

Minutes HRA Committee Meeting Tuesday 10 February 2026
Highfield Church Halls 19:00h



Committee Members present: Roger Brown, Ken Burtenshaw, Paul Beard, Jerry Gillen, Nadine Johnson, Nicolla Martin, Stephen Connolly, Martin Benning, Dave White, Karen Edwards, Barbara Claridge

Others present: Councillors Finn, Bunday and Barbour; Malcolm White (Oakmount Triangle RA), Charlie Nicholson, Jamie Holmes, Lyn Brayshaw, Graham Linecar, Katherine Holmes (Brookvale Road RA), Liz O'Connor (Portswood Residents Gardens)

Annex.i. HRA Questions for Ward Councillors

Annex.ii. HRA Objection to Avenue Campus Planning Application to fell mature trees

1. Prof. Roger Brown welcomed everyone to the meeting. He informed the meeting that a Committee only session would take place at the end of the open meeting to discuss the Committee's response to the ATZ Survey
2. Apologies: Paddy Bedi, Sonia Cottrell (University), Councillor Savage, Ed Hill
3. Declarations of interest: none recorded
4. Minutes, 20 January 2025 Committee Meeting were approved
5. Matters Arising, not covered elsewhere
 - a. Brookvale ATZ Survey update - information
 - i. HRA Questions for Ward Councillors (Updated see Annex.i.) This was a list of all the errors/problems/omissions related to the Brookvale ATZ Survey. This was noted but response not yet available
 - ii. Communications between HRAHonSec, Councillors and Officers including the SCC Overview Management Scrutiny Committee Chair, Councillor Blackman had been circulated in advance (Agenda Annex.i.). Cllr Blackman had responded offering a meeting. This was noted
 - iii. Brookvale Road members present raised how they felt safety was a major issue on Brookvale Road. The HonSec agreed that this was a significant factor and that HRA had reported to Ward Councillors and Officers that the current buildouts were dangerous especially to cyclists. She had contacted Officers about why safety had not been included in the Survey and was told that comments or ideas about safety could be added to the text box. Officers advised that this was a survey to see if there was community support for specific measures. Safety, especially around the school was supported by HRA but she had been informed that this would be addressed separately at a later date
 - b. Highfield House Hotel update – Nadine advised that information received was always posted on the News page of the HRA Website <https://www.highfieldresidents.org.uk/news/>. There seemed to be no sign that protests and counter protests were reducing or being moved elsewhere.
 - c. Chair's various letters to Cllr Winning – no response as yet from the Council Leader to the specific issues
6. Information Reports from Councillors. These were reported in Agenda Annex.ii. Councillor Barbour had held an inaugural meeting with Councillor Finn also attending to set up an interest group to draft a Portswood Neighbourhood Plan. This was in an early stage and was unlikely to receive any support funding from SCC whilst the Southampton Local Plan (The City Vision) was still being worked on. Ed Hill had represented the HRA Committee at this event. Councillor Barbour reported that there were still 2 or 3 places available on the working group if anyone was interested.

7. University

- a. Sonia Cottrell Students Union Chief Executive Officer – The HonSec reported that the Students Union was in the final stages of organising a memorial football match in memory of the student who had been murdered before Christmas. The details were not yet in place.
- b. Paddy Bedi – there was no update on Avenue Campus PBSA

8. HRA@50 – Programme update (BC - See report of event 1 in the Enews (2)).

The Valentine's Afternoon Tea was in the final stages of preparation. Committee support and help on the day was very positive. The Mencap catering team were set up and looking forward to the experience of working with the community. The HonSec was hoping for about 35 attendees but several reminders had had to be sent round. Thanks to Nadine for organising the mailchimp lists.

9. HRA Crime WhatsApp group for Highfield - NJ This had been reported with the Agenda as Annex.iii

10. Planning

- a. Avenue Campus PA to fell trees. The HRA Objection was now on the HRA Website. (see Annex.ii)

11. Reports

- a. Finance (MB) – As of 5 February 2026: Current Account Balance £3252.92; Income £451.00; Expenditure £91.85. 35 Day High Interest Account as of 5 February 2026: Balance £26235.16.
- b. Membership (NM) - Current 346; paid in January 22; did not renew in January 14; no new members
- c. Digital Communications Report – NJ (Agenda Annex.v)

12. A.O.B.

- a. The HonSec reported that she had been in communication with a member who had written to the managing agent of the two HMO properties at the end of Brookvale Road, next to the Waitrose entrance road, about the amount of rubbish and overflowing bins in the front gardens. The agent, SDM Properties, had been cooperative and was in the process of clearing up the mess. Apparently new bigger bins had been ordered from the Council. However, as there was no bin screening at the front of the properties, bigger bins would potentially still be an eyesore on Brookvale Road

Annex.i.

