

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**2.00pm 5 NOVEMBER 2025**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Cattell, Earthey, Nann, Parrott, Robinson, Sheard, C Theobald and Winder

**Apologies:** Councillor Thomson, Councillor Shanks

**Officers in attendance:** Matthew Gest (Planning Manager), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Steven Dover (Planning Officer), Chris Swain (Planning Team Leader), Charlotte Tovey (Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

**PART ONE**

**139 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**a) Declarations of substitutes**

139.1 Councillor Pickett substituted for Councillor Shanks.

**b) Declarations of interests**

139.2 Councillor Nann stated they had been involved in discussions regarding item A: BH2025/01414 – Site of Sackville Road Trading Estate and would withdraw from the chamber for the length of the discussions and decision-making process.

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

139.3 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.

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

**d) Use of mobile phones and tablets**

139.5 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 ‘airplane mode’.

**140 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

140.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2025 were agreed.

**141 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

141.1 Councillor Sheard (Deputy Chair) stated that they were chairing the meeting as Councillor Thomson was not available and had sent apologies.

**142 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

142.1 There were none for this meeting.

**143 TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS**

143.1 There were none for this meeting.

**144 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

144.1 The Democratic Services officer noted that item A was a major and items B, C, D, E had speakers, and were therefore automatically called. The committee did not call minor applications F, G and H. The applications not called for discussion were therefore agreed as per the officer recommendations set out in each report.

**A BH2025/01414 - Site of Sackville Road Trading Estate, Sackville Road, Hove - Full Planning**

1. The case officer introduced the report to the committee and updated the committee stating that one more representation had been received, which covered the same issues as other representations.

**Speakers**

2. Neighbouring Ward Councillor Bagaeen addressed the committee and stated that they had some core concerns regarding the development relating to infrastructure demands, highway and transport, and community health. The development also needed to be sustainable and requested extra conditions to cover this. The councillor requested that the highways junction improvements be completed before occupation, the bin's location be resolved and a GP surgery be included in the scheme.
3. Benjamin Wilkinson addressed the committee as the agent and stated that there had been no objections from consultees and significant public support for the scheme, which was broadly in line with the previous scheme on this brownfield site. Sarah Poulter of Hyde Housing addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that the development was 50/50 scheme between Hyde Housing and Brighton and Hove City Council. Two previous projects have been completed in the city, and this was the third. The homes will be 100% affordable with 183 for rent and remainder for shared ownership. The project is going forward with funding milestones and will support the housing applications made to the city, and essential workers in this fair and inclusive scheme.

4. The Planning Manager stated that there was no Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on this site, and the proposals did not include a GP surgery and there is no policy requirement for such

#### Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Earthey was informed that there will be incentives to use sustainable transport such as reduced bus tickets and car club membership. By condition a travel plan will need to be submitted by the applicant, including encouraging the use of sustainable transport. It was noted there was not enough room for large PV panels, however, all units would benefit from those in the development.
6. Councillor Pickett was informed that there was an obligation on the applicant of £200,000 to cover modelling for the Sackville Road junction improvements, and there was no overall scheme for the junction developed as yet. The monies would cover testing and findings. The s106 contributions will support the improvements to cycle lanes, car club bays and bus lanes improvements as part of the overall junction improvements. No safety risk has been established with the buses and refuse collection lorries sharing the bus lane. The bins will be stored within the development. It was noted that the refuse collections will be time restricted.
7. Councillor Robinson was informed by the applicant that the undercroft parking would have resulted in the loss of 16 units and increased the cost of fire and safety undertakings. The total build costs would have been increased by the parking. Removing the parking allows for better landscaping at ground level. The removal of the undercroft parking was broadly supported by consultees. It was noted that the applicant was the freeholder, and the PV panels will benefit all the units, not just the one's beneath the panels. It was noted that there was the potential for a pedestrian and cycleway cut through in the development. A new travel plan will be required by condition. The site is not within a Parking Zone (CPZ) and the parking survey showed capacity for overspill parking in the area.
8. Councillor Parrott was informed that the 5% of parking bays would be for disabled drivers. The applicant confirmed that analysis showed that one loading bay would be sufficient and there will be three dedicated mail rooms across the development. The applicant's transport consultant stated that an exercise had been undertaken for deliveries, the there was little chance of two deliveries taking place at the same time. It was noted that there was no specific planning policy for a doctor's surgery to be included in the scheme.
9. Councillor Sheard was informed by the applicant's transport consultant that deliveries at the bus stop could be prevented by traffic regulation orders.
10. Councillor Theobald was informed that a road safety audit had been undertaken, and no risk was found. Southern Water objected as it was considered that there was not enough contamination information. The contamination was considered to be the same as the previous approved scheme, and it would be unreasonable to do more prior to determination. There will be no piling without agreement by condition, and the Environment Agency are to be consulted. It was noted that the flats at lower ground level would receive less light however, the addition of balconies is considered an

improvement and is on balance acceptable. The inclusion of a community space is not a planning policy requirement. It was stated that it was too early in the process to see the finalised the junction improvements for Sackville Road. The BHCC Highways officer noted that cycleway improvements were required. This would be after modelling and surveys. The s106 monies would go towards design.

