
PLANNING AND RIGHTS OF WAY PANEL (WEST)
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 NOVEMBER 2015

Present: Councillors Denness (Chair), Lloyd (Vice-Chair), Claisse, L Harris and Mintoff

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

RESOLVED: that the minutes for the Panel meeting on 6 October 2015 be approved and signed as a correct record.

36. **14 WESTWOOD ROAD 15/01711/FUL**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending delegated authority be granted in respect of an application for a proposed development at the above address.

Redevelopment of the site. Erection of a 5-storey building to provide 18 flats (14 x two-bedroom and 4 x three-bedroom) with associated parking and vehicular access from Cambridge Road following the demolition of the existing buildings.

Russell Pearce, Sarah Allen, Annie Chamberlain, Gordon Gill (local residents / objecting) and Councillor Claisse (Portswood Ward Councillors / objecting) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The officer recommendation to delegate to the Planning and Development Manager authority to grant planning permission subject to criteria listed in report was not carried

RESOLVED to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below:

(i) Harm to Character

The proposed development, due to its design and amount of site coverage by buildings and hardsurfacing, would be an overdevelopment of the site with insufficient private amenity space for future occupiers, particularly in relation to two of the family-sized units. Furthermore, the design of the proposed building would be out of character with the area, would fail to reinforce local distinctiveness and would compare unfavourably with the existing building by reason of the contrived curved roof design and use of external materials. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the Adopted City of Southampton Local Plan (2015), Policies CS5, CS13 and CS16 of the adopted Southampton Core Strategy (2015) and the relevant sections of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (September 2006) especially Parts 2, 3 and 4.

(ii) Parking/Highways and Impact on Residential Amenity

Based on the information submitted, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development would not have a harmful impact on the amenities of nearby residential occupiers through increased competition for on-street car parking. The submitted survey fails to take into account existing day time commuter parking and as such, it is not clear the level of car parking proposed is sufficient to serve the development, particularly since

significantly less spaces would be provided than the Council's maximum adopted standards. Furthermore, the increase in the use of Cambridge Road by traffic would result in increased disturbance to the residents to the south of the site to the detriment of their amenities. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of Policy SDP1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015), Policy CS19 of the Southampton Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) and the adopted Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011).

(iii) Failure to Enter into Section 106 Agreement

In the absence of a completed Section 106 Legal Agreement the proposals fail to mitigate against their direct impact and do not, therefore, satisfy the provisions of Policy CS25 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2015) as supported by the Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2015) in the following ways:-

- (a) As the scheme triggers the threshold for the provision of affordable housing it is expected to provide a contribution to affordable housing to assist the City in meeting its current identified housing needs as required by Policy CS15 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document;
- (b) Site specific transport works for highway improvements in the vicinity of the site which are directly necessary to make the scheme acceptable in highway terms have not been secured - in accordance with Policies CS18, CS19 & CS25 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the adopted SPD relating to Developer Contributions;
- (c) In the absence of financial contributions towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project to mitigate recreational disturbance and pressure on the Solent European designated conservation sites, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010;
- (d) In the absence of a mechanism for securing a (pre and post construction) highway condition survey it is unlikely that the development will make appropriate repairs to the highway - caused during the construction phase - to the detriment of the visual appearance and usability of the local highway network;
- (e) In the absence of a Carbon Management Plan it is not clear how the development will achieve carbon neutrality or mitigate remaining carbon emissions from the development the proposal will be contrary to Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy.
- (f) In the absence of restrictions to prevent occupiers of the development from benefitting from parking permits for nearby on-street car parking, the development would lead to increased competition to on-street car parking that would be detrimental to the amenities of existing nearby residential occupiers contrary to policies SDP1 of the Local Plan Review and CS19 of the Core Strategy.

RECORDED VOTE refuse planning permission
FOR: Councillors L Harris, Lloyd and Mintoff
ABSTAINED: Councillor Denness

NOTE: Councillor Claisse declared an interest in the above application and after making his representation, left the meeting before the determination

37. **KING GEORGE PUBLIC HOUSE, OAKLEY ROAD 15/01551/OUT**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending delegated authority be granted in respect of an application for a proposed development at the above address.

Redevelopment of the site. Erection of 6x 3-Bed Houses With Associated Parking And Cycle/Refuse Storage (Outline Application Seeking Approval For Access, Appearance, Layout And Scale)

Councillor Galton and Councillor Furnell (ward councillors / objecting) and Adi Paplambu (architect) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

At the request of the Panel, officers amended the reasons for refusal to include an additional reason concerning the Impact on residential amenity that the development would have.

RESOLVED to refuse planning application for the reasons set out in the report and the additional reason set out below.

Additional reason for refusal

4. REASON FOR REFUSAL - Impact on residential amenity.

Based on the information submitted, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development would not have a harmful impact on the amenities of nearby residential occupiers through increased competition for on-street car parking. The submitted survey fails to take into account existing points of access to off-road car parking and failed to assess the situation at the start and end of the school day in relation to nearby schools. As such, it is not clear the level of car parking proposed is sufficient to serve the development, particularly since significantly less spaces would be provided than the Council's maximum adopted standards. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of Policy SDP1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015), Policy CS19 of the Southampton Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) and the adopted Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011).

38. **47-49 ARCHERS ROAD 15/01622/FUL**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending delegated authority be granted in respect of an application for a proposed development at the above address.

Redevelopment of the site. Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a three storey building to provide 10 flats (3 x one bedroom, 5 x two bedroom, 2 x three-bedroom) with associated car parking, refuse storage and landscaping.

The Panel requested that an additional clause be added to the section 106 legal agreement to restrict the issuing of parking permits to future residents and an additional condition on parking layout.

RESOLVED to delegate to the Planning and Development Manager authority to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 Legal Agreement, the conditions listed in the report, and the amendments to the S106, set out below.

ADDITIONAL S106 CLAUSE

(v) Restrictions to prevent future occupiers benefitting from parking permits in surrounding streets. No occupiers, with the exception of registered disabled drivers, shall be entitled to obtain parking permits to the Council's Controlled Parking Zones.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION

APPROVAL CONDITION: Parking layout and allocation [Pre-occupation condition]
Prior to occupation, the parking spaces hereby approved shall be fully marked out and retained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Furthermore, two of the car parking spaces approved shall be provided solely for use of the occupants of the two three-bedroom units and be retained for the use of these units for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A minimum distance of 6m between the parking spaces shall be retained and the turning area hereby approved shall be kept clear at all times to facilitate on-site turning unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.