

4th February 2026 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
28, 34 36, 40	Land North of Swanborough Drive	BH2025/00532	<p>Condition 16 to be amended to the following:</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Travel Plan to promote sustainable transport to and from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme should include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounts for first residential occupiers for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local bus travel - Cycle and electric bike vouchers/ bikeshare bundles discount - Car club membership (if implemented in North Whitehawk) • Details that demonstrate discussion and negotiation between the applicant and car club operators to support the supply of vehicles to the proposed car club bays (and implementation if viable and agreed) • Details that demonstrate discussion and negotiation between the applicant and bike share operator for the inclusion of bikes and hub at the proposed bike share area (and implementation if viable and agreed) • The provision of up to date public transport information within the building and to users of the building. • Sustainable transport promotional material being readily available to staff, centre users, residents and visitors including cycle and bus routes, car sharing and a schedule of sustainable travel activities and events. <p>The above works must be implemented prior to the occupation of the building and thereafter be maintained as such.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development maintains a sustainable transport strategy and to comply with policies SA6, CP7, CP9, CP12, CP13 and CP15 of the City Plan Part One and DM35, DM33 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two.</p> <p>Prior to a decision notice being issued, an informative will be added relating to the agreed Memorandum of Understanding to secure monitoring fees in relation the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the Travel Plan, as well as a requirement for an Employment and Training Strategy.</p>

			<p>New condition to be added as follows:</p> <p>Prior to the occupation of flats 08 and 14, a 1.8 metre high solid/opaque privacy screen shall be installed on the southern end of the balconies to these flats. The screens shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, to comply with Policies DM20 and DM21 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.</p> <p>Updated comments received from Sustainable Transport summarised below:</p> <p>Following amendments to the drawings to show a car club bay and bikeshare hub on site, concerns regarding the potential for overspill parking have been reduced and the Local Highway Authority are no longer objecting the proposed development subject to conditions/obligations regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cycle parking implementation - Travel Plan measures - Provision of a CEMP <p>The full response from Sustainable Transport can be viewed on the public register.</p>
63, 69, 82-83	Longhill School Falmer Road Rottingdean	BH2024/02499	<p>Additional Representations:</p> <p>Additional representations have been received from individuals and organisations who have already commented on the application. The total number of representations therefore remains as set out previously. The majority of the issues raised are already summarised within the officer report, but also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire risk, uncertain where students would assemble • Additional stress for nearby residents • There is an alternative site at 'Happy Valley' <p>The comments have been addressed in the report. Whilst commentators have suggested an alternative location, the planning committee must consider the application before them.</p>

p99 or	The Pinnacle (formerly Rayford House), 8 School Road	BH2025/02297	<p>Additional Representations:</p> <p>One additional representation has been received objecting to the planning application on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of consultation from the freeholder and B&HCC • Inaccuracies in freeholders' representation, as not all occupiers of The Pinnacle support the proposal • Unfair to attribute anti-social behaviour and crimes to the cut through • The cut through is a public benefit for the community. <p>In terms of the consultation, a site notice was put up outside the Pinnacle building by B&HCC in accordance with the relevant legislation. The applicant as freeholder also set out in their application form that all freeholders / leaseholders were served notice of the proposal prior to submission of the application.</p> <p>It is noted that not all of the occupiers of The Pinnacle support the application, this does not change how the application has been assessed, which is in accordance with national and local policy and legislation.</p> <p>All other issues raised in the representations have been covered in the committee report.</p>
-----------	---	--------------	---

