

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 18 October 2017 at 1.00 pm in the Executive Meeting Room - The Guildhall - Floor 3

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

Present

Councillors James Fleming (Chair)
Jennie Brent
Lee Hunt
Steve Pitt
Gemma New (Standing Deputy)
Darren Sanders (Standing Deputy)

Also in attendance

Councillors L Symes

Welcome

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

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The chair, Councillor Fleming, 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.

135. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies had been received from the following councillors: Steve Hastings (who was represented by Gemma New), Colin Galloway, Hugh Mason (who was represented by Darren Sanders), Frank Jonas and Robert New.

136. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Councillor Jennie Brent explained that she would not be sitting on the committee for two ward items for which she would be representing Councillor Luke Stubbs (relating to Craneswater Avenue and Granada Road) and would leave the room following her deputations.

Councillor Lee Hunt would be withdrawing from the room for the items for which his partner Richard Adair would be speaking as a deputation (relating to Tonbridge Street, Admiral Square and Clarence Road).

Councillor Darren Sanders made a non-pecuniary interest for the sake of transparency in that he knew someone who lived to the rear of the former Portland Hotel site, but he had not discussed this with them. Also during the discussion of 98

London Road, he made a non-pecuniary declaration in that his relatives run a shop at 102 London Road.

Councillor Jim Fleming made a non-pecuniary interest during the discussion of the item relating to 10 Clarence Road, in that within a deputation a reference was made to Mr D Brewer, who he knew but had no business dealings with.

137. Minutes of Previous Meeting - Planning Committee 20 September 2017 (AI 3)

It was agreed that a decision on the accuracy of the minutes be deferred until the next meeting. This would allow a meeting with those challenging the record to see if agreement could be reached.

138. Updates of previous applications by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development (AI 4)

There were no updates given at this meeting.

139. 17/01181/FUL - Brunel House 42 The Hard Portsmouth PO1 3DS - External alterations to include replacement of existing windows/panels on front/rear elevations with new full height windows/coloured infill panels; new windows to side wall (north elevation); and installation of new glazed doors and infill glazing to ground floor level below existing canopy (report item 1) (AI 5)

The Chair allowed the usual order to be varied to allow the Leader of the Council to speak before the officer presentation, due to her council commitments.

The following deputations were made, whose points are summarised:

- i) Councillor Donna Jones as Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development, spoke to object to the proposals, whose points included:
 - This was one of the prime development sites in the city and the appearance of the scheme was being decided which should be sympathetic to the Conservation Area and heritage setting
 - There had been major investment in the Hard Interchange where thousands of visitors would arrive and see the site which people do want to be redeveloped
 - Lengthy discussions had been had with the owners due to the importance of the site, with the Permitted Development rights being extended, to invite a worthy scheme but this application was disappointing and lacked hotel use
 - There was a poor quality of design for the cladding
 - Policy PCS23 should be a reason for refusal due to the design impact in the Conservation Area
- ii) Mr Hinsley the applicant's agent spoke in support of the application whose points included:

- The officer's report covered the facts for consideration, and this was an application purely relating to the design and appearance of the building as the change of use had already been granted
 - They had worked closely with the Conservation Officer and other Planning Officers and taken on board positive suggestions from them
 - The building had been vacant for many years
- iii) Mr R Oaten, the architect, also spoke in support, whose points included:
- The design aimed to take out the worst elements of the existing building (such as the windows) but retain the qualities of the building (the grid) to give it a new lease of life in the conversion to residential
 - The scheme improved the accommodation internally looking out and the visual appearance, so that it would not look like an office building
 - It was a scheme to last and not a quick make-over, with cleaned surfaces and colours that would not fade due to the high quality glazing system

Members' Questions

Members asked questions on the following:

- Could a scheme go ahead with less work required? The windows would need replacing for the residential use, and as this was within a Conservation Area planning permission was required for the window replacement
- Were there precedents created by the conversion of other office blocks in the city such Catherine House? It was noted that this scheme was different as it was in a Conservation Area and the design should be judged as to whether or not it was acceptable.
- It was clarified that there were not trees but plants on the roof terrace
- Whether there would be cleaning of the exterior?

