

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 23 April 2014 at 2.00 pm in The Executive Meeting Room - Third Floor, The Guildhall

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

### **Present**

Councillors David Fuller (Chair)  
Darron Phillips  
Jacqui Hancock  
Sandra Stockdale  
Ken Ellcome  
Frank Jonas  
Ken Ferrett  
Hugh Mason

Also in attendance  
Councillor Peter Eddis

### **Welcome**

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

### **Guildhall, Fire Procedure**

The chair, Councillor Fuller, explained to all present at the meeting the fire procedures including where to assemble and how to evacuate the building in case of a fire.

#### **45. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 1)**

Councillor Ellcome declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 10 as he had taken up the invitation from the applicant to inspect the property. However he had not made any comments on the application and remained open minded.

Councillor Mason declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 as he lives in the vicinity of Inglis Road, Southsea.

#### **46. Apologies (AI 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Les Stevens, Lee Mason, Margaret Foster and John Ferrett. Councillor Hugh Mason was in attendance for Councillor Foster and Councillor Ken Ferrett was in attendance for Councillor John Ferrett.

#### **47. Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee - 26 March 2014 (AI 3)**

(TAKE IN MINUTES)

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 26 March 2014 were agreed and should be signed by the chair as a correct record.

**48. Updates Provided by the City Development Manager on previous planning applications. (AI 4)**

There were no updates.

**49. Planning appeal decision relating to 107 Havant Road, Drayton (AI 5)**

(TAKE IN REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER)

Councillor Ellcome wished to formally register his disappointment with the Planning Inspector's decision as he felt allowing this development would set a precedent for other similar developments.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**50. Planning appeal decision relating to 93 Havant Road, Drayton (AI 6)**

(TAKE IN REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER)

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**51. 156,158 and land to rear of 154-172 Southampton Road Portsmouth (AI 7)**

(TAKE IN REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER)

**RESOLVED:**

**That point 1 of the resolution to grant outline permission (minute 147 of Planning Committee minutes of 4 December 2013) is amended as follows:-**

**Delegated authority be granted to the City Development Manager to complete a Section 106 Agreement that secures:**

**1) The provision of three units of Affordable accommodation [plot nos, 24, 25 and 26] ready for occupation by no later than the completion of fifteen open market dwellings.**

**2) The review of the viability assessment at 18 months from the date of the outline permission if no fewer than 10 houses have reached shell and core stage**

**3) In the event of further appraisal being required and demonstrating that there is an improvement in viability, in that some increase in Residual Land Value above that set out in the appraisal of the original provision of affordable accommodation proposed in the planning application is shown to have occurred in the period between the original appraisal and the development period to the shell and core stage, then a financial contribution to the provision of affordable housing reflecting the value of such an improvement shall be required**

- 4) The payment of a project management fee of £1000.
- 5) A Skills and Employment Training Plan.

**52. 14/00136/FUL - 22 Inglis Road Southsea PO5 1PB (AI 8)**

(TAKE IN REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER)

The City Development Manager reported in the supplementary matters list that a written deputation had been received by an objector who was unable to attend the meeting and this was attached as an appendix to the list.

A deputation was heard from Mrs Candy, objecting to the application, who included the following points in her representations:

- Her property has a small courtyard garden and backs onto the site;
- Moved into her property 26 years ago and the Gospel Hall was a major factor in their decision to purchase the property;
- Her property is not currently overlooked and the new development would mean they would be directly overlooked causing loss of privacy;
- Loss of light;
- Disagree that losing the hall would cause no significant impact to the area;
- The distance between the proposed development and her property would be 18.5 metres according to the scale on the plans, which contravenes the rule that the distance should be a minimum of 21 metres;
- The development would have a huge negative impact on the surrounding homes.

A deputation was also heard from Ms Barnard-Oetjen, objecting to the application, who included the following points in her representations:

- The Gospel Hall is a local landmark and gives character to the area;
- It would be shameful to demolish the building;
- Existing building improves and enhances the area and fits remit of a Conservation Area.

A deputation was also heard from Mr Lympany, objecting to the application, who included the following points in his representations:

- To demolish the Gospel Hall goes against what is morally right;
- The proposal to build two semi-detached houses in its place does not conserve or enhance the Conservation Area.

A deputation was heard from Mr McDermott, the Applicants Agent, who included the following points in his representations;

- Members need to balance the existing use against the proposed use;
- With regard to concerns on the lack of light, he had negotiated an amendment with his client and reduced the bulk of the first floor;
- The design of the dwellings works with the character of the area but gives a contemporary spin;
- The Gospel Hall is surplus to requirements and satisfied its loss is appropriate;
- 3 bedroom houses are desperately needed in the city;

- The proposed works would be controlled by a variety of schemes and conditions could be placed on this if the council was minded to do so;
- The impact of the building works would not be significant.

A deputation was also heard from ward Councillor Peter Eddis who included the following points in his representations:

- There is not currently a parking issue during the day in Inglis Road, but there is a parking issue in the evenings and overnight. The increase of two dwellings would therefore add to the parking problems in the evening;
- Anything new in the Conservation Area should enhance the area and the proposed dwellings are very bland;
- The proposed dwellings do not fit in with the other houses around it and have no character;
- Why not convert the existing building rather than demolish it?