11. Councillor Cattell was informed that the travel plan for the adjoining development has been very successful and has been used to incentivise sustainable transport. Residents will access to the mail rooms to collect and deliver.

#### Debate

12. Councillor Theobald considered the area to be shabby, and they hoped the design would be better. They considered the loss of the undercroft parking, health care support, and the Sackville Road junction improvements, to be a shame. The current road is not wide enough. The council could have taken the community space. The councillor was glad for the affordable housing and supported the application.
13. Councillor Robinson noted the lack of parking as they considered it was needed, as was the community space. Not having a GP surgery was not good. The councillor suggested the City Plan should be reviewed regarding community spaces. The councillor agreed the housing was needed and supported the application.
14. Councillor Pickett considered the low-rise design was good, however the ecological enhancements could have been better. The councillor considered the undercroft parking would have been good and the refuse collection arrangements not to be good. The councillor considered that the basic plan is good and supported the application.
15. Councillor Winder considered the housing was needed and the scheme not all bad. However, the public realm design was not good. The scheme was considered disappointing but needed. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Earthey stated they had concerns and public transport should be looked at, but they supported the application.
17. Councillor Parrott supported the application as the housing was needed, however, the scheme seemed to be only achieving minimum requirements.
18. Councillor Sheard considered the loss of the undercroft parking not to be good; however, this is a city centre location. The loss of the community space was also not good compared to the previous scheme. The City Plan therefore needs to be reviewed. The councillor supported the application.

#### Vote

19. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
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 **MIND 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**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 5 NOVEMBER 2025 THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed or significantly advanced, on or before the **18 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 BH2025/00877 - 13-14 Sydney Street, Brighton - Full Planning**

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

Speakers

2. Hugo Butterworth addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they represented the residents of Tidy Street, and they considered the proposals to be an overdevelopment and against policy. The two-storey extension is too big, and more than others in the area, which encroaches on 38, 39 and 40 Tidy Street to the rear. The development will result in a lack of privacy and will be out of character. Zoe Robinson addressed the committee as a resident, and they considered the development to be out of character in amongst the back-to-back houses. The three storeys with pitch roof are unprecedented in the area and will obstruct views. The development will offer a faceless wall to the rear. The scale and massing will be disproportionate to the area. The front elevation will be detrimental to the neighbours.
3. Ward Councillor McLeay addressed the committee and stated that they supported the residents, and they considered the shop front changes were not enough, out of scale and character. The extra storey is inconsistent with the small-scale neighbours. The existing flat roofed rear extension is being used to extend this development other three storeys. The pattern of the hill means the height and the bulk are not good in this conservation area. The scale is disproportionate, and it is not the case that there have been no complaints about the noise and smells from the current use. The committee are requested to refuse the application. If the committee agree to grant planning permission, then please add a condition to prevent the building being used as a house of multiple occupancy (HMO).
4. Nick Stickland addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that they had been working together with the planning officers since the preapplication was submitted. The applicant wants to improve the current building, bringing back consistency. The proposal increases density, however, that is fitting for the city centre. The natural light will be good for future occupiers. The development is set back from the rear boundary with the first-floor roof terrace set back as well. The daylight assessment has been undertaken and the proposals match others. The design has been carefully considered.
5. The case officer informed the committee that the development was set back from the rear boundary. The terrace was also set back, with screening to prevent overlooking. Views are not protected, and on balance are not significant enough to warrant a refusal. With regard to noise and smells, the Environmental Health officer has been involved, and the proposals include a new flue. There could be a condition regarding short terms lets if Councillors so wished, which would then require planning permission.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Theobald was informed that there are some three storey buildings in the area. The proposed frontage will include bay windows, sash windows and two shop fronts.
7. Councillor Earthey was informed that the original building was demolished and replaced sometime in the 1960s and there was no original building left. The proposals are recommended for approval as the existing detracts from the conservation area. It was not considered that the development was setting a precedent for more than two storeys in the street.
8. Councillor Pickett was informed that the proposals were designed to have the least impact on the buildings to the rear. The application has been found to have no significant impacts on light and outlook. The terrace screen is considered acceptable. The roof lights to be added will have sky views only and are considered acceptable under policy. The privacy screening will be as high as a regular garden boundary fence limiting views. It is considered that there will be some overshadowing at sunrise, and in the early morning but not after. The chimney height will be increased on neighbouring property, and the flue will be extended into third floor roof. Any changes to the flue will require planning permission.
9. Councillor Nann was informed that the roof terrace by condition cannot be increased, and the privacy screening needs to be in place before use.
10. Councillor Robinson was informed that the roof lights will in the top section of the roof.

