

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 10 November 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)
Chris Attwell (Vice-Chair)
Matthew Atkins
John Smith
Judith Smyth
Lynne Stagg
Linda Symes
Gerald Vernon-Jackson
Daniel Wemyss

Welcome

The Chair welcomed members of the public and members to the meeting. He explained to all present the fire procedures, including where to assemble and how to evacuate the building in case of a fire.

103. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies had been received from Councillor George Fielding (illness prevented a standing deputy attending), Councillor Jo Hooper (Councillor Symes deputised for her) and Councillor Robert New (Councillor Wemyss deputised for him).

It was confirmed that Councillors Linda Symes and Daniel Wemyss had been nominated as Standing Deputies on the Committee at Full Council on 13 October.

104. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

- Councillor Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest for agenda item 1 (The Boathouse, 4A Broad Street), agenda item 6 (Land Adjacent to South Parade Pier PLAREG) and agenda item 7 (Land Adjacent to South Parade Pier LBC) so would not participate in discussion on these items.
- Councillor Wemyss was making a deputation for agenda item 4 (49 Oriel Road) so would not participate in discussion on this item.
- Councillor Vernon-Jackson said he had talked to officers about regularising planning permission for agenda items 6 and 7 but the City Solicitor has advised that this is not an interest.

105. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 October 2021 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 20 October 2021 be agreed as a correct record subject to the amendment that Councillor Judith Smyth gave apologies.

106. Updates on previous applications. (AI 4)

The Head of Development Management reported that three new appeals have been received:

- 27 Lakeside Avenue - refusal for dormer to roof slope and side window; the application was a resubmission from 2020 and is pending with the Planning Inspector.
- 17 Craneswater Park - construction of two-storey front and rear extensions and roof alteration.
- 34 Whitwell Road - single-storey ground floor rear infill extension.

Five decisions have been received:

- 97 Havant Road - retrospective application for development on footprint of existing outbuilding. The Planning Inspector allowed the appeal as the construction does not detract from the character of the street scene and complies with PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan. The outbuilding does not unaesthetically impact on neighbours but it should be kept for purposes ancillary to the main building.
- 45-47 Worsley Road - first floor side extension and loft conversion with a rear dormer window. The appeal was dismissed as the increased roof height would be unduly prominent and fail to preserve the character of the area in accordance with PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.
- 3 Maidford Grove - single-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension. The appeal was allowed as the extensions were considered not unduly prominent, not obtrusive and would not conflict with PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.
- 3 Pains Road - sui generis HMO (House of Multiple Occupation). The appeal was dismissed as it cannot be certain that the application would not have an adverse effect on the Special Protection Area. It would increase wastewater discharge.
- 28 Hudson Road - Change of use from C4 to 7-bedroom sui generis HMO. The appeal was dismissed as communal space would fall short of the standards and living conditions would be cramped, inconvenient, unsatisfactory and represents an over intensive use of the property, and conflict with PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

The Chair noted that it was right to consider living conditions when assessing applications and this might mean overturning officers' recommendations.

107. 21/01095/HOU - The Boathouse, 4A Broad Street, PO1 2JE (AI 5)

External alterations (including installation of roller shutter to north-east elevation) and installation of 'Versadock' pontoon system with retractable gangway (to rest on existing slipway at low tide) (Resubmission of 21/00264/HOU)

Councillor Smith left the meeting at 11 am as he had a personal and prejudicial interest in this item.

The Development Management Lead introduced the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

Cllr Ian Holder has advised that no one has contacted him to object to this application, therefore he has no objection.

Cllr Rob Wood has advised that as one of the ward councillors he has received no verbal or written objections to this planning application from members of the public

only emails of support, therefore he does not have any objection to this planning application.

The Development Management Lead read out a deputation from Mr Robert Edge in support of the application.

Mr Lawrence (agent) made a deputation.

