

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 4 MARCH 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

Officers in attendance: Matthew Gest (Planning Team Leader), Katie Kam (Lawyer), Steven Dover (Senior Planning Officer), Helen Hobbs (Senior Planning Officer), Charlotte Tovey (Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

175 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

175.1 None for this meeting.

b) Declarations of interests

175.2 Councillor Theobald confirmed that they had been emailed regarding 77 Braemore Road. The other committee Members stated they had also been emailed.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

175.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

175.5 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'.

176 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

176.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2026 were agreed.

177 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

177.1 There were none for this meeting.

178 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

178.1 There were none for this meeting.

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

179.1 There were no requests for site visits.

180 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

180.1 The Democratic Services officer noted that all the planning applications on the agenda were minor and there were no major applications. Items A, B, G, H, I and J had speakers: therefore, these applications were automatically called for discussion.

The committee did not call applications E and F for discussion. The applications were therefore agreed as per the officer recommendations set out in each report. The updated running order would be A, B, G, H, I, J, C and D.

A BH2025/00969 - 95 Marine Drive, Rottingdean - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Roger Hanlon addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they lived to the rear of the development site. They objected to the loss of light, overshadowing and loss of amenity. The proposed height will be oppressive on neighbours, as will the bulk and massing. The proposals are higher than the existing property. The scheme includes windows that will overlook neighbours. The development will reduce view, create overshadowing, and be overwhelming.
3. Danny Tobin addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they considered the officer report to downplay the loss of light. If the committee permit the development, they will normalise the size and scale of development. The height of the proposals exceeds the existing property. The local family homes are being lost, and this development does not include any social or affordable housing.
4. Ward Councillor Fishleigh addressed the committee and stated that they considered affordable housing should be baked into the application and adhered to. Applications should adhere to the policies of the neighbourhood plan. The committee were asked to refuse the application.
5. Rory Ellacott addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the application was amended and the design was in character with the neighbours. The development is lower than the neighbouring buildings. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states more homes are wanted, and there are nine

in the proposed development, which has been appraised by the district valuer. A S106 agreement is attached to the scheme. The proposals are well designed in accordance with the city development plan.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the proposals were in line with the existing forward building line, and any further forward would be considered intrusive. The proposed roofline aligns with the neighbouring properties to the sides. There is a condition for landscaping the site which includes a 2m high fence and planting. The majority of windows will be given screening. The scheme is considered to be small under the city plan. Rottingdean Parish council objections are included in the report.
7. Councillor Sheard was informed that there are nine units in the development. Housing density is measured by the number of dwellings per hectare not the number of occupiers.
8. Councillor Robinson was informed that the neighbouring properties to the rear were on higher ground. There is some pattern to the layout of properties in the area.
9. Councillor Theobald was informed that the size of the scheme did not draw a contribution to balance the lack of affordable housing. There will be a late review imbedded in the S106 agreement. The seafront is considered the streetscene. The number of flats in the neighbouring developments to the sides is four and a private family home.
10. Councillor Earthey was informed that the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Plan covered the village vernacular, however, at the site location there is a huge variety of styles and design. The neighbouring properties were constructed before the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Plan existed; therefore, the committee can only look at the proposed development on its own merits. Unsold flats in other developments in the area is not a planning issue.
11. Councillor Pickett was informed that the details for water drainage were to be submitted by condition. The details of the landscaping are also to be submitted by condition. The agent confirmed that the existing front boundary wall is to be retained. Integral car charging points will be considered by Building Control.
12. Councillor Thomson was informed that the affordable housing would be 40% of a development over nine units. Developments over five units, and under nine, will have a late-stage review. If the cost of the development decreases, then the scheme will be reassessed. The application has gone through a number of amendments to get this stage, and the negotiations have taken time.
13. Councillor Nann was informed that they could consider the objections by Rottingdean Parish Council.

Debate

14. Councillor Theobald considered the design to be poor and boring. The scheme will be large and expansive, overlooking neighbours and is an overdevelopment of the site. The councillor was against the application.
15. Councillor Shanks considered the Parish Council objections should be considered and the impact on the street scene was not good. It was not good there was no affordable housing. The councillor was against the application.
16. Councillor Robinson was not happy with the lack of affordable housing, but they understood why. The development was considered to be similar to the side neighbours. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Earthey considered the development was contrary to the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Plan and was against the application.
18. Councillor Sheard considered the lack of affordable housing to not be good; however, they were able to consider what was in front of the committee. The councillor considered the housing crisis, the neighbourhood plan and the developments built before, which are massive. The scheme was not considered out of character and the density was acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
19. Councillor Parrott did not like the design; however, it was not overbearing. The councillor supported the application.
20. Councillor Thomson noted the neighbourhood plan was to protect against overdevelopment, however, officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

21. A vote was taken, and by 7 to 3 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 be **MINDED 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 THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed or significantly advanced, on or before the **6 May 2026** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of the report.

