

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 12 July 2023 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 Chris Attwell (Chair)
Lee Hunt (Vice-Chair)
Hannah Brent
Peter Candlish
Asghar Shah
John Smith
Judith Smyth
Mary Vallely
Gerald Vernon-Jackson CBE

Welcome

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

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The Chair 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.

82. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Raymond Dent.

Councillor Hunt apologised that he needed to leave the meeting at 12:30.
Councillor Brent apologised that she needed to leave the meeting at 14:45.

The meeting was adjourned for a short break at 13:11 and recommenced at 13:26.

83. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

84. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 June 2023 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 June 2023 be agreed as a correct record.

Planning Applications

The Supplementary Matters report and the deputations (which are not minuted) can be viewed on the council's website at:

Agenda for Planning Committee on Wednesday, 12th July, 2023, 10.30 am Portsmouth City Council

The Chair advised that he would be amending the order of the agenda; the applications were considered in the following order:

Item 1: Tipner East Land off Twyford Avenue and Tipner Lane, Portsmouth
Item 7: 39 Wykeham Road, Portsmouth PO2 0EG
Item 10: 13 Shadwell Road, Portsmouth PO2 9EH
Item 9: 15 Shadwell Road, Portsmouth PO2 9EH
Item 8: 12 Thurbern Road, Portsmouth PO2 0PJ
Item 5: 137 London Road, Portsmouth PO2 9AA
Item 6: 127 Powerscourt Road, Portsmouth PO2 7JQ
Item 11: 232 Queens Road, Portsmouth PO2 7NG
Item 12: 28 Hudson Road, Southsea PO5 1HD
Item 13: 3 Pains Road, Southsea PO5 1HE
Item 14: 36 Montgomerie Road, Southsea PO5 1ED
Item 15: 4 Chalkridge Road, Portsmouth PO6 2BE
Item 16: 30 Telephone Road, Southsea PO4 0AY

However, for ease of reference the minutes will remain in the original order.

85. 21/01357/FUL - Tipner East Land off Twyford Avenue and Tipner Lane, Portsmouth (AI 4)

Construction of 221 dwellings, new accesses onto Tipner Lane and Twyford Avenue, internal access roads & cycleways, open space, parking and associated infrastructure, including potential linkages to the proposed residential development to the north, existing residential development to the south and to the existing and proposed enhanced park & ride facilities to the west. The proposal constitutes EIA Development (revised scheme).

Edward Chetwynd-Stapylton presented the report and drew Members' attention to the information in the Supplementary Matters report.

He advised the application had previously been presented to the committee on 21 May but it had been deferred for further information to be obtained on flood risk mitigation, predicted traffic volumes and clearer illustrations on some aspects of the plan.

Deputations

Jeffery Hector - objecting.

Cliff Lane (agent) on behalf of the applicants, Bellway Homes,

Members' questions

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified:

- Bellway Homes had agreed to a condition on the installation of bollards. There was no sound planning reason to require the bollards are placed anywhere other than where the applicant was proposing. To do so may cause unintended

consequences or further interference with private law rights that are unknown at the present time.

