

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 4 FEBRUARY 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

Officers in attendance: Nicola Hurley (Head of Planning), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Ben Daines (Planning Team Leader), Sonia Gillam (Senior Planning Officer), Michael Tucker (Senior Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

166 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

166.1 There were none for this meeting.

b) Declarations of interests

166.2 Councillor Nann stated they had an interest in item C: BH2025/02297 - The Pinnacle, 8 School Road, Hove and would withdraw from the discussions, however they would be objecting to the application. Councillors Cattell and Parrott declared they were neighbouring ward councillors for item C, however, they remained of an open mind.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

166.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

166.5 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'.

167 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 167.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2025 were agreed.

168 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 168.1 The Chair welcomed Councillor Pickett to the committee and thanked Councillor Winder for their work on the committee. The chair also confirmed that Councillor Winder would be a substitute when required.

169 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 169.1 There were none for this meeting.

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

- 170.1 No site visits were requested.

171 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- 171.1 The Democratic Services officer noted that items A was a major agenda item and minor items B, C, D and F had speakers: therefore, these applications were automatically called for discussion. The committee did not call minor applications E, G and I. The applications not called for discussion were therefore agreed as per the officer recommendations set out in each report. The updated running order would be A, B, C, D, F and H.

A BH2025/00532 - Land North of Swanborough Drive, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Lauren O'Connor addressed the committee as resident representing other objecting residents. They stated that they were not opposed to a development on the site, however, they were concerned that there was not sufficient infrastructure for the proposed development. The residents have been involved in the consultation process since 2022 and stated that parking was a major issue. It appears that no one is listening. Swanborough Drive is a cut through and has become very congested with parked vehicles. If 56% of occupiers of the new development have one car, then 25/30 vehicles will be added to the existing parking crisis. The parking at other sites will not be sufficient. Local transport is declining, buses 1 and 21 cannot solve the parking problems. The road is often blocked with cars having to reverse to make way for others. The committee were requested to refuse the application and then come to Swanborough Drive to see the congestion for themselves.
3. Ward Councillor Williams addressed the committee and stated that the site was owned by the council, and the development would be for the benefit of local people. There are five other blocks of flats nearby, which are to be redeveloped in the future. The parking

issues in the area are understood, and this will be alleviated when the five blocks are remodelled. The proposed development will be a positive for the Whitehawk estate, and it was noted that parking came up as an issue from the consultation process. The last consultation gave positive responses. The committee were requested to approve the planning application.

4. Stephen Drybrough addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, Brighton and Hove City Council and stated that the development would provide 36 affordable homes, on the site set down in the City Plan. There were 6,000 on the housing register and this development will be an opportunity for families to have a home. Following consultations the development has been shaped for the community, with a community space forming part of the proposals. The homes will be high performance with affordable heating. The scale and massing have been carefully considered in the design. The sustainable transport will include a bus stop upgraded, cycle storage, discounts for bus users, car club spaces and electric bikes outside space. The habitat loss will be compensated by sympathetic landscaping and planting. The ecological gains from the development will be in the local park. The scheme is part of the 2,000 homes over two years project. The committee were asked to approve the application.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

5. Councillor Cattell was informed by the agent that the development will comply with condition 10: The development hereby approved should achieve a minimum Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating 'B'. The scheme has been designed with a fabric first approach and is compliant as designed. However, will be possible to make the development more efficient by adding solar panels.
6. Councillor Sheard was informed by the applicant that there would be one visitor parking space, undercroft parking, two additional blue badge parking spaces and car club bays as well. Also 46 cycle spaces, long stay, 12 short stay, plus 6 e-bike stands. It was noted that the access pathway to the community orchard would remain unchanged.
7. Councillor Robinson was informed by the applicant that the highways team looked at the parking stress in the area and found some commuter parking. The introduction of a parking zone would be challenging and does not form part of the scheme. The Principal Transport Development Officer stated it was considered that 20+ cars could park off road. It was likely that 45% of the residents would require parking and this equalled 16 vehicles. The development is close to the bus stop.
8. Councillor Theobald was informed by the Estate Regeneration Project Manager that all the new homes would be let to those on the housing register. The applicant stated that the accessible units would be on first and second floors, accessed via lifts. The scheme is compliant with requirements. A hedge with tree planting will form the northern boundary with a low-level fence to the rear of the site. The Principal Transport Development Officer confirmed that buses run on average every 8 minutes.
9. Councillor Parrott was informed by the applicant that there were no communal charging points or storage area for mobility scooters.

