

PLANNING COMMITTEE 10.01.2024

SUPPLEMENTARY MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE REPORT BY THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR - PLANNING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

<u>ITEM NO</u>	<u>REF NO</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
1	23/01289/FUL	291 QUEENS ROAD FRATTON PORTSMOUTH	No update.	No change to recommendation.
2	23/01220/FUL	19 TAMWORTH ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO3 6DL	<p>Following the publication of the Committee Report, the Applicant has re-measured the property for accuracy and submitted updated floorplans. The updated plans are in the Committee Presentation, and a revised schedule of floor sizes is in Appendix 1 below and in the Committee Presentation. All of the rooms are above the minimum size standards.</p> <p>Highway comments: Tamworth Road is a residential road with bus stops and amenities within the local vicinity. It is unclear how many bedrooms the HMO would be increased to, therefore there is the potential for increased instances of residents driving around the area hunting for a parking space, however this an issue of residential amenity for you to consider. It is not considered that size of the development would lead to a material impact to the function of the highway. The secure cycle storage should be implemented prior to occupation.</p> <p>Planning Officer response: it is not considered that the possible effect on parking of the proposal</p>	No change to recommendation.

			could constitute a reason for refusal, given the limited difference between C3 and C4 occupation. A cycle storage condition is already attached.	
3	23/00543/FUL	26 FEARON ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO2 0NJ	<p>The Officer Report notes at Para. 8.11 that the kitchen-dining room does not meet the required space standard, but that it is acceptable because of the separate lounge also proposed. It is proposed to secure this degree of communal living space by way of condition: <i>'The following room is not to be used as sleeping accommodation by any person and shall be retained for communal living space: Ground Floor Living Room shown on plan 096-PL02. Reason: In order to provide suitable living arrangements for the occupiers of the premises, in accordance with the HMO SPD 2019'.</i></p> <p>Licensing: the property would need to be licensed. Licensing comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) it is not clear if area of minimum ceiling height in 2nd floor bedroom meets the new licensing standard; (ii) it is not clear if 1st floor bedroom meets new licensing standard of 2.15m width; (iii) were the front living room to become a seventh bedroom, the kitchen/diner alone would not meet the required space standard. <p>Planning Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Applicant has amended the Floor Plan to show the licensing standard is met; (ii) The bedroom is 2.43m wide, so meeting the licensing standard; (iii) This is already noted in the Committee report. 	<p>Attach an extra condition as set out in the adjacent 'Comments' column.</p> <p>Amend Condition 2 with updated Plan numbers.</p>

4	23/01193/FUL	118 OPHIR ROAD PORTSMOUTH PO2 9ET	No update.	No change to recommendation.
5	23/00568/FUL	198 FAWCETT ROAD SOUTHSEA PORTSMOUTH	As a correction to the Officer Report at Paragraph 1.6, there would actually be a small single-storey extension constructed under Permitted Development, replacing an existing structure. It would form part of Bedroom 7.	No change to recommendation.
6	23/01456/HOU	20 PRETORIA ROAD SOUTHSEA PO4 9BB	<p>The Applicant has read the Officer report and made the submission reproduced in Appendix 2.</p> <p>The neighbouring property, no. 18, have written in support of the application. These neighbours note the two houses are set back from the road so the proposal will hardly be noticed, and that the dormer has been stepped away from their half of the semi-detached pair so they consider it would reduce any imbalance.</p> <p>Planning Officer response: Please see Appendix 2 re the set back. The dormer would be separated from no.18 by about 10cm only.</p>	No change to Recommendation, please see Officer response in Appendix 2.
7	22/01129/FUL	STAMSHAW AND TIPNER LEISURE CENTRE 69 WILSON ROAD PORTSMOUTH	For completeness, the annotations to the proposed elevations have been corrected vis-à-vis the details of the windows, as per Paragraph 8.8 of the Committee Report.	Update the plan reference numbers to Condition 1.

Appendix 1, 19 Tamworth Rd, 23/01220/HOU

Room	Area Provided	Required Standard
Bedroom 1 (ground floor)	11.75m2	10m2
Bedroom 2 (first floor)	11.75m2	10m2
Bedroom 3 (first floor)	11.98m2	10m2
Bedroom 4 (first floor)	10.53m2	10m2
Storage room (first floor)	5.27m2	Not required
Bike store (ground floor)	3.45m2	n/a
Communal Kitchen/Dining area (ground floor)	34.68m2	22.5m2, as all bedrooms meet or exceed 10m2
Lounge (ground floor)	14.58m2	Not required as all bedrooms meet or exceed 10m2
Bathroom (first floor)	4.8m2	3.74m2
Ensuite (first floor)	4.75m2	3.74m2
WC (ground floor)	1.55m2	1.17m2

Appendix 2, 20 Pretoria Rd, 23/01456/HOU

E'mail from the Applicant:

'Dear Planners and Committee Members,

The purpose of this application is to provide accommodation a new bedroom to accommodate our soon to arrive grandson adjacent to his parents as part of the dormer where they live.

