HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Planning Committee held on 29 September 2022

Present

Councillor Crellin (Chairman)

Councillors Milne, Tindall, Weeks, Bowdell (Standing Deputy) and Richardson (Standing Deputy)

The Chairman welcomed Neeru Kareer, the Interim Executive Head of Place to the Committee.

21 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fairhurst and Linger.

22 Minutes

RESOLVED that

a) the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 1 September 2022 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman; and

b) the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 27 September 2022 be received.

23 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interests relating to matters on the agenda.

24 Matters to be Considered for Deferment or Site Viewing

There were no matters to be considered for site viewing and deferment.

25 APP/20/00658 - Proposed Development site (former Electricity Board site), Bartons Road, Havant

(The site was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party on 27 September 2022)

Proposal: Proposed development of 175 apartments together with associated access, parking and landscaping.

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to grant permission.

The Committee received supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting, which:

(1) included written deputations submitted by on behalf of Havant Climate Alliance and Friends of the Earth and the applicant;

(2) summarised a response received from Portsmouth Water Company received after the agenda had been published;

(3) corrected the number of 2 bed units reported in paragraph 7.47 of the report;

(4) amended recommended conditions 2, 3, 4, 15, 16 and 17;

(5) proposed an additional condition (31) requiring the approval of a construction environmental management plan by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Portsmouth Water Company; and

(6) included information requested by the SVWP and other Councillors since the agenda was published.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Carr, who on behalf of the applicant, reiterated the issues set out in the written deputation submitted by the applicant.

In response to questions from members of the Committee, Mr Carr advised:

- advised that Use Class C3 was defined as residential use
- reported that five stories were required to make the development economically viable
- informed the Committee that the applicant had worked with the planning team to resolve planning objections
- advised that a further reduction in the number of apartments per hectare would make the scheme unviable
- assured the Committee that the applicant would comply with the conditions recommended by Environmental Health and the Police
- reported that the proposed blocks were design in accordance with government standards
- advised that the one bedroom flats would be built and sold for single occupancy
- made the Committee aware that the applicant could not control a situation where an occupier invited someone to stay as a guest
- advised that although the single bed apartments could accommodate a small double bed they would be sold as single person units
- explained the electric heating system and highlighted the efficiency of the system
- assured the Committee that the disabled parking bays would be adjusted to make them DDA compliant

In response to questions from members of the Committee, officers:

(a) advised that the Council required housing of all types and in particular 2 bed dwellings at a proportion of 35% of a development. This proposal would help the Council meet its housing supply target;

(b) showed the locations of the proposed crossing points;

(c) advised that the proposed formal pedestrian crossing would be a Toucan pedestrian crossing;

(d) reported that the amenities to be provided were a combination of amenity space within the apartments, outside external space and wider open space; it was considered that the proposed amenity space was satisfactory

(e) drew the members' attention to the update sheet which included information requested by the Site Viewing Working Party and other Councillors since the agenda was published;

(f) explained how the recommended conditions would seek to resolve the issues raised by the Police;

(g) advised that the financial viability of the scheme was independently assessed by a third party appointed by the Council; and

(h) reminded the Committee that Policy CS9 provided that affordable housing would not be required for a development if it would make the scheme unviable.

The Committee discussed the application in detail together with the views raised by deputees.

The debate revealed that there was no clear majority in favour or against the proposal with differences expressed over whether:

1 the Committee should determine the application from a strategic point or local point of view;

2 the proposal would contribute towards the Council's housing supply target;

3 the design and appearance of the scheme was appropriate for the area;

4 the proposed level of open space was satisfactory; or

5 the scheme would have a beneficial or detrimental impact of the scheme on the local area.

A motion moved by Councillor Milne and seconded by Councillor Richardson to permit the proposal as recommended in the submitted report and amended by the supplementary papers was lost with the Chairman using her casting vote.

A motion proposed by Councillor Weeks and seconded by Councillor Tindall to refuse the application for the reasons set out below was passed with the Chairman using her casting vote:

a. the development would not constitute sustainable development by the reason of absence of affordable housing contrary to policy CS9 and the NPFF

b. the proposal would by reason of its density and form, extent of hardstanding and parking including limited open space around the buildings represented an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the character of the area and the living environment for residents

c. the proposal by reason of its scale would be out of keeping with the character of the area.

d. the absence of the 106 Agreement.

It was therefore

RESOLVED that application APP/20/00658 be refused on the following grounds. The wording for the reasons for refusal to be determined by the Head of Planning after consultation with the Chairman

Grounds for Refusal

-

A. the development would not constitute sustainable development by the reason of absence of affordable housing contrary to policy CS9 and the NPFF

B. the proposal would by reason of its density and form, extent of hardstanding and parking including limited open space around the buildings represent an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the character of the area and the living environment for residents

C. the proposal by reason of its scale would be out of keeping with the character of the area.

D. the absence of the 106 Agreement.

-

26 APP/22/00728 - 36 Beach Road, Emsworth

Proposal: Erection of a first floor extension with dormer window to front and side with canopy to front elevation

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to grant permission.

RESOLVED that application APP/22/00728 be granted permission subject to the following conditions:

1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

EXISTING FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS
PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR AND ELEVATIONS
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR AND ROOF PLANS

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

The meeting commenced at 5.10 pm and concluded at 6.52 pm

……

Chairman