

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 2 SEPTEMBER 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Thomson (Chair), Sheard (Deputy Chair), Cattell, Nann, Pickett, Robinson, Shanks, C Theobald, Winder (Substitute) and Fishleigh (Substitute)

Officers in attendance: Matthew Gest (Planning Manager), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Liz Arnold (Planning Team Leader), Steven Dover (Senior Planning Officer), Michael Tucker (Senior Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

47 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

47.1 Councillor Winder substituted for Councillor Parrott and Councillor Fishleigh substituted for Councillor Earthey.

b) Declarations of interests

47.2 Councillor Pickett declared they had volunteered at Brighton Open Air Theatre (BOAT) in the past; however, they remained of an open mind regarding item C - BH2025/02901: Brighton, Hove and Sussex Sixth Form College, 205 Dyke Road, Hove. Councillor Fishleigh declared their son had played football at BHASVIC; however, they remained of an open mind regarding item C - BH2025/02901: Brighton, Hove and Sussex Sixth Form College, 205 Dyke Road, Hove.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

47.3 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.

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

d) Use of mobile phones and tablets

47.5 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'.

48 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 48.1 **RESOLVED** – Following changes from Councillor Pickett, the minutes of the meeting held on 5 August 2026 were agreed.

49 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 49.1 The Chair addressed the meeting and stated that on 17 August 2026 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was altered. This has introduced significant changes to the structure and presentation of the framework including the incorporation of development management policies. However, having carefully considered the new framework, officers are satisfied that in as far as issues to determine the cases on this agenda, the relevant policy has not fundamentally changed, and it does not alter the officer recommendations set out in the officer reports.

In October the national scheme of delegation will change so that there will be call-in from Members and no number of objections trigger point for an application to come to committee.

50 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 50.1 There were none.

51 MEMBER QUESTIONS

- 51.1 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.*

Answer: The matter is currently under investigation; the planning team are expecting a new application to be submitted by the applicant which will seek to amend the proposals as originally approved.

- 51.2 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?*

Answer: Secondary legislation for the National Scheme of Delegation and changes to planning committee were made on the 15 July 2026 and comes into force on 31 October 2026. A report will be presented to Full Council in September amending the Council's constitution to introduce the mandatory changes.

- 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?*

Answer: Digital screens require advertisement consent. Applications are assessed in accordance with policies contained in City Plan Parts One and Two. Given consent is already required for all digital screens, it is not considered that additional conditions restricting further digital adverts is necessary.

51.3 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 questions 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?*

Answer: The applicant has not come forward to discharge any of the conditions attached to their planning permission. The applicant has until 22 September 2028 to implement the planning permission. In the absence of an application to agree the details subject to conditions, it is not possible to respond to parts 2 and 3 of your question.

- 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)?*

Answers: 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?

The comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) dated 24 July 2026 have requested additional information in respect of condition 6. The applicant should not progress the application until such time as the conditions attached to the permission have been agreed.

Does the LLFA define what risk factors need to be in the risk assessment that they themselves require, specifically:

- *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?*
- *Are there any additional contaminants not adequately addressed by standard SuDS guidance?*

The consultation response from the LLFA state that the 'applicant has concluded that 'development has a very low risk of contaminating groundwater. This is after providing a brief assessment to the risk of groundwater contamination from the proposed pitch as well as a description of proposed mitigation methods. No reference to this simple index method in the CIRIA SUDs Manual has been made, and as per condition 6, this is still required. Additionally, we require an assessment of the risk from dissolved pollutants, leachates, fine suspended particles with water transported from elsewhere as well as zinc leaching, benzothiazoles, PAHs, microplastics and any manufacturer's environmental data from the pitch itself.'

*Which organisation(s) have or will be consulted to conduct the assessment to the risk of groundwater contamination to be provided to the LLFA?
By what date can we expect these organisations to report?*

The Local Planning Authority have no control over who the applicant commissions to carry out studies to support a planning application and there is no time frame currently set to respond with the required information, however, condition 2 attached to the permission does require works to commence within 3 years of the permission.

