
NOTICE OF MEETING

PLANNING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 23 APRIL 2014 AT 2.00 PM

THE EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM - THIRD FLOOR, THE GUILDHALL

Telephone enquiries to Lisa Gallacher 02392 834056

Email: lisa.gallacher@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Planning Committee Members:

Councillors David Fuller (Chair), Les Stevens (Vice-Chair), Darron Phillips, Jacqui Hancock, Margaret Foster, Sandra Stockdale, Ken Ellcome, Frank Jonas, John Ferrett and Lee Mason

Standing Deputies

Councillors Donna Jones, April Windebank, Luke Stubbs, Rob Wood, Ken Ferrett, Leo Madden, Gerald Vernon-Jackson, Hugh Mason, Neill Young and Lee Hunt

(NB This Agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting.)

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: www.portsmouth.gov.uk

Representations by members of the public may be made on any item where a decision is going to be taken. The request needs to be made in writing to the relevant officer by 12 noon of the working day before the meeting, and must include the purpose of the representation (eg. for or against the recommendations). Email requests are accepted. Contact: Julie Watson 023 9283 4826 or planning.reps@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

AGENDA

- 1 Declaration of Members' Interests
- 2 Apologies
- 3 Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee - 26 March 2014

The minutes of the previous meeting are to follow.

- 4 Updates Provided by the City Development Manager on previous planning applications.**
- 5 Planning appeal decision relating to 107 Havant Road, Drayton (Pages 1 - 2)**

Purpose

To advise the Committee of the outcome of the appeal, which was allowed.

Recommended that members note the report.

Planning applications

- 6 Planning appeal decision relating to 93 Havant Road, Drayton (Pages 3 - 4)**

Purpose

To advise the Committee of the outcome of the appeal, which was allowed.

Recommended that members note the report.

- 7 156,158 and land to rear of 154-172 Southampton Road Portsmouth (Pages 5 - 8)**

Purpose

To amend Minute 147 of the meeting of this Committee on 4th December 2013 in relation to the uplift in the provision of affordable accommodation as part of the proposed development.

RECOMMENDED

That point 1 of the resolution to grant outline permission is amended as follows;-

Delegated authority be granted to the City Development Manager to complete a Section 106 Agreement that secures:

- 1) The provision of three units of Affordable accommodation [plot nos, 24, 25 and 26] ready for occupation by no later than the completion of fifteen open market dwellings.**
- 2) The review of the viability assessment at 18 months from the date of the outline permission if no fewer than 10 houses have reached shell and core stage**
- 3) In the event of further appraisal being required and demonstrating that there is an improvement in viability, in that some increase in Residual Land Value above that set out in the appraisal of the original provision of affordable accommodation proposed in the planning application is shown**

to have occurred in the period between the original appraisal and the development period to the shell and core stage, then a financial contribution to the provision of affordable housing reflecting the value of such an improvement shall be required

4) The payment of a project management fee of £1000.

5) A Skills and Employment Training Plan.

8 14/00136/FUL - 22 Inglis Road Southsea PO5 1PB (Pages 9 - 24)

Construction of 2 semi-detached dwelling houses after demolition of existing building.

9 14/00177/HOU - 44A Craneswater Park Southsea Hampshire PO4 0NU

Construction of dormer windows to front and rear roofslopes and single storey extension to front/side elevation to garage (amended scheme of 13/01510/HOU).

10 14/00108/HOU - 14 And 32 Park House Clarence Parade Southsea PO5 3RJ

Alterations to roof to include increased ridge and mansard style dormer extension to western roof slope.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Agenda item:

Decision maker: Planning Committee

Subject: Planning appeal decision relating to 107 Havant Road, Drayton

Report by: Claire Upton-Brown, City Development Manager

Ward affected: Drayton & Farlington

Key decision (over £250k):

1. Purpose of report

To advise the Committee of the outcome of the appeal, which was allowed.

2. Recommendations

That the report is noted.

3. Background

A planning application was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 6th November 2013. The application, for the construction of a part 3-/part 4-storey building comprising 27 sheltered apartments, communal facilities and car parking with access from Carmarthen Avenue, was recommended by Officers for conditional permission. This recommendation was not accepted by the Committee who resolved to refuse the application. The reasons for refusal relating to the bulk of the proposal being out of character with the area and that the development made inadequate provision for the parking of cars.

The appeal was heard by way of an Informal Hearing on 18 March 2014.

The Inspector took the view that "the appeal site is large and the plot is considerably bigger than others in the vicinity" and saw "no reason why another substantial structure would be intrinsically harmful" and concluded that "that the bulk of the proposed building could be satisfactorily accommodated on the site without harm to the general character and appearance of the Havant Road area".

The Inspector gave weight to the evidence provided by the Appellant in respect of the likely demand for parking and noted that "there is a very convenient and frequent bus service linking to the local centres, and to Portsmouth city centre, which passes the appeal site and has bus stops in the near vicinity". The

Inspector also took the view that any 'demand for overflow parking "could easily be accommodated at these and other nearby locations without impeding traffic flow or causing parking stress to other residents or the roads". On the issue of parking the Inspector concluded with "the view that the current proposal makes adequate provision for on site car parking needs, and that on this basis there is no harmful contradiction of the requirements of policy PCS17 of the Portsmouth Plan".

The appeal was allowed subject to conditions.

4. Reasons for recommendations

For information to the Planning Committee

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

None.

6. Legal services' comments

The report is for information only.

7. Head of finance's comments

The report is for information only.

