

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 17 October 2018 at 1pm in 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 Hugh Mason (Chair)
Judith Smyth (Vice-Chair)
Donna Jones
Steve Pitt
Luke Stubbs
Claire Udy

Welcome

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

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The Chair 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.

112. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillor Suzy Horton (Councillor Rob Wood deputised for her), Councillor Gemma New and Councillor Tom Wood.

113. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

18/01143/FUL - 58 Cromwell Road

Councillor Stubbs declared a non-prejudicial interest as he knows the former landlord of the premises when operating as a pub.

Councillor Pitt declared a non-prejudicial interest as he was the landlord of the licensed premises opposite this premises.

18/00813/FUL - 32A Exmouth Road.

Councillor Judith Smyth declared a non-prejudicial interest as she lives near to this premises.

114. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 September 2018 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 19 September be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

115. Updates on previous planning applications by the Assistant Director of City Development (AI 4)

The Assistant Director of City Development advised that there were no updates of the committee.

116. 18/00057/FUL - Moneyfields Sports & Social Club Moneyfield Avenue, Portsmouth PO3 6LA (AI 5)

The Planning Officer introduced the report and pointed out the following correction to the first line on page 32:

*Free hire of the AGP for a period of 2 hours, twice a month on Sundays, throughout the year, between **6pm** and 8pm (with coaching arranged and undertaken by whichever local charity/ community group has booked the 2 hour slot).*

He referred members to the supplementary matters list. A further representation had been received relating to noise, drainage, visual impact and tree planting. A petition had also been received regarding the carpark. There was also a residual issue about fencing in Sport England's response.

The recommendations remained unchanged.

Deputations from the following people were heard:

1. Mr Pickup, agent
2. Mr Seiden, Director of Moneyfields Sports & Social Club and the Acting Chair of Moneyfields Football Club.
3. Councillor Sanders (objecting).

Members' Questions.

In response to questions, the following points were clarified:

- If problems arise from the public use of the car park, the applicant could apply for the condition to varied or removed.
- No notice had been given that the viability report would be considered in a public meeting. The broad figures are included in the report. Were the assessment to be made public at this meeting, the applicant's position might be weakened.
- The agent was then asked and said that the applicant would be happy for the assessment to be shared at this meeting. He added that the summary costs of the development were shown in the presentation, but not the assessment carried out by the PCC consultant.
- Officers explained that the Vail Williams report did not give total residual build per m². The costs were listed as:

1-14 plots rebuild cost	£1,593/m ²
Individual dwellings	£1,294/ m ²
Commercial build	£2.866667/m average (from 3 quotes).
Contingency in the build	5%
The developer's profit would be 17.5%.	The range of profit to be expected for a low risk scheme would be between 18

	and 20%.
Marketing sales fees	£185,735

Timings: 6 months lead-in time, 18 months construction and 8 months sales period. A total of 2 years and 8 months.

- In real terms, there is a funding gap of £1m after the profits are deducted. The controls proposed via the S106 agreement would ensure that the community enabling facility is built.
- The discussion between the applicant and Sport England is outside this application, but the council has been party to that. Sport England did not offer a grant to fund the gap, but officers could not say for certain that it would not be given in the future.
- If delegated authority were to be granted by the committee, a sum equivalent of 4 units would be given to the council to hold to ensure all the scheme is carried out.
- A condition ensuring the car park is opened to residents could not have been imposed on this application. However, as the applicant has offered this provision, it would be an enforceable condition.
- 2m high acoustic fencing would be erected along the full length of the existing boundary with the gardens on the club side.
- The Environmental Health assessment identified the maximum luminosity level required and concluded that it is reasonable and appropriate for the site.
- A letter was sent to all third parties, including residents in Salcombe Avenue informing them of the application. The case file could be viewed online and at the Civic Offices.

Members' Comments.

Members commented that they were mindful that the loss of open space was permitted when justified, the scheme would be beneficial to residents, the development application seemed sensitive, the train line would act as a buffer for the nearby houses, the car park would only be available for local residents and that the S106 agreement would protect PCC interests.

