

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, 26 January 2021 at 2.00 pm as a Virtual Remote Meeting

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.

1. Apologies (AI 1)

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Planning Applications 1 & 2: 44-46 Palmerston Road, Southsea, PO5 3QG - 20/00620/FUL and 20/00621/LBC

Councillor Donna Jones did not have a personal or prejudicial interest in the site of the former Debenhams, however that she had been in contact with the agent, applicant and architect. She would therefore leave the meeting for the discussion of this application.

Councillor Stubbs declared that he been contacted directly by the applicant on matters of process, not the merits of the application. He did not consider this an interest.

Councillor Judith Smyth advised she did not have an interest but had attended the public consultation meetings, and was a patient at the Trafalgar Surgery who had expressed an interest in moving into the ground floor of the new development.

Planning Application 5: 253 Twyford Avenue, PO2 8NY, 20/00375/FUL

Councillor Lee Hunt advised he did not have an interest but he had talked with the petitioner and made it clear he would keep an open mind and had been to look at the property.

3. Minutes of previous meeting - 9 December 2020 (AI 3)

Councillor Jones proposed two amendments to the minutes:

1) Minute 87 - Declarations of members' interests:

To amend the final sentence of the first paragraph to read:

She had met with senior planning officers Ian Maguire and Eze Ekeledo last Friday together with Councillor Luke Stubbs and Councillor Steve Pitt.

2) Minute 87 - Declarations of members' interests:

To delete the fourth paragraph:

'Councillor Jones did not go on to confirm if she had an open mind and that there was no bias; however, she later participated in the vote to defer the Debenhams application'.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 9 December 2020 be approved as a correct record subject to the above amendments.

4. Update on Previous Applications. (AI 4)

The Head of Development Management reported that the Council had received appeal decisions for two HMO refusals from the Planning Inspectorate.

20 Montgomerie Road, Southsea, which was for a change of use from a C4 HMO use to a 7 bedroom house. This was dismissed due to inadequate living conditions for its occupiers in respect of the inadequate nature and under provision of the communal space. An application for cost was also refused by the planning inspector.

An appeal was allowed for 130 St Andrews Road in Southsea on 11 December. This was a change of use from a dwelling house in class C3 or HMO C4 to an 8 bedroom Sui Generis application. The inspector did not accept there would be an adverse impact on living conditions for future occupiers of the property in regards to communal space.

Councillor Hunt said with regard to the Montgomery Road decision the planning inspector had looked closely at the room sizes and communal areas in particular. He felt it was really important developers provide adequate communal space and he hoped that the committee would continue to test this so that future occupants are looked after.

5. 44-46 Palmerston Road, Southsea PO5 3QG - 20/00620/FUL (AI 5)

(Councillor Jones left the meeting for the duration of this item)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report. Peter Hayward, Island Highway & Transport Consultants, was present for this item.

The Senior Planning Officer drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

The publicity period of the application was extended until 04 January 2021 with additional letters sent to neighbours and additional site notices were posted on site to advertise revisions to the scheme. 4 further letters of representations were received 3 of these were in objection to the scheme and they have been addressed in the main body of the report. One was in support of the application to revitalise the Southsea Town Centre. No further deputation requests were made.

For completeness and openness, I note the Applicant sent an email on 21/01/21 to each of the Members of the Planning Committee setting out some of the main points of the development proposals and their progress.

COMMENTS

Since publication of the main report, PCC's Housing Enabling Officer has provided consultation comments advising that the affordable housing provision for the scheme as proposed equates to 41 units. There is acknowledgment that the units in Block B may be suited to serve as the affordable element of the site however the provision of 36 in Block B is short by 5 units on policy expectation, and by concentrating them in one block fails to encourage mixed tenure and also mixed communities.

A commuted sum for off-site contribution has been suggested as an alternative. The Housing Enabling Officer also points out that in a mix block development, it would be difficult to get a Registered Provider (RP - Housing Association) to take on these units unless in a single block with the full free hold.

Following a review of the Council's Habitat Regulation Assessment, Natural England has since withdrawn their objection to the proposal provided that the applicant is complying with the requirements of the Interim Strategy for 104.3kg/TN/yr and that the Council, as competent authority, is satisfied that the approach will ensure the proposal is nutrient neutral and the necessary measures can be fully secured.

The Applicant proposes the GP surgery. This would be a positive benefit for the local community for the provision of health services, and would contribute to the vitality and viability of the local centre, and as such its provision is being secured via the legal agreement.

