

# Planning and Rights of Way Panel

Tuesday, 24th August, 2021  
at 4.00 pm

**PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING**

Guildhall

This meeting is open to the public

## **Members**

Councillor L Harris (Chair)  
Councillor Prior (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Coombs  
Councillor Magee  
Councillor Savage  
Councillor Vaughan  
Councillor Windle

## **Contacts**

Ed.grimshaw@southampton.gov.uk  
023 8083 2390 / 07385 416491



## **Statements and additional information received for Planning on the 24<sup>th</sup> August**



# **Agenda Item 5**

## **TPO – Athelstan Road**

Councillors/Trees Team  
Southampton City Council  
Civic Centre  
Southampton  
SO14 7LY

Dear Councillors

**Your ref: T2-738**

In addition to our objection letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> March 2021 we would like to add the following which we ask to be taken into consideration.

We started making enquiries about the Oak tree at the bottom of our garden, with the Tree Team in June 2020. Since that date and the 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021, when the TPO was issued, no works have been carried out by us, even though it could have been. In reference to the report provided by the tree team, a claim that we requested to pollard the tree is inaccurate. In an email sent on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2021, we asked the officer if we would be '*permitted to pollard the whole tree and maintain it as a smaller tree at our cost?*'. This was a general enquiry with the officer, not a request. Since then, having a better understanding of what tree pollarding is, we realised this wasn't the result we wanted and clarified this on a number of occasions to the officer. The well-being of this tree and garden is important to us and we are keen to create a relaxing and enjoyable family environment.

In reference to the initial estimation of the canopy coverage, it has been stated that the coverage is estimated at 50 square meters of a 225 square meter garden which equates to 22% and is considered sufficient. To be clear, from our rear boundary, the grass and shrubs area is 13 meters long (the tree covers 8.5 meters of this) and the remainder of the garden is tiered existing patio. We measured the tree on Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> August 2021 and the tree was 11.2 meters tall. The officer based her assessment of the loss of garden and light to the garden on a 7 metre high tree, which we believe is inaccurate and shouldn't be taken into consideration. We did ask for a meeting to agree the facts, but didn't receive a response to this. There has never been a site visit to our home.

In reference to visual amenity, our understanding is that our immediate neighbours would not object to the tree being reduced. Looking at the front of the house, we have planning permission to extend over the garage, so any view of the tree from Athelstan Road would be unlikely. In addition to this, please note that Appendix 3 photo 1 and 2 are NOT photographs of our Oak tree, which is the subject of this TPO. We believe one of these is a sycamore tree and we don't know the other. Our tree is not this visible from the road.

For clarification, the tree is not under any threat, it provides shade and privacy and we support its protection. We have also commenced landscaping the garden and the tree is now a feature of it. We take into consideration the amenity value of the tree, but would state that it affects us a family more than anyone else, quite considerably. We have a legal right to the peaceful enjoyment of our possessions, in this case our garden, and would seek that a TPO is not put on the tree and that we are allowed to maintain and manage the tree as needed and not have to apply and seek consent from the council prior to any work being carried out. We would never carry out this work ourselves but would seek advice and services from a professional tree surveyor and/or tree surgeon.

We sought guidance from a tree surveyor who clarified that the tree does not have honey fungus, which is a result we were glad to hear.

Yours Sincerely

Jacqui Turner and Giles Brotherton

158 Athelstan Road

Southampton

SO19 4DJ

## **Agenda Item number 6**

### **Gover Road**

Dear Sir/Madam

I refer to your above letter of 12 August regarding change of use for staff parking for Adams Morey.

Regrettably due to medical reasons I am unable to attend the meeting on 24 August, but as per my previous letter of 29 June, I re-iterate my reasons for my objection to the above proposal.

We were a quiet residential area and am unable to understand how Adams Morey initially gained planning permission for their garage. Many of the residents are senior citizens, who have lived in

the area for many years (myself 20 years) and over the past two years, have had to put up with the inconvenience of the Roundabout and more recently the flyover with the current situation, and

even more current, gas works and Toob who are/have been doing broadband work, despite I seem to recall something similar a month or so ago.

