

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

City Centre Master Plan

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	5	General	Support	CCMP has adopted a sound, straightforward evidence based process / raises city profile / strengths and weaknesses laid out clearly.	Welcome support	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	9	General	Comment	Maps – need much more detail in the maps when addressing the 7 VIP areas (transport, cycling, infrastructure improvements, crossing points etc)	More detailed plans will be developed as each development comes forward	No change required
Design ACB Architects	1	General	Support	Well thought out approach that could lead to improved city for residents and visitors alike. Accurate self critical observations on the city have allowed for a clear framework to address some of these issues. Redevelopment along the River Itchen would be particularly progressive for making a better city, including its connections.	Welcome support	No change required
Percy Savage	1	General	Support	Support that design of buildings should be individual Southampton and not identikit to other buildings being put up all over the country.	Welcome support	No change required
Percy Savage	2	General	Comment	The Council must stand up to developers and major corporates to prevent poor design such as IKEA, otherwise the Council will have to redevelop the city and review another Masterplan in 50 years.	Noted	
Percy Savage	3	General	Support	Support that the Council is dealing Southampton's planning malaise and recognising the assets and possibilities that the city has.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	1	General	Support	Business Solent believes this to be a thorough and professional document which is clear, concise and accessible.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	2	General	Comment	As a draft, Business Solent would hope that the graphic style, imagery and characterisation of Future Southampton can advance significantly in the final edition and be conveyed to the reader with much more emotion and passion for the future city centre.	The preparation of the CCMP has served its main purpose to guide investment and illustrate potential, raise the profile of the city, inform the preparation of the CCAP and provide design guidance.	No change required
Business Solent	96	General	Comment	Business Solent would wish to discuss updated policies and practice for procurement including criteria for using local labour / local businesses / businesses based within the city and city region.	Noted. Further dialogue continuing through business led action groups and in future through possible City Centre Forum engaging local	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					business organisations.	
Hammerson	22	General	Comment	We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments with you in more detail should this be appropriate.	Dialogue is on going as part of the proposals for Watermark WestQuay	No change required
Associated British Ports	10	General	Comment	For more detail, see comments on draft CCAP.	Noted	No change required
A. Samuels	1	General	Comment	This consultation exercise is a little confusing. There is a great deal of overlap or duplication between the CCAP and CCMP. Inevitably both documents contain an enormous amount of detail, when Government is expecting a more broad brush approach towards planning. It is difficult for responders to discuss fundamental principles and particular problems. Overall both documents contain much good sense and practical awareness; and commendation for good points is of no special purpose or value.	The CCMP was prepared as a back ground document to help inform the preparation of the CCAP. The relationship between the two will be clarified in future publications	Wording amended on p20 to clarify the relationship between the CCMP and CCAP
A. Samuels	2	General	Comment	The masterplan is a more readable and more elegant, though regurgitating what exists and what is already planned, though with an enlightened content and sophisticated presentation.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	3	General	Comment	See CCAP responses for general comments on topics and sites (except where responding to specific Master Plan proposals or suggesting specific changes for both plans).	Note comment	No change required
A. Samuels	4	General	Comment	Query why call the parks are called East Park and West Park instead of Andrews park and Watts Park?	Both parks are also known by these names	No change required
Turnstone Group	1	General	Support	The Master Plan for the future of Southampton is a very impressive piece of work and shows great vision. Certainly Southampton will be a very much improved city when these plans get built.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	3	Page 6	Support	(Executive Summary) Business Solent agrees with the overall assessment of the city.	Welcome support	No change required
John Lewis	1	Page 6	Support	John Lewis generally supports the objectives of the CCMP as a non-statutory, visionary development and investment framework for the city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
John Lewis	2	Page 6	Comment	Whilst it is noted that the CCMP is intended to inform and support the statutory policy framework set out in the CCAP, John Lewis considers that it should be made clear what weight will be attached to the CCMP in planning application decision making.	The CCMP is a key piece of evidence informing the CCAP, and will be a non statutory material consideration in the determination of planning	Text amended to clarify status

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					applications, where the Master Plan conforms with the CCAP.	
Business Solent	4	Page 6, 7	Support	(Executive Summary) Business Solent broadly agrees with the assessment of major issues with the city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	16	Page 21	Support / Comment	Generally supports 4 key roles & welcomes pro-active stance taken by SCC. Bullet point 3 welcomed – however it should provide info on how potential “could” be realised. Suggestion - Page 21 - Bullet 3 : “...Provides guidelines on how that potential could be realised to contribute to the quality of the scheme as a whole”.	Welcome support. See response above as a material consideration providing design guidance the word ‘should’ will be retained	No change required
Business Solent	5	Page 22	Support	(Introduction) Business Solent generally agrees with and supports these proposals.	Welcome support	No change required
Associated British Ports	1	Page 23	Support	ABP welcomes the recognition of the importance of the Port	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	6	Page 25	Comment	(Chapter 2) Business Solent believes that considerably more can be made of the Central Parks as star city centre assets.	Note comment	
Business Solent	7	Page 25	Comment	(Chapter 2) Business Solent believes that Royal Pier is the single most significant location in the whole of the city centre and unless a world class waterfront can finally be delivered by all those involved, Southampton will never attain the vision set out.	Note comment	No change required
Business Solent	8	Page 26	Comment	(Chapter 2) ABP plans should not, in view of Business Solent, be ‘alongside’ those for city centre growth, the two should be inseparable and working together.	Note comment. The document reflects the necessary boundary between the port and city required to meet operational and security needs of the port. A partnership relationship is in place on a number of projects to ensure mutual benefits	No change required.
Dr P.W.Garratt	6	Page 26	Comment	It is stated that one-third of extra population will live in the centre: what is this based on? No explanation for this.	The Core Strategy sets out the target to provide an additional 16,300 new homes with approximately 5,450 dwellings in the city centre	Reference added to Core Strategy in the text.
Dr P.W.Garratt	4	Page 28	Comment	Vision - Good that priority to walking cycling and buses; but	Further detailed schemes	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				“clearly marked cycle routes” not enough with cars travelling at 30 mph. Suggestion - Speed limits and speed humps are essential.	aimed at improving the environment for pedestrians and cyclists will be developed	
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	6	Page 28	Comment	The vision lacks aspiration	Disagree. The vision encapsulated a significant amount of change that sets high aspirations for the city centre	
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	17	Page 28	Support / Comment	Generally supports vision + the 7 cross cutting themes. Aviva supports expansion of retail core westwards but that the policy that flows from CCMP must create right context – i.e. it must recognise the inherent value wrapped up in existing assets and the challenge this presents in delivering higher value uses to make redevelopment viable. Suggestion - Consideration must be given to the need currently met by existing retail parks. See CCAP reps.	The CCMP sets out a long term vision and recognises in the Delivery section that redevelopment of the existing retail parks will only be possible in the longer term when the value of these assets make redevelopment viable. See detailed responses under relevant sections below.	No change required
Business Solent	10	Page 28	Comment	Business Solent supports overall vision as set out but a greater measure of co-ordination and consistency between the number of different visions for the city/city centre would be advantageous and further discussions should take place about this matter. Future Southampton group vision is ‘Southampton: international Maritime City – Gateway to the World’.	Welcome support. Each vision reflects the priorities of specific agendas however there are common themes across these such as a low carbon city	No change required
Hammerson	1	Page 28	Support	Hammerson supports the overall Vision set out in the CCMP	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	9	Page 28-31	Comment	Endorses the six cross cutting themes but questions why ‘A Great Place to Shop’ has been omitted from the CCAP as it is one of the signature characteristics of the city centre for residents and visitors.	Agree, however the city centre needs to offer a more ‘rounded’ offer as a place to visit as well to encourage people to stay longer in the city. Refer to response made to comments on CCAP	No change required
Hammerson	2	Page 28-31	Support	Hammerson supports the seven key themes set out in the CCMP	Welcome support	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	7	Page 31	Comment	Vision – a greener centre; New parks and open spaces will improve connectivity but should not be restricted to purely improving pedestrian friendly routes.	Noted. The text reflects the broader ‘green agenda’.	