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Planning application file 13/00386/FUL	Planning Services
Inspector's decision notice APP/Z1775/A/132210966	Planning Services

Agenda Item 6



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Agenda item:

Decision maker: Planning Committee

Subject: Planning appeal decision relating to 93 Havant Road, Drayton

Report by: Claire Upton-Brown, City Development Manager

Ward affected: Drayton & Farlington

Key decision (over £250k):

1. Purpose of report

To advise the Committee of the outcome of the appeal, which was allowed.

2. Recommendations

That the report is noted.

3. Background

A planning application was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 6th November 2013. The application, for the construction of a part single/part 2-/part 3-storey building comprising 51 sheltered apartments, managers flat, communal facilities and car parking, was recommended by Officers for conditional permission. This recommendation was not accepted by the Committee who resolved to refuse the application. The reasons for refusal relating to the scale and design of the proposal being out of character with the area and that the development made inadequate provision for the parking of cars.

The appeal was heard by way of an Informal Hearing on 19th March 2014.

The Inspector took the view that the site was capable of accommodating a large building and concluded that "the proposed building would have a significant, but acceptable, effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and as such is consistent with the requirements of policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework".

The Inspector "accepted the Appellant's evidence with regard to the level of on site car parking likely to be generated by the development proposed" and "noted the good public transport connection available at the site and examined the possibility of any occasional overflow parking being accommodated on local

roads". The Inspector concluded "that on site car parking arrangements are satisfactory and that given the specific nature of the proposal, there is no harmful contradiction of the requirements of policy PCS17 of The Portsmouth Plan".

The appeal was allowed subject to conditions.

An associated application for a partial award of cost against the Council on the grounds of failure to provide evidence to support the parking reason for refusal was refused.

4. Reasons for recommendations

For information to the Planning Committee

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

None.

6. Legal services' comments

The report is for information only.

7. Head of finance's comments

The report is for information only.

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Planning application file 13/00544/FUL	Planning Services
Inspector's decision notice APP/Z1775/A/132209450	Planning Services

Agenda Item 7



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Agenda item:

Decision maker: Planning Committee

Subject: 156,158 and land to rear of 154-172 Southampton Road
Portsmouth

Report by: Claire Upton-Brown, City Development Manager

Ward affected: Paulsgrove

Key decision (over £250k):

1. Purpose of report

To amend Minute 147 of the meeting of this Committee on 4th December 2013 in relation to the uplift in the provision of affordable accommodation as part of the proposed development.

2. Recommendations

That point 1 of the resolution to grant outline permission is amended as follows:-

Delegated authority be granted to the City Development Manager to complete a Section 106 Agreement that secures:

- 1) The provision of three units of Affordable accommodation [plot nos, 24, 25 and 26] ready for occupation by no later than the completion of fifteen open market dwellings.
- 2) The review of the viability assessment at 18 months from the date of the outline permission if no fewer than 10 houses have reached shell and core stage
- 3) In the event of further appraisal being required and demonstrating that there is an improvement in viability, in that some increase in Residual Land Value above that set out in the appraisal of the original provision of affordable accommodation proposed in the planning application is shown to have occurred in the period between the original appraisal and the development period to the shell and core stage, then a financial contribution to the provision of affordable housing reflecting the value of such an improvement shall be required
- 4) The payment of a project management fee of £1000.
- 5) A Skills and Employment Training Plan.

3. Background

A planning application was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting in December 2013. The application, for the construction of 32 no. 2- and 2½-storey houses and single-storey car ports; access road from Southampton Road (after demolition of No. 158 Southampton Road) with associated car parking and landscaping works (principles of access, layout and scale to be considered) was recommended by Officers for conditional outline permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement.

In resolving to grant conditional outline permission this Committee had regard to a viability appraisal that had been independently assessed, and the Committee accepted the provision of three affordable dwellings as part of the proposed development, although that was lower than the number of affordable dwellings that would be compliant with policy.

Where a developer proposes a lower provision than that normally required by policy PCS19, the associated legal agreement normally would make provision for the submission of a further viability appraisal should the development, or part of it, permitted by the outline permission not reach "shell and core" stage by a specified time. This is to incentivise the developer to proceed with the development rather than bank the permission (including a reduced affordable housing commitment) until the market has improved the development viability. Should that further viability appraisal demonstrate an uplift in residual land value and increased profitability, the agreement should be framed in such a way as to require an uplift in the provision of affordable housing by way of a financial contribution, to "recapture" from the improved viability the contribution to provision of affordable housing which has otherwise been foregone.

4. Reasons for recommendations

In this case the resolution of the Committee on 4th December 2013 required "a commensurate uplift in the provision of affordable accommodation in the event that the viability has improved in the intervening period."

It is highly likely that the developer would sell individual plots off-plan and this wording would lead to practical difficulties in securing additional dwellings on-site for affordable housing in the event that shell and core is not reached on at least ten of the houses within the specified time frame, so that a reappraisal was necessary at that stage. It is therefore considered necessary to amend the wording of that part of the resolution in relation to any uplift in the provision of affordable housing, so that the additional contribution (if any) to provision of affordable housing would be by a financial sum equivalent to the improved residual land value.

Having identified a potential difficulty in securing additional on-site affordable housing, and in the interests of maintaining a consistent approach to this issue, it is proposed to amend Minute 147 of the Planning Committee to enable any required uplift in the provision of affordable housing that can be demonstrated through the submission of a viability assessment to be secured by way of a financial contribution.

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

None.

6. Legal Services Comment

The terms of the agreement have to reflect properly the terms of the Committee's resolution giving authority to grant permission subject to particular requirements. In the event that it becomes necessary to enforce the terms of an agreement, the support of the court could not be assured unless the terms of the agreement were sufficiently clear and precise.

Where provision of affordable housing is considered, it would be unlikely that a financial uplift in viability could be reflected precisely in a specific number of affordable homes, or that such homes could, at that stage, be included in on-site provision. It would be more reasonable, at that stage, to require a financial contribution specifically equivalent to the uplift in the residual land value: such a specific sum could be evidenced as properly required in the event that the court was relied on to enforce the agreement provisions through an injunction.

