

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 20 September 2017 at 1.00 pm in The Executive Meeting Room, Third Floor, The Guildhall

These minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda and associated papers for the meeting.

Present

Councillors Jim Fleming (Chair)
Frank Jonas BEM (Vice-Chair)
Jennie Brent
Colin Galloway
Steve Hastings
Lee Hunt
Hugh Mason
Robert New
Steve Pitt
Tom Wood (Standing Deputy)

Also in attendance

Councillors Alicia Denny and Linda Symes

Welcome

The chair welcomed members of the public and members to the meeting.

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The chair, Councillor Fleming, explained to all present at the meeting the fire procedures including where to assemble and how to evacuate the building in case of a fire.

116. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David Fuller, Councillor Tom Wood was present as his standing deputy.

Councillors Robert New and Steve Hastings apologised as they would need to leave the meeting early. Councillor Lee Hunt apologised for arriving late to the meeting.

117. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

110-114 Palmerston Road

Councillors Robert New and Jim Fleming declared prejudicial interests as they know the owner of the premises. They would leave the room during the consideration of this application.

Councillor Steve Pitt declared a personal interest as he knows the owner of the premises but this was not prejudicial.

Public House, 119 Somers Road

Councillor Tom Wood informed the Committee that as he would make a deputation on this application, he would leave the room during the consideration of this item.

Former Dairy Site, Station Road

Councillor Pitt said he had received communication from the applicant regarding this item, but this would have no impact on his decision. Several other committee members said they had received the same letter from the applicant.

118. Minutes of Previous Meeting - 23 August 2017 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 23 August 2017 be approved as a correct record to be signed by the Chair.

119. Updates of previous applications by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development (AI 4)

There were no updates on previous planning applications.

The Assistant Director of Culture and City Development informed the committee that the consultation on the changes to the HMO SPD had started today and would last for 6 weeks, closing on 31 October. A report with the findings would then come back to the next PRED meeting. The committee were advised that they should only give minimal weight to the proposed changes in the document when considering the HMO applications on the agenda today.

120. Recent Inspector Decisions (AI 5)

The City Development Manger introduced the report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

121. 17/01014/PLAREG - 110 - 114 Palmerston Road Southsea PO5 3PT (AI 6)

Councillors Jim Fleming and Robert New had declared prejudicial interests so left the meeting during this item.

Councillor Frank Jonas chaired this item.

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that one further representation had been received, noting that the staff of the premises are not currently operating the windows in accordance with the proposed procedure and that this is

presenting a health and safety issue. It is noted that the windows are being opened by one member of staff only with no supervision from the duty manager.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Ms Susan Lloyd, objector, whose points included:

- She circulated some photos to the committee showing the open windows and gate which were taken a week after this application was discussed at the previous meeting.
- The new window-opening procedure is not being followed as it requires two members of staff and a duty manager to supervise. Whilst walking past the restaurant recently with her family, a member of staff was leaning out of the window to close it, narrowly missing hitting her husband as they were not concentrating what they were doing.
- The site is on a blind corner therefore dangerous for pedestrians walking past.

Mr Peter Cairns, objector, whose points included:

- He is registered blind and regularly walks along these narrow pavements outside the premises.
- The pavements are obstructed by cars parked on them.
- On previous occasions he had to ask the staff to close a large wooden gate which was swinging across the pavement in the wind.
- Despite the applications to have the windows open being refused, two and a half years later the owners continue to open them.
- Disregard to public safety.

Members' Questions

There were no questions.

Members' Comments

Members felt that the pavement on Palmerston Road is wide enough to allow for pedestrians to pass whilst the windows are open with a secure locking mechanism, however the pavement on Auckland Road West is too narrow for pedestrians to safely pass with outward opening windows. Members also noted the concerns raised in the deputations that the window opening procedures are not being adhered to with reports of people are hanging out of the windows to close them, causing a risk to passing pedestrians.

**RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:
(1) The outward opening windows over an adjoining highway would result in unacceptable risk of injury to pedestrians, specifically on Auckland Road West.**

(Councillors Fleming and New re-joined the meeting.)