10. Councillor Earthey was informed that by the Principal Transport Development Officer that there had been no double counting of parking spaces and there would be 16 available parking spaces.
11. Councillor Pickett was informed by the Principal Transport Development Officer that new residents would be able to get discounted bus travel from the council, and it was considered that there would be no significant impact on parking in the area. It was noted that new trees would be planted under the landscaping scheme. By condition the proposed materials for the balconies would be required to agreed.
12. Councillor Thomson was informed by the applicant that the community space was identified in the community engagement. There are other spaces, however, these are located further south on the Whitehawk estate. The proposed space will be a large hall with kitchen, which could be a café or meeting place. It was noted that the site was identified as housing allocation, even though there was a bee bank at the location. The sunlight/daylight assessment considered there would be some loss of light for three existing units in neighbouring blocks.

Debate

13. Councillor Theobald considered the design, with balconies and terraces, was good and the city needed affordable housing. The proposed community space was good; however, more parking spaces would have been better. The scheme was good for Brighton and Hove; therefore, the councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Nann stated they understood the inconveniences; however, 36 units was good and any issues arising could be managed. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Sheard considered that parking was an issue, however, there was a housing shortage and the city needed homes. Transport issues can be looked at, perhaps the new 1x bus could be re-routed to include the Whitehawk estate. More cycle parking would be better. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Robinson considered the design to be lovely, with the nice orchard, close by greenery and much needed 36 affordable housing units. More parking for future schemes would be appreciated. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Cattell stated they looked at the planning balance, the 'pros-and-cons' for the proposals. Parking for other schemes should be looked at, including when the nearby blocks are refurbished.
18. The Head of Service for Planning stated that no decisions have been taken on nearby blocks regarding their future.
19. Councillor Earthey considered the proposals ticked all the boxes and asked that all issues raised by existing residents be noted by the planning officers.
20. Councillor Pickett considered the biodiversity to be good, with reduced lighting and bee bricks. The design was great. The councillor supported the application.

21. Councillor Parrott considered the design to be great, and the scheme had been designed with disability in mind. The parking issues have been heard.
22. Councillor Thomson noted the parking issues.

Vote

23. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
24. **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 the applicant entering into a Memorandum of Understanding or a decision taken by the Cabinet/Director of Property and Finance of the council to ensure delivery of the Heads of Terms set out in the report, and also subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

B BH2025/02499 - Longhill School, Falmer Road, Rottingdean, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Terry Rose addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that they considered the proposals fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The noise impact has not been assessed and therefore conflicts with policy. The acoustic assessment is not robust, and seven properties have bedrooms nearby. There is no parking or travel plan. Any overspill parking will be on the school field. The proposals will unbalance this quite area. The committee are asked to pause the application and reconsider the proposals.
3. Neighbouring Ward Councillor Allen addressed the committee in support of the application and stated that the proposals created an opportunity for Longhill School to have a pitch that would benefit not only the school but community as well. The proposed 3G pitch will be safe and reliable with less muddy fields and more use. There will be social, educational and health benefits. The committee was urged to approve.
4. Ward Councillor Fishleigh addressed the committee in objection and stated that the proposed rubber crumb was not safe to use, and the committee should refuse the application. The councillor supports grass roots sports, nature conservation and the Living Coast. The rubber crumb was not compatible with the environment, and an alternative should be used. Like Councillor Allen, the councillor recognised the issues.
5. David Downes addressed the committee as a representative of Woodingdean Wanderers Football Club and stated that the pitch would offer not just football but a community club to belong to for 6-year-olds to seniors. The club are very proud of their large girls' team, and they champion female and disabled membership. Grass pitches are unreliable; an all-weather pitch would be better. The committee were asked to approve the application.