The Use Classes Order changed significantly during the summer of 2020, after the submission of this planning application. The Development Description was amended during the course of the application, at the Applicant's request, to reflect the new generic use class (Class E). Upon further consideration, though, the correct description, in accordance with the legislation, is the original description, referring to the Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 as applied for. Therefore, this note is to confirm the reversion to the original Development Description.

CONDITIONS

The Applicant has requested to have some of the recommended conditions split between the two principal elements of the scheme, for flexibility during any construction phases. Officers have raised no objection to this request for two conditions, as follows:

- 3. Materials and finishes;*
- 4. Design - Architectural Detailing;*

EDITS TO REPORT

Amended Condition 1:

The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than 29th May 2021.

Reason

To comply with our Nitrates bank trajectory and to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions given the limited supply of Council 'credits' forming the SPA nitrates mitigation.

Amended Condition 13:

No development shall start on site until revised access details providing for footway crossing type accesses and detailed Transport & Parking Strategy to mitigate the impact of reduced car parking provision within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved access detail and Transport & Parking Strategy. The Transport and Parking Strategy shall include details of the proposed distribution of parking allocation across Blocks A and B respectively.

INFORMATIVE

Informative with regards affordable housing (Condition 19)

The scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development on-site shall include:

- i. The numbers, type, tenure and location on/or off the site of the affordable housing provision to be made shall be in accordance with the aims and objectives of Policy PCS19 of the Portsmouth Plan (2012) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and associated guidance;*
- ii. The timing of the construction or occupation of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;*
- iii. The arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider [or the management of the affordable housing] (if no RP involved);*
- iv. The arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and*
- v. The occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced*

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1: That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning & Regeneration to grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions, and subject to completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement within three months of the Planning Committee meeting of 26/1/21 to secure:

- *The provision of Affordable Housing, on or off-site;*
- *The mitigation of effects on the Special Protection Areas (nitrate mitigation & recreational impact mitigation)*
- *The provision of a GP surgery in Block A.*

RECOMMENDATION 2: That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth to add/amend conditions where necessary.

RECOMMENDATION 3: That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning & Regeneration to refuse planning permission if the Section 106 Legal Agreement has not been completed within three months of the date of this resolution.

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

- Mr Playle - local resident
- Portsmouth Cycle Forum
- Mr Alex King, Managing Director of Mission Town Planning.

Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link [Planning Committee, 26 January 2021 on Livestream](#)

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

- The viability report had been updated by the applicant. This was now with the independent viability consultant and officers are awaiting feedback on that.
- With regard to timings and the nitrate bank, officers advised that they only have nitrates available up to that month. Developers can procure nitrates from elsewhere but if it is from our nitrate bank it is up to that date. After that date they cannot lawfully update that scheme. The date of 29 May that the development must be commenced by in amended condition 1, had been agreed with the applicant and they are aware of the nitrate credits that the Council has.
- With regards to the affordable housing delivery where an applicant indicates that the scheme would not be viable with regards to affordable housing, officers would put a review mechanism in place to review if any opportunity for affordable housing contributions could be taken from the scheme.
- With regard to amended condition 13, officers had included in the SMAT list a sentence to say that the authority must see a transportation plan to be able to discharge the conditions at the appropriate time. It is normal not to specify every detail in the condition but cycling is part of transportation and a lot of the ideas raised by the cycle forum had been considered and would be refined as the condition is discharged.
- The applicant has provided waste bins which are acceptable for the level of residential and commercial space proposed. There is a condition proposed to

ensure they are on levels where access is possible, and the internal consultees had found this acceptable.

- Due to the arrangement of the site a ground source heat pump was not possible. In the applicant's sustainability appraisal they have suggested other measures.
- There are no solar panels provided on site. Condition 22 is the standard condition seeking any range of measures appropriate for the building and this condition will require further investigation so that officers have an appropriate submission to approve if up to standard.
- Officers would expect a proportion of EV parking spaces and this would be part of condition 13 in the transportation and parking strategy.
- Officers were not sure condition 22 could be further strengthened at this stage. Officers might expect the large flat roof could be suitable for solar panels and would ask the applicant to look into that very seriously.

Members' Comments

Members felt this was an improved application from when it was previously submitted. In terms of the parking there is a deficit and this needed to be weighed up in the context of its accessibility to local transport and the considerable regeneration opportunity. This application will help to provide accommodation to meet the targets set by Government. The design is well thought out and will significantly improve the area.

Members noted that the parking shortfall compared to the required standard is 77 and the 23 space shortfall is on the basis of 1 space per unit. It was proposed by a member that conditions 13 and 22 come back to the committee to agree along with the financial viability however officers advised that this would have implications for the commencement of this development. Other committee members did not support this view as it was felt this could jeopardise the development as there is a very tight timescale.