Deputations are not minuted but can be viewed on the council's website at [Agenda for Planning Committee on Wednesday, 10th November, 2021, 10.30 am Portsmouth City Council](#)

Members' Questions

In response to questions, the following points were clarified:

- The Versadock pontoon would be about 1.5m from Feltham Row.
- The agent is correct to point out that internal works in a locally listed building do not usually need planning consent. However, raising the slipway means building an external wall which requires consent. Condition 3 of the planning consent granted in 1998 stipulated that the integral berthing area should be retained for berthing boats. A planning application for the Versadock has been applied for and accepted.
- The Versadock is 3.37 m wide and 5.2 m long. Versadocks float so the weight of a boat forces them down.
- The officer's report contains additional points made by the applicant to support a Versadock, for example, that it could help reduce debris collecting in that area of the Chamber. However, officers feel the arguments are not very persuasive as debris could be collected by other methods such as a basket on a long stick. There has been some anti-social behaviour around Feltham Row but other deterrents could be used such as raising the railings on Feltham Row. CCTV or lighting could be used to deter entry to the property via boat. It is unclear how much thermal efficiency would be achieved.
- There are other Versadocks in the Camber but they are set away from historic buildings. The property is an important building for the Camber.
- The applicant's point about flood defences is considered weak. Officers sought advice from the Environment Agency who advised that expensive and complex modelling would be needed to see if the Versadock would reduce flood risk; even so, the effect would be negligible.
- Members need to apply the planning policy test of assessing if the application would cause substantial or less than substantial harm. If members consider there is no harm that is fine but if they consider there is less than substantial harm the policy test requires them to weigh up the harm against any public benefits. Officers cannot see a persuasive benefit.
- Planning permission for the balcony was granted in 1992. The current proposal is to replicate the balustrade on the floor below but flush with the front elevation. The balustrade would be set back just behind the line of the shutter. There is no photograph of the Broad Street frontage but it has plain white small laths.
- No objections have been made by the Queen's Harbour Master. There are a couple of domestic berths nearby but there are no concerns about obstruction to boats in the wider Camber, especially as the site is in a corner.

Members' Comments

- Any changes must improve what is a historic area. The building is obviously a boathouse so changing it into another residential building removes a historic one.
- The Versadock would be about four feet from Feltham Row so people could jump on to it, thereby increasing anti-social behaviour in the area. The council may need to take steps to prevent the anti-social behaviour.
- The shutter could potentially be a valuable security feature.
- The area is a working dock and consideration needs to be given to how people use it.
- Sealing off the opening will change the historic character of the building. Members had some sympathy with the applicant but changing the building's function changes its character. There would be some harm with the loss of the ground floor as a functioning boatyard.
- As the Applicant's Agent noted when the shutter would be open (at night or when the applicant is away), officers advised that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, there might need to be a condition to address this matter.
- Officers advised prevention of crime could potentially be a planning matter. The views of the police could have been sought but at the moment there is not a great deal of evidence about crime near the property.

Resolved to refuse planning permission as recommended in the officer's committee report and the Supplementary Matters report.

Councillor Smith rejoined the meeting at 11.51 am.

108. 20/01330/FUL - Royal Naval Club & Royal Albert Yacht Club, 17 Pembroke Road, Portsmouth, PO1 2NT (AI 6)

Alterations to doors and windows and removal of 2no.staircases to facilitate conversion of second floor to residential apartments

The Development Manager Team Leader introduced the report and drew members' attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

Since the publication of the agenda, comments have been received (1) from the council's Principal Conservation Officer (Consultant), reproduced in full below and also (2) from the Chairman of the Club.

(1) Conservation Officer:

Further to your emails regarding the above and our subsequent site visit (03.11.21). I can confirm that I have viewed both the relevant details associated with these applications, and the actual fabric on site, that would be removed/alterd in response to the proposal, and offer the following comments:

HE Response

I note the attached email from Historic England (HE) to the previous case officer? Germaine (below) - dated 21st April 21.

This seeks the provision of an additional supplementary document providing further detail - photographs and exposition - regarding the significance and functionality of elements slated for removal/ alteration. Thank you for your email of the 28th Oct 21 with an addendum attached (prepared by heritage consultant

John Pike) which responds to HE's demand for further information. I am also in receipt of your email dated

Significance - high

The only Royal Naval Club in existence, the list description for the building suggests that it is an amalgamation of two 18th C houses with with late Victorian alterations (c.1875) by Thomas Hellyer of Ryde. The Yacht Club (first listed grade II in 1972), has at face value been well maintained, and is an imposing historic building, whose height, scale, form, materials and architectural detail/ornament afford it a notable and valuable 'presence' within the townscape of its immediate and wider context. Visually it is arguably the 'key' asset amongst a relatively dense cluster of other surviving historic buildings in the immediate area.

It is considered that these attributes give the asset a high degree of significance. This is derived principally (though not exclusively) from its historical/architectural qualities a product of its original composition and execution and relatively high degree of overall conservation. These factors ensure that it makes a positive contribution to the surrounding historic and wider street scene within the area.

