

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 9 December 2015 at 5.00 pm in the 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 Aiden Gray (Chair)
Colin Galloway
Scott Harris
Hugh Mason
Sandra Stockdale
Lee Hunt (Standing Deputy)
Darren Sanders (Standing Deputy)
Linda Symes (Standing Deputy)

Also in attendance

Councillors L Stubbs & M Winnington

Welcome

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

Guildhall, Fire Procedure

The chair, Councillor Gray, 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.

109. Apologies (AI 1)

These had been received from Councillors David Fuller (represented by Cllr Sanders), Jennie Brent (whose deputy Cllr Hockaday sent apologies as she was unwell), Ken Ellcome (represented by Cllr Symes), Steve Hastings and Gerald Vernon-Jackson (who was represented by Cllr Hunt).

110. Declaration of Members' Interests (AI 2)

Councillor Harris had supported the objector to 40 Hilltop Crescent application and therefore would leave the room and take no part in that discussion.

Councillor Hugh Mason had worked with the applicants of the Lakeside Business Park hotel but as this was a long time ago and this was not a pecuniary interest and had no bearing on this application.

Councillor Sanders and other members of the committee had received an email regarding the Lakeside Business Park which was not prejudicial. Councillor Sanders

also declared that the Southsea Neighbourhood Forum had discussed items relating to the tennis courts and the beach huts in Southsea but he had not expressed an opinion on these applications so could take part in the discussions.

Councillor Hunt announced that he would be making a deputation on the Lakeside application so would not be part of the committee for that item. Regarding the tennis court pavilion he had been involved in very early discussions about the site so would not take part in its decision. With regard to the beach huts he had also been involved in the earlier discussions on the project and would leave the room during discussions.

Councillor Symes would be making a deputation on the item relating to 10-14 Grove Road South so would not be part of the committee for this item. With regard to the tennis court pavilion she had looked at the plans for the pavilion but had not been involved in this version and therefore would remain part of the committee for this item.

Councillor Aiden Gray had received correspondence from the manager regarding Lakeside Business Park (as had other members of the committee) but would remain open minded in considering this item.

Councillor Galloway had spoken to the applicant regarding the Lakeside Business Park hotel but had not given any indication of his view and this was non-prejudicial.

Councillor Stockdale had also received correspondence regarding Lakeside Business Park hotel but had not expressed an opinion.

111. Minutes of the Previous Meeting - 11 November 2015 (AI 3)

RESOLVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the chair accordingly.

112. Updates on Previous Applications by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development (AI 4)

There were no updates to be reported by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

113. Application 1 - Ref: 15/01387/HOU - 40 Hilltop Crescent, Portsmouth PO6 1BD - Construction of first floor side extension (to include alterations to roof) and single storey rear extension; installation of front porch and raised decking to rear (AI 5)

Councillor Harris withdrew from the room in accordance with his earlier declaration of interest and took no part in discussion of this item.

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development report included a typographical error on page 5 referring to the impact on residential amenity of numbers 36 and 38; this should only refer to number 36. The supplementary matters list reported one

comment had been received from Ward Councillor Simon Boshier in support of this application (without specifying reasons).

One general comment has been received from the former owners of No.36 stating:
a) The new extension is not considered to be detrimental to the living conditions and whilst it is acknowledged that the outlook would be different from the kitchen window, it is unlikely to be 'gloomy and dark' due to the abundance of other windows on this side elevation; and,
b) As the Juliet balcony can only be seen from the bottom of the garden this is unlikely to result in a loss of privacy. The properties already mutually overlook one another.

One further comment has been received by Right for Light Consulting objecting on the grounds of the development breaches the 'Building Research Establishment "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Good Practice Guide" '

Deputations were then heard whose points are summarised:

(i) Mrs Swiderska from No.36 objecting, whose points included

- The planning officer had not visited the objector's property before coming to a decision on their recommendation and she therefore circulated photographs taken from her house which is a semi-detached property.
- The property at Number 40 was already near its own boundaries.
- Number 36 only had three windows downstairs so there was limited access to light and the kitchen was an important room for socialising.
- She referred to letters from the light consultants which showed there would be significant impact on the habitable area which had not been addressed by the planning officer.
- The side extension affected her garden and there would be shadows over it.

