

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, 9 March 2021 at 3.00 pm in the Virtual Remote Meeting

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

Present

Councillors David Fuller (Chair)
Judith Smyth (Vice-Chair)
Matthew Atkins
Lee Hunt
Donna Jones
Terry Norton
Lynne Stagg
Luke Stubbs
Claire Udy

21. Apologies (AI 1)

Councillor Chris Attwell sent his apologies. Councillor Hugh Mason deputised for him.

The Chair informed the committee that Portsmouth City Council is the applicant for Item no. 1 on the agenda, which is the planning application for the Tipner Interchange M275 Junction 1 off slip from Junction 12, M27 Portsmouth. The applicant has decided to withdraw this Item from the agenda to enable them to carry out a briefing with members on the application and to further consider the details.

22. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

No interests were declared.

23. Update on previous applications. (AI 3)

The Head of Development Management reported that the council had received notification of an appeal submission for 36, Pains Road, Southsea - a change of use from a C4 HMO to a Sui Generis premises for more than six people.

1, St John's Road, Portsmouth. This an appeal for non-determination for the building of a first floor extension and dormer windows to the rear. Officers marked it for refusal and referred it to the Secretary of State.

The planning enforcement inquiry on 6 nos. appeal has concluded. It is hoped that the PINS decisions for the enforcement notices will be received shortly.

24. 20/00457/OUT Tipner Interchange M275 Junction 1 off slip from Junction 12, M27 Portsmouth (AI 4)

This application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

25. 20/01483/FUL The Registry, St Michael's Road, Portsmouth (AI 5)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters document which reported that:

Additional Consultation Response:

Crime Prevention Design Advisor

Broad support, conditional upon residents being at the appropriate stage of their recovery to reside within this style of accommodation, the provision of effective onsite support for the residents at all times and the fitting of appropriate physical security measures.

Reviewing the information held by Hampshire Constabulary for the period 20/9/20 to 6/1/21, there were 45 reports of incidents relating to the premises.

City centre location with nearby open spaces. Our concerns centre on the possible problems from residents both within the accommodation and within the local area. Hampshire Constabulary recognises the need for accommodation for the homeless to assist with their journey back to a more normal lifestyle. Effective management / support of the residents is key to reducing the opportunities for crime and disorder. To provide for the safety and security of residents and visitors, the external doors should be fitted with an electronic door access system. The system should provide for fob access for residents and staff and audio and visual access for visitors. If entry is gained into the building it is possible to access all parts of the building, this increases the vulnerability of the building to crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB). To reduce that vulnerability, a CCTV system should be installed within the building, to provide images of the external doors, stairwells, lifts, other common access ways, the office and communal facilities, and basement.

Planning Officer's comment: *The response relating to the 45 reports of incidents cannot categorically be claimed that the incidents were resultant from occupants of the premises. The applicant has provided the Council with a copy of their Management Plan. There is an entrance intercom on the front door, and to each occupier's room, and an individual key to each occupier's room. This plan together with the CCTV provisions which are controlled by condition, are considered sufficient measures to ensure the safety and security of the premises.*

Further Representation

The University of Portsmouth has submitted an objection. A summary of the comments raised are as follows:

- (i) The university is supportive of the need for a solution to homelessness in the city and supported the use during the pandemic, but it was never envisaged that this would become a permanent location. This objection is not to be perceived as 'anti-homeless' but to identify and raise concerns about the impact the use of this specific building and its management has had on the users of the City Centre Campus. The University is set to return to business as usual from early / mid-March. There is clearly a change in planning circumstances in the near future with*

