.5 Councillor Bowden, the Chair concurred with points which had been made and the Head of City Planning and Development stated that officers of the constituent authorities recognised the importance of the marine environment and were seeking to ensure that there was a coherent and balanced approach. In answer to questions he explained that as the facility at Newhaven was designated for household waste rather than for construction/commercial, different processes applied.

55.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Local Aggregate Assessment 2013/14 for East Sussex and Brighton & Hove be approved and published.

56 UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX - LISTED BUILDING HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

- 56.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing seeking approval for statutory consultation on a draft Listed Building Heritage Partnership for eight grade I and grade II* listed buildings at the University of Sussex campus.
- 56.2 It was explained that new legislation had come into force in April 2014, under the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 (the ERR Act), which had introduced new optional powers for listed building control. These included the power to make Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreements to manage alterations to major listed buildings or groups of listed buildings in the same ownership. It was noted that if agreed this would be one the very first such agreements to be made nationally under the new powers.
- 56.3 Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreements could be entered into between local planning authorities and owners of large scale listed buildings or major groups of similar listed buildings, setting out works for which listed building consent is granted (excluding demolition). The Council considered that it would be appropriate to enter into such an agreement with the University of Sussex, together with English Heritage, in respect of the several high-grade listed buildings on the campus (designed by Sir Basil Spence in the 1960s). Such an agreement would replace and review the current non-statutory Listed Building Guidelines that had been in place since 1997 and which had last been reviewed in 2002. The proposed Agreement had been very much welcomed by the University.
- 56.4 The Policy and Projects Manager explained that in the absence of an LBHPA, the University would need to make several applications for each building to address issues as they arose. This would avoid the need for the University to make repeated applications for minor works and would allow the University to plan strategically to carry out works for which consent had been given. This would save time and resources for the University, the Council and English Heritage. Consented Works would be subject to particular conditions (referred to in Section 3 of the report) and also clarified the position with regard to other types of work.
- 56.5 Councillor Brown welcomed the report and the strategy set out within it which in her view represented a win – for both the University and the Council. Councillor Brown concurred that it was appropriate for the Agreement to be subject to review.
- 56.6 Councillor Deane enquired regarding the level of protection afforded to the listed buildings on site and it was explained that no major works were anticipated in the vicinity of the listed buildings at the present time.

- 56.7 Councillor Robins referred to the use of buff mortar as referred to in the report and it was explained that when works were undertaken materials were used to mirror the existing as far as it was practicable to do so.
- 56.8 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee approve the draft Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement (LBHPA) for land at the University of Sussex, for the purposes of public consultation.

57 DESIGNATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD/BUSINESS AREA AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM - BRIGHTON MARINA

- 57.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing requesting determination of two neighbourhood planning applications. One related to the designation of Brighton Marina as a Business Neighbourhood Area. The other application, linked to the area application, related to the designation of the neighbourhood forum for Brighton Marina. These designations were part of the neighbourhood planning provisions introduced by the Localism Act 2011. Once designated they would enable the forum to prepare a neighbourhood development plan for the area.
- 57.2 It was explained that the Brighton Marina Neighbourhood Area and Forum applications had been submitted in September 2014. The geographical area proposed was the same as that defined in the Brighton Marina Act and was bounded by the cliffs to the north and the harbour arms to the south, east and west where it is also bounded by the access road. Appendix 1 to the report showed the extent of the area delineated. The applicant had indicated that they considered the neighbourhood area should be designated a business area.
- 57.3 Councillor Mears stated that she had grave concerns regarding the surprising and unexpected level of responses to the consultation. She understood that in addition to the fact that some properties located at the Marina were short term/company lets, there were terms in some leases which could preclude residents from responding. Given the important role that any neighbourhood area had in forming and taking forward development policy she considered that this needed to be addressed before the application could be progressed. Councillor Mears stated that she supported the principal of a neighbourhood area but not as currently framed as it could result in the owners of the site, the Brunswick Group, having significant input regarding its future from which the leaseholders themselves might be excluded. It could place too much power into the hands of the developers.
- 57.4 Councillor Hawtree alluded to the fact that there had been differences of opinion between different local interest groups when the recent Hove Station Neighbourhood Area application had been considered. It was important to ensure that the public engagement process was inclusive.
- 57.5 Councillor Mears stated that she was in agreement that it was important for Members to feel assured that an appropriate level of public consultation had taken place, and in respect of the Forum's Membership. Councillor Mears was at pains to point out that her concerns were in no way intended as a criticism of the hard work which had been

undertaken by officers; she was strongly of the view however that these issues must be addressed before the Committee could determine this issue.

