

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**2.00pm 7 JULY 2021**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Littman (Chair), Ebel (Deputy Chair), Barnett, McNair, Moonan, Shanks and Yates.

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

**Officers in attendance:** Jane Moseley (Planning Manager), Luke Austin (Principal Planning Officer), Russell Brown (Senior Planning Officer), Robin Hodgetts (Principal Planning Officer), Tim Jeffries (Planning Team Leader), Fraser McQuade (Senior Urban Design Officer), Wayne Nee (Principal Planning Officer), Andrew Renaut (Head of Transport, Policy and Strategy), Emily Stanbridge (Senior Planning Officer), Hilary Woodward (Senior Solicitor) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

**PART ONE**

**1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**a) Declarations of substitutes**

1.1 Councillor McNair substituted for Councillor Theobald

**b) Declarations of interests**

1.2 Councillor Moonan declared that they had attended a site meeting on item G as a ward councillor prior to being on the Planning Committee and would withdraw if the item was called for discussion. Councillor McNair declared they had submitted letters of representation on item F and would withdraw if the item was called for discussion. Councillor Littman declared they had received lobbying on items A and F, and stated they knew one of the objectors on item J as a ward resident, but this would not impact on their determination of the applications.

**c) Exclusion of the press and public**

1.3 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.

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

## **2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 2.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2021 as a correct record.

## **3 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

- 3.1 The Chair of the Planning Committee stated the following:

Welcome everyone to Planning Committee. In our continuing battle against Covid, and in line with the protocol agreed by all group leaders, in addition to social distancing measures, masks are to be worn for this meeting. You are asked to continue to wear your mask while seated unless you are exempt. To assist those with hearing difficulties, closed captioning is on, and transparent visors are apparently available. If you'd like to use one, please inform one of the Democratic Services Officers.

I'd like to encourage everyone with an interest in planning in their area to sign up to our planning register. The planning register is designed to make it easier for people to find out about planning applications near to their homes and businesses, get involved with planning decision-making, and track the progress of their own planning applications.

You'll receive regular updates on planning applications, you can set up alerts to let you know when comments are submitted or a decision has been taken and you can look up information about where planning applications are using a map of the area. To sign up, go to the planning section of our website at [www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/planning-applications](http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/planning-applications) and select 'find and comment on planning applications'.

It's also worth noting that we publish new applications weekly on our planning web pages and this is highlighted on our social media, so look out for postings on the council's Twitter and Facebook.

We have a packed agenda today, and we will give every application the attention it deserves. However, I will do everything in my power to ensure we finish in time for everyone who wants to, to get home to watch the England/Denmark semi-final. For me, that means wrapping up by five past seven at the latest. With that in mind, let's get on with it.

## **4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

- 4.1 There were none.

## **5 TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS**

- 5.1 There were none.

## **6 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**A BH2019/01180 - Vallance Hall, 49 Hove Street, Hove - Full Planning**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

## Speakers

2. Ian Coomber addressed the committee as an objector and stated that Futurelab are a tech firm located next to the application site. The proposed office space appears to not be needed. Futurelab are not able to work remotely and will be disturbed by construction works as there is only a brick wall on the boundary. The loss of the tree outside the building is regrettable. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
3. Teresa Sutherland addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they felt the neighbours were not consulted and the development would have a severe impact on their property with loss of daylight and being overbearing. The objector stated they worked from home and that seven windows of their property face the development site and these are the only source of daylight. The neighbour requested an assessment of daylight/sunlight impacts on their property but was informed that any concerns would be considered at officer level, however, it appears the 45<sup>0</sup> rule was not used and what was the energy efficiency of the project? The neighbour had extreme concerns regarding the impact on the development on their own property.
4. Peter Young addressed the committee as architect for the scheme and stated that the application was coming before the committee three years after the pre-application advice was received. The project has had four case officers and four design changes. The development will be lower than the road and set back from the pavement. The application was considered to be a positive regeneration of the area and much needed office space. A daylight and sunlight assessment stated there would be no reduction for the neighbouring property as the windows affected are not principal windows. The proposed windows facing the neighbour will be obscured glazed and louvered. The scale of the project has been reduced. The development includes cycle parking and a green roof. The officer recommendation to approve is welcomed. The committee were requested to support the application.
5. The case officer clarified that the 45<sup>0</sup> rule was used to assess the scheme and some overshadowing would result from the development, however the harm was considered to be small and on balance acceptable. All the proposed windows are to be obscure glazed and louvered. It was considered there would be some loss of light, however, none of the windows affected were the only window in the room.