122. 17/00224/OUT - Former Dairy Site Station Road Portsmouth PO6 1PL (AI 7)

(Councillor Hunt arrived during this item)

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that a consultation response from Southern Water has been received and a copy is provided (as an appendix). In summary it describes: a sewer crosses part of the site, with potential for diversion (at the developer's expense); initial results indicate SW cannot accommodate the needs of this proposal unless discharge of surface water flow is no greater than existing levels, if proven to be connected; and, request for drainage related planning conditions and an informative. The recommendation is unchanged but drainage related planning conditions will be updated and a SW water informative added.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Roger Lattimore, supporter speaking on behalf of the residents of the last 7 houses in Station Road, whose points included:

- The initial plan had the entrance to the site further north which would have been right opposite his house in Station Road. Following a public meeting for residents, the applicant amended the plans to move the entrance further south as residents had suggested. This will create less of an impact on residents and provide a clearer view for traffic exiting the site.
- Station Road is a quiet road with traffic calming measures. He does not feel there would be an issue with increased traffic. When the dairy was in use numerous heavy duty vehicles travelling down the road so this will not be any worse than that.
- Opportunity for improvement to the site which will improve the area for residents who take pride in living in Station Road.

Ms Amanda Olley, Agent, whose points included:

- The Environment Agency has confirmed that the development will remain free from flooding.
- Traffic modelling has been carried out which has been accepted by the highways officer.
- Following the pre application advice they held a public meeting where residents requested that the site access be reconsidered and following this a revised access location has been proposed.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Overall there will likely be an increase in traffic compared to when the dairy was in operation, however it will be a different range of traffic with more cars and less HGVs. There will be some impact on traffic particularly at the junction with Eastern Road with up to 11 additional vehicles up to 2022.

- Page 20 of the committee report discusses flood risk and there were serious concerns by the drainage team about surface water drainage. It was not clear why the site flooded in winter 2012/13 and a lot of work has taken place to ensure that this will not be repeated. The drainage strategy has since been updated and the drainage team are satisfied with the measures put in place by the applicant. Condition 14 states that no development shall take place until a detailed scheme for the proposed means of foul and sewerage disposal has been submitted.

Members' Comments

Members agreed that this was a sensible development with good access from Station Road and it was pleasing to hear that the applicant had listened to the concerns of residents and moved the entrance of the site. It was felt that the increase in traffic would not be any worse than the HGVs serving the dairy when this was in use. The Chair added that it was good to hear that residents supported the scheme.

RESOLVED

- (1) Delegated authority was granted to the Assistant Director Culture and City Development to grant conditional outline permission subject to the completion of an agreement pursuant to section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure planning obligations with principal terms as outlined in the report.**
- (2) Delegated authority was granted to the Assistant Director of Culture and City Development to add/amend conditions where necessary.**
- (3) Delegated authority was granted to the Assistant Director of Culture and City Development to refuse planning permission if the legal agreement has not been completed within three months of the date of the resolution.**

(Councillor New left at the end of this item)

123. 17/00265/FUL - 50 Hudson Road Southsea PO5 1HD (AI 10)

The planning officer introduced the report. Councillor Fleming added that there had been a request from highways to add in a condition about cycle parking which had not been included in the report. The Assistant Director of Culture and City Development said this would read 'that prior to the first occupation plans should be submitted to the LPA showing the provision of four secure waterproof cycle storage spaces'

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Ms Katherine Webber on behalf of Dr Martin Willoughby who was unable to attend due to work commitments (East St Thomas Residents) objecting whose points included:

- Surge of HMO applications over the last 12 months which the East St Thomas Residents have opposed.
- Over 70% of houses in Hudson Road are HMOs
- Multiple residents have said that the property previously had three brothers living there which would invalidate the application. The committee should therefore give greater weight to the residents who see the residents every day compared to the landlord who does not live in the area.

