

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**2.00pm 3 DECEMBER 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:** Matthew Gest (Planning Manager), Katie Kam (Lawyer), Liz Arnold (Planning Team Leader), Ben Daines (Planning Team Leader), Michael Tucker (Senior Planning Officer), Wayne Nee (Principal Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

**PART ONE**

**148 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**a) Declarations of substitutes**

148.1 There were none for this meeting.

**b) Declarations of interests**

148.2 The Chair noted that the committee had been emailed as a group regarding items A, B and C.

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

148.3 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.

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

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

148.5 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'.

**149 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

149.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2025 were agreed.

**150 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

150.1 The Chair congratulated the planning team upon achieving a Gold Standard service and noted that the majority of planning applications over the last year, and some 1700 were dealt with under delegated powers.

**151 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

151.1 There were none.

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

152.1 No site visits were requested.

**153 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

153.1 The Democratic Services officer noted that items A and B were both majors agenda items and minor items C and F had speakers: therefore, they were automatically called for discussion. The committee did not call minor applications D, G and H. 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, F and E.

**A BH2025/02142 - Patcham Court Farm - Removal or Variation of Condition**

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

**Speakers**

2. Rebecca Mintrim addressed the committee as a resident and stated they had serious concerns and noted 1500 people had objected to the application. The concerns raised in the objections needed to be listened to and the application should be refused. The amendments applied for are not minor. Royal Mail were putting profits over resident considerations. HGV will be loading 10m from the closest property, with an expected 28 deliveries a day, with some at night, which is against planning policy. The impact on residents would be like a torture method. The inconsistency by Royal Mail is alarming, with other sites receiving more consideration than Patcham Court Farm. Trees and boundary foliage are to be removed, which will worsen the scheme for residents. Transparency is requested in the public interest.
3. Ward Councillors McNair and Meadows sent a speech, as follows: Residents in Patcham are very dismayed to see that the Royal Mail's plans have been changed for the worse. We strongly object to the HGV operational yard being relocated to the south of the site. It will be significantly closer to residents, particularly 133 Vale Avenue and the residents in The Village Barn and along Vale Avenue. With at least twenty-eight movements of large HGVs per day, this will cause significant disturbance through noise and air pollution. It is also deeply disappointing to see the removal of the green roof, two

of the swales and the wildflower meadows along the eastern boundary and the side of the building itself. The roof as it is will not be an attractive feature viewed from the South Downs. This quiet corner of Patcham is going to have significant air and noise pollution from HGVs. Water pollution and increased flooding is highly likely. The Royal Mail hardly conducted a thorough public consultation in the first place, and now the plans change – to the detriment of residents and wildlife. We hope the planning committee agree that these changes go too far and the Royal Mail should put up with the plans as originally approved.

4. Paul Bridson addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant and stated that the Royal Mail would be retracting from two town centre sites, and the new site would improve deliveries. Paul Derry also addressed the committee as the agent and stated that they had been working on this project for years with Royal Mail and they considered the matters objected to, remained unchanged. The access and vehicle movements remain the same. The lowering of the ground level will improve residents' views. Reversing alarms will be cut off by condition. There are no objections from consultees.

#### Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Shanks was informed that solar panels have been removed from the scheme. Councillor Shanks requested that other users be considered to use the roof space.
6. Councillor Robinson was informed that the acoustic walls, submitted in the original planning application, were to be retained in the scheme. It was noted that sound increases would be the same as the original scheme application and that 4db was acceptable.
7. Councillor Sheard was informed that Royal Mail were open to discussions regarding the use of the roof space by other companies as solar panel holders. The green wall is for screening and will face south. The green wall will be maintained by condition. It was noted that the Environment Agency found the aquifer to be 15m below ground level and by condition there were to be no ground works. Royal Mail vehicles would be tested at the Gatwick distribution centre and daily tests were not required.
8. Councillor Cattell was informed that the green wall will be planted in rows to assist growth, with details to be agreed by condition.
9. Councillor Theobald was informed that condition 30 needs to be updated to include the new noise report. The green roof is part of the holistic design of the site, and the small front extension is no longer needed. The green meadows have been removed from the scheme following the realignment of the car park.
10. Councillor Earhey was informed that the access for HGVs would be directly from the A23/A27 junction, with the deliveries coming from the Gatwick distribution centre. It was noted that the loss of biodiversity was 59% in the original scheme and 57% now.
11. Councillor Thomson was informed that the bat survey was accepted by the County Ecologist. The agent stated the application was not a cost cutting exercise and the development would be below lower and behind a tree screen. It was noted that condition 47 prevented reversing noise from HGVs, and different sounds would be used when required by law.

