

Southampton City Planning & Sustainability
Planning and Rights of Way Panel meeting 26 June 2012
Planning Application Report of the Planning and Development Manager

Application address: 28-30 Alma Road SO14 6UP			
Proposed development: Re-development of the site, demolition of existing buildings and erection of a two-storey building with accommodation in roof, containing ten flats with associated car parking, refuse and cycle store (outline application seeking approval for access, appearance, layout and scale).			
Application number	12/00339/OUT	Application type	OUT
Case officer	Mathew Pidgeon	Public speaking time	15 minutes
Last date for determination:	17/05/2012	Ward	Bevois
Reason for Panel Referral:	Referred by the Planning & Development Manager to agree reasons for refusal.	Ward Councillors	Burke Rayment Barnes-Andrews

Applicant: Mr K Mohmed	Agent: Concept Design & Planning Llp - Mr Rob Wiles
-------------------------------	--

Recommendation in Full

That the reasons for refusal are updated to include all reasons drafted in this report.

Appendix attached	
1	Previous report to panel (meeting date, 29/05/2012)

Recommendation in Full

The Planning and Rights of Way Panel are requested to add a reason for refusal, to those previously given, based on the applicants failure to complete a Section 106 agreement.

1.0 Background

1.1 This planning application was considered by the Planning and Rights of Way Panel on the 29th May 2012. Panel overturned the officer recommendation for approval and vote to refuse the application for the reason set out below.

The original officer report recommended to Panel that planning permission be granted and is set out in full as Appendix 1. The Panel resolved to refuse the application.

Development proposals of this scale are required to make appropriate contributions via a s106 agreement. Should the applicant appeal the decision to refuse the application, a reason for refusal identifying the necessary s106 provision needs to be added to ensure this can be secured in the event of a successful appeal.

Refusal Reason - Intensification in the use

The redevelopment of the site taking into account the context and character of the area, will result in an intensification in the use of the site, which by reason of the additional general activity, on street car parking, noise and disturbance would be to the detriment of the amenity of nearby residents. As such the proposal represents an over-intensive use of the site and is therefore contrary Policies SDP1 (i) and SDP7 (v) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review 2006.

- 1.2 In addition to the above reason for refusal, were the application approved, it would have triggered the need for a Section 106 agreement to mitigate the direct impacts on the development on local infrastructure as well as to secure affordable housing. As such, confirmation is also sought that the following deemed reason for refusal should be added:

Refusal reason - Failure to enter into a Section 106 Agreement

In the absence of a completed S.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 (January 2010) as supported by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations (August 2005, as amended) 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 from the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010)

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 - in accordance with policies CS18, CS19 & CS25 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended) - have not been secured.

c) Measures to support strategic transport improvements in the wider area in accordance with policies CS18 & CS25 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended) have not been secured.

d) A financial contribution towards the provision and maintenance of open space in accordance with 'saved' policy CLT5 of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006), policies CS21 and CS25 from the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) and applicable SPG is required to support the scheme and has not been secured;

e) A financial contribution towards the provision of a new children's play area and equipment in accordance with policy CLT6 of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006), policies CS21 and CS25 from the adopted

Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) and applicable SPG is required to support the scheme and has not been secured;

f) 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.

g) A financial contribution towards public realm improvements in accordance with the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended).

MP3 for 26/06/2012 PROW Panel