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	8	Page 31	Comment	Vision – easy to get about; Needs to be a transport plan that provides connectivity from interchanges to places of interest and activity.	Noted. Streets and spaces plan reflect this and further guidance is planned to address this in more detail	No change required
Business Solent	11	Page 32	Support	Agrees with the spatial concept illustrated in the Spatial Concept diagram. The rebalancing of the overall city centre to counteract the growing influence of areas west of the QE2 Mile and on-going decline to the east is considered by the business community to be a key issue and should be afforded a more significant emphasis within the Master Plan as a whole.	Welcome support	No change required
Hammerson	3	Page 32	Support	Hammerson supports the spatial concept set out in the CCMP	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	12	Page 33	Comment	The Changing City Structure diagrams are interesting but in presentational terms struggle to make their point. The diagram for 2030 appears crowded and overly complex.	Noted, however they do demonstrate how the city centre will grow over this period	No change required
Dr P.W.Garratt	5	Page 33	Object	“Over time car drivers will find it easier to park at city centre gateways and walk across the centre” – disagree; you must compel them to leave the city centre to pedestrians, cyclists etc.	Noted, however access will always be required for those who live and have businesses in the city centre, and the less able.	No change required
Business Solent	13	Page 34-35	Comment	This is perhaps the most significant conceptual drawing in the plan but is lacking that overall quality required of a significant, aspirational and growing European city.	Noted. The illustration is easy to ‘read’ and has been very successful in communicating the vision for the City Centre. As further work is done to develop detailed proposals for the VIPS the high aspirations should become more evident	No change required
Business Solent	14	Page 36	Support	Strongly supports the VIPs and would wish to further discuss the detailed proposals for each with the city council and others at the appropriate time.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss proposals further.	No change required
Hammerson	4	Page 36	Object	Hammerson has a number of concerns in relation to the Very Important Projects in terms of deliverability and the impact they may have on the city centre as a whole.	Noted. See detailed responses under relevant sections below.	
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	10	Page 36	Comment	Marketing – clarity needed on how this will be done i.e. sources of funding, delivery vehicles.	Noted. The Council is in dialogue with local businesses as to how marketing of the city centre can be progressed	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	15	Page 36	Support / Comment	VIPs - General support for areas of major change; the regeneration of Station Quarter + Heart of City in particular will help enhance vitality & viability of city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	15	Page 42	Support	Strongly supports these key objectives and would also wish to see particular emphasis given to the support and encouragement of small businesses within the PUSH identified growth sectors including low carbon businesses, research and development companies and knowledge/marine innovation uses.	Welcome support	No change required
Terrace Hill	1	Page 42	Object	The inclusion of an objective encouraging the delivery of existing office commitments at Mayflower Plaza is objected to and is inconsistent with the aims of the CCAP which introduces a more flexible approach to the sites development, and in particular the recognition that the site could support purpose built student accommodation. Alternative wording suggested - Delete objective encouraging the delivery of office development at Mayflower Plaza and acknowledge the flexible approach advocated in the CCAP	Agreed.	References to this are removed in text and plans and text amended to reflect a more flexible approach.
M. Hansen	1	Page 45	Object	Support local businesses by reducing rates and why not introduce free business rate? I can't believe that Southampton doesn't have shops like proper fishmongers, New Forest products and quality Fish and Chips.	Noted. Proposals for reducing rates are beyond the scope of the CCMP. Local traders are encouraged through the provision of regular markets in the Bargate area.	No change required
Business Solent	16	Page 46	Support	Agreed that attractive and convenient shopping is important, especially in terms of bringing in visitors and expenditure and creating local jobs but also with regard to supporting new residential and office developments.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	17	Page 46	Support	Strongly support the objectives for a Great Place to Shop, especially actions to support and take forward the niche and speciality market.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	11	Page 46	Comment	If it were possible to stimulate some "distinctive" retail areas that would bring "character" e.g. a niche shopping areas for jewellery, smart fashion, paintings, books and music area etc. Note that such developments would depend very heavily upon the trade.	Noted. Retail of this kind is encouraged where appropriate, however its viability does depend on market conditions which are out of the Council's control.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hammerson	17	Page 48	Support	Hammerson supports the strategy to consolidate, renew and expand the retail core, ensuring that Watermark WestQuay and proposals for the redevelopment of the Bargate and East Street Centres are brought forward successfully. Hammerson supports the creation of an extended retail circuit.	Welcome support	No change required
Hammerson	18	Page 48	Object	The need for the redevelopment of the Retail Parks now and in the longer term has not been demonstrated, nor has the level of retail floorspace now being considered for Itchen Riverside or the Station Quarter. Such a level of retail floorspace in non-central locations will only detract from the city centre.	Noted. The CCMP sets out a long term vision for the city centre. The proposals aim to improve links between the Station Quarter and other outer lying areas of the city centre with the retail core and integrate with the existing Primary Shopping Area. However policies in the CCAP will control the expansion of the PSA, including necessary impact assessments. See further comments in responses made to comments on CCAP.	No change required
M. Hansen	2	Page 48	Object	Support local independent shops rather than building a lot more new commercial units as there will be too many shops. It is better to bring in town houses to attract families.	Disagree. The Council is actively seeking to regenerate and improve the city centre's retail offer by encouraging local independents as well as national retailers. However, viability does depend on market conditions which are out of the Council's control. The proposals also include a mix of house types and tenures to attract families, for example in the redevelopment of the Fruit and Vegetable Markets	No change required
Business Solent	18	Page 49	Support	Strongly support proposals for speciality and visitor retailing, all of which should appear on the 'Extended Retail Circuit' diagram	Noted. The diagrams are primarily intended to show the	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				on page 48.	extension of the retail circuit with the expansion of the retail offer. There is already information on these diagrams and it is felt that adding in speciality shopping areas would further complicate the diagram. The text on p49 adequately covers this important retail offer.	
Dr P.W.Garratt	1	Page 49	Comment	Southampton needs an increase in shopping diversity (I.e. smaller independent businesses). Suggestion - Could Southampton offer reduced business rates for independent shops?	Welcome support. Business rates are currently set by central Government so the Council has no control over these.	No change required
Business Solent	19	Page 50	Support	Business Solent agrees with the overall analysis about the attractiveness of the city centre as a place to visit and the urgent need to modernise and diversify the offer and exploit more widely and proactively the setting of the city, its history and its culture.	Welcome support	No change required
Dr P.W.Garratt	2	Page 50	Comment	Southampton has no arts centre.	Plans are in progress to develop the site of the former Tyrrell and Green department store on Above Bar as an arts complex see VIP – Cultural Quarter.	No change required
Business Solent	20	Page 51	Support	Business Solent strongly supports the Leisure development objectives and the overall strategy illustrated by the concept diagram on page 51. The importance of much improved connectivity should be emphasised in the supporting text.	Welcome support. Noted.	Text amended to reflect need for improved connectivity.
Business Solent	21	Page 52	Support	Business Solent strongly supports the overall strategy and believes that the Royal Pier Waterfront is the most significant development site within the city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	22	Page 53	Support	Strongly support the New Waterfront International Maritime Promenade and Business Solent would like to discuss this in more detail including the name of the promenade which is possibly over-complex.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss proposals further.	No change required
Business	23	Page 53	Support	Strongly support the proposals for arena, conference and	Welcome support. Note	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Solent				exhibitions and Business Solent would like to discuss this in more detail.	request to discuss proposals further.	