[In assessing viability, the developer's profit is a constant, and the improved viability would be reflected in an improvement to the residual land value]

7. Head of finance's comments

The report is for information only.

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Planning application file 13/00371/OUT	Planning Services
Minute 147 of the Planning Committee of 4 th December 2013	Democratic Services

Agenda Item 8

PLANNING COMMITTEE 23 APRIL 2014

**2 PM EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM,
3RD FLOOR, GUILDHALL**

REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

ADVERTISING AND THE CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

All applications have been included in the Weekly List of Applications, which is sent to City Councillors, Local Libraries, Citizen Advice Bureaux, Residents Associations, etc, and is available on request. All applications are subject to the City Councils neighbour notification and Deputation Schemes.

Applications, which need to be advertised under various statutory provisions, have also been advertised in the Public Notices Section of The News and site notices have been displayed. Each application has been considered against the provision of the Development Plan and due regard has been paid to their implications of crime and disorder. The individual report/schedule item highlights those matters that are considered relevant to the determination of the application

REPORTING OF CONSULTATIONS

The observations of Consultees (including Amenity Bodies) will be included in the City Development Manager's report if they have been received when the report is prepared. However, unless there are special circumstances their comments will only be reported VERBALLY if objections are raised to the proposals under consideration

APPLICATION DATES

The two dates shown at the top of each report schedule item are the applications registration date- 'RD' and the last date for determination (8 week date - 'LDD')

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The Human Rights Act 1998 requires that the Local Planning Authority to act consistently within the European Convention on Human Rights. Of particular relevant to the planning decisions are *Article 1 of the first protocol- The right of the Enjoyment of Property*, *Article 6- Right to a fair hearing* and *Article 8- The Right for Respect for Home, Privacy and Family Life*. Whilst these rights are not unlimited, any interference with them must be sanctioned by law and go no further than necessary. In taking planning decisions, private interests must be weighed against the wider public interest and against any competing private interests Planning Officers have taken these considerations into account when making their recommendations and Members must equally have regard to Human Rights issues in determining planning applications and deciding whether to take enforcement action.

Web: <http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk>

INDEX

Item No	Application No	Address	Page
01	14/00136/FUL	22 Inglis Road Southsea PO5 1PB	PAGE 3
02	14/00177/HOU	44A Craneswater Park Southsea Hampshire PO4 0NU	PAGE 8
03	14/00108/HOU	14 And 32 Park House Clarence Parade Southsea PO5 3RJ	PAGE 13

22 INGLIS ROAD SOUTHSEA PO5 1PB**CONSTRUCTION OF 2 SEMI-DETACHED DWELLING HOUSES AFTER DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING****Application Submitted By:**

Town Planning Expert
FAO Keith Oliver

On behalf of:

Charles Marks Ltd
FAO Mr S Cowling

RDD: 12th February 2014**LDD:** 24th April 2014**SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES**

The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are whether the proposed redevelopment is acceptable in principle; whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, whether it would relate appropriately to neighbouring properties and whether it would have any impact on the safety or convenience of users of the surrounding highway network.

The Site

The application site relates to the curtilage of number 22 Inglis Road which contains a now vacant Gospel Hall. The site is located on the northern side of Inglis Road almost opposite its junction with Oxford Road. The site lies within the Campbell Road Conservation Area.

The Proposal

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the redevelopment of the site by the construction of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. The proposed dwellings would be of a traditional design and appearance and be sited to align with the adjoining dwelling to the east.

There is no relevant planning history.

POLICY CONTEXT

The relevant policies within the Portsmouth Plan would include: PCS15 (Sustainable design and construction), PCS16 (Infrastructure and community benefit), PCS17 (Transport), PCS19 (Housing mix, size and affordable homes), PCS21 (Housing Density), PCS23 (Design and Conservation)

The NPPF and the Residential Car Parking Standards, Sustainable Design & Construction, Housing Standard and Solent Special Protection Areas SPDs are all relevant to the proposed development.

The following extracts from the Guidelines for Conservation relating to the Campbell Road Conservation Area are also of relevance to this application.

The Conservation Area guidelines describe the northern side of Inglis road as consisting of "a two-storey brick terrace and gable facing semi-detached houses" of which "a few have pointed

arched doorways, which are echoed in the gospel hall in the centre of the block". The Guidelines note that "there are no architecturally significant buildings and few trees, a stark contrast to parallel Campbell Road". The guidelines recognise that "there has been a significant loss of buildings due to redevelopment" with, in particular Outram Road and Victoria Road North having suffered from unsympathetic redevelopment. The guidelines suggest that the "loss of further buildings in the north-west part of this Conservation Area in particular would seriously erode its character and would be undesirable" on the basis that it "is advantageous to learn from past mistakes and ensure future redevelopment enhances the character of the Conservation Area". The guidelines in respect of redevelopments state that the redevelopment of older properties will be opposed "unless it can be demonstrated that the redevelopment would positively enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area" and "if the property to be altered is deemed inappropriate or detracting from the conservation area, then redevelopment may be possible".

CONSULTATIONS

Contaminated Land Team

Recommends conditions

Environmental Health

Notes no complaints have been received from operation of adjacent commercial garage. Raises no objection to proposal in terms of impact of neighbouring commercial use to proposed dwellings

Highways Engineer

The site is located in an area of medium accessibility to public transport and lies within easy reach of high frequency bus corridor and Fratton rail station. The site lies 300m to the north of designated Albert Road Local Centre with a wide range of services and amenities. No off-street parking is provided, however there is unrestricted on-street parking outside the site. Parking congestion in this area is severe, due to the terraced housing (many converted to HMOs, student accommodation etc.) and little or no off-road parking. Inglis Road borders the new "MC Zone" residents' parking scheme and is the nearest unrestricted road. Inglis Road forms part of an area referred to as "North Kings", which is due to be surveyed in relation to residents' parking in April 2014.

