

# Public Document Pack

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 18 August 2021 at 10.30 am in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall

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

### Present

Councillors Lee Hunt (Chair)  
Matthew Atkins  
Jo Hooper  
Robert New  
John Smith  
Gerald Vernon-Jackson CBE

### Welcome

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

### 65. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies had been received from Councillors Chris Attwell, George Fielding, Judith Smyth and Lynne Stagg (Councillor Darren Sanders deputised for her).

### 66. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

#### **21/00820/VOC - Southsea Seafront from Long Curtain Moat in the West to Eastney Marine Barracks in the East**

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson declared a non-prejudicial interest as he is the Chair of the Cabinet meeting where this work had been agreed.

Kieran Laven, Solicitor declared a professional conflict of interest as he had advised the Coastal Partners in relation to their application before the Committee. He will leave the room for this item.

### 67. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 21 July 2021 (AI 3)

**RESOLVED that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.**

### 68. Update on Planning Applications. (AI 4)

The Head of Development Management advised that the Planning Inspectorate had dismissed appeal applications for the following applications:

28 Manning Road  
15 Montgomerie Road  
1 St John's Road  
10 Barham Way

An appeal against an enforcement order for 36 Campbell Road was part upheld and part amended.

The Planning Inspector has also received appeals for 1c Vie Road and 18 Pains Road.

**69. 21/00820/VOC - Southsea Seafront From Long Curtain Moat in the West to Eastney Marine Barracks in the East (AI 5)**

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the report and reported in the Supplementary Matters list the following update:

*Reference to the Solent and Dorset Coast pSPA at paragraph 12 should be amended to the 'Solent and Dorset Coast SPA'.*

*In addition, reference to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended) in the Recommendation should be amended to read 'Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)'.*

*The views of the Council's Heritage Consultant support the proposal. Whilst noting that rock revetment is extremely functional and unrefined in its character, it is not inappropriate in this context and the proposed amendments offer a number of design enhancements over the original proposal. The new design for the rock toe allows for a reduced rock volume and a more straightforward construction for the toe structure. The split level promenade separated terraced seating is considered an enhancement, with practical advantages in terms of reducing the risk of overtopping and the need for heavy sheet piling.*

*Visually it would provide a more subtle and refined solution for this part of the scheme. It would also perhaps afford visitors an inducement to 'dwell' in the area and fully appreciate the asset in a more spacious and visually reposeful setting. Notwithstanding its qualities, the scheme would still have an impact on the heritage asset. When considered in isolation from the wider proposal its impact is considered certainly less than substantial, and closer to 'intermediate' in its effect on the setting of the asset.*

*To be clear this level of impact is considered to be more than outweighed by the standalone conservation/ heritage benefits afforded by the scheme. In light of this and in concurrence with the views of Historic England, the scheme is considered capable of conservation support. Whilst the scheme is acknowledged as convincing, a note of caution is struck in regard to any subsequent possible introduction of further street furniture or other 'paraphernalia' into the setting of the asset, which*

*should ideally be avoided altogether. It is considered a matter of great importance in securing a successful long term outcome for this scheme. If a genuinely convincing reason is provided to justify the introduction of further street furniture, this must be kept to an absolute minimum, and the number, scale, siting, colour finish, material and detailed design of any features given very careful consideration so as to ensure they do not 'clutter' or confuse/diminish the setting of the asset.*

*The recommendation did not change.*

A letter from the Seafront Campaign Group dated 6 July 2021 to the Coastal Partners was circulated to the committee. The group had in it expressed disappointment that it had not been consulted. The Development Team Leader advised Members that the above rep/notification was not formally before the Local Planning Authority in the determination of the application, so unable to comment on it.

The committee was informed that all 26 partners who had given feedback to the original presentation, including this group had been contacted again at the next stage.

#### Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

Several clusters of rock pools had been created behind the rock revetment.

As the Flood Defence Scheme funding system was phased and did not fit simply into the planning system, the original application submitted in 2019 was based on information that was available at the time. Further funding has now been released so a new application has been submitted for the variations that could be done. The location being a heritage site is an important consideration the teams is working with Historical England to ensure it is improved by the work.

