
PLANNING AND RIGHTS OF WAY PANEL (EAST)
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5 AUGUST 2014

Present: Councillors Lewzey (Chair), Denness (Vice-Chair), Fitzhenry, Hecks and Tucker

9. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (INCLUDING MATTERS ARISING)**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2014 be approved and signed as a correct record subject to the amendment to show that Councillor Denness had been elected Vice-Chair for the Municipal Year 2014/2015.

10. **LAND REAR OF 38-40 LIME AVENUE - 14/00856/FUL**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending conditional approval be granted in respect of an application for a proposed development at the above address. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

Rob Wiles (agent), Angela Horn and Jean Underhill (local residents / objecting) and Councillor Jeffrey (ward councillor / objecting) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The Panel noted the receipt of amended plans, the amendment to Condition 13 and an additional condition regarding dropped kerb access.

Amended Condition

13. APPROVAL CONDITION - Construction delivery times

No deliveries to site between 8.00am – 9.30am and 3.00pm – 4.30pm Monday to Friday; and at no time on Saturday and Sunday during the construction phase.

REASON:

In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to prevent highway congestion, particularly during start and finish times of the nearby schools and college.

Additional Condition

APPROVAL CONDITION – Dropped Kerb

Details of the position and design of the drop kerb to serve the site be submitted and agreed in writing prior to the commencement of development. The drop kerb be installed as agreed.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to secure a satisfactory form of development.

RESOLVED

- (i) that planning permission be refused for the reason (01) set out below; and
- (ii) that the forms of words for the reason for refusal based on highways and parking grounds (02), be delegated to the Planning and Development Manager, in

consultation with the Chair and the proposer and seconder of the motion to refuse on those grounds.

Reason for Refusal

01. REFUSAL REASON - Out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area

The proposed development by reason of its design, scale, height, layout, level of site coverage with buildings and hard surfacing was out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area and symptomatic of a site overdevelopment. Furthermore, dwelling 1 by reason of its height and proximity to the south-western boundary appeared overbearing and lead to an increased sense of enclosure when viewed from 3 Lime Close and was detrimental to the residential amenities of those neighbouring occupiers. As such the development was contrary to Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006), Policies CS13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2010) and the relevant sections of the Residential Design Guide SPG (September 2006), particularly Parts 2 and 3.

RECORDED VOTE to refuse planning permission for the reason set out above:

FOR: Councillors Denness, Hecks and Tucker
AGAINST: Councillors Fitzhenry and Lewzey

Reason for Refusal

02. REFUSAL REASON – Insufficient parking and increased highway congestion

The proposed development was considered to provide an inadequate amount of on-site car parking for a development of two four bedroom houses within an area of low accessibility, having regard to the existing take-up of on-street parking adjoining the site (exacerbated by the proximity to nearby schools and Itchen College) and narrow carriageway width in Lime Close and Lime Avenue. Taken with the likely amount of car ownership and traffic generated by the development, it was considered that any car parking overspill from the development impacted negatively on the amenities of those living in Lime Close and Lime Avenue and lead to increased highway congestion in the area. The development proposal was thereby contrary to 'saved' policies SDP1 and SDP7 of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and policy CS13 and CS19 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2010) as supported by the adopted Parking Standards SPD (September 2011) and Part 5 of the Council's adopted Residential Design Guide SPD (2006).

RECORDED VOTE to refuse planning permission for the reason set out above:

FOR: Councillors Denness, Hecks and Tucker
AGAINST: Councillor Fitzhenry
ABSTAINED: Councillor Lewzey

11. **13 OMDURMAN ROAD - 14/00644/FUL**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending refusal in respect of an application for a proposed development at the above address and that an Enforcement Notice be served to remedy the breach of

planning control. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) that planning permission with regard to application 13/00418/FUL be refused for the amended reason set out below; and
- (ii) that an Enforcement Notice be served to remedy the breach of planning control.

Amended Reason for Refusal:

REASON FOR REFUSAL - Impact on character of the local area

The conversion of the property to a HMO results in an excessive concentration of HMO's within the immediate area. This results in an adverse impact on the overall character and amenity of the area surrounding the application site in terms of the mix and balance of households in the local community. Therefore, the proposed development was contrary to saved policies SDP1(i) and H4(ii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (Adopted March 2006) and policy CS16 of the City of Southampton Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted January 2010) as supported by the section 6.5 of the Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (Approved March 2012).