Members' Comments

Members recognised that there had been some improvement in the scheme before them, with visual interest but there were still concerns that there were missed opportunities for this prime site to be a building that the city could be proud of. The South wall remained blank, and there could be relief through images of Brunel or lighting to add interest. Most members were therefore minded to defer consideration, rather than refuse this application, for further discussions to take place to make further improvements for this important site.

RESOLVED that consideration be deferred for further discussions to take place between the applicant and the City Development Manager.

- 140. 17/00288/OUT - 98 London Road Portsmouth PO2 0NA - Outline application for mixed use development for construction of five storey building to provide 810sqm (GIA) shops (Class A1), 317sqm (GIA) medical hub (Class D1), along with 4,164sqm (GIA) of nursing, care home and assisted living accommodation**

(Class C2), with access from Stubbington Avenue, following demolition of existing building (principles of access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered) (report item 2) (AI 6)

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters Report stated:

"The applicants have submitted a revised plan for refuse storage facilities within the car park. They have also clarified that the warden would be responsible for taking bins to the roadside for collection. The Waste Management Officer has confirmed that these changes would address the concerns that were raised in relation to refuse storage. This therefore addresses reason for refusal 6.

The applicants Transport Consultant has also submitted a response to the concerns raised by the Highway Engineer. In relation to pedestrian access, they note that the alleyway and public car park are already used by pedestrians and suggest that the alleyway is of a suitable width for wheelchair users, although do not provide specific evidence to support this. In relation to parking, they contend that the submitted parking survey has demonstrated adequate capacity in the local area to serve the medical hub. The revised plan also includes additional facilities for cycle storage. This information has been reviewed by the Highways Engineer, however, the additional comments are not considered sufficient to overcome the highway concerns that have been raised. The reasons for refusal relating to parking and public access therefore remain unchanged.

Reason for Refusal 6 to be removed.

Recommendation to remain as Refusal with the other 5 reasons unchanged."

After the officer's presentation, deputations were made in support, which are summarised:

- i) Mr Boddy, the applicant, whose points included:
 - There had been detailed discussions over years and meetings with planning officers, and in response to previous criticisms the development was restricted to 5 storeys to reduce the bulk
 - The design included recesses and balconies to add features which were not dissimilar to other buildings in the city, and there was a variety of heights
 - A former CQC inspector was instrumental in the design who was very experienced in the care sector
 - He disagreed with criticisms of the design in the City Development Manager's report, and there was inclusion of a large kitchen in the area above the warden's flat
 - Air conditioning was being provided to help combat the issues of air quality
 - The access issue was being looked into with another staircase or lift being considered, and there were not currently problems with pedestrian access
 - There was a high level of support for the scheme and it would improve an area where businesses were closing, and increase local employment

- ii) Mr S Harris, a healthcare consultant also spoke in support whose points included:
 - The Solent Health Hub was an exciting prospect and would ease the strain on GP surgeries in the area, and would bring in investment from other bodies
 - These would be excellent facilities for the good of the wider community

Members' Questions

Members raised questions on the following issues:

- The width and accessibility of the alleyway - it was thought to be approx. 1.2m wide, so there would be problems for people passing buggies
- Were there alternative accesses? - it was reported that there is an alternative access to the rear
- The siting of the kitchen above the warden's flat - this was on a mezzanine floor of the medical centre (plans were circulated and an error pointed out in the report regarding the siting of this kitchen)

(The applicant also referred to another main entrance on London Road, but this was not to the medical hub)

Members' Comments

Members voiced concerns regarding discrepancies, such as a decision on the provision of a lift. The City Development Manager commented on the submitted plans being unclear and the case officer had tried to seek clarity on details with the agent. There was also concern by members regarding the safety of pedestrian access, especially for vulnerable residents who would have to cross a car park. The Chair also raised concerns regarding air quality, with London Road having one of the worst levels for NO² and tall buildings had problems with dissipation; there was an absence of an air quality assessment with the application. Members were aware of the need for more care provision in the city but details were missing from this scheme and the access arrangements were unsatisfactory.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the City Development Manager's report, as revised by the Supplementary Matters list.