There have been many changes as the design has developed and investigations carried out. The most significant were on the castle promenade and terracing where the bulk revetment has been reduced take the pressure off the historic structures and the soft soil.

The developers have taken into account what is known about climate change and rising sea levels and are confident that it will do the same job as originally intended.

#### Members' Comments

Members were pleased with the designs and the improvements to this section of the seafront. It will contribute to the world class seafront which people will enjoy and protect homes.

They noted that on this part of the promenade the cycle path is on the road as the path is narrow.

This variation better reflects this location which is one of the most important heritage in the UK.

The committee thanked Councillor Hugh Mason and all the officers who have been involved in this work and expressed interest in carrying out a site visit.

**RESOLVED to grant conditional permission as set out in the officer's committee report.**

**70. 19/01323/FUL - Plot E Lakeside Business Park Western Road Portsmouth PO6 3PQ (AI 6)**

Officers informed the Committee that owing to an unforeseen change in position relating to the envisaged s.106 agreement it was not now possible for this application to be determined at the meeting.

**71. 20/01464/FUL - 12-28 Arundel Street Portsmouth PO1 1NL (AI 7)**

The Assistant Director Planning & Economic Growth, Regeneration presented the application and reported that the update from the Supplementary Matters list:

*Members are advised that the development would be liable to the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy and that, based upon the proposed floor areas, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the proposed development has been calculated at £2,568,594.75. This may be adjusted slightly to reflect the final approved floor areas.*

*The recommendation was not changed.*

Michael Lampard, the applicant gave a deputation.

Deputations are not included in the minutes but can be viewed on the livestream on the following link [Planning Committee, 18 August, 2021 on Livestream](#)

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers explained that:

The new homes target is set by the government. Accommodation for students and older people do not fit in the definition of a standard dwelling so an algorithm is used to calculate how these fit in with the target. An older person's accommodation is the equivalent to 1.8 dwellings and a student's accommodation is the equivalent to 2.5.

If the market changes and students are not taking the rooms, the layout is considered flexible enough to be changed to offer other types of accommodation.

There is no council policy which imposes a limit on the height of buildings in the city.

Staff will be on site.

Many of the suggestions by the Private Sector Housing Unit set out in the report have been incorporated in the application or conditions.

Waste management is included in the scheme but recycling [food waste] is not mentioned specifically.

The retail units could only be changed to other uses with prior consent from the Planning Committee.

It is not possible to estimate how many student Houses of Multiple Occupation might be freed up for use by families if the residents chose to move to this property. The university is growing every year, so it is anticipated that there is a need for new student accommodation.

The committee would not have the authority to impose a condition to require that the accommodation be let out to homeless people in the summer months.

There will be a sprinkler system in a building of this height.

Condition 24 would require that the roof terrace be closed from 22:00 to 09:00.

The applicant is not required to prove the need for 591 bedrooms. There is a presumption in favour of development due to the new housing target.

There is an identified need for student accommodation of all types.

Officers could see no grounds for refusal. Opinions differ regarding very tall buildings and how these fit into the cityscape.

#### Members' Comments.

Members noted the following positive points of the application:

- The anticipated migration of students from HMOs in the city to purpose built accommodation as highlighted in the report. The students would live closer to the university campus and therefore travel less.
- The high quality of the materials.
- The high quality design which fits in with the future regeneration of the commercial centre.
- This property would help meet the government new housing targets.
- The area is in need of regeneration and the increased footfall would benefit Commercial Road.

However, concern was expressed about the possible perception that the council would be prioritising the housing needs of students over residents.

They noted the importance that a recycling service including food waste is provided.

Some members did not particularly like the scheme but acknowledged that there was no reason for refusal on planning grounds.

Some members said that they would prefer to see more affordable housing being built but the CIL money would be useful for the ward.

**RESOLVED** that the application be granted permission in accordance with the officers' report and the following amendment to Condition 28:

1. The condition 28 regarding waste management be amended to include the words "recycling" and "food waste".

**AND** that the decision notice should provide the following 2 Informative Notices noting:

- 1) The Committee's interest in a 3 year review of capacity at the development with the applicant.
- 2) The Committee's interest in the Council discussing with the applicant the potential for accommodating people on the Council's housing list for a maximum of two months outside the academic year.