- The applicant would be able to apply for the removal of the condition. This would have to go through the full planning process and the merits or otherwise of the removal would be considered at that point.
- The restrictive covenant needed to be serviced by Bellway Homes. The condition would require approval of the bollards from planning from a design and utility point of view.
- Travel through Tipner Lane would not initially be available. The part of the site to the west would only have access or egress from and via Tipner Lane.
- The Planning authority have no engagement in relation to resident parking permits. There was clear guidance that it was not appropriate for planning permission to prevent access to residents parking permits.
- The restrictive covenant was a private legal matter which was out of the control of the Town and Country Planning Acts. Any removal of the covenant would be a matter for the two landowners. This means there may be a possibility in the future that the covenant would be removed.
- Bellway Homes had not been asked if they would place the bollards at the entrance from Tipner Lane into the spinal road. The placement on the planning application would only allow housing adjacent to the north/south extension to Tipner Lane and the houses facing south on the northern side, access through Tipner Lane.
- The floor level of 4.6 metres would be consistent across both the Bellway and Vivid sites. This was 30cm above the highest predicted climate change flood level.
- Bellway Homes were required, by a condition, to make a pro-rata contribution to public transport.
- Conditions would be imposed requiring hard and soft landscaping schemes to be submitted for approval by the Council.
- Conditions in relation to biodiversity, permeable surfaces in parking areas and surface water drainage schemes would be considered in later plans. Final wording of conditions was yet to be finalised with the recommendation being to delegate this to the Head of Planning Services.
- There was no guarantee that at some point in the future there would not be through traffic. This was not currently part of the scheme, but traffic modelling suggested it would be far quicker to take the straight route through to Twyford Avenue rather than taking back streets.
- The finished floor level of the site would be one foot above the modelled flood risk height so there was no longer a flood risk associated with the site.
- Access to the M275 did not form part of the application.

Members' comments

Members considered the development to be essential for the city's housing needs and welcomed it.

They noted that local residents have welcomed over 1000 new homes having recognised the need for homes and affordable housing. There was concern about the possibility of traffic coming down through Tipner Lane into the community and the splitting of the new site 20% / 80% through the positioning of the bollards.

An additional condition was proposed that the bollards be placed at the junction of Tipner Lane with the western end of the spinal road, to protect the residential amenity, quiet and enjoyment of peoples' lives in Tipner Lane and the surrounding roads. Officers recommended condition of a trigger point prior to any works above damp-proof course.

Officers noted there was no planning or highway reason for the condition but accepted members' request for the condition and allowing for accessibility of buses.

RESOLVED to:

Approve in accordance with the officer recommendations with an additional condition relocating the proposed bollards, but also allowing bus access through them, with a trigger point of 'prior to any works above damp proof course' or similar wording delegated to officers.

- 1. Grant planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 agreement.**
- 2. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director for Planning and Economic Growth to finalise the wording of the draft conditions and finalise the S106 agreement in accordance with the draft heads of terms.**
- 3. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning and Economic Growth to refuse planning permission if a legal agreement has not been satisfactorily completed within six months of the date of this resolution.**

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BRIEFING

The Assistant Director, Ian Maguire gave a briefing on the key issue of material considerations prior to commencing the HMO part of the committee.

Of note, was the precedents that had been clearly set by previous appeals, Campbell and Lane which judged that, on individual cases, planning permission had not been required as the minor increase in occupancy was not a material change of use. Applying this precedent, the cases listed on the agenda had had their merits considered and the same officer decision reached, on the individual merits, that they did not require planning permission as the increase was only one or two occupants. There were also applications on the agenda that did require planning permission and again this had been decided on the merits of the individual case.

The Assistant Director stressed the need, should members come to a different planning judgement to that recommended in the application, to express the facts on a bespoke and individual basis. The use of wording by rote had previously resulted in cost being awarded against the council in the Lane decision. He strongly urged members not to utilise a form of wording by rote and instead look at individual appropriate wording based on the individual characteristics of the application before them to make a robust and reasonable judgement.

- 86. 19/00595/FUL - 137 London Road, Hilsea, Portsmouth PO2 9AA (AI 5)**

Change of use of part of ground floor and upper floors from a five bedroom/five person house of multiple occupation to a five bedroom/seven person house of multiple occupation (Sui Generis); to include construction of part single/part two storey rear/side extension; dormer to rear roofslope and associated cycle and refuse stores (note amended description)

The Assistant Director presented the report and noted that officers had decided that this did not require planning permission as it was not considered a material change of use.

Deputations

A deputation was made by Henry Thorpe objecting to the application.

