

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 1 APRIL 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

Apologies: Councillors Robinson and Shanks

Officers in attendance: Maria Seale (Planning Manager), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Steven Dover (Senior Planning Officer), Matthew Gest (Planning Manager), Michael Tucker (Principal Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

184 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

184.1 Councillor Winder substituted for Councillor Robinson.

b) Declarations of interests

184.2 Councillors Theobald, Nann and Thomson declared they were members of the gym that was the subject of item E: BH2026/00121: 2 St Heliers Avenue, Hove, and would remove themselves from the discussions.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

184.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

184.5 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'.

185 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

185.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2026 were agreed.

186 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

186.1 There were none.

187 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

187.1 There were none.

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

188.1 There were no requests for site visits.

189 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

189.1 Call Over: The Democratic Services officer noted that only one of the planning applications on the agenda was a major and the remaining 4 were minors. All the agenda items had speakers; therefore, the running order would be unchanged from the agenda: A and B would be considered together, then items C, D and E.

A BH2025/02723 - The Hippodrome, 51 - 52 Middle Street, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Channa Karunaratne addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they supported the restoration of the Hippodrome, however, they considered this application to increase the impact on the residents. The capacity increase from 1800 to 2300 was an issue, as was the removal of conditions, which protected the residents. As many as 1400 people would be leaving the venue at once, impacting on Ship Street and Middle Street, which are both in the cumulative impact zone. There is no management of taxis or s106 obligations. The risks to residents are not abstract. There has been anti-social behaviour in the area for the last 15 years, which the council should act to reduce.

3. Chris Smith addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they lived opposite the Hippodrome, and they were a director of Avalon. There is a great deal of noise from Middle Street, and the Hippodrome was in a residential area. The increase in proposed numbers will have a negative impact. The transport plan is not good enough. 450 taxis arriving and leaving at night will add the existing parking issues. The emergency services will have an issue with access. The local residents should be involved in designing the management plan and not just be consulted. The proposed roof will be harmful, with more impact on views.

4. Simon Lambor addressed the committee as applicant and stated that they wanted to save the Hippodrome. The previously proposed members bar has been removed. The 2300 capacity is half of that seen in the 1960s, and the bingo hall also capacity for more. The acoustic treatments are to protect the residents and over £1m has been spent on engineers to set up the plans, with modern compliances being an issue. The site is a crime hot spot, with Sussex Police regularly asking for CCTV footage. Break-ins have been an issue. This application is to bring the building to life again and thereby protect the area. The applicant has been engaging with the public. It is proposed that marshals will attend both ends of Ship Street Gardens to deter anti-social behaviour. It was stated that the area is not only residential and the applicant wants to mitigate disruption.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

5. Councillor Nann was informed that the Event Management Plan would be reviewable over 1, 3 and 5 years, and the local community could be involved. The numbers per performance are not known. There are 550 seats in the balcony with standing at ground level. If tables and chairs are added downstairs, this will reduce the capacity. It is hoped there will be a mix of performance types.
6. Councillor Theobald was informed by the applicant that the historic features, such as the Palm Court, would be retained where possible by the operator in their later interior designs. It was noted that there would be 6 exits, no additional seating, new toilets, and no disabled parking in the scheme, including the hotel.
7. Councillor Winder was informed by the applicant that the intension was to have a variety of performances in both the daytime and evening, and they would be predominantly live music lead. The applicant wanted to support other local businesses.
8. Councillor Parrott was informed that the premises licence will have conditions and that can be reviewed and bought to review by members of the public and by Sussex Police should licence conditions be breached or behaviour in proximity be causing a public nuisance.
9. Councillor Earthey was informed that the roof will increase by 3m in total height, however, any loss of view was not a planning consideration. The roof is already sited on a position which is taller than the properties in Ship Street Gardens and therefore increasing the scale of the roof would have little impact on properties to the south of the site. The roof is also considered to have little impact on Middle Street given that the visibility from street level would be limited however it would be visible from the upper floors of properties on Middle Street directly adjacent to the site but that it would be separated by the existing road of Middle Street and would not have a significant impact over the existing roof. It was noted the transport team have no objections to the application.
10. Councillor Sheard was informed that the increased capacity to 2300 was for the entire building. The surrounding roads are key routes, and the dispersal is likely therefore to be quick to surrounding commercial areas of the city.
11. Councillor Thomson was informed by the Highways officer that it was assumed that most patrons would walk away from the venue and the transport team had no objections. It was noted that the applicant assessed the transport, it was also noted that

they considered most journeys to be 'linked', and patrons would move onto other venues such as pubs. The numbers of taxis at nearby ranks were not known, however, this was a sustainable city centre location.