- 57.6 Councillor Mears added that in addition to the other points she had raised, she considered that a larger area should be designated than that currently proposed. For example, the Regency Terraces and other developments/properties located above the Marina could be impacted significantly by development there and there was therefore a case for their inclusion in any neighbourhood area. Councillors Morgan and Simson concurred in that view. Councillor Morgan stated it might also be appropriate for the Gas Works site to be included and he was in agreement that the area to be included should be re-visited.
- 57.7 Councillor Robins sought clarification of the powers that the Forum would have once set up and concluded that it was not appropriate for a decision to be taken as matters stood.
- 57.8 The Chair, Councillor Bowden, stated that he was of the view that the points made by Councillor Mears were valid and that it would be entirely appropriate for consideration of this matter to be deferred in order to address the concerns which had been raised. The Chair was in agreement that he would have expected a high response rate to the consultation that had taken place. Councillor Randall concurred in that view and having put the matter to the Committee, Councillor Bowden stated that it was clear that cross-party Members were of the view that they had concerns which needed to be addressed and that further dialogue needed to take place between officers in the relevant groups in order for a decision to be made.
- 57.9 Members were in agreement with the Chair that the following key issues needed to be addressed:
- Level of consultee responses
 - Public engagement
 - Extent of the area
 - Membership of the Forum
- 57.10 The Deputy Head of Law stated that whilst membership of the Forum and the extent of the area it should cover were separate issues, they were however clearly linked. He added that the committee could only consider the specific proposals put before it and given the issues raised it might be considered appropriate to defer the decision and have a further report tabled as soon as possible.
- 57.11 **RESOLVED** - That consideration of the designation of a Brighton Marina Business Neighbourhood Area as a business area neighbourhood area and the designation of the Brighton Marina Neighbourhood Forum (within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) be deferred in order for further dialogue to take place with the relevant and interested parties to resolve issues with participation and representation within and outside the proposed area, before these applications form the subject of a further report for consideration by the committee in due course.

58 CONSERVATION STRATEGY REVIEW

- 58.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing seeking approval of the revised Conservation Strategy.
- 58.2 It was explained that the current Conservation Strategy had been adopted in 2003 in order to clarify the council's responsibilities and to reaffirm its commitment toward the conservation of Brighton and Hove's historic built environment. It included a programme of action for the management of the city's heritage assets. Generally, the strategy had been successful. It was however now due for review. The report detailed the review of the current strategy which had been undertaken including the response to the consultation and sought approval for the adoption of a revised Conservation Strategy for the city for the next ten years.
- 58.3 The Head of City Planning and Development explained that this represented a significant piece of work which would be used to guide this area of work in the medium/longer term.
- 58.4 Councillor Morgan referred to the Brighton Hippodrome site enquiring whether the strategy would impact on any potential future use. The Head of City Planning and Development explained that any scheme put forward would be considered on its merits and put forward for consideration. Officers would continue to work with any potential developers to seek to secure protection, restoration and suitable viable uses for of the building, This was challenging as the buildings previous use as a Bingo Hall had ceased some years previously and since that time the fabric of the building had deteriorated significantly.
- 58.5 Councillor Morgan also referred to the apparent disparity between the number of conservation areas in Brighton and those in Hove. The Policy and Projects Manager explained that revisions would occur over time, Currently however, it was considered to focus limited available resources on existing conservation areas.
- 58.6 In commending the report, Councillor Randall referred to the importance of St Nicholas Church and its surrounding historic churchyard. He considered that the approach proposed represented a positive way forward.
- 58.7 Councillor Robins welcomed the level of detail set out in the report stated that he hoped that Easthill Park could be considered for inclusion at a future date.
- 58.8 Councillor Hawtree stated that he was disappointed that it was not proposed to extend any of the existing areas at the present time as there several areas within his ward which he considered were worthy of inclusion. He was pleased to note that it was anticipated that areas would change over time.
- 58.9 Councillor Brown was also disappointed that no areas were being extended at the present time, recognising however that the seafront area was protected, especially given that a number of important buildings there were in private ownership. It was important to concentrate scarce resources in the most effective and focused way.
- 58.10 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee approve the revised Conservation Strategy set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

