

---

SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL  
PLANNING AND RIGHTS OF WAY PANEL  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 NOVEMBER 2012

---

Present: Councillors Mrs Blatchford (Chair), Claisse, Cunio (Except Minute 82), L Harris, Lloyd (Except Minutes 78-82), Shields and Smith

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

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 October be approved and signed as a correct record.

74. **30 ST ANNE'S ROAD, WOOLSTON /12/01411/FUL**

The Panel considered the report of the Planning and Development Manager recommending refusal 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)

A change of use from a residential care home (use class C2) to a hotel with ancillary manager's accommodation and parking (use class C1).

Mr Millar (Applicant), Mr Dean (objecting) (Local Resident) and Councillor Payne (objecting) (Ward Councillor) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported that two additional objections had been received making the total number of 160 objections. The presenting officer reported two amendments to the reason for refusal to include the "Road" in the sentence beginning "The introduction of this use .... St. Anne's **Road** Conservation Area" and to include " and S.17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998" in the last sentence. The presenting officer stated that the words in Recommendation (ii) "and revert the building back to the authorised use" be deleted.

**RESOLVED**

- i) To **refuse** the planning application 12/01411/FUL for the reasons set out in this report; and
- ii) To Serve a Stop Notice and Planning Enforcement Notice to cease the use.

Reason for Refusal

Amendment

"..... whilst failing to either *preserve or enhance* the established character of the St. Anne's **Road** Conservation Area... For this reason the planning application has been assessed as contrary to saved policies SDP1(i) (iii), SDP7 (i) (v), SDP10 (iii), SDP16(iii), HE1(i) as supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (2012 – particularly paragraph 69) **and S.17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.**"

75. **84-88 MILLBROOK ROAD EAST / 12/00862/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. Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of 6 part two, part three-storey houses (comprising 5 x four bed and 1 x three bedroom) and erection of a three-storey block of 8 x 2-bed flats.

Mr Oldfield (Agent), Mr Pritchard, Mr Jackson, Mr Wilkins (objecting) (Local Residents) Ms Hiscock (objecting) (Local Resident on behalf of local Neighbourhood Watch scheme) and Councillor Moulton (objecting) (Ward Councillor) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported 6 additional letters of objection had been received. The presenting officer also reported an amendment to condition 4 and amendment to clause (vi) to the S106 Agreement, set out below:

4 “..... (g) details of how noise emanating from the site during construction will be mitigated and, **(h) details of temporary fencing during the construction process to secure the neighbouring site.** .....

(vi) An obligation precluding future residents of the flats **and houses** receiving car parking permits for the adjoining Controlled Parking Zones.

The presenting officer also reported the deletion of Recommendation 2 in the report and the amendment of Recommendation 3 in the report to delete the penultimate paragraph.

**RESOLVED** to **refuse** planning permission for the reasons set out below.

Reasons for Refusal

Overdevelopment

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site by reason of the following:

(i) Notwithstanding the council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Parking Standards, which are expressed as maximum quantum of parking that can be proposed to serve new development, the council considers that the provision of 11 parking spaces would be inadequate to help meet the travel demands of occupiers of the new development. This would harm the amenity of adjoining residents by exacerbating on-street parking difficulties, owing to overspill parking being generated by the new flats, which cannot be accommodated on site.

(ii) Two of the proposed houses and the proposed block of flats would not be served by sufficient private and useable external amenity space which is fit for purpose. Having regard to the size of the units which are capable of accommodating families with children and the remoteness of the site to public open space, the development is therefore considered to provide a poor residential environment for future occupants.

The development would therefore provide contrary to policies CS5 (1) and CS13 (4) (6) (7) (11) of the City of Southampton Local Development Framework Core Strategy Document (January 2010) and saved policies SDP1 (i), SDP7 (iv) and H7 (ix) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006), as supported by the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006 (with specific reference to paras 2.3.14 and 4.4.1 to 4.4.4).

#### 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) In the absence of a mechanism for preventing future residents of the development from receiving car parking permits for adjoining Controlled Parking Zones, the proposal is likely to result in overspill car parking which would represent harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents, contrary to saved policy SDP1 of the Local Plan Review 2006.

RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillor Claisse, Cunio, Harris, Lloyd, Shields and Smith

AGAINST: Councillor Mrs Blatchford

76. **72 WESTWOOD ROAD / 12/01286/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).

Extensions to the side and rear, conversion of the existing building into 10 flats (3 x studio, 3 x one bedroom, 3 x two bedroom and 1 x three bedroom) with associated facilities and erection of a new four bedroom house at the side with associated parking.