Mr James Oliver, applicant whose points included:

- The previous owner of the property signed a statutory declaration stating that the property has not been used for any other purpose other than C4 use.
- He has provided numerous tenancy agreements to the planning officer as evidence that the property is let to unrelated tenants.
- Turned rooms into en-suites to provide a high standard of accommodation.
- 6 similar applications have recently been refused and have always been successful when been appealed.
- The committee should follow the policy the council put in place in 2001.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- In situations such as these the council are establishing whether the use is established based on a balance of probabilities. That is not to say there is no other evidence to say three brothers were living in the property. The local planning authority can only make a decision based on the evidence before it. In this case based on the evidence available the offices have concluded that the property has been operating as C4 use. If there is evidence to the contrary this needs to be shared with the LPA however none has been received.
- The planning officer received an email from a resident saying they believed three brothers had been living in the property since 2012 but they could not provide specific dates or be 100% sure. It is a 6 bedroom house so even if three brothers occupied three rooms, the other three rooms may have been rented by unrelated individuals.
- A statutory declaration is not routinely asked for, it was on this occasion following the query raised at the June planning committee.
- The statutory declaration was signed by the previous owner covering a period since 1999 until Mr Oliver purchased the house.
- The committees' legal advisor explained the definition of balance of probabilities.
- As the property is already a C4 use the 10% measure of HMOs in the area is removed. There is no measure when changing from C4 use to Sui Generis. The current consultation on the HMO SPD is suggesting a change to this so that when over a 10% threshold applications for C4 to Sui Generis use are refused. The consultation has only just started so the committee can only give light weight to this as there is no guarantee

that this will be adopted. The committee should therefore make their decision today based on the current HMO SPD.

- The second lounge would become the 7th bedroom.

Members' Comments

Members were sympathetic to the concerns of residents in this ward with the amount of HMO applications that had been submitted recently and agreed with the statement in the deputation that the system is against residents as they are unable to appeal. There were mixed views from the committee; some members felt that as there was still some uncertainty as to whether this should be classed as a HMO the application should be refused. Other members felt that even if three brothers were resident it was likely that three other unrelated people occupied the other bedrooms therefore it should be classed as C4 use.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reason: There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate the use as a C4, accordingly the change of use to sui generis would result in an unbalance in the community.

124. 17/00793/PLAREG - Public House 119 Somers Road Southsea (AI 11)

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that five additional representation had been received in support for the following reasons:

- (a) The pub makes a valuable contribution to the streetscene;
- (b) The pub is disabled friendly and welcoming;
- (c) The completed changes are in keeping with other properties close by;
- (d) The pub provides a clean, safe environment for the local community;
- (e) The changes have kept the business viable; and
- (f) Loss of the pub would impact the local community as well as fire service and police personnel close by who frequent the pub.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Adrian Blackwood, supporter, whose points included:

- Commend the applicant as he had made improvements to the building to ensure sound is kept within the building and has made it look more appealing.
- Splendid and fit for purpose.
- The castellations are the dominant feature of the building and have not been altered.

Mr John Molloy, Applicant whose points included:

- Apologised for not applying for planning permission - he was not aware that the building was listed. It was made a listed building since he owned it but did not recall being notified.
- The alterations were to make the building structurally sound.

- The smaller windows that have been installed are to improve security and to limit the amount of noise to residents from the pub.

Councillor Tom Wood, ward councillor whose points included:

- Thanked the planning officer for his work on this application as he had been exceptionally helpful.
- He has done significant research into local listing and said that councils can choose whether to locally list a building.
- Does not mean that planning application should be refused.
- Mr Molloy did not realise the building was listed.
- The significant part of the building is its castellations, this should not stop improvements being made to the remainder of the building.

Councillor Tom Wood then left the room for the remainder of this item.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The building is locally listed, not statutory listed therefore do not require listed building consent. The building is unique however not enough to be added to the statutory list.
- The LPA would expect the owner to consult with them before making any changes.
- A report went to PRED in 2003 with a list of properties with unique qualities to add to the local list and following that a letter was sent to the owners notifying of the LPA decision.
- The French windows on the east elevation appear to have been there originally but were then closed over.

Members' Comments

Although the works have not been carried out in the correct manner, which the applicant admits, members did not think the works were of the detriment of the pub. Members were pleased that the applicant wants to improve the pub for the local community especially as many local pubs are closing. It was noted that the unique part of this building is its castellations which had not been altered and approving this application would not set a precedent for the removal of these. Members felt that the east elevation works had been completed with a degree of sensitivity and were more concerned with the north elevation, however on balance felt that the alterations of the pub to increase security did not create adverse harm to the local listing.

