

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 5 MARCH 2025

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Loughran (Chair), Earthey, Nann, Robinson, Shanks, C Theobald, Thomson (Deputy Chair), Winder and Sheard (Substitute)

Officers in attendance: Jane Moseley (Planning Manager), Alison Gatherer (Legal Officer), Steven Dover (Planning Officer), Wayne Nee (Planning Officer), Jack Summers (Planning Officer), Michael Tucker (Senior Planning Officer), Vinicious Pinheiro (Assistant Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

67 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

67.1 Councillor Sheard substituted for Councillor Galvin.

b) Declarations of interests

67.2 There were none.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

67.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

67.5 The Chair requested Members ensure that their mobile phones were switched off, and where Members were using tablets to access agenda papers electronically ensure that these were switched to 'aeroplane mode'.

68 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 68.1 **RESOLVED:** The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2025 were agreed.

69 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 69.1 The chair noted that Councillor Allen had stepped down from the planning committee and councillor Thomson was now deputy chair. It was also noted that expected timetable for local development schemes would be that during the summer of 2025 the comments from the consultation started in January 2025 would be looked at with a view to publishing in summer 2026, submission and adoption in 2028.

70 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 70.1 There were none.

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

- 71.1 There were no requests for site visits.

72 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- 72.1 The Democratic Services officer called the agenda applications to the committee. The following items were not called for discussion and were therefore taken to be agreed in accordance with the officer's recommendation:

- Item E: BH2024/03124: Brighton Co-Operative Society, Whitehawk Road, Brighton

A BH2023/02859 - Brighton, Hove and Sussex Sixth Form College, 205 Dyke Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Ward councillor Bagaeen addressed the committee and stated that they welcomed the recommendation to approve the application. The council expressed they wish to invest in schools recently, please agree. It was noted that no other sixth form colleges will close as a result of this development. The objectors' concerns about the impact of the college on the area are down to other factors, not the college. There are no objections from transport. The new building will be an excellent addition to the site.
3. Ward Councillors Lyons considered the college a success, starting at 2,000, now 3,500 students, growing to 4,000 in the future. The S106 agreement is good and there are no objections in the ward or from ward councillors. It was noted that more classrooms are needed, and the existing porta-cabins are out of date and improvements are needed. The development may overshadow Crocodile Walk; however, the pathway is mostly used by students, not residents. The committee were asked to agree the application.

4. Neighbouring Ward Councillor O'Quinn addressed the committee and stated that they were objecting to the application on behalf of residents. The expansion of the college is considered an issue with numbers rising from 2,700 five years ago and now 3,700, and 4,000 soon. Students come from outside the city as well as inside and the numbers are increasing. This is phase three of the master plan, and the development is too big and too high, with a loss of open space. The development will give no break in the building line. The temporary classrooms intended for five years have now been in place 17 years.
5. Michael Baldwin addressed the committee as the Principal of BHASVIC and stated that the removal of the suboptimal buildings was required. A pre-application enquiry had been submitted in September 2022 with an outline application following in 2023. The temporary buildings are already in situ and the college has been working with the council at all stages. The development has been amended to stop any loss of green space. The new building will be more cost effective and efficient. The design will complement the other new buildings on site. The existing porta-cabins are considered ugly. The student numbers have peaked, and they need to be served. Local residents have been reassured that there will be no loss of green space, and the local community has been effectively engaged with.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the land is not public open space, and it is shared with Cardinal Newman school. The land to be built on is under the ownership of the college.
7. Councillor Thomson was informed that Sports England have withdrawn objections now the development will not be on the playing fields, and the netball courts will be reinstated.
8. Councillor Sheard was informed that the cycle sheds were well used, and additional cycle parking would be provided once capacity was reached, secured through the Travel Plan.
9. Councillor Loughran was informed that new lighting was not proposed for Crocodile Walk but there will be a lighting strategy secured by condition relating to the site.
10. Councillor Earthy was informed that a lighting strategy is being secured by condition.
11. Councillor Theobald was informed that the netball courts will be reinstated, and they will remain in the same location. Currently provision is found off site.

Debate

12. Councillor Thomson was minded to approve the application as the council should invest in schools.
13. Councillor Robinson was minded to approve the application even though the design was boxy, and lower would be preferred.