## Questions

6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the underground car park would accommodate 28 cars and that Building Regulations would look at how the car park was to be constructed.
7. Councillor Ebel was informed that the development was one storey higher than the neighbouring offices and that daylight was considered sufficient. The number of workers to be accommodated was not known at this stage.

## Vote

8. A vote was taken, and the committee voted unanimously that planning permission be granted.
9. **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 7 October 2021 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 12 of the report.

**B BH2020/02801 - 27-31 Church Street, Brighton - Full Planning**

1. The case officer introduced the application to the committee.

## Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Deane submitted a speech which was read out to the committee by a Democratic Services officer as follows:

I write in my capacity of ward councillor in support of the North Laine Community Association and local residents in their objection to this application. While it is true to say that this site needs to be developed, having lain vacant for many years, it is important that it is not 'developed at any price'. The proposed building is overly large and overbearing. It will totally dominate and overshadow this narrow street that adjoins the North Laine Conservation area, creating an unpleasant canyon.

There have been numerous applications for this site over the years, many containing proposals for retail and residential, i.e. mixed use. For this site to be used only for offices takes away the mixed use element in a way that will do nothing to enhance the local area or provide amenity for local people. The city does not need a monstrous office block at this location, it desperately needs new homes, and by granting this application today, the committee will be throwing away an opportunity to do something that might otherwise help to alleviate the city's housing crisis.

I believe residents are right to point out that the pavement along Church Street is too narrow for the amount of footfall along it, the proposed bike stands will cause an obstruction, and the parking bays in front of the building will narrow the pavement even further. The frontage should be scaled back to allow for better pedestrian access.

While the site had lain dormant, it has developed a covering of wildflowers that attract insects and a potential habitat for small mammals and has acted as a small oasis in the urban environment. The landscaping suggested for this development is minimal and misses an opportunity to provide any significant outside space, as the footprint of the proposed building will cover almost the entire area.

The privacy of local residents in the immediate vicinity will be severely compromised by the outlook over Portland Street, the row of small terraced houses will be completely overshadowed, and the homes in Windsor Street will lose too much natural light for the scale of this building to be acceptable.

In summary, this is an overbearing building that constitutes over- development, does nothing to alleviate the housing crisis and misses the opportunity to add to the city's biodiversity. For these reasons, I would ask that the proposal be refused.

3. Paul Burgess addressed the committee as the agent for the applicant and stated that the site had been derelict since 1990s and had been identified in the City Plan part 2 as a brownfield site. The site has two extant planning permissions. There is a shortage of grade A office space in the city and the sustainable office space will be flexible, creating approximately 350 new jobs. The development company has delivered other schemes in the city and has had detailed discussions with the council with support from the Heritage Team and Conservation Advisory Group (CAG). The development is considered to respect the location with a glazed ground floor area to add interest at street level. The proposals include two green walls and a green roof. The regeneration of the site is supported by the council. The committee are requested to approve the application.

#### Questions

4. Councillor Yates was informed that the general advice was given regarding the mansard roof and dormer windows, requesting a reflection of the building opposite. The Senior Urban Design Officer stated that no detailed advice had been given regarding the scale of the dormers. A nod to the building opposite had been requested and a balance was to be struck in the design of the building.

#### Debate

5. Councillor Barnett considered it a shame that no housing was proposed, however, she agreed there was little office space in the area, which needed to be made more respectable. The councillor supported the application.
6. Councillor Yates acknowledged the resident's concerns, however, the design was considered to understand the environment they are operating in. The design of the mansard roof is a good contemporary design. Mixed use would have been better; however, this is the scheme before the committee. The councillor supported the application.
7. Councillor Ebel considered the site an eyesore at the moment and high quality office space was needed in the city. The site has good transport links. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Littman noted there was very little grade A office space in the city and the proposals were well designed.

