

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**2.00pm 4 JUNE 2025**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Thomson

**Officers in attendance:** Maria Seale (Planning Manager - Interim), Katie Kam (Senior Lawyer), Charlie Partridge (Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

**PART ONE**

**94 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**a) Declarations of substitutes**

94.1 None for this meeting.

**b) Declarations of interests**

94.2 None for this meeting.

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

94.3 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.

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

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

94.5 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'.

**95 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 95.1 Councillor Theobald requested that the minutes of 7 May 2025 reflect that regarding planning application BH2024/02729 - Royal Sussex County Hospital, Eastern Road, Brighton, they were noted as mentioning both the height of the proposals and that they considered the previous design to be better. The Democratic Services officer agreed to include the comments in the minutes for 7 May 2025 planning committee.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2025, with amendments, were agreed.

**96 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

- 96.1 Councillor Sheard noted that Councillor Thomson wished to thank Councillor Loughran for their work as the previous committee chair and to Jane Moseley (Planning Manager) who had left the authority. The councillor also wanted to congratulate Maria Seale and Matthew Gest for taking over the role.

**97 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

- 97.1 There were none.

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

- 98.1 There were no site visit requests.

**99 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- 99.1 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 B: BH2024/02796: 4/4A Church Place, Brighton
- Item D: BH2025/00150: 31 Wanderdown Road, Brighton

**A BH2025/00387 - 182 Old Shoreham Road, Hove - Full Planning**

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee. Maria Seale informed the committee that a further representation had been received, however, the matters covered have already been addressed in the report.

Answers to committee Member questions

2. Councillor Robinson was informed by the highways officer that a review of the site could be undertaken if problems occur.
3. Councillor Theobald was informed that the car park was for all the stores at the retail park. The application would not attract s106 or CIL payments. The applicant confirmed the existing mezzanine floor would be removed as it was not required, and toilets would be provided for customers.

4. Councillor Earthey was informed that the planning committee could only consider the application and not the potential traffic issues that may arise, as no change of use was occurring. It was noted that the store opening hours would not be 24hrs and would be restricted as per the Committee report.
5. Councillor Nann was informed by the Highways officer that the Local Highway Authority would monitor the impact of the store if required.
6. Councillor Robinson was informed that the application did not require a traffic assessment as the use of the site stays the same.
7. Councillor Shanks was informed that there are no limits on the number of supermarkets in the city as competition is not a consideration, but that policy sought to control their location (when permission is required for their use).

#### Debate

8. Councillor Cattell considered the scheme was basically a change to the shop frontage, and the proposals were a huge improvement.
9. Councillor Nann considered the existing building looked bleak and the proposed works look good. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Theobald welcomed the development and the considered the design to be good with extra glazing. The proposals were also considered good for jobs. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Robinson considered the proposals to be an improvement to the area and the new glazing will be good. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Winder considered the existing building to be shabby and the proposals to be an improvement. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Earthey supported the application.

#### Vote

14. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
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.

#### **B BH2024/02796 - 4/4a Church Place, Brighton - Full Planning**

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

#### **C BH2025/00363 - Hanover Crescent Enclosure, Brighton - Full Planning**

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

#### Speakers

17. Paul Papadopoulos addressed the committee as an objecting resident and stated that they had legal objections to the proposals, and that the courts stated that the objections must be taken into account. Under 1981 act there is a statutory ban on structures on the enclosure. Only a shed may be erected for maintenance purposes and the application will be in breach. There are no 'get out' clauses. No approval for the proposals has been agreed at the enclosure board annual general meeting. The application is a misuse of private funds. The council own the land, and this is a breach of trust.

18. Martha Turland addressed the committee as a member of the Hanover Crescent committee, the applicant and stated that the scheme had received support by 72% of the committee. The funds used for the scheme would be repaid to the committee in use charges. The proposal was submitted to support cleaner environment. Hanover Crescent currently have no access to on street chargers. The East Sussex 1981 Act should not be part of the consideration process.

19. The legal officer noted that the East Sussex 1981 Act was outside planning considerations and the committee were able to determine the application and that any redress under this Act should be sought outside of the planning application.

#### Answers to committee Member questions

20. Councillor Shanks was informed by the applicant that the crescent is a private road with no access to parking zone permits. There are 48 parking bays and 42 vehicles currently. The charger will not be for (general) public use only Crescent residents.

21. Councillor Robinson was informed that East Sussex 1981 Act was not a planning issue.

22. Councillor Theobald was informed that the garden area was large and was shown the amount of area lost and the size of the kiosk and electric vehicle charging post.

23. Councillor Cattell was informed that the existing wooden posts on the enclosure were not classed as 'buildings' and would be structures.

24. Councillor Parrott was informed by the applicant that the electric vehicle charger could extended to service more than one vehicle in the future, should that be required.

#### Debate

25. Councillor Theobald noted that the trees on the enclosure were protected. The proposed electric vehicle charger was good, and most residents supported the scheme. The councillor supported the application.

26. Councillor Robinson considered there was nothing to dislike. There were no charging points currently available, so they supported the application.

27. Councillor Shanks considered the proposals to be a great project, and they supported the application.

28. Councillor Cattell noted the crescent was not in a parking zone and considered the use of the electric vehicle charger would be good.

Vote

29. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.

30. **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 BH2025/00150 - 31 Wanderdown Road, Brighton - Full Planning**

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

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

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

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

101.1 None for this agenda.

**102 APPEAL DECISIONS**

102.1 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 2.54pm

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Chair

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