This is a positive scheme and members noted that residential use was the only option for this site due to the current environment.

RESOLVED

(1) Delegated authority was given to the Assistant Director of Planning & Regeneration to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions within the report and supplementary matters list, and subject to completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement within three months of the Planning Committee meeting of 26/1/21 to secure:

- **The provision of Affordable Housing, on or off-site and / or inclusion/insertion of a viability review [if necessary] to secure maximum benefit with regards affordable housing provision;**
- **The mitigation of effects on the Special Protection Areas (nitrate mitigation & recreational impact mitigation)**
- **The provision of a GP surgery in Block A.**

(2) Delegated authority was granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth to add/amend conditions where necessary.

(3) Delegated authority was given to the Assistant Director of Planning & Regeneration to refuse planning permission if the Section 106 Legal Agreement has not been completed within three months of the date of this resolution.

6. 44-66 Palmerston Road, Southsea PO5 3QG - 20/00621/ LBC (AI 6)

(Councillor Jones remained out of the meeting for the duration of this item)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report. Peter Hayward, Island Highway & Transport Consultants, was present for this item.

Members' Questions

There were no questions.

Members' Comments

Members were happy with this proposal and felt that the development would improve this area as a whole.

RESOLVED to grant listed building consent as set out in the Officer's Committee report.

7. The Registry, St Michael's Road, Portsmouth 20/01009/FUL (AI 7)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

The Principal Planning Officer drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

Crime Prevention Design Advisor

The main Committee report noted 'no comments received', they can now be reported as follows, in summary:

This premises will house a fairly large number of persons , CCTV will be an essential tool for maintaining the safety and security of residents, staff and visitors.

The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear the Governments continuing commitment to "create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion and resilience".

The proposal is to house up to 41 persons, some with complex needs, within this building. During the period 1st October 2020 to 12th November 2020 we received 25 reports of incidents relating to the premises. The Registry lies on the edge of the city centre, there are nearby open spaces. Our concerns centre on the possible

problems caused by the residents of this accommodation both, within the accommodation and within the local area. Hampshire Constabulary recognises the need for accommodation for the homeless to assist with their journey back to a more normal lifestyle. Effective management / support of the residents is key to reducing the opportunities for crime and disorder. At paragraph 3.5 of The Information and Management Plan advises "trained supported workers would be on site 24/7, with an initial three workers being on site at all times individuals would have their own bedroom and share bathroom, kitchen and communal space facilities." The plans show an office with facilities, but I am unable to find the bedrooms. To that end, space within the building to provide bedrooms for use by onsite staff should be annotated on plans. To provide for the safety and security of residents and visitors, the external doors should be fitted with an electronic door access system. The system should provide for fob access for residents and staff and audio and visual access for visitors.

If entry is gained into the building it is possible to access all parts of the building, this increases the vulnerability of the building to crime and anti-social behaviour. To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour a Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) system should be installed within the building. Cameras should be deployed to provide images of the external doors, stairwells, lifts, other common access ways, the office and communal facilities. The plans show a basement housing the cycle store, gym and laundrette, basements are isolated places which increases the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour CCTV cameras should be deployed within the basement. To summarise our position, Hampshire Constabulary broadly supports this application. However, this support is conditional upon the residents being at the appropriate stage of their recovery to reside within this style of accommodation, the provision of effective onsite support for the residents at all times and the fitting of appropriate physical security measures.

The Officer recommendation is unchanged, however an additional condition is proposed relating to Security Surveillance.

Security Surveillance

Within four weeks of the granting of the development hereby permitted, details inclusive of location and type of CCTV surveillance measures shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. They shall be installed as approved within one month of their approval, and shall thereafter be retained as approved unless agreed in writing otherwise.

Reason: In the interest of amenity in accordance with Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

- The premises will be occupied 24 hours a day by individuals.
- There is not a barrier directly outside of the premises and the case officer said this was outside the ownership of the landowner and would be a highways issue.

Members' Comments

Members were happy to accept this application. Members felt that this was a sensible use of the building and having this facilities close to the Civic Offices and services for the homeless was very sensible.

RESOLVED

(1) To grant conditional planning permission as set out in the Officer's Committee report and supplementary matters list.

(2) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth to add/amend conditions where necessary.

8. 20/01021FUL - 155-157 Elm Grove, PO5 1LJ (AI 8)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

The Principal Planning Officer drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

The Officer recommendation is unchanged though an additional condition relating to Security Surveillance is proposed:

Security Surveillance

Within four weeks of the granting of the development hereby permitted, details inclusive of location and type of CCTV surveillance measures shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. They shall be installed as approved within one month of their approval, and shall thereafter be retained as approved unless agreed in writing otherwise.