## Debate

12. Councillor Theobald considered that seven conditions to be amended was a lot. The moving of HGVs to the south part of the site was not good, as reversing vehicles make noise. The loss of the green roofs, and some screening was not good. The new frontage will be very visible and therefore worse. There will also be a risk of flooding. The councillor was against the application.
13. Councillor Robinson considered the site was now lower and less visible. It was a shame about the loss of the green roof. The noise levels have been explained; there is stronger screening and the HGVs will be safer. The councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Sheard was concerned at the impact on the aquifer and the loss of solar panels. The councillor considered on the whole the scheme meets the levels of sustainability, and solar panels could be added to the roof later. The loss of the green roof was a concern. The councillor supported the application. It was noted that an informative could be added to the scheme, requesting that Royal Mail look into solar panels.
15. Councillor Parrott did not consider the changes to be significant. The councillor was disappointed at the loss to the solar panels. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Nann considered the changes did not justify a refusal. The noise levels of 4db were acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Shanks considered the Brighton Energy Co-Ops should be considered to place solar panels on the roofscape.
18. Councillor Earthey considered that the roof should support solar panels.
19. Councillor Cattell considered the details regarding the green wall were good and Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) was acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
20. Councillor Thomson regretted the losses.

## Vote

21. A vote was held, and by 9 to 1 against the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
22. **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 as set out in the report, and subject to the S106 agreement for planning application BH2022/02232 which also applies to this S73 application.

**B BH2025/00834 - Saltdean United Football Club and Playing Fields, Saltdean Vale, Saltdean, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition**

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

#### Answers to Committee Members Questions

2. Councillor Earthey was informed by the agent that the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating was 'excellent' when considering the clubhouse only and 'good' when the football pitches were included. It was noted that the club undertook the BREEAM submissions.
3. Councillor Sheard was informed that the 2021 planning permission has been slow to implement as the conditions have taken time to agree, however, the scheme was making good progress now.
4. Councillor Shanks was informed that it was not possible to support community groups to achieve BREEAM rating, however, Environment officers could advise.
5. Councillor Thomson was informed that a rating of 'very good' was not achievable as paperwork had not been supplied.

#### Debate

6. Councillor Cattell stated that they had been through BREEAM training and considered it expensive and complicated, and therefore difficult for community groups. The councillor did not consider that Council staff are qualified to assist.
7. Councillor Theobald was satisfied with the application and considered that a BREEAM rating of 'good' was good enough. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Earthey noted that the club could not improve the BREEAM rating. The councillor supported the application.
9. Councillor Robinson supported the application.

#### Vote

10. A vote was held, and the committee agree unanimously to grant planning permission.
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.

#### C BH2025/01881 - Withdean Sports Complex, Tongdean Lane, Brighton - Full Planning

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

#### Speakers

2. Simon Farncombe addressed the committee as a neighbouring resident and stated that they were not against the pool but the additional traffic. Is the park-and-ride still active, or not. Signage was removed in November. Is the park-and-ride, formal or informal. Is

there to be an application for a two-storey car park to accommodate the additional planning requirements. The proposed walkway doesn't go anywhere. Pedestrians will use other access points. The proposed access will increase flooding to Tolldean Lane. Please defer the application to discuss the parking intensification, coach and bus access, pedestrian access, facility creep, the need for a two-storey car park and consideration of the Buxton report sent via email to the committee.

3. Tom Cox addressed the committee as the agent on behalf of the applicant and stated that the park and ride at the site was not formal. Discussions are currently being held with Highways regarding car park opening times. The pool is a great addition to the community.

#### Answers to Committee Members Questions

4. Councillor Shanks was informed by Principal Transport Development Officer that the lane from the train station to the site was not deemed accessible for all. The Transport Strategy Manager stated that the car park charges are free for 3 hours, £3 per day and £10 overnight.
5. Councillor Earthey was informed by the Transport Strategy Manager that 'park and ride' would usually follow the Oxford City model, however, here that is not possible. There is a lack of integrated ticketing. The Falmer campus trial results are being looked at. The case officer stated the parking numbers were relevant.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that there was seating at the poolside, however, no competitions were held at the pool, and the pool was for community use. There is no provision for coach parking presently, however, this would be introduced into the new car park. The Principal Transport Development Officer confirmed that coaches currently drop off on Tolldean Lane and Withdean Lane, on double yellow lines. The number of coaches is not known. Two small trees are to be removed.
7. Councillor Parrott was informed that there was disabled access to the building with the addition of both external and internal ramps. Access to the pool is already in place with wide corner stairs. A hoist is also available. The agent confirmed that all consultees fully endorsed the facilities.
8. Councillor Sheard was informed by the agent that flooding on site had been assessed under the 1/100-year model. Storm water attenuation has been introduced with a permeable paving system. The case officer confirmed that water collection details would be provided by condition. Currently water runs off to the side boundary swale.
9. Councillor Thomson was informed that the biodiversity net gain would be 10% and this would be onsite provision by landscaping and off-site units. The Ecology team are happy with the application and the condition to provide updates. 34 small trees are to be introduced across the site with, details to be provided by condition. Two trees are to be lost from the overflow car park. The majority of trees are to be retained.
10. Councillor Winder was informed that the landowner will maintain the new trees, with details by condition.