Does each organisation have a specific and unique role, or is there a degree of overlap in their professional remit?

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?

Otherwise, how will the LLFA handle a difference of opinion or conflict on the perceived degree of risk?

There is some overlap in scope between the LLFA and Southern Water.

Southern Water have not raised any concerns with the submission, whereas the LLFA has raised concerns.

It isn't for the LLFA to handle a difference of opinion, that rests with the Local Planning Authority.

Who makes the final decision – is it Planning Officers based on the recommendation of the LLFA?

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?

The Local Planning Authority make the final decision based on consultee responses on technical matters where they are needed.

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?

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)?

Condition 15 attached to the planning permission requires:

Within 3 months of the use of the 3G Artificial Grass Pitch commencing:

- (a) certification that the 3G Artificial Grass Pitch hereby permitted has met FIFA Quality Concept for Football Turf - FIFA Quality or equivalent International Artificial Turf Standard (IMS) and World Rugby Regulation 22 Standard and,
- (b) confirmation that the facility has been registered on the Football Association's Register of Football Turf Pitches and has received WR Regulation 22 Certification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable, provides multiple sporting benefits and to accord with Development Plan Policy CP17 and DM9.

This application is yet to be submitted. When an application is submitted, Sport England will be consulted, and this condition is sufficient to verify the pitch meets the specifications set out in the conditions.

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).

The assessment of the risk of groundwater contamination can take place ahead of the pitch being built or condition 15 being discharged, as the prospective pitch design that will be necessary to meet those sporting standards will already be known.

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

52.1 There were no site visit requests.

53 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

53.1 The Democratic Services officer confirmed that all agenda items were called forward for discussion as they were either major applications or had speakers. The order of items remained the same as set out in the agenda.

A BH2025/02480 - 104 Cowley Drive, Brighton - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Allen addressed the committee and stated that the Toby Inn had closed in 2006, and the site has been vacant since. The proposed new social housing will be good, giving homes to some of the 2,000 and more in temporary accommodation. The committee were asked how they could turn down the development which the councillor supported. The brownfield site has been redundant for two decades. The committee were asked to support the application.

Answers to Committee Members Questions

3. Councillor Theobald was informed that the proposed gardens were not very large, approximately 4 x 6.5m and all units have some outside space. The proposals are higher than the existing pub building, but they located in a different area of the site, in the northwest corner, a suitable distance from the existing neighbouring properties.
4. Councillor Robinson was informed that no parking survey had been undertaken and there five parking spaces were proposed. The layout of the parking would be agreed by condition, and no objections had been received from the Highways team. It was noted that there would be the need for an access ramp to the east of the building for step free access and across the site there was a drop in levels of 1.5m.
5. Councillor Shanks was informed by the agent that the re-use of the existing building was not possible, the position of the pub would allow only limited accommodation.
6. Councillor Pickett was informed that there was one unit proposed for wheelchair accessibility. There is no clear or quick link from the car park to the unit. The access is to be agreed and condition 17 states that: 'No development shall commence on site until a Scheme of Management of vehicle and any other forms of parking and stopping in the car park area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority'. Informative four states: 'The applicant is advised under Part S of

the Building Regulations that new dwellings providing a parking space now require an EV charging point'. The bio-diversity net gain will not relate to on street trees; however, it will be in the local area. The trees on the street are to be protected by condition.

7. Councillor Thomson was informed that car parking would be located in the southeast of the site and the accessible unit in the northwest block of the development. The access will not be level, however, it will be step free. On street parking may be possible; however, there are several junctions converging near the site. The agent confirmed they would prefer parking closer to the accessible unit and there were double yellow lines on the street next to the site.

