

# Planning and Rights of Way Panel

Tuesday, 24th January, 2023  
at 4.00 pm

## **PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING**

Conference Room 3 and 4 - Civic Centre

This meeting is open to the public

### **Members**

Councillor Coombs (Chair)  
Councillor Savage (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Blatchford  
Councillor Magee  
Councillor J Payne  
Councillor Prior  
Councillor Windle  
Councillor Vaughan

### **Contacts**

maria.mckay@southampton.gov.uk  
023 8083 3899 / 07385 399156

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND PRESENTATIONS

**5 PLANNING APPLICATION-22/01397/FUL 309-311 SHIRLEY ROAD, SOUTHAMPTON** (Pages 1 - 6)

Public Question and Statements

**6 22/01188/FUL 6 CROFTON CLOSE** (Pages 7 - 10)

Public Statements

Monday, 16 January 2023

Service Director, Legal and Business  
Services

# Agenda Item 5

## **Planning Meeting regarding application 22/01397/FUL**

One of my main concerns are regarding this development is parking. I live on Newlands Aveune and it is already very difficult to park on this street, there are already a number of local businesses which use this road to park various work vans/cars, namely Harraps, Gas Works, Dominoes and the Firework Factory. Also there are regularly cars parked on the pavements, on double yellow lines and blocking driveways.

This is only going to get worse if this planning goes ahead, as I understand it there will be 25 parking spaces for a congregation of about 400, which will inevitably increase as this is their reason for moving premises. So where are these people going to park?

There is also going to be an increase in the volume of traffic in the area, Shirley High Street is already a very busy road and this is a difficult junction to cross if you are going against the flow of traffic.

Many Thanks

Louise Meyrick

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

## Appendix 3

**From:** Tracey Beckerleg <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 16 January 2023 09:32  
**To:** Democratic Services <[Democratic.Services@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:Democratic.Services@southampton.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** 22/01397/FUL

To whom it may concern

I cannot attend the meeting but I would like to submit a statement.

I am really excited about the prospect of the Bingo Hall being used as a church. This will bring many positives to Shirley, for looking at the church website it would seem that they have many groups and opportunities for the people of Shirley. I really do hope they will keep the external aspect of the Bingo Hall, it is a beautiful building and would be good to see that maintained, as the Victory church in Portswood has done.

My only concern as a close resident is the parking aspect.

Janson Road and the surrounding roads are already very difficult to park in as a resident. Many people use the road to park in if they work in the local shops. Cruise passengers leave their cars here for weeks at a time, and if they are overhanging your drive that can mean many days of difficulty getting in and out of it.

We have multiple occupancy housing at the end of our road and they all park on the pavement which makes it hard if you have a wheelchair or a buggy. And everyone parks on the double yellows at the end of the road, and nobody stops them.

The church opening times are going to be long and not just at weekends but everyday and every evening. And all I can see is how this will only create parking problems for those of us who live in the surrounding roads. There will only be 23 dedicated parking spaces on the plans. The church says it has a membership of 400. Yes there is a bus route, but who with a car is going to use a bus when they can conveniently get themselves there using this means and if they are staying late in the evening, possibly 11.00pm.

And so then where will 400 people park? In the adjoining roads I would imagine, which will just make it impossible for anyone who actually lives in these roads, and I have already stated that parking is awful in particularly our road.

The roads are not safe, people drive down them at speeds that are ridiculous, buses and lorries come down here and I think this will cause an accident that is just waiting to happen.

The parking really does need to be considered over everything else, and a satisfactory guaranteed answer needs to be given, not just we have a minibus, and there is a bus route. The church needs to be able to guarantee that their presence will not cause anymore disruption to residents in the adjoining roads, and they need to be held accountable for this, if these plans are passed.

Kind Regards  
Tracey Beckerleg

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

Appendix 4

24 January 2023

Development Management

Southampton City Council

Civic Centre

SOUTHAMPTON SO14 7LS

Dear Sir

Application No: 22/01397/FUL – Old Shirley Bingo Hall, High Street, Shirley

Conversion from Bingo Hall (Sui Generis) to Church class F1

The Janson Road Residents' Group wish to make the following comments to the Planning and Rights of Way Panel at its meeting on the 24 January 2023 regarding the proposed conversion of the Bingo Hall to a Church:

Concerns have been expressed by local residents regarding

- i) Car parking - in view of a possible congregation of some 400 people. From the comments that have been lodged on the web site it would appear that members associated with the Church come from an area encompassing Alresford, Stockbridge, Lyminster, Hedge End at least - apart from Southampton. These are distances that would not be readily or easily undertaken by public transport. The present building only contains 25 parking spaces. Janson Road is already extremely congested and difficult for residents to park their vehicles. Many people use the road to park in if they work in local shops/businesses or are customers. Cruise passengers leave their cars in the road for weeks at a time.
- ii) We have multi occupancy at the High Street end of Janson Road and the occupants park their cars on the pavement making it difficult for wheelchair and buggy users. Cars are also parked on the double yellow lines in this vicinity.
- iii) Local residents would also like clarification of what activities will be taking place on the premises between the proposed hours of operation ie between 0900-2300 for 7 days a week with regard to possible noise and disturbance particularly late in the evening.
- iv) Any approval for this proposed change of use must contain clarification of the proposed car parking arrangements and use of the premises which can be enforced by the Council.