Business Solent	24	Page 53	Support	Strongly support proposals for a Sports Village and Business Solent would like to discuss this concept in more detail.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss concept further.	No change required
Business Solent	25	Page 54	Support	Strongly support overall strategy for culture and arts in particular relating to the Old Town and the suggested 'City Discovery Centre'.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	26	Page 56	Support	Strongly support objectives for a Great Place to Live especially relating to the provision of more family homes and the new city centre secondary school or academy.	Welcome support	No change required
M. Hansen	3	Page 56	Support	I completely agree with most of the Master Plan; building tall buildings in the centre and bringing back families is the way forward. The city centre streets need proper railings and tree-lined streets. Suggest demolishing a few run-down council houses from the centre. Southampton also needs a zero-tolerance attitude to crime.	Welcome support. Plans to improve the public realm include tree lined streets. Council owned housing are important in contributing to a wide range of tenure in the city centre, however plans are progressing to improve the public realm around these estates and better integration with the city centre. The Council works with Hampshire Police Authority to reduce crime.	No change required
Associated British Ports	2	Page 57	Comment	Firstly, when making plans for the future of the city centre, the Council should not assume that the current pattern of port use within the Port estate will remain as it is today. Secondly, the Council must assume that Port operational land may at any time be used for any port operational purpose including the movement of heavy freight at any time of the day or night. ABP is keen to avoid the problems that may arise if an inappropriate, sensitive land use is established on adjoining land to the Port on the assumption that a currently relatively benign port operation will remain.	Noted – the Council recognises these points, any future proposals for housing close to port land will take into consideration port operations.	No change required
Business Solent	27	Page 58	Support	Strongly support overall strategy for new homes. It is suggested that serious consideration be given to an increase in	Welcome support	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				the number of new homes proposed to maximise the resident population of the city centre and bring more life and activity to it.		
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	30	Page 58	Comment	Part 3, themes - Needs to be more specific in terms of forecasting growth, in particular in terms of the 5,000 homes. With more people in the city centre a clear statement on perceived job market and businesses should have been made.	The Core Strategy sets out detail on the growth forecast.	Wording added on job opportunities resulting from predicted growth.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	31	Page 58	Comment	Part 3, themes - A statement needs to be made throughout with regard to proposals for affordable housing re. residential areas.	Agree.	Wording added on affordable and mixed tenure housing
Business Solent	28	Page 60	Comment	'Attractive and distinctive' is considered by the Future Southampton Group to be perhaps the most significant of the seven themes.	Noted	No change required
Business Solent	29	Page 60	Support	Strongly support objectives and overall approach taken for 'Attractive and distinctive' theme.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	31	Page 60	Support	Strongly agrees that a clear and readable visual structure is essential to the legibility of the city centre.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	32	Page 60	Support	Agrees with the identification of a series of major gateways to help define the overall structure of the city centre. However it is suggested that serious consideration should also be given to the re-establishment in an appropriate form of the historical town gateways.	The Old Town Development Strategy identifies this design principle. The preparation of architectural guidelines is recommended in the CCMP which will be considered resources permitting.	Wording added on reinforcing line of the Town Walls and location of historic gateways
Business Solent	33	Page 60	Support	Agrees with the general approach to tall buildings and proposals sent out in the conceptual plan on page 63. However Business Southampton considers that the Southampton skyline is at present one of the most significant adverse and disappointing aspects of the city centre.	Noted; recent planning approvals and future development plans once built out will begin to address this concern	No change required
M. Hansen	4	Page 60	Object	Southampton needs to have some unity in its architecture. Some areas like the Old Town / Oxford Street / Bedford Place should have some areas rebuilt as they once were and new buildings should be subject to extremely strict quality control. This wouldn't cost much more than building new (from my experience as a property developer).	Due to changes over time in landownership, use patterns and demand, building regulations, construction technology and viability it is not practical nor desirable to replicate past development patterns or architectural styles. However listed building	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					and conservation area status help to control inappropriate development.	
Business Solent	30	Page 61	Support	Strongly support the Urban Design Framework.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	34	Page 65	Support	Generally agrees with locations for landmark buildings but Business Solent would like to discuss them in more detail.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Business Solent	35	Page 65	Support	Agrees with the advice on the role of the heritage. Business Solent strongly supports ways the CCMP seeks to celebrate this heritage more fully by redevelopment of sites, revealing the Town Walls, re-establishing Brunswick Square and facilitating increased activity on the waterfront which will generate demand and investment in historic buildings and spaces in that location.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	36	Page 66	Support	Business Solent agrees with this approach to urban blocks and that opportunities to increase the permeability of other areas should also be proactively explored. By defining what components are required, it would become immediately apparent what types / forms of development are appropriate and which are not.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	37	Page 66	Support	Strongly supports proposition that frontages to the main routes and open spaces should generate activity on the street, including shops, cafes and bars.	Welcome support.	No change required
Design ACB Architects	2	Page 67	Comment	Section 3 Future approaches of Southampton should be compared with cities such as Melbourne and Dusseldorf which do not have a common typology rather than cities such as Bath, West London, Barcelona and Copenhagen with consistency. Southampton cannot match the latter as it doesn't have very large areas of preserved historical architecture, nor recreate with modern buildings which have short lifespans.	Noted. New development in the western parts of the city centre and along the waterfront offer the potential to develop a more consistent design approach to development, such as height constraints, as demonstrated in recent development along Harbour Parade and West Quay Road	No change required
Business Solent	38	Page 67	Support	Strongly agrees that consistency of building height and form is a character of many of the most recognisable and identifiable cities and is a key element of their enduring quality. Although	Welcome support.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				this was the case historically for Southampton, modern developments have forgotten the significance of this context and this must be rediscovered.		
Business Solent	39	Page 68	Support	Strongly agrees that adapting to change over time is an important quality which has to be harnessed within the city centre.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	40	Page 68	Support	Agree that in the city roof areas are important opportunities which should be taken up.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	41	Page 69	Support	Business Solent considers that the lack of 'city identity' is one of the most important issues which the city centre needs to face up to. The development of a simple set of architectural references would help provide a consistency and coherence to the built form and help distinguish it from other locations.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	42	Page 69	Support	Strongly endorse specific guidelines such as design codes taking forward the Streetscape manual and Business Solent would wish to discuss this in detail with the city council and others.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Business Solent	43	Page 69	Support	Business Solent agrees that considerations of the sustainability of built form can help to create a rich character within the centre and should contribute to defining the suggested city-style.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	44	Page 70	Support	Business Solent agrees that the city centre has an important role in making the city a sustainable place.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	45	Page 70	Support	Strongly endorse measures to improve the sustainable performance of the city centre.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	46	Page 71	Support	Agree that all those areas beyond the Central Parks should be priorities for various forms of new parks and public access. Generally support the 'Streets and Spaces' approach shown on the plan and the accompanying objectives and proposals.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	47	Page 72	Support	Supports the proposal for a green network of streets and spaces developed out from the existing parks and connecting to new open spaces.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	48	Page 72	Support	Proposed network of green streets connecting to existing and new open spaces along the main routes is endorsed by Business Solent including the eight new major green spaces.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	49	Page 73	Support	Supports proposals for green roofs and walls.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business	50	Page 73	Support	Agrees that new green space can provide opportunities for	Welcome support.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Solent				wildlife and encourage a more bio-diverse environment. Would also support the restoration of a natural profile to the waters edge to encourage wildlife.		