(ii) Mr Limderman from No.36 also objecting, whose points included:

- There was a high wall and the distances given by the planning officer were inaccurate - there would be blocking of the view to the street and sky.
- There would be an overwhelming sense of enclosure caused by the extension and it would also be out of character for the area of semi-detached properties - there are other examples of cat slide roofs in Hilltop Crescent.
- There would be overlooking caused by the balcony and the open decking by the fence leading to loss of privacy in the garden.
- He would welcome a change in the design as the neighbours had a double sized plot.
- The proposal contravened national policy guidelines, human rights and the local planning policy considerations as well as the loss of light advice.

- (iii) Mrs Luxton from No.40 spoke in support of her application whose points included:
- She circulated photographs to members and a supporting letter from the previous owners of No 36 and explained the reasons for wishing to convert the house and the layout of it.
 - There is a 3.5m gap between the properties.
 - There would not be the overlooking as portrayed by the neighbours who already had a view into their garden
 - No 36 also had a building line set back further than for No 40 so should not be affected by the proposal.
- (iv) Mr Luxton from No.40 spoke in support of this application added the following points:
- The road had a mix of house types in it and there was only one other with a cat slide roof and many properties had been extended.
 - There had only been one letter of objection by the neighbours other than by paid professionals and the neighbours had purchased the property when they knew the application was to extend was being submitted.
 - The garage at No 36 had been used for storage of a vehicle.
 - There were other Juliet balconies in the road such as at No 32.
 - He disputed the level of overlooking to each property and the loss of privacy that would be caused.

Members' Questions

Members asked questions relating to the measurements that had been queried by the deputations and it was reported that there was approximately 4.2m between the properties. Members also asked why the officers had changed their recommendation to support which was based on the significance of the impact on the level of amenity and it was concluded that there would not be a significant loss of light or outlook to the kitchen window. It was asked how much of the scheme could be carried out as permitted development and it was confirmed that as only a small part of the extension could be PD only the porch could be altered to become permitted development. Members also asked questions regarding the BRE tests and the status of these. It was confirmed that these are guidelines only and whilst some councils may use these more frequently than others Portsmouth City Council did not reference them as guidelines and did not refer to them in any local plan policies.

Members' Comments

Members did not feel that loss of light would be a sustainable reason for refusal in this case. It was noted that the porch had permitted development rights.

RESOLVED that conditional planning permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development.

114. Application 2 - Ref: 15/01417/FUL - 10-14 Grove Road South Southsea PO5 3QT - Change of use from shop (A1 class) to restaurant (A3 class) and construction of chimney stack adjacent to side wall of No8 Grove Road South (AI 6)

Councillor Symes withdrew from the committee for this item to appear as a deputation but then had no further part in the discussion of this item.

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development referred to the supplementary matters list which reported three additional representations of objection had been received (one written on behalf of two other neighbours closest to the application site in Grove Road South and Merton Road). The points of objection reiterate those outlined in the committee report but emphasise the very close proximity to neighbouring properties (approximately 6m [20 feet] away). Although still urging refusal it suggests if temporary permission is granted then at least residents will have facts about nuisance caused. Noise concerns would be compounded by little information available about nuisance from any plant and equipment. Further, a closing time of 10pm is considered by residents to be totally unreasonable and should be limited to 7pm Sunday to Thursday and 10pm Friday and Saturday. Furthermore, Holmbush Court Residents' Association have written to reiterate their objections by petition remains unchanged.

Environmental Health has conducted an odour risk assessment and based on the currently available details provided by the applicant's agent conclude the kitchen extraction system to represent an unacceptable scheme. However, if (1) a different specification within the product range provided and (2) a silencer introduced into the ductwork and/or different fan were selected and (3) details of how the ductwork is fixed (the kitchen shares a party wall with a property to the east potentially introducing noise and vibration) then based on more careful design/location there is likely to be a technical solution.

Assistant Director of Culture & City Development drew members' attention to the recommendation which took into account the new publicity that had required representations to be submitted until 11 December.

The following deputations were made whose points are summarised:

- (i) Mr Goodman (objecting) whose points included
- Expert advice was needed regarding ventilation and filtration which would need regular maintenance and he queried whether there would be an acoustic jacket provided. Also would the fans have silencers? There were also general extraction, there would be holes in the wall that are not shown in the plans.
 - It was not specified whether there would be air conditioning and condenser units. Without these there would be odours and noise being emitted and it would also affect the business of the Chinese restaurant next door.
 - The pictures circulated show how close the property was to Admiral Square and Grove Road South properties.
 - The design would mean a noisy restaurant with a large glass frontage and high ceilings.