B BH2025/03004 - Keasley House, 10 Franklin Road, Portslade - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Members Questions

2. Councillor Pickett was informed that the new development considered not to have an impact on existing dwellings.
3. Councillor Robinson was informed that the application had come before the committee as the applicant was related to a council officer.

4. Councillor Sheard was informed that there was a small open space on site, however, there was a park some 200m to the west, as well as Hove Beech Park within walking distance.

Debate

5. Councillor Sheard considered the development to be nice and looking good. The councillor supported the application.
6. Councillor Theobald considered the scheme to fit well into the site, and it was a good development.
7. Councillor Robinson considered the two new homes to be good. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Pickett considered the scheme to be an improvement on the existing and supported the application.
9. Councillor Earthey considered two new homes to be good and supported the application.

Vote

10. A vote was held and the committee voted 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 BH2025/01589 - 80 Overhill Drive, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Members Questions

2. Councillor Robinson was informed that the adjoining twitten gave access to the nearby school; however, this was not the main entrance. No safety concerns have been identified regarding access to the school.
3. Councillor Theobald was informed that it was regrettable that some trees would be lost, and the trees would be replaced as part of the landscaping and BNG measures.
4. Councillor Thomson was informed that the trees can be cut down without permission if they are not in a conservation area or covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Debate

5. Councillor Pickett considered the twitten adjoining the site to be well used and parking to be an issue. The councillor noted the objections.

6. Councillor Cattell considered the scheme to be well designed, and they asked that proper render be used. The Planning Manager confirmed that material details would be agreed by condition.
7. Councillor Theobald was concerned that the adjoining twitten would be blocked by works. The design was good; however, the loss of trees and shrubs was disappointing.
8. Councillor Shanks supported the application.
9. Councillor Sheard considered the objections to be retrospective as traffic was already an issue, and they did not consider one house to be overdevelopment, nor would there be overshadowing from this small development.

Vote

10. A vote was held, and the committee agreed 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 be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to the receipt of no further representations raising additional material considerations not already considered here within the re-consultation period ending 3.03.2026 and the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

D BH2025/02251 - Rockwater, Kingsway - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Members Questions

2. Councillor Shanks was informed that the retention of the huts was approved in 2025. The application was not for change-of-use. The three retail kiosks have permanent consent, and the three new cabins form the application before the committee. Users of the sauna would use Rockwater as a base to change. The management plan would cover the hours of operations.
3. Councillor Robinson was informed that the cabins do break the line with the beach huts; however, they were in line with Rockwater.
4. Councillor Shanks was informed that the Planning Manager was not aware of a need for a license to operate the proposed sauna.
5. Councillor Earthey was informed that users would change in Rockwater, and the cabins would be a sauna only.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that the developments at the rear are currently unauthorised.

Debate

7. Councillor Sheard considered the concept to be good, and users would decide themselves if using Rockwater for showers and toilets was a good idea.

8. Councillor Shanks was concerned that the development was privatisation of public space, stating that building 'creep' was an issue. The councillor would abstain from the vote.
9. Councillor Theobald considered the kiosks were good for food and drink, and saunas had health benefits. The councillor was disappointed there were no changing areas; however, the application was a good thing.
10. Councillor Robinson considered the application could be considered over commercialisation; however, the council needed the income and to support such projects. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Parrott stated they were not a fan of Rockwater as they were not 'good neighbours. Saunas are good for health and the applicant wanted to be community minded.
12. Councillor Cattell considered there was a need for visitors to the beach and commercial competition was not a planning matter. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Earthey expressed concerns that there were no changing areas; however, the councillor supported the application.

Vote

14. A vote was held, and by 9 to 1 abstention, the committee agreed 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.

E BH2025/01474 - 62 St Georges Road, Brighton - Full Planning

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

F BH2025/01860 - 120 Longhill Road, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent

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

G BH2025/01026 - 40 Selhurst Road, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Philip Leppard addressed the committee as a resident and thanked the case officer for their diligence. The hedge proposed does not reach the garage wall on the boundary. This means not all the boundary will be screened. Please ensure that the hedge

continues all the way to the garage. The patio doors replacing the side bathroom windows to the patio should be obscure glazed.