Debate

8. Councillor Nann was in favour of the application and supported it.
9. Councillor Cattell considered that access issues needed to be overcome. The design was very good, and the affordable homes were welcomed. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Theobald considered the loss of the pub to be sad there were not enough parking spaces. In 2025 permission was granted for five family homes, and this would have been better as they would have bigger gardens and would be in keeping with the character of the existing homes in the area.
11. Councillor Winder considered it was good to have new homes, and more landscaping would have been better. New homes are needed; therefore, the councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Pickett considered the proposals to be good with no overlooking, well designed, on a bus route, with bat and bee boxes and hedgehog homes. The councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Robinson considered the homes were needed. The gardens were not great, and they were much needed. The councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Shanks considered the scheme to be great and supported the application.
15. Councillor Sheard considered if a scheme could not be built here, then where? The gardens are small; however, the development is close to the South Downs National Park. The existing building is empty, and the proposals make good use of the site.
16. Councillor Fishleigh noted there were double yellow lines all around the site and they felt sorry for residents regarding the parking.
17. Councillor Thomson considered the development a good mix.

Vote

18. A vote was held and by 9 to 1, 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** subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report.

B BH2026/00110 - 36 Kingsthorpe Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Pickett was informed that the light assessment had been looked at the windows on the west side of the building would be affected however these were secondary windows and the development was therefore within guidelines with no primary windows being affected. It was noted that the constraints of the site meant it was no longer commercially viable.
3. Councillor Sheard was informed by the agent that solar panels were not included in the development as there were not appropriate regarding the design and air source heat pumps were better for this location.
4. Councillor Theobald was informed that the neighbouring property was a commercial building at no.34 and there are windows to the rear of the property and on the eastern elevation. Policy DM2O has been applied.
5. Councillor Robinson was informed that the air source heat pumps would be individually installed in each unit. It was noted the development was 2m from existing neighbours, which was considered acceptable for this development.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that there was no affordable housing on the site and the developer could make a contribution instead. The development was in a controlled parking zone and there was a high take up of parking permits. Informative 6 relates the development being car free. The Principal Transport Development Officer confirmed that the no parking had been proposed by the applicant.
7. Councillor Thomson was informed that the site was near a railway station; however, access via private land was no longer possible. The small western elevation windows of neighbours would be affected by the development. The 45⁰ rule has been used to assess the impact of the development on the neighbours. It was noted that a S106 payment would be made prior to commencement.

Debate

8. Councillor Nann supported the application and noted that it may be inconvenient for neighbours; however, there was nowhere else to build in Wish.
9. Councillor Cattell noted residents may be annoyed at the development and there was no affordable housing on site; however, providers would not pick up one unit alone. The contribution sum was welcomed to build new homes across the city. The councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Robinson considered the S106 contribution to be good, as was the design, even though the development is close to neighbours. The councillor supported the application.

11. Councillor Theobald considered it was a shame there was no affordable housing; however, the contribution sum would be good. The precedent has been set by the large flats and the development looks acceptable. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Sheard considered the housing is good for the community.
13. Councillor Winder supported the application as there was mostly housing in the area and the commercial building was not needed. 14 flats were good for the area.

Vote

14. A vote was held, and the committee unanimously 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 be MINDED TO GRANT planning permission subject to a s106 agreement based 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 25 November 2026 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of the report.

C BH2025/02901 - Brighton Hove and Sussex Sixth Form College, 205 Dyke Road, Hove - Full Planning

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

Speakers

2. Graeme Hawkins of Brighton Open Air Theatre (BOAT) addressed the committee and stated that the report agrees that there will be an impact on the theatre from noise. There would have been seven clashes of BOAT and Brighton, Hove & Sussex Sixth Form College (BHASVIC) events this season, which is against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and city plan policies which protect cultural venues. The all-weather pitch will be only 50m from BOAT. The committee were asked to recommend winter use only with nothing during the summer holidays. BOAT is a unique venue which will clash with the use of the pitches.
3. Steve Geliot of Dyke Road Park association considered the proposals to be in conflict with local plan policies. Sport England have no objections; however, they have not endorsed the proposals. Park users are not mentioned in the report. In the ecology report neither soil nor invertebrates are not mentioned. Wild birds will be affected by the development. The light assessment has not been provided, and the height of the lights will impact on the park, 10m is too high. Louvres should be added to the lights to prevent spill.
4. Ward Councillor Bagaeen addressed the committee and stated that they supported the application, and the committee should look at the development plan as a whole under CP17. Sports England state that capacity for football is needed under CP18, and

football is a healthy sports activity for young people on this school site. BOAT is a cultural asset; however, the impact of this development can be mitigated.