**Brookvale ATZ Survey Questions Arising from HRA Members for Ward Councillors
Committee Meeting 10 February 2026**

Question	Comment	Outcome if Known
Had the Council responded to the OSMC 18 September Resolutions before this survey was designed?	HRA highlighted this on Monday 2 Feb	See HRAHonSec letter Acknowledgement from Cllr Blackman
In the Survey pre-amble what is meant by 'the historic issue of high levels of traffic remain'?	Data missing	
Where can I find the data on 'returned closer to pre-trial levels'?	Data missing	
When was the most recent traffic count on Brookvale Road	Data missing	
What were weekly traffic levels on Brookvale Road before anything physical began for the Bus-gate Trial?	Data exists for this and was used in the Phase 2 Consultation	Now showing as error 404 on the Connecting Southampton Portswood pages on SCC Website?
In Q1 Why was there initially no option to reply 'None of the above'	HRA highlighted this on Monday 2 Feb	Wade: amendment made to the Survey (after 5 responses only)
In Q3 Why is there not an option 'Remove the Build-outs' or 'Return to how it was'	Stating 'Do nothing' does not cover this concept i.e. the build-outs are dangerous and I want them removed	Greg: the survey is designed to assess if there is community support for specific measures. There is a free text box in the survey where respondents are able to add further detail on their tick box responses or suggest other options not presented if they would like to
In Q3 Why are the options limited to 1 choice only?	A combination of e.g. speed cushions and raised table at Junctions might be a reasonable choice	See above
Q5 If you use the unique identifier code (received by letter) is your individual address and identity identifiable?	Pre Q1 there is this statement: When you submit this form, it will not automatically collect your details like name and email address unless you provide it yourself. Is this in accordance with SCC Data Protection Policy?	

Which roads exactly received letters?	Cllr Finn told HRA (January HRA Cttee meeting) she thought it would be all roads leading off Brookvale Road (Oakmount Triangle Roads, Uplands Estate, Winn Road, Westwood Road)?	
Why were residents in roads that would be affected by the survey of the roads in the survey not sent a letter?	Winn Road, Westwood Road, Highfield Close?	Letters were not delivered on the same day and some still not by Saturday 7 Feb
Why is cycling or pedestrian safety not considered worthy of being included?	Cycling and pedestrian safety were often highlighted as significant issues	See Greg's response above and same from Wade
Letters were not received in Westwood Road until 10 Feb	Why were there different delivery dates? Were all of the addresses commissioned at the beginning of the process?	
Why were no paper copies of the Survey available in the first instance?	HRA had to request this. Available in Portswood Library for Friday 6 Feb	Greg confirmed paper copies in Portswood Library on 6 Feb
Why is the Survey not available on the main SCC Consultations and Surveys ? Have Your Say website	Comment made by several members	
The Survey was extended by a week but with little publicity	The reason was the slow delivery of letters by the Post Office	Not known if all letters were delivered
The link on the letter (https://soton.cc/3A0ts4c) did not land on the Survey page	It was not straight forward to find the survey page	Confusing
At the end of the Survey it is asked whether 'you would like to save your response'.	If reply 'Yes' a link opened up requiring you to log onto your Microsoft Account	The only work around was to select 'print' from the menu hidden in the top right hand corner (print as a .pdf)

Annex. ii. Highfield Residents Association

Avenue Campus, University of Southampton Tree Works Applications 26/00006/TPO, 26/00007/TPO & 26/00010/TPO

Highfield Residents Association objects to the felling of trees at Avenue Campus unless they are dangerous.

Of particular concern in the application, permission is sought to fell 1 cherry tree and 5 mature ash trees (these stated ash die back). The ash trees (refs. T35, T94, T97-100 in 26/00006/TPO) are mature, very tall and have an imposing positive visual effect on the campus.

These are mature ash trees and their loss will:

- negatively impact the screening between Avenue Campus and adjoining residential roads
- have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity in general
- remove both screening and habitat of the local area
- The loss of such a larger number of mature tall trees would be significant to residents on the boundary.

Whilst recognising the need for good tree management on the Avenue Campus Site, HRA objects to the felling of mature trees because they are showing signs of ash die-back. The removal for this reason was not supported by the SCC Tree Officer in a similar application in 2024. Nor is it recognised as best practice by the Woodland Trust (of which I am a member) for dealing with ash die back.

The scale of the overall proposed tree felling should be fully scrutinised by the Tree Officer on a tree by tree basis and where possible trees should be preserved to preserve biodiversity corridors and mixed habitats.

No tree replacement planting has been illustrated by the applicant. For any tree felled for safety reasons the replacement tree should be of a significant proportion and maturity.

In summary, we strongly object to these wide-ranging Tree Works. We therefore ask the council to reject the felling of the ash trees (for a second time in 14 months) and any other mature tree that could be saved by careful Arboricultural management. HRA asks that a requirement is made that replacement trees be specified to balance the reductions/removals so that the woodlands of the Avenue Campus are managed according to best practice. The emphasis should be on 'preservation and safety' rather than 'dead or dying'.

Even within the mixed groups application, tree felling rather than maintenance appears to be the norm. This is not acceptable practice unless the trees are dead or dangerous.

HRA asks for consideration that it is now too late in the calendar for such tree management and felling due to the proximity of the nesting season.

HRA objects the Planning Applications as submitted and asks that the Tree Officer is vigilant in his inspection and where possible any tree that could be saved is saved, whether that be a tall mature ash or a small cherry in a mixed group.

HRAHonSec 21 Feb 2026