RESOLVED that delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of City Development to:

- 1. Grant conditional permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement in accord with the principals outlined in the report including an appropriate level of mitigation set out in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy (so there would not be a significant effect on the SPAs)**
- 2. Add/ amend conditions where necessary.**
- 3. Refuse planning permission if the legal agreement has not been completed within three months of the date of the resolution.**

117. 18/00840/FUL - 38 Vernon Avenue Southsea PO4 8SA (AI 6)

The Planning Officer introduced the report and referred members to the supplementary matters report. One additional representation had been received raising concerns about the notification process, the change of use to four bedrooms,

the argument that four people could be considered as operating as a family, the property already being used as a HMO and how quickly issues would be addressed by the landlord.

The recommendation remains unchanged.

An amended site plan was circulated.

A deputation was heard from Mr Eveleigh (the applicant).

Members' Questions.

In response to questions from members, the following points were clarified:

Mr Eveleigh explained that he knew the other tenants as they were students on the same course as his son. He did not intend to re-let the property to students after they have left.

The Assistant Director of City Development added that when a landlord lives at a property with two other people planning permission for a change of use to a House of Multiple Occupation is required.

Members' Comments.

Members noted that granting the application would not increase the proportion of HMOs within a 50m radius to over 10%.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted.

118. 18/00813/FUL - 32A Exmouth Road Southsea PO5 2QL (AI 7)

Councillor Jones left the meeting.

The Planning Officer introduced the report and referred members to the supplementary matters list. Two further letters of objection had been received expressing concerns that were similar to those previously reported. Nine other representations had been received concerned that the amended drawings did not address concerns they had already raised. A petition containing the names of 57 individuals had also been received. Details of the council's discussions and additional condition are set out in the list.

Deputations were heard from the following people:

Objecting

Mr Foster

Ms Shepherd

For

Mr Knight, agent

Mr Oliver, applicant

Members' Questions.

In response to questions, the following points were clarified:

- There would not be a significant loss of light to neighbouring properties.

- There is a 35m of separation in some cases.
- One of the conditions stipulates that land contamination investigations must take place and the appropriate remediation as necessary.
- The drainage team has been involved in discussions regarding the high water table.

Members' Comments.

Members were pleased to note that the design was in keeping with the area, the development would not limit the light to neighbouring properties, would make the area feel safer and was not an over-development of the site.

RESOLVED that the application be granted subject to conditional permission.

119. 18/01143/FUL - 58 Cromwell Road Southsea PO4 9PN (AI 8)

The Planning Officer introduced the report and referred members to the supplementary matters list. Three additional representations had been made regarding loss of light and privacy, inadequate parking provision, lack of notification and loss of nearby public houses. Two other representations were received regarding the development not being in keeping with the area, overdevelopment and parking.

A deputation was heard from Mrs Atkins (against).

Members' Questions.

In response to questions, the following points were clarified:

- The use of the wall at no. 1 Tokar Street is a party wall issue and therefore not a planning issue.
- The amount of parking proposed would be a net improvement to the current parking provision.
- During negotiations, only cosmetic changes had been requested. The possible removal of the house from the application, was not discussed.
- The applicant had not indicated a willingness to remove the separate dwelling part of the application.
- It is located next to a conservation area and would use good materials.
- During the conversion of The Cellars no parking was provided.
- Moving the separate dwelling would to the west would create a gap with possible maintenance problems.
- The determination of this hearing could be deferred in order to ask the applicant to consider reconfiguration of site to provide easier access/ egress for cars.

Members' Comments.

Members considered the loss of light to the neighbouring property, the over intensification of the site, the logistics involved in parking in the courtyard area and exiting onto the main road, the materials proposed and the visual impact of this property which would not be in keeping with the nearby properties.

RESOLVED that the application be refused.

Reasons.

1. The proposed dwelling house to the west of the site would, by reason of its extent of site coverage and inconsistent fenestration represent a visually harmful form of development that would fail to relate appropriately to the adjoining terrace of properties on Tokar Street and the wider street scene resulting in an overdevelopment of the site that would be at odds with the character and appearance of the area. Therefore the proposal would be deemed to be contrary to Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan and the principles of good design set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed internal courtyard area represents a cramped layout, lacking adequate space to sufficiently accommodate the different activities relating to the movement of cars, bicycles and bins and would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

The meeting concluded at 4:15pm.

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Hugh Mason