

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

General comments

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Health and Safety Executive	1	General	The LPA are required to have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan Regulations in relation to managing risk of major hazards.	See below	See below
Health and Safety Executive	2	General	If there are any major hazard sites and pipelines, or associated consultation zones, within the Local Development Plan area, it would be helpful to indicate to potential developers the constraints likely to be imposed by their presence through a policy and proposals map.	Further dialogue has been undertaken with the HSE. There are two hazardous sites: the gas holders on Britannia Road, and the port explosives area.	Add a reference to the need to consult the HSE in the design guidance to the Itchen Riverside, Ocean Village and St Marys Quarters, and in the Port. Add consultation zones on proposals map.
EBRA	1	General	Only able to make general comments due to complexity of the document.	Note scope of the comments. Accept that the plan is complex (due to the size of the city centre and the number of topics to address).	Amend Appendix 1 and include diagram to show how the CCAP fits with other plans.
EBRA	2	General	There will be other factors such as state of economy, change in government policies and wishes of developers which will decide eventual outcomes.	The role of the CCAP is to guide development. Accept that its delivery will depend on external factors as well actions by the council.	No change required
EBRA	14	General	Support introduction of thresholds relating to HMOs.	Note comments. This is covered in the Supplementary Planning Document dealing with HMOs.	No change required
EBRA	15	General	Archaeology must be carefully preserved in accordance with regulations and not compromised by financial pressures.	This will be protected in line with NPPF / Core Strategy policy.	No change required
Shopmobility	1	General	Shopmobility are excited about the proposed changes but concerned that they may be forgotten in the process.	Welcome support. We accept the importance of	Add in specific reference to