Mr McDermott (Agent) was present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported an additional letter had been received from residents of 74 Westwood Road giving comments on the application. An additional condition was also reported.

**RESOLVED**

- i) to delegate to the Planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the report and subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure the terms set out in the report;
- ii) in the event that the legal agreement is not completed within two months of the Panel meeting the Planning and Development Manager be authorised to refuse permission on the ground of failure to secure the provisions of the Section 106 Legal Agreement;
- iii) that the Planning and Development Manager be given delegated powers to vary relevant parts of the Section 106 agreement and to remove, vary or add conditions as necessary.

Additional Condition

18 APPROVAL CONDITION - Amenity space for the house (Performance Condition)

The rear garden for the new house as shown on the approved plans shall be provided and enclosed with boundary fencing as approved before the house is first occupied and retained thereafter for the sole use of occupiers of the house.

Reason:

To ensure adequate private amenity space is provided for this family sized house in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS16.

Amenity space for house and fence to be in place before occupation and retained thereafter.

RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillors Mrs Blatchford, Cunio, Lloyd and Shields

AGAINST: Councillor Claisse

ABSTAINED: Councillors Harris and Smith

77. **100-102 HIGH ROAD / 12/01217/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. Four storey building to form student accommodation (9 self-contained studio flats) with ground floor commercial floorspace and associated amenity space, refuse and cycle storage. Outline application seeking approval for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale with Landscaping reserved. Car free scheme amended following validation.

Mr McDermott (Agent), Mr Hopgood (objecting) (Local Resident), Councillors Mintoff and Turner (objecting) (Ward Councillors) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported three additional objections had been received. The presenting officer also reported an additional S106 clause.

**RESOLVED**

- i) to delegate to the Planning & Development Manager to grant conditional approval subject to the conditions in the report and subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure the terms set out in the report and the additional S106 clause set out below;
- ii) that the Planning and Development Manager be given delegated powers to vary relevant parts of the Section 106 agreement (including following ongoing discussion and/or the receipt of an independently verified viability assessment) and to remove, vary or add conditions as necessary.

**Additional S106 clause**

- ix. The development signs up to the national best practice code for student accommodation (not managed and controlled by educational establishments) or equivalent best practice Southampton Accreditation Scheme for Student Housing (SASSH).

**RECORDED VOTE**

FOR: Councillors Mrs Blatchford, Lloyd and Shields  
AGAINST: Councillors Cunio and Harris  
ABSTAINED: Councillors Claisse and Smith

78. **158-168A PORTSWOOD ROAD , SO17 2NJ / 12/01201/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).

Part three/part four storey extension (following part demolition of existing building) to form student accommodation (19 self-contained studios and cluster flats comprising 62 study bedrooms) managed as a hall of residence above and to the rear of retained ground floor commercial units with associated amenity space, parking and other facilities and vehicular access from Westridge Road. (Outline application seeking approval for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale with Landscaping reserved) (amended with revised design and internal layout, removal of rear pedestrian entrance and introduction of manager's flat).

Mr McDermott (Agent), Dr Buckle, Mrs Jameson (objecting) (Portswood Residents Garden Association), Mr Gillen (objecting) (Highfield Residents Association), Councillors Vinson and Norris (objecting) (Ward Councillors) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer suggested amendments to conditions 11 and 20 and two additional conditions:

- Amend condition 11 to also require details of parking, material storage, and construction method during construction to ensure that the access to the rear of the shop was not impeded and servicing could take place.
- Amend condition 20 to ensure 24 hour occupation of the manager's office
- Additional condition to require details to show how the development will not prevent obstruction to the footway and highway during construction, particularly with details of construction cranes and parking
- Additional condition to require details of the refuse store

**RESOLVED** to **refuse** planning permission for the reasons set out below:

#### Reasons for refusal

##### Overdevelopment / Over-intensive use

The proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site by reason of its scale, bulk and massing. Moreover the amount of development sought represents an over-intensive use of the site creating a crowded and poor living environment and a level of general activity that would be detrimental to the residential amenities of nearby residents. The development is therefore contrary to policies SDP1(i), SDP7 (iii) (iv), SDP9 (i) (v) and H2 (iii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and policies CS3, CS5(1) and CS13(1) (10) (11) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2010) as supported by the Residential Design Guide SPG.