I have written to the Council now on 2 occasions, requesting some compensation on rates for our inconvenience of the traffic diversions, noise and pollution that we have suffered, with no joy from

yourselves. In addition to this, we have sadly lost AT LEAST 4 citizens that I am aware of the in the immediate vicinity of Adams Morey, including Mrs Sanders husband (No 3) and Mr Hall (No 5) over the past

year or so. I currently am living next door to a rental property, who leaves home at 0645hrs every morning for work, and thus have my sleep disturbed, because as a senior do not normally arise until 0800hrs,

We unfortunately cannot select our neighbours, I would therefore ask you, would you like to live next to a Car Park for the rest of your lives? I would suspect NO, for the noise, pollution, and inconvenience

of listening to doors being banged, people chit chatting on their way, which also happens now continually from motor bikes, racers and chit chatters who pass by from the Industrial Estate I would imagine!

In addition to the above reasons, we also have to suffer the numerous pigeons that loft in Adams Morey and cause immense disgust with their droppings, when landing on our conservatories and other areas

of building with their droppings having to be continually cleaned up. Again, when I complained about this, was told it was not a hazard! Admittedly, this has nothing to do with the car parking, but just another

inconvenience that Adams Morey put on the residents of this street. I feel they should relocate their whole business elsewhere, before they encroach further along this, what was ONCE A QUIET neighbourhood,

before the M271 and Redbridge flyover, which is another constant battle of noise at night.

Not being a car driver, I frequently use the bus stop located outside Adams Morey, or walk past No 1 (as was) to get to the opposite side of the road. As I am usually in a hurry it would likely mean that myself

and other bus users will have to be continually on our guard against the staff exiting No 1 when leaving that site.

Yours faithfully

PAT WALSH (MRS)



"These comments are made on behalf of the City of Southampton Society.

We object to the proposed change of use of 1 Gover Road.

We suspect that, from a technical point of view, the planning officer is correct in recommending "Conditional Approval". However we are also aware that the residents of Gover Road have suffered greatly over the years from the increase in traffic, with its associated noise and pollution, and the expansion of the Adams Morey business.

We feel that the time has come when for once the concerns of the local residents should be afforded primacy. If Adams Morey wish to expand further then maybe they should be asked to look for an alternative site.

Simon Reynier  
City of Southampton Society

## **Agenda Item number 7**

### **Milton Road**

21/00909/FUL 152 Milton Road Objection for reading out at Panel meeting.

This would be an out of character new back garden development, out of keeping with layout of the established Victorian/ Edwardian houses in the vicinity.

It would set a precedent for mews type development in Wilton Avenue where the houses on the north side have long gardens giving on to an exit road.

Would be contrary to established policies SDP7, (iii) and SDP1, of Local Plan Review March 2006, and CS 16 , CS 13 Local Development Framework January 2010 and Paragraph 2.3.14 of Residential Design Guide September 2006.

The report states that there are 20 buses an hour at 400 metres, in Shirley Road , when in fact the distance is twice that much.

Lorraine Barter

42 Harborough Road

Polygon

SO15 2FY

Statement from Ms Steele

I would like to state my strongest objection to the above planning application, which refers to land commonly known as 152 Milton Road.

### **Overview**

The proposal to form a separate dwelling represents an over-intensive use of the site, introducing a form of back land development which would be wholly out of character with the layout and context of the established pattern of development in the area, with the formation of a separate dwelling causing harm to neighbouring occupiers in terms of increased activity. Furthermore, the application site is compact, allowing minimal amenity space and outlook to the occupiers of the proposed dwelling and would therefore be detrimental to their amenity. As such the proposal is contrary to saved policies SDP1 (i) and SDP7(iii)(iv) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (Adopted March 2006) and policies CS13 and CS16 of the Development Plan Document Core Strategy Local Development Framework (Adopted January 2010) as supported by the guidance set out in paragraph 2.3.14 of the Councils Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (approved September 2006).

### **Boundary line**

The boundary of the proposed development is incorrect and encroaches upon my garden (garden grabbing), this will involve loss of garden to me. The owners of 152 did ask to buy a piece of my garden, however I refused for reasons stated in this document. This still stands: because I have chosen to put a temporary fence in front of the wall ( child safety) the owners/planning design at 152 has perceived this as being the boundary , thus grabbing 6-10 inches of my garden.