(ii) Mr Allan Smith, also objecting, whose points included:

- It was an inappropriate site for a large restaurant of up to 90 covers which is not wanted or needed in a residential area.
- There could also be problems with deliveries.
- There had been 82 objectors and no supporters for this proposal.
- Details of the extract system had only been made available the day before and environmental health had said that the details were inadequate.
- Residents did not want a 10pm or 11pm closing time.

(iii) Ms Upton also spoke to object, whose points included:

- She was pleased that this had previously been deferred for more details.
- She was concerned that the odours would go to the level of the bedrooms of the two storey houses in the residential area.
- She was concerned regarding the opening times and the early waste disposal collections which would affect the amenity of the area.

(iv) Mr Critchley, as the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application whose points included:

- The applicant would be able to have a short term change of use without planning permission but this application had been put in to offer control as it other commercial uses could be operated without it.
- A technical solution is possible and achievable regarding the extraction systems.
- The clients would welcome an 11 pm opening on Fridays and Saturdays.

(v) Councillor Symes made a deputation as a ward councillor whose concerns included:

- Another use could operate without the need for sanctioning by the committee and therefore there was the need for strict conditions to protect the residential amenity of the area.
- Whilst the property was not within the Shaping Southsea area but there was a narrow pavement and there were concerns regarding noise.
- She hoped that there would not be late openings favouring 7 pm during the week and 10 pm for Fridays and Saturdays as there may be a proliferation of such uses.

(Councillor Symes then withdrew from the room.)

Members' Questions

Members questioned what other uses could operate on the site without the need for planning permission, with lawful use - officers confirmed that there could be a retail use which could be a convenience store type operation (open early to late) as there

are temporary permitted development rights for a change from a shop to a restaurant for up to two years. It was asked what affect the extraction fan and equipment would have on the amenity of houses in the proximity as well as the small courtyard behind at Ivy Cottages. It was noted these were approximately 15-18 metres away. Officers reported that it would require a high specification technical solution for the odours to be dealt with. The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development quoted the latest general permitted development order regarding temporary uses with shops converting to a flexible use (A1, A2, A3 & B1 uses) for up to two years, for which there were some limitations such as up to no more than 150m² floorspace.

Members' Comments

Members were mindful of the advice given regarding the permitted development rights enabling the conversion of shops to restaurants and of the advice from officers that there could be a technical solution to the extraction of fumes. There were concerns regarding the size of the business and its effects on the residential area, there was a member comment that it would not be beneficial to defer again. It was felt that, on balance, the application should be supported, recognising that there is a condition relating to provision of details on the extraction equipment. Members also favoured amending the hours of opening condition to be Monday to Thursday to 8pm, Friday to Saturday to 9pm (no Sunday opening).

RESOLVED that delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development to grant conditional permission after expiry of the publicity period provided that no representations are received raising new material planning issues.

115. Application 3 - Ref: 15/01492/FUL - Lakeside Business Park Western Road Portsmouth PO6 3EN - Construction of a six-storey hotel (Class C1) up to 7,761sqm floorspace car parking and associated landscaping (AI 7)

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's supplementary matters list reported that in addition to the letter of support from the site owners outlined in the report, 126 other representations have been received in support of the proposed hotel. It includes a letter from the nearby Porsche Centre, who considers the proposal to provide an identifiable landmark, of benefit to the city and community, and they would not want the siting of the hotel any closer to their own building. Some of the emails in support of the proposal include comments on the much needed additional hotel bedrooms to support Portsmouth as a visitor destination, creation of 100 new jobs, generation of additional spend in the local economy, more bars/restaurants for those working at Lakeside North Harbour and the wider community, new health and fitness club for local residents/campus occupiers and their employees and as a catalyst for attracting more companies to Lakeside.

Further clarification has been sought on the apparent disparity of employment likely to be created by this development. The agents confirm "The 170 jobs identified represent a maximum number of jobs that the hotel could reasonably produce in the future and is based on historic Village hotel job generation numbers nationwide. The 100 jobs referred to in the Members pack is the number of jobs anticipated immediately following opening of the hotel; this figure is anticipated to rise following opening and will continue to rise as the hotel becomes more successful."

