

East Area Committee

Cherry Trees, St Matthews Street

Thursday 10 August 2006

7.30pm to 10.00pm

Minutes & Actions

Councillors Present

Abbey: John Durrant, Miriam Lynn

Coleridge: Jeremy Benstead, Lewis Herbert,

Petersfield: Kevin Blencowe, Ben Bradnack

Romsey: Raj Shah, Catherine Smart

County Councillors: Paul Sales (Abbey), Martin Ballard (Coleridge), Alice Douglas (Romsey)

06/28 Minutes

The minutes of the meetings on 22 and 29 June were approved.

06/29 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Publicity for Area Committees

The Committee Manager had circulated a briefing note on expenditure and distribution of advertising for the Committee. Cllr Smart pointed out that there were no poster sites included in Romsey Ward.

- The Committee Manager said that he would identify suitable sites in the ward.

Environmental Improvements

progress with Environmental Improvements under consideration or being progressed and the updated budget. The officers had also asked whether members were prepared to consider a late submission on mobility crossings. However as these had not been circulated within the deadlines for public access to the Committee's agenda, members asked for a fuller report on the crossings.

- The Landscape Architects would be asked to report to the Committee's next meeting.

Contra-Flow Cycle Schemes

A member of the public commented on the minutes on the issue raised about the introduction of contra flow cycle lanes in Petersfield.

Cllr Bradnack said the AJC were not prepared to reconsider the designation of the contra-flow cycle lanes for a further year.

06/30 Apologies For Absence

Councillors Caroline Hart, Ben Stafford, Victoria Bruce, Sarah Ellis-Miller, Nichola Harrison

06/31 Declarations Of Interest

None

06/32 Open Forum

Resident 1

The resident pointed out the changes to the pedestrian crossings at Gonville Place/Gresham Road and at East Road/Burleigh Street, had in her opinion, worsened the possibility of

accidents creating a conflict between cyclist and pedestrians using the crossings.

Richard Preston, from the Highways Authority responded and explained the thinking that had gone into the changes in the layout of these crossings. He said he would take the concerns back to the County Council and report on proposals following the review, which was in hand. In terms of consultation with pedestrians he pointed out that there was no pedestrian lobby with which to discuss changes such as these.

Members said that

- They were not convinced on the benefit of the changes on the East Road crossing.
- The high volume of traffic along Gonville Place should be taken into account and the lessons learned from the development of a satisfactory crossing be applied to other locations.
- There was inevitable confusion when pedestrians and cyclist had the same rights of way.

A member of the public commented on the poor regulation of cyclists by the authorities, both in terms of enforcement by the Police and the City and County Councils.

06/33 Introduction of The Gambling Act 2005: Public Consultation on The Statement of Principles

The City Council's Licensing Officer spoke to the Committee about the draft statement of principles as a part of the public consultation process seeking feedback on its content, prior to the drawing up of a final statement. Public comment was invited as part of the consultation process.

A member of the public asked whether the same situation applied as in alcohol licensing about demand not being a criteria for refusal of a licence.

The Licensing Officer confirmed that it would be the case. She also confirmed that 'day' lotteries or raffles would continue to be unlicensed.

06/34 Newmarket Road Traffic

Councillor Durrant, the Chair had asked for this item to be included on the agenda. Members of the public were invited to comment on and discuss traffic congestion in Newmarket Road and future development to the East of the city. Richard Preston from the County Council, the Highway Authority, was present at the meeting.

The Chair said that last year he had asked the then Executive Councillor for Planning and Transport to initiate a review of the development of Newmarket Road in terms of planning and highways issues. This had not been put in hand and he asked the Committee to consider whether there was support for a review of this description by Environment Scrutiny Committee. This would take a form of post scrutiny.

The Committee commented that

- Labour members had carried out a quality of life survey along Newmarket Road that revealed the poor state of life experienced by the residents along Newmarket Road.
- The review should take into account the effects of planning and highways decisions made by both City and County Councils in the development of Newmarket Road.
- The implications of development to the East of the city following Marshall's airport moving to a different site.
- The results of traffic surveys carried out by the County Council should be used in the review.

Richard Preston, representing the Highway Authority said that the County proposed to look at the situation in three ways, the results of development along Newmarket Road, the medium term issues and the long-term proposals.

Following a wide-ranging discussion of these issues and relevant aspects, it was

Resolved, by 6 votes to 0, to request the Executive Councillor for Planning and Transport to present a report on the planning and development decisions on Newmarket Road, including the traffic impact assessments, to the Environment Scrutiny Committee in advance of the highways proposals to be made to the AJC in January.

06/35 Applications For Planning Permission

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those which the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up.

These minutes should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown in the minutes.

8.1

Site 26C Stone Street
Proposal Erection of one 2 bed house to replace existing garage/store
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions outlined in the report and the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 24 August
Application No 06/0618/FUL
Applicant Mr and Mars Mahoney, 74 Radegund Rd
PSR Mr Maile, Susan Carlyle (Residents)
Deferred (by 5 votes to 0) to allow members to carry out a site visit.

8.2

Site 25 Seymour St
Proposal Erection one 4 bed house
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions and satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 August
Application No 06/0558/FUL
Applicant Carolan Developments 180 Perne Rd
PSR R Stigwood (Resident)
Decision **Approve** (by 3 votes to 1)

subject to the satisfactory completion of the S106 agreement by 30 August 2006 and to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

Refusal of application Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, and the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 30 August 2006, the application is **refused** for the reason set out in the report.

8.3

Site 254 Mill Road
Proposal Retrospective Application (subdivision of existing flat into two separate flats)
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions
Application No 06/0521/FUL
Applicant Dr K G Mathai 27 Mill Road
PSR -
Decision Approve

subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

8.4

PLANNING ENFORCEMENT CONTROL

Site

19 Devonshire Road

Alleged Breach

Without planning permission, the carrying out of operational development namely, the erection of a full width, flat roofed box dormer on the rear of the property

Recommendation

the Head of Legal Services be authorised to issue an enforcement notice under the provisions of S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for, without planning permission, the carrying out of operational development, namely the erection of a full width, flat roofed dormer to rear of dwelling house.

Owner/Occupier

Mr S Lloyd-Beavis

PSR

-

Decision

Authorise (by 5 votes to 0) the Head of Legal Services to issue an enforcement notice under the provisions of S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for, without planning permission, the carrying out of operational development, namely the erection of a full width, flat roofed dormer to rear of dwelling house.