Impacts

Whilst it is noted that objectors have suggested potentially negative amenity impacts to nearby properties and concerns around parking, these issues do not per se have a meaningful bearing on the separate and equally important question of any heritage impacts associated with the scheme.

External Impact - Low

The material provided, and S/V confirm both that the windows are found on a later projection/ extension at the rear of the building - an elevation which has been subject to significant alteration over time and is much more utilitarian/crunder and therefore a historically (and also architecturally) much less significant element of the building, and also that the widows themselves are non original/ 'historic' fabric.

Where the exterior of the building is concerned the proposal is limited in scope/ scale to alterations to no more than no. 2 windows situated close to one another. In terms of these works, the commitment (expressed in the revised heritage statement) to retain the sliding sash window that was proposed to be blocked-up in the rear projection' is noted (and regarded as positive).

Even in the event that the widow is not retained, although it replicates the appearance of an historic window, close inspection of its highly machined timber finish and overall condition strongly suggest that it is of modern (1980s?) construction. This, in combination with the overall scale, and lower quality of the rear elevation, and the number and range of windows that can be found there, leave me satisfied that its removal and making good would not harm the historic or architectural interest of the building in any meaningful way.

I also concur that the 'small window' that would be blocked-up is a much later unsympathetic addition. The prior alteration and modest scale of this window, alongside the applicant's commitment to make good the opening using 'matching

brickwork and pointing' are considered sufficient reasons to also justify support for this aspect of the scheme.

In light of the acceptability of the proposed works to the windows this, the overall impact of this element of the proposal on the character and significance of the asset is considered low.

Internal Impact - low

Bearing in mind the low heritage impact of the external works, it is considered that the acceptability of this proposal in conservation/ heritage terms hinges on the weight given to the significance/ value of those elements of internal fabric (staircases) that it is proposed to remove/alter.

It is clear from the details provided in the supporting D&A/ Heritage Statements, and from visual inspection during the S/V, that the building's interior fabric and floor plan are 'complex', and have been subject to very significant previous alteration. In this context it is reasonable to assert that not all elements its interior share the originality or quality of the best preserved interior components of the building, or contribute equally to the overall character and significance of the asset

Staircases

That said, the number of staircases that are slated for removal/alteration is notable. They are however examples of more utilitarian, and therefore arguably less architecturally/ visually special fabric (than say the principal staircase). Notwithstanding this they nevertheless still enjoy some relatively modest, but still intrinsic historic and aesthetic value of their own. Their survival also contributes to understanding the 'original' historic floor plan/ layout of the building, but given the overall scale, complexity and the range of historic fabric that still survives their contribution in this regard is also relatively modest.

The staircases have been viewed in their entirety in situ.

'Tower' Staircase

Although historic the staircase is of quite a heavy unrefined design, and lacks the finesse and therefore architectural/ aesthetic value of other higher status staircases within the building. It is essentially a fragment of the original (the remainder - at least half - having already been lost/ removed with consent at the time of the addition of the mansard roof to the building). The element that remains has lost its integrity and it is considered that its significance has been eroded to a point where the retention of what remains is not considered essential, or necessary to maintain the overall significance of the asset.

The retention of the double access doors to this staircase, as an internal feature within the proposed flat is however strongly encouraged.

Kitchen Service Staircase

This staircase has also already been partially removed/ truncated (with consent) at the upper story of the building. It is again only partial removal of the remaining fabric that is being proposed here - a single story element for the formation of a bedroom. A significant proportion (two thirds) of the existing remaining staircase would remain. The impact here would not of course be comparable with total

removal of the fabric, a significant degree of original fabric would also be retained. In light of the work that has already taken place and the relatively limited scope of proposed removal I am satisfied within the wider objectives of the scheme, that the impact of this element of the scheme is also acceptable.

Sufficient Information Provided

The statements supporting the application could have explained some of the impacts with a little more clarity. Nevertheless, the scheme called for a corroborating site visit - which has now been undertaken. With the benefit of this, I am also satisfied that the level of detail provided in support of the application is proportionate to the assets' importance and is sufficient to interpret and understand the nature and scale of the potential impacts. In this regard I consider the information that has been provided, to meet the requirements of paragraph 194 of the NPPF (2021), and certainly sufficient to make an informed and balanced judgment as to the acceptability of the proposal.