3. Amir Dadgari addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that the officer report found the changes acceptable and would cause no harm to the neighbouring properties, in accordance with policy. The application regularises the extensions. Conditions require a 1.8m hedge and fencing, which will add privacy. Obscure glazing has been added to the side windows and officers have found the design acceptable. Refusal would prolong issues with neighbours. The committee were requested to approve the application.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

4. Councillor Robinson was informed that the obscure glazing was considered translucent, however, the proposed boundary screening will resolve this.
5. Councillor Cattell was informed that the raised ground levels to the rear exceed permitted development rights. If the committee refuse the application, then it is possible that the applicant would be required to reinstate the original ground levels. The Planning Manager confirmed that if the application were refused then the situation would be looked at. It was noted that the applicant would have the right of appeal.
6. Councillor Nann was informed that the condition relating to the boundary fencing and hedge has been amended but not including an extension of the screening to the garage.
7. Councillor Pickett was informed that the details of the hedging are to be provided by condition. The applicant confirm that they proposed to extend the hedge to the garage by using planters along the existing steps. It was also noted by the applicant that the obscure glazing on the side windows has been signed off and was deemed to be compliant.
8. Councillor Thomson was informed by the applicant that the side window obscure glazing had been signed off by the Building Control officer and the planning enforcement officer.
9. Councillor Sheard was informed that the majority of the works were retrospective, including the patio doors to the study. It was noted that the condition regarding the boundary hedging required Cherry Laurel, as this would be dense, evergreen and would maintain privacy.
10. The Planning Manager confirmed that no obscure glazing was included in the application and Building Control was different to Planning.
11. Councillor Theobald was informed that the ground source heat pump would be located on the north side of the property, and by condition the noise levels are to be background only.
12. Councillor Shanks proposed that condition 2 be enhanced to include reference to fixed planters allowing the hedging to extend to the garage. Wording to be agreed.
13. Councillor Robinson seconded the motion.
14. The committee voted unanimously to amend condition 2.

Vote

15. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
16. **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.

H BH2024/03142 - 87 Hove Park Road, Hove - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Sinclair Bilton addressed the committee as a neighbouring resident and stated that there had been eight online objections to the application, which is most of the properties near to the application site, and they have all objected. Only one dormer required to have obscure glazing. The applicant will be able to see directly into the neighbour's kitchen via the skylights. None of the windows are 'non opening'. There are no side dormers in Hove Park Road, only Velux windows. The dormers at the rear will have panoramic views of the neighbours and will set a precedent. It was noted that Ward Councillor Lyons objects to the scheme.
3. Ward Councillor Lyons stated that they considered the proposals should not overlook neighbours and the side dormers are not in keeping with the other properties. The side dormers will be able to look into neighbour's bedrooms and kitchen areas. Other proposals have been refused, and Velux windows installed instead. The dormers also give the property a three-storey appearance. The Councillor requested that the committee refuse the application.
4. David Williams addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the proposals were to be installed under permitted development, however, they decided to submit a planning application. The agent understood the neighbour's objections, and the side window to the gym has been removed from the scheme. Obscure glazing has been offered. A bat survey has been undertaken, and bat boxes are to be installed. A bat licence will be obtained if the committee agree to grant planning permission.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

5. Councillor Robinson was informed that the plans have been revised and condition four requires obscure glazing. It was noted that under certain circumstances side windows are permissible under permitted development.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the skylights, when over 1.7m above floor level, can be opened. The neighbour stated that their kitchen was a single storey rear extension with two skylights which allows a view of the proposed position of the dormer window.

7. Councillor Robinson was informed that limited opening windows would be challenging to enforce and any skylights less than 1.7m above floor level would be required to be fixed shut.

Debate

8. Councillor Cattell considered the development would not cause harm and the design of the dormers was good. The councillor considered it was unlikely that the applicant would stand at a window and look at the neighbours.
9. Councillor Sheard stated that they were against the forcing the windows to be shut. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Robinson proposed a motion to amend condition 4 to add obscure glazing to all side dormers. Wording to be agreed.
11. Councillor Earthey seconded the motion.
12. By a vote of 5 to 4, and 1 abstention, the committee agreed to amend condition 2.

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 BH2025/03063 - 77 Braemore Road, Hove - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Rose Bungener addressed the committee as neighbour and stated that they were speaking for all the neighbours, and they considered the proposals should be in line with the City Plan. The proposed first floor extension will lead to a 50% loss of sunlight to the neighbour, which is not in line with policy DM20. The ground floor extension will be 50% more than others in the street, going beyond and over building lines. The additions are too wide, being 50% of the back elevation. If granted, it would be preferred if works were Monday to Friday only as neighbour has cerebral palsy. It is considered that the development breaches policies DM20 and DM21. The loft and side extensions were acceptable. The committee were requested to refuse the first-floor extension.
3. Michael Benwell addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the application is nearly identical to the previous July 2022 scheme and the first floor satisfies guidance. The additions extend no further to the rear than the existing and are not a wrap around. The single storey addition includes a flat roof to reduce impact. A neighbour at number 88 has had an identical roof extension approved. The dormer is modest and there are no other rooflights. Under policy CP12 the scheme is acceptable.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

