

SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE DECISION MAKING

RECORD OF THE DECISION MAKING HELD ON 21 OCTOBER 2014

Present:

Councillor Letts	Leader of the Council
Councillor Barnes-Andrews	Cabinet Member for Resources and Leisure
Councillor Jeffery	Cabinet Member for Education and Change
Councillor Chaloner	Cabinet Member for Children's Safeguarding
Councillor Kaur	Cabinet Member for Communities
Councillor Rayment	Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Councillor Shields	Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care
Councillor Payne	Cabinet Member for Housing and Sustainability

28. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS TO CABINET MEMBERS

The following questions were submitted:-

1. Traffic Study – Grove Road/Firgrove Road

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment – Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

Will the Cabinet ask officers to carry out a detailed traffic study for the area of Freemantle around Grove Road and Firgrove Road? A considerable number of residents have over many years asked that Firgrove Road be made a one way. A great deal of concern is being expressed in the ward about the impact of the new mosque at the corner of Firgrove Road and Grove road. As well as parking there are concerns about visibility for drivers. Issues have been raised with officers who have responded by saying that any proper analysis and potential changes would require a full traffic study to be carried out.

Answer

We have previously been asked to investigate issues with the level of commercial vehicle traffic and traffic speeds in Firgrove Road. From the sample traffic count and observations it was not evident that there was a problem with commercial traffic in this area.

Another concern was that traffic uses Firgrove Road as short-cut to avoid the traffic signals at the junction of Shirley Road/Howard Road. The sample traffic count shows a higher traffic flow north-westbound, though to invest in a traffic study and prospective measures, we would need some evidence of significant road safety or other issue that would require Firgrove Road to be prioritised for funding.

To help focus the available funding for road safety measures we map all injury accidents across the city and where there are clusters of accidents these will then be reviewed to assess whether are related underlying causes that could be addressed through highway improvements or regulation. Localities are ranked on a

cost-benefit ratio resulting in a number of possible schemes for funding as part of the Annual Safety Review. Firgrove Road would currently not merit consideration under this process, given the low level of recorded injury accidents relative to other sites in the city.

If Firgrove Road was made one way we could expect the following impacts:

- * Reduced traffic levels (by removing one flow of traffic, though there may be some increase in the direction of the permitted flow due to reduced journey times).

- * An increase in traffic speeds (by increasing the available carriageway in direction of permitted flow) and therefore a possible increase in the number and severity of traffic accidents.

- * Increased traffic on other road(s)

- * A small increase in journey times to access adjoining roads

- * Little or no impact on parking as the road is too narrow for parking on both sides and already saturated.

Whilst an extensive traffic study would be required as part of designing any traffic management scheme in Freemantle, this would need to be funded. On the current evidence and for the reasons outlined above, it is difficult to argue that a traffic study in Firgrove Road would merit such funding when compared to other sites across the City.

2. South Stoneham Cemetery

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment – Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

In September it was reported that a due to an administrative error a family plot was unprepared for a burial at South Stoneham Cemetery. It was reported that the City Council would carry out an investigation. Can the cabinet member provide an update on the progress of the investigation?

Answer

Both the Council and the Co-op have carried out full investigations into this matter. The Co-op did make an enquiry regarding the availability a burial on the day in question, however no confirmation that the burial was going ahead was received by the Council. There is no evidence that the Co-op submitted the documentation required for us to carry out a burial.

This meant that we were not aware that the burial party were going to arrive at the cemetery on the day in question and therefor no preparations had been made. As the burials team was attending to another burial in a different cemetery, logistically there was no way that a grave could be prepared on that day.

The Co-op have put additional measures in place to ensure that this very unfortunate incident does not happen again. Obviously our thoughts were very much with the family and an alternative date was arranged for the burial.

3. Regents Park Community Centre

Question from Councillor Galton to Councillor Jeffery, Cabinet Member for Education and Change.

Can the Cabinet Member outline what steps they are taking to resolve the ongoing issue with the relocation of the Regents Park Community Centre as a result of the school merger and future expansion plans of Tanners Brook Primary School?

Answer

A consultation meeting with local residents was held on 3 October 2014, at the school, with a view to looking at the issues of concern in detail and formulating mutually agreeable solutions. At the meeting, the only issue of concern that was relevant to the planning application was that of potential noise pollution from the

proposed new development, once occupied. The Council is looking to address this concern in the following two ways:

- The relocation of the proposed development site, to move it further away from neighbouring residential properties. This relocation will be reflected in the future planning application.
- The undertaking of an acoustic survey to assess the potential for any noise pollution from the new development and any impact that this may have on neighbouring properties. If the survey identifies that the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties, the Council will look to build suitable acoustic mitigation measures into the design.

The acoustic survey is scheduled to be completed by the end of October. It is intended to bring the scheme back to the Planning Panel for consideration in January 2015, which allows sufficient time to make any necessary adjustments to the design of the building.

4. Tanners Brook School, Parking and Associated Traffic

Question from Councillor Galton to Councillor Jeffery, Cabinet Member for Education and Change and Councillor Rayment, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

Can the Cabinet Members fully review the issue of car parking and associated traffic in the roads immediately around Tanners Brook School ahead of the further school expansion?