Members' questions

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified:

- The daylight to the communal space was via the double doors to the rear of the property and the windows within the flat roof. It was immediately adjacent to a single storey building so the light was unobstructed around the front of the terrace. The rear garden only received light in the latter part of the day.
- The void in bedroom 5 was an area of existing building that was not habitable space - it was the gap between the internal and external wall.
- The square markation in bedroom 2 could be the mark of a previous wall that would be coming out as part of the orientation of the internal space.
- Bikes would be stored in the garden on the vertical hanging bicycle storage rack.
- An increase of 5 - 6 people was open to the applicant, but the committee had to apply their judgement on the application as submitted - 5 - 7 people.

Members' comments

Members considered there was not enough room for 7 people in the property due to the small size of bedroom 5 which falls below the space standards.

They also considered the fact that the rooms are not regularly shaped which specifically would be grounds for rejecting the application.

Planning Permission

Members stated the proposal was considered development as it was moving above the 6 persons as an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area.

The Assistant Director advised against using this wording as, in accordance with the Lane Judgement, it would inevitably be judged as an unreasonable reason due to the lack of specificity to the application.

The final wording in respect of the reason for refusal was delegated to Officers.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the planning application required planning permission.**
- 2. To refuse planning permission on the basis that:**

- a) **The size of the accommodation provided in bedroom 5 was insufficient to provide occupants with amenity in preference or in addition to the communal living space and therefore overall the development is not considered to provide a good standard of living environment for those occupants contrary to PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.**
- b) **The development would have an unmitigated likely significant effect on the Solent SPA through recreational disturbance and increased eutrophication contrary to the Habitats Regulations.**

87. 21/01417/CPL - 127 Powerscourt Road, Portsmouth PO2 7JQ (AI 6)

Application for a certificate of lawful development for existing use as house in multiple occupation with 7 beds.

The Assistant Director presented the report and advised the only question that needed to be considered was whether the application required planning permission or not.

Deputations

There were no deputations.

Members' questions

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified:

- Nothing had changed since the previous refusal to a 7 bed HMO on the basis of the inadequacy of the communal space. The Planning Inspector had made no consideration in respect of the impact of the increase and no statement to indicate whether he had given any consideration as to the need for planning permission. The inspector had only considered that the merits of the case were unacceptable.
- The application for a Certificate of existing lawful use was because the applicant did not consider the use requires planning permission as this was not a material change of use.
- Whether or not the property was licensable did not come under the Planning department.

Members' comments

Members noted the lack of ensuite bathrooms, which was unusual, and the small size of the rooms. Adding a seventh bedroom would affect the combined living space available. The development was considered very small, and 6 occupants was enough.

Members considered that the proposal was considered development as it was moving above the 6 persons as an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area.

RESOLVED to refuse a certificate of lawfulness.

88. 22/01076/FUL - 39 Wykeham Road, Portsmouth PO2 0EG (AI 7)

Change of use from six bed house in multiple occupation (Class C4) to house in multiple occupation for seven persons (Sui Generis)

The Assistant Director presented the report.

Deputations

Deputations were made by:

Henry Thorpe, objecting.
Councillor Daniel Wemyss
Councillor Ben Swann
Maisie Durrant for the Agent (Applecore)

Planning Permission

Members considered the proposal was considered development as the current C4 approval was for 6 persons in an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building within a highly built up terrace street and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area.

Members were advised by officers that the wording was simply paraphrasing of wording used previously. In addition, the assertion by a committee member that class C4 only allows up to 6 people and that any more than that is by definition a change of use was not correct and the committee should not base their judgement on that.

Members' questions

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified:

- Planning does allow for incremental growth over time, but members should not impose control over the numbers of occupants in an HMO despite having imposed these conditions before. The main control of occupancy is via private sector housing licencing.
- The property was currently a 6-bedroom house but it may, historically, have been a 3 bedroom house.
- In relation to combined living space, the guidance says there must be 34 square metres for a 6 or 7 bed HMO. If all the bedrooms were over 10 square metres, then the combined living space can be 22.5 square metres.
- The HMO database was constantly kept up to date by planning applications, licensing applications, through third party intervention and reporting and from ward member and neighbour notifications.
- The proposal involved no operational development so any overshadowing or criminal trespass through scaffolding would be a matter that was covered by permitted development.
- Bin storage would be in the front garden as was the current case.

