
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
PLANNING AND RIGHTS OF WAY PANEL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 JULY 2012

Present: Councillors Mrs Blatchford (Chair), Claisse, L Harris, Lloyd, Smith and Barnes-Andrews (Items 29 to 32)

Apologies: Councillors Cunio and Shields

29. **APOLOGIES AND CHANGES IN PANEL MEMBERSHIP (IF ANY)**

The Panel noted that apologies had been received from Councillor Cunio and that Councillor Barnes-Andrews was in attendance as a nominated substitute for Councillor Shields in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.3.

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

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 June 2012 be approved and signed as a correct record, subject to an amendment to minute number 22, Banister School to reflect that Councillor Moulton spoke in support of the planning application.

31. **SOUTHAMPTON BIOMASS PLANT, WEST BAY ROAD /12/00749/PREAP1**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending a formal response be submitted on the revised proposals for a biomass fuelled electricity generating station at the above address. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes)

Mr Brighton (Developer), Ms Grove (objecting) (local resident), Mr Galton, Ms Gil-Arranz and Dr King-Ly (objecting) (No Southampton Biomass), Councillor Moulton and Councillor Vinson (objecting) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer recommended a revised recommendation (ii) to the Panel seeking agreement that the City Council reserves its position on the issue until it has reviewed the findings of the Health Impact Report. The presenting officer also reported that 4.25 should refer to "off-site" landscaping.

RESOLVED unanimously that:

- (i) The recommendations and findings of the report are noted and a HOLDING OBJECTION based on the submitted details and a lack of information is reported formally to Helius by 3rd August 2012 in response to their formal pre-application consultation with the City Council under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. A summary of the recommendations is attached at Appendix 3. The following recommendations were amended and the City Design Manager's response (Appendix 5) was amended, detailed as follows;

- (ii) it is recommended to Helius that any formal application to the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID) should be supported by a Health Impact Report (HIR) as required by Policy CS10 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2010). The City Council reserves its position on this issue until it has reviewed the findings of the HIR.
- (iii) Delegation be given to the Planning and Development Manager to comment following consultation with the Chair of the Panel on the adequacy of the consultation exercise when notified by NID. This requires a 14 day turnaround from receipt; and
- (iv) Despite the objections raised by the Council delegation is given to the Planning and Development Manager to work with the applicants to prepare a draft Development Consent Order ('planning conditions') and draft Development Consent Obligation ('S.106 legal agreement) for submission to the NID in due course. The obligation is to include as a minimum:
 - (a) Employment & Skills Training;
 - (b) Off-site landscaping
 - (c) Strategic and Site Specific Transport Contributions;
 - (d) Off-site heat user study;
 - (e) TV reception study (pre and post construction);
 - (f) Highway Condition Survey (pre & post construction); and
 - (g) Off-site air quality monitoring

Amended recommendations

Recommendation – Biomass Plant on Operational Port

No objection to the principle of a biomass development on operational port land providing at least 62.5% of the biomass material is delivered to the site by sea. Whilst no objection is raised to the principle of development an OBJECTION is raised to the proposed scale of operation as it exceeds both the Category 5 (50,000T) and Category 6 (90-600,000T) plant size specified in the submission Minerals and Waste Local Plan and supporting documentation. In addition, further justification is required with regard to the proposed size of the operation and the choice of locations within the Port where other less sensitive locations may be possible. Furthermore, it is considered that the promoter cannot claim to be totally committed to being a sustainable business if they are to use non-renewable sources to heat their on-site office space (as indicated at paragraph 3.12.20 of the technical submission) and do not commit to BREEAM or another measure for sustainable building. This should be revisited. It is also unclear how the other 'ancillary' operations will be powered.

Recommendation – Landscape & Visual Effect

The relocation of the Primary Development Area further away from the nearest residential neighbours with the clear improvements to the Foundry Lane viewpoint are noted. The proposed options are, however, not acceptable on the grounds of being of inappropriate scale, massing, height, poor architectural and landscape quality. It is the opinion of the City Council that they will have a negative visual impact on local amenity and the skyline of the city for the reasons given by the Council's City Design Manager in the response dated 3rd July 2012. An assessment of the plant at night, to show the proposed lighting, is also missing from the current submission. An objection will be submitted in the event that a formal application for these current proposals is lodged. It

is the Council's opinion that the need for the development does not outweigh the harm that would be caused by its implementation as currently proposed.