- more people interacting with the local area than what was experienced when the change of use first happened and since the temporary permission was granted.
- (ii) There have been a number of incidents that occurred involving university students and staff, which has led to concerns over the safety, security and amenity.
 - (iii) The university feel that it is too soon to grant permanent permission, the temporary permission allows for the use to be monitored and managed safely and effectively. A permanent permission should only be granted after the temporary permission has been assessed and expired.
 - (iv) There will be times of the day when Registry full staff surveillance of all residents is not possible, eg having lunch
 - (v) Rough sleepers who associate with The Registry have used the University's hygiene stations to wash. Individuals have also hidden within toilets in an attempt to sleep overnight.
 - (vi) Large groups congregate next to Mercantile House which the university own.
 - (vii) Hypodermic needles have been found within the grounds of St Andrews Court.
 - (viii) Vehicles have been parked in the University's House car park, which had to be moved on in case of potential drug dealing.
 - (ix) The safety and security concerns have a direct impact on staff and students, as well as the wider perception of the University
 - (x) Hampshire constabulary received 25 reports of incidents 1st October – 12th November 2020 in relation to the building, which may not reflect those incidents occurring in the surrounding area. Increased to 45 over 20th September – 6th January 2021
 - (xi) Suggested that there should be a patrol around the external areas of the building that would ensure there is staff presence around the building as well as inside.
 - (xii) It would appear as though the safety measures in place are not working.
 - (xiii) Proposal is contrary to policies PCS4 and PCS23
 - (xiv) In conclusion, wish to see a number of factors demonstrating the success of the temporary permission, after which, it should then be considered appropriate to assess the permanent change of use. These include reduction in the number of incidents, exclusions, details of 'moving-on'.

Planning Officer's comment: It became apparent prior to the determination of the temporary planning permission that a permanent application had been submitted and was to be determined imminently.

The premises has sufficient shower and cleaning facilities to cater for the occupiers of the premises, on this basis there is no need for the occupiers to wash outside of their own accommodation.

With regards to any illegally parked cars, these should be moved along in the normal fashion, by public or private traffic enforcement, or any suspected illegal activity reported to the police.

These and other incidents raised cannot be categorically related to occupiers of The Registry.

The applicant has a robust management process and tenancy, and strict eviction policy, for use if/when necessary. The applicant works closely with the Police, community Warden team and the Rough Sleeper Partnership Board, to ensure the best-possible cross-agency support is provided.

Officers have considered the policy position as part of both the Temporary consent as well as the current permanent proposal and has recommended that the proposal is policy compliant. The applicant is a responsible authority will continue to work with the various agencies, and with the University, to provide vital accommodation and support, to prevent difficulties in the first place, and address any new issues as-and-when they arise.

The officer's recommendation remained unchanged.

It was noted that Councillor Fuller had dropped out of the meeting at the start of this item and although he had since re-joined, he had not heard the officer's presentation and therefore would not Chair this item nor vote.

Councillor Darren Sanders, Cabinet Member for Housing and the Prevention of Homelessness gave a deputation on three applications: The Registry, Kingsway House and the former Elm Grove Library. Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link [Planning Committee 9 March 2021 on Livestream](#).

Members' Questions

In response to a question, Councillor Stagg explained that she had asked the Safety Team to look into the possibility of installing bollards at the front of the premises to enhance the safety of residents. The planning officer added that this had been raised by the committee in January and is outside of the application site. He added that the land is probably managed by Highways.

Members' Comments

Members agreed that the barriers were outside this committee's remit and noted that the pavement was narrower outside the Hampshire Boulevard further up the road.

It was felt that this was a very successful programme and the staff should be congratulated for their high quality work.

The premises' overall size and room sizes were considered to be appropriate for the tenants and their belongings.

Members were disappointed that the university has not offered to help fund and run courses for the residents at the Registry to help them get back on their feet and that the university had not reported the incidents that it had listed in its deputation.

Councillor Matthew Atkins joined the meeting at this point. He declared that he had no interests to declare and would not vote on this application.

Resolved to grant conditional planning permission as set out in the officer's committee report and the Supplementary Matters report.

