

PLANNING COMMITTEE	Agenda Item 65(b) Brighton and Hove City Council
---------------------------	--

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 17 SEPTEMBER 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING - SKYPE

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Littman (Chair), Osborne (Deputy Chair), Childs (Opposition Spokesperson), Miller (Group Spokesperson), Fishleigh, Henry, Hills, Simson and Yates

Co-opted Members: Roger Amerena (Conservation Advisory Group)

Officers in attendance: Jane Moseley (Planning Manager), Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Rebecca Smith (Planning Officer), Sven Rufus (Planning Officer), Russell Brown (Senior Planning Officer), Michael Tucker (Planning Officer), David Farnham (Development and Transport Assessment Manager), Helen Hobbs (Senior Planning Officer), Jody Blake (Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

42 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

42.1 Councillor Hills substituted for Councillor Shanks and Councillor Simson substituted for Councillor Theobald. Councillor Janio sent apologies

b) Declarations of interests

42.2 Councillor Simson declared they had been lobbied on item I and had served on the Licensing Committee when the licence was considered but remained of an open mind. Councillor Hills declared they knew the applicant for item E and would withdraw from the debate and any decision making for that item. Councillor Miller declared they had been lobbied on items C, D, E but remained of an open mind. Councillor Yates declared they had been lobbied on items C, D, E but remained of an open mind; however, they had submitted representations on items G and K and would withdraw from the debate and any decision making on those items

c) Exclusion of the press and public

42.3 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.

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

43 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

43.1 **RESOLVED:** The Chair was authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 5 August 2020 as a correct record.

44 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

44.1 The Chair addressed the committee, other attendees and those watching the webcast and encouraged them to take part and say what you think about City Plan Part Two. The consultation will be on the council website from 7 September to 30 October 2020. It seems that there will be less planning control in the future given the recent announcements from the government. In 2016 the council were given a target of 13,200 homes by 2030. The government have changed the matrix calculator resulting in a 287% increase, 4 times the current figure, and this is not achievable. We ask that the residents and councillors stand against the changes. This is not a party political matter. David Renard, the local government association Housing spokesperson states that there is no substitute for local knowledge in decision making as they know their area best and can ensure that wider issues will be considered such as infrastructure and affordable housing.

45 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

45.1 There were none.

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

46.1 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.

47 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

47.1 The Democratic Services Officer read out all the agenda Items. It was noted that all Major applications and any Minor applications with speakers were automatically reserved for discussion. There were no major applications for consideration at this meeting.

47.2 It was noted that the following item(s) 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:

- **Item H:** BH2019/03758 – 17 Old Shoreham Road, Hove - Full Planning
- **Item J:** BH2020/01509 – 46 Queens Gardens, Brighton - Full Planning
- **Item K:** BH2020/00995 – 90 Southall Avenue, Brighton - Full Planning

A BH2020/01466 - Hill House, 53 Western Road, Hove - Full Planning

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of development, affordable housing, design and heritage, biodiversity and landscaping, the impact on neighbouring amenity, the standard of accommodation created, the impact on the highway, and sustainability.

Speakers

3. Ward Councillor Clare spoke on the item and expressed concerns regarding the development of the listed building. Residents in Holland Mews to the rear of the site will be impacted by construction traffic, loss of light from the increase in height of the proposals and loss of privacy from the proposed balconies. A traffic management plan is requested to address the traffic issues. The development is located in parking zone M, which is a congested zone, please make the proposals a car free development.
4. John McLean spoke as the applicant's agent and stated that they had been on a site visit with officers to clarify the proposals as they were mindful that the building was listed. The impact of the proposal was assessed from 17 different viewpoints. The heritage team felt the visual impact would be negligible. The Conservation Area Group (CAG) approved the setback design of the top floor with edge planting and set back parapet handrail. The applicant is happy to repair the Hills pavement mosaic. CAG also approved of the proposed front elevation to the north. The replacement windows, roof and extensive refurbishment will return the building to landmark status. The applicant understands the concerns relating to construction traffic and has submitted a Construction Management Plan to the case officer which will avoid using Holland Mews. There is considered to be no loss of sunlight and daylight estimates are acceptable for the residents of Holland Mews as the less than one storey development will be set to the north side of the building away from the mews.

