

# Planning and Rights of Way Panel

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND PRESENTATIONS

**5** **22/00588/REM CENTENARY QUAY, WOOLSTON** (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Head of Green City & Infrastructure recommending that conditional approval be delegated to the Head of Planning & Economic Development in respect of an application for a proposed development at the above address, attached.

Monday, 3 October 2022

Service Director, Legal and Business  
Services

This page is intentionally left blank

## Application: 22/00588/REM

### Planning issues and Material considerations.

I originally expressed my thoughts and opinions when the phase 6 plans for Centenary Quay were first proposed. I am fully aware that due to the impacts of covid and numerous changes outlined by Crest Nicholson, that plans do and will continue to change. However, that biggest concern for residents is a lack of private and visitor parking within the development.

I am a resident of the Adonia apartments that were part of phase 5, along with Arcadia. These buildings comprise of 87 residential properties. The new phase 6 plans state 29 car parking spaces for phase 5 residents. I am no mathematical expert, but 29 spaces will not accommodate 87 apartments.

It has become clear, that residents who have purchased through the government's shared ownership scheme, have been misled through not only the buying process but by the plans that have been submitted and provided to us. By misled I mean, when we bought our properties, we were advised we would have **temporary** parking to the side of our building as "our" parking would not be ready at the same time as our property completion. Said land at present is a waste ground, holding building material. In reality, our **temporary** parking is in a multi-storey car park (Keel Road) – this is a 5 minute plus walk to the furthest end from our own homes. As plans keep changing, we seem to be overlooked and dismissed. It may not seem important to Crest or Southampton City Council, but it does impact people's lives greatly.

We can't even park outside our own home to drop off shopping etc because the whole residual area is double yellow lined with the constant threat that we will get parking tickets. The bigger impact is that we will not be able to sell our properties. Who wants a home, with a car parking space in a different postcode!!!

All new proposed homes have an allocated parking space outside of their property, **this should be same for us phase 5 apartment owners.**

In the new phase 6 planning application, who is guaranteed one of the 29 phase 5 spaces? Are these ring fenced for Crest private buyers? We need Crest to clearly state in the plans who will benefit from the parking amendments. Stating phase 5 is clearly not good enough and will continue to raise further questions and further planning objections from residents.

*The definition of "Temporary" means lasting for only a limited period of time; not permanent.* So, plans need to clearly factor in our permanent spaces. We have been waiting over two years now!

An environmental element, aside from above that I would like to also raise, is the lack of waste bins provided throughout the whole of Centenary Quay. A new park has opened directly opposite the Arcadia apartments, which funnily enough this was also expressed to residents that it "**would be for parking**" – a miscommunication again! So, a park has been built for residents to enjoy but I have noticed that the area is already becoming a dumping ground for rubbish as no waste bins have been provided, this in turn increases the risk of vermin and pests!

Emma White, ■ Adonia.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Hannah Galpin, ■ Adonia, SO19 9XE.** Please note this statement corresponds to application **22/00588/REM** however accounts for **22/01331/DIS**.

Re. planning application **22/00588/REM** and the amended parking plan **22/01331/DIS** for Phase 6 of Centenary Quay; the plan proposes 218 car parking spaces, including 29 allocated to Phase 5 (**17/02514/REM**). Phase 5 comprises 87 apartments in buildings named Adonia and Arcadia.

Specific residents of Adonia and Arcadia (shared ownership residents in 'affordable' units, including myself) have been forced to park in multi-storey car parking at the northern end of the development (Keel Road) since Phase 5 completed. This is over 5 minutes of walking door to door. The other residents in Adonia and Arcadia, 'private' owners (who purchased their apartments from Crest) have however had their parking accommodated with a mix of on-road parking outside the apartments and underground parking nearby (Denyer Walk, much closer than Keel Road).

The shared-owner residents have been repeatedly seeking a concrete update for 18 months and yet have received no reply from Crest NOR clarification as to the planned location of our permanent parking; this planning application has therefore added to residents confusion and concern. As noted in the planning statement for **22/00588/REM**, attendees to a public viewing event on Tuesday 22 February sought clarification upon seeing the plans as to the permanent provision for Phase 5 residents parking.

It would appear that ground located behind and to the side of Adonia (currently being used as a compound for materials or is bare ground) was previously approved for 'temporary' parking for Phase 5, with a provision of 68 spaces. Phase 5 residents even have diagrams showing this parking in their lease documents. However, this area remains a building site and was never converted to temporary parking.

**In profound frustration, we again raise the question of our permanent parking. Please can it be demonstrated clearly and concretely by the applicant, how the 29 spaces are being allocated to Phase 5 residents, when it appears to be not nearly enough in quantity to meet the need.** How are the shared ownership residents being accounted for? If they are not being accounted for, how would such a gross oversight be permitted by planning. The implications are far reaching for residents who are then committed permanently to a 5+ minute walk to their parking (this would confirm that false promises were made to residents previously and shared ownership residents will undoubtedly and disproportionately face unfair disadvantage at the time of trying to re-sell their properties).

This page is intentionally left blank