Reason: In the interest of amenity in accordance with Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

- There was no metal barrier at the front of the building however there is brick wall that runs along the frontage of the building and an alleyway that leads from the premises which forms a barrier to the road.

Members' Comments

There were no comments.

RESOLVED

(1) To grant conditional planning permission as set out in the Officer's Committee report and supplementary matters list.

(2) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning & Economic Growth to add/amend conditions where necessary.

9. 251 Twyford Avenue, Portsmouth PO2 8NY 20/00376/FUL (AI 9)

The Planning Officer presented the report. Peter Hayward, Island Highway & Transport Consultants, was present for this item. The planning officer reminded the committee that this application was deferred from the December meeting as a resident who had objected to the application had not received written notification that they could make further deputations.

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

Since the publication of the Committee Report, the proposed floor plans have been amended to provide dedicated ensuites for bedrooms 1, 2 and 3.

(HMO SPD-OCT 2019)

Area provided: Required standard:

<i>Lounge</i>	<i>17.5m²</i>	<i>11m²</i>
<i>Bedroom 1</i>	<i>16m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>
<i>Ensuite B1</i>	<i>4.7m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>
<i>Dining room</i>	<i>15.2m²</i>	<i>11m²</i>
<i>Kitchen</i>	<i>12.5m²</i>	<i>7m²</i>
<i>Bedroom 2</i>	<i>18.2m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>
<i>Ensuite B2</i>	<i>3.8m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>
<i>Bedroom 3</i>	<i>16.99m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>
<i>Ensuite B3</i>	<i>3.8m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>
<i>Bedroom 4</i>	<i>10.5m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>
<i>WC</i>	<i>1.6m²</i>	<i>undefined</i>
<i>Bathroom</i>	<i>5m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>126.99m²</i>	<i>70m²</i>

The ensuites are all considered to be of an acceptable size and layout. All of the bedrooms are well over the guidance of 6.51sqm following this amendment and the communal space is unchanged. The amended floorplans are therefore considered to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for 3-6 residents sharing.

Since the publication of the Committee Report, an Appropriate Assessment has been completed and Natural England have been consulted and responded; they concur with the Councils conclusion that no mitigation is required for the development.

The Officer's recommendation remained unchanged.

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

- Mrs Daisy Cobb on behalf of local residents
- The Applicant - Applecore Design Agency - (Carianne Wells)

Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link [Planning Committee, 26 January 2021 on Livestream](#)

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

- There is a difference of 0.5 parking spaces overall.
- There will be a significant reduction in demand in terms of the commercial elements which will be lost as a result of the proposal. The parking standards require commercial developments to be assessed individually. The committee need to make sure they do not lose sight of the parking demand of the commercial elements that will no longer arise as a result of the application.
- There is a condition on the proposal to provide 4 bicycle parking spaces.
- Solar panels are not included as part of the application and these are not usually attached to a small development. The building regulations will ensure sustainable construction and energy efficiency.
- There are two other HMOs located in the area which are quite close. Both are C3/C4 properties. Twyford Avenue is a primary road and is along a bus route. 249 Twyford Avenue is a takeaway. It is not considered the proposal would result in significant harm to the surrounding residential amenity.
- The Willows is a group of flats and each individual flat is counted within the 50m radius. Of the 34 flats within the Willows a certain number are included within the percentage calculations. Officers explained the process for how the calculations are carried out.

Members' Comments

Members were concerned that the changes to the front elevation adversely impact the street scene and felt the application does not meet the parking standards in a densely residential area. It was also felt that the application was also out of character for the area. Other members disagreed and felt that this would improve the appearance of the building. Members recognised the severe parking issues in this area of the city but noted that the residents may chose not to have a car. The Highways Consultant said that if the committee refused the application on parking grounds it would be hard to defend at an appeal as this proposal reduces demand for parking by removing all the parking required for the commercial element which is one or two spaces.

**RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:
The proposal would, by reason of the increased parking demand associated with the change of use, fail to make provision for car parking in accordance with the requirements of the Council's adopted Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Accordingly the development would fail to provide an adequate level of car parking to meet the future transport needs of the occupiers, which would be likely to increase demand for already limited on-street car parking facilities to the detriment of the environment of**

the area and contrary to policies PCS17 and PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan and the aims and objectives of the adopted Parking Standards SPD to maintain a balanced approach between car parking and sustainable transport.