#### Vote

9. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously 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 7 October 2021 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 13 of the report.

### **C BH2020/00931 - Former Dairy, 35 - 39 The Droveaway, Hove - Full Planning**

1. The case officer introduced the application to the committee.

#### Speakers

2. Kevin Brown addressed the committee as an objector, in the presence of another objector, Ms Wright, and stated that the application was not the same as before and that the conservation aspects of the site were important. Concerns related to the high number of proposed dwellings and the density of the development. The proposed rooflights are a concern with regard to loss of privacy and noise. The lower sill heights are also a concern. leading to overlooking. Light pollution as well as the loss of sea views are a concern, as is overshadowing and overlooking. The planned vehicle access from Mallory Road raises concerns regarding parking and traffic, and the access of construction traffic. The committee were requested to condition that no weekend working will take place and there will be no construction traffic access from Mallory Road.
3. Joseph Pearson addressed the committee as the agent for the application and stated that the key matters were the general design and footprint. The properties on the northside of the site will be 1.7m lower than the approved development, with ridge heights as before. Only one unit will face Mallory Road. Rooflights proposed will be angled so there will be no overlooking for the neighbours. It is noted that the council Heritage Team support the application. The site has been vacant since 2016 and it has been a challenge to deliver commercial space in the scheme for this mixed use site. The number of homes has been increased following negotiation with officers.
4. The case officer informed the committee that the ground floor plan was similar to the extant permission and the ridge heights on the north elevation facing the objector at no.6 was lower than the extant permission.

#### Questions

5. Councillor Moonan was informed that the materials would include clay tiles, and flint walls with brick dressing. It was noted that the developer would be required by condition to copy the existing and samples will need to be supplied to the council for agreement. The new buildings in the development will have painted masonry, brick work with grey metal roofing and aluminium windows. It was also noted that there was no condition regarding access from Mallory Road.

6. The Senior Solicitor stated that condition 8 related to a construction management plan and that the council would agree the routes into the site under this plan. If the Members wished to add a condition it would need to be fair and reasonable.
7. The case officer noted that the proposals include 2 parking spaces accessed from Mallory Road, and these were unallocated, the same as with the extant permission. Condition 20 requires details of parking areas, allocation and management.
8. The Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) representative was informed that the existing barn roof tiles are to be repaired and retained. The existing long strips of rooflights are to be retained in the commercial buildings to look less residential. The existing buildings are locally listed, not nationally, and are currently vacant. The benefit of the development is considered to outweigh the harm. It was noted that the pantiles are to be replaced with clay tiles and that materials are by condition to be approved. The CAG representative requested that the pantiles be saved and used in the new development.
9. The case officer noted that the pantiles did appear to be mentioned in the extant permission and the heritage comments did not mention the pantiles either.
10. The Planning Manager noted there was no objection from the Heritage Team to the removal of the pantiles and it would be unreasonable to condition their retention.
11. Councillor Barnett was informed that there would be 26 parking spaces, less than the extant permission, on balance appropriate for the scheme. Less parking has allowed for extra amenity space with the increase in the size of gardens. The key issue is to retain the historic buildings on site, and the shared courtyard as a historic space.
12. Councillor Shanks was informed that the artistic component of the s106 agreement would be used on site and that local residents are able to contribute to the discussions via their ward member.

#### Debate

13. Councillor Yates considered that the use of non-heritage roof tiles was not good and felt it was expected that the pantiles be retained. The councillor requested a condition to retain the pantiles.
14. The Senior Solicitor noted that conditions need to be reasonable and that the Planning Manager had advised against the addition of such a condition.
15. Councillor Yates proposed a motion to add a condition to retain the pantiles. The motion was seconded by Councillor Moonan.
16. Councillor Shanks stated their support for the application.
17. Councillor McNair stated the surrounding area consisted of large individual properties and the proposed scheme was not similar in design. The proposals were not considered to match the surrounding area and was an overdevelopment of the site.

Vote

18. A vote was taken on the motion to retain the existing pantiles by condition and agreed by 4 to 2, with 1 abstention.
19. A vote was taken, and the committee voted by 5 to 2, that planning permission be granted.
20. **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 7 October 2021 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 13 of the report.