The response from the City Design Manager's response dated 3rd July 2012 will read as follows (Appendix 5):

"The three architectural solutions are presented as a 'dressing up exercise' and do not yet demonstrate architecture that is sensitive to place. This should not be necessary because the form and function of the engineering proposal should be driving the architectural solution. The site is in a gateway location situated alongside the busiest approach into the city and so the buildings/structures will become a landmark and should be symbolic of the Council's aspirations and approach to high quality design and its sustainability credentials. As with the Thames Barrier the interplay between the architect and the engineer should result in a memorable architectural form. There are examples where high quality architecture has produced visually interesting solutions such as the Marchwood Incinerator (designed by leading infrastructure architect Jean Robert Mazaud) which demonstrates how a simple approach to the structural form and colour treatment can successfully minimise the visual impact of a large structure. An imaginative approach to the design of chimney stacks has been taken near Heathrow, just off the M4, at the Lakeside Energy from Waste Incinerator; here three chimneys have been wrapped in an open stainless steel spiral structure that distracts from the utilitarian form of the chimneys. The choice of materials and colour is also important. A more neutral palette of colours that reduces the apparent size of the tall structures when set against a predominantly grey sky would be appropriate. This might be accented by colours characteristic of the port or maritime location and a feature lighting scheme could be used to dramatically light up the development at night, celebrating a memorable architectural form."

32. **LAND ADJOINING JOHN THORNYCROFT ROAD (PART OF FORMER VOSPER THORNYCROFT SITE), VICTORIA ROAD 12/00749/PREAP1**

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

Full permission sought for Phase 3 of the Centenary Quay development with a mixed residential and employment use comprising 329 residential units (102 x one bedroom, 178 x two bedroom and 49 x three bedroom units), a food store (Class A1 - 5,500 square metres), commercial space (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4 or B1 - 1,685 sq. m) and a management suite (84 sq. m) in buildings ranging in height from four-storeys to twelve-storeys with associated basement car parking and cycle parking, landscaped public and private open spaces, servicing and other works including junction improvements and temporary access to the rivers edge. (Environmental Impact Assessment Development).

Ms Alpin (Applicant) and (Mr Hall) (Applicant) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer updated the Panel on the S106 agreement (xxii) that the public toilet from Phase 2 of the library no longer proposed to be deleted and that paragraph

6.10.1 should be amended with this change. The presenting officer also reported that the last sentence for the reason for granting permission should refer to Phase 3.

RESOLVED unanimously that authority be delegated to the planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission submitted to criteria listed in the report and subject to the following the amended S106 condition and amended planning conditions:

S106 agreement

(xvi) The setting up and establishment of a management company for a long term maintenance of the River Itchen edge:

Amended Conditions

26 APPROVAL CONDITION – Refuse Management

Self closing rubbish bins shall be provided for the disposal of putrescible waste in accordance with details of a refuse and litter management plan for both public and private areas of the development that shall have been submitted and agreed prior to the first occupation of the development. The approved details shall include a management strategy for the emptying of the bins on a regular basis to prevent the build up of waste materials across the development and shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details prior to the occupation of the development.

REASON:

To avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft through the attraction of birds and in the interests of hygiene

50 APPROVAL CONDITION - BREEAM Standards (commercial development)

Written documentary evidence demonstrating that the development has achieved at minimum an overall rating of Very Good against the BREEAM standard, with Excellent level on the minimum standards (as indicator on the pre-assessment estimators dated 28/03/12) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and verified in writing prior to the first occupation of the development hereby granted, unless an otherwise agreed timeframe is agreed in writing by the LPA. The evidence shall take the form of a post construction certificate as issued by a qualified BREEAM certification body.

Reason:

To ensure the development minimises its overall demand for resources and to demonstrate compliance with policy CS20 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted Version (January 2010).

33. **6 DENBIGH GARDENS SO16 7PH 12/00684/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).

Change of use from residential (Class C3) to a house in multiple occupation (HMO, Class C4).

Dr Wells and Mrs Wawman (objecting) (Local residents) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported that three additional conditions be added:

- (i) Retention of existing front boundary treatment including replacement of hedge should it be removed;
- (ii) Removal of permitted development for Class A, B and E of Part 1 Schedule 2;
- (iii) Details of refuse storage.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **refused** for the following reasons.

RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillors Claisse, L Harris and Smith

AGAINST: Councillors Mrs Blatchford and Lloyd

Reason for Refusal – Unacceptable Intensification of Use

The intensification of the use of the property and activity associated with it would be out of character with the local area and detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents. The proposal would also result in the loss of a family dwelling for which there is a proven demand. The proposals are therefore contrary to saved policy H4 of the Southampton Local Plan Review 1996 and Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2010.