Louise Castelli

Chair

Janson Road Residents' Group

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 6

22/01188/FUL 6 Crofton Close SO17 1XB

Dear Panel

We live at ■ Crofton Close and are one of the 14 objectors.

We were closely involved with each planning application and Appeal at No 5 in the 12 year period from 2006 - 2018, which is next door to No 6.

We could not understand why the four Appeal Inspectors' Decisions on No 5 had not been taken fully into account in the Case Officer's recommendation, so we emailed Stephen Harrison, Service Manager Development Management last week asking why this was so. He sent us a comprehensive response which helped us to understand the thinking behind the recommendation

We would however still like the panel to consider the following;

The findings and decisions taken by each of the four separate Planning Inspectors on No 5 over the 10 year period 2007 – 2017 were as per our objection, i.e. :

*"more bedrooms can accommodate more adults ..... which results in more cars ..... which leads to more parking problems ..... to the detriment of the character and amenity of the estate."*

Also, two Planning Inspectors gave as one of their reasons for refusal that it would set a precedent.

*Nb. Only one part of just one of the four Appeals on No 5 referred to its use as an illegal HMO.*

The Case Officer's report for No 6 refers to just one difference between No 5 and No 6, i.e. in 6.5.2 re turning space.

**Why is this one difference overriding all the other Appeal findings and decisions by four separate Planning Inspectors on No 5 in 2007, 2008, 2014 & 2017?**

We are not only very disappointed by the recommendation to approve, but extremely concerned that this development will set a precedent for the rest of our estate as foreseen by two Planning Inspectors.

We hope that there will be enough time for you to discuss fully the points we have made before deciding on this case.

Thank you.

Peter & Nadine Johnson

This page is intentionally left blank

----- Original Message -----

From:

To: [Democratic.services@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:Democratic.services@southampton.gov.uk)

Sent: Monday, 23 Jan, 2023 At 15:41

Subject: SUBMISSIONS RE APPLICATION NUMBER 22/01188/FUL 6 CROFTON CLOSE SOUTHAMPTON COMMITTEE HEARING TUESDAY 24 JANUARY 2023

To The Planning Committee

I refer to my previous objection to this Application. I see this is recommended for Conditional Approval. I wish to make further observations on matters referred to in the Officer's Report. These mainly relate to parking – and the impact that this development would have on the character and amenity of Crofton Close – issues highlighted by Planning Inspectors on appeals relating to the neighbouring property - 5 Crofton Close.

The proposal here would create a house with 6 bedrooms – 5 of them doubles, with 3 ensembles, lending itself to a large number of adult occupants (up to 11 - even if within the same family) and a correspondingly large number of cars (5 or 6?). This raises real issues regarding parking and amenity.

Number of on-site spaces. The Report states that there will be 4 spaces available – the garage plus 3 spaces on the driveway. However, the garage is behind the end parking space on the driveway. It cannot realistically be expected that any of the occupiers will want to use the garage as their “day to day” parking space – they would run the risk of being blocked in by other occupiers parking on the drive. The realistic useable everyday spaces would be limited to the 3 spaces, not 4 (the 3 spaces on the drive).

Additional cars will therefore have to park elsewhere. The Report refers to the property complying with the minimum parking standard of 3 parking spaces. However that standard is presumably aimed at reducing pressure on other on-street parking resources **where other on-street parking is in fact available**. In other words, it is addressing a scenario where other on-street parking IS available nearby (but the aim of the policy is to limit use of such other **available** parking). Here the position is very different. In Crofton Close there is **no** other on-street parking available. Therefore additional cars from number 6 would have to park either on the narrow road (likely causing an obstruction) or, far more likely, on the pavement. The Inspector in the Appeal Decision for no 5 (the neighbouring property) said (of **this section** of estate Road) in paragraph 11 of his Decision letter dated 14 November 2017, *“Moreover, given the nature of the layout and the fairly narrow estate road there is an unacceptable likelihood of the displaced vehicle being parked on the pavement. Later in the same paragraph the Inspector says “Furthermore it seems to me that additional on-street parking would result in a sense of visual clutter in the streetscene, detracting from the attractive open character.”* Those comments apply with equal force to this application.

Finally there is the issue of precedent – highlighted by each of the Planning Inspectors on previous appeals – and in particular its adverse impact on parking. In paragraph 17 of the same Decision Letter the Inspector concluded that *“Although unacceptable anyway, in itself, for the reasons given, I share the concern of local residents with regard to precedent. Allowing the appeal may well result in significant future pressure from other occupants to carry out similar development **without making adequate car parking provision** [emphasis added]. This would result in further harmful effects.*

Without intending any disrespect, having carefully read the Report to this Committee I do not consider that it took account of the above issues (contrary to the approach of previous Planning Inspectors) and I urge this Panel to refuse the Application.

Thank you for your time.

M Howarth ( Crofton Close)