

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 24 June 2015 at 5pm in the Guildhall. These minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda and associated papers for the meeting.

Present

Councillors Aiden Gray (Chair)
Stephen Hastings (Vice-Chair)
Ken Ellcome
Colin Galloway
Scott Harris
Hugh Mason
Sandra Stockdale
Gerald Vernon-Jackson

Welcome

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

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The chair, Councillor Gray 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.

56. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Jennie Brent; Councillor Linda Symes attended as her deputy.

57. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Councillor Vernon-Jackson declared an interest in item 10 as he had called it in and would make a deputation.

Councillor Symes declared an interest in item 10 as she would make a deputation.

58. Minutes of the Previous Meeting - 3 June 2015 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee held on 3 June 2015.

59. Updates from the City Development Manager on Previous Planning Applications (AI 4)

The City Development Manager gave an update on McCarthy Stone Savoy Building, South Parade, Southsea.

The Inspector allowed the appeal as the building would:

- Form a boundary for the conservation area and enhance its character.
- Make use of the brown field site and offered an energy efficient design.
- Assist with meeting the needs on aging population and relieve some of the pressure on the public purse by increasing the housing options available.
- Create employment opportunities.
- Have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties.

He also noted that the traffic assessment was sound and the flooding management plans acceptable.

In response to questions from members, she explained that no costs were awarded.

Councillor Gray expressed the committee's disappointment with the outcome and noted that it had been a difficult decision and members had weighed up all the evidence. He thanked those who had determined that application.

60. 15/00788/PAMOD - Request to modify legal agreement attached to planning permission ref 09/00643/OUT relating to land at 10 St James's Street Portsea (AI 5)

The City Development Manager introduced the report.

A deputation was made by Mr Buchanan on behalf of the applicant and included the following points:

- This material is designed to last. Repainting and the ongoing maintenance would incur significant cost and it would be susceptible to weathering and flaking.
- It would not be appropriate to repaint this building simply because of one objection to the colour.

Members Questions.

Members sought clarification regarding the intention of the applicants stated in 2009, the business rates, parking, the impact of potential increased traffic, the potential economic benefits to the city, off street parking, the colour of the building and the number of units.

Members' Comments.

Members discussed the possibility that the applicant use the university's carparks.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred and the applicant instructed to negotiate the use of the University of Portsmouth's carparks during the vacation period.

61. 15/00787/PAMOD - Request to modify legal agreement attached to planning permission ref 11/00961/FUL relating to land at 61 Earlsdon Street Southsea (AI 6)

The City Development Manager introduced the report and advised that a letter had been received from neighbouring occupiers of commercial premises as detailed in the supplementary matters list.

In her deputation, Mrs Tarrant included the following points on her behalf of her and her husband:

- She had concerns that future tenants could be unsuitable or disruptive and that would be no initial vetting or monitoring of their behaviour.
- If the agreement were to be varied, the use of the building could change in the future, particularly if it was sold.
- The students can be seen at their desks by the window.

- The planning conditions imposed when the application was agreed had not been fully completed e.g. the installation of the cycle storage.
- Their rights of way had been infringed.
- Their boundary was no longer in place.
- There had been two break-ins in the last year; prior to that there had been none in 30 years.
- The bin store would have to be rebuilt.
- Their own premises is licensed for light industrial use but out of consideration for the students, most of the noisier work is carried out outside of term time.
- There has been illegal parking across their entrance.
- There will be more cars parked in the area.
- The company does not pay taxes in the UK

Councillor Gray informed Mrs Tarrant that her allegations regarding tax avoidance are not a matter for consideration and could be deemed libellous.

Mr Buchanan included the following points in his representation:

- Unilife has no intention of running a hostel.
- The committee considered the layout of the building and the outlook of the bedrooms when it granted planning permission. The windows do not face directly into their property.
- There is no on-street parking.
- The allegations of breaches of right of way and entrance blocking are a civil matter.
- There are many sustainable transport options in this area.
- Mr and Mrs Tarrant are under no obligation to restrict their work to outside of term time.
- The impact on residential amenity would be acceptable.
- The council agreed that a property in Middle Street could accept non-students outside of term time.

Councillor Luke Stubbs included the following points in his representation:

- During the summer months there would be more people occupying the rooms than in term time.
- There may be breaches of planning permission.

Members' Questions.

Members sought clarity regarding alleged breaches of planning consent, the council's responsibility regarding rights of way disputes and the use of the building.

Members' Comments.

Members discussed possible transport options for tenants and parking arrangements.

RESOLVED that determination of this application be deferred to enable the applicant to investigate working with the university regarding the use of their car parks and for the committee to receive a report from the enforcement team regarding compliance with the current planning permission.

It was also agreed that a letter be sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to pass on the concerns that had been raised.

- 62. 14/00402/FUL Brunel House/ Havant Street Car Park, 42 The Hard, Portsmouth - construction of a forty storey tower to include a halls of residence (class C1) for students comprising 454 study/ bedrooms, 313 residential flats, 877 SQM of commercial floorspace for use as class A1 shop of A2 financial/ professional services or A3 cafe/ restaurant or A4 drinking establishment or A5 hot food takeaway and 0 SQM for use as class B1 office or taxi office and construction of a part 7/part 6 multi storey car park on Havant Street car park and former ambulance station sites, after demolition of Brunel House, Victory Public House, 'City Wide Taxi's ' building and former ambulance station. (AI 7)**

The City Development Manager introduced the report.

Bruce Calton included the following points in his representation:

- He is proud to have worked on this project for many years.
- Currently when people arrive at The Hard the first thing that they see is an unloved office building.
- This building would be a catalyst to the regeneration of this area and the wider area.
- It would be well managed, provide employment and be highly sustainable.
- The cycle storage would be prioritised.
- Parking would be provided but restricted.
- There would be secure access.
- This represents a significant investment.