Business Solent	51	Page 74	Support	Strongly support the blue grid proposed with significant practical as well as aesthetic and biodiversity benefits.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	52	Page 74	Support	Supports approach to Sustainable Urban Drainage.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	53	Page 74	Support	Supports both the overall water features concept and the Western Esplanade proposal to create a major water channel.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	54	Page 74	Support	Supports proposals for the 'Access to the Water's Edge'	Welcome support.	No change required
A. Samuels	13	Page 74	Comment	Water features may "look nice" but they are expensive to build and maintain and subject to weather and abuse and other problems and are generally not desirable. Grass and shrubs and plants and flowers are altogether better.	Noted. Water features will need to respond to legislative requirements for sustainable urban drainage which will incorporate soft landscaping as a means of water retention to reduce risks of flooding.	No change required
Dr P.W.Garratt	10	Page 74	Object	We do not need more water features; just allow enjoyment of the ones we have by improving access.	Noted. New features and new ways of implementing water retention and management through sustainable urban drainage systems will need to be considered as one of the means of reconnecting the city with its waterfront by establishing a "blue grid".	No change required
Business Solent	55	Page 75	Support	Supports the 'managed adaptive approach' to flood risk together with broad proposals set out for managing flood risk, design proposals and dealing with surface water.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	56	Page 78	Support	Business Solent agrees with the strategy for renewable energy together with the general proposals set out.	Welcome support.	No change required
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	1	Page 78	Comment	Small scale wind turbines can have a detrimental impact on military radar and DIO safeguarding can complete a technical assessment. Within PPS22 developers should confirm that MOD and aviation concerns have been addressed. To confirm the suitability, please complete the standard windfarm proforma and forward it to DIO.	Noted	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Dr P.W.Garratt	11	Page 78	Comment	<p>Re. Biomass – the impact on the environment of biomass energy production on a global scale is negative until authorities exercise control over the sources of fuel.</p> <p>Suggestion - Southampton should capitalise on its position for geothermal power.</p>	Noted. Work on expanding the energy network is progressing as identified in the Plan and through the Low Carbon City Strategy	No change required
Business Solent	57	Page 80	Support	Business Solent agrees with the approach on transport but would wish to discuss the detailed implications of the various transport issues involved.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Associated British Ports	4	Page 80	Object	The plan does not mention where the balance lies between pedestrian movements and the access needs of the Port. ABP considers that the final Plan must make it clear that if there is any conflict between proposed new development and the interests of the operational Port, in respect of its access as well as possible limitations on the use of adjoining Port land, then such conflict must be resolved in favour of the interests of the nationally significant port. This approach is supported by national transport policy (PPG 13), National Policy Statement on ports and draft National Planning Policy Framework. Core Strategy policy CS 18 also requires development not to prejudice access to the Port along the key road corridors.	Noted. The Council is in active dialogue with ABP on a number of development and highway improvement proposals	Wording added to reflect a balanced approach is required.
Dr P.W.Garratt	3	Page 80	Comment	<p>No mention of Park & Ride to keep cars out of the city.</p> <p>Suggestion - Plenty of unused land at the junction of M271 and Millbrook bypass.</p>	As the growth of the city centre is expected to be slower than envisaged in the Core Strategy strategic park and ride facilities are not currently required. However consideration may be given to demand from the east where there are higher increases in demand, using the strategic Transport for South Hampshire transport model	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	21	Page 80 - 92	Comment	Easy to get about - Aviva supports in principle the enhancement of key transport routes, but is concerned about contradiction between growth agenda / reducing road capacity. Re retail – this is dependent on easy access by car (and public transport) otherwise people would travel elsewhere. Any	Noted. A strategic transport model has been developed by Transport for South Hampshire to comprehensively assess the	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>reclassification of roads should take account of requirements for future development; therefore policy should state that enhancements will maintain capacity.</p> <p>Downgrading/realigning roads around the Aviva retail park is a concern – any loss of parking would make the plan ineffective as it would harm the vitality and viability of the city centre.</p> <p>Suggestion - Welcome ref. to CCMP to ensure sufficient car parking (p.90). However this chapter must go further & acknowledge that from a retail perspective the competitiveness of city centre depends to a significant degree on gaining easy access by car (as well as public transport) and able to easily park close to the central shopping area.</p>	wider transport impact of city centre redevelopments. New parking standards are set out in support of Policies 16/17 in the CCAP. The aim is to maintain the existing level of car parking and a balanced approach to maintaining access for cars and public transport with improved pedestrian links.	
Business Solent	58	Page 81	Support	Agrees with this view on transport and accommodating growth.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	59	Page 82	Support	Agrees with the transport hierarchy and endorses the basic principles in the concept diagram on page 82.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	60	Page 82	Comment	Business Solent remains to be convinced that either the CCMP or CCAP has adequately demonstrated how the concept can be practically translated into a workable arrangement on the ground and would wish to discuss the detailed implications including a future possible park and ride.	Note request to discuss proposals further	No change required
Business Solent	61	Page 83	Support	Broadly agrees with the approach on Central Station but would wish to discuss the relevant detailed design issues including the possibility of moving the station concourse eastwards closer to the city core and the issue of coach station relocation.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss proposals further	No change required
Business Solent	62	Page 85	Support	Agrees with all these proposed interventions in the plan 'From Ring Road to City Streets' but would wish to discuss the relevant detailed design issues.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Business Solent	63	Page 85	Comment	Business Solent would like to see consideration given to routing traffic around the Station Quarter via Commercial Road and Central Station bridge to East Park Terrace and New Road becoming (primarily) for access and buses only and for Civic Centre Road to be significantly modified on the south side of the Civic Centre to incorporate a pedestrian only public space.	Noted. Options to improve the pedestrian environment in Station Quarter (and the rest of the City Centre) are being considered alongside a balanced approach to maintaining access for cars and public transport	

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	64	Page 86	Support	Agrees that improving the environment for pedestrians is key to growth as a connected series of places rather than individual isolated developments.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	65	Page 87	Comment	Agrees with this approach of offering high quality open space, squares and streets to make walking more attractive but would wish to discuss the principal routes in more detail with city council and others.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss routes further	No change required
Business Solent	66	Page 88	Support	Support the preparation of a more detailed bus strategy and would wish to proactively participate in its formulation.	Welcome support. Note request to be involved in its formulation	No change required
Business Solent	67	Page 88	Object	Business Solent disagrees with the proposal to relocate the coach station to a suggested site off Mountbatten Way and would wish to further discuss relocation options.	Policy 16 of the CCAP encourages the relocation or redevelopment of the existing coach station to provide closer links with the transport interchange at Central Station. Note request to discuss relocation when this development opportunity comes forward.	No change required
Business Solent	68	Page 88	Support	Agrees that making the city centre more accessible to cyclists has potential to encourage even more than 400-500 peak hour journeys identified as required to meet the growth plans and would wish to further discuss detailed proposals.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	69	Page 90	Support	Supports overall approach to parking and the aim to cap overall parking provision with no more parking provided than required to make developments viable.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	70	Page 90	Comment	There is a need to begin shifting the balance between private non-residential long stay spaces and public managed long and short term spaces with new public parking at principal gateways into the centre and over the medium and longer term gradually reducing the number of private spaces as sites are redeveloped and removing selected existing public car parking facilities within the central core where appropriate.	New parking standards are set out in support of Policies 16/17 in the CCAP. The aim is to maintain the existing level of car parking and a balanced approach to maintaining access for cars and public transport with improved pedestrian links.	
