

PLANNING COMMITTEE 24.04.2024

SUPPLEMENTARY MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE REPORT BY THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR - PLANNING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

<u>ITEM NO</u>	<u>REF NO</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
1	24/00069/FUL	4 SANDRINGHAM ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO1 5DN	No additional comments	No change to recommendation
2	23/01138/FUL	61 ST CHADS AVENUE PORTSMOUTH PO2 0SD	For completeness Southern Water's full response is attached within Appendix A.	No change to recommendation
3	23/01106/FUL	51 SHADWELL ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO2 9EH	<p>Committee site visit notes attached within Appendix B</p> <p>Comments by Henry Thorpe on behalf of the Oriel Road Resident Association:</p> <p>Can I question the development having visited it you should now appreciate that it is an overdevelopment of the site. As you are aware I have campaigned against "Super HMO" for a number of years and this one is within a couple of metre of my property over looking my garden. I have had no notification because I am in the neighbouring road and it isn't even displayed. You need to control the size of these properties even</p>	No change to recommendation

			<p>given the limitation that is given to you because of permitted development.</p> <p>The report states the following: "3.3 The Applicant has stated that works to extend the property will be undertaken under permitted development (without the need to apply for planning permission). These works include a rear dormer and rooflights to the front roofslope; these works are not included in the application. They should not be considered as part of the application."</p> <p>I would counter this argument by saying that this part of the report probably isn't true. And I would also ask if I were a committee member what this means. Are you approving the plans as submitted? or are the plans not approved even if past by the committee because of this statement. Why is it not accessed by the planning officers as part of the application?</p> <p>The rear part of the building is I would guess a post war extension. (drop in the roof ridge height for the rear projection, different construction (it is rendered), dissimilar to the neighbouring property (property on one side doesn't have it) etc.) if this is the case the permitted development rights for the property have been used up a exceed. You are then in your rights as a committee to reject the loft conversion into the rear projection and the ground floor further extension. The building upto the recent building incomplete building work certainly been in place for 10 years so would get retrospective planning approval. But it would also invalidate the claims made in the application and give you the ability to control it further expansion.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	24/00005/FUL	22 HEWETT ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO2 0QP	No additional comments	No change to recommendation
5	24/00014/FUL	129 GLADYS AVENUE PORTSMOUTH PO2 9BD	No additional comments	No change to recommendation
6	24/00074/FUL	49 ORIEL ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO2 9EG	<p>Comments by Henry Thorpe on behalf of the Oriel Road Resident Association:</p> <p>This is an overdevelopment of a property having seen the property you can barely open the patio doors without hitting the back wall.</p> <p>I have tried to concentrate on planning issues but I would ask that Darren talks to the Hilsea councillor present about how this property may have got licencing. It certainly should fail the licencing requirement based on the properties illegal usage and management.</p>	No change to recommendation
7	24/00103/FUL	31 MARGATE ROAD SOUTHSEA PO5 1EY	<p>Comments by Henry Thorpe:</p> <p>This is one of the few houses in this road not neighboured by other HMO. Please reject this application based on the unbalanced community. I suggest you agree the principle for the rejection and give the chairman the ability to write a more detailed response with supporting information.</p>	No change to recommendation

<p>8</p>	<p>24/00083/FUL</p>	<p>27 VICTORIA ROAD NORTH SOUTHSEA PO5 1PL</p>	<p>The Floorplans within the Committee Report are incorrect, in respect of the Proposed Second Floor, the room labelled 'Study' within the committee report is in fact Bathroom 2 within the Schedule of Room Sizes and the second floor bathroom shown in the committee report is actually to be an ensuite for bedroom 8. Correct Plans below:</p> <div data-bbox="1099 496 1727 1190"><p>The image contains two architectural floor plans. The top plan is labeled 'Second Floor Plan' and shows a layout with three bedrooms, two bathrooms, a storage area, and a veranda. The bottom plan is labeled 'First Floor Plan' and shows a layout with three bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a central hallway. Dimensions are provided for various rooms.</p><table border="1"><caption>Dimensions from Second Floor Plan</caption><thead><tr><th>Room</th><th>Dimensions (m)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Veranda</td><td>3.02</td></tr><tr><td>Bathroom 4</td><td>2.4</td></tr><tr><td>Storage</td><td>1.5</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (top right)</td><td>1.59, 3.55</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (middle right)</td><td>3.72</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (bottom left)</td><td>4.3</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (middle left)</td><td>4.8</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (middle right)</td><td>4.03</td></tr></tbody></table><table border="1"><caption>Dimensions from First Floor Plan</caption><thead><tr><th>Room</th><th>Dimensions (m)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Bathroom 2</td><td>2.38, 2.9</td></tr><tr><td>Bathroom 1</td><td>1.55</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (top right)</td><td>3.5, 3.72</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (middle right)</td><td>4.23</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (bottom left)</td><td>4.23</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (bottom left)</td><td>5.9</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom (middle right)</td><td>4.44</td></tr></tbody></table></div>	Room	Dimensions (m)	Veranda	3.02	Bathroom 4	2.4	Storage	1.5	Bedroom (top right)	1.59, 3.55	Bedroom (middle right)	3.72	Bedroom (bottom left)	4.3	Bedroom (middle left)	4.8	Bedroom (middle right)	4.03	Room	Dimensions (m)	Bathroom 2	2.38, 2.9	Bathroom 1	1.55	Bedroom (top right)	3.5, 3.72	Bedroom (middle right)	4.23	Bedroom (bottom left)	4.23	Bedroom (bottom left)	5.9	Bedroom (middle right)	4.44	<p>No change to recommendation</p>
Room	Dimensions (m)																																					
Veranda	3.02																																					
Bathroom 4	2.4																																					
Storage	1.5																																					
Bedroom (top right)	1.59, 3.55																																					
Bedroom (middle right)	3.72																																					
Bedroom (bottom left)	4.3																																					
Bedroom (middle left)	4.8																																					
Bedroom (middle right)	4.03																																					
Room	Dimensions (m)																																					
Bathroom 2	2.38, 2.9																																					
Bathroom 1	1.55																																					
Bedroom (top right)	3.5, 3.72																																					
Bedroom (middle right)	4.23																																					
Bedroom (bottom left)	4.23																																					
Bedroom (bottom left)	5.9																																					
Bedroom (middle right)	4.44																																					