141. 17/00867/FUL - 8 Montgomerie Road Southsea PO5 1ED - Change of use from purposes falling within a C3 (dwelling house) or C4 (house in multiple occupation) to Sui Generis (house in multiple occupation) for seven or more people (report item 3) (AI 7)

After the City Development Manager's presentation deputations were heard, which are summarised:

- i) Dr M Willoughby, objecting, on behalf of the East St. Thomas Residents Forum, whose points included:
 - There is a density of 56% HMOs in the road, and this is for a 'super HMO' with developers taking advantage of a loophole with the SPD being out to

consultation and at the last committee a similar HMO application was deferred due to this period of consultation.

- The property had gone from 2 to 3 floors with off-set levels causing problems to adjoining neighbours, with possible fire safety implications
 - The doubling the number of occupants was an overdevelopment of the site, leading to more rubbish in the street and parking problems in the road
 - There was concern that one of the lounges would be converted to a 9th bedroom losing communal space
 - This was not a marginal increase
- ii) Ms K Webber, objecting, on behalf of the East St.Thomas Residents Forum, whose points included:
- There would be a cumulative impact of noise disturbance to neighbours, caused by groups returning late at night
 - Residents parking only allowed 2 permits per property and this house would have more than 2 cars, it would exacerbate the parking shortfall in the area
 - There were concerns of rubbish piling up in the street from an HMO and associated hygiene concerns
 - Loss of a family house
- iii) Ms H Taylor, objecting, on behalf of the East St.Thomas Residents Forum, whose points included:
- Her own experience of living next to a student HMO; students did not merge into the community and there was disturbance caused by noise, parties into the early hours, bad language, and fire alarms going off, which made the elderly residents feel vulnerable, and these had been reported to the Council, University of Portsmouth, police, the landlord and councillors.
 - There was an over-intensification of HMOs in the city which was causing stress to families and impacting on communities.
- iv) Mr Oliver, the applicant spoke to support the application, whose points included:
- He clarified that the application was for 8 persons and not 9, and the HMO licence was for 8
 - There had been a large reconfiguring and renovation of the building
 - There is a protective firewell in the centre of the stairwell, and fire alarms
 - The layout was over 4 floors, and the scheme was over twice the size of the Clarence Road property that the committee had passed

- The Planning Inspectors had seen well-managed properties so these did not lose at appeal
- Student behaviour is down to landlord management, and he lived locally and wanted to invest in this accommodation
- The bedrooms were of a good size, all over the minimum standards and the layout was not down to profit otherwise 10 would have been applied for
- If this was deferred he would seek non-determination with costs

Members' Questions

It was asked what the percentage of HMOs was for the 50m radius; this was confirmed at 34%. Members asked about the size of the en suites; these had not been given on the submitted plan.

Members' Comments

The possibility of deferring until the new SPD for HMOs was in place was considered. The size of rooms and en suites were considered and that a private sector HMO licence had been granted for 8 persons.

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development advised the committee to make a decision rather than defer as there is still a policy in place, so an Inspector when considering this non-determination may award costs against the authority.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the condition within the City Development Manager's report.

142. 17/01049/FUL - Land to Rear of Former Portland Hotel Tonbridge Street Southsea - construction of four-storey building comprising six flats and ground floor office (Class B1A), two integral garages and detached cycle store (report item 4) (AI 8)

The Chair agreed to vary the order for this to be brought forward on the agenda.

Councillor Lee Hunt withdrew from the room in accordance with his earlier declaration of interest for this item.

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters report stated that: "In addition to those previously reported within the Planning Committee report, two further letters of representation have been received from adjoining occupiers within Portland Court. Their objections can be summarised as follows: (a) Cramped form of development; (b) Loss of light; (c) Loss of privacy; and (d) Increased noise. These matters have been addressed within the Planning Committee report."

