

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 1 JULY 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Thomson (Chair), Sheard (Deputy Chair), Cattell, Earthy, Guilmant (Substitute), Hill (Substitute), Parrott, Pickett, Robinson and C Theobald

Officers in attendance: Ben Daines (Planning Team Leader), Katie Kam (Lawyer), Michael Tucker (Principal Planning Officer), Steven Dover (Senior Planning Officer), Rebecca Smith (Planning Officer), Chris Swain (Planning Team Leader) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

19 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

- 19.1 Councillor Hill substituted for Councillor Shanks. Councillor Guilmant substituted for Councillor Nann.

b) Declarations of interests

- 19.2 There were none.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

- 19.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

- 19.5 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'.

20 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

20.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2026 were agreed.

21 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

21.1 There were none.

22 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

22.1 There were none.

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

23.1 No site visits were requested.

24 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

24.1 Call Over: The Democratic Services officer noted there was one major application on the agenda and five minor applications. The major and any minor applications were automatically called for discussion. Items A, B, C and E were therefore called. The committee also called item D: BH2025/03092: Site of Amex House Edward Street Brighton. Item F: BH2026/00840: 14 Ashford Road Brighton was not called for discussion, and the application was therefore agreed as per the officer recommendation set out in the report. The agreed running order was A, B, C, D and E.

A BH2025/03062 - Homewood College, Queensdown Road, Brighton - Full Planning

1. The Case Officer introduced the application to the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Parrott was informed that there were no reports of accidents at the access pinch point to the site.
3. Councillor Theobald was informed that the use was not for a specific charity and the use change was temporary. The councillor considered that less than 6 years would be acceptable and that a light system was used to control traffic in other tunnels in the city.
4. Councillor Cattell was informed that the caretakers house was currently vacant and was included in the site.
5. Councillor Sheard was informed that the reason for the application to be for 6 years, was not known. It was noted that the access pinch point was a tunnel and the use could be shorter than the 6-year applied for.
6. Councillor Hill was informed that it was not known if there have been any noise complaints from the site and the caretakers house was included in the site and would be treated as the same. It was noted the caretakers house could have non planning restrictions such as a covenant requiring the house to be used in conjunction with the use of the rest of the site.

7. Councillor Robinson was informed that there was a second pedestrian access to the site avoiding the road tunnel. It was noted by the councillor that if the site were to become available for housing, the council would look at it as part of the regeneration of the city.
8. Councillor Pickett was informed that there were conditions covering any lighting changes and signage to encourage non car travel.
9. Councillor Thomson noted the use proposed was a 'meanwhile' use.

Debate

10. Councillor Parrott noted the city was short on housing and charity space. The councillor considered the site would be useful with the proposed change of use.
11. Councillor Guilman considered if the site were not a school, then a charity use would be good.
12. Councillor Sheard noted the 'meanwhile' use and considered the site should be used for housing, whilst recognising the needs of charities. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Robinson considered the proposals to be a good use of the site, and it would not be left to rot away. It was considered the change of use would help the charity sector.
14. Councillor Hill considered the site would be good for a housing charity.
15. Councillor Theobald considered the site would be better for housing; however, they supported charities. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Earthey 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.

B BH2025/02913 - St Margarets, High Street, Rottingdean, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Bill Ainscow addressed the committee as the president of the St Margarets Residents Association and stated that the flats share the freehold of the building. The speaker noted they could not stop the existing roof developments as they considered the

telecoms companies could do anything, however, the new application required planning permission. It was considered that once granted, planning permission would not be required for further development, and more masts could be added under permitted development. The speaker asked that other sites be looked at.