## **72. 20/00913/HOU - 28 Tregaron Avenue Portsmouth PO6 2JX (AI 8)**

The Head of Development Management introduced the application and reported the following supplementary information:

*Subsequent to the publication of the Committee Report, Officers recommend the frosting of a large, first floor bedroom window, due to overlooking and loss of privacy that would otherwise result. The window is on the north elevation of the proposed extension, and would face across to the patio/garden area of 26 Tregaron Avenue, at a distance of about 7m to the boundary. The Applicant has verbally stated their agreement to such a condition.*

*Further condition:*

*The north-facing first floor window hereby approved shall be fitted with frosted glazing to at least Pilkington Level 3 (or equivalent). Any opening lights in this window shall be top-hinged only and shall be at a minimum height of 1.7m above the finished floor level of the room which the window serves. The window shall be maintained as such during the lifetime of the development, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity at 26 Tregaron Avenue, in accordance with PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan [2012] and with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework [2021].*

*The recommendation did not change.*

The Chair declared a personal and prejudicial interest: he had worked with Mr Goss twenty years ago and had no contact with him on a social level since. He decided to absent himself for this item.

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson was elected Chair for this item.

Simon Goss and Andrew Sadden made deputations against the application. They also circulated drawings for the committee.

Dean Harris, the applicant, also made a deputation.

#### Members' Questions

In response to questions from the committee, officers clarified the following points:

The drawing circulated by Mr Sadden of the view of the proposed extension from his house was close to accurate broadly speaking but exaggerated the scales somewhat. It shows a solid wall along the boundary fence.

Following feedback from neighbours, the applicant had reduced the height by 1m and removed the rendering on the plans.

Home owners have the right to reasonable enjoyment of their home but not a right to a view.

Architectural detailing is a challenge. Condition no. 3 states that materials for the exterior should be submitted for approval prior to use. Rendering is often useful to increase light.

The window on the frosted window does overlook and impact on the privacy of the neighbour's property. Frosting will mitigate that.

The extension at no. 24 was mentioned in a deputation and backs on to the side of neighbouring properties whereas no. 28 backs on to a neighbour's rear garden.

The window on the south elevation is frosted and the one on the north elevation facing no. 26 would require frosting.

#### Members' Comments

The committee discussed various points regarding this application including massing and loss of amenity. It was agreed that a site visit would be beneficial.

**RESOLVED that this application be deferred to allow members to conduct a site visit.**

### **73. 21/00383/ADV - The News Centre London Road Hilsea Portsmouth PO2 9DG (AI 9)**

Councillor Lee Hunt retook his position as Chair.

The Head of Development Management introduced this application.

Heidi Smith made a deputation against the application.

#### Members' Questions.

In response to questions from the committee, officers clarified the following points:

The details of the application that had been approved in 2007 for a sign at a very similar location were not available due to a loss of Wi-Fi in the Council Chamber.

The committee could impose a condition limiting the hours that the light is illuminated that differed from the one proposed by officers.

Members' Comments.

The committee felt that they needed to consider the previous permission for a sign at this address to determine this application, and, due to continuing IT problems, this was not possible during the meeting beyond the written content of the officer report.

**RESOLVED that this application be deferred to allow information on the existing permission for a sign at this location to be brought to the committee.**

**74. 21/00731/CS3 - Landscaped Area to East of D-Day Museum Clarence Esplanade Southsea PO5 3NT (AI 10)**

The Head of Development Management introduced the application.

Members' Questions.

The application was submitted on 13 May 2021 for a statue that had been erected in the Peace Gardens.

Members' Comments.

It was noted that the council should follow its own rules that applications should be submitted before works are undertaken. However, the fact that the application was retrospective was not a reason for refusal.

Members also noted that the location was appropriate for this statue.

**RESOLVED that the application be granted retrospective planning permission.**

The meeting concluded at 2:10pm

.....  
Signed by the Chair of the meeting  
Councillor Lee Hunt