Business Solent	71	Page 91	Support	Broadly supports possible framework for major new parking locations but agrees that this will need to be tested further and	Welcome support. Note request to be involved in this	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				would wish to proactively participate in the formulation of standards and the strategy.	framework	
Business Solent	72	Page 92	Support	Agrees with the view that delivering growth and expansion of the transport system requires close partnership working.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	73	Page 95	Comment	Notes that a key part of the southern frontage to Platform Road west of Admiralty House appears to be omitted from the Holyrood / Queens Park quarter and recommends consideration of amending the boundary.	Noted; boundary of quarter incorrect on map.	Boundary to be amended
Business Solent	74	Page 95	Comment	Question whether the City Cruise Terminal area should be included within either the Western Gateway or Royal Pier / Waterfront.	The City Cruise Terminal is within the control of ABP and therefore cannot be included within the boundary of the CCMP	No change required
Business Solent	75	Page 97	Support	Supports this overall approach but finds the schematic impression of the new Station Square included to be rather bland. Business Solent would wish to discuss the relevant detailed design and related issues including the square, the possibility of moving the station concourse eastwards and the proposed coach station relocation.	Noted. This is an initial artist's impression and detailed work is beyond the scope of the CCMP. Further work has now commenced to develop the proposals in more detail. Further dialogue will commence at an appropriate stage	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	12	Page 98	Comment	(and CCAP Station Quarter) Realignment of Western Esplanade - there needs to be commitment to transport rights of way / management of movement.	Noted. Further work has now commenced to develop proposals in more detail	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	11	Page 99	Comment	(and CCAP) Fails to deal adequately with car parking issues on Station Quarter / Western Gateway (how managed, relocated, dispersed, or provision outside of area etc).	Noted. Further work has now commenced to develop proposals in more detail	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	13	Page 99	Comment	(and CCAP Station Quarter / Western Gateway) New office-led area will need to be underpinned by retail, café and restaurants to encourage quality occupation.	Agreed. This point is made in the text.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	20	Page 99	Object	(and CCAP policy 20) Support the Station Quarter gateway destination concept but this needs to relate to all forms of transport. Have serious doubts re. viability of quantum of office uses proposed, notwithstanding CSPR. Aware that market testing is underway – and this should be made available for scrutiny to	Detailed work is beyond the scope of the CCMP. Further work has now commenced to develop the proposals in more detail and test viability.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>ensure robust evidence.</p> <p>Support the re-provision of car parking, as this is important to Retail Parks, but requires clarification (definition of “surrounding developments” is unclear). Concerns at loss of car parking / road capacity.</p> <p>Reference to a detailed masterplan needs clarification.</p> <p>Suggestion - Evidence base has not been made available, unable to provide further suggested changes without interrogation of this.</p>		
Hammerson	5	Page 99	Comment	<p>Support aspiration to create a new CBD focused on a new station square. Hammerson has serious concerns over the need for and viability of 41,147 sqm of retail floorspace that form part of the proposals (page 177). This is significantly in excess of what would constitute ‘local’ or ‘ancillary’ retail referred to in pages 99 & 101. The level proposed would be far in excess of that usually associated with station retailing and is at a scale that will detract from the city centre. It has no rational or reasonable basis and should be substantially reduced.</p>	<p>The proposals set out in the CCMP are illustrative demonstrating the potential capacity of the city centre in the longer term. It is accepted that in the life time of the CCAP retail uses will be ancillary to the Central Station itself as set out in Policy 20 of the CCAP. The CCAP states the criteria for an appropriate expansion of the PSA in Policy 5.</p>	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	18	Pages 99 & 117	Comment	<p>Concerned that the axonometric diagrams and layout plans give impression that more work has been done than is the case. These diagrams must not be translated literally into policy.</p> <p>Suggestion - Figures, layout plan etc should be clearly marked as indicative.</p>	<p>Noted. The source illustration on p34 and 35 is clearly labelled “illustrative view”</p>	<p>For additional clarification additional labels added to illustrative views in each Quarter</p>
A. Samuels	14	Page 101	Comment	<p>Query how the capacity of Western Esplanade be reduced and what this means.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Wording to be amended to clarify intention to reduce vehicular capacity whilst rerouting through traffic</p>
Business	76	Page 103	Support	<p>Supports overall approach to Western Gateway but would wish</p>	<p>Welcome support. Note</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Solent				to discuss detailed design and related issues.	request to discuss issues further	
Associated British Ports	5	Page 103	Object	ABP are extremely concerned about indications that residential use will be welcomed in the Western Gateway. Current uses are generally compatible with operation of a large port operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The proliferation of residential use in any part of the Western Gateway area has the potential for significant implications for the current and future operation of the adjacent parts of the Port. Residential use is not, in principle, an appropriate use in this quarter in accordance with current national policy.	Noted. When appropriate, further detailed plans will be developed taking into consideration a balanced approach to the needs of the city with that of the Port operations. Further dialogue will commence at an appropriate stage	No change required
A. Samuels	15	Page 103	Comment	The use of this phrase Western Gateway can be misleading. Exactly how does it differ from what is now generally known as West Quay? Certainly linkage must always apply. Relocating the smaller industrial units will be unpopular, and anyway will not be easy. The Western Gateway concept is probably over-ambitious.	Noted. The CCMP clearly defines this area of the city centre being to the west of WestQuay Shopping Centre and West Quay Retail Parks. The proposals for Western Gateway are long term.	No change required
Associated British Ports	3	Page 105	Object	ABP is concerned at references throughout the draft CCAP and CCMP which point to the possibility of making the City Cruise Terminal a new waterfront destination should the Port wish to facilitate this. Unfortunately other than in a carefully regulated situation such as applies around a passenger terminal, it is not possible for ABP to 'facilitate' a proposal for public access to or on operational port land within the customs fence, even if it wished to do so.	Noted. This remains a potential opportunity in the longer term, providing the Port wish to provide direct access to the Cruise Terminal. The CCAP clarifies that the Cruise Terminal is not identified as a key destination.	No change required
Associated British Ports	6	Page 105	Object	The design guidance should not refer to maintaining and creating views to cruise liners and other port operational land buildings within the Western Docks as land uses are subject to frequent change to meet needs of traders and shippers and these enjoy permitted development rights.	Noted. It is not appropriate to discount views of the water and port activity as this is fundamental to the city's location by the Rivers' Test and Itchen and is part of its unique identity. However it is recognised that the Port has permitted development rights which mean that views cannot be protected.	Text added to clarify 'views of the water and port activities should be maintained or created, as appropriate.
Associated	7	Page 106	Object	Reference to a strategic link towards the City Cruise terminal	Noted. See response above.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
British Ports				and connections to it are inappropriate.		
Business Solent	77	Page 109	Support	Strongly supports the overall approach to Royal Pier Waterfront and because of the overwhelming importance of this site would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	16	Page 109	Support	(and CCAP Royal Pier) Waterfront is a valuable opportunity to support the city becoming an international destination – and favourable to the city's overall renaissance.	Welcome support	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	18	Page 111	Comment	(and CCAP Royal Pier) The council needs to be more specific as to the breakdown of mixed uses envisaged for this site.	Noted. Detailed work is beyond the scope of the CCMP. Further work has now commenced to develop the master plan proposals in more detail.	No change required
Associated British Ports	8	Page 111	Comment	Residential uses will only be acceptable in any Mayflower Park / Royal Pier redevelopment scheme provided that it does not adversely impact on the ongoing successful operation of the port.	Noted. Dialogue has commenced on appropriate locations for residential development.	No change required
Hammerson	6	Page 113	Support	Hammerson supports the principle of the Royal Pier Waterfront VIP and believes it is imperative that any scheme brought forward on the site links with both the Watermark WestQuay scheme and the wider city centre.	Welcome support and discussions will be necessary on the links between Royal Pier Waterfront and Watermark WestQuay schemes as well as to the rest of the city centre.	No change required
Dr P.W.Garratt	8	Page 113	Comment	Concerned about how the Royal Pier redevelopment will be reached across a busy road.	Further detailed design work is commencing to improve pedestrian access.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	17	Page 113	Comment	(and CCAP Royal Pier) Needs to be a clearer statement as to the mode of transport and connectivity to the site.	Noted. Detailed work is beyond the scope of the CCMP. Further work has now commenced to develop the master plan proposals in more detail.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	14	Page 115	Comment	Support the strategy to reinforce retail core and extend westwards & creating value to stimulate change. Consideration needs to be given to how the existing needs of the Retail Parks will be provided in future (Aviva's view is that the retail park offers a complimentary retail offer to West Quay	Noted. The CCMP sets out a long term vision for the future development of the city centre and how this might be achieved. The policies set out	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>Shopping Centre) – i.e. should the needs be re-provided within Heart of the City or elsewhere? (existing tenants might be forced out of the centre). Question whether these plans are deliverable.</p> <p>Alternative text - in view of the need for further evidence to be made available, unable to provide further suggested changes.</p>	in the CCAP are those that are considered to be achievable over the period to 2026.	