Regard must be given to the former demand for parking associated with the use of the current building as a chapel where the vehicle generation would be significantly greater than that from two dwelling houses. The site is located close to local services and amenities and having regard to its location, and demand for parking associated with the use of the current building as a chapel it is considered that a car free development would accord with the aims and objectives of the Residential Parking Standards SPD.

No objection subject to provision of cycle storage facilities

REPRESENTATIONS

Objections have been received from the occupiers of 11 neighbouring properties, the Portsmouth Society and from Ward Councillor Eddis on the following grounds: a) exacerbation of existing parking issues; b) loss of light; c) proposal is of unsympathetic design; d) loss of an important building which should be retained and re-used; and e) impact of building works.

COMMENT

The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

whether the proposed redevelopment is acceptable in principle;
whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
whether it would relate appropriately to neighbouring properties; and

whether it would have any impact on the safety or convenience of users of the surrounding highway network.

Other issues to consider are whether the proposal complies with policy requirements in respect of sustainable construction, space standards and SPA mitigation.

Principle of Development

The existing building on the site appears to date from the inter-war period and is currently vacant, having become surplus to requirements by the Trustees of The Gospel Hall and been sold to the applicant. The building itself is of a pleasant appearance but is considered to be architecturally undistinguished (as recognised in the Conservation Area Guidelines) and of little historic significance. The Conservation Area guidelines make provision for the redevelopment of sites in certain circumstances. Having regard to the form and age of the existing building it is considered that its loss would not give to any substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that its replacement with an appropriate form of redevelopment would have the potential to enhance the site and the Conservation Area.

The site is located in a predominantly residential area characterised by two-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings with the existing hall and neighbouring garage being very much at odds with the character and urban grain of the locality. Accordingly the principle of building two houses on the site is considered acceptable.

Impact on Conservation Area

As discussed in foregoing section, the loss of the existing building is considered acceptable in the context of its impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed dwellings would be of a traditional design and appearance and have taken their inspiration from the short terrace of dwellings to the west of the site beyond the adjacent garage and include a projecting bay window to the ground floor and stone detailing to the windows. During the life of the application amended drawings have been sought and received to introduce gable ends to the roof. In design and heritage terms the proposed dwellings are considered to be appropriate such that they would complement and harmonise with the contextual streetscene and as such would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Impact on Amenity

The existing building covers almost all of the site with effectively just a walkway running around it at the sides and at the rear. The main element of the building is approaching two-storey in scale with the rear part comprising single storey extensions. The proposed redevelopment would result in the removal of built development at the rear of the site where it abuts residential gardens to allow for the provision of back gardens for the proposed dwellings. During the lifetime of the application amended drawings have been sought and received reducing the scale of the rear projection of the dwellings to increase the separation from neighbouring properties. This has resulted in gardens of 11 metres in depth which compares favourably with the depths of back gardens in the area which are typically between 9 and 12 metres in depth. It is considered that the scale and siting of the proposed dwellings, when compared to that of the existing building, is such that it would not have any significant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

The proposed dwellings would be sited adjacent to a small commercial garage, however colleagues in Public Protection advise they have no records of any complaints being received about the operation of this use. Having regard to the relatively modest size of the adjacent commercial property it is considered that the proposal would not be likely to have any significant effect on the amenities of future occupiers.

Parking

The application site benefits from an unrestricted lawful use for purposes within Class D1. This use class includes places of worship, education facilities and day nurseries. These uses would

inherently have a level of traffic generation and demand for parking associated with them which must be recognised as a fall back position. The site does not benefit from off-street parking and whilst there may be scope for some to be provided the formation of vehicular crossovers would result in the loss of existing on-street parking. Furthermore the provision of off-street parking either on drives or in garages would be untypical of the Conservation and arguably would detract from its character and appearance. Having regard to the level of demand for parking which could be associated with the lawful use of the site, the level of parking likely to be associated with the occupation of two houses and the likely impacts of providing off-street parking, it is considered that a car free development is acceptable in this instance.

Other matters

The proposed dwellings would exceed the minimum space standards associated with policy PCS19 and are laid out in a manner that provides an appropriate form of accommodation for occupiers. The submitted drawings indicate the provision for facilities for the storage of cycle storage in the gardens of the dwellings. It is considered that such provision is acceptable and can be secured through the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition.

The application includes no information about how the proposal meets the requirements of policy PCS15 in respect of Sustainable Design and Construction. It is considered that conditions could be imposed to ensure that the development is built to the required standard.

The proposal would lead to a net increase in population, which in all likelihood would lead to a significant effect, as described in section 61 of the Habitats Regulations, on the Portsmouth Harbour and the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Areas (the SPAs). This has been acknowledged by the applicant who has indicated that they will complete a unilateral undertaking to provide the necessary mitigation. The Solent Special Protection Areas SPD sets out how the significant effect which this scheme would otherwise cause, could be overcome. Based on the methodology in the SPD, an appropriate scale of mitigation could be calculated as $(2 \times £172) = £344$. The applicant has indicated that they are willing to provide SPA mitigation in this way. Consequently it is considered that, subject to securing appropriate mitigation in accordance with the SPD, there would not be a significant effect on the SPAs.