Questions for speaker

5. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the applicant was happy to agree conditions relating to no construction traffic in Holland Mews; details of window replacement and landscape strip on roof terrace – introduced to prevent overlooking; and repair of Hills pavement mosaic.
6. Councillor Hills was informed that there would be no loss of light to Holland Mews to the rear of the building.
7. Councillor Fishleigh proposed a motion to add a condition to retain the Hills pavement mosaic. This was seconded by Councillor Henry.
8. The Chair put the motion to the vote, and it was agreed unanimously.

Debate

9. Councillor Miller considered the design to improve the building and approved of the new units to be gained by the development. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Yates considered that the applicant had engaged with the community and supported the application.
11. Councillor Osborne considered the housing mix to be acceptable. A car free development would be desirable. The inclusion of 12 solar panels was good and the councillor stated their support for the application.
12. Councillor Littman was delighted to see the make-over for the building and the repair of the mosaic. The councillor supported the application.
13. A vote was taken and by unanimous vote, planning permission was granted.
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 be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out in the report and the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, SAVE THAT should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before the **2nd October 2020** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11.1 of the report.

B BH2020/01467 - Hill House, 53 Western Road, Hove - Listed Building Consent

1. The listed building consent (LBC) application was considered at the same time as BH2020/01446 – Hill House, 53 Western Road, Hove - full planning application.
2. A vote was taken and by unanimous vote, listed building consent was granted.
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** listed building consent subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

C BH2020/01620 - 57 Goldstone Crescent, Hove - Full Planning

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of development, affordable housing provision, density, design, landscaping and biodiversity, their impact on neighbouring amenity, the standard of accommodation, the impact on the highway, and sustainability.

Speakers

3. Ward Councillor Bagaean spoke on the item to the committee declaring that they spoke on behalf of residents and the Hove Park Forum. The councillor expressed concerns that a site visit had not taken place and did not consider the other designs mentioned in the design and access statement are material, and strongly disagreed with the statement that the tree is not significant. The development site is not a windfall and is not on the register of potential development sites. The density of the area is important, and the titled balance of consideration should be ignored. No affordable housing has been offered in the scheme. The design and access statement states that the applications at 57 and 55 are being dealt with separately. The Hove Park Forum is currently working on the Hove Park neighbourhood plan, and this should be a material consideration even though it has not been adopted yet. The plan includes design guidelines created to protect the area. This development fails on landscaping and sustainability strategies. The Forum commissioned a housing needs assessment and found the dwelling mix must be decided by life stage modelling. Hove Park plays a wider role in the city and offers larger homes.
4. The Planning Manager informed the committee that there had been no site visits during lockdown to protect the health and safety of staff and residents. The neighbourhood plan has not been drafted and therefore has no weight in the discussion.
5. The case officer informed the committee that the developments at 57 and 55 Goldstone Crescent were two separate applications. This was a decision made by the applicant as they were two separate properties under different ownership.
6. Ian Coomber spoke to the committee on the item as the applicant's agent. The speaker considered that the application was a model of co-operation and working together with officers. It was noted that the presentation was the best view of the application. The street scene in the area is not considered uniform. The development includes a mix of flats which will be good for those wishing to downsize. The scheme is good and cannot be considered against the draft neighbourhood plan design code. The area offers a variety of housing creating a good mix. The development will help to address the 5 year land supply for the council. It is considered that the report and presentation are good and show everything needed to determine the application. The speaker requested the committee to approve the application.

Questions for speaker

7. Councillor Miller was informed that the development would be a good match for those wishing to downsize in the area.

Questions for officers

8. Councillor Hills was informed that the cycle parking would be to the rear of the building. The exact location is under negotiation. By condition the development will not be occupied until this has been resolved.
9. Councillor Childs was informed that the development was a similar footprint to the existing property and the majority of the garden would be retained.
10. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the developer decided to submit two applications for 57 and 55 Goldstone Crescent as they were under different ownership. The Councillor was informed that the S106 agreement would need to be signed and agreed before the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced.
11. The Senior Solicitor informed the committee that the S106 agreement would need to be agreed before 2 October 2020 as this would be before CIL started. After that date the contributions will change.