3. Ward Councillor Fishleigh addressed the committee and asked what other sites there could be in this challenging village location. As site sharing was considered to be a possibility, the committee were asked to defer the application whilst other sites were investigated. The councillor considered the photos used in the officer's presentation were old and offered to provide newer ones. The councillor understood the resident's position but felt a resolution was needed and noted that permission for the existing temporary lattice mast in the nearby car park had run out.
4. The case officer clarified that they had visited the site two weeks ago and the photos were supplied by the applicant, along with substantial information and alternative sites. The objection from the planning team was the harm caused by the proposals. The considerations of the planning inspector from the previous refusal were taken into account.
5. Chris Stratton addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that this was the only site that works in the valley location. The site was the only location that gave emergency services connectivity. The existing temporary mast in the nearby car park gives 38% of the amount of range that would be offered from St Margaret's. It was noted that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports the need for phone masts and the authority needs to comply with policy. The temporary mast obscures views, whereas the proposals would have a minor impact. St Margaret's is only locally listed and has existing masts.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Pickett was informed that the proposals have been located in an area that allows resident access to the roof. The White Horses Hotel renovations include the installation of a pitched roof, which prevents use by masts. It would be possible to move the proposals around St Margaret's roof space. It was stated that proposals are considered on existing sites first, then on buildings, and then on ground locations. The agent confirmed the existing temporary mast was for 18 months only and this timescale has expired.
7. Councillor Hill was informed by the agent that the ward councillors had been consulted, and a drop-in session had been held. Some residents had supported the proposals and other had not. The agent was not able to confirm if that if planning permission was granted there would be more masts in the future, however, they speculated that in the future 6G would require less masts as existing masts could be used. It was noted that permitted development only allowed 3 masts per roofscape. It was further stated that the applicant cared about the community hence applying for planning permission rather than erecting masts under permitted development rights, however, phone coverage must be provided.
8. The case officer considered they would need to see any proposals before they could state if they were permitted development or not.

9. Councillor Parrott was informed that the National Health Service (NHS) was moving away from Airwave network and onto Emergency Services Network (ESN). It noted that there was no evidence of the impact on emergency services. The agent considered networks were getting worse, as they power down and up when needed. The case officer noted while the location may be ideal from a communications perspective, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) had to consider impact and harm. The LPA considered that other sites should be looked at. It was noted that there had been no request for pre-application advice. The agent confirmed that they were trying to solve existing network issues in the area and future proof.
10. Councillor Guilment was informed by the agent that a mapping exercise had been undertaken with St Margarets at the centre. The temporary mast in the nearby car park would give 38% of the coverage that could be achieved from St Margarets. If the temporary mast were increased to 30m, that would give 88% coverage of what the proposals could achieve. It was noted that the only other site looked at was the nearby car park where the temporary mast is located.
11. Councillor Earthey was informed by the LPA that the proposals were considered to cause harm to the heritage assets of the conservation area and locally listed building. The proposals are considered to increase the harm with reference to the previously refused scheme. The shroud proposed to obscure the lower mast is not considered to be good. The case officer stated the proposals were being refused regarding the impact. Other sites, such as ground based locations, could have been looked at.
12. The agent considered that the lower mast masking by the proposed shroud was preferable to a much larger shroud covering the whole mast.
13. Councillor Robinson was informed by the agent that networks give the emergency services 'slices' of coverage.
14. Councillor Cattell was informed that the previous application was refused on impact grounds and these proposals were considered to increase the harm.
15. Councillor Thomson was informed that the shroud would be constructed of fibreglass and painted to be in keeping with the style of the existing Art Deco building. The agent confirmed that the Heritage reports had taken longer than expected, and they did ask to meet with planning officers. The case officer stated that a pre-application meeting would have been preferred, along with more details.
16. Councillor Theobald was informed that St Margarets was a locally listed building.

Debate

17. Councillor Earthey considered that other sites were problematic and the village was a black spot for emergency services. The main road was heavily used, as was the access to the beach, where marine services access the sea. The councillor considered that the application should be sent back to the agent, and a meeting held to talk through the issues and locations.
18. Councillor Hill considered that there was clear harm to the conservation area, however, it was a black spot and that could mean harm to life. Increasing the temporary mast to

30m was not a good idea. There was no perfect solution. The councillor on balance supported the application, even though it was a shame there was not pre-application advice requested.

19. Councillor Theobald remembered the previous refusal in 2024. They noted the locally listed building, which was highly visible. Other masts being added was also a threat. The building was not considered the right one and the councillor supported the case officer's recommendation to refuse.
20. Councillor Parrott stated they understood the issues and that telecoms were essential and poor networks were a major issue. Emergency services were a real concern with regard to network coverage. On balance the councillor would support the application.
21. Councillor Robinson considered the issues to be complicated, knowing how the previous application was refused. The councillor considered facts were missing, which the applicant should have supplied. The councillor supported the officer recommendation to refuse.
22. Councillor Sheard considered emergency services coverage to be very important and other locations should have been looked at. The councillor considered the application should be returned to the agent for more information to be supplied.
23. Councillor Thomson was conflicted as it appeared that lives might be at risk, however, the impact on the locally listed building was important. A pre-application meeting would have been best, and the councillor did not want to defer. The councillor supported the officer's recommendation to refuse.
24. Councillor Cattell considered the issues around the emergency services to be a big issue, however, there was no paperwork to support this.

