

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Bedrooms 3 and 4 on the existing plan would both be subdivided to create the additional two bedrooms, creating 6 bedrooms in total.
- Bedrooms 3 and 4 would be smaller than the minimum requirements if the amendments to the HMO SPD are approved.
- There is no bathroom on the first floor just a WC. There are 3 WCs in total.
- Based on the information in the proposed new SPD bedrooms 7 and 8 could be let as double rooms however there may not be enough communal space for additional occupants.
- The Private Sector Housing team have based their response on room sizes and advised they are suitable for a single individual occupancy.

Members' Comments

One member felt that this application should be deferred until a decision on the amendments to the HMO SPD had been made. It was noted that under the new HMO SPD two of the bedrooms would be under the minimum size standards. Other members commented that the committee has to consider the applications with the position as it stands today and this application is reasonable. There was concern that there is no bathroom on the first floor and also that in the future 10 people could be living in the property which would be an over intensification.

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

128. 17/01192/HOU - 22 Exeter Road Southsea PO4 9PZ (AI 14)

(Councillor Steve Pitt was not present for this item)

The planning officer introduced the report.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

objector, whose points included:

- Lack of accuracy by the applicant in their measurements.
- No mention in the officers report of the 90cm gap to his property
- States on the council's website that a resident's right to light should be taken into account. The proposal will block out light from his kitchen diner where they spend a lot of their time.
- Overbearing effect on adjacent properties.
- No properties to the west have two storey extensions.
- Invited his neighbour in so he could see the how much light they have in their kitchen/diner with the single storey extension and they commented that a second storey would impact further on their loss of light and they would rethink their plans.

- Will have a major effect on their amenities.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- Officers are not suggesting that because the single storey extension was permitted that a second storey would not have much more of an impact on the neighbouring property.
- Members need to consider the relationship of the window between the two properties and the amount of light that will be reduced if a second storey is permitted.
- The 45 degree angle is a rule of thumb guidance and not law.

Members' Comments

Members commented that if the neighbouring property only had one window in their kitchen/diner they would be very concerned and object to the application, however as there are two windows (one obscured glazed) felt that the neighbouring property would still have sufficient light.

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the City Development Managers report.

~~1001014/HOU - 50 Stubbington Avenue Portsmouth PO2 0JA (A145)~~

The planning officer introduced the report and reported in the supplementary matters list that a representation in support had been received from Councillor Young commenting: " I have sat in front of the planning committee several times to make deputations on planning applications for HMOs in this part of the city and one of residents biggest concerns is the impact on parking that these developments will have on the city. Here we have an application which is to create on road parking and the planning department decides to reject it. This application, I believe will have minimal street impact and will improve safety for the applicant"

The harm raised by the Highways Authority and identified in the reason for refusal relates solely to the impact on highway safety.

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

Councillor Alicia Denny, ward councillor whose points included:

- Not many pedestrians using Stubbington Avenue apart from school drop off and pick up times, therefore this would not impact on pedestrians.
- If this is a statutory road why are there not double yellow lines down both sides of Stubbington Avenue?
- This proposal would remove one parked car from the road.
- The applicant only wants to park a small car on the forecourt, although not sure how there would be control over the size of the car that parks in the space if the applicant were to move.