- If no cycle storage was in the application this could be addressed through a condition.

Members' comments

Members noted that all the space standards had been complied with and all rooms were ensuite. The application was considered one of the better ones and members were happy to propose conditional permission with a limit of 7 people.

There was a concern about the number of HMOs in this particular area.

RESOLVED to grant conditional permission as per the conditions indicated in the report with additional conditions on cycle storage and limiting occupation to a maximum of 7 occupants.

89. 22/01152/FUL - 12 Thurbern Road, Portsmouth PO2 0PJ (AI 8)

Change of use from Class C3 (dwelling house) to 7-person house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis)

The Assistant Director presented the report. He noted that this application required planning permission.

Deputations

Deputations were made by:

Cllr Russell Simpson
Cllr Daniel Wemyss

Members' questions

In response to members' questions, officers clarified:

- Matters such as soundproofing are not dealt with by Planning. Building regulations would require an appropriate level of sound resistance for the internal walls.
- Bedroom 2 was 8.725 square meters if excluding the area which is the hallway. Bedroom 3 was 7.6 square meters.

Members' comments

Members considered the internal corridors within the rooms should not be counted as living space. Two of the rooms were not of the dimensions claimed due to this. Therefore, the communal space would be relied on more heavily by these rooms, making the combined communal space insufficient.

There were concerns that a desk could not be fitted into these rooms.

The final wording in respect of the reason for refusal was delegated to Officers.

RESOLVED to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1. The layout of the accommodation and resultant usable floorspace provided in bedrooms 2 & 3 is insufficient to provide occupants with amenity in preference or in addition to the communal living space, and**

therefore overall the development is not considered to provide a good standard of living environment for those occupants contrary to PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

2. The development would have an unmitigated likely significant effect on the Solent SPA through recreational disturbance and increased eutrophication contrary to the Habitats Regulations.

90. 22/01559/FUL - 15 Shadwell Road, Portsmouth PO2 9EH (AI 9)

Change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to 8-person house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis)

The Assistant Director presented the report and drew Members' attention to the information in the Supplementary Matters report. He advised the application does require planning permission.

Deputations

Deputations were made by:

Henry Thorpe objecting
Councillor Daniel Wemyss objecting
Maisie Durrant for Agent (Applecore)

Members' questions

In response to members' questions, officers clarified:

- The previous change of use which was consented had four bedrooms, a separate kitchen and separate dining space. A condition was imposed on the basis that occupancy more than 4 would not meet the standards because of the room sizes versus communal space. This was agreed on appeal by the inspector. There had now been a substantial extension to the rear to change that into a combined living space and alter the number of bedrooms.
- The planning SPD allowed for 34 square meters of communal space if all the bedrooms were over the necessary size. Up to 10 people could occupy the accommodation and comply with the planning standards.

Members' comments

Members considered there was no justifiable reason to refuse the application.

RESOLVED that the Secretary of State be advised, in respect of the ongoing appeal, that the Local Planning Authority would have concluded that the application be granted subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement necessary to secure the mitigation of the impact of the proposed residential development on Solent Special Protection Areas (recreational disturbance and nitrates) by securing the payment of a financial contribution and conditions - Time limit, Approved plans, Cycle Storage and completion of permitted development works

91. 22/01643/FUL - 13 Shadwell Road, Portsmouth PO2 9EH (AI 10)

Change of use from house in multiple occupation (Class C4) to an 8 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis) (resubmission of 21/01622/FUL)

The Assistant Director presented the report and drew Members' attention to the information in the Supplementary Matters report.