##### 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) Site specific transport works for highway improvements in the vicinity of the site in accordance with polices 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.

b) 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.

c) A financial contribution towards the provision and maintenance of public open space (including sports pitches) 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;

d) In lieu of an affordable housing contribution an undertaking by the developer that only students in full time education will be permitted to occupy the flats;

e) The submission and implementation of a Student Drop Off/Collection Management Plan committing to an ongoing review of the site;

f) A Site Waste Management Plan;

g) Submission and implementation within a specified timescale of a Travel Plan;

h) No student, with the exception of registered disabled drivers, shall be entitled to obtain parking permits to the Council's Controlled Parking Zones;

i) The securing of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for implementation of localised parking permit scheme in the streets adjoining Westridge Road, subject to positive outcome from consultation with local residents;

j) Submission of a highway condition survey to ensure any damage to the adjacent highway network attributable to the build process is repaired by the developer;

k) The development signs up to the national best practise code for student accommodation (not managed and controlled by educational establishments) or equivalent best practise (SASSH).

#### RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillors Mrs Blatchford, Claisse, Cunio, Harris and Shields  
ABSTAINED: Councillor Smith

#### 79. **EAST STREET SHOPPING CENTRE AND ADJOINING LAND / 12/01355/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 Shopping Centre and car park as a new foodstore (5,534 square metres gross floorspace) with car parking on upper levels, including works of demolition, retention of Capital House and the Royal Oak Public House; new vehicular access arrangements, including construction of a new roundabout on Evans Street, highway and public realm improvements, including creation of a new pedestrian link between East Street and Evans Street, landscaping and associated works (affects an existing right of way).

Mr Winter, Mr Stocker (Agents), Mr Mills (Consultant), Mr Button (supporting) (Central Hall), Mr Batt (objecting) (Local Trader) and Mr Hendry (objecting) (ABP) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

The presenting officer reported the following updates:

- Letters of objection received from Cllr Tucker, ABP and Future of Southampton Group
- 2 letters of support received
- that recommendation 3 be deleted;
- CS9 be included as an additional reason for granting permission
- Refuse Management Plan to be added to the S106 as a Head of Term;
- That a number of conditions be amended

### **RESOLVED**

- i) to delegate to the Planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission subject to the conditions in the report, the amended conditions set out below, the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure the terms set out in the report and the additional S106 Head of Term;
- ii) in the event that the legal agreement is not completed within two months of the Panel meeting the Planning and Development Manager be authorised to refuse permission on the ground of failure to secure the provisions of the Section 106 Legal Agreement;
- iii) that the Planning and Development Manager be given delegated powers to vary relevant parts of the Section 106 agreement and to remove, vary or add conditions as necessary.

#### Additional S106 Head of Term

(xii) Submission and implementation of a refuse management plan.

#### Additional Reason for Granting Permission

CS9

#### Amended conditions

#### 12. APPROVAL CONDITION - Piling [Pre-Commencement Condition]

Prior to the commencement of development approved by this planning permission, **apart from demolition of the existing buildings**, (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), .....

#### 13. APPROVAL CONDITION - Archaeological investigation [Pre-Commencement Condition]



No development shall take place within the site, **apart from demolition of the existing buildings down to ground floor slab level**, until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work .....

15. APPROVAL CONDITION - Archaeological damage-assessment [Pre-Commencement Condition]

No development shall take place within the site, **apart from demolition of the existing buildings down to ground floor slab level**, until the type and dimensions of all proposed groundworks (including details of foundations, ground beams, all services etc) have been submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.....

18. APPROVAL CONDITION - Storage / Removal of Refuse Material [Pre-Occupation Condition]

**Before the building is first open to the public** full details of facilities to be provided for the storage and removal of refuse from the premises together with the provision of suitable bins .....

19. APPROVAL CONDITION - Layout of Car Parking/Servicing (Pre-Occupation Condition)

The whole of the car parking, cycle storage and servicing facilities **for the retail use hereby approved** shown on the approved plans....

21. APPROVAL CONDITION - Cycle and changing facilities (Pre-Occupation Condition)

The retail use hereby approved shall not be **first open to the public** until cycle storage, changing, washing and shower facilities for members of staff have been provided in accordance with details.....

22. APPROVAL CONDITION - Security measures (Pre-Occupation Condition)

Before the use hereby approved **opens to the public**, details of a CCTV system and other security measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority .....

23. APPROVAL CONDITION - Details of lighting (Pre-Commencement Condition)

**The retail use shall not be open to the public** until details of external lighting to the buildings and external areas of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.....

24. APPROVAL CONDITION - Public realm details (Pre-Occupation Condition)

The development hereby approved shall not be **open to the public** until details of the treatment to the public realm surrounding the buildings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.....

28. APPROVAL CONDITION - Sustainability statement implementation [Pre-Occupation Condition]

**Prior to the retail use opening to the public** the sustainability measures as detailed in the application documents shall be implemented unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.....