**D BH2021/00780 - Land at Junction of Foredown Road and Fox Way, Portslade - Outline Application**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Questions

2. Councillor Shanks was informed that the affordable housing would be provided on a second site the developer is bringing forward, which would be secured through the legal agreement.
3. The Planning Manager noted that a commuted sum was not being sought and the legal agreement will bind the developer to build the cluster of affordable homes.
4. The Senior Solicitor advised that the s106 agreement would require that the affordable housing would need to be built by a certain stage in the development.
5. Councillor Yates was informed that the access shown in the plans was for bins and a portacabin and the 'dog leg' road would be used for amenity reasons. Condition 5 included a highways agreement to improve the footways.

Debate

6. Councillor Yates stated they liked the proposals, which was a good use of the site, with the density not out of keeping with the other new dwellings nearby.
7. Councillor Littman stated that they considered the ecological conditions to be good and they supported the application.

Vote

8. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously that planning permission be granted.

9. **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 to secure 30% affordable housing (four dwellings) provided off site 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 **7<sup>th</sup> January 2022** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 12.1 of the report.

**E BH2020/03291 - 83 Lustrells Crescent, Saltdean, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent**

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.

**F BH2021/01013 - 4 Keymer Road, Brighton - Full Planning**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the report to the committee.

Speakers

2. Joanne Avison addressed the committee as an objector and stated that the key aspect of their objection to the application was the impact on the neighbouring properties. The proposals will block daylight, be overbearing and result in a loss of privacy, contrary to planning policy. The case officer did not view the property from the neighbour's property; however, ward Councillor McNair did visit. The two storey development will result in a loss of daylight and privacy. The scheme is broadly the same as the previously refused application. The small garden means the development will be too near the neighbouring property. A bungalow would be more suitable as it would be smaller. The committee are asked to look at it again.
3. Ward Councillor McNair addressed the committee and stated that they were not aware of the previous reasons for refusal, however, 18 letters of objection have been received. It is considered that the scheme will have an overbearing impact on the neighbour's property contrary to planning policy. The balance between garden and dwelling will be different from the surrounding area. The councillor also stated they had visited the neighbours' homes. There is no parking and cycles will not be suitable in this hilly location. Nearby projects have been granted with parking, so why not here. The development will result in a loss of amenities with loss of light and space, and no parking. The neighbours will be in the shadow of the development and the scheme will set a precedent.
4. Nick Jones addressed the committee as the agent for the application and stated that the application was for a two storey dwelling and the design has been worked from first principles not from the previously refused applications. The design is sensible and

considerate and responds to the reasons for refusal of the previous applications. The proposals are significantly lower than the previous scheme and smaller. It was noted that there is a significant level change between the objecting neighbour and the application site, and the parking accords with parking standards. No parking was given for the previously refused schemes.

5. The case officer informed the committee that the separation distances between the proposed dwelling and the neighbour were approximately 12 to 14 metres. The neighbour and the proposed dwelling will be set at an oblique angle so the view from the windows will not be direct.

Vote

6. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed by 5 to 1 that planning permission be granted.
7. **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.

**G BH2021/01750 - 8 Blatchington Road, Hove - Prior Approval Retail/Bank to Dwelling**

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 **GIVE** prior approval for the development and the following Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

**H BH2021/01453 - Henge Way, Portslade - Removal or Variation of Condition**

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 BH2021/01163 - Garages opposite 6-10 St Johns Road, Hove - Full Planning**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Mr Wickson addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they had rescued several flats in Adelaide Crescent and now occupied one of them to the rear of the application site where marginal light is received. Neighbours were not notified

of the proposals and no site visits have taken place. The daylight and sunlight into the neighbouring property will be affected as the officer failed to notice windows facing the scheme. The architect's drawings do not show that the neighbouring flats are at a lower level to the proposals. The flats at lower levels will be held to ransom with the fire exits closed off by the development. The garages on the site are used. The flat roof design of the proposals will cast shadows and the development will reduce parking. The neighbours have not been contacted at any time during the three month application process time.