Answers

Councillor Jeffery: The matter of car parking and associated traffic will be considered as part of any planning application for the expansion of the school, should it be deemed necessary to do so. The question of whether it is necessary to undertake a Transport Assessment (or similar) is ultimately determined by the Planning Department and/or the Planning Panel, upon receipt of an application.

Councillor Rayment: The need and requirements of such issues are fed into the planning application process as in this case. The Council does not have the resources to undertake these studies and the emerging guidance on residents parking areas will outline this process further.

The Centre for Sustainable Travel Choices team are working with the school to promote the "Bike-It" scheme to encourage children to travel to the school by cycle. We are also hoping to implement the parking pledge campaign ready for the new school year so pupil's start off with 'good habits". We are aware of the needs of the school to increase the parking for cycles and are working with the school on this. We shall of course monitor the situation.

29. EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

Cabinet appointed Councillor Rayment to the Local Access Forum.

30. LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND

DECISION MADE: (Ref: CAB 14/15 13456)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To accept LSTF revenue grant of £996,500 from the Department for Transport (DfT);
- (ii) To add £996,500 to the 2015/16 revenue estimates of the Environment and Transport Portfolio funded by the DfT grant (subject to approval of the budget strategy at full Council in February 2015);
- (iii) To increase by £105,000 the Sustainable Travel capital scheme, contained within the Environment and Transport Portfolio capital programme, funded by £65,000 of 2015/16 Local Transport Plan government grant and £40,000 of site specific 'Section 106' developer contributions;
- (iv) To increase by £140,000 the Integrated Transport Systems capital scheme, contained within the within the Environment and Transport Portfolio capital programme, wholly funded by 2015/16 Local Transport Plan government grant; and
- (v) To approve capital expenditure in 2015/16 of £105,000 on the Sustainable Travel capital scheme and £140,000 on the Integrated Transport Systems capital scheme, which form part of the Council's match funding for the LSTF bid

31. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT POLICY

DECISION MADE: (Ref: CAB 14/15 13605)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and having received representations from a member of the public Cabinet agreed to remove the bold formatting in paragraph 4.2 of the policy. Cabinet also considered recommendations from OSMC from their meeting on 16 October 2014 and accepted that the Planning Enforcement Policy enabled recurring and cumulative breaches be taken into consideration when enforcement action was determined. The Committee also recommended that the use of letters threatening Section 215 notices be increased and that this role should not be undertaken by specialist Enforcement Officers. Cabinet cautioned issuing too many Section 215 notices and suggested a review of how many had been issued before any decision to increase was made.

Having taken the above into consideration, Cabinet then agreed the following:

To approve the revised Planning Enforcement Policy, attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

32. RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY PANEL A RECOMMENDATIONS - MAINTAINING BALANCED NEIGHBOURHOODS THROUGH PLANNING

DECISION MADE: (Ref: CAB 14/15 13603)

On consideration of the report of the Leader, and having received representations from Members of the Council and members of the public, Cabinet also considered recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee meeting held on 16 October 2014 and agreed the following:

- a) the Leader considered the inclusion of a timescale for implementing the response to recommendation (vi) “Homes in Multiple Occupation SPD – To-Let Signs” on Page 2 of the Appendix; (Cabinet confirmed that in the light of current funding difficulties this would not take place until the end of March 2015).
- b) the Leader considered amending the response to recommendation (i) “Educate, Engage and Enforce” on Page 5 of the Appendix, to reflect a more positive response and clarifying that the Council would continue to support communities in developing neighbourhood plans; and
- c) the Leader considered incorporating parking implications as part of the proposed review of Houses in Multiple Occupation.

The following recommendation was rejected, with a view to reviewing after the next General Election:

- d) the Executive reconsidered their position in relation to the development of an Article 4 Direction to remove Permitted Development Rights for Houses in Multiple Occupation.

Having taken the above into consideration, Cabinet then agreed the following:

To receive and approve the proposed responses to the recommendations of Scrutiny Panel A, attached as Appendix 2.

33. *SOUTHAMPTON PERMIT SCHEME FOR MANAGEMENT OF ROADWORKS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES ON THE ROAD NETWORK

A decision on this item was deferred to the Cabinet meeting on 18 November 2014.

34. *CHAPEL RIVERSIDE - APPOINTMENT OF A DEVELOPMENT PARTNER

DECISION MADE: (Ref: CAB 14/15 13380)

On consideration of the report of the Leader, Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To approve the sale of the site to the recommended bidder, Developer A, as set out in confidential Appendix 2 and to delegate authority to the Head of Development, Economy and Housing Renewal to negotiate the final terms and conditions, and;
- (ii) In the event that Developer A withdraws or does not complete a Development Agreement with the Council within an agreed timescale to approve the sale of the site to the reserve bidder, Developer B, set out in confidential Appendix 3, provided that the Head of Development, Economy and Housing Renewal, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member, considers this to be in the Council’s best interests; and to delegate authority to the Head of Development, Economy and Housing Renewal to negotiate the final terms and conditions.

- (iii) To authorise the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Head of Property Services to make all necessary arrangements to make the site available for sale and to enter into the required legal documentation.
- (iv) To authorise the Director of Place to take any further action necessary to give effect to the decision of Executive in relation to this matter.