RECOMMENDATION: Condition Permission subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement pursuant to S106 of the TCPA to secure an appropriate contribution towards mitigation measures in connection with the Solent Special Protection Areas SPD

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.
- 2) Unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings - Drawing numbers: 001 Rev.E; 002 Rev.B; and 003 Rev.B.
- 3) No works pursuant to this permission shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:-
 - (a) a desk top study documenting all the previous and existing land uses of the site and adjacent land in accordance with national guidance as set out in Contaminated Land Research Report Nos. 2 and 3 and BS10175:2011;and, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority,
 - (b) a site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as being appropriate by the desk study in accordance with BS10175:2011- Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice;and, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority,

(c) a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring. Such scheme shall include nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works.

4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied/brought into use until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority verification by the competent person approved under the provisions of condition 3(c) that any remediation scheme required and approved under the provisions of condition 3(c) has been implemented fully in accordance with the approved details (unless varied with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority in advance of implementation). Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority such verification shall comprise;

(a) as built drawings of the implemented scheme;

(b) photographs of the remediation works in progress;

(c) Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free of contamination.

Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the scheme approved under condition 3(c).

5) Development shall not commence until written documentary evidence has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority proving that the development will achieve a minimum of level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, including nine credits from issue Ene 1, one credit in issue Hea 3 and two credits from issue Ene 8, which evidence shall be in the form of a Code for Sustainable Homes design stage assessment, prepared by a licensed assessor and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

6) Neither of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until written documentary evidence shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority proving that the development has achieved a minimum of level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, including 9 credits from issue Ene 1, one credit from issue Hea 3 and two credits from issue Ene 8, which will be in the form of a post-construction assessment which has been prepared by a licensed Code for Sustainable Homes assessor and the certificate which has been issued by a Code Service Provider, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

7) No development shall commence until details, including samples where appropriate, of the types and finish of all external materials (to include walls, roofs, windows, doors, rainwater goods and other architectural detailing and front boundary wall and railings) to be used has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

8) Neither of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until the new wall and railings shown on the approved drawings to the front of the site adjacent to Inglis Road has been constructed, completed and thereafter retained.

9) a) Development shall not commence until details (including height, appearance and materials) of the boundary treatment between the application site and number 40 Campbell Road have been submitted to and approved in writing.

b) The western dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the boundary treatment approved pursuant to part a) of the condition has been provided.

The reasons for the conditions are:

1) To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission granted.

3) In order to ensure that the site is free from prescribed contaminants in accordance with saved policy DC21 of the Portsmouth City Local Plan 2001-2011.

- 4) In order to ensure that the site is free from prescribed contaminants in accordance with saved policy DC21 of the Portsmouth City Local Plan 2001-2011.
- 5) To ensure the development has minimised its overall demand for resources and to demonstrate compliance with policy PCS15 of the Portsmouth Plan and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
- 6) To ensure the development has minimised its overall demand for resources and to demonstrate compliance with policy PCS15 of the Portsmouth Plan and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
- 7) To ensure the development is finished in appropriate materials that will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.
- 8) To ensure a satisfactory setting for the development in the interests of enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.
- 9) To protect the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and future occupiers of the development in accordance with policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

PRO-ACTIVITY STATEMENT

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework the City Council has worked positively and pro-actively with the applicant through the application process, and with the submission of amendments an acceptable proposal has been achieved.

02

14/00177/HOU

WARD: EASTNEY & CRANESWATER

44A CRANESWATER PARK SOUTHSEA HAMPSHIRE PO4 0NU

CONSTRUCTION OF DORMER WINDOWS TO FRONT AND REAR ROOFSLOPES AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT/SIDE ELEVATION TO GARAGE (AMENDED SCHEME OF 13/01510/HOU)

Application Submitted By:

Ken Ross RIBA & Associates
FAO Mr Kenneth Ross

On behalf of:

Tillisent Ltd
FAO Mr Naushik Hooda

RDD: 24th February 2014

LDD: 22nd April 2014

This application has been referred to the Committee by Councillors Terry Hall and Luke Stubbs.

SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES

The main issues are whether the proposed dormer windows to the rear roof slope would, in their amended form, overcome the reasons for refusal on the previous application, whether the proposed roof alterations and extension would relate appropriately to the recipient building, and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, and whether those alterations would affect the living conditions of adjoining and nearby residents.

Site and surroundings

This application relates to a two-storey detached house situated on the west side of Craneswater Park north of its junction with St Helens Parade. The house is set within a comparatively modest plot that backs onto the landscaped communal area within Craneswater Mews. The latter comprises a pair of staggered terraces of two- and three-storey houses with steeply pitched roofs leading off an access from Craneswater Avenue.

The property falls within the Craneswater and Eastern Parade Conservation Area. The conservation area extends from Whitwell Road in the west to where Eastern Parade meets St Georges Road to the east and, reflecting differing periods of development, comprises areas with distinct characteristics. The central part, bounded by Craneswater Avenue to the west and Festing Road to the east is characterised by both modern and older styles of development. Much of the east side of Craneswater Park was redeveloped in the 1960/70s with six-storey blocks of flats with open frontages. The west side of the road has a mixture of inter-war houses and post-war blocks of flats. Craneswater Mews and the four detached houses onto Craneswater Park, which replaced a pair of large pre-war houses represented a modern intervention with steeply pitched roofs over facebrick elevations articulated with bay windows. The layout of the Craneswater Mews development provided a private triangular shaped communal area opening out from the Craneswater Avenue frontage giving views of the rear of the houses fronting Craneswater Park.

Proposal

The applicant seeks permission for the construction of three dormer windows to the rear roof slope, each obscure glazed with an openable fanlight 1.7m above floor level. Each dormer window would be 2.2m wide and 1.05m to the eaves of a hipped roof with an overall height of 2.5m. To the front roof slope the applicant proposes to construct a pair of dormer windows of similar dimensions, and at ground floor the construction of a side/front extension to enlarge the integral garage.