6. Rachelle Otulakowski addressed the committee as Longhill School's headteacher and stated that they believe the heart of the community was the school and this should be a community lead decision. The 3G pitch would be good, giving opportunities for the pupils and clubs to exercise all year round and broaden the school's abilities to care for the students.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

7. Councillor Cattell was informed that national policy does not prevent use as risks of using rubber crumb have not been established in the UK. The agent stated that the crumb collected in the anti-toxic grill will be collected and redistributed across the field. It was noted that alternatives were available, and some were being used across the UK. However, the crumb has been banned in European Union, but not in the UK. There were mitigation measures in the design of the scheme.
8. Councillor Robinson was informed by the school manager that a lot of work had been put into noise mitigation, with signs on the pitch, netting, kick boards and reduced bookings after 7pm. The football season is August to May and lettings for later times will naturally reduce.
9. Councillor Theobald was informed that the distance to the closest house was approximately 45/50 metres and 90 metres from the centre of the pitch. Saturday will be added to condition 18: The floodlighting hereby permitted shall not be in use except between the hours of 09:00 to 21:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00 to 20:00 on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays.
10. Councillor Pickett was informed by the school manager that the football foundation regulations require the school to have funds available to change the material if needed later. It was noted that new trees will be planted for muffle sound.
11. Councillor Earthey was informed by the agent that the anti-toxic grills are affective, and rain will not wash the crumb away. It was noted that not all pitches have detox boxes/grills. The case officer stated the school car park had 75 spaces and the field would only be used once or twice a year.
12. Councillor Nann was informed that the cost of alternative materials was not known and the committee needed to look at the application before them. It was noted by the school manager that the football foundation was looking at alternatives.
13. Councillor Thomson was informed by the school manager that the netting/skirting was to contain the crumb. The parents watching matches would be seated in the covered area outside the leisure centre, at the far end of the field away from residential properties. It was noted that no whistles would be used after 7pm by condition, as there would be no matches, only training sessions.
14. The head of Planning informed the committee they should only consider the application before them.

Debate

15. Councillor Theobald considered more trees would be good. The facility was good and it was noted that there were no objections from the Parish Council, Sports England, or the South Downs National Park. The all-year-round pitch was good for the school. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Robinson stated they had looked at Blatchington Mill's pitch and noted resident's objections. The mitigations methods forming part of the scheme seem good. The councillor supported the application as the area and school need it.
17. Councillor Sheard considered traffic to be an issue; however, the idea of the pitch was smashing. It was noted that there was a community need for the facility. The councillor considered the school was noisy anyway and mitigations could be made if issues arise later. The councillor supported the application.
18. Councillor Nann supported the application.
19. Councillor Parrott supported the application.
20. Councillor Cattell considered the benefits to fantastic. The councillor supported the application.
21. Councillor Earthey was torn as they agreed with the idea but not the toxicity of the rubber crumb.
22. Councillor Pickett was torn as they considered the proposals to be a good scheme, however, the crumb was an issue.
23. Councillor Thomson considered the scheme to be good and supported the application.

Vote

24. A vote was held and by 7 to 2 the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
25. **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 the applicant entering into a Memorandum of Understanding or a decision taken by the Cabinet/Director of Property and Finance of the council to ensure delivery of the Head of Term set out in the report, and also subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

C BH2025/02297 - The Pinnacle (formerly Rayford House), 8 School Road, Hove - Removal or Variation of Condition

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

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Nann addressed the committee and stated that they represented objecting local residents. The proposals would represent a significant loss of amenity.

The removal of access points is not good for the community. The pathways lead to close by schools, the train station and buses. Anti-social behaviour is a matter for the police. The applicants are requested to not block the access, and the committee are asked to refuse the application.