12. The applicant stated that there would be daytime events, along with seasonal events. A dressing room will be retained as a heritage item and memorabilia will be displayed. Tours of the building are to be instigated, and numbers depend on the number of bookings. The applicant stated that the event management plan will show how many marshals are to be employed per performance and how the patrons are to be dispersed.
13. It was noted that the conditions to be removed related to the balconies and external bar areas, which are no longer to be used. There is no relaxation of controls. The gating of Ship Street Gardens is not a planning matter in itself but that marshals could be required as part of the Event Management Plan. The new roof is the best way forward for acoustic insulation. The applicant stated that they had consulted sound engineers and this had led to the new steel roof frame supporting cement acoustic boards. The applicant also stated they would remain with the project for a long time.
14. Councillor Pickett was informed that the roof will be higher and the same shape. The grand master control panel is not useable but is to be retained as a museum piece.

Debate

15. Councillor Cattell considered the site was located in the historic core of the city, and after the Pavilion was the most important heritage asset with cultural significance.
16. Councillor Theobald considered the applicant had done a fantastic job so far. They knew residents have issues, but more protection will be added by this application. A variety of performances would be good, and Max Miller should be in the hall of fame.
17. Councillor Earthey was concerned at the extra 500 patrons as they wanted safety to be put first, however, on balance they supported the application.
18. Councillor Sheard expressed concerns that performing arts venues were dying out. The residents' issues and concerns were noted; however, this is a city centre location.
19. Councillor Pickett was glad an operator was in place, and the Hippodrome would be given priority phasing before the hotel. The councillor supported the application.
20. Councillor Nann considered the review mechanism to be good. The Councillor supported the application.
21. Councillor Thomson noted that the residents were generally onboard with the renovations and noted that the gating of Ship Street Gardens was not a planning matter. The Councillor supported the application.

Vote

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

23. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission subject to the Conditions & Informatives set out at Appendix B of the report.

B BH2025/02726 - The Hippodrome, The Hippodrome, 51 - 52 Middle Street, Brighton - Listed Building Consent

1. The application for Listed Building Consent was discussed at the same time as the application for planning permission. For minutes, please see BH2025/02723.

Vote

2. A vote was held, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant listed building consent.

3. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **APPROVE** Listed Building Consent subject to The Conditions & Informatives set out at Appendix B of the report.

C BH2025/00500 - 23C Shirley Drive, Hove - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Esme Hall addressed the committee as a resident and stated that local residents object to the application. The planning inspector, who is higher than a planning officer, refused the previous application and the property should be demolished. This application is for retrospective permission. The basement is not good. The original proposal was for a three-bedroom house, which was objected to. There 14 new conditions, however, it cannot be relied upon that they will be adhered to. The new owner knew of the enforcement action. If this is permitted a precedent will be set where developers build first with permission and ignore conditions. Please refuse.

3. Ward Councillor Lyons addressed the committee and stated that the previous application had drawn attention in the national press. Not enough of this application is different from that refused by the planning inspector. Local residents object to the scheme and there is no emergency vehicle access to the property. The design is not in keeping with the area. The conditions have been ignored. A new crossover, to be constructed prior to occupation, will be harmful to the tree between the highway and the property boundary. The property is a badly designed white box that should have wood cladding. Please refuse.

4. Dave Wood addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the receivers. The background is noted and they have tried to liaise with the local planning authority (LPA). The property is in receivership. The agent is open to discussions and noted that above ground the property is largely within policy and the basement bedrooms have been reduced.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