Business Solent	78	Page 115	Support	Supports the overall approach for the Heart of the City Quarter but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues including the need for proactive steps to correct the current east-west imbalance, concerns about the East Street Shopping Centre proposals and potential issues with the Bargate Shopping Centre and Above Bar Parkside.	Noted. Further dialogue will commence at an appropriate stage.	No change required
Hammerson	8	Page 115	Support	Hammerson supports the principle of the redevelopment of the Above Bar West and Above Bar and Bargate areas of the city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
Hammerson	9	Page 115	Object	Hammerson has consistently objected to the further westwards expansion of the core city centre as they do not believe this represents the most appropriate way of enhancing and expanding the attraction and function of the city centre. Hammerson therefore objects to the future development of the West Quay Retail Parks as envisaged in the CCMP.	Noted. The CCMP sets out a long term vision for the future development of the city centre and how this might be achieved. The CCAP states the criteria for an appropriate expansion of the PSA. Proposals coming forward earlier than set out in the phasing or not capable of forming an expansion to the PSA will be subject to an impact test. This is in order to protect the existing retail areas and is in line with the Core Strategy approach. Policy 5 in the CCAP will be amended to clarify this.	Text to added to clarify this point: 'Proposals coming forward earlier than set out in the phasing plan and that do not form part of an expansion of the primary shopping area will be subject to an impact test.'
A. Samuels	16	Page 115	Comment	Until the extended WestQuay Watermark is built and opening it will be difficult to plan ahead in any detail, because the impact of the new development will need to be assessed first. A large format store is unlikely to appear in Portland Terrace, awaiting	Noted. See response above	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				this assessment though the site cries out for development. Connectivity with the Parks from the eastern side of Above Bar would be a huge improvement.		
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	24	Page 116	Comment	(and CCAP Heart of the City) There needs to be an economic development appraisal that takes account of sectors, jobs, asset value, quality of floorspace required, mixed use analysis to help support the CCAP.	The CCAP and CCMP were based on commercial advice from Strutt and Parker which supported the Preferred Approach paper. Further deliverability evidence is being prepared	No change required
John Lewis	3	Page 116	Object	Aligned with comments on the CCAP, John Lewis considers that the long term proposals for redevelopment of the existing retail parks at Harbour Parade and West Quay Retail Park could adversely impact upon the vitality and viability of the existing PSA. It considered that the proposed high density / multi level retail including large format stores on the existing retail park land may adversely impact upon the PSA as existing retailers in the retail core relocate to new accommodation and/or spending is diluted across the city centre to impact upon the trading of existing stores in the PSA and WestQuay.	Noted. See response above	No change required
A. Samuels	5	Page 121	Comment	The eastern side of Above Bar should be redeveloped so as to open out into the parks, instead of being just ugly service points.	Noted	No change required
Business Solent	79	Page 123	Support	Supports the overall approach to the Cultural Quarter but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Hammerson	11	Page 123	Support	Hammerson support the Cultural Quarter VIP	Welcome support	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	27	Page 123	Comment	(and CCAP Northern Above Bar / Mayflower Plaza) Further work needs to be undertaken to improve pedestrian, cycle and transport links / needs to be commitment to open civic space.	Noted. Further detailed plans to improve the public realm is commencing through the City Streets programme.	No change required
A. Samuels	12	Page 124	Comment	The old cinema block immediately to the north of Civic Centre Road would be a useful "rounding off" acquisition for development from the City Council.	Noted	No change required
A. Samuels	17	Page 124	Comment	The premises on the east of Above Bar (north of the proposed Arts Complex) are poor and need sensitive comprehensive redevelopment, using the Park aspect to the east to maximum advantage.	Noted	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hammerson	12	Page 128	Support	Hammerson support the Southampton Solent University VIP	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	80	Page 129	Support	Supports the overall approach to the Southampton Solent University Quarter but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
A. Samuels	9	Page 129	Comment	As universities are charities there can be legal difficulties if they try to let part of their land to commercial enterprises for commercial purposes. This issue arose in connection with Lloyds Register at the University of Southampton, and fortunately was resolved, on the research and teaching arguments.	Noted.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	28	Page 130	Comment	(and CCAP East Park Terrace / St Marys Road) Any buildings on the proposed extension sites must have a positive relationship with all of the frontages (the park, Charlotte Place etc).	Noted	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	29	Page 130	Comment	(and CCAP East Park Terrace / St Marys Road) St. Mary Street and Northam appear to be severed from St. Mary's Road / Newtown; there needs to be a definitive statement re. linkage and connectivity.	Agreed.	Wording amended to reflect the need for positive relationships, creating coordinated and coherent street frontages
Southampton Solent University	1	Page 130	Object	The rationale behind the identification of the 'landmark features' is not clear, nor does the plan identify what might be defined as a landmark feature. For a small site the provision of 5 landmark features seems excessive and unnecessary. Object to the identification of these unless evidence is shown to justify their proposal and what might be expected. Policy 33 in the CCAP does not refer to these. Suggest that the provision of a high quality design developed through discussions with the council ought to be sufficient to secure a suitable scheme in visual/architectural terms.	Landmark buildings are explained on p65. The site is in a prominent location adjacent to the Parks and eastern approach and warrants landmark features in these locations.	No change required
Southampton Solent University	2	Page 132	Support /Comment	Supports the aspiration to downgrade EPT providing that the University can maintain adequate safe and convenient vehicular access to the EPT site.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	81	Page 134	Comment	Business Solent is not entirely persuaded by the proposed leisure led scheme or the secondary school / academy at Itchen Riverside Quarter and would wish to discuss other options together with design issues including connectivity.	Noted. Note request to discuss options for future development of the site.	No change required
Hammerson	7	Page 135	Comment	Hammerson supports the principle of the Itchen Riverside VIP	Noted. This area relates to a	Amend foot note on

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				although questions the justification for the 35,853 sq m of retail floorspace. There is no policy justification for such a level of retail in this location, significantly divorced from the city centre and at a scale that will detract from the city centre. It has no rational or reasonable basis and should be substantially reduced.	regional leisure –led mixed use development of the site which was being proposed at the time of preparation of the CCMP and public consultation in 2012. The CCAP Policy 25 states that proposals for retail in this 'out of centre' location will be considered in relation to viability and national retail policy/Core Strategy CS 3.	p177
Associated British Ports	9	Page 135	Comment	ABP's view is that the Itchen wharf sites do not have a long term future and will be probably be available for redevelopment purposes well within the plan period of the CCAP.	Noted.	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	1	Page 135	Object	Tarmac and Hanson object to the principle for redevelopment of the wharves. There is no need to relocate the wharves and the continuing operation of the wharves is important for the built development proposed in the City.	The wharves make an important contribution to mineral supply. If the capacity can be relocated then they can be redeveloped; if not they will continue to be safeguarded in line with the Minerals and Waste Plan (which also allows for improvement of the wharves).	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	2	Page 135	Object	Tarmac and Hanson are concerned that any future planning applications for such things as replacement or improvement of existing facilities will be affected by the council's aims and development policies for the area. This is not acceptable clear guidance should be provided to ensure the continuance of existing uses will not be affected by Master Plan policies.	Noted. As noted above the wharves will remain safeguarded until such time they can be relocated.	No change required
