

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 12 August 2020 at 2pm Virtual Remote Meeting - Remote

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
	Chris Attwell
	Lee Hunt
	Donna Jones
	Terry Norton
	Lynne Stagg
	Luke Stubbs
	Claire Udy

Welcome

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

49. Apologies (AI 1)

There were no apologies for absence.

50. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Item 4: 19/00886/FUL 187 Havant Road

Councillor David Fuller declared a personal and prejudicial interest because of his employer's business, another care home on Havant Road. There could be the appearance of bias if he participates in and votes on this item. He will not participate in or vote on this item and will vacate the chair.

Councillor Lynne Stagg declared a personal and prejudicial interest as her daughter works for the Society of St James. She would leave the meeting for this item.

Councillor Terry Norton declared a personal and prejudicial interest because he had carried out some case work relating to this application. He would make a deputation and then leave and not take part in the debate.

Item 8: 20/00322/FUL Portsmouth Football Club, Fratton Park, Frogmore Road.

Councillor Donna Jones declared a pecuniary interest because she is the stadium Director and had been leading this piece of work. She would leave the meeting for this item.

51. Update on previous applications (AI 4)

The Head of Development Management gave the following updates:

The Planning Inspector had upheld this planning committee's decisions regarding the appeals for the applications at 7 Beatrice Road and 32 Montgomery Road.

52. 19/00886/FUL - 187 Havant Road. Conversion of care home (Class C2) to 13 self-contained units of 'move-on' accommodation (Class C3), with associated bicycle and refuse storage.

Councillor David Fuller left the meeting for this item and Councillor Judith Smyth took over as Chair.

The Planning Officer presented the report and added that in Supplementary Matters Report that had been circulated to the committee:

10 further representations had been received since publication of the report objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- a) short notice given to residents to make comments;
- b) no facilities in the area to accommodate the needs of the residents;
- c) off-licence very close to the site which would not help residents;
- d) inappropriate location with many elderly residents and families;
- e) increased pressure on local health services;
- f) increased parking problems due to lack of visitor parking;
- g) concern that some local residents still have not been consulted properly about the proposals; decision seems to be being rushed through;
- h) problems in the area have already increased since temporary use of the building;
- i) flats do not meet required size standards;

One additional representation received in support of the proposal, making the following points:

- a) the change of use will not be significant;
- b) the use is likely to generate less traffic as the residents are unlikely to own cars;
- c) the area has good accessibility to the city centre by public transport and cycling;
- d) provision of move-on accommodation for the homeless is essential;
- e) Drayton would benefit from a more diverse population.

Officers considered that the matters raised in the further representations had been addressed within the committee report.

Further written deputations were read out as part of the officer presentation from:

Against

Marcus Kaye with additional comments from his daughter Susannah Williams
Julie Salmond
Darren Brewer
J M Parry
Spencer-Gardner
Dawn Young

Supporting.

Applicant

Deputations were given by Councillor Steve Wemyss and Councillor Terry Norton. Both were against the application.

Councillor Darren Sanders gave a deputation in support of the application.

Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link <https://livestream.com/accounts/14063785/planning-12aug2020>

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

- The planning committee has no control over codes of conduct or eviction policies for occupiers or tenants.
- This application has been assessed as a specific type of accommodation: move-on. Planning Officers have used The Homeless Foundation's definition of move-on accommodation as set out in paragraph 5.4 of the report.
- The officers' view is that although room sizes are significantly below the nationally set minimum room size standards, this is acceptable in this instance.
- The application is for self-contained units and therefore fall within Class 3 use category as the property is not for one family nor is it a HMO.
- The recommended condition stipulates that tenants' can reside there for a maximum of two years. This adequately mitigates the use of the land.
- PCS19 states that all new developments should meet the size standards.
- There is a need to consider whether the need to house rough sleepers outweighs the need to meet the minimum standards.
- This is the first time that a planning application for this type of accommodation has been presented to Portsmouth City Council's planning committee. Similar conditions have been imposed on planning permission in other local authority areas.

Members' Comments

Members expressed concern regarding:

- The size of the property and the possible implications of not adhering to the nationally recognised minimum size standards.
- The lack of a nationally accepted definition of move-on accommodation.
- Access to public transport is not ideal nor cheap. Most people in the area have cars.
- The lack of shared communal space which would be useful to enable conflicts to be resolved.
- Tenants who are not working or employed would spend a lot of time in their small units to the detriment of their mental health.
- Granting planning permission for units that fall significantly below the minimum size standards could set a precedent and lead developers to design micro-flats and claim exceptional standards.