3. Neil Bernard addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that the Pinnacle Freehold was created to restrict access to residents of the flats. Access should only be for Pinnacle residents and not for others. The application is for the removal of an access point and the installation of a controlled gate. The access point currently gives straight onto a highway, which is considered dangerous. The application would reduce highway safety concerns. The application is to reduce access and thereby reduce crime. The committee were requested to support the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Cattell was informed by the agent that the gates should have been added, however, the original scheme was not completed at the time Pinnacle Freehold took over. It was confirmed that there was provision for 40 cycles, however, they were not used. There has been low level anti-social behaviour, however, this has not been reported to the police. The access leading straight onto a road was considered a Health & Safety issue by the applicant.
5. Councillor Pickett was informed that the pedestrian access will be restricted to pedestrians only.
6. Councillor Sheard was informed by the Head of Planning that the application was for the installation of a gate and blocking an access.
7. Councillor Parrott was informed by the agent that all the residents of the flats would be able to use the gate.
8. Councillor Thomson was informed by the legal officer that the existing condition permitted the 4 units to use the gate, however, this application proposes that access would be for all the flats.

Debate

9. Councillor Robinson considered that a big detour would be created for residents by the proposals, however it can't be helped, the gate is acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Sheard considered the detour for residents a shame. The anti-social behaviour and crime are not good, however, there was no planning reason to refuse the application.
11. Councillor Parrott considered the neighbourhood to be close-knit and a good environment, however, there was no planning reason to refuse the application, and they reluctantly supported the proposals.
12. Councillor Earthey considered there was no planning reason to refuse the application.

13. Councillor Theobald stated they were torn and were sad for the local residents who would have to walk around, however, they considered there was no option but to grant permission.
14. Councillor Cattell considered there was no need for the application. Young families will need to walk a long way round. The councillor was against the application.
15. Councillor Thomson considered it would be safer to allow more people to pass through the area.

Vote
16. A vote was held, and by 6 to 1, with 1 abstention, the committee agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Nann took no part in the decision-making process or vote)
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 BH2025/02344 - 89 Holland Road, Hove - Removal or Variation of Condition

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

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor O'Quinn stated they were speaking on behalf of local residents, and they considered 38% increase in bulk and massing was not modest. Objections relate to noise, from students and parents, littering and parking. The level of noise is considered excessive. Complaints have been made, but to no avail. Significant issues arise at drop off and pick up times, with major congestion. Hove junior school is nearby and that has a knock-on effect. It is considered that the proposals will add 34 extra parents.
3. Zac Denton addressed the committee as the agent and stated that the nursery has been extended, and the space is already available. It was noted that Ofsted find the increase from 51 to 70 acceptable. There is a demand for more spaces in this city centre location. The woodland play area is good, and this is a sustainable location. The proposals agree with policies CP9 and CP18. The committee were requested to support local businesses and agree the application.
4. The Head of Planning stated that the more than 51 may well currently go to the nursery and the restriction to 51 was at any one time.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Parrott was informed by the agent that there is a travel plan in place, 88% of parents used sustainable transport, and the traffic levels would be low level. It was noted that the management plan included staggered drop off and pick up times.
6. Councillor Pickett was informed by the agent that Ofsted had assessed the nursery and found 70 pupils acceptable.

7. Councillor Robinson was informed that the management plan would cover smells, noise, and any other neighbour's issues.
8. Councillor Sheard was informed that the transport team have no objections and the capacity of the building was not a planning issue.

Debate

9. Councillor Sheard considered that if the transport team were content, then they would be also. The small building was a concern, however, there was no reason to refuse the application.
10. Councillor Robinson considered the applicant had listened to the case officer and there was a need for nursery places in the city. There was no reason to refuse the application, therefore, the councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Nann considered that 70 pupils will make as much noise as 51. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Parrott considered the noise created by parents on drop-offs and pick-ups, was an issue and asked that they be considerate to neighbours.
13. Councillor Pickett requested that 70 be the limit.
14. Councillor Earthey considered the applicant should be a good neighbour.
15. Councillor Thomson requested the applicant be nice to neighbours and should try not to have an adverse impact.

Vote

16. A vote was held, and the committee unanimously agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Theobald took no part in the decision-making process or the vote).
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.