A. Samuels	6	Page 136	Comment	Question whether "Saints Square" is compatible with the need for wharf side space and facilities for aggregates and such materials? What is the proposed plan for the wharves? Hitherto protecting the Itchen wharves has been the policy. The plan seems to think otherwise.	Noted. See response above	No change required
A. Samuels	7	Page 136	Comment	It is nearly time to rename the "Town Depot" site.	Noted; this is a working title for the site and will be changed in due course as	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					new proposals come forward	
A. Samuels	18	Page 136	Object	The future of the aggregate industry must be safeguarded. Coming out of recession the development and construction industry will require substantially increased supplies of aggregate. The proposals for the riverside land to the north of the old town depot land seem far too ambitious, including a Saints Park.	Noted. See response above.	No change required
Turnstone Group	2	Page 136	Support	Thank you for giving American Wharf a proper 'setting' to reflect its Listed Status.	Welcome support	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	20	Page 136	Support	(and CCAP Town Depot) Itchen Riverside vista should use St. Mary's stadium as a backdrop. Suggestion - Creation of a riverside pedestrian walkway along Itchen Riverside	Noted. The Stadium is identified as a key building in the Tall Building Framework on p63. Proposals for a continuous riverside walkway are included.	Text amended to include reference to views towards the Stadium
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	22	Page 137	Comment	(and CCAP Town Depot) Building design at Town Depot & Riverside must be of the highest quality; this will influence the commercial viability.	Agreed	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	19	Page 138	Support	(and CCAP Town Depot) The site potential is understated – there is a wealth of development opportunities beyond the proposed community, sports and recreation uses.	Agreed. The CCMP identifies other possible uses.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	21	Page 138	Comment	(and CCAP Town Depot) Transport infrastructure should be re-considered Suggestion - Consider a Stadium / St. Mary's halt station.	Agreed. Improved connectivity is identified.	No change required
A. Samuels	8	Page 138	Comment	Question who does or would sponsor a maritime academy, what about Warsash, and what is the view of the maritime world and of Solent University?	Noted. Further discussions with relevant parties are being progressed.	No change required
Business Solent	82	Page 141	Support	Supports the overall approach to the Ocean Village Quarter and would suggest that the 'knowledge quarter' and 'maritime events' roles could be more robustly reflected within the CCAP. Business Solent would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss issues further	No change required
Dr P.W.Garratt	7	Page 141	Object	Ocean Village is stated by residents as being too far away – disagree.	The statement relates to a generalised perception.	Text amended to say '...it is perceived by some to be too far from the Centre.'
Dr P.W.Garratt	9	Page 147	Comment	Concerns raised with reference to the redevelopment of the	Noted.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				fruit & veg area – and whether it will escape the pressures that 'killed' Kingsland Market.		
Business Solent	83	Page 147	Support	Supports the overall approach to the Holyrood/Queens Park Quarter but has significant concerns regarding the absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within this quarter. Business Solent would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues including the reinvigoration of Canal Walk and Back of the Walls links and the southern frontage of Platform Road.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss detailed design etc as developments evolve.	No change required
Hammerson	10	Page 147	Support	Hammerson support the Fruit and Vegetable Market	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	19	Page 148	Comment	Fruit and vegetable market land proposals are good. But the vulnerability of residents to abuse from leisure users must always be borne in mind.	Noted	No change required
Business Solent	84	Page 153	Comment	Business Solent would wish to discuss the proposed redevelopment and detailed design of key sites including Albion Place, WestQuay Eastern site and the Bargate/Bargate Shopping Centre locations including opportunities for new retail, leisure and housing and a possible 'City Discovery Centre'.	Note request to discuss detailed design etc as developments evolve.	No change required
Business Solent	85	Page 153	Comment	Supports the overall approach proposed for the Old Town. However outside the key sites, and in terms of the need for selective redevelopment of the more degraded parts alongside sensitive management of historical assets, there is an absence of guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within this quarter. Business Solent would wish to discuss these concerns about other detailed design issues.	Welcomes support. Note request to discuss detailed proposals for regenerating the Old Town.	
A. Samuels	20	Page 154	Comment	The claim of an alleged town green to the east of High Street has been hanging around too long and should be resolved one way or the other; otherwise development could be seriously impeded.	Noted. The CCAP clarifies policy in relation to this land	No change required
Business Solent	86	Page 159	Comment	Generally supports the approach proposed for St Marys. Business Solent has concerns regarding the absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading /	Welcomes support. Note request to discuss detailed proposals for regenerating the St Mary's Quarter.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				enhancement of the built environment within this quarter. Business Solent would wish to explore means by which more localised and smaller scale, yet significant changes could be considered, perhaps through neighbourhood planning.		
A. Samuels	10	Page 160	Comment	Queried what the green space around St Mary's Church is and whether there is any agreement with the Church.	The space is identified as existing open space – a church yard and is protect open space in the CCAP	No change required
Longfleet Engineering	1	Page 163	Support	Suggested change to the Carlton Crescent office area in the CCAP will allow greater flexibility in future alternative use of No. 8 Southampton Street which is considered consistent with the aims of the CCMP.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	87	Page 163	Comment	Supports the overall approach proposed for Bedford Place but has concerns regarding the comparative absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within this quarter. Business Solent would wish to explore means by which more localised and smaller scale, yet significant changes could be considered, perhaps through neighbourhood planning.	Welcomes support. Note request to discuss detailed proposals for regenerating the Bedford Place Quarter.	
Business Solent	88	Page 167	Support	Supports the overall approach proposed for the Central Parks.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	89	Page 172	Support	Agrees with the importance of delivery and believes the ultimate success of the Plan will require a range of parties to work together closely towards a common objective over a protracted time period, something which hasn't necessarily happened before.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	90	Page 172	Comment	Two key delivery actions are required; a clear business plan for each VIP and appropriate arrangements to be put in place outside the VIPs.	The Council has prepared a 5 year Delivery Plan in order to monitor progress on VIPs, public realm improvements and other infrastructure related schemes. Aspects of this will be shared with the business community when appropriate.	No change required
Business Solent	91	Page 172	Support	Supports the establishment of a City Centre Forum in principle and believes that the necessary and essential enhanced	Welcome support	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				partnership arrangements should be fully implemented as soon as possible, building on, and possibly simplifying what already exists.		