Notwithstanding the officers report, the three homes at 18, 20 and 22 are already out-of-character with the surrounding streetscape; they are modern homes built on land 30 years after World War 2 bombs destroyed Victorian/Edwardian terraced homes there. The plain fact is they are very different.

Another difference is their setting back from the front pavement line. Here we differ with officers who say 20 Pretoria Road (plus 22 and 18) "are slightly set back". The accurate measurement is 15 feet set back from the pavement line and 10 feet set back from the elevations of the bay and forecourts all the way along the street; in fact we have created off-road (gravel) parking which easily takes a large car along with two shrub borders. This demonstration how far back the front elevation of the three homes are.

If you look at pictures 5, 6 and 7 you will see (pic 5 and 6) looking west from the junction of Haslemere Road towards St Augustine Road. You will note the roof slope at number 20 is not that noticable. You can also see the eastern elevation of number 16 Pretoria Road. Again this shows how far back from the street setting the row of 18, 20 and 22 are.

In short the proposed dormer on the front slope of number 20 will not have an adverse impact on the street scape being set back 15 feet from the pavement line and 10 feet back from from the plane of the fronts of the terraced homes; remember 18, 20 and 22 are already different in the rhythm of the streetscape.

Even so, contrary to the officers report, there are several front roof slope dormers nearby.

Picture 1 and 2 show a front roof slope dormer in Winter Road at the end of Pretoria Road. You will note it spans almost the entire width of the property. This development does not benefit from being set back 15 feet from the pavement line as our application does. It stands obvious to anyone passing. If this is permissible then so too should the application you are considering today. The application at number 20 Pretoria Road is set back from the streetscape avoiding any incongruous appearance on a home that is already very different to those around it.

Picture 3 is a home in Pretoria Road at the junction with Haslemere Road. The dormer is on the front roof slope overlooking Pretoria Road. If this is permissible on an established Victorian/ Edwardian home within the rythm of roofslipes, then so too should our application at number 20 be allowed. Remember the pictures 5 & 6 evidence how the proposed dormer at number 20 is set back 15 feet thereby not breaking the rythm of the roof scapes whereas the two examples I have shown - do break the symmetry and rythm of the roof scapes but have presumably been deemed acceptable. Therefore our proposed dormer also should be acceptable.

Picture 4 shows a smaller dormer in the front roof slope of a house nearby - again diagonally opposite the junction of Pretoria Road with Winter Road.

All of these show that front roof slope dormers are permissible even in the established Victorian terraced housing in the vicinity of our 1970s home at 20 Pretoria Road which is set back 15 feet from the pavement line thereby avoiding any impact, unlike the three examples above, on the streetscape.

You will notice in picture 7 that you can't see number 20 Pretoria Road but you can see number 22. You will further see the front elevation (facing north) of number 22 rises to an apex. This is different - again, from number 20. The proposed dormer roof at number 20 will be lower than the front elevation at number 22. The proposed dormer will 'sit back' into the front roof slope at number 20.

The proposed front dormer does not span the entire width of number 20 and - as you can see is set back off the front of the building and steps in and away from number 18. We have consulted the owners of number 18 and 22 Pretoria Road and both have told us they have no objection to our proposal.

Officers suggest this proposal does not conform with policy PCS23; however we have demonstrated how the streetscape will not be adversely impacted by this proposal on the grounds it is set back 15 feet from the pavement line and, unlike the 3 examples given, will not have any impact on the rhythm and symmetry of the roofscape along Pretoria Road.

The finishing materials we can agree with the Local Planning Authority but already we intend to reflect the materials used on the two homes either side - especially number 22 which reaches up with its apex and dominant design in the row of three 1970s homes.

Kindly remember number 20 is set 15 feet back from the pavement line so any dormer here, unlike the other three evidenced, will not be 'seen' nor will it jut out forward of the current roofscape being 'masked' or obscured by the tall elevation of number 22 and the side elevation (west facing) of number 16.