4. Councillor Nann was informed that the consistency was important and there are a variety of extensions in the area. The proposals are to the rear of the property only. The loss of light is comparable to the previously approved application. A sunlight assessment was not required. It was noted that summer and winter sunlight are different. It is not usual for this scale of development to restrict working hours, and environmental health will cover any issues arising. The legal representative confirmed that the conditions needed to be proportionate and reasonable.
5. Councillor Cattell was informed that the objecting neighbour was to the north of the application site and the overshadowing and loss of light would be predominantly to the neighbour's rear garden.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed that the ground floor extension extends 3m from the rear of the property and a development somewhat similar to the proposal could be constructed under permitted development.
7. Councillor Thomson was informed that there are a variety of extensions in the area, some more than 3m deep.
8. Councillor Robinson was informed that the first-floor extension will match the existing gable at the rear.
9. Councillor Shanks was informed that this application is different from the 2020 application in that the first-floor addition is different.

Debate

10. Councillor Nann considered the loss of sunlight for the neighbour was an issue, and they would like an agreement regarding the hours of work. The councillor was against the application.
11. Councillor Shanks stated that works would not take place on Sundays. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Sheard considered that the whole year should be considered regarding sunlight, not just the shortest day of the year.
13. Councillor Robinson considered that the applicant should look at hours of working. The officer guidance was for approval. The councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Theobald considered the effect on the rear garden of the neighbour to be not too big, however, they were not happy. The councillor was against the application.
15. Councillor Cattell considered it was unreasonable to ask the applicant to have a sun/daylight assessment. There is not a lot of sun in the winter. The councillor supported the application.

16. Councillor Thomson considered the sunlight issues to be spurious, however, reducing the hours of working to Monday to Friday would be good.

Vote

17. A vote was held, and by 7 to 3, the committee agreed 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.

J BH2025/03024 - 2 Richmond Road - Householder Planning Consent

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

Speakers

2. Dominic Furlong of the Round Hill Society addressed the committee and stated that they objected to the application on behalf of the society. The application has undergone some changes, however, there were still elements of concern. The rear dormers should under policy SP12 not unbalance or disturb the roofscape. The application property is one of four houses in a unified composition. Most properties have rooflights and the dormers at number 10 were introduced before protection was introduced.
3. Michael Doyle of the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) stated that the group were working with the council on heritage and conservation. The groups views were represented in the case officers report. The group support the box sash windows, welcome conservation rooflights, however, there are no other rear elevation dormers in this section of buildings. The harm would be viewable from nearby roads. The group objects to the opening of the 'blind window' on the front elevation. The committee were requested to the refuse the application.
4. Chloe Lewis addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that they appreciated the case officer's recommendation to grant planning permission. The two rear dormers will be hard to see from nearby properties, and there are other dormers in the street and nearby. The dormers are required for stair access to the loft room. The front elevation window does not interfere with the building and there are others in the road. The twitten has been graphitised and the applicant wishes to improve on this. The applicant does not want to change the conservation area.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

5. Councillor Cattell was informed that policies SPD9 and SPD12 were used to consider the two rear dormers, and they were in line with these and there are other dormers nearby.
6. Councillor Earthey was informed that there were skylights nearby, dormers and windows in the front elevation blank space. The Planning Manager confirmed that they would be resistant to change if there were no others in the area.

7. Councillor Pickett was informed that it was possible for the bathroom to not have a window, however, there are others in the road. The councillor was informed that they needed to consider the application before them and committee could not refuse just the blank window infill.
8. Councillor Shanks was informed that the proposed bathroom window would have a hardwood frame filling the blank space. This was considered better than the UVPC windows existing in other properties.
9. Councillor Robinson was informed that the dormer windows were similar to others, however, they were on the rear.
10. Councillor Theobald was informed that the new bathroom window would fill the blank space on the front of the property. Others nearby have small windows, which may have been inserted before regularisation.
11. Councillor Thomson was informed that the grouping within the conservation area was an issue for consideration.

Debate

12. Councillor Shanks considered the conservation area was important and the committee needed to be careful. The councillor was against the application.
13. Councillor Pickett considered the blind window should remain. The councillor was against the application.
14. Councillor Theobald considered it was important to keep the conservation area standards and the twitten was a mess. The councillor was against the application.
15. Councillor Robinson considered the two dormers to be acceptable; however, they were not sure about the blank window.
16. Councillor Parrott considered the blank window to be an issue; however, the two dormers were acceptable.
17. Councillor Sheard considered it was a shame about the blank window being removed; however, the design of the replacement window was good. The councillor supported the application.

Vote

18. A vote was held, and by 7 to 3, the committee agreed 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.

181 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

182 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

182.1 There were none for this agenda.

183 APPEAL DECISIONS

183.1 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 7.03pm

Signed _____ Chair

Dated this _____ day of _____