Relevant planning history

This development dates from 1978 when permission was granted for the redevelopment of the area of land between Charminster and No.40 Craneswater Park to provide two terraces of four houses and four detached houses. The applicant previously proposed more significant alterations to the rear roof slope in 2013 although subsequently withdrew the application. An application for the construction of three dormer windows to the rear roof slope [clear-glazed], two dormer windows to the front roof slope and a ground floor side/front extension to the garage was considered by this Committee on 29 January 2014. Notwithstanding a recommendation to grant conditional permission the Committee resolved to refuse permission on the grounds that the rear dormers would have an unacceptable relationship resulting in overlooking and a loss of privacy to the properties in Craneswater Mews and would therefore be contrary to policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

POLICY CONTEXT

In addition to the National Planning Policy Framework the relevant policy within the Portsmouth Plan would include PCS23 (Design and Conservation) which seeks to achieve high quality design and ensure that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining and nearby residential properties.

The document 'Eastern Parade and Craneswater Southsea CA 29 - Guidelines for Conservation' notes that dormer windows are a feature of some properties in this area for example on the southern side of Whitwell Road which displays both original dormers and modern additions. In more recent times there has been a tendency to create larger dormer windows although fortunately they are few in number in this area. These can have an adverse

effect on the appearance of a group of properties and large dormers that dominate the roofscape and are out of proportion with the scale of the property will be discouraged.

The City Councils Design Advice Note in relation to roof alterations, first published in 1994, advocates dormer windows of a size that would relate appropriately to the roofscape.

CONSULTATIONS

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

At the time of preparing this report five representations had been received from the occupiers of the adjoining and nearby houses objecting to the proposed dormer windows to the rear roof slope. In summary the grounds of objection are that;

(a) whilst it is a marginal improvement on the previous application many of the reasons for objection remain.

(b) the dormer windows are out of character with the area, out-of-keeping and out-of-scale with the surrounding properties,

(c) the changes to the roofscape will be overbearing and dominating,

(d) the dormer windows will maintain a perception of overlooking to the central garden area, even if the windows are frosted.

(e) The use of frosted windows is, in itself, not an acceptable approach in the conservation area, as they would be visible from public area and would provide a constant reminder of an ill thought out and inappropriate design.

(f) The bedrooms are extremely large and there is no doubt that sufficient space could be provided to create the bathrooms without the dormers being necessary.

(g) This lip service amendment of obscure glass v clear glass does not address the huge scale of the extension, residents feel vulnerable by the imposing scale and risk that the owners will simply change the obscure glass to clear once they have moved in.

(h) The windows to the rear of property will not only overlook the front gardens of the 8 properties comprising Craneswater Mews significantly impacting upon the privacy of those residents but will also intrude upon the internal privacy of at least one of these properties i.e. No 53. The use of opaque glass does little to mitigate this.

(i) If this application is granted what has been a uniform development existing for some 34 years is in danger of becoming a hotch potch of designs as there will be little to stop neighbours from submitting similar but different applications.

Objections have also been submitted by Councillors Terry Hall and Luke Stubbs on the grounds that the proposed development;

(a) although with the minor marginal improvement of obscure glazing it remains totally out-of-keeping and out of scale with other similar properties,

(b) will result in a change to the roofscape, and

(c) will be overbearing and dominating leading to overlooking, loss of privacy and would thereby negatively impact the quality of life of neighbours

(d) overdevelopment

(e) velux windows should be used.

COMMENT

The key issues are;-

1) whether the impact on residential amenity has been addressed and overcome the reason for refusal.

2) whether the proposals would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Impact on amenity

Having considered the previous application on its individual merits this Committee concluded that the installation of three dormer windows to the rear roof slope would have an unacceptable relationship resulting in overlooking and a loss of privacy and therefore harmful to the living conditions of the adjoining and nearby occupiers.

Ordinarily a householder would be able to construct dormer windows to the rear roof slope of a single dwellinghouse. However, in recognition that such development could have the potential to adversely affect the appearance of a conservation area a restriction was imposed under the General Permitted Development Order removing that type of alteration. Craneswater Mews to the rear comprises two staggered terraces some 27m apart adjacent to the Craneswater Park houses reducing to 8.5m adjacent to the Craneswater Avenue frontage. Those three-storey properties have habitable room windows that face each other across the Mews. The submitted drawings show that the three dormer windows to the rear roof slope would serve bathrooms, two being en-suite. Each dormer window would be obscure glazed with a central openable fanlight at a minimum 1.7m above internal floor level. The applicant has confirmed that the level of obscuration based on Pilkington gradation would be a pattern to level 4 or 5 with level 5 offering the greatest obscuration. Those windows would face west across Craneswater Mews and their relationship to the windows in the adjoining and nearby houses fronting the Mews would be similar to the relationship of the existing first floor windows that also serve bedrooms and a bathroom. The physical relationship between the houses fronting Craneswater Park and those facing the Mews is such that mutual overlooking already exists. It is considered that the proposed dormer windows, each being obscure glazed and serving a bathroom, would not significantly affect that situation. A suitably worded planning condition could be imposed requiring the obscure glazing to be to a minimum of level 4 and that only the fanlight is openable to ensure that any perceived loss of privacy is minimised. With such a restriction it is considered that the proposed dormer windows would not have such an adverse impact in terms of overlooking to justify withholding permission.

The proposed dormers to the front roof slope would face the front of the six-storey block of flats on the opposite side of Craneswater Park across a distance of approximately 38m. The proposed relationship would be no different than existing first floor bedroom windows. It is, therefore, considered that the living conditions of the occupiers of the properties on the opposite side of Craneswater Park would not be adversely affected.

