

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 6 AUGUST 2025

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Thomson (Chair), Cattell, Earthey, Nann, Parrott, Robinson, Shanks, Sheard, C Theobald and Winder

Officers in attendance: Maria Seale (Planning Manager), Katie Kam (Lawyer), Wayne Nee (Principal Planning Officer), Jack Summers (Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

112 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

112.1 None

b) Declarations of interests

112.2 None

c) Exclusion of the press and public

112.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

112.5 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'.

113 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

113.1 **RESOLVED** – The meeting minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2025 were agreed.

114 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

114.1 The chair addressed the committee and stated that the L3 Emblem House, Home Farm Business Centre, application, refused at committee had been allowed at appeal. The chair considered this disappointing news. The chair considered the training held the previous week had gone well and asked those unable to attend to watch the recording of the meeting. The chair promoted the briefing sessions held each month a week before the committee, where relevant questions could be asked and clarification given by the planning officers. The chair considered the briefings to be very informative.

115 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

115.1 There were none.

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

116.1 No requests were submitted.

117 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

117.1 The Democratic Services officer noted that there were two items on the agenda, one major application, which was automatically called for discussion, and one minor application which had speakers, therefore all agenda items were called for discussion.

A BH2025/00899 - Land Adjacent to West Stand American Express Stadium, Village Way, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Cattell was informed that there were no details available for how the Bennetts Field development would be started. The development was approved by Lewes District Council.
3. Councillor Robinson was informed that the Bennetts Field scheme was not on land owned by the football stadium. Vehicle access will be from the A27 and Village Way. The first and second decks will be accessed via ramps. There will be no vehicle access from the north and west of the site. Access via Village Way is considered the safest route for employees and directors. On non match days it is considered there will be very little pedestrian traffic. On match days there will be a no movement restriction one hour before and one hour after the match. There will also be stewards on site to assist movements between pedestrians and vehicles. Village Way is under the ownership of the stadium.

4. Councillor Theobald was informed that there will be disabled parking bays on the ground floor, giving level access to the stadium and second deck, access being gained via the lift. The Falmer Campus of Brighton University is closest the development and no bedrooms are located nearby. It is hoped that the disruption of operations will be kept to a minimum. The agent stated they did not have the timescale of the development to hand.
5. Councillor Shanks was informed that over 500 parking spaces were lost when Bennetts Field lease ran out in 2021. The original planning consent for the stadium included a minimum of 1,500 parking spaces. Currently there are 2,219 parking spaces. Other sites are being looked on land owned by the stadium. New landscaping is proposed. The 6 existing small trees are to be relocated on the site and more trees planted in the development area. The details of the soft landscaping and maintenance are to be provided by condition.
6. Councillor Sheard was informed that the Fan Zone structure is on a different level to the development and is only has pedestrian access.

Debate

7. Councillor Robinson considered the development to be in keeping with the site, with a good layout. It was considered good that the trees are to be replaced and the existing trees to be relocated within the site. The councillor considered more disabled parking bays would be good; however, they supported the application.
8. Councillor Sheard considered the design to be ingenious, with good ramp access. The onsite parking for staff will take the pressure off other car parks and will therefore have a positive impact.
9. Councillor Theobald considered it would be nice to keep the trees and hedges. The application is a good idea since losing Bennetts Field parking area. It was noted that the South Downs National Park have no objections. The design was considered good and the development excellent.
10. Councillor Thomson considered the design to be good, the parking gained was a small amount; however, there were lots of conditions, and they therefore supported the application.

Vote

11. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
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 be **MIND TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement and the following Conditions and Informatives, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 agreement not be completed or significantly advanced on or before 6th February 2026 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of the report.

B BH2025/00936 - 295 Dyke Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Jon Newey addressed the committee as a neighbouring resident and stated that they were speaking on behalf of 12 residents who had objected to the application. The proposals are considered over development of the site, with a loss of privacy for neighbours. The speaker lived at 293 and the proposed construction accessway will be inches from the neighbour's house, an Arts & Crafts building and construction traffic will have an effect on the house. The development site slopes, and a huge swimming pool will need to be removed. It is estimated this will take a year at least with lots of disruption. The speaker considered a brick wall along the boundary should be erected instead of the thin wooden fence. The trees to be removed along the boundary will also lead to a loss of privacy.
3. Simon Bareham addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the application was for reserved matters and outline permission had already been granted. The proposals have been reduced and will be 4m to 5m away from the boundaries, whilst the garage will be 2.2m from the boundary. The proposals conform the planning policy DM20 and good practice. The 430 rule is not broken. The windows facing the neighbours will be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking. The development is designed to simulate with the surroundings and is acceptable under policy.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Shanks was informed by the agent that the boundary treatments will be agreed by condition, however, a brick wall potentially could be looked at. The case officer confirmed that there was no condition requiring a construction environmental management plan and it was not usual to request to agree the boundary treatments until occupation.
5. Councillor Earthey was informed that there was no Neighbourhood Plan for this area of the city.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that the boundary trees on the south side would be removed and replacements planted across the site. There are no direct south facing windows on the development, only one dormer set much further back.
7. Councillor Cattell was informed that there were no Tree Preservation Orders on the site, and it was not in a conservation area. The resident stated they did not speak when the previous application came to committee as they were not advised of the meeting. It was noted that the proposed small dormer windows would obscure glazed and it was considered that there was no impact on privacy.
8. Councillor Robinson was informed that a temporary wall or barrier could be constructed to protect the neighbouring property under a construction environmental management plan. The planning manager stated the boundary wall would however need to be

acceptable and may not be practical alongside a construction access, and that temporary fencing may be more suitable. The agent stated that a party-wall agreement would also need to be agreed.

9. Councillor Thomson was informed that a construction environmental management plan was not usually considered necessary for this small scale of development. However, if the committee wanted a plan; this could be added by condition. It was noted that the proposals would be 20m away from the house at 293 Dyke Road and there was one other new dwelling in the road nearby at 285.
10. The resident stated that the extension on their house was not shown on the drawings. The case officer stated this was noted at the site visit.

Debate

11. Councillor Shanks considered a condition requiring a construction environmental management plan should be added. The planning manager stated a standard model condition wording could be used and adapted as necessary with the addition of a temporary fence alongside the access boundary.
12. Councillor Robinson considered the party wall agreement would be difficult and extra protection would be good for the neighbour. The legal officer noted that the party wall agreement was outside planning considerations. It was noted that construction vibration would potentially be covered if a construction environmental management plan was added by condition.
13. Councillor Theobald stated they were not keen on backland developments and these proposals seemed large. The boundary screening is to be removed resulting in a loss of privacy. The development will set a precedence. The councillor was torn about the application.
14. Councillor Sheard considered that a construction environmental management plan would be excessive for the scale of development.
15. Councillor Cattell considered that a construction environmental management plan would not be required, the application is supported as it stands.
16. Councillor Nann considered the digging out of the site would be an issue. The councillor considered there was no reason to refuse the application.
17. Councillor Thomson considered they would approve the application and asked that the applicant be mindful of neighbours.
18. Councillor Shanks proposed a condition to add a construction environmental management plan. Councillor Robinson seconded the motion. The wording to be agreed by the proposer and seconder.

Vote

19. A vote was held on the additional condition and by 7 to 3 the motion was agreed.

20. A vote was held and the committee agreed by 9 to 1 to grant planning permission with the additional condition.

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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report, with the added condition.

118 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

119 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

119.1 There were none for this agenda.

120 APPEAL DECISIONS

120.1 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 3.54pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of