However, members recognised the need for new housing in the city and noted that the Society of St James had explained that the tenants would be better off with smaller rooms and that the expectation is that most of the time they would be at college or work.

RESOLVED

Permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in the report and delegated authority granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth.

53. **20/00357/CS3 - Land Corner Northern Parade & Doyle Avenue. Construction of 16 dwellings, comprising 4no. 3 bedroom townhouses, 3no. 4 bedroom accessible houses and 9no. 2 bedroom flats with associated parking (resubmission of 19/01690/CS3).**

54.

Councillor Fuller re-joined the meeting and chaired the rest of the meeting.

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

36 further representations have been received since publication of the Officer Report for Committee, objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- a) Development out of character with other properties in the area;*
- b) Inadequate parking causing highway /pedestrian safety and air quality concerns; consideration should be given to ways to provide more parking in the local area through changes to highway markings etc;*
- c) Lack of outside space for residents;*
- d) Overdevelopment of the site;*
- e) Increased population will create problems with social distancing on footpaths and roads, increasing health risk;*
- f) There could be better alternative uses for the site such as a park, community centre or parking provision for the nearby school;*
- g) The houses and flats are too big for the plot;*
- h) Internal arrangement of the flats not suitable for families;*
- i) Increased indiscriminate parking could lead to issues with emergency vehicle access in the area;*
- j) Particular concerns about increased parking problems in Templeton Close and Conan Road;*
- k) Feel that the scheme is being 'pushed through' without due regard to residents' concerns;*
- l) Increased strain on local facilities and services such as healthcare;*
- m) Negative impact on local house prices;*
- n) Insufficient bicycle storage;*
- o) Limited bus services from Northern Parade;*
- p) Increased waste and pollution.*

A letter had also been received from Penny Mordaunt MP, making the council aware of the concerns raised by residents in relation to parking pressure and safety of road users. The letter requests that the Planning Department considers the concerns of residents carefully as part of the planning process.

The Planning Officer reported that:

Matters relating to design, layout, standard of living accommodation and parking had been addressed within the planning committee report. The concern regarding impact on house prices is not a material planning consideration.

The applicant confirmed their intention to provide electric vehicle charging points for the three disabled parking spaces in front of the dwellings fronting Conan Road.

An additional plan showing the detailed elevations of the cycle and refuse storage facilities had also been provided. Conditions 2, 18 and 19 had been updated to reflect the additional plan number.

Further written deputations were read out as part of the officer presentation from:

Against

Janet Rennell-Smith
Stephen Carter
Mrs N Vaughan

Councillor Scott Payter-Harris gave a deputation against the application.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

The Highways Engineer had clarified his concerns regarding amenities and impact on air quality of people driving around looking for parking spaces. Solar panels would be installed on the roofs.

Seven or eight representations had been received after the report had been published. Approximately ten more had been received early this week. None of these had indicated that they wished to make a deputation.

Parking in front of the houses on Northern Parade side of the building had not been investigated. None of the parking spaces would be allocated. It would be for the council to manage these through the tenancy agreements.

Members' Comments

Members noted the pressure from the government to build 12,000 new homes in the city, the need for more social housing particularly for disabled tenants and that this application was not an over-intensive use of the site.

Councillor Donna Jones reported that she had not been involved in any of the residents' discussions about this applications as one of the Ward Councillors for that area and therefore could sit on the committee for this item.

There was concern that this application would only provide 12 out of the 29 parking spaces required by the parking standards. However, more parking spaces would be made available after the removal of the hoardings particularly during term time.

RESOLVED

Permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

- 55. 19/01697/FUL - 1-3 Warwick Crescent. Construction of a 3 storey block of 4no. 5 bedroom and 1no. 6 bedroom student accommodation cluster apartments with associated refuse and cycle stores and amenity space (description amended 28/01/2020 and amended plans).**

The Planning Officer presented the report.

Further written deputations were read out as part of the officer presentation from:

Florentina Boorman - against
PDP Architecture LLP, the agent on behalf of the applicant.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, the Planning Officer explained that:

A management plan is being commissioned under section 106 to secure the contributions and the management of student arrivals and departures and will include having a one hour slot in the first weekend or first two weekends of term.

The original permission agreed in 2019 was based broadly on the public house that had been there previously. The current application is not materially larger.

This application is for residential student and therefore would not directly address any employment use. This is an application for a different type of resident for the property that already has planning approval so there is no loss of commercial use.

