

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 3 June 2015 at 5.00 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 Stephen Hastings (Vice-Chair)
Jennie Brent
Ken Ellcome
David Fuller
Colin Galloway
Scott Harris
Sandra Stockdale
Gerald Vernon-Jackson

Also in attendance
Councillors Robert New and Luke Stubbs

Welcome

The Chair welcomed members of the public and members to the meeting. As Councillor Gray was unable to attend this meeting, Councillor Hastings as Vice Chair explained he was chairing the meeting today.

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The Chair, Councillor Hastings, 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.

49. Apologies for Absence (AI 1)

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Aiden Gray and Councillor Hugh Mason. Councillor John Ferrett was in attendance for Councillor Gray and Councillor Darren Sanders was in attendance for Councillor Hugh Mason.

50. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Councillor Vernon-Jackson declared a prejudicial interest in planning applications 1, Roko Health & Fitness Club and 2, Darby House, as he had had discussions on both applications in a previous role. He left the room before these applications were discussed.

Councillors Ken Ellcome and Scott Harris declared personal interests in planning application 1, Roko Health & Fitness Club, as they are both season ticket holders at Portsmouth Football Club.

Councillor Darren Sanders declared a personal interest in planning application 1, Roko Health & Fitness Club, as he had previously given money to Portsmouth Football Club.

51. Minutes of Previous Meeting - 29 April 2015 (AI 3)

(TAKE IN MINUTES)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 29 April 2015 were agreed and signed by the chair as a correct record.

52. Updates from the City Development Manager on previous planning applications (AI 4)

There were no updates.

53. Dates and times of Planning Committee meetings for 2015/16 municipal year (AI 5)

The committee noted the dates of Planning Committee meetings for the 2015/16 municipal year. These were agreed as:

24 June
22 July
19 August
16 September
14 October
11 November
9 December
13 January 2016
3 February
2 March
30 March
27 April

All meetings are on Wednesday and will start at 5pm.

(Councillor Vernon-Jackson left the meeting at this point due to his prejudicial interest in the subsequent planning applications).

54. 14/01523/FUL - Roko Health & Fitness Club Copnor Road, Portsmouth PO3 5EW - Construction of up to 3 metre high fencing with 5 metre high netting above to enclose 2 additional football pitches on land to the East of ROKO/Portsmouth FC Training Ground; Siting of 2 storage containers and water storage tank (AI 6)

The City Development Manager's supplementary matters report set out that a representation has been received from Penny Mordaunt, MP for Portsmouth North noting she has received representations from local residents both for and against the proposal. The representation was attached to the supplementary matters list. Three

additional objections have been received to the application, as have seven additional representations in support of the proposal.

A deputation was made by Mr Colvill, objecting to the proposal. Mr Colvill also spoke on behalf of Mrs Grant. Their points included:

- He felt that Policy PCS13 which does not require protected open space to be publicly accessible was absolutely wrong.
- He referred to the Council's core strategy and references within this stating that it is increasingly important to protect the city's open spaces and natural Environment, and asked why the Council would want to reduce this by approving this application.
- Parks and open spaces should be open to all therefore putting in fencing is wrong.
- Portsmouth Football Club has advised they would install CCTV on the footpath however this does not prevent crime.
- Existing pitches are suitable for football and are regularly used for this.

A deputation was made by Mr Slingsby, objecting to the proposal whose points included:

- Portsmouth is the second most densely populated city after London so protected open space is essential.
- Following the fences being built for the 5 a side pitches at Roko, residents were assured there would be no more development on the site.
- There is now 35m left of open view at ground level.
- The effect on the local residents will be huge as the fields are currently used by a many for sports, dog walking etc.

A deputation was made by Mrs Hill, objecting to the proposal whose points included:

- Objects to the application as it means the area will purely be used for football, which is not the only thing people are interested in and they would prefer for the fields to remain open for other activities.
- Portsmouth Football Club hardly uses the pitches already in place.
- The narrowing of pathway to Hilsea station will cause a health and safety risk to people walking to and from the station.

A deputation was made by Mr Garnett, objecting to the proposal. He felt that the open space is a valuable amenity and fears that if the application is approved, this will be lost forever and it will make the area less attractive.

A deputation was made by Councillor Robert New as ward councillor. His points included:

- Disappointed as it seems that little progress has been made since the application was before the committee in February.
- If this application was approved it would be to the detriment of the local community.
- Concerns of safety with people using the pathway to Hilsea station as the pathway would be enclosed creating a 3-4 metre corridor and if anyone encounters an incident there will be no way to escape . He was heartened that PFC have said they will install CCTV cameras as he had explored

whether PCC could install cameras that would be linked to the police, however there was currently no budget for this.

- When PFC had initially approached the Leader to discuss this it had not been advised that the pitches would be caged off and it was assumed that the pitches would remain as open space for the public to use.
- Community use agreement still would not benefit the local community.

A deputation was made by Mr Saunders, the applicant's agent. His points included:

- £250,000 invested in pitches and they are integral to the future of PFC.
- Since the application had been deferred in February, the club had met with local residents and following concerns had agreed to add hedge planting to screen the containers and agreed to install CCTV to enhance security.
- The CCTV would be monitored by the clubs current setup and would be 24 hour surveillance.
- The application would have no impact on parking in the area.
- The open mesh fencing would maintain a sense of openness.
- Will benefit the local footballing community.