To be clear I do not consider that further information is necessary at this stage

Conservation Support

On balance, and having particular regard to the economic imperatives which have driven the submission - the need for the club to develop novel and ongoing sources of revenue to help ensure the building's long term maintenance and repair, I am satisfied that the scale and impact of the proposal is sufficiently limited in the context of the building overall, to make the proposal acceptable in conservation heritage terms. In light of this it is considered that the proposal should be granted LBC and planning permission.

(2) *The letter from the Club Chairman sets out the financial position that the club is in and emphasises the need for the development to be approved in order to secure the club's future.*

Mr Keith Toomey (applicant) gave a deputation for this and the following items.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers said they were unsure if the residents' parking zone was over or undersubscribed. It is considered there is enough space for vehicles generated by the three apartments. The development's residents could apply for permits in the zone.

Members' Comments

There were no comments.

Resolved to grant conditional planning permission as set out in the officer's committee report and the Supplementary Matters report.

109. 20/01331/LBC - Royal Naval Club & Royal Albert Yacht Club, 17 Pembroke Road, Portsmouth, PO1 2NT (AI 7)

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which are same as for the previous item.

Members' Questions

There were no questions.

Members' Comments

There were no comments.

Resolved to grant Listed Building Consent as set out in the officer's committee report and the Supplementary Matters report.

110. 21/00509/FUL - 49 Oriel Road, Portsmouth, PO2 9EG (AI 8)

Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to purposes falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouse) and Class C4 (house in multiple occupation)

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

One further letter of objection has been received since the agenda was published raising concerns regarding parking, anti-social behaviour and loss of family homes. The representation raises no new material planning considerations and the matters raised have been addressed within the officer's report.

Error in paragraph 5.5 of the officer report. The officer makes reference to several applications for proposed Class C4 HMOs which are currently being considered by the Local Planning Authority. It is suggested the properties are located outside of the 50m radius of this application site, however, it should be noted 78 Oriel Road is located within the 50m radius. However, as the application relating to 78 Oriel Road is yet to be determined, it does not affect the HMO count data for this application.

Error in paragraph 5.17 of the officer report. This paragraph makes reference to a single storey rear extension being constructed under permitted development. This is an error, no external works are being proposed as part of this application.

Error in paragraph 5.18 of the office report. Paragraph 5.18 should read, 'it is not considered that the impact of one further HMO would have any demonstrable adverse impact to the wider amenity'.

Mr Henry Thorpe and Mr Taki Jaffer gave deputations objecting to the application.

Councillor Wemyss gave a deputation then left the meeting at 12.26 pm.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers clarified that

- The 50 m radius is a circular radius. A proposal to take into account the number of HMOs in a particular street had been rejected by the Planning Inspector. However, applications can be refused which would result in three HMOs adjacent to each other or a property being sandwiched between two HMOs. Compared with other local authorities Portsmouth has fairly strict criteria.
- The Legal Advisor advised that in Portsmouth under Article 4 there are no permitted development rights allowing a property to be converted from Class C3 use into Class C4 HMO use. Neighbouring areas may operate differently.
- Heat from the dining-room could help warm the conservatory.
- The conservatory is about 5 m² so the dining-room is about 12 m².
- There only appears to be a bath in the bathroom, not a shower, which officers said was not a concern in view of the proposed number of occupants. There is

also a single WC on the ground floor. Members suggested that standards could be amended to reflect that many HMOs now have en suite bedrooms.

- Very little work appears to have been done on the property.
- Members have to consider the conservatory, bathroom and toilet configuration as they are presented today.

Members' Comments.

- Members were wary of giving false hope to objectors by refusing the application which might then be overturned by the Planning Inspector. However, useful points have been raised in discussion.
- Communal space needs to be available all year round so the application could be refused on the grounds that the conservatory would be very cold in winter and therefore unusable. It would be difficult to heat in an environmentally friendly way.
- One bath for six people is inadequate. A bath is also less environmentally friendly than a shower.

Resolved to overturn officers' recommendation to grant conditional planning permission for the following reasons:

The conservatory and utility room are functionally poor for inclusion as part of the communal space, thus the communal spaces would fall significantly short of the Council's adopted standard and having a detrimental effect on the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan Portsmouth's Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy).

111. 19/01356/HOU - 15 Oyster Street, Portsmouth, PO1 2HZ (AI 9)

Construction of single storey rear extension and creation of a roof terrace including installation of glass balustrading (description amended)

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the report.