30. APPROVAL CONDITION - BREEAM Standards (commercial development) [Pre-Occupation Condition]

Written documentary evidence demonstrating that the development has achieved at minimum a rating of 'Very Good' against the BREEAM standard shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and verified in writing prior to **the retail use first opening to the public** unless an otherwise agreed timeframe is agreed in writing by the LPA.....

80. **GRACECHURCH HOUSE, 25-35 CASTLE WAY /12/01171/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).

Alterations and extensions involving raising the height of the building and change of use from offices into a 95 room hotel (resubmission of application 11/01844/FUL).

The presenting officer reported two additional S106 Heads of Term.

**RESOLVED**

- i) to delegate to the Planning and Development Manager to **grant** planning permission subject to the conditions in the report, the S106 terms set out in the report, the additional S106 Head of Term set out below, and to be able to refuse the application if the legal agreement is not signed within two months;
- ii) that the Planning and Development Manager be given delegated powers to vary relevant parts of the S106 agreement and to vary, delete or add conditions as necessary.

**Additional S106 Heads of Term**

(vi) Submission and implementation within a specified timescale of a Travel Plan, in accordance with Policies CS18, CS19 & 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); and,

(vii) A financial contribution towards public realm improvements within the city centre, as part of the North/South Spine Strategy, in accordance with Policies CS13 & 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).

81. **7 GREENBANK CRESCENT / 12/01435/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 C3 dwelling house to 9 bed sui generis house of multiple occupation (HMO) with associated parking

Mr McDermott (Agent), Ms Hardwick and Mr Bartlett (objecting) (Local Residents) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

**RESOLVED** to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below:

Reasons for refusal

Unacceptable Intensification of use

The change of use of the property from a C3 family dwelling to a large HMO (Sui Generis use), taking into account the context and character of the area, will result in an intensification in the use of the property, which by reason of the additional general activity, refuse generation, noise and disturbance would be to the detriment of the amenity of nearby residents, and is out of character with the context of the local neighbourhood. Furthermore, the provision of 1 parking space (which is less than the maximum standard set out in the Council's adopted Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document) would be inadequate to help meet the travel demands of occupiers of the new development. Having regard to the site's low accessibility to public transport, the proposal is likely to result in overspill car parking on the surrounding streets which would appear out of keeping with the suburban nature of the surrounding area and result in noise and disturbance. As such the proposal represents an over-intensive use of the site and is therefore contrary Policies SDP1 (i), SDP7 (v) and H4 (i) & (ii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review 2006; and CS16 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) and as supported by section 6.7 of the Council's adopted Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (March 2012).

RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillors Mrs Blatchford, Claisse, Cunio, Harris and Smith

AGAINST: Councillor Shields

82. **7 GREENBANK CRESCENT / 12/01455/OUT**

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 4x4 bed semi detached houses with associated parking and cycle/refuse storage, following demolition of existing building (outline application seeking approval for access, appearance, layout and scale)

Mr McDermott (Agent), Ms Hardwick and Mr Bartlett (objecting) (Local Residents) were present and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the meeting.

**RESOLVED** to **refuse** planning permission for the reasons set out below:

Reasons for refusal

Design & Character

The proposed redevelopment of 7 Greenbank Crescent with four dwellings, in the manner proposed, is considered to be a discordant form of development that would harm the established pattern of development that prevails within the area. The proposals, by reasons of their design, siting, spatial characteristics and building-to-plot relationships (between themselves and their neighbours) and their subsequent residential density would exhibit a characteristic that significantly differs from the prevailing pattern of development. Furthermore, the exclusion of garden land from the Government's definition of previously developed land (as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2011)), and the subsequent shift in emphasis for housing delivery, makes the principle of the proposed development on this mature garden harder to justify. Taken together, these factors are considered to be symptomatic of an overdevelopment of the site which would harm the character of the area. As such, the development would prove contrary to the provisions of policies CS4 and CS13 (1) (11) of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy (January 2010) as supported by "saved" policies SDP7 and SDP9 (i) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and the guidance as set out in the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (September 2006) (namely, sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.7.7, 3.7.8, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10.2 and 3.11.3).

RECORDED VOTE

FOR: Councillors Mrs Blatchford, Claisse, Harris and Smith

ABSTAINED: Councillor Shields

83. **NAMING OF STREET A FORMER HENDY FORD SITE, 360-364 SHIRLEY ROAD**

The Panel considered the report of the Senior Manager: Planning, Sustainability and Transport seeking approval of the street name 'Selby Place' for the new housing development under construction on the former Hendy Ford site, Shirley Road. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

**RESOLVED** that the name 'Selby Place' as the name for the new housing development under construction on the former Hendy Ford site, Shirley Road be approved.