Vote

25. A vote was held, and by 7 to 3 the committee agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse.
26. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in the report.

C BH2026/00020 - Site of Amex House, Edward Street, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Lademacher addressed the committee on behalf of local residents and stated that they considered this location a tranquil part of the city and the building was not constructed for a gym. Noise was an issue and the impact on the residents, including vibration borne noise through the building. The report only comments on air borne noise. The councillor requested the application be refused as no evidence has

been provided to show the suitability of the site. There are two existing gyms nearby and no reason to permit the application.

3. Steve Eccles addressed the committee as a director of Edward Street Quarter who has overseen the project and stated that the building was constructed as a mix use community. This is a high-quality development with vacant lower ground floors. Permission for a climbing wall has been granted and that will be coming soon. A gym company is interested in the office space. The applicant has worked with planning officers and supplied evidence. The gym company already have sites within the city.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Robinson was informed that the conditions would be different to the previous application for the climbing wall, as they will include prevention of vibration noise. The case officer confirmed that prior to occupation a noise management scheme will be required. The building is a new build and therefore has good sound proofing. The planning manager confirmed that E use classes are generally considered to be, compatible with residential units. Music would be conditioned to be low. It was noted that the noise management plan would cover how the operator would deal with different scenarios such as talking, door banging etc.
5. Councillor Guilmant was informed that there were two applications for the site as they were two separate units. The gym will be traditional and not a climbing centre and is a currently a concrete box. Free weights will require spring floor or matting and this will be submitted to planning. The planning manager confirmed that the application was for leisure uses and would allow for other leisure uses in addition to a gym. Steve Eccles confirmed there were three flats above the lower ground floor. It was not known if other gyms were 24hr. It was noted that the unit was marketed from March 2023 to now and has been empty the entire time. There are no finishes to the unit and no flooring at this time.
6. Councillor Cattell was informed that the interested company operated 24hr gyms. Steve Eccles stated that noise testing was ongoing throughout the building and other works included the removal of a concrete floor and the fitting out of offices. The case officer noted that the building conformed to building regulations including sound proofing.
7. Councillor Pickett was informed that the applicant applied for the 24hr use and sound mitigation would be part of the noise mitigation plan. It was noted that a noise decibel of reduction of 5db above Building Regulations requirements was appropriate for party walls when permission was granted in 2018.
8. Councillor Theobald was informed that 24hr opening would accommodate different working patterns.
9. Councillor Thomson was informed that the three applications, two for this agenda and one for the previous agenda were submitted separately as they were for three separate units. It was noted a tenant was ready to move into the space and use as a 24hr gym. Steve Eccles stated they wanted to reassure residents that the conditions would be fulfilled. The case officer stated that the use was not for a specific end user. The tenant lined-up required 24hr use.

10. Councillor Parrott was informed by Steve Eccles that they were not sure what the noise vibration already experienced by residents was. It was noted there was a tenant awaiting the granting of change-of-use. Steve Eccles considered that a reduction in hours from 24hr would mean the unit would be re-marketed.

Debate

11. Councillor Cattell noted that the mixed use was required by the planning permission and gyms are a good use under policy. The units are empty at the moment and are therefore 'dead' space. The councillor was happy with the conditions proposed and supported the application.
12. Councillor Parrott considered it was a shame the space was empty, and a gym was a desirable use. Edward Street is not a quiet part of the city and was a busy area. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Theobald considered the application a good use of the site, however, the councillor was worried for the residents regarding the 24hr use and considered 7am to 11pm would be better.
14. Councillor Hill considered the 24hr use supportive of all residents, some of whom may have different working times. The councillor did not consider a precedent would be set and supported the application.
15. Councillor Sheard considered that residents wanted the 24hr use and they knew people who work odd hours. The councillor considered the area, near the police station, St James' Street and the hospital, so the residents already live with noise. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Guilment supported the 24hr use as they considered mitigation was in place and the use of the space as a gym would be good for mental health.
17. Councillor Robinson considered that noise inside the gym was acceptable, however the 24hr use was a concern.
18. Councillor Thomson noted there were 24hr gyms in the city.