Matthew.Garrad@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Date

29th February 2024

Contact

Tel 0330 303 0368

Dear Mr Garrad

**The Environmental Information Regulations 2004
Request for Information
EIR reference 2436**

Thank you for your request for information which we received on 1st February 2024. We have dealt with your request under The Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR 2004). This letter provides the response to your request, as follows:

23/01138/FUL: - 61 St Chads Avenue, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO2 0SD.

Further to the below, thanks for your comments. I was hoping I could get some further comments/information from yourselves around sewage flooding incidents, and the property. A similar application at the site was previous refused due as:

It is not considered that there is adequate capacity available for drainage resulting from the proposed occupation of the site, nor details to provide confidence to the Council that additional capacity will be provided prior to occupation, resulting in an unacceptable reduction to the level of foul water disposal service and local surface water flood risk contrary to Policy PCS12 (flood risk) of the Portsmouth Plan 2012.

Can I get any further comments on the above, happy to have a chat around the scheme if that would be helpful.

We can confirm that Southern Water does hold information of the type you have requested as follows:

Southern Water has undertaken a desktop study to determine if there is sufficient capacity in the existing public sewer network to cater for additional foul sewerage flows from the proposed development. The desktop study indicates that we can facilitate foul sewerage run off disposal to service this proposed development.

The development shows this to be a change of use from a single dwelling to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and it already has an existing connection into the public sewer network. The increase in the flow due to the change of use is very minor, that is 0.04 l/s (litres/seconds).

Our records also indicate that there have been no flooding incidents recorded with 100m of the proposed site.

We have, however, listed below all the records of flooding we hold for the last 10 years, from the property to 200m downstream.

Date	Postcode	Sewer
11/1/2019	PO2 0S*	Public -Former S24
29/12/2017	PO2 0S*	Public -Former S24
18/12/2017	PO2 0S*	Public -Former S24

Please note, we have provided shortened postcodes due to Data Protection considerations as per Regulation 12(3) and 13 of the Environmental Information Regulations.

Under the Regulations Southern Water does not have to provide you with a copy of this information if one of the exceptions in the Regulations applies. In this case Southern Water considers that Regulation 12(3) & 13 "the information requested includes personal data of which the applicant is not the data subject" applies, so will not be providing you with the full postcode data.

We are entitled to make a reasonable charge for information provided under the Regulations. Details of our charging scheme can be found on our website: <https://www.southernwater.co.uk/water-for-life/protecting-the-environment/environmental-information>. In this case we have decided to waive our charge.

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review. Internal review requests should be submitted within forty working days of the date of receipt of this response and should be addressed to Head of Legal, Southern Water Services Ltd, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 3NX or you can email EIR.Internal.Review@southernwater.co.uk.

If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of the internal review, you can apply, without charge, to the Information Commissioner, who will consider whether Southern Water has complied with its obligations under the Regulations, and can require Southern Water to remedy any problems. You can find out more about how to do this, and about the Regulations in general, on the Information Commissioner's website at: www.ico.org.uk. Complaints to the Information Commissioner can be made via the "report a concern" section of the Information Commissioner's website.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

EIR Officer

Appendix B

Committee site visit notes 51 Shadwell Road 18/04/2024 9.00am

Attendance (All committee members were invited)

Cllr Chris Atwell (Chair)

Cllr Judith Smyth

Cllr Mary Vallely

Cllr Vernon-Jackson

Sam Kushner (Planning officer)

Jake Seaborn (On behalf of applicant and agent)

Councillors were provided with printed copies of the floor plans and elevations and were briefed on the reason for the site visit (unclear plans submitted). Councillors were shown the rear garden of the property to view the rear of the property including the ground floor extension. Councillors then viewed the interior, including the ground and first floors. The site visit concluded at approximately 9.20am. The planning officer measured the rear extension and confirmed it was 3m in length and therefore within permitted development allowances.

This page is intentionally left blank