34. **5 BELLEVUE ROAD SO15 2YE /12/00471/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).

Redevelopment of the site, demolition of the existing building and construction of a 4-storey hostel for homeless persons comprising 65 bedsits with associated works.

Ms Stanley (supporting) (Housing Department for Southampton City Council) and Mr Waterfield (Applicant) was present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

RESOLVED unanimously to **grant** planning permission subject to the conditions in the report.

35. **LAND BETWEEN WEST PARK ROAD AND COMMERCIAL ROAD 12/00675/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. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes)

Redevelopment of the site. Erection of three new buildings ranging in height from 9 storeys to 16 storeys to provide student accommodation (197 cluster flats - 1,104 study bedrooms) above ground floor commercial uses (1,152 square metres floorspace) with associated parking and other facilities and vehicular access from West Park Road (Environmental Impact Assessment Development) - Description amended following validation.

Ms Sutton (Agent), Mr Monaghan (University of Southampton), Mrs Barter (objecting) (Local resident) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported that paragraph 6.8.3 no longer proposed to have a new Unilink Service but instead to rely in increasing the frequency and route of an existing service (probably the U2). It was also reported that (xix) of the S106 legal agreement should refer to air quality improvements.

RESOLVED unanimously that authority be delegated to the planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission submitted to criteria listed in the report and subject to the following amendment to the S106 condition:

S106 Agreement

(xix) A contribution towards Air Quality Improvements within the Commercial Road Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

36. **THORNHILL HOUSING OFFICE, TATWIN CRESCENT, SO19 6JT 12/00584/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. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

Erection of 9 two-storey (4 x 3 bedroom, 5 x 2 bedroom) with associated access and parking.

The presenting officer reported that the description of the development should refer to 4 x 3 bedroom and 5 x 2 bedroom.

RESOLVED unanimously that authority be delegated to the planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission submitted to criteria listed in the report.

37. **36 ABBOTTS WAY SO17 1NS 12/00766/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)

Erection of single storey side/rear extensions (Resubmission)

Mr Allen (Agent), Dr Buckle and Mr O'Conner (objecting) (Local residents), Councillor Norris and Councillor Vinson (Ward Councillors) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

RESOLVED to **grant** planning permission subject to the conditions in the report.

RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillor Mrs Blatchford and Councillor Lloyd
AGAINST: Councillor Claisse and L Harris
ABSTAINED: Councillor Smith

NOTE: This item was carried with the use of the Chair's second and casting vote.

38. **115-125 WILTON AVENUE 12/00682/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. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes)

Redevelopment of the site. Erection of a part three-storey, part four-storey building to provide 30 self-contained student flats with associated refuse, parking and cycle stores (Outline application seeking approval for access, appearance, layout and scale).

Mr Wiles (Agent), Mrs Barter and Mrs Baker (objecting) (Local residents) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported that planning condition 12 could be deleted and that Condition 15 should be amended as set out below:

Amended condition

15. APPROVAL CONDITION – Management of Student Accommodation and Car Parking [pre-commencement condition]

Prior to the first occupation of the residential part of the development hereby approved, a detailed Management Plan to deal with the day-to-day running of the residential units shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the residential part of the development hereby approved. The Management Plan shall include details of how the car parking is to be controlled to ensure use by students only on changeover days. The agreed details shall apply during the lifetime of the development.

Reason:

In the interests of reducing issues of noise and anti-social behaviour and to promote sustainable forms of travel

RESOLVED unanimously that authority be delegated to the planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission submitted to criteria listed in the report and the amended condition detailed above.

39. **MENTAL HEALTH DAY CENTRE, BEDFORD HOUSE, AMOY STREET 12/00381/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. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes)

Re-development of the site, demolition of the existing building and provision of 10 x 2 and 2.5 storey houses (8 x 3-beds, and 2 x 2-beds) with associated car parking and storage (outline application seeking approval for access, layout and scale)

Mr Lubbock, Mr Pothecary, Mr Lovelock, Mr Fleetwood, Ms Stephens (objecting) (Local residents) and Councillor Bogle (supporting) (Ward Councillor) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported the following additions to the S106 Agreement:

- (vii) Submission and implementation within a specified timescale of a Council approved Landscape Management Plan;
- (viii) A financial contribution towards public realm improvements within the City centre, as part of the North/South Spine Strategy, in accordance with Policies CS13 and CS25 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document – Adopted Version (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended)

RESOLVED unanimously to defer the decision on the planning application in order for further negotiations to take place in relation to the access arrangements.