59 ST AUBYNS PLANNING BRIEF

- 59.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing seeking formal approval for a planning brief that had been prepared for the former St Aubyns School, Rottingdean and which had been subject to a public consultation exercise which had informed the final brief. The former school site and boundary included all land which fell within the curtilage of the Grade II listed school building situated within Rottingdean Conservation Area with its ancillary playing field to the east.
- 59.2 It was noted that the planning brief sought a high quality sustainable redevelopment in the heart of Rottingdean Village which respected the character of the existing heritage assets and the public recreation opportunities arising from the existing open space. The St Aubyns Planning Brief was attached as Appendix 2 to the report. A copy of the Consultation report was attached as Appendix 3.
- 59.3 The Head of City Planning and Development referred to correspondence which had been forwarded to Members of the Committee, explaining that there was no potential conflict, no one had been precluded from the consultation exercise and it remained for any developer to bring forward a viable scheme. It was as a recreational facility but increased public use would be encouraged.
- 59.4 The Chair welcomed the Chair of Rottingdean Parish Council, Cllr Bob Webzell, and Parish Cllr Sue John who were present representing the St Aubyns Project Group of Rottingdean Parish Council. The request for a brief to be produced for this site had come from the Parish Council as a result of concerns expressed by local people about the future of the site, following the closure of the school in 2013. The Parish Council were currently undertaking preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan and were keen to see a planning brief introduced to guide the future development of this strategically important site. The Chair, stated that he wished to extend his thanks to Rottingdean Parish Council who were part funding the production of the brief, for their positive contribution to the process.
- 59.5 Both parish councillors stated they welcomed the opportunity to attend the meeting and commended the joint working which had taken place in respect of the consultation process and drawing up the brief which addressed the needs and wishes of the residents and the site's owners. There were concerns that potential developers could come forward with a scheme which was out of keeping with the site and role of the brief in providing a rubric for future development was seen as integral in providing it with a measure of protection.
- 59.6 Councillor Mears stated that officers had worked tirelessly to bring this document forward, the site was a sensitive one on which appropriate development could be beneficial and the importance of maintaining the existing "green lung" could not be over-estimated. This was an important document because it provided clear guidelines for future development.

- 59.7 Councillor Hawtree supported the brief stating that he wanted, however, to sound a note of caution in that there was no absolute protection of the existing playing field, although it had been protected as far as it was practicable to do so.
- 59.8 Councillor Morgan stated that the significance of the open air swimming pool at the site had been referred to and he enquired whether it was intended that this would be retained for public use. The Head of City Planning and Development confirmed that any scheme brought forward would be considered in terms of its viability. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the swimming pool was within that area identified as suitable for development.
- 59.9 **RESOLVED** – That the Economic Development & Culture Committee approves the St Aubyns Planning Brief as a material planning consideration in the assessment of development proposals and planning applications relating to the site.

60 DCLG CONSULTATION: PROPOSED CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT FOR TRAVELLER SITES

- 60.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing seeking confirmation of the council's response to the Government's consultation on proposed policy changes to the Planning Policy Statement for Traveller Sites.
- 60.2 It was noted that the Planning Policy Statement for Traveller Sites (PPTS) had first been published in March 2012 alongside the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It set out national planning policy for traveller sites and as such needed to be taken into account in the preparation of development plans and in the determination of planning applications.
- 60.3 The Head of City Planning and Development confirmed that although it had not been possible to bring details of the officer response to the Committee at an earlier time there was an opportunity to discuss it and confirmation of the response was sought.
- 60.4 Councillor Brown stated that she was disappointed at the lack of consultation which had taken place with members, considering that the Chair, Deputy Chair and both opposition spokespersons should have been consulted prior to the response being sent. Whilst supporting the majority of the proposals she did not agree with the response to question 1A, as the Committee were being asked to agree the response in its entirety, she would abstain from voting because she was unable to do so. Councillors Mears, Simson and Wealls concurred in that view.
- 60.5 Councillor Mears stated that people were either "travelling" or they were not. If individuals had ceased travelling, then their designation was different. Also, there are different categories of traveller, there are those who are van dwellers and there are those who are from a gypsy background.