Mr Graeme Swinburne gave a deputation objecting to the application.

Dr Lloyd (applicant) gave a deputation.

The Legal Advisor advised that

- Councillor Wemyss (who rejoined the meeting at 1.19 pm) could not vote on this application as he had missed the presentation and part of a deputation.
- Portsmouth Cathedral has not been notified about the amended application but this does not raise issues, particularly as the proposal is smaller than in the original application, so the matter can proceed.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers clarified

- It is very subjective as to whether the proposal meets the tests in the NPPF.
- The terrace would occupy about 80% of the total roof area. The applicant confirmed the property is 4.65 m wide and 8 m deep; 1 m will be removed at the back and 1.2 m at the front. There is a roof light on the stairs; the other roof light is walk on so it is a usable area.

Members' Comments

- Although Oyster Street is very near the historic Portsmouth Cathedral the houses in it are not themselves historic. Many buildings on South Parade have glass

balustrades on the roof and do not appear to be a problem; they sometimes make the buildings look nicer. If the terrace is installed sympathetically it is not a problem.

- Furniture such as a parasol may be visible.
- There is enough usable space and as it is stepped back on the balance of probability there would not be very much overlooking. Respect has been shown to the Cathedral.

Resolved to grant conditional planning permission as set out in the officer's committee report.

112. 21/00983/PLAREG - Land Adjacent To South Parade Pier, Southsea, PO4 0SW (AI 10)

Retrospective application for change of use of land and construction of external raised terrace ancillary to A3 Café use on land adjacent to South Parade Pier

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and drew attention to the Supplementary Matters which reported that:

The application has been called into the Planning Committee by Councillor Linda Symes.

Remove condition 1 (time limit) from recommendation.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers clarified that

- The Legal Advisor advised that land ownership and trespass are not material considerations.
- The raised terrace is not built in exactly the same place and to the same dimensions for which conditional planning permission was given in 2018. The floor area is about 40% bigger than originally intended. Instead of being attached to South Parade Pier there is a small gap of just under 0.5 m; the purpose of the gap is unclear.
- The logistics of carrying food and drink from outlets on the Pier to the terrace is not a planning matter.
- The visual impact of the structure when occupied is not a matter of concern.
- It is unclear what the purpose of the timber posts is. Using them for installing an awning would require planning permission; likewise, if the applicant wanted to install a kiosk on the terrace. Heating lights might be used in the winter; depending on the type of light, planning permission might be required.
- The measurements are a more accurate representation than the drawings of what the structure might look like if it had been built to the original specifications.
- The terrace is ancillary to the Tea on Sea café. In discussion on whether use of the terrace is restricted to a particular outlet, to any outlet on the Pier or any other outlet, the Legal Advisor advised that an ancillary structure does not need to be physically connected to a principal structure; it could be a parasitic use. A condition could be imposed to restrict use of the terrace ancillary to cafés on the Pier. Whether the use could be restricted to just Tea on Sea would have to be discussed to see if it is reasonable.
- The Chair had enquired as to why the structure was bigger than specified in the conditional planning permission granted in 2018 and would forward the reply to members.

Members' Comments

- Allowing a gap between the terrace and the Pier and may have created a legal loophole which would let other businesses use the terrace.
- The timber posts are unattractive, the terrace is not flush with the Pier and has a negative effect on visual impact. The terrace occupies space on the open beach. The structure is too big and too near the Pier, an historic building. Rubbish might collect in the gap. Other cafés wanting to do the same would unlikely to be treated sympathetically.
- There were concerns about serving 50 to 60 people in a crowded part of the promenade.
- There had been opposition to the Coffee Cup in Eastney and it is now very popular. The Seafront Masterplan encourages activities for people to do on the seafront and the Pier needs income to flourish.
- Cafés like the Coffee Cup and the Southsea Beach Café are standalone and not close to other buildings. The Pier may rent the terrace to whoever pays the most which may lead to problems.
- It is not good that the structure is bigger than was permitted but the principle of a terrace with decking has been approved so a refusal may not be sustained on appeal. Officers emphasised that the previous consent is a significant material consideration for members and the Planning Inspector. There could be a condition to make it ancillary to the cafés on the Pier.