The ground floor extension to the garage and extension to the lean-to roof to the front elevation would, in terms of its physical relationship have no effect on outlook or sense of enclosure in relation to the adjoining property to the south. It is therefore considered that this element of the proposals would be acceptable.

Impact on the conservation area

Whilst this and the adjoining property are of identical design the detached houses to the north and south are of a different appearance and contribute to an overall variation in the street scene with a combination of architectural styles and building sizes. The property to the south has a row of three half-inset dormer windows to the front roof slope. The middle two houses in that row have a staggered frontage and a break in both the roof line and roof plane.

Both of the proposed dormer windows to the front roof slope are considered to be comparatively modest in scale and relate appropriately to the existing building. One would align with the existing projecting bay, and the other would be off-set from the centre of the recessed section of roof slope. When viewed from Craneswater Park it is considered that, in the context of the street scene, the proposed dormer windows would, by virtue of their size and position within the roof, represent visually acceptable features in the street scene. Having regard to the significant variation in architectural styles and articulation to those buildings it is considered that the proposed front dormers would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed alterations to the ground floor would involve the extension of the lean-to roof above the existing porch across the front of the existing garage with a return to the side elevation above a side extension 1.2m in width by 5.5m in length. The adjoining house has a side extension with a similar lean-to roof and a lean-to roof to a porch and garage. It is considered that the proposed alterations to enlarge the garage and provide a wrap-around lean-to roof would, in forming a subservient feature, relate satisfactorily to the existing building and in terms of its contribution to the street scene would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed dormers to the rear roof slope would be set approximately 1.8m up the roof slope from the eaves and, with separation distances of 1.3m and 1.1m, would appear as clear insertions into the roof slope. The northernmost dormer window would be situated above the existing two-storey bay while the southernmost dormer would be aligned over a first floor window. The ridge line of the central dormer window would be aligned with the junction between the upper and lower ridge lines of the existing roof. The roof to the dormer windows would be set 0.6m below the lower ridge line.

By virtue of the layout of Craneswater Mews the rear of this property is visible from the public realm in addition to the occupiers of the adjoining and nearby houses. In terms of the roofscape of Craneswater Mews, of which the four houses fronting Craneswater Park is integral, there have been no dormer additions. That would not, however, preclude such alterations in principle. Their specific exclusion from the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order by virtue of the location in a conservation area brings them within planning control.

In the context of the rear elevation of the house the proposed dormers would be considered to represent visually acceptable features and would be of proportions that would sit comfortably within the roof slope and relate appropriately to the existing first floor windows. Although alterations to the roofscape adjacent to Craneswater Mews have been limited to rooflights, in a wider context the proposed dormers would nevertheless be considered to represent a form of development that meets the objectives of policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan and the design guidelines for the conservation area. Overall, it is considered that the proposed dormers are of sufficient design quality to preserve the appearance of the conservation area.

Other matters raised by local residents

Other than a concern in relation to the future use of the property the matters raised by local residents have been addressed as part of the main issues. This application relates to the construction of dormer windows which would facilitate the provision of two en-suite and a family bathroom to a home. Any conjecture in relation to the future use of the property would not be a material consideration. Although local residents have maintained their objections to the visual impact of the dormer windows, the reason for refusal on the previous application identified overlooking and loss of privacy as the harm arising from that proposal.

It is considered that with an appropriate level of obscuration and limited openings this revised proposal would overcome the reason for refusal and be capable of support.

RECOMMENDATION Conditional Permission

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.
- 2) Unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: Hooda/Craneswater Southsea/2014/01.
- 3) The dormer windows to the west facing roof slope shall be glazed with obscured glass of a pattern and gradation that meets a minimum of level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass Range, or

such other textured glass range offering the same degree of obscuration as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall thereafter be permanently maintained in that condition.

4) With the exception of the fanlight, which shall not be openable below 1.7m from finished internal floor level, the dormer windows to the west facing roof slope shall be non-opening and permanently maintained in that condition.

The reasons for the conditions are:

- 1) To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2) To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission granted.
- 3) In the interests of protecting the privacy of the adjoining occupiers and to prevent overlooking in accordance with policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.
- 4) In the interests of protecting the privacy of the adjoining occupiers and to prevent overlooking in accordance with policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

PRO-ACTIVITY STATEMENT

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework the City Council has worked positively and pro-actively with the applicant through the application process, and with the submission of amendments an acceptable proposal has been achieved.

03

14/00108/HOU

WARD:ST JUDE

14 AND 32 PARK HOUSE CLARENCE PARADE SOUTHSEA PO5 3RJ

ALTERATIONS TO ROOF TO INCLUDE INCREASED RIDGE AND MANSARD STYLE DORMER EXTENSION TO WESTERN ROOF SLOPE

Application Submitted By:

Town Planning Expert
FAO Mr Jonathan McDermott

On behalf of:

Mr J West

RDD: 3rd February 2014

LDD: 30th April 2014

This application has been called to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Luke Stubbs (Eastney & Craneswater Ward).

SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES

The key issues in this application are whether the proposal would be of an acceptable design in relation to the recipient building and the wider street scene, whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area, and whether it would have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

The site and surroundings

This application relates to a large three-storey building, with additional accommodation within the roof space, located to the northern side of Clarence Parade. The building has been subdivided into a number of flats with this particular application relating to two small apartments located at roof level occupying the southern half of the roof. Unfortunately the building has been subjected to a number of unsympathetic alterations and additions in the past with the dormer extensions that serve the application properties being the most prominent of these changes. The site is located within the 'Owens Southsea' Conservation Area and due to the curve in the road and set back of adjoining buildings, Park House occupies a particularly prominent location on Clarence Parade. The surrounding area comprises a mix of two-four storey properties, a large retirement block of flats and the Queen's Hotel, all of which form the backdrop to a large expanse of open space forming Southsea Common. The building is located within the indicative flood plain (Flood Zones 2 & 3).

