

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 2 March 2016 at 1.00 pm in the The Executive Meeting Room - Third Floor, The Guildhall

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

Present

Councillors Aiden Gray (Chair)
 Jennie Brent
 Ken Ellcome
 Colin Galloway
 Scott Harris
 Hugh Mason
 Sandra Stockdale
 Linda Symes (Standing Deputy)

 Also in attendance
Councillor Lee Hunt

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.

21. Apologies for absence (AI 1)

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Hastings who was represented by Councillor Symes as his standing deputy. Councillor Ellcome apologised that he would have to leave the meeting at 2pm for a Lord Mayor's meeting.

22. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of members' interests.

23. Minutes of previous Planning Committee - 3 February 2016 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 3 February 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24. Update on Previous Applications by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development (AI 4)

There were no updates on previous applications.

25. Ref: 15/02015/HOU - 8 Lendorber Avenue, Cosham, Portsmouth PO6 2JY - Construction of single-storey rear and side extension following demolition of existing rear projection (AI 5)

Following a presentation on the item by the City Development Manager the following deputations were made, which are summarised:

- (i) Mr Stephen Smith spoke to object as the adjoining neighbour at no.6 Lendorber Avenue, whose points included:
 - The impact of the proximity of the extension to the boundary fence
 - the effect on his own south facing window which relied on light for his kitchen, dining room and into the lounge area, so did have amenity reasons for refusal not just design grounds, and the shadowing over the garden
 - It would give a linked terrace effect being so close to the boundary
 - There would be loss of access for bins
 - Rainwater would have a long way to run along the flat roof of the extension and may run directly onto No.6
- (ii) Mr P Cross spoke as the applicant, in support of his application, whose points included:
 - The proposal was to make improvements to a run-down property and apologised for having started work on the permitted works
 - The report used inflammatory terms exaggerating the effect of the development which would be using matching materials and of reasonable scale and most of the extension would not be visible from the road
 - The 'fall-back position' clearly illustrated what could be constructed under permitted development, with a side extension of the same length as the proposal, but it was more sensible to have a co-joined extension
 - A pitched roof design had previously been offered

Members' Questions

Questions were raised concerning the increase of the footprint of the building and how much could be permitted development. It was reiterated that the 2 potential permitted development buildings could not be connected. The sunlight scheme submitted by the architect was also confirmed to be an accurate representation of the overshadowing on the neighbouring property, as this had been assessed by the case officer when visiting the site. It was also confirmed in response to a question that there would be loss of access to the rear of the garden for bins.

Members' Comments

Members were mindful of the issue of permitted development rights and what could be built with a gap but also the overshadowing that would particularly affect the neighbour's window.

RECOMMENDED that permission be refused for the reasons outlined in the City Development Manager's report.

26. Ref: 15/02081/FUL - 235 - 249 Goldsmith Avenue, Southsea PO4 0BS - Construction of two part 6-/part 4-storey blocks to form 70 apartments with associated parking and landscaping after demolition of existing buildings (re-submission of 15/01239/FUL) (AI 6)

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters list reported that:

- (i) The previously refused scheme (15/01239/FUL) is the subject on an appeal that is due to be heard at an informal hearing in June.
- (ii) Amended drawings had been received showing changes to the layout of the proposed disabled persons units.
- (iii) Recommendation unchanged. Condition 2 to list the following drawings:
13.093.B.001 Rev.A; 13.093.B.003 Rev.B; 13.093.B.004 Rev.B;
13.093.B.010 Rev.A; 13.093.B.025 & 13.093.B.026

When presenting the item the City Development Manager also referred to a typographical error in the report - in Condition 10 reference to 'the High Street' should be deleted and replaced with 'Goldsmith Avenue'.

Deputations were then made whose points are summarised.

- (i) John Waterfield of First Wessex spoke as the applicant:
 - This would provide 70 new affordable homes addressing a need in Portsmouth, approximately 262 people would be housed in energy efficient flats in an accessible location, taking people off the council's waiting list
 - The scheme was attracting a substantial social housing grant from the government
 - This was an improvement to the current unsightly industrial complex
- (ii) Peter Warlow of HGP Architects spoke as the agent in support of the application:
 - The scheme met the relevant local plan policies and national policy aims for sustainable development and Tall Buildings policy
 - The design sought to address issues raised by the previous refused scheme going to appeal
 - This exceeded the separation distance so was not overlooking existing residents
 - There was benefit to the city via the off-site open space provision
- (iii) Councillor Lee Hunt spoke as ward councillor to object to the scheme:
 - He believed that this application was worse than the previous one due to the impact of the huge buildings on residents nearby
 - The Design Review Panel comments were negative about the design
 - It was out of keeping with the immediate area which had houses
 - The tower blocks would look into the back gardens of those to the rear

- It would be overbearing in an already highly densely populated area of the city and would cause more parking problems there
- A development at the site should be more in keeping providing houses with gardens

(Councillor Ellcome left the meeting at this point.)

Members' Questions

In response to a question it was confirmed that the representations had not come from the other ward councillors but from residents and nearby commercial properties. It was also confirmed that there was only one shared entrance/egress to the site which was not judged to have a detrimental effect on the highway network and which would need to be used by refuse collection vehicles. It was asked how far the blocks were from the nearest residential property in Orchard Road which was 25 metres, so the angle from the 6 storey to these would be approximately 50 degrees. Members questioned the level parking provision for the sustainable development. The size and internal layout of the flats was examined and it was confirmed that these exceeded minimum standards.

Members' Comments

The provision of affordable housing, attracting government funding, was welcomed for the city and the size of the flats were seen to be adequate. Discussion took place as to whether this would be an overbearing scheme for the site.

RESOLVED

(1) that delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Culture and City Development to GRANT CONDITIONAL PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the applicant first entering into a legal agreement pursuant to S106 to secure:

- **21 units of affordable housing;**
- **a financial contribution of £12,180 to mitigate the impact of the proposed residential development on the Solent Special Protection Areas;**
- **the installation of heavy duty goal ends to the ball existing court in the Orchard Road Play Area or financial contribution of £25,000 towards such works;**
- **the replacement of the existing woodchip surfacing in the Orchard Road Play Area with wet-pour or financial contribution of £17,500 towards such works;**
- **the implementation of the travel plan associated with the proposed development;**
- **a financial contribution of £5,500.00 towards the monitoring of the travel plan associated with the proposed development;**
- **the preparation and implementation of an Employment and Skills plan to cover the construction phase of the development; and,**
- **a monitoring fee of £620.00 towards monitoring the payment of the open space contribution, the provision of the affordable housing and the implementation of the employment and skills plan**

(2) that delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Culture and City Development to refuse planning permission if the legal agreement has not been completed within three months of the date of the resolution pursuant to Resolution (1)

The meeting concluded at 2.15 pm.

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Aiden Gray