RESOLVED Conditional Permission granted for the following reason: The security of the pub that has driven the design of the alteration outweighs the harm to the character and appearance of the locally listed building and does not set a precedent for the removal of the castellations.

125. 17/01029/FUL - 17 Marmion Road Southsea PO5 2AT (AI 9)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Adam Peters (also on behalf of Carole Chantler and Georgia McCann) objector whose points included:

- Moved to Wilton Place 6 years ago and is very content with the mixed use of the area. Everything closes at 17:30 so noise is not an issue.
- Currently 4 cafes, 1 pub, 1 brasserie and 1 takeaway so plenty of options to cater for people doing shopping. If people want nightlife they have the option of Osborne Road and the south of Palmerston Road.
- No objection to mixed use of commercial areas.
- If approved will severely impact the quality of life for residents whose houses back directly onto the site as the restaurant will be open to 22:30.
- Would create additional traffic as the back will be used for deliveries, and increased noise causing a significant impact on residents.
- Staff on their breaks will congregate at the back if wanting to have a cigarette causing noise to residents.
- Would have no issue if the restaurant closed early evening.

Mr Graham Spencer, objector whose points included:

- Concerns over the increased noise and smell coming from the restaurant.
- Detrimental effect on life and no way the applicant can guarantee no additional noise.
- Cobbled Streets of Wilton Place act as an 'echo chamber' amplifying the level of noise.
- Marmion Road is an area with a particular character and has specialist shops.
- Back of building will inevitably be used for parking.

Mr Les Weymes, Agent whose points included:

- Ceiling requires investigation to determine what additional sound proofing is required to limit noise.
- Will retain the existing shopfront thereby preserving the street character.
- Simplify maintenance of fans.
- Seeks operational hours that accord with planning officers recommendation and trust that the committee accept that the hours are not late night use.

- The applicant would not object to adding a condition to restrict servicing at the rear to certain times of the day.

Councillor Linda Symes, ward councillor, whose points included:

- Notice on plans that the development is proposed to have an extremely small kitchen and very large bar which is a concern
- Osborne Road is typically a place where people go in the evening for meals/drinks and Marmion Road is much quieter once the shops close and is a quiet residential area.
- Want to continue to have a mix of shops in Marmion Road.
- This will create a huge impact on residential amenity.
- The application mentions that Waitrose car park can be used for parking however as people have been misusing the car park the top level has been closed off.
- Can put numerous conditions on but if there is no one there to police it these are unlikely to be adhered to.
- Huge impact on residential amenity.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Wilton Place is a cul-de-sac.
- The location of deliveries has not been provided only some proposed delivery times.
- The planning policy team monitor frontages of town centre and have a series of documents they refer to compare and obtain an updated figure. In this case if approved the retail frontage would be 77% of A1 to be retained. All frontages are included and all usages of frontages mapped.
- Frontage includes the whole of primary frontage in Southsea town centre.
- Officers overlay frontage length and the uses of building to come to their calculation.
- Everything that has been graded A3 use at any time has been included in this calculation.

Members' Comments

Members felt that if this application was approved it would cause disturbance to residents, particularly to the flat above. Members commented that due to the south westerly wind direction and the height of buildings this will create a vortex and smells will travel through to the properties in Wilton Place. Members commented that deliveries would be very difficult due to the narrowness of Wilton Place and would block the road. This was therefore not an acceptable use. It was also felt that Marmion Road is a specialist area unique to Portsmouth that therefore this would not be an appropriate use. Members also commented that generally a number of shop owners are being forced out due to rising business rates. There is concern that the property will remain empty and

the committee would need to ensure it is robust when any further applications for vacant shops that come to committee.

RESOLVED that the application be refused on grounds of:

Due to the close proximity to residential properties the proposed use would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to nearby residents' as a result unacceptable noise, disturbance, odours and smell and therefore be contrary to Policy PCS23.

126. 17/01272/FUL - 26 Jersey Road Portsmouth PO2 7PY (AI 12)

The planning officer introduced the report

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Ms Caryn Chamberlain, objector, whose points included:

- The previous application had 4 bedrooms when it previously was considered by the committee. When the application was re-submitted it still had the lounge proposed to change into bedroom 4 and the only change was the addition of a downstairs WC. The public sector housing team had identified that no lounge was identified and as a consequence did not meet the required standard.
- The application has since been amended so that the lounge is retained and there are only 3 bedrooms. Would there be any guarantee that the original 4th bedroom would not be reinstated?
- Only 1 bathroom with a separate WC under the stairs.
- Detrimental impact on adjoining residents.
- Although frequent bus links, nothing to stop residents each owning a car.
- Ideal houses for first time buyers and should be retained as a family home.
- This is a quiet residential road.
- Parking is already an issue in the evenings.