#### Debate

11. Councillor Cattell noted the daylight/sunlight report recorded minimal/little loss of light and balcony screening was good. The North Laine roofscapes are a key part of the views in the area. The proposed shop fronts are good. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Nann considered the current building to be a blot-on-the-landscape and the development a restoration. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Theobald stated they were divided over the development. There is other three storey buildings and the rear of the proposals has been pushed back. It was noted that the Heritage team were happy with the development. The councillor was sorry if the scheme affects the properties to the rear in Tidy Street.
14. Councillor Pickett considered the current building to be ugly; however, they understood resident's issues. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Robinson noted the Heritage and sunlight discussions. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Earthey considered when weighing up the scheme they supported the application.
17. Councillor Sheard considered it was natural to have two and three storey buildings in the area. There is currently a notable gap in the street. The councillor felt sorry for the

residents of Tidy Street however, they considered the development added to the area and supported the application.

Vote

18. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.

19. **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 BH2025/01792 - First Floor and Second Floor Flats, 7 St Johns Place, Hove - Full Planning**

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

Speakers

2. Bruce Warren addressed the committee a resident and stated they represented the neighbours. The loss of amenity was an issue, with concerns regarding the sound and how this will travel around neighbours. The proposed outside space is large and will be used for large gatherings. Even low speech levels will be too high for neighbours. The balcony will overlook first avenue properties. The proposals could set a precedent, and the building is listed in a conservation area has been neglected. The resident was against the application.
3. Megan Smith addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the building has suffered over time and detracts from the area. The original windows are to be restored. The proposed terrace has been set back to reduce overlooking. The use of the balcony will be seasonal with no overlooking increase on the existing situation. All the alterations being undertaken will be for the new owner, who wishes to restore the building. The development aligns with policy in this well considered scheme. The committee were requested to approve the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Cattell was informed that it was considered that there was no loss of parking as the garage is currently not used for parking.
5. Councillor Nann was informed by the resident that currently conversations can be heard, like a whispering gallery and conversations will bounce off the wall some 7m away.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that hours of use would not be appropriate for a dwelling house. The planning manager noted that such a condition on a residential property would be unenforceable. The party walls will have sound proofing by condition, and any unreasonable use of the balcony can be enforced through the Environmental Protection Act.
7. Councillor Pickett was informed that there were no other balconies in the mews block.

8. Councillor Sheard was informed that it appears that other roofs are used for amenity space in the nearby area. The planning manager noted there had been some enforcement actions in the area but could not confirm if the raised terrace at 54 First Avenue was in lawful use or not.
9. Councillor Robinson was informed that the balconies are usually encouraged in new builds, however, they can be refused if considered to directly overlook neighbouring properties.
10. The Planning Manager provided the verbal update that the conditions to secure the retention of interior historic features had been removed from the recommended conditions.

#### Debate

11. Councillor Robinson understood resident's concerns and as balconies can be noisy. The councillor requested that the residents work together to reduce the harm.
12. Councillor Cattell supported the application.
13. Councillor Theobald considered the application to be a heritage gain.
14. Councillor Pickett noted that officers had worked hard with the applicant. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Sheard considered the development to be good and noted that other flat roofs were being used by residents as outdoor space. The councillor supported the application.

#### Vote

16. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

#### **D      BH2025/01793 - First Floor and Second Floor Flats, 7 St Johns Place, Hove - Listed Building Consent**

1. The Listed Building Consent application was discussed at the same time as the planning application. For minutes, please see BH2025/01792.

#### Vote

2. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant listed building consent.
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** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.



**E BH2025/01442 - 22A Wilbury Crescent, Hove - Full Planning**

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

Answers to Committee Members Questions

2. Councillor Robinson was informed that the neighbouring residents had expressed concerns regarding loss of amenities from overlooking.
3. Councillor Sheard was informed that the development is for three-bedroom flat. The fourth room is below space standards and cannot be used as a bedroom.

Debate

4. Councillor Cattell noted that if the application were for a house and not two flats then the development could be constructed under permitted development. The councillor found no reason to object to the scheme and supported the application.
5. Councillor Theobald noted there were a number of dormer and Velux windows in the area, and they did feel they could turn down the application.
6. Councillor Earthey did not consider the scheme to be out of keeping with the area and they supported the application.
7. Councillor Sheard considered the size of the rear garden to be irrelevant and the development to be nice.

Vote

8. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
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 **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

**F BH2025/01655 - Corn Exchange, Church Street, Brighton - Listed Building Consent**

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

**G BH2025/01654 - Corn Exchange, Church Street, Brighton - Full Planning**

2. This application was not called for discussion. The officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

**H BH2025/02245 - 28 Herbert Road, Brighton - Full Planning**

3. This application was not called for discussion. The officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.

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

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

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

- 147.1 There were none for this agenda.

**147 APPEAL DECISIONS**

- 148.1 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 5.21pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of