5. Neighbouring Ward Councillor Barton Ahmad addressed the committee and stated they were the chair of the Dyke Road Park association and had been a BHASVIC student. The councillor wanted all to enjoy sport; however, some green spaces have been lost forever. The green spaces have great community value, and this field is for all. The school is not offering Physical Education for all the moment, and this application could be seen as a commercial venture.
6. Neighbouring Ward Councillor Muten stated that many residents have contacted them regarding this application and the impact on BOAT, which is a very successful venue. Residents are concerned at the noise impact from the proposed pitches would undermine the performances. The loss of public space is not good; the proposals represent development creep. The benefits do not outweigh the adverse impacts.
7. Molly McLean addressed the committee as the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, stated that health and wellbeing was very important for young people. Local plan policy CP17 encourages development. This application is not for a change-of-use. The impact on BOAT is recognised, and the management plan proposes no whistles or other noise at performance times. The only conflict will be in summertime. The application is supported by planning officers.
8. William Baldwin of BHASVIC, stated the college wanted to be a good neighbour; however, they feel that the students are getting a poor deal with the lack of sports facilities. There is only a field at this time, which is not good for sports students. Currently the female football team travel to other pitches to train. The proposals are for the school and community use. The site has hosted a soccer camp each summer in that location for a decade and received no complaints. The noise management plan and reaching out to talk with BOAT will help. Both BOAT and BHASVIC are unique community assets.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

9. Councillor Fishleigh was informed by the agent that other materials were considered however, the alternatives like corn husk and cork are being tested and have been shown to degrade quickly, be less reliable and require a lot of maintenance, and are very expensive. Crumb is considered the best material, supported by Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and Sports England, subject to the containment measures secured by condition. It was noted that planning officers were aware of the concerns, however, the committee were requested to determine the application before them. There are proposed mitigating measures including solid boards at the edge of the pitch, grills, brushes and raised awareness. Graeme Hawkins considered it was too late to complain to BHASVIC if a performance were interrupted by noise.
10. Councillor Shanks was informed that the site outlined in the application was the area under BHASVIC ownership. The remainder of the field is owned by the council, who is not willing to sell any more land to the college. William Baldwin considered the asset needed to be regulated. The proposed pitch would be bookable and managed by the venue hire team. The college were not looking for a revenue stream. It was noted that the Bio-Diversity needs were based on an area of habitat and a scoring system, and

the site was designated modified grass land. The councillor was informed that any conditions needed to be reasonable and necessary, and a blanket ban was not considered reasonable.