14. Councillor Shanks considered the college a great asset and success in the city.
15. Councillor Earthey supported the application as the existing temporary buildings are shanty-like in appearance and need to be removed.
16. Councillor Sheard noted the college is highly rated in Britain and the students need proper buildings to study.
17. Councillor Theobald considered that mostly no objections have been received, however, it was sad to lose some trees. The councillor noted the college was very successful. The red/brown brick design is very good. The councillor supported the application.
18. Councillor Winder supported the application; however, they considered the loss of trees not to be good. The overall plan was good, and the temporary buildings need to go.
19. Councillor Loughran supported the application as they considered the development an appropriate use of space on a very limited site. The scheme respects the open space and is a good high quality design offering good views for the students and no interference with the Brighton Open Air Theatre (BOAT).

Vote

20. A vote was taken and the committee voted unanimously to grant planning permission.
21. **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 and the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

B BH2024/03067 - Western Esplanade Pond, Fountain and Public Toilets, Western Esplanade, Hove - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Susan Howard addressed the committee as a resident and stated that local residents welcome the plans, however, they objected to the privatisation of the open space. The high fencing will destroy the setting, as will the proposed building, which is considered inappropriate. The development will be a step change in the landscape character. The committee were asked to remove the container building.
3. Graeme Kerr addressed the committee as a resident and stated that the fencing at the café would be some 20m away from the sand courts and 2.4m in height and this was to keep people out of what was traditionally a public area. The fencing is too high. 2m in height in some places and 2.4m in others.
4. Ward Councillor Cattell addressed the committee and stated that they considered the Hove Beach Park to be a success, the first new park in 100 years, which is supported by the West Hove group. It was noted that sports bring health benefits. The fencing is high.

Against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the development is considered to cause less than substantial harm, when weighed against the balance of harm. The committee were asked to agree with the officer recommendation to approve.

5. Katie Mintram addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that they had been operating in the city for 18 years on the Brighton site. The design of the development was to connect the sand courts, seating and café. The venue would be intergenerational. The beach house would be used for school groups and pedestrians would be able to wander through the site. The gates would be open during opening hours. The courts would be pay-to-play. It was considered that children would be secure within the fencing, which is also to stop balls flying out of the site and people in. All state schools will receive 10 hours per week free. It will be a safe place to meet, safe and good for the community, where all generations are served.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Nann was informed that the site levels change and the sand was an asset worth some £38,000 on top of the sub-base. The sand will be topped up every one/two years. The fence height is to stop people getting in because sand tends to be more inviting than other areas such as tennis courts, and to keep balls getting out.
7. Councillor Robinson was informed that Perspex fencing would require cleaning and is too expensive to use over such a large area. The applicant has looked at all sorts of designs and they want to keep the pond. The site needs to be secure for schools' attendance. The beach house location could only move closer to the promenade if the pond were removed. The case officer noted that the northeast corner was the location that interrupted views least. It was noted that boundary fencing details of materials and design will need to be submitted by condition. The posts have a metal core with a wooden surround.
8. Councillor Thomson was informed that nursery groups will be able to use the site for free, and anyone can sit in the area without spending money. The beach house is an important part of the development and would be approximately 11 to 12% of the site. It was noted that the pond was historically a fountain, and this had fallen into disrepair. The applicant wishes to upgrade the fountain. The sand on the courts will exert strong pressure on the fence line, hence the large posts.
9. Councillor Shanks was informed that the application was for the area covered by both the pond and the café. The café makes the application viable. It was noted that 6 sand courts were hoped for, but only three fit the site. Multiple sand sports would be possible.
10. Councillor Theobald was informed that the main public toilets were in the former bowls club building, now in use as a toilet, and an accessible toilet will be located in the café. There will be two within the sand courts area, in the beach house. The public toilets will be 115m metres from the site.
11. Toni Manuel (Seafront Development Manager) stated that the development responded to the needs for community and public consultation had taken place. Options using a single operator or in-house management had been looked at, and the decision was

made to use an independent operator with the facility open to the community, not a private membership club.

12. Councillor Winder was informed that the trees located on other areas of the overall Kingsway-to-the-Sea development will be planted and maintained.

Debate

13. Councillor Nann considered the local business offer would revitalise the area and asked the committee to approve the application.
14. Councillor Shanks considered the application to detract from the area was not appropriate for the space.
15. Councillor Theobald stated they were annoyed at the closure of the current toilets. The councillor did consider that the applicant was doing a good job, and the beach house design looked great. The fencing did not offend. It was good to see sports, and this scheme would be a compliment to the seafront.
16. Councillor Thomson did not object to the overall scheme and felt it was great to be open to all. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Robinson considered the fencing to be an issue and would like changes to be made.
18. Councillor Sheard considered the development well designed for the area and struggled to see the fencing as a major issue. The fencing needs to be in place to protect the investment and stop volleyballs flying high. In the context of the area the councillor considered the scheme the missing piece. The councillor supported the application.
19. Councillor Winder considered the balance of consideration: the sea front was a unique place; the fencing was a worry as it stopped views.
20. Councillor Earthey was not happy with the fencing but understood the need. The councillor considered the scheme to be the missing piece of the jigsaw and supported the application.
21. Councillor Loughran considered the application to be very difficult, they supported the use of the site, however, they were bothered by the intervisibility.