The following deputations were made, which are summarised:

- i) Miss Kilshaw (who reported that Miss Angus was not present to make her deputation) to object, whose points included:
 - She had lived in Portland Terrace for 10 years, and had previously attended the committee; she was objecting as her property with an extension which was the most affected by the proposal, but had not been consulted

- The importance of the site being within the Thomas Owen Conservation Area
 - This created a sense of enclosure
 - There were residential properties about the shops in Palmerston Road and this was an overdevelopment of the site
 - The amenities of the area were already under pressure
 - Concerns regarding fire engine access to properties
- ii) Mr R Adair spoke to object, whose points included:
- The committee should not rely on the previous Planning Inspectors decisions
 - This was out of character for the Thomas Owen Conservation Area, near a Grade II listed building
 - The Highways Team comments on the presumed garage use - it was unclear if the parking spaces would be used by the offices or flats and the impact of displaced parking in local residential streets, so there should be parking provision for each flat
 - It was overdevelopment of a cramped site
- iii) Mr J Garrett, the applicant spoke in support of his application, whose points included:
- There had previously been fire damage and there was tipping of rubbish on the car park
 - He had been through a lengthy planning process and had started to convert the hotel building with an expensive refurbishment scheme
 - He had looked into the issues of the foundations at no.3 and at the right of way
 - There were fire precautions with a dry riser access to the hotel
 - If it was left as it was it would be an eyesore, and he was removing the knotweed
 - The neighbours' concerns had been addressed in the previous application regarding daylight and noise, and there was a reduction in commercial space
 - He had used 2 architectural teams to find solutions so that the building sat well in the location, and he had increased the number of parking spaces allocated to the units
- iv) Ward Councillor Linda Symes spoke to object, whose points included:
- This design was less attractive than the previous one with the garages at the bottom and the loss of car parking spaces
 - The nearby residential parking zone lacked 300 spaces

- A bad development should not be placed on the site
- The right of way issue should be determined first

Members' Questions

Members questions included:

- When was the red line on the plans indicating parking spaces amended? It was reported that initially 5 spaces had been indicated in error and so the red line was reduced to take out a space and there had been further public consultation
- Was there sufficient access for emergency vehicles?
- The allocation of parking spaces - this was covered in condition 5 which allocated these to residential units only

Members' Comments

Members were mindful of PCC's parking policy and the comments made by the Highways Engineer regarding the reduction in the number of spaces provided, especially with the nearby parking zone being under great pressure, so this application would make the situation worse there. It was felt that the Planning Inspector had made an incorrect assumption on the council's parking policy.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would fail to provide adequate off-road parking facilities in line with the requirements of the Parking Standards and Transport Assessments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which would exacerbate the significant parking shortfall within KC resident's parking zone that is already oversubscribed by more than 300 spaces (in terms of spaces available to permits issued). The proposal would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Policies PCS17, PCS23 and the Parking Standards and Transport Assessments SPD.
2. Without appropriate mitigation the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Portsmouth Harbour and Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Areas and so is contrary to Policy PCS13 of the Portsmouth Plan and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended).

143. 17/01087/FUL - 52 Craneswater Avenue Southsea PO4 0PB - Change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to purposes falling within Class C4 (house in multiple occupation) or Class C3 (dwelling house) (report item 5) (AI 9)

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters Report stated:

"One letter of support has been received from the applicant. The applicant cannot attend committee. The applicant indicates there is a large forecourt that could be used for the off-road parking for three vehicles, and that internal furnishings would be of the highest quality for future occupiers."

Deputations were made, which are summarised:

- i) Ms D Emery, objecting, whose points included:
 - This was in a Conservation Area so guidance was that the application should preserve or enhance the character of the area, and no heritage statement had been submitted
 - There is a restrictive covenant - this should remain a family dwelling and not be a business
 - The appearance of the Edwardian property's frontage would change with 6 separate refuse bins and cycle storage which would be unsightly, along with alterations for post and intercom provision
 - This would be the loss of a family dwelling
 - There were cases of refusals for similar applications in the area
 - There would not be adequate parking for the increased number of occupants
- ii) Councillor Jennie Brent made a deputation on behalf of fellow Ward Councillor Luke Stubbs (before she withdrew from the room to take no further part in the discussion of this item), whose points of objection included:
 - This would change the pleasant nature of the road and was not good for the character of the locality, and there should be retained housing for a variety of sector needs
 - There had been a lot of objections
 - Lack of floor plan submitted
 - How the 10% rule was applied in this area
 - There had been 2 previous cases of refusals on Conservation Area grounds locally, which had been upheld on appeal
 - Increased noise and disturbance which would be detrimental to the amenity and character of the area