Councillor Luke Stubbs included the following points in his representation:

- Although the removal of the eyesore is to be welcomed, there would be a negative impact on the heritage assets.
- There would be a lack of affordable housing.
- Page 33 of the report states that there is an unrealistic level of profit being put forward by applicant.
- There would be a loss of parking.

Members' Questions.

Members sought clarity regarding the viability assessment, the impact on the drainage system, the impact on the conservation area and heritage assets, the advertising of this proposal, the lack of parking, the current planning permission, the impact on those who would live in its shadow, the building requirements and insulation.

Members' Comments.

Members discussed congestion, affordable housing, the potential benefits to the city, the impact on heritage assets, the need to replace the current building and the design.

RESOLVED that the application be refused.

63. 15/00293/FUL - St John's College 36-40 Grove Road South, Southsea PO5 3QW - formation of new car park, accessed via The Thicket, including new entrance gates, wall and pillars after removal of part of the external wall. (AI 8)

The City Development Manger introduced the report.

Mr James Kirby included the following points in his representation:

- The map he circulated showed the three approaches to the school.
- The photograph he circulated showed the entrance from the east approach.
- This is a conservation area.
- There would be fewer parking spaces and increased traffic.
- The six parking spaces would have to be removed to increase visibility.
- The area around the entrance would become a congestion black spot.
- Approximately 100 pupils are in this area every morning and afternoon. They do not pay attention to traffic and walk along narrow roads, some of which lack pavements.
- HGVs ignore the signs and use these roads.

Councillor Linda Symes included the following points in her representation:

- She asked the committee to refuse the application.
- The council is trying to reduce the number of cars entering the city.
- The Park & Ride now starts at 8am.
- The school has submitted 89 planning applications for this site
- She wondered whether the school would permit more staff to drive to work.
- There would be fewer spaces for visitors and residents.
- The adjoining building is grade II listed.
- School staff can use the Park & Ride.

Members' Questions.

Members sought clarity regarding the increased water drainage into the systems due to the removal of the lawn, the width of the pavement in the Thicket, the use of the entrance and access to the site.

Members' Comments.

Members discussed the council's policy discouraging people driving into the city, the loss of parking for residents, access, visibility, safety, its location in a conservation area.

DECISION

The application was refused.

64. 15/00502/FUI - Cavendish House, 18 Victoria Road South, Southsea PO5 2BZ - change of use from purposes within class D1 to a 15 bedroom halls of residence (within C1) and associated off-road parking (re-submission of 14/01665/FUL) (AI 9)

The City Development Manager introduced the report.

Mr Booth included the following points in his representation:

- He has lived in Cavendish Road for 15 years.

- There are 13 B&Bs in this road and the neighbouring one.
- There would be a reduction of on-street parking in the road.
- On 4 October 2010 planning permission was granted for a family dwelling
- Student halls of residence should be purpose built.
- The designs show six parking spaces, but three are not useable.
- The Highway Engineer said that there is low accessibility to public transport.
- This will increase congestion.

Mr Munt asked the committee to note the following points:

- He lives opposite the development.
- Parking is at saturation point in this area.
- There would be no onsite management
- He wondered whether there would be further education, English language or university students.
- If the property is sold, it may no longer be used exclusively for students.

Members' Questions.

Members sought clarity regarding the current planning permission, the distance between the rear of the property and the boundary wall, the accessibility of the proposed three adjoining onsite parking spaces, the location of the refuse/ recycling area which would mean that vehicles would have to stop on the corner to load the bins and the safety of cars reversing onto the main road.

Members' Comments.

Members discussed the proposed onsite parking, on street parking, the volume of traffic on the road and the safety of vehicles reversing onto it.

RESOLVED

The application was refused.

65. 15/00572/HOU - 53 Goldsmith Avenue, Southsea PO4 8DU - installation of dropped kerb (re-submission of 14/01015/HOU) (AI 10)

The City Development Manager introduced the report.

Annette Clancy included the following points in her representation:

- She received a letter in November 2013 from the council inviting her to express an interest in having a dropped kerb.
- The Highways Agency visited in May 2014 and said that there was no reason for refusal as there were no safety issues; traffic flow had reduced in this section of the road since the introduction of the bypass in Rodney Road/ Fratton Way and that this section of the road was going to be declassified but it was not implemented after a manager left.
- She has kept the grass area.
- It is not by the junction or bus stop.
- There are two disabled parking spaces opposite her property.
- This would create a parking space.
- There is room to turn around her car around on her property.
- Having her car off road would make it easier for large vehicles to pass.
- There are 28 dropped kerbs on Goldsmith Avenue and only three of the drives offer turning space.
- At the Traffic & Transportation meeting in March 2014 it was recorded that there had been no accidents in the previous three years caused by vehicles emerging onto the highway.

Councillor Ellcome asked the committee to note that he was not the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation in March 2014.

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson included the following points in his representation:

- It is located in the quietest part of Goldsmith Avenue.
- There are 28 other dropped kerbs nearby so a precedent has been set.
- The council's policy is to not oppose dropped kerbs in this section of the road.
- No evidence of any danger if this were to go ahead.
- In this area some cars have been damaged whilst parked on the street.

Members' Questions.

Members sought clarity regarding how distance from the junction and Clovelly Road, the locations of the dropped kerbs and the time the photograph shown was taken.

Members' Comments.

Members discussed the fact that there is room to turn on the property, the distance from Clovelly Road, the policy, the lighting and the officers' advice regarding the safety.

RESOLVED that the application be refused.

The meeting concluded at 9pm.

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Aiden Gray