The proposal

Permission is sought for alterations to the roof to include increased ridge and mansard style dormer extension to the western roof slope.

Relevant planning history

A previous application for external alterations to No.32 only was refused in April 2013 (ref. 13/00044/HOU). The reason for refusal was as follows: 'In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed dormers would, by reason of their design, bulk and alignment, represent an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development that would fail to relate in an appropriate manner to the recipient building and the wider street scene. Furthermore the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and to policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan'.

A subsequent appeal against this decision was dismissed in September 2013 (ref.APP/Z1775/A/13/2198594, a copy of which is attached as an appendix to this report). The inspector opined that: "There are a number of existing dormers within the roof slope which fail to align with the windows below. The parties are in agreement that the existing dormers are less than sympathetic with regard to their design and relationship to the host building. However the existing dormers are small in scale and this helps to reduce their prominence. Although the modern design of the two proposed dormers may be, as noted by a third party, attractive in themselves, the proposal to construct two large dormers, following the removal of six existing smaller dormers, would significantly increase the prominence of the dormers as a result of their increased bulk. Consequently the dormers would appear incongruous within the roof space and the wider street scene. Furthermore the proposed dormers, as a result of their size, would have a poor relationship with the existing smaller dormers that would be retained within the roof slope.... The development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area. Although the harm to the Conservation Area would be 'less than substantial' I do not consider that the limited public benefits, associated with the proposal, outweigh the harm that would be caused".

POLICY CONTEXT

In addition to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, the relevant policies within the Portsmouth Plan would include: PCS12 (Flood Risk) and PCS23 (Design and Conservation). Regard is also made to the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area Guidelines.

CONSULTATIONS

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

Eight letters of support have been received from local residents and Eastney & Craneswater Ward Member Councillor Luke Stubbs on the grounds of: (a) The proposal would enhance the appearance of the property and make a positive contribution to the street scene; (b) The proposal would not affect the character and appearance of the conservation area; and (c) The proposal would result in improved internal living conditions.

COMMENT

The determining issues in the application are:

1. Design, including impact on the character and appearance of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area, and
2. Impact on residential Amenity

Design including impact on the conservation area

The applicant proposes a number of alterations to the roof of Park House increasing its height with the installation of a pitched cap and the construction of a mansard style dormer extension to the western roof slope replacing the existing dormer extensions. A number of windows and folding patio doors to serve flats Nos. 14 & 32 would project slightly beyond the mansard. These alterations would apply to approximately two thirds of the roof with the northern section remaining unchanged.

Park House is a large three storey building which is particularly prominent when viewed from the west on Clarence Parade and Southsea Common. A number of dormer extensions have been installed to the western roof slope to serve two apartments. Whilst these existing dormers are considered to be less than sympathetic in terms of their design and seemingly random alignment with the windows below, their prominence is reduced by their scale and individual nature which reduces their cumulative bulk.

In an attempt to address the concerns of both the Local Planning Authority and the Planning Inspector, this proposal now incorporates two units of accommodation at roof level rather than one, allowing for a comprehensive redesign of all of the existing dormer windows (10 in total) on the western elevation. It is noted however, that the internal layout of the two flats dictates where the replacement dormers can be positioned preventing direct alignment with the windows below.

Whilst the proposed position of the individual dormer projections is considered to represent a slight improvement on the existing layout, they would be set against a new mansard style extension that would stretch across the width of the two units. With the use of lead flashing against the slate mansard elevation, it is considered that this would represent a significant increase in bulk at roof level which would be particularly prominent when viewed from the west.

In addition, the section of roof slope to the northern part of the building would remain unchanged from its original form. As a result there would be an obvious junction between the original shallow pitched roof and the bulkier mansard style extension proposed by the applicant which would be exacerbated by a slight step in the building line. Given the buildings orientation and prominent location, the full impact of this change in roof form would be particularly noticeable both at long and short distance views. On that basis it is considered that the proposed alterations at roof level would represent an incongruous form of development that would fail to relate in an appropriate manner to the recipient building and the wider street scene.

Park House is located on the southern edge of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area. Whilst the building is neither Statutory Listed nor included on the City Council's List of Locally Important Buildings and Structures, it does make a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area and its backdrop to Southsea Common. For the reasons identified above it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the overall design of the building and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the conservation area in this location. Whilst this harm may be 'less than substantial' the limited public benefits

associated with the proposal would not outweigh the harm that would be caused. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would conflict with Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan which aims to ensure, amongst other things, that all new development is well designed, respects the character of the city, is of an appropriate scale for its context and relates well to the city's Conservation Areas, and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on residential amenity

Having regard to the presence of the existing dormer windows, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact on the amenity of adjoining or neighbouring occupiers, in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. It is accepted that the proposal would increase the amount of useable floor space within the two residential units, improving living condition for existing and future occupiers. This would not however, outweigh the harm identified above.

Other matters

It is considered that the proposal would not result in an increased risk of flooding at the site.

RECOMMENDATION Refuse

1) The proposed alterations would, by reason of their bulk, window alignment and relationship with the unaltered section of roof, represent an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development that would fail to relate in an appropriate manner to the recipient building and the wider street scene. Furthermore the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the principles of good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and to policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan.

PRO-ACTIVITY STATEMENT

Notwithstanding that the City Council seeks to work positively and pro-actively with the applicant through the application process in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework it was not considered that the harm arising from the proposal could be overcome and the application has been refused for the reasons outlined above.

C. Upton-Brown

.....
City Development Manager
11th April 2014