Debate

12. Councillor Miller considered the number of units and affordable housing contribution to be good, along with the materials. The dug down design was good, as was the downsizing for city residents and the flats will add 7 units to housing targets. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Osborne appreciated the report and the development, on the same footprint, not over the height of neighbouring properties and with little harmful effect, to be acceptable and supported the application.
14. Councillor Hills considered the development to create more good homes, with downsizing opportunities and to be well planned. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Fishleigh found the application a challenge to consider away from the other development proposed at No.55.
16. A vote was taken and out of the 9 Members present the committee voted by 7 to 2 that planning permission be granted.
17. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out in the report and the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, SAVE THAT should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before the **2nd October 2020** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11.1 of the report.

D BH2020/01619 - 55 Goldstone Crescent, Hove - Full Planning

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of development, affordable housing provision, density, design, landscaping and biodiversity, their impact on neighbouring amenity, the standard of accommodation, the impact on the highway, and sustainability.

Speakers

3. Ward Councillor Brown spoke to the committee and stated that they objected to the application. The councillor considered that both the previous application at 57 and this application at 55 Goldstone Crescent should be considered at the same time. The applications will set a precedent in the area. The proposals are near other developments, but they are not the same. This is the wrong location. The application is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, to be overbearing and to upset the street scene. The three parking spaces proposed are insufficient on the busy road where street parking is congested. There are no bus stops nearby. Under City Plan Part 1 the characteristics of the area need to be maintained; this application does not do that. This residential development is not in character. The councillor requested that the committee refuse the application.

Questions for speaker

4. Councillor Simson was informed that the neighbouring property was a bungalow, and the development would be overbearing on that dwelling.
5. Councillor Hills was informed that the nearest bus stop was in Woodruff Avenue some 200 metres away, where a limited service stopped.
6. Ian Coomber spoke to the committee as the applicant's agent. The speaker considered that the application was similar to that at 57. The engagement with officers had been good. It was considered that the site was a windfall and the downsizing possibilities were good. It was noted that the area was not exclusively large houses. The impact on the neighbouring bungalow has been assessed and found acceptable by the case officer. There are sustainable transport links nearby. The speaker requested that the committee grant planning permission.

Debate

7. Councillor Hills considered that a mix of housing in the area would be better than just larger homes.
8. Councillor Miller considered the number of units to be good and the affordable housing contribution to be acceptable. The councillor noted that the report stated there would be

no detrimental impact on the neighbouring bungalow and had seen this on a drive -by. The councillor supported the application.

9. A vote was taken and out of the 9 Members present the committee voted by 7 to 2 that planning permission be granted.
10. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out in the report and the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, SAVE THAT should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before the **2nd October 2020** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11.1 of the report.

E BH2020/01973 - 40 Dyke Road Avenue Brighton - Full Planning & Demolition in a Conservation Area

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development, its design and heritage impacts, particularly in relation to the conservation area. The impact on neighbouring amenity, the trees on site, transport network and sustainability issues are also considered.
3. The committee were informed by the case officer that paragraph 8.4. should read: The present proposal would result in the replacement of the existing dwelling so no housing gain.

Speakers

4. Lap Chan spoke to the committee as the applicant's agent. The determination of the application is considered on the loss of the existing building which is only a heritage asset in as much as it is in a conservation area. Other properties in the area are set back from the front boundary and there is no consistency in the area. The styles and appearance of properties in the area are mixed with most buildings being behind walls and hidden from sight. The development has been redesigned following contact with the case officer and this was supported by the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) and a ward councillor. The new dwelling could meet Passivhaus standards as the new build will be energy efficient. It is noted that the existing building is not updateable.

Questions for speaker

5. Councillor Miller was informed that the applicant would live in the new property.
6. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the CAG approved the arts & crafts design.

Questions for officers

7. Councillor Yates was informed that the application was for a replacement single dwelling. It was noted that the property had been converted back to one dwelling from two, some time ago.

