

Development Management  
Southampton City Council  
Ground Floor  
Civic Centre  
Southampton  
SO14 7LS

18 Ethelburt Avenue  
Swaythling  
Southampton  
SO16 3DD  
Tel 023 8062 8665 (day)  
023 8055 8245 (eve)  
dan.hopgood@virgin.net

9<sup>th</sup> March 2011

Dear Sir,

**Planning Application Number 11/00204/FUL  
Area Housing Office, Youth Centre and Car Park Site, Parkville Road, Swaythling,  
Southampton  
Building Management Plan**

I object to the above planning application on the grounds that the Building Management Plan undertaken for the above Application is not sufficiently developed for use as part of the planning application.

**Access**

The document refers to a Travel plan created by Odyssey Consulting Engineers. No such document was found with the planning application. It is assumed that the reference is to the Transport Assessment Report (TA), upon which I have commented on separately.

**Security**

The only access to the site after 10pm will be via the North East corner of the site. This is the furthest point of the building from the stated main pedestrian routes and so will make the development less attractive for pedestrian users at night. It makes the distance to all the most convenient bus stops longer, thereby making bus use less attractive at night and increasing the distance students will be walking outside the building at these times. This would increase their exposure to any hostile activity in the area at night. It would also make any noise nuisance worse for locals.

The report discusses lighting uniformity but not lighting levels. Due to the proximity of residential properties – notably 1 Parkville Road, the issue of light spill from lighting and

in particular white light used for face recognition on CCTV needs to be carefully designed. This is not mentioned in the report.

## **Car Parking**

I have made separate comments on the Transport Assessment.

No mention is made of the parking provision for staff use – hall porter, retail and medical use. The previous planning application for similar uses provided 20 spaces for medical staff alone. Overspill parking is therefore inevitable and the development will remove the only convenient public car park. No assessment has been made of the capacity of the surrounding area to support this overspill parking and the effects on the area. This is essential to be able to assess the impact of the scheme and come to a balanced planning decision.

No mention is made of any parking restrictions that would apply within the site and how they would be enforced. If no restrictions are put in place, abuse of the parking is bound to take place. A statement should be included with the application to state what is proposed.

The following text is contained in the last paragraph on Page 7: *“The University of Southampton has a strict no-car policy for students in Halls, they are required to agree not to keep a car in Southampton. Therefore no student parking has been provided on the site, as the Uni-link bus runs straight past the site”.*

The problem with the undertaking signed by students not to keep a car in Southampton is one of enforcement. Whilst it may be possible to enforce such an agreement on campus and within the Hall sites, such a policy is not enforceable off-site. This was acknowledged in a telephone conversation on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2011 between Daniel Hopgood and Helen Harley of Southampton University External Relations. Thus if on-street parking is available around the development, which it is, students will inevitably abuse the system, causing a serious nuisance for the surrounding area.

The Uni-Link bus service does not run *“straight past”* the site as stated. The Transport Assessment states that the nearest bus stops for the U1 service are 450m away. They are actually between 495 and 575m away, depending on the direction of movement and time of day. The maximum recommended distance to these stops using the DfT Inclusive mobility document is 350m. This will discourage bus use and increase the pressure for increased unauthorised car use.

The following text is also contained in the last paragraph on Page 7: *“When students are moving in and out of halls they will be asked to get dropped off at the University where a bus will shuttle them to the Halls along with their belongings”.* This contradicts the TA, which states that there will be a detailed plan within the Building Management Plan for implementing a timed sequence of access for individual students. This conflict in the

documents needs to be explained. If the plan is as described in the Building Management Plan it is impractical. This would be a self-catering Hall of residence and students will be arriving with cooking equipment and food as well as their college gear, sports equipment, clothes, entertainment gear and so on. Arrival by bus would be strongly resisted and abused by residents in these circumstances and the policy would quickly shown to be not credible. The procedure outlined in the TA is also not credible as written, since it contains a host of omissions, which I have commented on in my separate comments on the TA document

A delivery layby is shown, but no parking restrictions are mentioned. Without strongly enforced and serious parking restriction it is inevitable that this layby would be used by users of the development and elsewhere, possibly causing a safety issue for fire and other emergency services. Obstruction of the layby would lead to deliveries limited to out of hours – causing a noise nuisance that hasn't been assessed and possibly affecting the profitability of the retail units. Refuse collections – if not able to be undertaken out of hours could end up blocking the highway, causing a safety issue.

### **General**

The level of detail in the Building Management Plan appears woefully inadequate for the scale and complexity of the management operations required to successfully operate the site. How the fence dividing the site at night would operate and the responsibilities and powers of the warden are two examples of omissions that need to be addressed for a balanced planning decision to be drawn.

Yours faithfully,

**D.W.J Hopgood**

B.Eng (Hons), C.Eng, MICE, Chartered Highways and Infrastructure Engineer