E BH2025/02379 - 297 Cowley, Brighton - Full Planning

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

F BH2025/01886 - 21 Chailey Avenue, Rottingdean - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Nigel Smith addressed the committee on behalf of objecting residents and stated that they considered the proposals to be an overdevelopment, transforming this modest cottage. The proposals increase the width, depth and height of the property giving an overbearing and terraced appearance. The development fails the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Plan, particularly policies S1 and H2. It also fails City Plan Part 2 policies DM18, DM21 and SPD12. The extensions are not subordinate. The impact on neighbour's amenities would be severe, with extensive overlooking. There is an intensity of development on the plot when viewed with the existing large self-contained dwelling in the rear garden. Flooding issues in the area make the expansion of hard surfacing troubling. The proposals undermine the Neighbourhood Plan and fail on design, scale, neighbouring amenities and local character. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
3. Robert Stevens addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that they owner of 21 Chailey Avenue and were appearing at committee following a lobbying of Rottingdean Parish Council by local residents. The applicant had acknowledged neighbours' concerns and made alterations. The proposals were to maintain the unique style of the property and the design was to create a well-balanced home, more in line with the neighbouring properties. The design is appropriate, with no overlooking, loss of light or loss of amenities for neighbours. The scheme is sustainable and worth supporting. The committee were requested to approve the application.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

4. Councillor Pickett was informed that the existing garage was to be retained and the height would be the same as the neighbouring properties.
5. Councillor Thomson was informed that with regards to flooding, the hardstanding already exists, the garden area is not part of the application and there is no loss of light to neighbouring properties. The application has been amended with the reduction of the upper balcony, side windows and the insertion of obscure glazing to prevent overlooking.
6. Councillor Earthey was informed that the gaps between properties were acceptable.
7. Councillor Robinson was informed that the garage was linked to the neighbouring garage.
8. Councillor Sheard was informed that the bulk of the proposals was not considered to be out of character for the area.

Debate

9. Councillor Cattell considered that every house was different in the area and the gaps between are also different. It was not clear why the Parish Council objected. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Nann was unable to see the objections and supported the application.

11. Councillor Pickett noted the large garden and there was not much overlooking, and plenty of space in the area. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Parrott was unable to see the objections, and they considered the proposals were not too close to the plot boundary, and there was no impact on the South Downs National Park. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Sheard noted the house was small and in a unique road, and understood that sudden changes can be shocking, however, areas do change. The councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Robinson supported the application.
15. Councillor Thomson supported the application.

Vote

16. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission. (Councillor Theobald took no part in the decision-making or vote)
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.

G BH2025/02255 - Basement Flat, 99 Buckingham Road, Brighton - Full Planning

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

H BH2025/02114 - 3 Ridgewood Avenue, Saltdean - Householder Planning Consent

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

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Parrott was informed that the dwelling would be one property with a roof dormer. Planning permission would be required to divide the house into two dwellings.
3. Councillor Pickett was informed that the trees to the rear formed part of the protection plan which would be submitted by condition. It was noted that a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was not needed.
4. The Head of Planning stated that the trees would be protected by condition but not by a TPO or were worthy of TPO protection.
5. Councillor Robinson was informed that the property was considered comparable to others in the area, the land is overlooked by neighbours and boundary fencing will be erected without the need for planning permission. The proposals are not considered to have a significant impact on the neighbouring properties.

6. Councillor Earthey was informed that the neighbouring property at no.91 was refused planning permission but allowed at appeal.

Debate

7. Councillor Earthey declared the property was in their ward and noted that the dwelling was in a decrepit state. A refurbishment of the dwelling was better than leaving the house to decay. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Sheard noted the plot was overgrown and has not been used to its full potential. The councillor considered the proposals should be built.
9. Councillor Robinson considered it was better to convert the dwelling into a good home.
10. Councillor Cattell considered the property a sad little house and the proposals are good. The dwelling, at the end of the road, needs converting. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Pickett liked the house and noted the proximity of the neighbours; however, the plans are very good. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Thomson supported the application.

Vote

13. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
14. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

I BH2025/02302 - 48B Ventnor Villas, Hove - Full Planning

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

172 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

173 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

- 173.1 There were no informal hearings and public inquiries attached to the agenda.

174 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 174.1 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 6.15pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of