Vote

22. A vote was taken, and by 6 to 3 the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
23. **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.

C BH2024/02981 - 119 Church Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Courtney Darby addressed the agent acting on behalf of the applicant stated that this was not an application for an extension but a fully collapsible structure. Please only look at this application not any previous applications. The structure is of timber frame, with fenced sides and a retractable canopy, which is fundamentally different from before. The host building will be seen and not covered. The site is next to a brutalist car park and mostly invisible. It is noted that Historic England have not objected, and the rear garden will remain the same. The canopy is needed for the unpredictable weather. Support has been received from residents. Please defer and make a site visit.
3. The case officer clarified that the retractable structure was considered the same in form and scale as an extension.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Shanks was informed that the fencing from 2024 application has been retained, and it was recognised by the applicant that some parts were unlawful. The fencing was attached to the boundary walls, but the listed building was not damaged. It was noted outside seating in the rear garden would be acceptable.
5. Councillor Robinson was informed that the structure was not shown off the boundary walls. Other unsuitable structures in the surrounding area do not set a precedent and are not justification for more inappropriate development.
6. Councillor Loughran was informed that the previous refusal and appeal decision related to the structure in the rear garden, even if not attached. It was noted that pre-application advice had been given but not adhered to.

Debate

7. Councillor Robinson stated they knew the business on the site, and understood why they submitted the application; however, they should not go against policy or ignore advice. The councillor agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse.
8. Councillor Earthey agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse. The councillor did not feel they could allow erosion of the conservation area.
9. Councillor Theobald considered the applicant had partially complied with the planning officer and noted that parasols would be better than the proposal. The councillor agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse.
10. Councillor Sheard considered the application to be infringing on the listed building and the conservation area. The councillor agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse.
11. Councillor Loughran considered that the design quality had not met policy DM27. The councillor agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse.

Vote

12. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to refuse planning permission in line with the officer recommendation. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process or those following).
13. **RESOLVED: REFUSE** planning permission for the following reasons: The development would cause harm to the historic significance of the grade II listed terrace and wider The Avenues and Cliftonville Conservation Areas due to its form, scale and materiality. It would remove the open rear garden/yard area and reduce the legibility of the historic plan form, and has introduced an alien, incongruous structure to the rear, visible from the public highway. For these reasons, the development is contrary to policies CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One, and DM18, DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two.

D BH2024/02982 - 119 Church Road, Hove - Listed Building Consent

1. The case officer introduced the application to the committee.
2. The committee considered the Listed Building application at the same time as the planning application.
3. For minutes, please see BH2024/02981 – item C on the agenda.

Vote

4. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to refuse planning permission in line with the officer recommendation. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process).
5. **RESOLVED: REFUSE Listed Building Consent for the following Reasons:** The development would cause harm to the historic significance of the grade II listed terrace and wider The Avenues and Cliftonville Conservation Areas due to its form, scale and materiality. It would remove the open rear garden/yard area and reduce the legibility of the historic plan form, and has introduced an alien, incongruous structure to the rear, visible from the public highway. For these reasons, the development is contrary to policies CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One, and DM18, DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two.

E BH2024/03124 - Brighton Co-Operative Society, Whitehawk Road, Brighton

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

F BH2024/02569 - 9 The Beeches, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. John Boothby addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they were a new neighbour to the applicant, and they supported the scheme which would benefit the area. The height of the building was not a problem.
3. Ward Councillor Lyons sent a speech to the Democratic Services officer, who read out the following: If you live at The Beeches, just off Dyke Rd, you will be living in a bungalow, where the planning application is proposed. The site looking to be developed also includes a parcel of land to the rear which has been previously part of 22 Dyke Road Ave. Infilling applications should be in keeping with the surrounding properties. A similar type of property would be supported and not a two-storey house. The new top floor would provide sight into gardens and windows of several adjoining properties from all elevations. The sizeable terrace on the north elevation top floor would provide direct views into windows & gardens of numbers 11 and 15. No objection to the design, however, the application is not in keeping with the properties it faces and recommend the committee rejects the application. It is considered out of character. Only one property being built therefore the councillor had no highway safety objections with minimum extra car use. The loss of an orchard is sad. The application should be rejected because of the design. Please ask the applicant to come back with an application that is no higher than the surrounding bungalows.
4. Santino Sarri addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that they had purchased the land to build a dream home for their family. A previous design had been approved and the internal and external proposed are very similar to the approved scheme. This application includes a shorter driveway, which is considered better. Support has been received for the application following revised drawings. The committee were asked to grant planning permission.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Sheard was informed that access would be off The Beeches following the design changes.
6. Councillor Loughran was informed that the footprint will be very similar to the previous application with a smaller first floor. The pool will be around 4m in length.
7. Councillor Theobald was informed that planning permission had been granted to reduce the size of the existing house to allow access to the site. Two bedrooms will be reduced; however, a loft extension will be built.