#### Members' questions

Members sought clarification on the use class of the building and whether there was a precedent on the minimum distance between properties. Clarification was also sought on whether the proposed roofs were hipped or non-hipped as the plans were contradictory to advice given. Members sought clarification on the use of the buildings surrounding the site on the plans and on the materials that were proposed for the dwellings to ensure that they would fit in with the existing buildings.

#### Members' comments

Members commented that it would be a great loss if a further community building was lost in this area. Members felt that the proposed dwellings were of inadequate design and did not meet the necessary standards for a Conservation Area. This would therefore conflict with Policy PCS23. It was felt that the application would be more appropriate if the design was more similar to the adjoining properties.

#### **RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:**

- The proposed design neither preserves nor enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- The proposal is bland and inappropriate.
- No SPA mitigation.

#### **53. 14/00177/HOU - 44A Craneswater Park Southsea Hampshire PO4 0NU (AI 9)**

(TAKE IN REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER)

The City Development Manager reported in the supplementary matters list that a written deputation objecting to the application had been received from ward Councillor Winnington on the grounds that;

- (a) It is still out of scale with properties in the local area,
- (b) It will change the rooflines in the area,
- (c) Precedent, and

(d) Craneswater Mews would be completely overlooked.

The previous application was refused permission on the grounds that the occupiers of Craneswater Mews would be overlooked. The proposed alterations have addressed this issue by the inclusion of obscure glazing and provision of en-suite bathrooms at the rear.

A deputation was heard from Mr Greener, objecting to the application, who included the following points in his representations:

- He lives in Craneswater Mews which is directly next to the site;
- The 8 houses in Craneswater Mews have a shared garden which would be overlooked;
- Distance of 7m from his bedroom to the proposed dormer;
- The change to the application of having obscured glass is such a minor change;
- Concerns that if approved this will set a precedent for the other houses in Craneswater Park;
- The application was refused previously due to the properties being overlooked and the same issue still applies;
- Skylights would suffice rather than dormer windows.

#### Members' questions

Members sought clarification on the previous reasons for refusal of this application and whether the use of level four obscure glass removes the effect of overlooking from the proposal.

#### Members' comments

Members felt that the applicant had listened to the concerns raised previously and had remodelled the internal layout so that the rooms in the dormers were now bathrooms with obscured glazing. This would remove the concerns of overlooking and members noted that the planning conditions stated that these windows must be obscured glass for perpetuity, and this was enforceable.

**RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the City Development Manager's report.**

#### **54. 14/00108/HOU - 14 And 32 Park House Clarence Parade Southsea PO5 3RJ (AI 10)**

(TAKE IN REPORT BY THE CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER)

The City Development Manager reported in the supplementary matters list that in addition to those previously reported (9), 22 further letters of support have been received from local residents and St Jude Ward Member Councillor Peter Eddis. These representations can be summarised as follows: (a) The proposal would enhance the appearance of the property and make a positive contribution to the street scene; (b) Proposal represents a sympathetic addition improving alignment with the windows below; (c) The proposal would not affect the character and appearance of the conservation area; and (d) The proposal would result in improved internal living conditions for residents.

Two additional letters of support had also been received from local residents which were circulated to the committee.

A deputation was heard from Mr McDermott, the Applicants Agent. He circulated to members' additional photographs and plans of the proposed roof alterations. He included the following points in his representations:

- Recognition that the existing roof form is unsatisfactory;
- Existing dormers unattractive;
- Efforts have been made to address the planning inspectors concerns on the previous application for external alterations;
- Would enhance and improve the street scene;
- The proposal will align the majority of dormers to the windows below. The window that would remain unaligned is a fire escape, however they will seek to make improvements to this;
- The proposal attempts to restore the ridgeline;
- It was proposed to change the white UPC windows to windows that would blend better with the roof.

A deputation was heard from ward Councillor Peter Eddis who included the following points in his representations:

- Existing dormers unsympathetic.
- The proposal would improve the window alignments, give increased head room height, however noted this would increase the bulk of the roof.
- In support of the proposal and it will enhance the area, however noted that the scheme is not perfect and there were areas where alignment was not possible due to the fire escape staircases;

#### Members' questions

Members sought clarification on the amount the proposed roof would be raised by and the impact of this on the street scene. Clarification was also sought on the inspector's previous reasons for dismissing the appeal.

#### Members' comments

Members commented that there had been no objections to the proposal and noted that a redevelopment of the whole roof was unachievable. Members agreed that although the proposal was not perfect, it was an improvement to the current roof. Members felt that if permission was granted a condition should be included so that material of the windows is changed to be more in keeping with the roof to make this less prominent.

#### **RESOLVED that the application be approved for the following reasons:**

The proposal would improve the appearance of Park House and the wider street scene, appearing less conspicuous than the existing dormer windows, improving cohesiveness and alignment with the windows below. Furthermore the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the 'Owen's Southsea' Conservation Area.

The meeting concluded at 3.40 pm.

---

Signed by the Chair of the meeting  
Councillor David Fuller