Members' Comments

Members sympathised with the loss of light for the neighbouring property caused by this building but noted that it would be the same size as the pub that had been there originally.

RESOLVED

Permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in the report and delegated authority granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth.

- 56. 19/00589/FUI - 109-113 Sultan Road. Construction of additional storey and conversion of first floor to provide 5 self-contained flats; alterations to rear of ground floor to provide access, cycle storage and refuse storage.**

The Planning Officer presented the report and asked the members to note that the following line in the report should be deleted: Paragraph 5.8: *all but one window*.

A further written deputation was read out as part of the officer presentation from Kim Blake objecting to the application.

Members' Questions.

In response to questions from members, the Planning Officer explained that:

The parapet would be 2.4m higher than the existing one. The shadow on the neighbouring garden is not considered to be detrimental.

The windows at the back of the building would be obscure glazed.

Members' Comments.

Members noted that this would be an overbearing feature for neighbours especially at no. 115. However, there is sufficient street parking.

RESOLVED

Permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in the report and delegated authority granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth.

- 57. 20/00322/FUL - Portsmouth Football Club, Fratton Park, Frogmore Road. Improvements and alterations to the north-east and south-east sections (Milton End) to include construction of turnstiles and entrances (including change of use of part of local residential garden); construction of buildings to provide further facilities including disabled access, toilets blocks and security office; improvements alterations to concourse areas, stands, seating and facilities; extension of roof; retention of TV screen and replacement of boundary walls.**

The Planning Officer presented the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that two further representations had been received since publication of the report.

One representation raises objection to the proposals on the following grounds:

- a) Lack of notification to neighbours about the proposals;
- b) Concern about increased numbers of visitors to the stadium and resulting impact on local parking;
- c) Concern about residents safety if increased numbers of people entering and leaving the stadium on match days;
- d) Noise and disturbance during construction works;
- e) Increased parking problems likely to be caused by construction vehicles.

It is confirmed that public consultation was carried out in the form of letters to immediate surrounding neighbours and a site notice, as per the details set out in paragraph 4.1 of the committee report. The proposal would not result in an increase in the overall capacity of the football stadium. Any problems that may arise during construction would be short term and would be addressed through separate environmental legislation.

One representation is from the occupiers of No.42 Carisbrooke Road, raising concerns about the construction of a wall on the south-east side of the site, as follows:

- a) Wall being built but permission not yet granted;
- b) Only notified late about the intention to start works on the wall;
- c) Noise and disturbance;
- d) Concern about open access from the new storage area into private garden;
- e) Concern about what may be stored in the storage area;
- f) Loss of privacy

In response to the above representation, the applicant's agent confirmed that work had begun on the construction of a new wall to the rear of No.44 Carisbrooke Road, the timing of which related to part of the purchase agreement of the land. The applicants had since arranged to meet with the occupants of No.42 Carisbrooke Road to agree a suitable boundary treatment adjacent to their garden.

One representation received in support of the scheme, making the following points:

- a) The works would create better segregation of away fans;
- b) Would provide proper facilities for disabled fans;
- c) Hope that there could be wider upgrading of stadium facilities in the future, subject to improved road/railway infrastructure;
- d) The scheme would improve Specks Lane;
- e) Improvements to the Football Club could act as a catalyst to rejuvenating the Fratton and Milton areas of the city.

Further consultee comment - Environmental Health:

The Environmental Health Officer has commented that in their view, the provision of the proposed new concourse, which would be closer to the properties in Alverstone Road, would not represent a significant difference in noise environment. The works would not increase the capacity of the stadium and would be used as a supporters' entry and exit before and after the game similar to the use of the existing walkway. In addition, the new concourse is likely to disperse fans more quickly and the screening may result in reduced communication between fans on the walkway and those below. In summary, given the existing level of noise from the stadium, it is not considered that there would be a significant change in measured noise levels at nearby noise sensitive premises.

Further written depositions were read out from:

Andrew Smith - objecting.

PTP, the applicant's agent.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members officers explained that:

The chain link fence would be replaced by a more solid structure of the same height and therefore provide more secure screening and would be supported on columns so that there should be no impact on safety.

The Assistant Director Planning & Economic Growth informed the committee that he has an ex-officio post as the Chair of Portsmouth Football Club Safety Advisory Group and can confirm that the Football Club has liaised with the relevant safety organisations and this is dealt with by a separate legislative regime.

Members' Comments

Members noted the good design, the better facilities and that there had been no complaints from neighbouring residents.

RESOLVED

Permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The meeting concluded at 18:16

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor David Fuller