- 60.6 Councillor Robins stated that he came from a gypsy background, those who had ceased to travel still recognised their heritage and in his view it was very important that the community was properly consulted in respect of any proposals/provision. He sought confirmation that arrangements were in place to ensure that this community was properly consulted. The Head of City Planning and Development confirmed the consultation arrangements which were in place.
- 60.7 The Chair, Councillor Bowden noted the points made by Councillor Brown in relation to the consultation process, explaining that he was aware that the time frame for response had been very tight.
- 60.8 Councillors Deane and Randall concurred with the proposed response.
- 60.9 In answer to questions, the Legal Adviser to the Committee explained that it was not possible to amend the terminology set out in the DCLG document as this could not be done in isolation from other legislation which used the same terminology. The Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing stated that the terminology used referred to the ethnicity of this group, whether they travelled or not, did not change their perceived ethnicity .
- 60.10 **RESOLVED** - That the officer responses set out in Appendix 1 to the report be confirmed as the Council's response to the consultation exercise and that Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) are notified to that effect.

Note: Councillors Brown, Mears, Simson and Wealls abstained from voting in respect of the above recommendations.

61 HOUSING STANDARDS REVIEW CONSULTATION 2014

- 61.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development and Housing seeking approval and endorsement of the officer response sent on behalf of the council in response to the recent government consultation on the Housing Standards Review.
- 61.2 It was explained that the response had been submitted to the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in order to meet the consultation deadline of 7 November 2014. The council's response as noted as being subject to the approval and endorsement of the committee.
- 61.3 The Government proposals sought to revise guidance, requirements and standards set out in the Building Regulations, and to introduce a nationally recognised space standard. As part of the proposals the Government intended to wind down the Code for Sustainable Homes which contained requirements, applied through planning policy, relating to water use, waste storage, energy use, materials, pollution and ecology.
- 61.4 Councillor Randall stated that whilst he was able to support the proposed response, he had grave reservations in relation to the manner in which these standards would operate in practice. This had been discussed at Housing Committee at some length and would be raised through the appropriate channels. Councillor Mears stated that she was in

agreement with a number of the concerns expressed by Councillor Randall but was also in agreement that the response was appropriate whilst concurring that a number of issues arising needed to be highlighted as part of robust and continuing dialogue.

- 61.5 The Executive Director of Environment, Development and Housing stated that he was aware of the concerns raised by Councillors Randall and Mears and , they would be conveyed back to the appropriate cross party working group in the first instance.
- 61.6 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee approves and endorses the officer response to the Government's Housing Standards Review Consultation 2014 set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

62 MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE

- 62.1 The Committee considered the circulated schedule which provided an update on the current progress of major projects across the city.
- 62.2 Councillor Mears referred to the Black Rock scheme stating that it was disappointing that Ward Councillors had not been consulted formally. Councillor Hawtree enquired regarding potential schemes in the vicinity of Hove Station. It was confirmed that the Neighbourhood Forum had now been set up in accordance with the Committees' recent decision and would be taking on an active role.
- 62.3 The Chair, Councillor Bowden stated that he was pleased to note the progress which had been made in respect of both the King Alfred and the Heads of Terms in relation to the Waterfront.
- 62.4 **RESOLVED** – That the contents of the schedule be noted and received.

63 ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

- 63.1 Item 52:-Fees and Charges 2015/16 – Assistant Chief Executive Directorate.

The Committee agreed that with the exception of the proposed fees and charges for the Royal Pavilion for 2016/217 as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, consideration of all other fees and charges be deferred for discussion at Budget Council.

The meeting concluded at 6.55pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of