11. Councillor Nann was informed by William Baldwin that they did not want a blanket ban or a hierarchical use of the field. The planning team leader stated that the committee could not ask BOAT to negotiate operating times by condition. Graeme Hawkins confirmed they wanted no use of the pitch during late spring and summer. It was noted by Graeme Hawkins that seven disruptions could put off theatre companies from booking BOAT. It was also noted that by condition the pitch would have community use and Sports England will only support if the proposals are for college and community use. It was noted that by condition a noise review was required within 12 months.
12. Councillor Cattell was informed that a condition requiring unilateral agreement condition would not be necessary, reasonable or enforceable.
13. Councillor Sheard was informed that the seven overlapping cases were in 2026 only. It was noted that BOAT could change performances. Graeme Hawkins stated they wanted the hours of use restricted to prevent noise and sound interference.
14. Councillor Robinson was informed that the potentially the existing use of the field could be for longer hours than proposed. Currently loss of daylight ends use, the proposed lights will continue into the evening. William Baldwin confirmed there was a direct complaints line to BHASVIC during college hours.
15. Councillor Theobald was informed that a relocation of the proposed all-weather pitch further away from BOAT would interfere with the existing pitches. It was noted to alter the hours, another planning application would be required, if this one were agreed. There have been three light assessments, and one by BOAT.
16. Councillor Pickett was informed that the 10m height of the lights was a balance between high enough to give coverage and low enough to be angled. The agent noted this was an indicative scheme, and the Lux and bulb colours would be agreed by condition. The light spill plan shows the light reduces quickly as it moves away from the pitch. The agent confirmed the tree area would not be affected. It was noted that the fencing would be similar to others in the city and the height of 4.5m was to prevent ball escape, and the lower fencing of 2m was for tennis etc. It was noted that the performances with microphones at BOAT were restricted by planning conditions. There was a maximum of 28 amplified performances per season. William Baldwin stated that BHASVIC had approached Cardinal Newman High School to book pitches, however Cardinal Newman stated they had no capacity to offer during school hours. It was noted that the Longhill School site would have long term assessments by condition. The summer soccer school only use the pitch area owned by BHASVIC.
17. Councillor Thomson was informed by the agent that the lights would be for evenings and winter months only. It was noted that condition 11 covered lighting details. The noise consultant stated that the noise from the pitch would be ball impact. William Baldwin stated that they felt BHASVIC's reputation needs protection and they were happy to talk to BOAT representatives, however they considered not using the pitch in summer would be unreasonable. There have been no complaints regarding the existing soccer summer school. It was noted that staff on site would guarantee a hard stop at the agreed times. Graeme Hawkins stated they were concerned about

continuous noise. The agent's noise consultant noted the noise climates have been measured, and the other pitches will continue to be used.

18. Councillor Winder was informed that it was up to the committee to balance Biodiversity gains/losses with the community benefits. It was noted that the County Ecologist had not raised no objections.

Debate

19. Councillor Robinson stated they were not able to support a condition regarding a blanket ban on use of the proposed pitch. They considered the officers have worked hard and agreed with the recommendation. The councillor supported the application.
20. Councillor Theobald stated they felt the concerts at BOAT were good, and they would prefer the pitch to be located further south. They noted there were no complaints and they were keen to support sport, as it was good for children. The councillor hoped BHASVIC would work with BOAT to gain good resolutions, as they were both valuable assets.
21. Councillor Nann stated they respected both BHASVIC and BOAT. The councillor supported the application and felt sure they would come to some agreement.
22. Councillor Pickett stated that they had some concerns, and they would prefer a more sustainable surface material.
23. Councillor Sheard considered the proposals were advantageous to the community and the conditions would result in minimum impact. The councillor supported the application.
24. Councillor Shanks stated they could not support the application as the proposed surface of rubber crumb was an issue. They considered the proposals were urban creep, when the public becomes private. The councillor wished to propose a blanket ban condition on use of the pitch; however, no committee Member seconded the motion.
25. Councillor Cattell stated they understood the conflict, and felt negotiations would be good. The councillor supported the application.
26. Councillor Winder considered the application to be difficult and complex; however, the conditions were good. The councillor supported the application.
27. Councillor Thomson considered that BOAT was much cherished and they did not want to see it damaged in anyway. The councillor asked that BHASVIC and BOAT get along and they supported the application.

Vote

28. A vote was held, and by 8 to 2, the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
29. **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 BH2025/00293 - Land Adjacent to Westfield Rise, Saltdean - Outline Application
Some Matter Reserved**