The proposed dwelling wall is far too near to my garden wall, how on earth could it get repaired and how could bungalow get its gutter cleaned out on that side. I have previously pointed out where the extension wall on 152 has missing bricks (this was when the new owners purchased the property) however the owners have yet to address this issue, which implies the upkeep will not be a priority and the dwelling will fall into disrepair and eventually become an eyesore.

### **Privacy**

The development is large and overshadows my garden substantially, casting shadows which will also overlook my property etc garden. Both houses either side of my property have built extensions, so I already feel a little closed in and have lost privacy light and sunlight

### **Right to light**

As previously stated, the height and size of the proposed building will diminish the amount of light I receive.

### **Right to sunlight**

The height and size of the proposed building will diminish the amount of sunlight my home and garden receive, making part of my garden unusable, especially for planting or social activity.

### **The spirit of the community/Environmental.**

This is a highly densely populated area and already you can see the effects on the environment and community. Bins are often overflowing and left out in the street encouraging rats and seagulls, it is the council's policy to keep bins off the pavements. However, it is stated in the proposal that bins are usually kept on the pavement and

implies this would be the case for the new dwelling. This would be a violation of council policy.

There is no stipulation of how many people will be living in the dwelling, which in turn creates noise (remember this dwelling is at the side of my garden and will take up more than half of the land). There will also be parking permits in an already oversubscribed area.

#### **Effect on Flood Protection and the Sewage issue.**

There is a flooding problem in this area, especially as we are at the end of the street property 152 drains often overflow and caused my drain to also overflow and thus sewerage was dispersed into my garden but luckily not my house. This can be confirmed with southern water who will have a record of how many times they have been called out.

Do the calculations for surface water discharge take account of increasing strength and frequency of very heavy rainfall in the coming years?

There is also a river that runs close or underneath the property and with the effects of global warming flash floods are only due to increase.

#### **Effect of increase in traffic and car parking.**

This area is always being redeveloped where houses are turned into HMO's or flats; the area is becoming unsightly and overcrowded.

There needs to be a proper traffic and parking assessment carried out as although this development falls just below the threshold the area has a particular local bottle neck. The threshold is a city wide one, but there are local specifics here that should be considered.

Perhaps interview with residents on the surrounding streets should be held to get a more realistic view on this - there are problems already which means this planning application is incorrect.

#### **Poor Design/size**

The scale will impose itself over my dwelling.

The profit motives.

The motivation is not community based but profit based; I see nothing that will enhance the community or surrounding area.

I'm all for entrepreneurs but not at the expense of others and their wellbeing.

#### **Other areas for consideration**

I know this is available to the public and did call to ask if this could be excluded for the following reason.

I am a registered emergency and respite foster carer and have concerns over the impact the development would have over safeguarding children. By this I mean being overlooked and loss of privacy.

As part of being a foster carer stringent guidelines must be adhered to, this includes my house as well as my garden. Previously I had created a safe/quiet space in my garden

for those children that required it particularly autistic children. This development will disturb this and my plans to enhance/redevelop the garden along with it.

Local services are stretched (Doctors & Dentists) to their maximum so much so that I no longer have access to a local dentist. The doctors are also under huge pressure.

There is ample regeneration all along the south coast, especially Southampton, with more than enough newly built 2 bed properties, I see no reason why there would be a need to squeeze this two-bed property within the polygon.

If I wanted to sell my property what would be the impact of this development have on price and saleability. Although I know this is not considered as part of the planning process (not sure why) I needed to document this to ensure that there has been no foul play or kickbacks.

I therefore consider that the proposal is contrary to policies of the local plan and request that the planning application is refused.

Kind regards

Ms Steele

## Statement from Councillor Bogle

My comments on the portal are probably sufficient. To outline my issues with the application.

The concerns I had were to do with vehicular access from an awkward point on Wilton Avenue, loss of green space and over-development. Polygon has been particularly affected by poor quality and inappropriate residential development using out buildings and other spaces to try and maximise returns on a piece of land or property.