Vote

19. A vote was held and by 8 to 2 abstentions 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.

D BH2025/03092 - Site of Amex House, Edward Street, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Answers to committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Robinson was informed that a noise management plan was to be supplied by condition.
3. Councillor Pickett was informed that the roof lights were not internal, and residents could look down on them. Black out materials would be used to prevent light pollution to residents. The planning manager stated the rooflights should remain closed.
4. Councillor Parrott was informed that there were more party walls to this application than the other two applications at the site.

Vote

5. A vote was held, and by 7 to 2 Abstentions, the committee agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Hill took not part in the decision-making process or vote)
6. **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 BH2026/00234 - 65 Ladies Mile Road, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Michelle Graham addressed the committee as a neighbouring resident and stated that they considered the proposals to be an overdevelopment of the site, which was not vacant and was the rear garden of 65 Ladies Mile Road. The development will affect the openness and green views of the area and will be out-of-step. The proposed parking to the rear of the site needs to be rejected as an over intensification. The development will reduce the amount of space and therefore be out-of-keeping with the area. The proposals will be near the neighbour's boundary and result in overlooking and loss of privacy against policy DM20. The resident understood housing was needed, however, they considered the proposals must be appropriate. The development will have significant impact and should be refused.
3. Ward Councillor McNair addressed the committee and stated that they considered the site had received change upon change. The existing House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) was suitable for seven persons. The proposals if approved should have a condition to prevent use as an HMO. The site is next to an open park, and the development would have an impact on openness of the space. The councillor requested no extensions to the property without planning permission. The councillor agreed with the transport team in that the new driveway will reduce on street parking. There is a gradual loss of green space in the area and they should be respected. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
4. Toby Deacon addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of applicant and stated that the location was sustainable, and the proposals would add to the housing supply. Following officer recommendations, the development has been reduced, and

the bungalow was considered a good design. There is no overlooking, loss of light or intensive bulk and massing. The development is a two-bed dwelling and therefore a reasonable size. The car parking stress levels are acceptable, and highways team have no objections. The space standards have been met and are not against National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Theobald was informed that there is an Article 4 direction preventing conversion to an HMO. To convert to an HMO would require planning permission. It was noted that the resident speaking in objection lived next door in the other half of the pair of semi-detached houses, and the development would be 4.5m from the boundary with the neighbour.
6. Councillor Pickett was informed that the proposals include storage in the undercroft and hallway. There is no alteration to the street lighting as the access has been moved away from the streetlamp. Landscaping is to be approved by condition.
7. Councillor Robinson was informed that the proposals are to occupy the northwest part of the rear garden of 65 Ladies Mile Road. It was noted that the proposed rear elevation windows will look at the boundary fence 4.5m away.
8. Councillor Guilmant was informed that an Article 4 prohibits conversion of the development to an HMO, and no permitted development will be available for the new dwelling.
9. Councillor Cattell was informed that the development was a self-build/custom build dwelling, therefore the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was not payable, and the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) was not required either for a self-build project.

Debate

10. Councillor Cattell considered it was hard to accept there would be any overlooking as the proposals were set back beyond a 1.8m fence. The existing property has a lot of garden space and would appear to be a typical Patcham bungalow in a high-density area. There are no yellow lines to prevent street parking. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Pickett considered the dwelling to be modest, which fits well into the location next to open space. It was good to retain the tree and remove permitted development rights. The design is good. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Robinson expressed sympathy for the neighbouring residents; however, they considered the development would add to the area as it was small and not imposing. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Theobald considered the plans were not readable and the outlook of number 67 will be affected. Parking in the area is difficult, and this development will reduce parking spaces. The proposals will set a precedent and change the appearance of the area.

14. Councillor Sheard considered the small single storey development to have reduced impact on the area, parking and to help the housing crisis. The councillor supported the application.
15. Councillor Guilmant considered the application to have a sympathetic design similar to the neighbouring properties. The councillor supported the application.
16. Councillor Thomson considered that neighbours often object to planning applications but find it's not so bad once it has been built.

Vote

17. A vote was held, and by 8 to 1 the committee agreed to grant planning permission. (Councillor Hill took no part in the decision-making process or the vote)
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.

F BH2026/00840 - 14 Ashford Road, Brighton - Householder Planning Consent

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

25 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

26 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

- 26.1 There were none for this agenda.

27 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 27.1 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 6.04pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