Debate

8. Councillor Shanks stated they were happy to agree as they already have permission.
9. Councillor Theobald considered the pool could be noisy and access was now not off Dyke Road Avenue. It was a shame some trees were to be removed. It was considered the development should be a bungalow.
10. Councillor Robinson supported the application as the neighbours were ok with it.

11. Councillor Earthey noted there were other pools nearby. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Winder considered the end result acceptable and raised no objections.
13. Councillor Loughran noted the development increased density. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

14. A vote was taken, and by 7 to 1 the committee agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and took no part in the discussions or 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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

G BH2023/03396 - St Nicholas Church, Church Street, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Shanks was informed that the purpose of the application was to complete the works identified in the heritage management plan. A number of groups have been involved including the clergy. Residents have been listened to and a revised scheme submitted.
3. Councillor Robinson was informed that the lighting will have two different settings, some going off at 10pm and some staying on all night to provide ambient lighting at low level. The details of the lighting will be provided under condition.
4. Councillor Nann was informed that a lighting architect had prepared documents submitted with the scheme.
5. Councillor Winder was informed that the lights would turn on at dusk each evening and this would vary according to summer or winter.
6. Councillor Loughran was informed that the lights would have sensors, consultation had taken place on safety issues and anti-social behaviour.

Debate

7. Councillor Theobald considered the scheme to be good and an improvement. As there had been no objections from the heritage team, the councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Robinson considered the scheme to look fantastic. The councillor supported the application.

9. Councillor Loughran considered the lighting was urgently needed for the public benefit. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

10. A vote was taken and the committee unanimously agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and took no part in the discussions or decision-making process).
11. **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.

H BH2023/03397 - St Nicholas Church, Church Street, Brighton - Listed Building Consent

1. The case officer introduced the application to the committee.
2. The application for listed building consent was considered at the same time as the planning application. For minutes, please see BH2023/03396: item G.

Vote

3. A vote was taken and the committee unanimously agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and took no part in the discussions or decision-making process).
4. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** Listed Building Consent subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

I BH2024/02276 - 11 Bazehill Road, Rottingdean - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Charly Robertson addressed the committee as a neighbouring resident and stated they objected to the scale and size of the rear patio, and they had no objections to the house even though there was overbearing impact from the extension. The 5m high boundary wall was an issue. Some of the windows will be obscure glazed, but not all. It was requested that the patio only be on the east side of the property. The boundary fencing has been increased by 0.5m and it is noted that winds knock down high fences so it would need to be robust. It is noted that the property is not a family home, but a developer is proposing the works.
3. Philip Atkins addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the proposals to the rear elevation would improve the existing building, which is not owner occupied. The road is sloping, and the houses go down the hill so the impact is typical of the relationships. It should be noted that the parish council objections

have been withdrawn, as have those of other neighbours. The level of the patio proposed has been lowered to the level of the garden and a privacy screen erected on the lower patio along with 2m evergreen planting on the boundary.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Theobald was informed that the patio was at garden level and the side windows were obscure glazed. The resident noted that the rear bedrooms were level with the patio as a result of ground levels dropping away.
5. Councillor Robinson was informed by the agent that there was no breach of guidance, and it was noted that there are views of rear windows from the gardens of all terraced houses.
6. Councillor Nann was informed that there was no oblique view of the neighbour's house from the application property.
7. Councillor Loughran was informed that by the agent that the privacy screening will consist of strengthened glass and etched.

Debate

8. Councillor Robinson considered the proposals to be a vast improvement on what is existing. The councillor supported the application.
9. Councillor Sheard supported the application as they could not see a planning reason to turn down the scheme. It was noted the privacy was already an issue in the road due to the stepped nature of the road.
10. Councillor Winder considered improvements outweighed any concerns. The screening and boundary planting are good. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Theobald considered the existing house to be terrible and amended plans are better. The councillor was minded to grant planning permission.
12. Councillor Nann considered it would be wrong to vote against the application.
13. Councillor Loughran considered there was no reason to refuse and supported the application.