The Highways Authority is satisfied with the revised site plan for both cycle and car parking arrangements, subject to conditions for their provision/retention and details to be approved of the structure for secure/weatherproof long-stay cycle parking.

In the latest version of the BREEAM pre-assessment the developer has made significant improvement to the proposals. The commitment to Life Cycle Costing and, now, the inclusion of a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit to contribute to the domestic hot water and electricity loads show a greater commitment to Portsmouth's policies and priorities than was evident in earlier submissions. The CHP gives stated modelled savings of 16.9% of building energy and 8.3% CO2 emissions. In summary, whilst still falling some way short of an overall Excellent rating (62.31% v 70%), the assessment is much more convincing than the original. The original claimed rating of 63.70% was not credible, as demonstrated by the revision, under scrutiny, down to 59.34%. Whilst some aspects of the proposal are still not entirely convincing, the applicant has now adequately demonstrated that some BREEAM credits will be difficult to secure for this development on this site. More importantly, they have made significant improvements to the proposals and indicated that efforts will be made to secure further BREEAM credits as the design progresses.

Delegated authority was sought from the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development to amend conditions 2 (approved plan numbers, to include the updated site plan 150139_01-Z01Rev07) and 11 to appropriately reflect the most recent updates to the BREEAM pre-assessment justifying an expected level within 'Very Good', but falling short of 'Excellent', including relevant specified credits. Subject to this amendment to conditions 2 and 11, recommendation unchanged.

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development also reported the late representation from Southern Water which had also been considered and requested delegated authority for any necessary amendment to condition 13 arising from this late consultation response.

Deputations were made which are summarised:-

- (i) Mr Stackhouse spoke in support of the application, representing Village Urban Resorts whose points included:
 - a similar scheme had been approved in 2012.
 - The company was committed to invest in Portsmouth.
 - This application would have the same footprint as the previous proposal.
 - There is a need for more hotel provision in the City for the promotion of its economic development and the hotel would also have food and leisure facilities, which would be used by local residents as well as by guests.
 - There would be £20m invested and the employment of over 100 people during construction and the opening of the hotel and that there had been a positive response from local businesses and residents and no objections have been received.
- (ii) Mr Wood, Northwood Investors also spoke in support of the application as owners of the business park. His points included:

- Their customers welcome a hotel at Lakeside and this represented a good quality hotel on the campus.
 - The applicant would provide high quality business facilities as well as health and fitness
 - This would attract further tenants to the business park.
 - The design was contemporary, subtle and appropriate.
- (iii) Councillor Lee Hunt appeared as a deputation and not as a member of the committee and took no further part in the discussion of this item after making his deputation. His points included:
- He supported this as well as the previous application as there was a need for quality hotels in the area to support visitors to the major events in the city.
 - The investment was welcome and this promoted local employment.
- iv. Councillor Luke Stubbs as Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Community Development welcomed the application. His points included:-
- The report had the independent recommendations of professionals
 - The design is striking the city is short of higher end hotels.
 - The business park had different sizes of buildings so this tall building would be in keeping.
 - The 100 jobs were critical to the city which needs growth and community facilities were welcomed.

Members' questions

Members asked questions regarding possible flooding implications and it was confirmed that these had been considered by Southern Water and The Environment Agency who advised there is an acceptable solution for the site (referring to condition 12 within the report). Questions were also raised regarding the loss of trees on the site and use of native species and if there are links to sustainable travel plan - it was noted that the shuttle bus service was aimed at the commuters.

Members' comments

Members hoped that the trees lost could be replaced on the site. Members supported this proposal which would help meet the need for hotel bed spaces for major events in the city it was felt that this was a landmark building on this site.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted subject to conditions outlined in the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's report as well as delegated authority being given to the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development to amend conditions 2 and 11 as outlined within the supplementary matters report and condition 13.