Ms Jackie Clark, objector, whose points included:

- Lives directly opposite the site in no. 21. Spent a lot of money doing up her home and if knew this was going to happen she would not have bought home. Will have an impact on property values.
- The developer does not live in the area.
- Very thin walls so noise will travel.
- If a family with young children occupied the property, there would be some noise but not late at night as children would be in bed.
- A lack of 3 bedroom family homes to rent in Portsmouth.
- No reason why this needs to be a HMO. This is a family orientated area. If a group of young people occupied the property they will have no respect to the working adults who live in the road.
- If issues with drinking/violence who do residents contact?

Mr Tom Vaughan, on behalf of the applicant, whose points included:

- High standard of accommodation provided and the property was previously uninhabitable. Extensive renovations have taken place.
- Changed proposed 4th bedroom to a communal room so now exceeds communal space requirements for a HMO. Also added a downstairs WC.
- There is a demand for shared housing in the city. No HMOs currently exist in Jersey Road.
- Will only be a maximum of 3 tenants who will be vetted through an estate agency. It will not be let to students - it is not in a student area.
- Would be perfect for staff working at QA with the bus links. Contact has been made contact with QA Hospital and there are a number of people wanting shared housing.
- High standard of accommodation so will attract professionals.
- Bin stores will be provided and has provided a waterproof bike store.
- Loss of property value is not a material consideration.
- He is personally responsible for any issues in the property. People will be on call if there are maintenance issues and will be resolved within 24 hours

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The property only has a licence for 3 people.
- The 4th bedroom was removed as this would reduce the amount of communal space under the required level of the Public Sector Housing Team.
- Officers advised that they could not answer building regulation query about whether the regulations had changed so that there now needs to be two doors between a communal area and WC but would investigate and inform the committee.
- The original 4th bedroom could not revert back to a bedroom as the restriction would come from the Private Sector Housing Team.

Members' Comments

Members noted that the applicant had addressed the previous concerns of the lack of communal space and it was clear that the property has been refurbished to a high standard. Members commented that they were pleased the application was now for a 3 bedroom HMO rather than the previous 4 bedroom proposal that was submitted.

Members were sympathetic to the concerns of the residents and some mentioned that they live/have lived in the vicinity of HMOs so are aware of the potential issues, however agreed that the committee must adhere to law and its planning policies. It was felt that the applicant had renovated the property to a high standard and this would attract young professionals. There is no reason to refuse it and if they did it was likely it would be granted permission if it is appealed.

The Chair added that the council can do more for residents if there are issues with it operating as a HMO compared to a private let. Members requested that the Assistant Director of Culture and City Development confirm via email the building regulations and the required number of doors between a communal area and WC.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report

(Councillor Steve Hastings left the meeting at this point)

127. 17/01189/FUL - 43 Edmund Road Southsea PO4 0HZ (AI 13)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr J Kennedy, objector whose points included:

- Lived in Edmund Road for over 50 years.
- Opposite no. 43 is a disabled bay with a huge van that parks there. Directly opposite there is normally a huge white van parked there so cars often have to inch through the gap that is left.
- There are 31 houses on the eastern end of Edmund Road, at least 10 of these are HMOs.
- The area was previously occupied by naval officer, and other professionals but slowly seen the area go downhill once the university was created.