Debate

8. Councillor Miller approved of the design, which was considered better than the previous one and more fitting to the area. The scheme for a family unit was good. The councillor supported the scheme and was against the officer recommendation for refusal.
9. Councillor Fishleigh considered the design to be an improvement and supported the application.
10. Councillor Simson considered the existing property to be an eyesore and the new design to be better than the previous one. The councillor supported the scheme and was against the officer recommendation for refusal.
11. Councillor Yates supported the application and was against refusal. The proposed dwelling, to be of a high standard, would be a good addition to the area. More dwellings would have been better, but one was better than none.
12. Roger Amerena (CAG) considered this application to be better than the last one with the forecourt wall being reinstated. The new dwelling would be a plus for the area.
13. A vote was taken and out of the 8 Members present the committee voted unanimously against the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission. (Councillor Hills had withdrawn and took no part in the debate or decision-making process).
14. A motion to grant planning permission was proposed by Councillor Miller and seconded by Councillor Childs.
15. Councillor Miller stated what the proposed reasons for grant as per the recommended reason for refusal except remove "No" in the second sentence; third sentence reads "...existing building does preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the area and would not cause harm..."; final sentence deleted. The reasons for grant should be included in the minutes.
16. Councillor Littman requested that the imposition of suitable conditions be delegated to the Planning Manager.
17. A recorded vote was held: Councillors Osborne, Childs, Miller, Henry, Fishleigh, Yates, Simson and Littman voted in favour of granting planning permission.
18. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration the report and resolves TO GRANT planning permission for the reasons set out above and subject to conditions to be agreed by the Planning Manager. The final wording of the GRANT to be agreed by the Planning Manager.

F BH2020/01899 - 4 Tandridge Road, Hove - Full Planning

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development, the design and appearance of the proposed dwellings and the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity. The standard of accommodation to be provided, transport implications and sustainability and are also material considerations.

Speakers

3. Matthew Binns spoke to the committee as an objector. The speaker considered that their family would be adversely affected by the application. There did not appear to be any engagement by the applicant with the neighbours or a site visit to assess the impact of the proposals. The development will be incongruous. The property is two dwellings already and had been refused before. The speaker considered that they would lose light, and there appeared to be no assessment of this, loss of privacy as the rear of the new building will align with rear boundary of the neighbouring property. There have been other applications along Tandridge Road and this application will in result in? overcrowding with too many properties together. The speaker asked the committee to refuse the application.

Questions to speaker

4. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the garage to the rear of the application site may have been turned into an office. The councillor was also informed that the application was considered to affect the light and privacy of the neighbouring properties. It was also noted a previous application for a replacement dwelling was granted planning permission. The councillor was informed that there were two dwellings on the application site.
5. Councillor Miller was informed that the new builds in the road were of a different design and had received little objection.

Questions for officers

6. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that a site visit had not taken place and as far as officers knew, the property was known as one dwelling.
7. Councillor Miller confirmed that a site visit would be appreciated to understand the site better.
8. The Senior Solicitor asked the committee whether they were happy for the case officer to carry out the site visit or would the Members wish to attend.
9. Councillor Littman addressed the committee and all the Members agreed that the case officer should carry out the site visit.

10. The Planning Manager stated that an extant planning permission existed for the site allowing two dwellings to be built.
11. A vote was taken and on a unanimous vote, all 8 committee Members agreed to defer the application pending a site visit to ascertain whether the application property was in use as one or two dwellings. (Councillor Yates was not present during the discussions and took no part in the decision making process).
12. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration the report and agrees to defer the application pending a site visit.

G BH2020/01870 - 136 Ladysmith Road, Brighton - Full Planning

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the proposed change of use, the effects of the proposed change of use on neighbours' amenity, the standard of accommodation to be provided for future occupiers, and transport matters.

