

# Planning and Rights of Way Panel

Tuesday, 21st September, 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

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND PRESENTATIONS

**5 PLANNING APPLICATION - 20/00138/FUL -QUAY 2000** (Pages 1 - 4)

Statements received

**7 PLANNING APPLICATION - 21/01047/FUL - 20 HOWARD ROAD** (Pages 5 - 6)

Statement received

Monday, 13 September 2021

Service Director, Legal & Governance

# Agenda Item 5

21<sup>st</sup> September 2021

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find below my statement to be read at the planning meeting later today.

REF: 20/00138/FUL Quay 2000 Horseshoe Bridge

I speak on behalf of a number of local residents in objecting to the further reduction in opening hours of the walkway. We object to the proposed changes on the following grounds:

Firstly, the reduction in hours essentially blocks access to the walkway during winter for many who work standard office hours. Those who use the walkway on their commute to and from work will no longer be able to do so. Access to the waterfront is of positive benefit to mental health – I often walk round there to help clear my head – and the additional restrictions will severely limit access to many particularly during the winter months.

Secondly, the path is designated as a permissive route which was supposed to be open at all times “in perpetuity”. Due to antisocial behavior, the current opening hours were agreed. Many local residents were already unhappy with this first reduction in hours, however given the problems in the area the current opening times seem a reasonable compromise. The Hampshire Chronicle today reports that Police say that the problems have largely been addressed by the current opening hours, and there is therefore no justification for reducing the hours still further. Furthermore closure of the walkway simply displaces the problem elsewhere also to the detriment of local residents.

Finally, imposing further limitations on access to the walkway sets a dangerous precedent that could easily lead to closure of the walkway altogether for the general public. Ultimately, local residents who enjoy using the walkway are suffering because of what is a public disorder and policing problem. Whilst we appreciate that Quay 2000 residents wish to feel safe in their homes – an outcome which appears to have been achieved by the current opening hours – this cannot be at the expense of access to the waterside for the many people who make use of this walkway for commuting and leisure, nor to the detriment of other nearby areas when the problem is simply displaced.

Kind regards,

Sarah Brightwell

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

## Appendix 2

I will not be attending the Panel but ask for the following statement on behalf of Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society to be submitted to the Panel.

Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society, SCAPPS, is disappointed it has to submit this statement in support of the recommendation in the report -- disappointed that the applicant has not accepted the concession offered by the Panel in July 2019.

SCAPPS objected to the 2019 application to remove the obligation in the section 106 Agreement requiring public access to the waterfront walkway at all times. SCAPPS did so because it supports the City Council's policy that when development takes place on the waterfront, public access should be secured. There are far too few opportunities for Southampton residents to gain access to the waterfront; every opportunity is precious, and those who know this Quay2000 site will know the outstanding and attractive views from the walkway up & down the Itchen.

SCAPPS reluctantly acknowledges the reasons for the concession offered by the Panel in July 2019. 'Reluctantly' because anti-social behaviour is unfortunately an occasional problem in some public open spaces. Only a tiny minority of users of parks, paths and open spaces cause that disruptive activity. To withdraw public access is an extreme measure to be considered only when all other measures have failed. It penalises the majority who, with no detrimental impact on other users or nearby residents, enjoy using that space.

The applicant has installed gates and is prepared to enter into a management agreement specifying when and how they would be locked and unlocked. The dispute is confined to hours of closure. SCAPPS asks the Panel to remain firm in sticking to the hours specified in the July 2019 decision. SCAPPS was unaware until seeing the report of the applicant's amendment to the proposed hours of closure. SCAPPS remains of the view that closure at 8pm in summer and 4pm in winter is too early when for much of the season daylight extends beyond those hours. SCAPPS supports the Panel's proposal of opening at 7am in the morning and opposes the applicant's request the gates remain locked and the waterfront walkway closed until 8am.

SCAPPS therefore asks the Panel to accept the recommendation in this report.

Graham Linecar  
Secretary SCAPPS

This page is intentionally left blank

## Statement from Mr Robert True,

I would like this additional statement to be added to my original planning objection concerning 20 Howard Road (Application 21/01047/FUL).

I am deeply concerned that this planning application has not already been rejected for the reasons clearly outlined in my previous objection. The issues that I previously raised can not simply be brushed aside and ignored; they must be acted upon.

Of particular concern is the careless manner in which serious traffic and parking issues have evidently been dismissed. The panel must, therefore, be made aware of the important details that have been deliberately ignored.

Howard Road is an extremely busy road, with ever-increasing amounts of traffic, that now includes articulated lorries, buses, and coaches. The volume of traffic is always increasing and never decreasing; and the council can not claim ignorance of this in light of the expansion of St. Mark's School. The road is extremely dangerous for pedestrians and local residents trying to enter and exit their properties by car. The traffic does not – repeat **does not** – give way to those trying to enter and exit their properties. This is a huge hazard that has been completely ignored and must not be ignored by the panel, especially considering the vast number of school children using the road to access multiple nearby schools at St. Mark's, Bannister, Springhill, St. Anne's and King Edward's. If offices are permitted to exist at 20 Howard Road, this will mean a grossly increased risk to pedestrians and passing vehicles posed by a huge number of vehicles turning into 20 Howard Road and exiting 20 Howard Road at all times of the day, seven days a week.

Compounding the above issue is the fact that there is a children's nursery virtually opposite 20 Howard Road, that already causes the same dangerous traffic issues at certain times in the morning and mid-to-late afternoon, for the very same reasons as listed above. There has been a serious accident immediately outside the nursery gate caused by someone exiting the nursery not paying attention to an oncoming motorcyclist. Granting permission to this application will mean that the exact same traffic issues and hazards are present on **both** sides of the road in the **exact same location** of the street. I have no doubt that there will be traffic accidents, injuries, and fatalities in this area of the street if this application is approved. Please note that if there are any such future incidents, I will hold the applicants, the members of the panel, and the council, legally responsible and I will bring the matter to the attention of the media and the Cabinet Office. I strongly suggest that you listen to those of us who know best about the matter, considering our 30 years' experience living on the street.

Furthermore, there is already an issue with non-residents parking on the road and blocking our driveways. This problem has existed for many years and will almost certainly be made far worse if offices are allowed to exist at 20 Howard Road. The applicants need to be made aware that neighbours will report them for **every vehicle** that parks across our properties, blocks our driveways, or causes us noise or disturbance in any way. We will be keeping written, photographic, and video evidence of every instance, should this application be approved.

As yet another matter to raise, vehicles, including delivery vans, regularly use the driveways of properties in the immediate area to turn around, often when high levels of traffic are present to avoid waiting in the queue. I have observed this happening at 20 Howard Road, along with 19 (the children's nursery) 21, 22, and my property at 24 Howard Road. Visitors to offices at 20 Howard Road are highly likely to do exactly the same after having parked on the road.

The sheer level of disrespect local residents have been shown by the applicants in this case is despicable. Once again, I stress that this application must be rejected and the voice of local people must be heard.

This page is intentionally left blank