Mr Steven Barlow, applicant, whose points included:

- A resident of Portsmouth for 40 years and as a student lived in a HMO.
- He is a hands on landlord and endeavours to resolve any issues/complaints quickly.
- Has been a landlord for 15 years and never had any complaints against him or any of his tenants.
- He has introduced himself to many of the neighbours but hasn't yet met Mr Kennedy.
- The current lawful use is C4.
- This is a huge property with 2-3 car parking spaces at the front. He only ever lets to students and currently only 1 resident has a car.
- Two letters of support have been received from the neighbouring attached property saying the property is well managed and it would not create any additional noise.
- Sustainable location, close to the university with two cycle stores.
- Complies with relevant council policies.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Bedrooms 3 and 4 on the existing plan would both be subdivided to create the additional two bedrooms, creating 6 bedrooms in total.
- Bedrooms 3 and 4 would be smaller than the minimum requirements if the amendments to the HMO SPD are approved.
- There is no bathroom on the first floor just a WC. There are 3 WCs in total.
- Based on the information in the proposed new SPD bedrooms 7 and 8 could be let as double rooms however there may not be enough communal space for additional occupants.
- The Private Sector Housing team have based their response on room sizes and advised they are suitable for a single individual occupancy.

Members' Comments

One member felt that this application should be deferred until a decision on the amendments to the HMO SPD had been made. It was noted that under the new HMO SPD two of the bedrooms would be under the minimum size standards. Other members commented that the committee has to consider the applications with the position as it stands today and this application is reasonable. There was concern that there is no bathroom on the first floor and also that in the future 10 people could be living in the property which would be an over intensification.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report

128. 17/01192/HOU - 22 Exeter Road Southsea PO4 9PZ (AI 14)

(Councillor Steve Pitt was not present for this item)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Trapnell, objector, whose points included:

- Lack of accuracy by the applicant in their measurements.
- No mention in the officers report of the 90cm gap to his property
- States on the council's website that a resident's right to light should be taken into account. The proposal will block out light from his kitchen diner where they spend a lot of their time.
- Overbearing effect on adjacent properties.
- No properties to the west have two storey extensions.
- Invited his neighbour in so he could see the how much light they have in their kitchen/diner with the single storey extension and they commented that a second storey would impact further on their loss of light and they would rethink their plans.

- Will have a major effect on their amenities.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Officers are not suggesting that because the single storey extension was permitted that a second storey would not have much more of an impact on the neighbouring property.
- Members need to consider the relationship of the window between the two properties and the amount of light that will be reduced if a second storey is permitted.
- The 45 degree angle is a rule of thumb guidance and not law.

Members' Comments

Members commented that if the neighbouring property only had one window in their kitchen/diner they would be very concerned and object to the application, however as there are two windows (one obscured glazed) felt that the neighbouring property would still have sufficient light.

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the City Development Managers report.

129. 17/01214/HOU - 56 Stubbington Avenue Portsmouth PO2 0JA (AI 15)

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that a representation in support had been received from Councillor Young commenting: " I have sat in front of the planning committee several times to make deputations on planning applications for HMOs in this part of the city and one of residents biggest concerns is the impact on parking that these developments will have on the city. Here we have an application which is to create off road parking and the planning department decides to reject it. This application, I believe will have minimal street impact and will improve safety for the applicant"

The harm raised by the Highways Authority and identified in the reason for refusal relates solely to the impact on highway safety.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Councillor Alicia Denny, ward councillor whose points included:

- Not many pedestrians using Stubbington Avenue apart from school drop off and pick up times, therefore this would not impact on pedestrians.
- If this is a statutory road why are there not double yellow lines down both sides of Stubbington Avenue?
- This proposal would remove one parked car from the road.
- The applicant only wants to park a small car on the forecourt, although not sure how there would be control over the size of the car that parks in the space if the applicant were to move.

Councillor Robert New who was not able to stay until this part of the meeting had also submitted a written representation which was read out to the committee as follows:

"I'd like to convey my support along with ward colleagues for the application before you today, in particular regarding the dropped curb to allow vehicle access to the property.

I'd like to support the resident in that I think it's sensible to create off road parking where possible and given the nature of this section of Stubbington Avenue, I think the wider street impact will be minimal and improve vehicle security at the very least for the applicant."

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- The parked car would overhang footway by 0.5m.
- The councils SPD guidance that states length should be 5m for a parking space. In this case it is 4.1m.
- The redundant bus stop is definitely being removed. Once it is removed the road could have spaces for cars to park on both sides of the road creating more parking spaces.