Resolved to overturn officers' recommendation to grant conditional planning permission for the following reasons:

The size of the proposed deck, its appearance as a separate structure and the inclusion of upright structures is considered to result in adverse visual harm to the character of the seafront and unjustified harm to the conservation area and the adjacent listed pier, contrary to Policy PCS9 and PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan Portsmouth's Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy).

113. 21/00984/LBC - Land Adjacent To South Parade Pier, Southsea, PO4 0SW (AI 11)

Construction of external raised terrace ancillary to A3 Café use on land adjacent to South Parade Pier

The Head of Development Management introduced the report.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members as to whether an appeal against refusal could be defended, officers said that the planning history shows that the planning policy has not changed much since the previous permission in 2018.

Members' Comments

There were no comments.

Resolved to overturn officers' recommendation to grant conditional planning permission for the following reasons:

The size of the proposed deck, its appearance as a separate structure and the inclusion of upright structures is considered to result in unjustified harm to

the adjacent listed pier, contrary to Policy PCS9 and PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan Portsmouth's Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy).

Councillor Atkins left the meeting at 2.55 pm.

114. 21/01329/DOC - Southsea Seafront From Long Curtain Moat In The West To Eastney Marine Barracks In The East (AI 12)

Application to seek approval of details reserved by conditions 2 (phasing), 5a/5b (archaeology), 17 (soft landscaping), 22 (external lighting), 23 (street furniture and walls), and 25 (hard surfacing materials) of planning permission 21/00820/VOC (for part sub-frontage 4 only, Southsea Castle)

The Legal Advisor left the meeting for this item as he has advised the applicant.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the report. Alex Prior and Nicola Reid from Coastal Partners were present to answer any questions. The Heritage Consultant has advised that the proposals are acceptable.

Members' Questions

In response to questions from members, officers clarified that

- There is currently no lighting around Southsea Castle. Lighting elsewhere on the Esplanade is being re-used in the sea defences scheme.
- The memorial seats are not covered by the conditions presented to the Committee today and are slightly separate to the planning application. The proposal is not a planning application so imposing a condition on whether the memorial seats should be re-used, restored or replaced by new seating is not possible as a condition cannot be imposed on a matter already decided. Members are considering details on a decision that has already been granted. The seating is a separate matter of detail yet to be determined. The judgement is about the suitability of the range and location of seating in the area and can be made irrespective of which structure a collection of memorial plaques might be placed on.
- There are ongoing discussions between the council and Coastal Partners which recognise the importance of the memorials to families. Some solutions have been suggested: remove the plaques and put them on new seating; etch on the timber of new seating; a combined memorial area. Coastal Partners will incorporate the chosen solution into the scheme.
- The council and Coastal Partners are compiling a list of everyone who has a memorial seat so that families are involved.
- The Sea Defences Working Group has had long conversations about the memorial seating. The desire to create a holistic design for sea defences is understandable but as the seating is a sensitive matter it is hoped there will be further discussions.
- It will be about 18 months to two years before the landscaping and seating are affected by the sea defences work.
- The exposed point around the Castle is a particularly harsh environment so different types of material need to be used on the upper and lower parts of the promenade.
- The lights are set back as far as possible to avoid obstructing pedestrians, scooter users etc. They are the most practical way of running electricity.

- The new promenade is higher than the current one with a 1:7 slope down into the Bandstand area. The lights cannot go further back as they would breach the retaining structure.
- The plants are all native British species and have been selected to cope with a harsh environment. The aim is to have species that are already found along the Southsea coast.

Members' Comments

Members agreed that a report on the memorial seating should go to a Cabinet meeting in recognition of the matter's sensitivity and requested that families should be consulted individually about any decisions. Planning officers are requested to write to the lead officers.

Resolved to approve details of conditions as set out in the officer's committee report.

115. 20/00960/HOU - 34 Freshwater Road, Portsmouth, PO6 3HU (AI 13)
Construction of two storey side and rear extension (Amended description)

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report.

Members' Questions

There were no questions.

Members' Comments

Although the design could have been softened slightly, members considered that the extension would not adversely affect the surrounding area.

Resolved to overturn officers' recommendation to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

Reasons for permission: The proposed side extension would not result in an incongruous excessive and visually intrusive form of development and would not be out of character with the local area. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy PCS 23 of the Portsmouth Plan 2012.

Recommendation - Conditional Permission

Conditions

- 1 Time Limit**
- 2 Approved Plans**
- 3 Materials**

The meeting concluded at 3.25 pm.

.....

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Lee Hunt