10. 253 Twyford Avenue, Portsmouth PO2 8NY 20/00375/ FUL (AI 10)

The Planning Officer presented the report. Peter Hayward, Island Highway & Transport Consultants, was present for this item. The planning officer reminded the committee that this application was deferred from the December meeting as a resident who had objected to the application had not received written notification that they could make further deputations.

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

Since the publication of the Committee Report, the proposed floor plans have been amended to provide dedicated ensuites for all four of the bedrooms.

(HMO SPD-OCT 2019)

<i>Area provided:</i>		<i>Required standard:</i>	
<i>Lounge</i>	<i>22.5m²</i>	<i>11m²</i>	
<i>Bedroom 1</i>	<i>11.3m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>	
<i>Ensuite B1</i>	<i>2.97m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>	
<i>Kitchen/Dining room</i>	<i>22.5m²</i>	<i>24m²</i>	
<i>Bedroom 2</i>	<i>16.7m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>	
<i>Ensuite B2</i>	<i>3.1m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>	
<i>Bedroom 3</i>	<i>12.3m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>	
<i>Ensuite B3</i>	<i>3.3m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>	
<i>Bedroom 4</i>	<i>15.3m²</i>	<i>6.51m²</i>	
<i>Ensuite B4</i>	<i>3.2m²</i>	<i>3.74m²</i>	
<i>WC</i>	<i>1.7m²</i>	<i>undefined</i>	
<i>Total</i>	<i>114.87m²</i>	<i>76m²</i>	

While all of the ensuites are undersized, that is compared to the size for shared facilities. Given that they are for single use by the occupant of each individual room and the otherwise acceptable layout they are considered to be acceptable. All of the bedrooms are well over the guidance of 6.51sqm following this amendment and the communal space is unchanged. The amended floorplans are therefore considered to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for 3-6 residents sharing.

Since the publication of the Committee Report, an Appropriate Assessment has been completed and Natural England have been consulted and responded; they concur with the Councils conclusion that no mitigation is required for the development.

A matter of replacement windows has been brought to officers' attention, on the north elevation (Gruneisen Road). The site has been re-visited and there are indeed new windows, either ill-fitting or boarded-up. The Applicant has explained: 'The properties have had no builders on site since last summer whilst a planning decision is made, as some of the works carried out will be dependent on whatever decision is made. There are remedial, works to the roof, exterior, replacement windows all still to be carried out along with the internal works. The property has been boarded in an effort to keep it water tight after the ground floor windows were ordered at incorrect sizes. As the property has been entered on numerous occasions by teenagers, our client fitted the incorrect windows as he felt it would be more of a deterrent than just the boarding.'

I am assured that if and when planning permission is granted and the consent implemented, correctly-fitting windows will be installed and the property will return to a normal appearance, as well as being productively inhabited.

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

- Mrs Daisy Cobb on behalf of local residents
- The Applicant - Applecote Design Agency - (Carianne Wells)

Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link [Planning Committee, 26 January 2021 on Livestream](#)

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

- With regard to the large window on the northern elevation that officers advised that a condition may be necessary so they can properly control what happens there. A smaller bathroom window would be more appropriate.
- Officers said with regard to the windows that the main problem was the window on the ground floor next to the door and the explanation was that the wrong windows were ordered but were fitted anyway. Officers would not want these for the longer term and he did not believe the owner would want that. The applicant would be required to resolve this to meet the building regulations.
- Under the parking standards SPD this property would require two car parking spaces.
- 251 Twyford Avenue had an under supply of 0.5 car parking spaces. This application would have less demand on car parking spaces due to the removal of the commercial element.
- The cycle storage will be at the rear of the property and there is a condition on the application for secure weatherproof bicycle storage.

Members' Comments

Concern was raised with the quality of the work so far to the property. Members also commented that the proposal would have an adverse impact to the street scene. There were also concerns with the adverse impact on the already overcrowded streets with parking. Other members thought that this was a good use for this derelict site and felt it should be approved. Members noted that the application for 251 Twyford Avenue had been refused by the committee earlier today and this

application is next door therefore the same issues apply and some members felt it was right to refuse. Officers explained that the application for 251 Twyford Avenue was for a 3 bedroom property so there was a discrepancy on the residential side only for parking. This application is a 4 bedroomed existing dwelling so there is a different parking demand.

RESOLVED

To grant conditional planning permission as set out in the Officer's Committee report and supplementary matters list subject to an amendment to condition 3 requiring details of the weatherproof bicycle storage to be approved by the local planning authority prior to first occupation; and an additional condition regarding full details of the two first floor windows: the front bedroom window facing Twyford Avenue, and the ensuite window facing Gruneisen Road.

The meeting concluded at 6.40 pm.

.....
Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor David Fuller