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

Speakers

2. Callie Lister addressed the committee as a resident and stated that they lived on Coombe Meadow. There has been a noticeable uplift in vehicles in Westfield Rise leading to Coombe Meadow, which limits access for emergency and refuse vehicles. Coombe Meadow is 4.8m wide, however, with parking this is reduced to 2.75m and 3.5m lower down the road. The road is full of vehicles at night, with pavement parking being usual. It often that deliveries are prohibited by the parking. Adoption of Coombe Meadow has been refused by the council. The access for the proposed houses could come from Coombe Farm. Residents want safe access route to the new houses.
3. Zac Denton addressed the committee as the agent acting on behalf of the applicant and stated that they wanted support for the nine much needed family homes, on this site allocated for development in the local plan. Access from Coombe Meadow is the only issue. The highway officers have not objected to the scheme. The layout is indicative and allows for consideration under reserved matters. There will be a S106 agreement.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Fishleigh was informed by the Principal Transport Development Officer that they had not visited the site and they had no objections. The planning manager confirmed that a lot of applications are determined on the information provided by the applicant. It was noted that the committee should consider the application before them not the 72-home development at Coombe Farm.
5. Councillor Robinson was informed that as a minor application there had been no general scoping provided. It was noted that in the report at 7.3, Transport raised no objection and considered in terms of access, a safe and accessible design was achievable.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed by the Principal Transport Development Officer that gradient from Coombe Farm development was too steep. The agent confirmed there was a 10m difference in levels.
7. Councillor Theobald was informed by the Principal Transport Development Officer that Coombe Meadow was already served by emergency services and highways have no objection to the application.
8. Councillor Pickett was informed that the committee should consider the access and the new homes in relation to the application before them. The access from Coombe Farm is considered too steep. It is not known what standards were used in the past to measure the gradient. There are no yellow lines on the private road (Coombe Meadow).

9. Councillor Thomson was informed that the access would be from the existing road. The Principal Transport Development Officer stated that the gradient from Westfield Rise and Coombe Meadow was achievable for emergency services. Pavement parking is an issue; however, it has not prevented the refuse truck from getting access to the homes. It was noted that a fire truck was 2.6m wide.
10. Councillor Shanks was informed by the Principal Transport Development Officer that an easement from the owner of Coombe Meadow would be required to gain access across the private road, and this has been agreed. The officer noted that a deferment would not allow for any more information to be provided as width of the road would remain the same, pavement parking was a known issue, and the introduction of yellow lines would not be reasonable.
11. Councillor Sheard was informed that condition 10 stated that: 'Notwithstanding the plans hereby permitted, no development shall commence until a scheme detailing the design of the proposed street and spaces has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority'.
12. Debate
13. Councillor Fishleigh considered that 71 of the 72 homes granted permission on Coombe Farm have been built. One home was removed to allow access to the nine new homes applied for here.
14. Councillor Shanks felt they did not feel happy to vote for the proposals as they had not enough information.
15. Councillor Theobald considered the meadow to nice and open, and there would be an impact on the South Downs National Park from light pollution etc. The information on access was not good enough and no fire engines would be able to get up there. The councillor was against the application. The planning manager noted the application was not in the South Downs National Park and there was a 5m buffer zone to the rear of the proposals.
16. Councillor Pickett noted that the Coombe Farm homes already exist and wanted the original access to be used, and they could not agree the application given the impact on the roads to the site. The councillor was against the application.
17. Councillor Sheard expressed concerns that the committee were considering the access road but not the route to it. The councillor supported the application as they saw no reason to refuse it. It was noted that a sweep analysis was not required as the access road was straight.
18. The planning team leader stated that condition 3 was for nine new homes, and this has not changed. The layout and landscaping were to be agreed.
19. Councillor Thomson noted the existing access road could not be decided by the committee, therefore as there was no reason to refuse the application, they would support it.

Vote

20. A vote was held and by 5 to 4, with 1 abstention, the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
21. **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 25 November 2026 the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of the report.