A deputation was made by Ms Martin of Pompey in the Community, on behalf of the applicant. Her points included:

- The community use agreement requested by Sports England is being drafted and they are working with them to ensure all parties are happy.
- Health development and skills development is key.
- It is intended that the pitches will also be used by disabled and special needs teams including the amputee football team. Also for walking football and the women's and girls football programme which are all funded by Sports England.
- Evidence to show that well-structured activities such as those planned will make a huge impact and can help to reduce anti-social behaviour.

Members' Questions

A question was raised about the effect of the proposal on the existing cricket pitch. Officers advised that the plans had been adjusted so that the layout of the pitch did not need to be changed; therefore the initial objection from Sports England had been withdrawn. In response to a question regarding whether a condition could be added if the application were to be approved, to prevent any advertising boards being attached to the fencing, officers advised that a condition could be added that the fence must be installed in accordance with the drawings submitted with the application. Officers confirmed that the letters of support and objection were from a mix of local and other residents. Officers were asked to comment on the issues relating to the size of the proposed pitches, further expansion and light pollution to houses in Wesley Grove raised in the letter from Penny Mordaunt. Officers advised that one of the pitches would be a full size football pitch measuring 60m x 95m and one would be slightly smaller measuring 60m x 80m. Officers were not aware that the club are planning on expanding in the future, however if there were any future plans they may require the submission of a further planning application if additional fencing was required or through a separate process relating to the disposal of the land if any additional land was owned by the Council. This planning application did not include lighting for the pitches so there would be no light pollution to properties.

In response to a question, there was no requirement for the council to consult with Network Rail as the pathway is on Council owned land and the Network Rail boundary is on the other side.

Members asked how often the pitches would be used by the football club. The Chair invited the applicant to reply who advised that there were plans to use the pitches every day apart from Wednesday's. In response to a question whether Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money could be used to improve safety, officers advised that CIL money was for infrastructure only however there is no CIL money available. In response to concerns raised about the safety of users of the footpath, officers advised that the planning officer had taken into account the nature of the proposal, the nature of the fencing and the existing lighting and it was felt that there would be no additional risk to users of the path.

With regard to protected open space being open to the public, officers advised that some of the green infrastructure in the city is publicly accessible however there is some which is not although this still has a key role to play. With regard to the issue of the land being leased to PFC, Legal advice was given by the Senior Solicitor (Planning). She advised that under the Local Government Act 2000 the Executive and Regulatory Functions must be considered separately. Therefore the issue of appropriating the land so that it could be leased would be considered by the Executive at a separate meeting and following an advert being placed in the press for two weeks. In deciding whether to proceed with the appropriation, the portfolio holder would be obliged to take account of any responses, comment and objection received in response to the advertisement.

Officers advised the committee that they must make their decision based on whether the proposed fencing would cause a detrimental impact on residents.

Members' Comments

Members were sympathetic to the concerns raised by residents however felt that there was no planning reason to refuse the application. Members felt that it was important Portsmouth Football Club consult with local residents when finalising the community use agreement. Officers confirmed that the draft condition relating to the community use agreement would require it to be approved by the Council before development could proceed.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined within the City Development Managers report and the addition of the following condition:

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking and/or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the fencing hereby permitted shall not be altered, improved or added to without the express grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority for that purpose.

Reason: To maintain views through the site in the interests of amenity and the safety of users of the adjacent footpath/cycle way in accordance with policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan.

55. 15/00425/REM - Darby House Skye Close Portsmouth PO6 3LU - Application for the approval of Reserved Matters in respect of the appearance, scale and landscaping relating to the construction of 8 dwellings with associated car parking approved under outline application 13/00553/OUT (AI 7)

The City Development Manager introduced the report.

A deputation was made by Mr Trickett, objecting to the proposal whose points included:

- Does not object to the development in its entirety; however he objects to the relocation of the two parking bays to opposite his driveway in Orkney Road.
- The road is very narrow and he currently needs to reverse into his driveway. If there were two cars parked in the proposed parking bays opposite, this would make it very difficult for him to park and would need to mount the kerb.
- Cars parking in the bays would no doubt use his driveway to turn around in since Orkney Road is a dead end.
- Is it possible for the spaces to be relocated or removed?

A deputation was made by the applicant, Mr Wawman whose points included:

- The development is in keeping with the existing character of the area.
- There are now more off street parking spaces proposed and the highways department raised no objections to the development.
- Willing to extend the width of the drop kerb should it cause a problem parking for the properties in Orkney Road.

Members' Questions

In response to a question regarding one of the objections being that a three bedroom property was out of keeping in the area, officer advised that there is only one three bed dwelling proposed on the development and this would not be out of keeping with the estate.

Members' Comments

Members felt it would be sensible to widen the drop kerb as suggested by the applicant and officers advised this would be a matter for the applicant and Mr Trickett to discuss outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED that the application be approved.

The meeting concluded at 6.40 pm.

.....
Signed by the Chair of the meeting