5. Councillor Sheard was informed that the application did not cover granting permission for the access. Fire & Rescue have requested sprinklers and Building Control (BC) are looking into this. The agent confirmed that the sprinklers have been installed. It was noted that drainage at the site was a BC matter that would be looked into as part of that process.
6. Councillor Pickett was informed that the balcony, belonging to the host house over the access (preventing emergency vehicle access), was a BC issue, as was the installation of sprinklers. It was noted that the new window in the remaining basement bedroom was not large, but acceptable in terms of BRE light levels.
7. Councillor Thomson was informed that there was no basement in the original planning permission, and therefore the permission had fallen away. The bedrooms in the basement had little light, and now it is proposed that two are used as storage with no windows, and one is a bedroom with an enlarged window. The agent confirmed that they were looking for a suitable solution to avoid demolition.
8. Councillor Cattell was informed that the inspector's decision was based on a technical point in the appeal submission given the limitations of the chosen ground of appeal, and an enforcement notice has been served. A breach of conditions could result in an enforcement action.
9. Councillor Theobald was informed that the sprinklers have been installed and the access was unauthorised. The agent confirmed the property was vacant at the moment and had been sold subject to contract. It was noted the acceptability of the access would be covered by the Highways team.
10. Councillor Nann was informed that the demolition notice was not for the committee to look at. The legal officer noted that the committee should look at the application before them.
11. Councillor Parrott was informed that the Fire & Rescue access would be considered under BC.

Debate

12. Councillor Cattell considered it was a real shame about the design. However, demolition was not sustainable. In the principle the property was acceptable, and there is an extant permission. Setting a precedent to build without planning permission was not likely and retrospective applications were unusual.
13. Councillor Nann considered there were good reasons to not allow, however, these were not planning reasons. The councillor therefore supported the application.
14. Councillor Sheard expressed the belief that the committee were not the moral police, and BC will have a lot to look at. The councillor had concerns.
15. Councillor Theobald considered there were so many items wrong with the application, that made a mockery of the planning system. The councillor considered a precedent

would be set and they felt sorry for the neighbours. The councillor was against the application.

16. Councillor Winder expressed concerns at setting a precedent and considered the property not to be safe or habitable. Was the property a house or just rooms.
17. Councillor Pickett expressed no concerns with the location; however, they considered the design poor and not habitable. The councillor was against the application.
18. Councillor Parrott considered the application to be morally not be good. The councillor had faith in the Fire & Rescue and BC.
19. Councillor Earthey stated they were deeply concerned; however, they trusted the BC team. The councillor supported the application.
20. Councillor Thomson expressed concerns at the building without permission; however, they supported the application and considered that demolition would not be sustainable.

Vote

21. A vote was held, and by 7 to 2 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 in the report.

D BH2025/02981 - 15 Auckland Drive, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Taylor addressed the committee and stated that Bevendean was perfect for families, with homes built in the 1940/50/60s close to the Downs, parks and schools. These are the future of the city. The council are buying back homes. The application should be considered under policies DM1, DM7 – the scheme was not good quality with the scale and form of the roof extension being harmful to the host building. The application is against policies CP12, DM18 and DM21. The increase from 5 to 8 occupiers will create an increase in noise and disturbance and the design is poor against policies DM20 and DM40.
3. Joseph Pearson addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that the property would be quality student accommodation and there no other Homes of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) within 50m of the location. The house is already an HMO and has been for the last 20 years. The council's city plan calls for mixed communities, not just families. A film school is opposite. The extensions could be constructed under Permitted Development Rights (PDR).

Answers to Committee Members Questions

4. Councillor Nann was informed that the Use Class was Sui Generis as there would be more than 6 persons sharing the dwelling. It was noted the applicant could use permitted development rights for the physical works if they wished and the application is for the change of use.
5. Councillor Pickett was informed that the roof dormer was under the volume allowed for a single dwelling under PDR.
6. Councillor Sheard was informed that the bedrooms were at the minimum size allowed and this was a better standard than under an HMO licence.
7. Councillor Cattell was informed that the previous application included the single storey rear extension. Larger dormers are allowed under PDR and current council design guidance for dormers is more lenient than previously at the time of the last refusal, especially where there is PDR fallback.
8. Councillor Theobald was informed that it was not known if other HMOs in the area had as many occupiers as 8.
9. Councillor Thomson was informed that the proximity of the film school had no impact on the calculations of HMOs. It was noted that there was no loss of a family home, there was 32sqm communal space, and sound proofing to adjoining property. The Environmental Health team or other agencies will cover any noise or anti-social behaviour reports.