E BH2026/01171 - 6 Westbourne Place, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Team Leader introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Margaret Parkes addressed the committee as resident neighbour living at No.2 Westbourne Place and stated that the area was predominantly residential. The proposed outdoor seating will create a noise nuisance, impacting on neighbours. The commercial bins will be 2½ times bigger than the residential bins. The working hours of seven days a week is not acceptable. The extractor proposed is also not acceptable as it will be too close to the windows of flat 8a. Starting at 5am six days a week is not acceptable. The increase in traffic will have an impact on this narrow street. The scale and intensity will have an impact on the neighbouring homes. The committee were requested to refuse the application.
3. Henry Wagstaff addressed the committee as the agent and stated that the officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission for this independent coffee shop. The agent agreed that noise for neighbours would be unacceptable. The currently vacant building will be brought back into use.
4. Ellie Barber addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that Franks is more than just a coffee shop. Named after their granddad, the family all live nearby, in the strong community of Westbourne Place where there are street parties and friendships. The applicant wanted to be open, honest and clear. The space will be well designed, warm and welcoming.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Robinson was informed by the applicant that the extractor fan would be installed through the existing chimney and will be sound proofed. The premises will not be open from 5am every day, and baking starts at 6am. The agent confirmed that condition 6 required the extractor fan to be installed correctly. The planning team leader confirmed that a change of use was not required; however, the changes to the building do require planning permission. It was noted that odour can be considered a statutory nuisance as well as noise. Condition 6 requires the proper installation of the extractor and ventilation systems.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the 2023 planning permission for a three-bed dwelling was not implemented. The applicant confirmed they would not be roasting coffee beans on site.

7. Councillor Pickett was informed that the commercial bins would be the same size as residential bins, and the rear alleyway is a right to access for all the properties. The existing use of the building is commercial. It was noted that the use of the rear garden was conditioned between 10am and 5pm Monday to Friday and 10am to 4pm on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. The agent confirmed that the maximum number seated in the rear garden was five.
8. Councillor Fishleigh was informed by the resident that the rear gardens of no.2, 4 and 8a are used regularly. It was also noted that the no.2 is a flat, 4 a music repairs workshop and 6 was Pyromania, which has moved to 8. The applicant confirmed there were a few garages in the area.
9. Councillor Theobald was informed by the agent that the opening time of 7am was not unreasonable and supported the diverse community in the area. The rear garden has different hours, and the property as existing is class E, and could therefore be a coffee shop without planning permission. The applicant confirmed that the seating inside the coffee shop would be for 25 persons and the proposed extension was to provide an accessible toilet.
10. Councillor Thomson was informed that the workshop has moved from 6 to 8 Westbourne Place. The applicant stated that it would be unlikely that 25 people would be in the coffee shop from 7am. They will be living above the business so will not want to upset neighbours.
11. Councillor Sheard was informed that the garage opposite opens at 8am.
12. Councillor Thomson was informed that the officers have no objection to the business, the outdoor use or the extension of the property.

Debate

13. Councillor Cattell noted there were other businesses in the area, and a café would be acceptable adding vitality to the area. The conditions would safeguard the neighbouring residents. The councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Sheard stated they understood residents' concerns and empty buildings are an issue. The proposals were good and the councillor supported the application. The applicant was requested to be respectful of neighbours.
15. Councillor Fishleigh considered extractor fans can be an issue and maybe the reason this was not a café before. The councillor was against the application. The planning manager stated the extractor fan was mostly internal, and planning permission was not required for a coffee shop.
16. Councillor Pickett considered condition 6 to be good, the proposals in keeping and good that the applicant would be above the shop. The councillor supported the application.
17. Councillor Shanks noted the property already had planning permission. The neighbours should complain to environmental health if there are any issues.

18. Councillor Winder considered that lots of inner-city areas want small investments, and they need to be encouraged.
19. Councillor Robinson expressed concerns regarding the extractor fan and the opening hours; however, it was good that the applicant would be living upstairs. The councillor requested that the applicant talk to neighbours. The councillor supported the application.
20. Councillor Theobald stated they were sorry for the neighbour as extractor fans can be noisy. Five would be lots in the rear garden and this is the wrong place for a coffee shop. The planning manager confirmed the use class was E, which means a flexible space, the rear garden could have a commercial use and will fit only 5 persons.

Vote

21. A vote was held, and by 8 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.

54 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

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

55 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

- 55.1 None for this agenda.

56 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 56.1 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 7.34pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