Members' Questions

The impact of this proposal in a Conservation Area was raised: the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development responded that there is no change to the physical appearance of the property, so the activity level would need to be considered to see if there was a similar level. Questions were then raised regarding the internal layout and storage of refuse and cycles (a condition would ask for details which the City Development Manager would seek to be to the rear of the property). It was confirmed that the covenant was not a planning consideration. The inclusion of the flats at Norman Court in the HMO count was queried: the new SPD was not yet adopted.

Members' Comments

Members were mindful of the precedent for decisions by the Planning Inspector to allow similar applications and that this was considered to be within the 10% threshold for HMOs on the current method. Members sympathised with the concerns of local residents but did not feel that there were sustainable planning grounds to refuse the application.

The Chair did ask that as the counting of the flats at Norman Court had been detrimental, this type of occurrence and should be looked at when considering the new SPD on HMOs.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report.

144. 17/01235/FUL - 11 Playfair Road Southsea PO5 1EQ - Change of use from house in multiple occupation (Class C4) to 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis) (report item 6) (AI 10)

After the City Development Manager's presentation deputations were heard, which are summarised:

- i) Dr M Willoughby, objecting, on behalf of the East St.Thomas Residents Forum, whose points included:
 - There was a very high density of HMOs (two thirds of the road) and this was another 'super HMO' for profit
 - There was a lack of clarity such as on the communal areas
 - It should be deferred until the new SPD on HMOs had been adopted
 - The loft conversion meant an intensification of use and almost doubling the occupancy
 - Bedroom 3 did not meet space requirements
 - Such developments were unsustainable for the city
- ii) Ms K Webber, objecting, on behalf of the East St.Thomas Residents Forum, whose points included:
 - The continued over-intensification of the area was affecting the lives of local residents, with impact on parking, waste management and noise disturbance
 - There should be more balance with so many students
 - This should be rejected or deferred pending the outcome of the new SPD on HMOs
- iii) Ms H Taylor, objecting, on behalf of the East St.Thomas Residents Forum, whose points included:
 - Living next door to a student let property she was aware of the problems experienced by neighbours, of noise disturbance with the intensive use of the

property and more washing/showers as well as the coming and going of people

- These houses and streets were not designed for this use
- It was hoped that the new SPD would benefit residents rather than developers

iv) Ms C Webb made a deputation to support the applicant, whose points included:

- As a third year university student living at the property she had seen all the improvements made, with new heating system and removal of damp, through the refurbishments it now had a bright communal area and the bedrooms were up to the required standards
- The landlord was on the accreditation scheme and there was Building Regulations approval.

Members' Questions

Members queried the size of rooms, such as Bedroom 3 to ensure they met the space standards (which was 7.5m² for a single occupied room). It was asked if there was division between the kitchen and living room space and the provision of communal space. The exact size of the kitchen was not known. The Assistant Director of Culture and City Development clarified that the room sizes were controlled by the licence for the HMO.

Members' Comments

Members were concerned at the lack of communal space and by the lack of information on the size of rooms, layout and facilities as they wished to consider the amenity of occupiers and therefore needed more information.

RESOLVED that consideration of this application be deferred.

145. 17/01310/FUL - 6 Admiral Square Nelson Road Southsea PO5 2DQ - Change of use from purposes falling within Class C3 (dwelling house) to purposes falling within Class C4 (house in multiple occupation) (report item 7) (AI 11)

Councillor Hunt withdrew from the room for this item in accordance with his declaration of interest.

After the City Development Manager's presentation deputations were heard, whose points are summarised.