#### Debate

11. Councillor Theobald considered the building design to be bland. It was a shame that trees would be lost, as well as parking spaces. The swimming pool is good for the community as training in the city is good for safety and a healthy lifestyle. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Sheard considered that teaching residents to swim was good and the pool will be a benefit to the area, which outweighs the loss of parking. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Shanks noted that getting around the city actively via buses and bikes, was good.
14. Councillor Robinson considered the new pool to be fantastic and will add little pressure to parking. Visitors should use buses and bikes.
15. Councillor Earhey considered it was good to use public transport. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Thomson noted that it had been 40 years since a new pool was built in the city and considered that parking was important. The councillor supported the application.

#### Vote

17. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
18. **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 BH2025/02421 - 54 Auckland Drive, Brighton - Full Planning**

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

#### **E BH2025/01397 - 70 North Street, Portslade - Full Planning**

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

#### Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Robinson was informed that the single storey extension was set back from the boundary with the neighbours.
3. Councillor Sheard was informed that the collection parking had been added, and this would allow vans to park on the site. There is no parking at the moment.
4. Councillor Earhey was informed that the collection point was on the south side of the building.

5. Councillor Theobald was informed that the building was 22m wide.

Debate

6. Councillor Sheard considered parking was an issue in the area, and the on-site parking would be good. The councillor supported the application.
7. Councillor Robinson considered the application would tidy up the site and was, overall, an improvement. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Thomson noted the proposed single storey extension was away from neighbours. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

9. A vote was held, and the committee voted unanimously to grant planning permission.
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.

## F      BH2025/01832 - 4 Bennett Drive, Hove - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Colin Hawkins addressed the committee as a neighbour and stated that they lived at no.2 for the past 27 years. They object to the application as the first-floor terrace proposed will be overwhelming. The terrace will be a massive increase and lead to an invasion of privacy for the neighbour. The terrace will give a grandstand view of the neighbouring garden. The development will result in overlooking, loss of privacy and noise. A first-floor balcony has previously been refused. Planning needs to be consistent. The proposals are an extreme over development of the site, which has been objected to by the neighbours. Previous applications were considered an invasion of privacy.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

3. Councillor Sheard was informed that the difference between this application and the 2014 application was the enlargement of the front elevation middle dormer, however, the rear roofscape is the same. The 2014 application had larger dormers to the rear and an additional single storey extension.
4. Councillor Robinson was informed that the balconies proposed in the 2019 application were Juliet style. The single storey extension proposed in the application is 1m larger than the 2019 application, and 3.5m beyond the original building. It was noted that overlooking is subjective. The roof terrace has been reduced and considered acceptable with the addition of privacy screens. The privacy of the gardens near to the property are protected.

5. Councillor Earthey was informed that the roof dormers are to be extended. The proposed balcony is to include 1.5m privacy screens, however, there will be some overlooking.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that the development is bigger than 2019 proposals and the screens can be looked over.
7. Councillor Shanks was informed that the issues raised by the neighbour were looked at by the case officer on the site visit.
8. Councillor Thomson was informed that the privacy screens would be 1.5m high. 1.8m screens is usually the highest.

Debate

9. Councillor Sheard expressed concerns that the proposed balcony is not suitable for the area. The privacy screens make the development worse.
10. Councillor Theobald stated they did not like the proposed balcony as it was unfair on neighbouring properties. The councillor was against the application.
11. Councillor Winder considered the property a jumble of extensions. The councillor was against the application.
12. Councillor Robinson considered the property already a jumble and larger screens would be better.
13. Councillor Shanks was against the application.
14. Councillor Thomson was not happy with the application.
15. Councillor Earthey considered the proposals were an overdevelopment of the site and was against the application.

Vote

16. A vote was held and by 3 to 6 the committee did not agree with the officer recommendation. (Councillor Cattell had left the meeting and took no part in the discussions or decision-making process).
17. A motion to refuse the application was made by Councillor Sheard and seconded by Councillor Earthey on the grounds that the scheme was an overdevelopment and invasion for privacy with loss of neighbour's amenities under policies CP12 and DM21.
18. A recorded vote was held and the following councillors voted for the motion to refuse: Sheard, Shanks, Earthey, Theobald, Winder and Thomson. The following councillors voted against the motion to refuse: Nann, Robinson and Parrot.
19. **RESOLVED:** That the committee refuse the application for the reasons set above, the wording to be agreed between the planning officers and the proposer and seconder.

## **G BH2025/01647 - Garages 1 to 6 Rear of 187 Kingsway, Hove - Full Planning**

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

H BH2025/01008 - Land East Of 5 Nolan Road Brighton - Full Planning

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

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

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

155 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

155.1 There were none for this agenda.

156 APPEAL DECISIONS

156.1 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 6.14pm

Signed Chair

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