Deputations

Deputations were made by:

Henry Thorpe objecting,
Councillor Russell Simpson objecting
Maisis Durrant for agent (Applecore)

Planning Permission

Members considered that the proposal was considered development as the current C4 approval was for 6 persons in an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building within a highly built up terrace street and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area in respect of 13 Shadwell Road

Officers advised caution in using the same phraseology as before.

Members' questions

In response to members' questions, officers clarified:

- The SPD guidance does consider 3 HMOs in a row and 2 sandwiching a home in the middle. The applications for 13 & 15 Shadwell Road do not fall foul of the SPD.
- 13 & 15 Shadwell Road already have permission to be HMOs so are included in the HMO count for the area. Number 16 has applied to be an HMO but does not yet have permission. Number 9 is a dwelling house. If all the properties became HMOs the percentage would not be above 5%.

Member's comments

Members considered that as the space standards have all been adhered to there was no reason to refuse the application, but the application should be limited to 8 persons.

RESOLVED that the Secretary of State be advised, in respect of the ongoing appeal, that the Local Planning Authority would have granted conditional permission.

92. 23/00080/FUL - 232 Queens Road, Fratton, Portsmouth PO2 7NG (AI 11)

Change of use from purpose falling within dwelling house (Class C3) to a 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis) [note change of description]

The Assistant Director, PCC Regeneration, presented the report and drew Members' attention to the information in the Supplementary Matters report. He noted that the application did require planning permission and recommended the addition of a

further condition to say that the work should be fully completed prior to the first occupation for the 7 bed HMO.

He drew attention to another typo within the report on the size table at the top of page 87. The ensuite for bedroom 7 does comply fully with the space standards.

Deputations

Deputations were made by:

Henry Thorpe objecting.
Simon Hill for applicant

Members' questions

In response to members' questions, officers clarified:

- The dotted line on the plan for bedroom 4 was the ridge of the room so the whole room was accessible. The three rectangles were Velux windows in the roof slope rising up to the highest point of the room. The room was above the acceptable space standards at 10.415 square meters.
- There was a bifold door in the communal kitchen/dinning room leading to the outside space. The rear wall of the building opened up.
- Cycle storage would be secured through a condition.
- The existing property had a small lounge where bedroom 2 was. There was a rear extension going in and the square staircase would be reorientated to a rectangular staircase. The marks on the plan were the current previous walls and square staircase.

Members' comments

There were no comments.

RESOLVED to grant conditional planning permission.

93. 22/01610/FUL - 28 Hudson Road, Southsea PO5 1HD (AI 12)

Change of use from a six bedroom house in multiple occupation (Class C4) to a 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis) [note amended description]

The Assistant Director presented the report.

Deputations

A deputation was made by Maisie Durrant for the applicant.

Planning Permission

Members considered the proposal was considered development as the current C4 approval was for 6 persons in an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area.

Officers reiterated their earlier advice regarding the use of the wording as applied previously.

Members' questions

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified:

- The ground floor shower room had now been omitted to allow for the expansion of bedroom 6. Some of bedroom 5 had been re-provided to bedroom 4 and the shower room on the second floor had been slightly reduced to give more space to bedroom 1 to ensure compliance with the space standards.

Members' comments

Members were happy to agree planning permission as the property met the space standards with ordinary, normal sized and shaped rooms. The occupancy was to be limited to 7 people.

RESOLVED to grant conditional permission as per the officer recommendation with additional conditions relating to cycle storage and limiting occupancy to 7 people.

94. 22/01657/FUL - 3 Pains Road, Southsea PO5 1HE (AI 13)

Change of use from house in multiple occupation (Class C4) to 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis)

The Assistant Director presented the report and drew Members' attention to the information in the Supplementary Matters report.

Deputations

A deputation was made by Maisie Durrant, for agent (Applecore)

Planning Permission

Members considered that the proposal was considered development as the current C4 approval was for 6 persons in an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area. In an area of extremely high number use as HMOs with over 40% in that road.

