

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 3 JUNE 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

Officers in attendance: Matthew Gest (Planning Team Leader), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Oliver Redmond (Senior Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

10 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

10.1 None for this meeting

b) Declarations of interests

10.2 None for this meeting

c) Exclusion of the press and public

10.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

10.5 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'.

11 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

11.1 **RESOLVED** – Following changes received from Councillor Theobald, the minutes of the meeting held on 6 May 2026 were agreed.

12 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

12.1 None for this meeting

13 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

13.1 None for this meeting

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

14.1 No site visits were requested by the committee Members.

15 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

15.1 Call Over: The Democratic Services officer noted that there were no major planning applications on the agenda. Out of the three minor planning applications on the agenda, only item B: BH2926/00064 – 165 Hollingdean Terrace - had speakers and was therefore automatically called for discussion. Item C: BH2026/00748 – Sussex County Cricket Ground - was not called, and the application was therefore agreed as per the officer recommendation set out in the report. Item A: BH2025/03081 – Site of Amex House - was called. The new running order would therefore be B followed by A.

A BH2025/03081 - Site of Amex House, Edward Street, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Robinson was informed that if they wanted to state no sound or vibration to be audible externally by condition, then the committee would need to propose the condition. The Planning manager cautioned against adding a condition removing outside noise as it was hard to segregate different noises outside a building.
3. Councillor Shanks was informed that the Use Class Order changed in 2020, and the development was agreed in 2018. Class E now has different elements. Restrictions should only be imposed for good reasons. It was noted that condition 6 was considered sufficient.
4. Councillor Pickett was informed that insulation would be looked at as part of acoustic mitigation measures required by condition if the application were to be granted.
5. Councillor Theobald was informed that the ground floor and lower ground floor were agreed as office space in the original planning permission.
6. Councillor Thomson was informed that the ground floor has been marketed as office space. A climbing wall may be possible under the leisure use class.
7. Councillor Earthey was informed that by condition a noise reduction scheme needs to be submitted and Environmental Health can take action if there are any issues.
8. Councillor Shanks was informed that a condition could restrict any amplified sound.

Debate

9. Councillor Nann considered that climbing walls were not quiet but were very noisy.
10. Councillor Pickett considered thudding an issue, and treadmills should not be used. Bouldering could be installed instead of a climbing wall. As a new building, the councillor hoped the construction was good.
11. Councillor Theobald considered the proposals to be a good use of the space. And as long as there was good sound proofing, the councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Cattell that most of the ground floors in new developments were empty, and there was a need for employment space as well as light industrial use. It was a shame the space was not used as offices. However, the councillor was glad to see any use for the ground floor. As long as the conditions were robust, the councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Sheard considered the proposals to be a good use of the space. The location was near St James' Street, on a main bus route with heavy traffic and not far from a hub of night life, so there will be constant background noise. The gym was a good idea.
14. Councillor Robinson stated they had faith in the planning officers and supported the application.
15. Councillor Cattell considered that new build regulations would have been used to construct the building with some sound insulation. The location is on a route to the hospital near the police station. Blue lights will be common at night and daytime.
16. Councillor Nann noted there was a marked difference between noise and sound. Sound can be controlled, however, noise cannot. The councillor considered the committee needed to be careful.
17. Councillor Robinson proposed a condition to control amplified music. Councillor Earthey seconded the motion.

Vote

18. An individual vote was held and Councillors Cattell, Earthey, Parrott, Robinson, Shanks, Theobald, Pickett and Thomson voted for the proposed condition. Councillors Nann and Sheard voted against the new condition. The new condition was agreed.

Vote

19. A vote was held and the committee agreed unanimously 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.

B BH2026/00064 - 165 Hollingdean Terrace, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Fowler sent a speech to be read out by the Democratic Services officer as follows: I wish to object on the grounds of overdevelopment, the harmful impact on neighbouring residents and the surrounding environment. Having visited, I believe the proposal would result in overcrowding and the loss of a significant proportion of the garden space belonging to No. 165. The existing tree is highly valued by local residents, and it appears that birds regularly nest there. Residents would prefer to see the tree maintained rather than removed. Birds also nest in the bushes, and it would be unfortunate to lose this habitat. The proposed development would also have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties on Harrington and Quarry Bank. The scale and position of the building would reduce natural light to neighbouring gardens and create overlooking issues, resulting in a loss of amenity. The plans indicate a proposed entrance into the alleyway used by residents of Quarry Bank. Clarification should be provided. There is also the nearby substation to consider, and overall, the proposal appears to be trying to squeeze a development in with minimal garden provision and insufficient regard for the impact on neighbouring residents. I would request that an ecological survey be carried out to confirm whether foxes or other wildlife inhabit the vacant land. Finally, Quarry Bank already experiences significant parking and access problems, with cars and vans frequently causing obstructions for refuse and recycling collection vehicles as well as emergency services. For all of these reasons, I ask that this application be refused. Ward Cllr Asaduzzaman also supports the residents' objections.
3. Liam Russell addressed the committee as the agent representing the applicant and stated that they had been developing in Brighton and Hove for the last 25 years and were aware that each site needed an honest assessment. Any development should improve the area. This proposal is for a modest new home, designed with positive attitude to architecture. The agent has been working with planning officers and has reduced the scale of the development. The recommendation has been agreed with officers. The home will add to the housing supply. The site has been in family ownership for 60 years and will be a retirement home for the applicant. The committee were requested to support the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Theobald was informed that the main access to the proposal would be from Harrington Place and the tree in the rear garden is not in a conservation area or covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The garden at 165 Hollingdean Terrace will be 63sqm. The side elevation windows will be fixed shut and obscure glazed. It was noted there would be some overshadowing given the topography of the site and orientation; however, this was not considered harmful enough to refuse the application.
5. Councillor Shanks was informed that the tree may only be removed outside of the nesting season. The access from Quarry Bank will be gated.
6. Councillor Pickett was informed that a new condition regarding vibration from a substation would need to be agreed prior to occupation.

7. Councillor Robinson was informed that the neighbours to the rear would see the proposed green roof to the sitting area. It was noted that the downstairs rear room of the development would be lower than the boundary wall.
8. Councillor Thomson was informed that the development needs to comply with the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 regarding any loss of habitat.

Debate

9. Councillor Robinson considered the development was good. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Shanks considered the development to be a good use of the small space. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Cattell considered that as there were very few brownfield sites left, this was a good development. Objectors have considered the proposals to be out of place; however, the design is modern in style and others have extended in the same style. There are a number of dormers in area of a similar design. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Parrott supported the application.
13. Councillor Pickett considered the design to be good, in this tiny space, that fits a lot in. The vegetation will be increased by the green roof and planters. The councillor considered the development to be really good.
14. Councillor Earthey considered the development to be a good use of the space around the substation. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Theobald considered the space to be good, however, there would be some overshadowing, and it was a shame to lose the tree. The negotiated reductions are good. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Sheard considered the development to be imaginative and a good solution to the space. New housing should be encouraged. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Thomson considered that more housing was better, and this was a good use of the space, and it was good that there had been talks between the agent, applicant and the planning officers.

Vote

18. A vote was held and the committee voted unanimously 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.

C BH2026/00748 - Sussex County Cricket Ground, Eaton Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

16 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

17 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

- 17.1 There were none for this agenda.

18 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 18.1 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 3.10pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of