As mentioned neighbours either side are fine with our proposal and officers state no objections have been received.

In the opening paragraph officers report that 'new development must be well designed and respect the character of the city'. Officers further report there is no loss of residential amenity in terms of light, outlook or privacy or noise or disturbance ...'

This is a well designed thought through proposal which being set back 15 feet from the pavement line does not have any impact on the streetscape nor the rhythm and symmetry of surrounding homes and roofscapes. The dormer is set back off the front plane/elevation of number 20 and does not span the entire width of number 20 and its height is lower than the top of the roof at number 22; therefore, this modest proposal is well designed respecting the adjacent homes at numbers 18 and 22 either side.

As a result of the explanations and additional evidence we have added - especially with the dormers already built nearby, we respectfully you give consent'.



113 Haslemere Road – no planning history but in place since before 2009



88 Winter Road – no planning history but in place since before 2009



123 Haslemere Road – no planning history but in place since before 2009

In addition to the above, the Applicant has submitted eight more photos, of other properties in the area with front roof extensions/dormer windows. These are provided below. As with the above three images, the Planning Officer has added notes about each site's planning history:



13 Aston Road – permission granted in 2004 (A*38633/AA)



4 Aston Road – permission granted in 2002 (A*37868/AB)



37 Hatfield Road – no planning history but in place since before 2009



69 Hatfield Road – permission refused in 1991 (A*25312/AA)



122 Canterbury Road – no planning history but in place since before 2009



2 Highland Road – no planning history but in place since before 2009



1 Oliver Road – permission granted in 1995 (A*10361/AA)



160 Haslemere Road – permission granted in 2000 (A*30283/AA)

The applicant sent additional five photographs on Tuesday 9 Jan at 4pm.

The applicant specifically wanted to bring members' attention to 120 Orchard Road where he states:

"This is 120 Orchard Road near to Heidelberg Road end; you will see it is a large dormer on the front slope facing Orchard Road.

This dormer at Orchard Road is almost the entire width of the house and rises up off the front elevation to full height. You also see that this dormer, like so many I have sent in pictures of, is prominent in the street roofscape and street scene; whereas the application in front of you at 20 Pretoria Road on a house set back 15 feet from the pavement line and masked by the west facing flank wall of number 16 Pretoria Road and the homes from 22 going eastwards - will not be and is supported by the adjoining neighbours Mr and Mrs Pike at number 18."



Pictures numbered 19, 20 & 21 in Grayshott and Empshott and Haslemere Roads.



Pictures 18 & 19 showing front roof slope dormers at 168 & 170 Talbot Road facing onto Orchard Road.

120 Orchard Road – no planning history, according to Google maps the dormer was not in place in August 2021



Officer response:

The Applicant considers the application property and the two adjoining properties (one to each side) are already out-of-character, due to being of post-war construction while the rest of the street is Edwardian/Victorian. That is agreed by the Planning Officer.

The Applicant notes the property is set back more than the 'slightly set back' description given in the Officer Report. The Applicant notes the set back is 15 feet (4.57m). The Planning Officer measures the set back from the Applicant's Site Plan as 4.36m, but accepts the Applicant's figure if that has been measured on-site (the difference is limited, at 21cm).

The Applicant considers the proposal would not be very noticeable, as demonstrated from certain angles shown in his photos (provided in the Presentation). The Planning Officer agrees that is true, from more acute and/or distant positions, but from closer to the site and from less acute angles, the proposal would be very noticeable.

The Applicant notes there are several front roof slope dormers nearby, none of which are on properties set-back like his, and provides photos of eleven (see above). The Planning Officers had seen the two nearest examples (113 and 123 Haslemere Avenue) in assessing the application prior to report publication. Both are outside the western section of Pretoria Rd within which the application sits, as one of 47 properties. None of these 47 properties have a front dormer. The first three examples highlighted by the applicant were not the subject of planning applications, i.e. they were constructed without the benefit of planning permission. They were all constructed prior to 2009 (the earliest Google streetview images available). The Planning Officers do not consider them to provide any clear support for the application in question. The further eight examples have their histories summarised next to the photos above. Four of those were granted planning consent, all of those were smaller (narrower) than the proposed extension at 20 Pretoria Road, and all of those were decisions taken between twenty and twenty-nine years ago. The fifth (69 Hatfield Road) was refused planning permission. The sixth, seventh and eighth sites did not apply for planning permission. For the reasons set out here, the Planning Officer still does not consider these cases support the current application.