Debate

3. Councillor Childs considered that there were lots of Homes of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) in this crowded area. The councillor expressed concerns that the proposed change of use would have a negative impact on the area with regards to noise, rubbish and more cars needing parking.
4. A vote was taken, and the 8 Members present voted by 3 to 5 against the officer recommendation to approve the application. (Councillor Yates was not present during the debate and took no part in the decision making process).
5. A motion to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Childs and seconded by Councillor Fishleigh.
6. Councillors Childs proposed that the reasons for refusal would be on the grounds that the application would potentially have a negative impact by way of parking, noise and waste and thereby be contrary to planning policy QD27 – protection of amenities.
7. A recorded vote was taken, and of the 7 Members present councillors Childs, Miller, Fishleigh and Simson voted to refuse the application, whilst councillors Osborne, Hills and Littman voted to grant the application. By a vote of 4 to 3 the application was refused. (Councillors Henry and Yates were not present during the debate and took no part in the decision making process).
8. **RESOVLED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report but resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission on the grounds that the proposed development would potentially result in noise, parking issues and waste which would have a negative impact on amenity. The final wording of

the refusal to be agreed by the Planning Manager in consultation with the proposer and seconder.

H BH2019/03758 - 17 Old Shoreham Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

I BH2020/01548 - 23 Trafalgar Street, Brighton - Full Planning

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 showed the proposed scheme in the context of neighbouring development.
2. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of development, design and heritage, the impact on neighbouring amenity and on the highways network.

Speakers

3. Ward Councillor Deane spoke to the committee. The councillor considered that Members were absolutely right to refuse the application when it first came to committee and noted that councillors from all parties considered it as a 'pub by stealth' and is therefore an inappropriate change of use within the Cumulative Impact Zone. The councillor noted that although licensing conditions stipulate no outside drinking beyond 6 pm there would be noise and disturbance to nearby residents from smokers who will be permitted outside until 10 pm. The councillor also found it concerning that there is a whiskey bar open to the public in close proximity to Brighton Met College. This second application has at best minor tweaks compared to the first application and few, if any, concerns raised have been allayed. The councillor considered that although there have been numerous letters of support for this application the members are requested to take note of the postcodes of those supporters as the councillor believes a significant number are not from Brighton and do not represent the wishes of local people. The councillor urged the committee to abide by policy and again refuse this application, as there is very little difference between this and first time around.
4. Sebastian Woolf, the applicant, spoke to the committee. The applicant thanked the case officer and stated they were a business owner in the whiskey trade and well known in the North Laine area and understood the dynamics of the area. The applicant did not consider they were off loading cheap alcohol but would be open for the sampling and selling of whiskies. Support had been received from around the UK and distributors would be invited to Brighton to enjoy the applicant's own whiskey brand. Brighton is a good place for small businesses, and this will not be a large chain pub like venue. The independent whiskey will be bottled in Brighton with labels designed by local artists.

Questions for the speaker

5. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that the applicant did not speak to the committee on the previous application. The applicant confirmed they had not spoken to the North Laine trader's association but had spoken in person to other business owners and believed there would be employment opportunities and that people were excited by the proposal.

Questions for officers

6. Councillor Fishleigh was informed that although not relevant a premises licence had been granted.
7. Councillor Hills was informed that petitions and support had been received from across the UK.
8. The Planning Manager stated that the material considerations within the objections or representations in support were to be considered, and not the number of objections or representations in support.

Debate

9. Councillor Simson supported the applicant that they considered to be unique.
10. Councillor Fishleigh supported the application.
11. Councillor Osborne supported the application and considered the conditions to be acceptable.
12. Councillor Childs supported the application and considered the conditions to be good, along with the building improvements, and the employment and tourist benefits.
13. Councillor Littman considered the application to be better than the previous one and that the proposals would be good for the city. The councillor supported the application.
14. A vote was taken and the 8 Members who were present when the vote was taken the committee voted unanimously that planning permission be granted. (Councillor Yates was not present during the discussions and took no part in the decision making process).
15. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

J BH02020/01509 - 46 Queens Gardens Brighton - Full Planning

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

- 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 in the report.

K BH2020/00995 - 90 Southall Avenue, Brighton - Full Planning

- 1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.
- 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 set out in the report.

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

- 49.1 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.

50 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

51 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

52 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 52.1 The Committee noted the content of the letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising of the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

The meeting concluded at 5.08pm

Signed _____ Chair

Dated this _____ day of _____