26. 20/01482FUL - 155-157 Elm Grove Southsea (AI 6)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

It was noted that the deputation which Councillor Sanders had given at the start of the previous application also covered this application.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, Councillor Sanders explained that tailored support is provided to residents and is broken into three categories: one for residents who require the lowest level of support; two for those who need a little more and three for those whose needs are complex.

Members' Comments

Members noted that despite having reservations when this project had been proposed, the residents opposite the premises have not reported any problems.

Kingsway House which is situated nearby can offer additional help and support for the tenants.

Resolved to grant conditional planning permission as set out in the officer's committee report.

27. 20/01484/FUL - Kingsway House, 130 Elm Grove Southsea (AI 7)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

The Principal Planning Officer drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that an additional consultation response had been received from Natural England. They had no objection to the application.

It was noted that the deputation which Councillor Sanders had given at the start of the other applications also covered this one.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, Councillor Sanders explained that the support given to residents was tailored to their individual needs and included assistance with job hunting, mental health and increasing self-confidence. He added that funding for mental health support is available from Public Health England.

Members' Comments

There were no comments from members.

Resolved to grant conditional planning permission as set out in the officer's committee report and the Supplementary Matters report.

28. 20/00470/HOU - 12 Blake Road, Drayton and Farlington, Portsmouth (AI 8)

The Planning Officer presented the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

Since the publication of the committee report, a neighbour has notified the Local Planning Authority (LPA) of some statements and dimensions in the report they

consider to be inaccurate. In-the-round, the LPA consider that the Committee report is fair in its content, and need only comment on the following three specific points:

The neighbour considers the following statement in Paragraph 5.15 of the report to be incorrect: 'a two-storey rear extension.... 19/00129/HOU at no.14, the dimensions of this extension are not dissimilar to those of the proposed extension'. The approved two-storey extension at no. 14 projected 2.2m from the rear elevation and was 3.5m wide. The current application's two-storey extension would project 4m from the rear elevation, and be approx. 4.4m wide.

The neighbour also notes that his objection reference to planning application 16/00824/HOU at 6 Blake Road has not been raised in the Committee report, the LPA will take this opportunity to rectify the omission, and with apologies. The neighbour considers the rear terrace at no. 6 to be equally pertinent to the current application. That terrace was approx. 4.7m deep, and was refused planning permission. The current application's terrace is 1.3m/1.6m deep (please see below).

Lastly, the neighbour measures the proposed terrace as 1.6m deep, while the Committee report states it is 1.3m deep. The terrace does indeed measure 1.6m deep from wall to edge of the first step, but the Applicant has explained that a safety balustrade would be necessary, set-in approximately 0.3m from the edge of the first step. In any event, in my opinion the difference of 0.3m is not material in its effect on amenity, and the Planning Inspector would consider any necessary conditions on such details were the appeal to be allowed.

The recommendations remained unchanged.

Two written deputations from Malcolm Cook and Tom Pasterfield were read out which were against granting of the application and were read out to the committee. A written deputation from the applicant was also read out. Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link [Planning Committee 9 March 2021 on Livestream](#).

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, the officer explained that:

The proposed extension would project 5m from the rear elevation which is the same as the extension at number 10. The owners at number 14 have planning permission for an extension of the same length.

There is a large raised terrace at number 6 which comprises raised decking. An extension is a built structure and therefore the planning considerations would be different. However the potential impact on neighbouring amenities would be assessed in both cases.

Members' Comments

It was noted that many householders on this slope build these type of extensions to take advantage of the view.

As there is already an extension of the same size at number 14, members felt that there was no reason to reject this application.

The first floor would be of a reasonable size and any potential overlooking of number 10 would be minimal given that there is a screen already in place.

People should be encouraged to adapt their homes to fit the needs of future generations.

RESOLVED

Grant delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth to advise the Secretary of State that the local planning authority would have determined that the application should be approved subject to the imposition of conditions, and to supply to the Secretary of State a copy of the relevant report and meeting minutes accordingly.

The meeting concluded at 5.18 pm.

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor David Fuller