- i) Mr R Adair spoke to object, whose points included:
- Residents had raised their objections as this is a separate, gated community and they did not wish its character to be changed
 - There was already an HMO there and another would take it above the threshold
 - St. Jude ward had too many HMOs whilst other properties stood empty so was it needed?

ii) Ward Councillor Linda Symes spoke to object, whose points included:

- There were discrepancies in the calculations with more shared accommodation just outside the measured radius
- 6 unrelated people live and behave in a different way to a family
- It is a small enclave of houses and not a row of houses
- There was not sufficient parking provision so there would be an impact on the surrounding roads
- There are thin walls so there would be noise issues and the amenity of residents would be affected
- These properties were designed for family use

Members' Questions

The size of bathrooms was asked; the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development responded that this information had not been provided by the applicant (the licence is granted by Private Sector Housing who look at size of rooms) and this was not a legal requirement.

Members' Comments

It was noted that there were no comments from Private Sector Housing on the adequacy of provision. The unusual layout of the set of properties meant that properties face inwards, and this would change the nature of this unique community. The nature of the higher density of HMOs just outside of the radius was also noted, and may be another issue for the SPD to consider. The proximity of high density communities at St.Johns College and the McCarthy and Stone building and their impact was raised. There was already one HMO and another would breach the 10% threshold.

RESOLVED that permission be refused for the following reason:

In the opinion of the local planning authority, the gated community of Admiral Square has a unique character and with similar isolated clusters of development in the local area, the development is distinct and detached from the prevailing urban character of Portsmouth. The creation of the proposed HMO would significantly adversely affect and fail to protect the individual character of this gated community. This impact would be exacerbated by the presence of an existing HMO within Admiral Square and would undermine the retention of a mixed and balanced community within the development. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies PCS20 and PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 146. 17/01367/FUL - The Ferryman Guest House 16 Victoria Road South Southsea PO5 2BZ - Construction of first floor rear extension with obscure glazed screens; external alterations to provide "Juliet" balconies; installation of external staircase and hooped ladder access to rear; and installation of PV array at roof level (report item 8) (AI 12)**

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters report stated:
"The agent has queried why conditions four and five have been imposed. These conditions are to protect trees in the rear garden from any disturbance associated with the work and to protect residential amenity. The full reasoning for these conditions is outlined in the committee report."

Members' Questions

The impact of windows and screens (and views from the balconies) was raised and it was reported that the internal layout of the adjoining property had changed since the previous application.

Members' Comments

There were no comments.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report.

147. 17/01373/HOU - 3 Paignton Avenue Portsmouth PO3 6LL - Construction of first floor rear extension (report item 9) (AI 13)

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters Report stated:

"In addition to the conditions on page 75, the following additional condition is included:

Condition:

4) The proposed side windows on the ground floor side elevation shown on drawing 'BENNETT01A REV B A0' shall be non-opening unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be permanently retained in that condition.

Reason:

4) To prevent the windows opening out onto the shared driveway in the interest of safety, in accordance with Policy PCS17 of the Portsmouth Plan."

Deputations of opposition were made, which are summarised:

i) Ms R Birch, whose points included:

- The effect on her property and the height and size was out of character with the rest of the road
- She had been told she could only have permission for a small extension to avoid invading the privacy of others but this extension would encroach on her property
- Problems by the weight of the wall which could cause damage to her property

ii) Miss B Murphy, whose points included:

- This would also affect her property's amenities
- There would be overlooking into her downstairs living area

- Loss of light to her building and garden area
- The extension would be obtrusive, overbearing and would give a sense of enclosure
- There were no other similar extensions in the road so it was out of character
- The applicant could have used the roof space
- There is not a shared driveway

Members Questions

Members asked about the changes compared to the previously submitted scheme, the line of the extension compared to the neighbouring properties and the level of overlooking. It was asked if the window could be obscured but were advised that this could be an issue with Building Regulations. It was asked why officers had suggested a pitch roof design: this was to be sympathetic with the style of the house.

Members' Comments

Members were concerned regarding the impact on the neighbouring properties at No.1 and No.5 Paignton Avenue, especially the loss of amenity at No.5. They considered the photographs circulated by one of the deputations in trying to assess the impact with relation to overlooking which they wished to consider further by undertaking a site visit.

RESOLVED that consideration of this application be deferred, to allow a site visit to be undertaken by the committee.