Debate

10. Councillor Cattell noted that in the past HMOs were only restricted in certain areas of the city, and now, all has changed. The councillor noted there was no loss of a family home and supported the application.
11. Councillor Theobald considered the dormer to be ugly, and they were fed up with the loss of family homes. The councillor expressed concerns that noise would increase from overcrowding, which was too much for the property.
12. Councillor Sheard stated HMOs were needed as there was a housing crisis. They considered the property to be acceptable with sound proofing. The size of the bedrooms could be improved; however, they supported the application.
13. Councillor Pickett considered the design to be out of balance; however, they supported the application.
14. Councillor Cattell considered the property would provide a good home for students and others. They considered there was a strong case for this HMO. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Parrott considered the bedrooms to be very small, and the living space to be good. The dormer is considered to be ugly. However, a mix of housing is needed, and the councillor supported the application.

16. Councillor Earthey considered the property to be a rabbit hutch for humans, and they sympathised with the Ward Councillor; however, on balance they supported the application.
17. Councillor Winder expressed concerns at the size of the bedrooms; however, the living space was good. The councillor noted that some HMOs were being converted back to family homes. The councillor supported the application.
18. Councillor Thomson considered 8 persons sharing to be a lot; however, there was no reason to refuse.

Vote

19. A vote was held, and by 8 to 1, the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
20. **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 BH2026/00121 - 2 St Heliers Avenue, Hove - Removal or Variation of Condition

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

Speakers

2. Lucy Egan addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that they were a well-established sports provider, and they took over the venue two years ago. The application is for a modest variation of the opening times for internal activities only. Many of the local residents use the site and there is community support for the gym. Noise monitoring is ongoing and it has not been unreasonable compared to 24hr gyms. There 24 members of staff, a large number of which are instructors. The financial viability of the site would be at risk if the new hours are not granted.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

3. Councillor Pickett was informed that the submitted noise impact assessment report did not assess the 6am time period and had been used to measure the external tennis courts and was not suitable for this application. The assessment covered both people activity and cars, plus external running classes. The Environmental Health team confirmed they had received complaints in the past, the most recent in summer last year when speakers were placed on the external tennis courts. There have been no direct noise complaints to the gym and only one complaint when speakers were placed on the external tennis courts.
4. Councillor Cattell was informed that there was a strong community of members and not all were driving, some were walking, some cycling. There was not much noise outside from those wishing access the building first thing in the morning. Outside running (associated with 'hyrox' classes) will be stopped to reduce noise. It was noted that the Environmental Health Team have advised not to condition a noise management plan

given the uncertainty of it working, however, it was possible to defer to obtain an updated noise assessment.

5. Councillor Earthey was informed that the access to the site was shared with other businesses and was not lockable. It was noted that the applicant would not be repeating the class with external speakers on the tennis courts.
6. Councillor Parrott was informed that the building was derelict when the applicant started and they have made it viable. The previous occupiers opened at 5.30am. The access to other businesses and houses is in constant use. There are notices on doors requesting users to note the gym is sited in a residential area.
7. Councillor Sheard was informed that the applicant was not able to do anything about pavement noise from runners.

Debate

8. Councillor Pickett noted that other gyms open at 6am. The councillor supported the application as they considered there was no reason to refuse the application.
9. Councillor Parrott noted other gyms opened at 5.30am and the last complaint was in 2025. If there was no music and the external speakers were removed and the noise was managed at the opening times, then all issues have been dealt with.
10. Councillor Earthey considered a compromise would be to have an updated noise assessment before making a decision.
11. Councillor Sheard considered there two ways forward; one to defer the application to allow an updated noise assessment to be submitted or to pass the application with a condition requesting a noise assessment.
12. Councillor Winder considered the case officers recommendation to refuse the application was not right.

Vote

13. A vote was held, and by 0 to 6 against, the committee voted against the officer recommendation to refuse. (Councillor Thomson (Chair), Councillor Nann and Councillor Theobald did not take part in the vote or any part of the decision-making process).
14. Councillor Cattell proposed a motion, seconded by Councillor Parrott, to approve the application with a condition to add a noise management plan. Wording to be approved by the deputy chair, Councillor Sheard, and the proposer and seconder.
15. A vote was held, and Councillors Earthey, Cattell, Winder, Parrott, Pickett and Sheard agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Thomson (Chair), Councillor Nann and Councillor Theobald did not take part in the vote or any part of the decision-making process).

190 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

191 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

191.1 There were no informal hearings and public inquiries for this agenda.

192 APPEAL DECISIONS

192.1 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 6.24pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

