

PLANNING

2 August 2017
10.00 am - 2.10 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Blencowe, Hart, Holt, Sarris and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer
Principal Planner Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton
Senior Planner: Lorna Gilbert
Senior Planner: Michael Hammond
Legal Advisor: Rebecca Williams
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/128/PlanApologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Hipkin.

17/129/PlanDeclarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor R. Moore	17/132/Plan & 17/133/Plan	Personal: Resident of Lichfield Road. Part of the Lichfield Road Resident Association.

17/130/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 5 July 2017 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

17/131/Plan17/0172/FUL 34 - 36 Madingley Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of a residential apartment development to be arranged within two blocks comprising of ten 2 x bed units and 6 x 1 bed units along with car and cycle parking, refuse provisions, hard and soft landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings on the site.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from two local residents.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The removal of green space would have a detrimental impact on the local wildlife and would cause a loss to the diverse array of species to the area.
- ii. Moving the development back would have a negative impact on the conservation area as some of this area would be lost.
- iii. The development would damage the amenity of the conservation area as it neither maintained nor enhanced the appearance of the conservation area.
- iv. Strongly objected to the removal of 19 mature trees and various hedge rows which acted as a natural barrier to the surrounding properties and also supported the wildlife.
- v. The conservation principle of the area should be strong enough to refuse the application.
- vi. No development over two stories high should be permitted in the local residential area.
- vii. Objected to the massing, and density and the loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. No's 2,4 and 6 Lansdowne Road would become overlooked.
- viii. No development over two stories high should be permitted in the local residential area.
- ix. Considered the access to be dangerous as vehicles would be turning from the highway with a speed limit of 40 mph over a cycle path at the point where the cycle path was at its narrowest.
- x. The development would increase the flood risk the area.
- xi. There has been considerable pressure from dense development north west of Madingley Road; the north side should be left to be in keeping with the conservation area.

Mr McEwan (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officer (the Section 106 needs to be completed prior to issuing the decision notice).

17/132/Plan17/0381/FUL 71 Greville Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear dormer, and change of use of dwelling to large scale HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) for 8 no. persons, with associated bin and bike storage

The Senior Planner referred to a typographical error in condition 6 of the report "drawing no.P02 Rev E" should be "Rev H".

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Greville Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The applicant had used a 2 step approach to obtain planning permission by making the original application then applying for change of use.
- ii. Few residents had objected to the original application but various residents had objected to the (second) HMO application.
- iii. 2 more people would occupy the building in addition to the current 6.
- iv. The application sought change of use from a family home to HMO. Further occupants were expected in future as per 17/0382/FUL (next item) which was another application by the same developer.
- v. Queried:
 - a. If it was fair and proper to allow a 2 stage application.
 - b. What was the evidence that site occupants were not car dependent.
- vi. Asked for the application to be refused.

Mr Proctor (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor R. Moore (Coleridge Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern that the application could be approved in part due to the proposed management plan. Similar plans were not working in other HMOs managed by the developer, which impacted on neighbours' amenities.
- ii. It was not possible to guarantee that occupants would have no cars. There was only 1 car parking space allocated to the development.
- iii. Queried how it was possible to guarantee the garden would not be built on as part of the development as per 17/0382/FUL (next item). This needed to be guarded against in conditions.

Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Romsey was a congested area.
- ii. Many houses were becoming HMOs through 2 step applications.
- iii. Expressed concern that the developer had built a family home then sought to become a HMO through change of use.
- iv. Queried if the Committee were aware of HMO licensing regulations such as room size.
- v. Parking was an issue in Romsey, particularly in Greville Road. Referred to Highways Agency comments in the Officer's report regarding the impact of the application on traffic flow and parking in the area.
- vi. This application could set a precedent for HMOs in Greville Road, although it was not the first property in multi-occupancy.
- vii. There was no agreement set out in the application to control refuse arrangements for occupiers, to put out or take back bins on collection days.
- viii. Expressed concern over the impact of 8 HMO occupants on neighbours' amenities.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers and verbal update to amend condition 6 to:

The area labelled "hardstanding to provide 1 parking space" as shown on drawing no.P02 Rev H shall be constructed in permeable surfacing only.

Reason: To minimise flood risk (Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)).

17/133/Plan17/0382/FUL 11 Lichfield Road

The Committee received an application for change of use.

The application sought approval for change of use from an eight person HMO to a nine person HMO. This change would be accommodated through the provision of an additional bedroom and en-suite in an outbuilding in the rear garden.

The Senior Planner referred to a typographical error on the front page of the report where the recommendation was listed as "approval" when the Officer recommended "refusal" (as set out P117).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Lichfield Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Suggested the application would not meet Local Plan conditions as it would not be a good living environment.
- ii. The proposed new living space would disturb the amenity of existing site occupants.
- iii. Concerns about drainage.
- iv. Existing parking/traffic flow issues would be exacerbated.
- v. There was no application for a drop kerb in front of 11 Lichfield Road. Expressed a desire to protect the grass verge.

Mr Proctor (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor R. Moore (Coleridge Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There had been on-going issues since people moved into 11 Lichfield Road:
 - a. Occupants.
 - b. Noise from the house and garden.
 - c. Impact on neighbours' amenity space eg overlooking from house.
 - d. Verges.
- ii. Queried how the outbuilding was allowed when HMOs had no permitted development rights. Queried if the outbuilding was erected before the property became a HMO.
- iii. Suggested the application was an overdevelopment of the site which was out of character with the area.
- iv. Residents were concerned that the property had become a HMO (when it was a family home originally) and the number of occupants was increasing.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to refuse the application for change of use in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

17/134/Plan17/0743/S73 Land Adjacent to 1 Campbell Street

The Committee received a Section 73 application.

The application sought approval to vary condition 2 of permission 15/1950/FUL to permit construction of a dormer window instead of skylight "Velux" window at front and extension of approved rear dormer.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the Section 73 application in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

17/135/Plan17/0478/FUL 1 Vinery Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for amendments to planning approval 16/0670/FUL granted 07/09/2016 to raise roof ridge approximately 150mm

Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Said that orientation of the property was important due to the impact it would have on neighbours.
- ii. Suggested the Applicant was trying to get more out of the site through a 2 step application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

17/136/Plan17/0155/FUL 9 Maitland Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extension and conversion of the existing dwelling into 4 flats.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

17/137/Plan17/0606/FUL 1 Sunnyside

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a two storey dwelling adjoining 1 Sunnyside following the demolition of existing garages.

Mr Bettison (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

17/138/Plan17/0757/FUL 24 St Philips Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear extension.

The Principal Planner referred to a typographical error in paragraph 8.7 of the report regarding measurements in the plans.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of St Philip's Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Suggested the recommendation to approve was based on incorrect measurements in the plans.
- ii. The proposed extension would look over neighbours, only 2m of the 8m garden would not be built on.
- iii. Took issue with the size and scale of the extension and felt this would be out of character with the area.
- iv. Expressed concern about:
 - a. Impact on amenities and sunlight.
 - b. Noise and disturbance from extra property occupants. This would exacerbate existing issues.
 - c. The application was a trojan horse for a HMO.
 - d. The application would exacerbate existing parking issues.

Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The property was an unlicensed HMO all ready (it did not meet the threshold to require permission).
- ii. Expected an application in future to further develop the site.
- iii. Expressed surprise the Conservation Officer had not commented on the 6m extension.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 2) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

The meeting ended at 2.10 pm

CHAIR