- 116. Application 4 - Ref: 15/01501/FUL - 18 Highland Road Southsea PO4 9AH - Alterations to existing retail unit to form smaller lock-up shop (Class A1) and change of use of existing residential dwelling (Class C3) and rear part of original shop to purposes falling within class C4 (house in multiple occupation) or Class C3 (dwelling house) (A1 8)**

Deputations were made which are summarised below:

- (i) Mr Weymes the agent in support whose points included:-
 - The applicant was seeking Local Authority permission before applying for an HMO licence within the flexible C3 family/HMO occupation.
 - This met local Policy PS20 which confirms that shared accommodation helps meet the housing needs in Portsmouth.
 - The proposal does not exceed the 10% threshold of HMOs in the area.

- (ii) Councillor Winnington spoke as a ward councillor objecting to the proposal whose points included:-
 - He challenged the HMO threshold in this case as an address was registered as an HMO but not currently in use as one, so if this was granted it would go above the 10% for the area.
 - He had received representations from residents in Exeter Road where the front door of the property was, regarding problems with parking and congestion in the area, especially as this was near a row of shops.
 - The lock-up shop would also have movement to and from it.
 - Residents were concerned regarding the noise from flats in HMOs in a family area so it affected their amenity.

- (iii) Councillor Luke Stubbs as a ward councillor also spoke objecting to the proposal. His points included:-
 - He could not see that the lock-up shop could be viable with little access to it and very few facilities in it.
 - There is still debate on whether there are other HMO properties nearby which could be further investigated.

Members' questions

Members asked questions of the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development regarding how the assessment of HMOs had been undertaken. It was reported that visits taking place by enforcement officers and there is also use of Council Tax information. The property in question did not need planning permission to go back from HMO to a family C3 use. Where properties have a mixed C3/C4 use they are counted as C4 use for the benefit of these counts.

Members' comments

Members felt constrained by the restrictions of a national planning policy and the decisions made by inspectors on HMO properties at appeal. There was concern regarding the layout and the lack of amenity both in the residential property and the lock-up shop and it was reported that there are no minimum sizes for rooms as part of the planning consideration as this is a matter that is dealt with by the HMO licence. Whilst members were concerned regarding the living conditions of the occupiers they felt that as this was dealt with by the HMO licensing and not by planning permission they did not have sustainable grounds to refuse this application.

RESOLVED that conditional planning permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's report.

- 117. Application 5 - Ref: 15/01624/FUL - 51 Frogmore Road Southsea PO4 8RB - Change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to purposes falling within Class C4 (house in multiple occupation) or Class C3 (dwelling house) (AI 9)**

There were no deputations on this item and there were no members' questions.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's report.

- 118. Application 6 - Ref: 15/01679/FUL - Tennis Courts Canoe Lake Southsea Esplanade Southsea - Construction of part single-/part two-storey building incorporating roof terrace following demolition of existing tennis pavilion (AI 10)**

(Councillor Hunt did not take part in discussion of this item and left the meeting.)

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's supplementary matters list reported further consultee responses and representations as set out below.

Representations

One further letter of representation (six in total) has been received. This representation in support of the proposal suggests that the proposal would improve upon the existing building and make a positive and attractive addition to the area that could be enjoyed by more people.

Contaminated Land

Southsea Common was once military land and whilst testing of the common has previously found that remedial works are not required, the area of the tennis courts has not yet been tested. In this instance a desk study is not required but precautionary minimal testing should be submitted to demonstrate that the site is not polluted. In this respect conditions relating to land contamination are requested.

Ecology

The application is supported by Phase I Ecological Survey (Ecosupport, September 2015) and I am satisfied that this represents the current conditions at the application site.

The survey identified limited habitats within the site, including amenity grassland, ornamental trees and ornamental shrubs. These were found to be of negligible ecological value and of negligible potential to support protected species. Based on the information provided, this assessment is considered to be reasonable.

In considering the building to be demolished, no evidence of bats was found and no potential roost locations / access points for bats to gain access to possible roost locations were identified. It was concluded that there was negligible potential for bats to be present.

In view of the survey findings the development is unlikely to result in a breach of the law protecting bats and no concerns are raised. However, the Phase I Ecological Survey has made recommendations for mitigating potential impacts of the new development and enhancing the site for biodiversity. Therefore, a condition requiring the implementation of the recommendations is suggested.

Environmental Health

Any noisy activity generated by the proposed use would not be unduly intrusive as it would be masked by high background noise levels and the building will be a considerable distance away from the nearest residential properties (approximately 70 metres).