148. 17/01455/FUL - 239 Powerscourt Road Portsmouth PO2 7JJ - Change of use from purposes falling within Class C4 (house of multiple occupation) to 7-bedroom house of multiple occupation (Sui Generis) (report item 10) (AI 14)

This item had been withdrawn from this agenda so that consideration was deferred until a later meeting.

149. 17/01456/FUL - 10 Clarence Road Southsea PO5 2LG - Change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to purposes falling within Class C4 (house in multiple occupation) or Class C3 (dwelling house) (report item 11) (AI 15)

The Chair agreed to vary the agenda order for this item to be taken earlier. Councillor Hunt withdrew from the room for the consideration of this item in accordance with his earlier declaration of interest.

Before the officer's presentation, it was asked that whether due to the emerging Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which would update guidance on Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO), whether consideration of this item should be deferred until the SPD was agreed? Claire Upton-Brown, the Assistant Director of Culture and City Development responded that there were several HMO applications for determination on this agenda and if these were not determined within the 8 week period there could be appeals on the grounds of non-determination, and possible costs incurred by the Council. It was therefore placed on record that members were

concerned that there may be reputational issues caused by an influx of such applications during the period of consultation on the developing SPD. It was stressed that each application would be considered on its own merit.

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters report stated:
"As a matter of clarification in response to comments raised by the Private Sector Housing Department relating to no bathrooms being included on the proposed layout, the applicant has confirmed that the property would have five ensuite bathrooms adjoining each of the bedrooms."

Deputations were made, which are summarised:

- i) Mr R Adair - objecting - whose points included:
 - St. Jude ward did not need any more HMO dwellings, when houses were standing empty, and there should be further investigation if there is a need and the 10% calculation rules
- ii) Mr P Moore, the applicant spoke in support of his application, whose points included:
 - The accommodation was designed for the young professionals market
 - He was investing in properties and upgrading them
 - There is an increase in young single people so the demand is there in the rented sector
 - The accommodation, with en-suites and communal provision, more than satisfied the council's housing standards
- iii) Ward Councillor Linda Symes spoke to support this application which would cater for young professionals in the city, and welcomed this as a good application for shared accommodation.

Members' Questions

The location of worktops on the plan was clarified.

Members' Comments

Members were pleased to see the sizes of bedrooms and provision of en-suites for each one, so welcomed the quality of this development which would provide a good standard of housing for local people.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report.

150. 17/01556/FUL - 20 Granada Road Southsea PO4 0RH - Change of use from purposes falling within HMO (Class C4) or dwelling (Class C3) to form 8 bedroom HMO (Sui Generis) (report item 12) (AI 16)

The City Development Manager's Supplementary Matters report stated:

"Further to the publication of the Planning Committee Report, two representations have been received objecting to the development on the grounds of: (a) the application site is being overdeveloped; (b) the proposal would have an impact on family housing; (c) the proposal would be out of character with the surrounding area; (d) the property would be overcrowded; (e) the property would be occupied by less respectful residents; (f) fire safety issues and (e) increased parking demand."

.....

It also clarified that the proposal section should read "This application seeks planning permission to use the property as an 8 bedroom, 8 person house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis)", not 7 person.

A deputation was due to be heard from the applicant Mr Bateman, but he was not present at the end of the meeting when this item was discussed.

Councillor Jennie Brent made a deputation on behalf of Councillor Luke Stubbs as ward councillor, before withdrawing from the room and taking no further part in the discussion of this item. The points made on behalf of Councillor Stubbs included:

- He was familiar with the building which had previously been a party office
- It was prone to flooding
- Private Sector Housing had indicated there were inadequate facilities and a small kitchen area
- The Council were consulting on the SPD policy to close the loophole for large HMOs
- It did not meet the national standards for shared accommodation

Members' Questions

Questions were asked on the details of layout and access to the upper rooms and their sizes.

Members' Comments

Member were concerned regarding the comments by Private Sector Housing and the sizes of rooms and layout was confusing, therefore a deferral was sought to seek clarification.

RESOLVED that consideration of this application be deferred.

The meeting concluded at 7.05 pm.

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor J Fleming