Business Solent	92	Page 172	Support	Fully support strengthening links between local businesses, the community and the city council. It is highly likely that differing solutions and methodologies will be required to suit different circumstances and timescales.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	95	Page 172	Comment	Business Solent is keen to promote the creation of a Southampton / Solent 'embassy' working with the public and education sectors to proactively promote the city and city region and operate as a central point for information and city marketing.	Noted	No change required
Hammerson	19	Page 172	Comment	It is acknowledged that the plan sets out an ambitious vision for the city centre that can only be delivered by the Council working in partnership with the business community, investors, key landowners and public stakeholders. Hammerson wish to play an active and positive role in the delivery of the CCMP.	Welcome support. Note request to be involved in the delivery of the CCMP	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	33	Page 172	Support	It will be quite a challenge but the CCAP / CCMP is visionary and presents the best chance to deliver on the seven VIP's – the review of the City Transport Strategy (which identifies 14 key issues) shows how the CCAP and connectivity / infrastructure themes relate.	Welcome support	No change required
Hammerson	21	Page 172-4	Comment	Floorspace figures here are inconsistent with the Table on page 177 and importantly significantly in excess of the Core Strategy figures in policy CS 1.	The figures given are indicative showing the potential capacity for new development in the City centre over the next 15 years and beyond, and therefore are not consistent with the Core Strategy Partial Review which covers the period up to 2026	No change required
A. Samuels	21	Page 172-4	Comment	A single central unified business forum is essential and the business community must play a much more active part in city planning. The plan is weak on infrastructure, especially transportation and the relationship with the transport operations is disappointing. Funding needs much more careful calculation.	Noted. Detailed work is beyond the scope of the CCMP. Further work has now commenced to develop the master plan proposals in more detail.	No change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	22	Page 172 - 177	Object	<p>Would expect a growth strategy such as proposed to be subject to rigorous testing with attention to funding, phasing and monitoring & review of evidence base. There is little substance or detail and this is an area that requires urgent attention.</p> <p>Aviva aware that further work has been commissioned for Station Quarter – but it should have been to inform the CCMP; and as an investor we would expect this type of evidence base prior to any design work in the current economic climate. Aviva will want to scrutinise the evidence base in some detail and remain concerned that CCMP is premature and based on unsound evidence base.</p> <p>Suggestion - SCC needs to give attention to expanding & enhancing the delivery chapter. Without access to evidence base & feasibility work that underpins it, we are not in a position to offer alternative approach at this stage.</p>	Noted. Further viability work is being progressed to support the CCAP.	No change required
Business Solent	93	Page 173	Comment	Likely role of the local business sector could include the following key aspects; critical friend, promotion, initiating development, lobbying, development policy and direct role.	Welcome support of local business in helping to deliver the CCMP	No change required
Hammerson	20	Page 174-5	Support	The sequence of delivery is largely supported subject to our detailed comments on sites.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	94	Page 174-5	Support	Agrees with the initial development phasing sequence. Business Solent would wish to discuss the key aspects more formally with the city council, Hampshire Chamber of Commerce (Southampton) and others at the earliest opportunity.	Welcome support. Note request to discuss phasing sequence further	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	19	Page 174 -175	Comment	<p>Welcome the flexible timeframes for areas which Aviva have an interest in; essential if the plans are to have realistic prospect of delivery – but timeframes require monitoring and discussion with key stakeholders during the plan's lifetime.</p> <p>Suggestion - Add sentence on end of second paragraph (p.174): <u>"These timescales will be subject to regular monitoring and review"</u></p>	Welcome support. Text to be amended to address this point.	Text to be added at end of second paragraph on p174 'The timescale for delivery of all projects will be regularly monitored and reviewed. Proposals for redevelopment in the longer term will be subject to sufficient progress being made on

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
						early and mid term redevelopments and will be subject to appropriate impact tests.'
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	32	Page 174-5	Comment	Part 5, delivery - Needs to be much clearer commitment to actual timelines for each VIP so that infrastructure can be planned.	Noted. Further detailed work is being prepared to develop infrastructure plans to support VIPs and other developments	No change required
John Lewis	5	Page 175	Support	John Lewis generally agrees with the proposed priorities and sequence of development with the Heart of the City prioritised for development within 15+ years. Additional explanation should be included in part 5 to confirm that long term projects will only be considered for redevelopment after completion of early and mid-term projects and subject to appropriate impact assessment.	Welcome support. Text to be amended to address this point.	See response above.
John Lewis	4	Page 176	Object	The quantum of proposed retail and leisure development exceeds the Core Strategy target of 130,000 sq m gross new retail as well as identified capacity for additional comparison retail floorspace in the GVA Retail Study. In the light of this, and the reductions in the scale of office development in the CSPR, John Lewis considers that the CCMP's delivery objectives should be amended.	Noted. The figures given are indicative showing the potential capacity for new development in the City centre over the next 15 years and beyond, and therefore are not consistent with the Core Strategy Partial Review which covers the period up to 2026	Text added to clarify point – 'The figures given on this page and the next illustrate the potential capacity of the City centre to accommodate substantial growth over the next 15 years and beyond. These figures are therefore greater than those proposed in the Core Strategy Partial Review (period up to 2026). All proposals will require further testing through further studies and development briefs and will be subject to appropriate impact assessments.

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
A. Samuels	22	Page 176	Comment	The scale of growth in offices and warehouses and retail seems unduly optimistic, in view of rapidly advancing technology, requiring less office space not more, and more warehousing and less shop space in retail.	Noted. See response above.	See response above.
Hammerson	13	Page 177	Object	A number of the VIPs include a significant amount of retail and leisure/food and drink floorspace. Hammerson has consistently maintained that the focus for new retail development should be the core city centre (PSA). This would address existing deficiencies, notably east of Bargate and would rebalance the retail focus of the centre. These proposals should progress in advance of any further expansion of the centre to the west, a point acknowledged by the GVA retail study.	Noted. The CCMP sets out a long term vision for the future development of the city centre and how this might be achieved. The CCAP states the criteria for an appropriate expansion of the PSA. Proposals coming forward earlier than set out in the phasing or not capable of forming an expansion to the PSA will be subject to an impact test. This is in order to protect the existing retail areas and is in line with the Core Strategy approach. Policy 5 in the CCAP will be amended to clarify this.	See response above
Hammerson	14	Page 177	Object	The floorspace figures quoted in this table take no account of the level of floorspace lost through the development proposals. It is insufficient to state that 'some will involve redevelopment of existing floorspace' (footnote). The level of net additional floorspace is important as it is only through this analysis can the VIPs promoted within the CCAP and CCMP be assessed against the Core Strategy. As matters currently stand, neither document is in conformity with the Core Strategy and cannot be supported.	Noted. See response above. A more detailed assessment of net additional floor areas has been carried out in support of the policies set out in the CCAP	Text added to footnote to clarify point.
Hammerson	15	Page 177	Object	If the total figures in the table are taken at face value, the CCMP identifies retail development significantly in excess of the retail need identified by GVA and within the Core Strategy. On this basis, there is no need to identify non-central sites for new retail development, especially the West Quay Retail Parks which would only exacerbate the westward shift of the city centre.	Noted See responses above	No further change required

Consultation Responses – CCMP and Public Realm Report 2012

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No. etc	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hammerson	16	Page 177	Object	Floorspace figures for Watermark WestQuay are incorrect. They should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retail (A1-A3): 34,700 sq m GIA - Hotel (C1): 5,600 sq m GIA - Residential (C3): 241 units - Cinema (D2): 7,800 sq m GIA 	Noted	Figures changed in table to correct ones

Public realm summary report

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Page No.	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of comment	Officer Response	Recommended change
Business Solent	1	Page 6	Support	Strongly agrees with analysis on 'Why is quality of public space important'. The main aim for the city centre and the city as a whole should therefore be 'to create liveability of its inhabitants'.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	2	Page 10	Support	Agree with the main challenges identified and considers it important to proactively address them all both now and over the next 20 to 30 years of city centre enhancement and development delivery.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	3	Page 12	Support	Agrees that to significantly increase accessibility and invite further use will help build a strong identity for the City as an attractive and enjoyable place to live and work.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	4	Page 12	Comment	Business Solent believes that actions such as the introduction of additional and more frequent city centre event programmes, new uses and functions are essential to increase the numbers and flow of people in the centre.	Noted	No change required
Business Solent	5	Page 14 - 20	Support	Business Solent fully supports all the proposed interventions and would wish to see them fully embedded in the final versions of the CCMP and CCAP.	Welcome support	No change required