The applicant has suggested that they will only open from 09:00 to 21:00hrs, if these hours were conditioned as part of any decision made, any noise caused from the operation of the tennis courts and the pavilion would not cause an adverse impact upon sleep from its use.

Should the applicant at any stage provide entertainment which causes a nuisance this can be dealt with under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

In summary it is unlikely that a loss of amenity will be caused to the nearest residential accommodation. Therefore no objections are raised.

Conditions

Two new conditions were suggested to address potential land contamination and ecology. The recommendation by the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development remained unchanged subject to the inclusion of additional conditions relating to potential land contamination and ecology.

Deputations were made as summarised below:

- (i) John Cooke, Canoe Lake Leisure in support of their application whose points included
- The company had safeguarded 12 grass courts for 25 years and were committed to investment in them with new machinery and increased on-line bookings.
 - The next phase was the rebuilding of the derelict pavilion.
 - The investment would mean the grass courts would be brought up to international tournament standards so there would be the reintroduction of tournaments and county competitions with world ranked players visiting and this would help promote tourism.
 - This investment was at no cost to the council being a philanthropic enterprise.

- There is also a coaching programme and there was a need for an appropriate pavilion and administrative space as well as for community services.
 - The Lawn Tennis Association had given their support and may give a grant.
 - The pavilion design was appropriate for the regeneration at Canoe Lake.
- (ii) Councillor Winnington then spoke as a ward Councillor in support of the application whose points included:
- There had been discussion with the ward councillors and the residents regarding the evolution of the design which was now welcomed, giving a sense of space and minimum impact on the area and maximum use for the local community.

Councillor Stubbs had registered to speak in support of the application but was not present when this was discussed at the meeting.

Members' Questions

The layout was discussed and where there would be storage facilities and waste provision, some of which was off-site at the café.

Members' Comments

Members were supportive of the application, welcoming the design and the improved community facilities.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's report and the supplementary matters report.

119. Application 7 - Ref: 15/01746/MMA - 19 Lennox Road South Portsmouth PO5 2HS - Retrospective application for minor material amendment to planning permission 13/00228/FUL to amend the internal arrangement of the three permitted residential units to accord with Drawing No: 0262-D-001B (AI 11)

The Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's supplementary matters list reported a further representation from the occupiers of the adjoining property objecting to the proposal on the grounds that; (a) the applicant has deviated from the original plans, (b) the layout has changed significantly which will ease its further development into a HMO thereby deceiving the Council, (c) the staircase is now against the party wall resulting in noise intrusion, and (d) poor quality of work and building control enforcement.

The permission granted on appeal was for the creation of two maisonettes and one flat. These revised details still provide two maisonettes and one flat within the same parts of the building, albeit that the internal arrangements have been amended. Consequentially the associated external alterations, as described in the report, are significantly less.

In relation to the appeal decision the Planning Inspector concluded that the proposed conversion scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. This revised scheme would similarly preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Matters in relation to the motive of the applicant, potential future uses and building control are not material to the planning considerations of this application.

A deputation was made by Mr Pike as the applicant's agent in support, whose points included:

- Whilst this was similar to the proposal that had been granted on appeal there were advantages to this design with fewer external alterations and less visual impact on the Conservation Area
- There was a revised layout internally with the stairways away from the party wall so there was less impact on the adjoining property.

Members' Questions

It was asked if there had been enforcement regarding the garage and it was clarified that it was not part of this application but the applicant had been advised to modify the door.

Members' Comments

Members supported the application but an informative would be sent to the applicant to remind them to ensure the garage door does not open over the highway.

RESOLVED that conditional permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the Assistant Director of Culture & City Development's report.

120. Application 8 - Ref: 15/00942/CS3 - Land Opposite Junction Of St Georges Road And Southsea Esplanade Southsea - Installation of 25 beach huts and timber decking sited on seafront (AI 12)

A decision was made to defer consideration of this application until the following meeting due to time constraints.

121. Application 9 - Ref: 13/00791/FUL - Eastney Beach, Eastney Esplanade, Southsea - Installation of 25 beach huts and new timber boardwalk to eastern end of Esplanade (amended description) (resubmission of 12/00968/FUL) (AI 13)

A decision was made to defer consideration of this application until the following meeting due to time constraints.

The meeting concluded at 10.00 pm.

Signed by the Chair of the meeting
Councillor Aiden Gray