Members' Comments

Members felt that it would be very difficult for the applicant to navigate her car into the proposed forecourt space as once the bus stop is removed there will be cars parked either side of the entrance. Some members stated that once dropped kerbs are introduced it stops cars several parking on that section of the road even though one car will be removed onto the forecourt. It was also noted that if the wall was removed and a white line painted on the road to stop people parking over the entrance, this was not enforceable. The Chair added that paving over front gardens to create parking spaces also has an impact on surface water drainage so is not a sensible solution.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons: The proposed dropped kerb and access to the site would result in a vehicle having to make multiple shunting movements over the footway and within the carriageway (in the event of vehicles travelling from the direction from which they arrived) which would result in a hazard and inconvenience to the users of the highway to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies PCS17 of the Portsmouth Plan and saved policy DC26 of the Portsmouth City Local Plan 2001-2011.

130. 17/01329/FUL - 5 Edmund Road Southsea PO4 0LL (AI 19)

The planning officer introduced the report and reported from the SMAT list that an email has been received from the applicant confirming that the use of the property as an 8 bedroom HMO has been approved by the Housing Team. The applicant has also provided a statutory declaration stating that the property has not been used for any other purpose than C4 use since 1 September 2011 to the present day. The officer also reported that the size of the kitchen/dining/living space within the building has been confirmed as 28.41m² (rather than 26.68m² in the committee report).

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Mr Abhai Pandya, applicant, whose points included:

- The proposed room sizes are very generous.
- There are three showers and WCs.
- Neighbours have his phone number to report any issues with the tenants. He has only had one issue to date which was to tidy the garden and this was resolved within one hour.
- He has completely refurbished the property to a high standard.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- There is no WC on the second floor, tenants would need to use the facilities on the floor below.
- The three WCs also have showers. The plans were slightly out of date in that he has now added a shower to the downstairs WC as well.

Members' Comments

As with the previous similar applications, one member proposed that this application be deferred until the outcome of the SPD consultation is known as this may be approved but in the future the room sizes might be unacceptable. Members felt it was important to get a good standard of accommodation for residents and were not confident that the proposed changes were in the interest of residents. They were also not convinced that there is demand for extra rooms in the city and this was an issue across the city. The Chair added that the committee needed to be consistent with its decisions today.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report.

131. 17/00920/FUL - 59 Liss Road Southsea PO4 8AS (AI 8)

The planning officer introduced the report. There were no deputations.

Members' Questions

Officers advised that there were 12 HMOs in the area and in the context of PCS 20 this would account for 50%.

Members' Comments

As with the previous HMO applications, one member proposed that the application be deferred until the outcome of the SPD is known.

RESOLVED that this application be deferred until the revised SPD is adopted.

132. 17/01215/FUL - 1 Edmund Road Southsea PO4 0LL (AI 16)

The planning officer introduced the report.

There were no deputations.

Members' Questions

There were no questions.

Members' Comments

As with the previous HMO applications, one member proposed that the application be deferred until the outcome of the SPD is known. Members commented that this was the third HMO application for Edmund Road on this agenda in an area where the level of HMOs is already over 10% and in light of this it should be deferred.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred until the revised SPD is adopted.

133. 17/01240/FUL - 63 Jessie Road Southsea PO4 0EJ (AI 17)

The planning officer introduced the report.

There were no deputations.

Members' Questions

In response to a query on room sizes the planning officers confirmed these were:

Bedroom 7 - 10.34m²
Bathroom (first floor) - 4.42m²
Bedroom 6 - 8.36m²
Bedroom 3 - 9.68m²
Bedroom 4 - 8.06m²
Bedroom 5 - 9.06m²
Bedroom 1 - 12.95m²
Bathroom (second floor) - 3.46m²
Bedroom 2 - 7.82m²

The officers did not have the benefit of a head height drawing so could not comment on whether there is enough liveable space in bedroom 1 which

goes into the roofspace.

Members' Comments

One of the issues raised by the Public Sector Housing Team is that communal areas are under the required size. As this application removes one of the communal areas dropping it under so less than the required standard which is a concern, particularly as it would be possible to meet the required room standards.

RESOLVED that the application be refused on the grounds of the change of use would result in an inadequate standard of living accommodation lacking adequate amenity space.

134. 17/01243/FUL - 61A Osborne Road Southsea PO5 3LS (AI 18)

This item was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 6.25 pm.

.....
Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Jim Fleming