3. Julia Mitchell addressed the committee as the agent for the applicant and stated that there are no vehicle repair businesses on site, and the garages are only used for storage. The proposed scheme will bring benefits to the conservation area as residential use is less harmful than commercial use. The design is to match the existing dwellings and the scheme will be car free with close- by amenities. It was noted that the Highways Team support the scheme. To protect the neighbours' amenities the development is stepped back on the first floor away from Adelaide Crescent. The daylight report noted that the neighbours' windows facing the development were in rooms with more windows. The four new dwellings were considered to help with housing targets and to be sustainable. The committee were asked to grant planning permission.
4. The case officer informed the committee that the site was currently used as vehicle storage. Site notices were put up and the immediate neighbours to the application site were notified of the application. Reasonable steps were taken to inform neighbours of the proposals.

#### Questions

5. Councillor Shanks was informed that the proposals were 3.5 metres higher than the existing buildings.
6. The Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) representative was informed that the proposals would be the same distance from the rear neighbouring properties as the existing buildings and the design has been agreed by the Heritage Team.
7. Councillor McNair was informed that the development would be car free and this was supported by the Highways Team.

#### Debate

8. Councillor Yates stated they understood the comments by the CAG representative however the councillor had no objections to the design. It was considered that a car free scheme was good and in keeping with the area. The loss of the garages is not considered to be significant and four new dwellings will be good for the city. The design was on balance acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
9. Councillor Ebel considered the existing garages did not look nice and the development would be an improvement. The councillor supported the application.

10. Councillor Littman noted the changes to residential from commercial in the area and considered the design to be clever and to reduce the impact of the development. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

11. A vote was taken, and the by a vote of 4 to 2 planning permission was granted. (Councillor Moonan did not take part in the discussions or decision-making process).
12. **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 as set out in the report.

#### **J BH2021/01360 - 1-13 Shelldale Road Portslade - Full Planning**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Robert Rosenthal addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they were speaking on behalf of other neighbours to the site and they did not object to the proposals as such. Concerns related to the impact on the fabric of the adjoining property. It was considered that the developer had taken a cavalier attitude to the neighbours who sought assurance that the developer will reach an agreement with the council's building control team. Other concerns related to the amount of excavation that the development will require, some 8,000 cubic metres approximately. The construction works will create noise and disturbance. The council were asked to send a clear message to the developers that agreements must be reached with neighbours during demolition and construction.
3. The Senior Solicitor noted that Building Control matters were separate to planning matters and not for this committee to consider, as with the matters under the Party Wall Act which were civil issues. The committee could not make assurances requested by the objecting neighbour.
4. Jon Puplett addressed the committee as the agent for the applicant and stated that the application related to a redundant brownfield site and the previous use for car repairs disturbed the neighbours. The design of the development extends the terrace and pays respect to the existing buildings. Soft landscaping is to be added and the new dwellings would be of a sustainable design including modern office space. The location is accessible, and the scheme will enhance the street scene. The developer has paid full regard to the neighbours and respects the Party Wall Act and the development plan.

Questions

5. Councillor Yates was informed that the agent has spoken with the neighbour and answered questions and is happy to answer more in future. The applicant is a responsible developer and notes the conditions attached to the report. The Party Wall Act is a civil matter in which the developer will engage. The neighbour's concerns are noted, and the developer wants to be a good neighbour.

Debate

6. Councillor Ebel considered the proposals to be a great improvement on the existing buildings and noted the much needed four new large family homes to be constructed. The councillor supported the application.
7. Councillor Shanks considered the development to be a good use of the site and encouraged the developer to have discussions with the neighbour.
8. Councillor McNair considered the four new family homes with garages to be good, however, the grey appearance was not considered to mimic other existing houses in the area. It was considered that the narrow window design made the new dwellings look narrow, however, in general the design was good.
9. Councillor Yates considered the application to be a good mixed use scheme with four new dwellings and office space. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

13. A vote was taken, and the committee voted unanimously that planning permission be granted. (Councillor Moonan did not take part in the discussions or decision-making process).
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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

**K BH2021/00320 - 56 & 58 Barn Rise, 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.

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

7.1 There were none.

**8 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE**

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

**9 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES**

9.1 There were none.

**10 APPEAL DECISIONS**

10.1 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 addendum to the agenda.

The meeting concluded at 5.28pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of