Members' questions

In response to members' questions, officers clarified:

- The long corridor on the plan of the proposed ground floor was a pathway down the side of the property with a gate shown at the rear of the pathway.
- The front door was on the side of the property.
- The lounge in the basement had a window leading to steps up into the rear garden. This was to provide light in accordance with the inspector's instructions and as a means of escape.

RESOLVED to grant conditional permission as per officers recommendations with additional conditions for cycle storage and limiting occupancy to 7 people.

95. 23/00089/FUL - 36 Montgomerie Road, Southsea PO5 1ED (AI 14)

Change of use from a six bedroom house in multiple occupation (Class C4) to 8 bedroom house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis)

The Assistant Director, PCC Regeneration, presented the report and drew Members' attention to the information in the Supplementary Matters report.

The appeal not yet started so jurisdiction remains with the committee.

Deputations

A deputation was made by Maisie Durrant, for agent

Planning permission

Members considered the proposal was considered development as the current C4 approval was for 6 persons in an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage, and amenity impact as well as impact on the Solent special protection area. Particularly in an area where there was over 30% HMO and this was originally a 2 bedroom house.

Members' questions

In response to members' questions, officers clarified:

- A bike is able to be taken through to the bike store at the back of the house. A bike can be taken through any space a human can get through - the bike can be stood on its rear wheel. There was no reasonable evidence to suggest that a bike could not be manoeuvred through the corridor as illustrated on the floor plan.
- The property had been inspected by the licensing team who made the professional judgement to grant a licence for 8 people in November 2022.

Members' comments

Members considered that half of bedroom 8 was not usable due to its layout in two parts with an ensuite. They considered there was unusable space in bedrooms 5 and 2 as well. Members noted bedroom 6 had a very long corridor which reduced its size. The reduction in usable space in these bedrooms rendered the communal space too small. Members proposed refusal on this basis. The final wording in respect of the reason for refusal was delegated to Officers.

RESOLVED to refuse planning permission because:

- 1. The size of the accommodation in bedrooms 1, 2, 3 and 8 was insufficient to provide occupants with amenity in preference or in addition to the communal living space, and therefore overall the development is not considered to provide a good standard of living environment for those occupants contrary to PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.**

2. The development would have an unmitigated likely significant effect on the Solent SPA through recreational disturbance and increased eutrophication contrary to the Habitats Regulations.

96. 23/00112/FUL - 4 Chalkridge Road, Portsmouth PO6 2BE (AI 15)

Change of use from a purpose falling within dwelling house (Class C3) to a 7 person house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis) [note change of description]

The Assistant Director presented the report. The property has planning permission to be C4 which had not yet occurred, so the application was for C3 to C4 which required planning permission.

Deputations

A deputation was made by Mr Joseph Williams, the applicant.

Members' questions

There were no questions.

Members' comments

Members agreed to grant planning permission with a limit of 7 people.

RESOLVED to grant conditional permission as per officer recommendations with a limit of 7 people.

97. 23/00524/FUL - 30 Telephone Road, Southsea PO4 0AY (AI 16)

Change of use from 6-bed/6-person house in multiple occupation to a 7-bed/7-person house in multiple occupation

The Assistant Director presented the report.

Deputations

A deputation was made by Maisie Durrant for agent

Planning Permission

Members considered the proposal was considered development as the current C4 approval was for 6 persons in an HMO and the extension to additional people had the potential effect to increase the intensity of the use of the building and the corresponding increase in the impact on other residents of parking, noise, waste, sewerage and amenity impact in an area which is already over 40% of houses that are HMOs as well as impact on the Solent special protection area.

Members' questions

There were no questions.

Members' comments

Members proposed approval of planning permission with additional conditions of limiting to 7 people and the addition of a cycle store.

RESOLVED to grant conditional permission as per officer recommendations with additional conditions for cycle storage and limiting occupancy to 7 people.

The meeting concluded at 3.32 pm.

.....
Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Chris Attwell

This page is intentionally left blank