

Brighton & Hove City Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 51

Subject: Members' Written Questions

Date of Meeting: 2 Sept 2026

Report of: Executive Lead Officer for Strategy, Governance & Law

Contact Officer: Shaun Hughes

E-mail: shaun.hughes@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 To receive any questions submitted to Democratic Services.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1.2 That the Committee responds to the questions.

Members' Questions:

1. **Councillor Shanks Question:** *Regarding Hove Beach Park - Since this was given planning and constructed nearly all the trees have died and have not been replanted. Can you tell me how the planning department are carrying out enforcement to ensure replanting and care of the trees as agreed by the committee in their approval of the original application.*

2. Councillor Pickett Questions:

- A) *With regard to the new Planning and Infrastructure Act that comes into force on 31 October 2026, what changes have been put in place for Planning Committee with regard to updated Terms of Reference?*
- B) *There have been particular concerns around outdoor advertising. Are we putting any extra conditions in that would help restrict an increase in digital ad screens within the city?*

3. Councillor Earthey Questions:

- A) **BH2021/04167 Brighton Gasworks** - *This application was approved on appeal some time ago, but there remains no sign of 'shovels in the ground'. Local residents and businesses are very concerned. My question are:*
 - i. *What progress has been made in discharging the conditions associated with this application?*

- ii. *What are the most problematic conditions, i.e. the ones causing the biggest delay?*
- iii. *Can you estimate a date-of-discharge of all the conditions?*

B) BH2024/02499 and BH2026/01574 Longhill School - *This application was approved in Feb 2026, but there was an important condition: Condition 6 – which states: ‘The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until confirmation has been provided to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing:*

- *to demonstrate that the proposed drainage strategy offers sufficient treatment to prevent groundwater contamination*
- *to provide a maintenance schedule for the proposed drainage elements.’*

I understand from document BH2026/01574 – SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE COMMENTS 21018760 that BHCC acting as LLFA has stated: ‘We cannot recommend the discharge of condition 6 until further assessment to the risk of groundwater contamination has been provided...’

My questions are:

- i. *Does the LLFA’s refusal to recommend discharge of Condition 6 put the application on indefinite hold until the LLFA receives a satisfactory risk assessment?*
- ii. *Does the LLFA define what risk factors need to be in the risk assessment that they themselves require, specifically:*
- iii. *Which contaminants are to be covered, such as PFAS, PAHs, 6PPD and 6PPD-quinone, metals, microplastics and other tyre-derived compounds identified by more recent scientific research?*
- iv. *Are there any additional contaminants not adequately addressed by standard SuDS guidance?*
- v. *Which organisation(s) have or will be consulted to conduct the assessment to the risk of groundwater contamination to be provided to the LLFA?*
- vi. *Does each organisation have a specific and unique role, or is there a degree of overlap in their professional remit?*
- vii. *By what date can we expect these organisations to report?*
- viii. *If there is a degree of overlap in professional remit, can we reasonably expect all organisations to be unanimous in their recommendations, i.e. they do not contradict each other?*
- ix. *Otherwise, how will the LLFA handle a difference of opinion or conflict on the perceived degree of risk?*
- x. *Who makes the final decision – is it Planning Officers based on the recommendation of the LLFA?*

- xi. How will the final decision be made - is it based on weighing up all the factors on an ensemble basis, or can it be decided if a single risk factor is above the threshold for acceptance?*

I believe there is a question over the exact specifications of the 3G pitch to be installed, therefore my further questions are:

- xii. Has the applicant stated the specifications of the pitch clearly enough such that compliance with FIFA, Sports England, and World Rugby Regulation 22 can be confirmed?*
- xiii. If there is any doubt, will you confirm that a risk assessment of the risk of groundwater contamination cannot and therefore will not proceed until the pitch's specifications are finalised? (Otherwise, there is the risk that the pitch that is actually laid is not the same as the one that passed the risk assessment).*
- xiv. Assuming the pitch is installed, will you confirm that thorough checks will be made to ensure the pitch meets the specifications stated in the Planning Application's Conditions (i.e. full Certification)?*