Vote

14. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and did not take part in the discussion or 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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

73 BH2024/02855 - ALDRINGTON RECREATION GROUND, WISH ROAD, HOVE - FULL PLANNING (COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT)

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

Speakers

2. Des O'Dell addressed the committee as the secretary of the Friends of Wish Park and cricket was important, and they had fought for a grass pitch. More information had been requested but not received and more dimensions were needed. Wish Park has changed over the last 20 years. There are no adequate changing places, and casual use of the pitch outside of core hours will be an issue. A central location would be better.
3. Laura Spence addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that the recreation ground was widely used for sport and recreation. The development of a strategy for the park was ongoing. It was noted that seven cricket pitches have been lost in recent years across the city. The pitches that are available are already fully booked for the upcoming cricket season. The site is supported by Sussex Cricket and the English Cricket Board. The pitch will be sited 50 yds from neighbouring properties and will be artificial. Two football pitches will need to be moved slightly.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Nann was informed that the goal posts for the two football pitches could be moved. The applicant noted that cricket was not restricted to one pitch at a time. The resident noted that in the winter the park was used for dog walking and football and in the summer was used for a wide range of events and this would be a point of conflict. The resident considered teams were covered by insurance, however, random turn ups were not. It was noted that the pavilion is to be refurbished, however, there will be only one set of changing rooms.
5. The Planning Manager noted that Health & Safety issues and liability were not planning matters.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the resident representations were balanced between positive and negative. It was noted that the public may book the pitch through the Brighton and Hove City Council website. It was noted that the English Cricket Board have given advice.
7. Councillor Theobald was informed that more cricket pitches were needed across the city. It was noted that cricket nets were not possible at the park.
8. Councillor Robinson was informed that while the cricket pitches would take up a lot of space, 75% of the park is taken up with football currently. It was noted by the applicant that the council have public liability insurance and there was no other site with cricket pitches alongside each other.
9. Councillor Sheard was informed by the resident that 30m high safety nets were not practical in this location.

10. Councillor Loughran was informed that a ball trajectory analysis had not been requested. It was noted that Sport England's planning remit relates solely to the loss of playing fields which was not the case with this scheme. .

11. The Legal officer noted that the park was already a sports ground, and cricket was already being played so this was no change.

Debate

12. Councillor Robinson considered a risk assessment was required.

13. Councillor Winder agreed and requested the application be deferred.

14. Councillor Theobald wondered what the residents wanted.

15. Councillor Sheard considered a second pitch was wanted and requested a deferment so a risk assessment could be submitted.

16. Councillor Earthey proposed a deferral to get a risk assessment.

17. Councillor Nann considered the committee needed to approve or not, there was no time to assess the risk.

18. The Planning Manager noted that the funding of the project was not a planning issue. If the committee so wished they could vote to have the application decided under delegated powers so the funding deadlines would not be missed.

Vote

19. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant delegated authority to the case officer to determine the application once a risk assessment has been received confirming whether the pitch can be used safely.

74 BH2024/02584 - 6 ST AUBYN'S GARDENS, HOVE - FULL PLANNING

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

Speakers

2. James Yates addressed the committee as a representative of a neighbouring resident and stated that they wished the application to be refused. It appeared that the applicant had asked forgiveness rather than make a proper planning application. A hole has been created in the boundary wall to access to the site and new windows added against conservation guidance.

3. Alistair Dodd addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the first and second floor were a maisonette, and an additional floor had been added to an existing flat. The use of the new area was mistaken as a second floor flat. The property now complies with window and space standards. The sash windows now comply with policy. The applicant recognises mistakes and now wishes to comply.

4. The case officer informed the committee that this was a retrospective application, the building was not listed, however, it was in a conservation area. The new windows are UVPC to match the existing, and not wood.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Robinson was informed that the new windows were in the drawings, and they were considered more uniform and fitting in style.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that there was an outbuilding to rear of the property that had permission and could be used lawfully.

Debate

7. Councillor Robinson considered the property was in a conservation area but not a listed building, and the changes were to the rear. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Loughran considered the home standards to be improved and there were no issues raised by the objectors to warrant a refusal.

Vote

9. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission. (Councillor Thomson had left the meeting and did not take part in any discussions or the 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 in the report.

75 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

76 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

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

77 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 75.1 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 7.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of