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			Shopmobility provide a vital service for those with mobility issues and is a lifeline for local residents and customers enabling them to come into the city and spend money. We also provide an information service for visitors to Southampton.	the service and the need to reprovide it if its current location is redeveloped. (See response to comments on Policy 27)	Shopmobility and its reprovision
Southampton Action for Access	1	General	No reference to any relocation of city <i>shopmobility</i> (reference was made to this in previous consultations)	We accept the importance of the service and the need to reprovide it if its current location is redeveloped. (See response to comments on Policy 27)	Add in specific reference to Shopmobility and its reprovision
Business Solent	2	General	The CCAP relates reasonably well to the format and general content of the Master Plan although there are a number of detailed differences which are sometimes unexplained.	Welcome support. Accept the need to explain any differences; notably moving the Green Mile from Kingsway to Queensway and combining the 'Great Place to Shop' and 'Great Place to Visit' themes.	Add in explanation of differences between the CCAP and Master Plan (para 4.30 and 4.156)
Business Solent	97	General	Further information submitted with response; Future Southampton 'Visions and Values Paper' and 'Thoughts on a Master Plan for Southampton'.	Welcome the detailed submission from Business Solent	No change required
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	1	General	The principal concern of the Ministry of Defence relates to development and construction within the statutory safeguarding explosives consultation zone surrounding Marchwood Sea Mounting Centre (SMC). Several key development sites are within the outer zone known as Vulnerable Building Distance (VBD). The MOD is unlikely to be concerned by developments within this zone unless it supports a high concentration of people. All buildings in the VBD should be deemed 'non-vulnerable' i.e. of robust construction and design that will not collapse or sustain damage causing critical injury to the occupants should an explosive incident occur. Buildings that contain large areas of glass, tall structures (3+ storeys) or of lightweight design are classed as vulnerable.	Note comments on explosive safeguarding requirements. It is important to identify this issue in the Plan. Further discussions have been held with the DIO, and it is considered unlikely that the requirement to make buildings 'non vulnerable' will affect the objectives of the plan on the relevant sites.	Add reference in the supporting text to policy 14 (design), and a cross reference in the design guidance for quarters within the zone (Western Gateway, Royal Pier Waterfront, and small parts of Heart of the City and the Old Town.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hammerson	2	General	The Plan is overly long and difficult to navigate; it repeats long passages of the CCMP; provides conflicting messages, is inconsistent in its approach; and is selective referring to the relevant evidence base. As a result its effectiveness is undermined.	<p>Note comments. However the plan covers a large area and a number of issues and it would not therefore be appropriate to produce only a short plan.</p> <p>The CCMP has a different role to the CCAP and is more promotional. As a background document there will be considerable amount of repetition between the two plans. Accept the need to explain any differences; notably moving the Green Mile from Kingsway to Queensway and combining the 'Great Place to Shop' and 'Great Place to Visit' themes.</p> <p>Disagree that there is selective references to the evidence base (see responses on individual comments).</p>	Add in explanation of differences between the CCAP and Master Plan (para 4.30 and 4.156)
Hammerson	3	General	The Submission version should be shortened and redrafted to provide clear and concise advice / guidance on the detailed city centre policies and the identification of development opportunity sites, the levels of floorspace anticipated and the key site specific requirements to be delivered as part of a redevelopment proposal.	Disagree. Whilst recognising the importance of clear, concise guidance on the key development sites, the CCAP also provides the opportunity to set these sites within a context of the different quarters in	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				the centre and the strategic approach to development.	
Hammerson	4	General	To make policies clear, specific development sites should be identified rather than referring to a number of sites within a particular quarter i.e. map 15 shows 'Harbour Parade and Asda site' yet this is referred to as 2 separate sites elsewhere in the plan. This inconsistency is prevalent in other areas of the plan and is confusing.	Agree that there should be consistency in the name of development sites	Amend maps and text to refer to Above Bar West or Asda / Marlands Shopping Centre
Hammerson	5	General	In light of Hammerson's concerns about the general approach and drafting of the document, these representations focus on a number of key policies rather than the detailed wording / drafting.	Note scope of comments	No change required
Hammerson	20	General	It would be helpful if sites can be referred to on a consistent basis in both the CCAP and CCMP to minimise the opportunity to misinterpret specific policies and confuse the reader	Agree with the need for consistency. The Above Bar West name is used throughout both plans. As it is a new name, there is a need to refer to Asda and the Marlands Shopping Centre to explain where this site is.	No change required
Hammerson	21	General	We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments in more detail should this be appropriate.	Note request for further discussions	No change required
Environment Agency	10	General	Our 'Groundwater Protection: Policy & Practice' (GP3) part 4 outlines our policies for a number of development types and activities. Reference should be made to this document, in particular the sections relating to our general approach to groundwater protection, the discharge of liquid effluents to ground, land contamination, ground source heat pumps and cemetery developments	The Core Strategy policy 20 already requires measures to promote water efficiency and manage surface water run off.	
A. Samuels	1	General	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	Note comments and welcome overall support. The size of the document is because the plan covers a large area and a number of issues. As national guidance has shortened,	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			good sense and practical awareness; and commendation for good points is of no special purpose or value.	there is more need for local guidance to provide certainty for developers on the approach we will take. The CCMP has a different role to the CCAP and is more promotional. As a background document there will be considerable amount of repetition between the two plans.	
A. Samuels	3	General	The time delay in adopting city plans is always far too long. The core plan should be made ready quickly, as soon as possible after the NPPF comes into force.	The CCAP must follow the government's procedures in order to have sufficient weight when determining planning applications. Unfortunately this is a lengthy procedure, culminating in an examination.	No change required
A. Samuels	15	General	The declining Millbrook Industrial Estate, with its own railway station, and in close proximity to the Central Station, needs a substantial uplift. This might have some impact upon demand for office space and other space in the city centre i.e. warehousing and storage.	Agree with the need to improve industrial estates outside the city centre. This will be addressed in a later plan covering the area outside the city centre.	No change required
Natalia Kulabuchova	2	General	The water supply in Portland Street needs to be checked whether there is too much fluoride or chemicals being added, as the water smells unpleasant and unusable.	This is beyond the scope of the council and planning policy to address.	No change required
Gavin Marsh	11	General	Object - The consultation process considering the scope and reach of these proposals has been nowhere near sufficient. It has been a top down process with little genuine engagement.	Disagree. Considering the time and resource constraints, the consultation was sufficient and used a variety of different approaches to publicise the plans and	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>seek comments.</p> <p>Information was available online and in hard copies at libraries, Gateway and in the Central Housing Office. A display was produced and sited in the Central Library and Art Gallery foyer. Letters were sent out to statutory agencies, local bodies, businesses, residents and amenity groups. Groups with a particular interest in the city centre were offered a meeting</p> <p>The consultation was publicised in the City View magazine and reported in local media. The council also worked with Planning Aid on two specific events in St Marys. These provided the opportunity for community leaders to encourage people to get involved and find out more about the proposals.</p>	
Business Solent	1	General	Business Solent believes that the overall scope, content and structure are appropriate. The draft policies and text are broadly correct but Business Solent has detailed comments set out in the response.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	5	General	<p>Endorses the need to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a world class accessible waterfront • Safeguard the key parks, heritage and waterfront assets 	Welcome support	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better connect the various parts of the city centre with each other • Create more public spaces for events and where people can meet • Provide attractive, safe, interesting routes throughout the city centre • Improve the sense of arrival in the city 		
Environment Agency	1	General	The Environment Agency is generally supportive of the approach to the CCAP.	Welcome support	No change required
Environment Agency	9	General	We support the re-use of previously developed land as this provides an opportunity to improve soil and water quality and prevent further pollution. We expect any contamination to be dealt with in line with national guidance.	Welcome support	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	7	General	It would be negligent for the council to spend this money unless viability has been studied and a 15 year trajectory considered. Any trajectory will show the exact percentage rise required in property to then release the site for development. This will of course be offset by the projected increase in build costs to enable zero carbon building.	See response to 6.1	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	9	General	The council must stop moving from one pie in the sky idea to another while spending on generic documents as these documents do not deliver as can be seen by studying the large sites in the failing SHLAA.	The council is meeting the requirements of national guidance in producing future plans for the city and appropriate evidence to support them.	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	11	General	The council need to stop being blinded by those with fast cars and sharp suits and engage with local developers and agents as local knowledge is worth a million times more than any generic CCAP.	See response to 6.1	No change required
Coal Authority	1	General	Advised that, as the administrative area lies wholly outside the current defined coalfield, it is not necessary to consult The Coal Authority for emerging planning policy documents.	Response noted	No change required (amend database)

Chapter 1 - Context

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hammerson	1	1.2	Object - As matter currently stand, we do not believe that plan is sound. It does not accord with current national policy and is not consistent with the adopted Core Strategy. It is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and fails to make sufficient reference to the updated evidence base provided by the GVA Retail Study and revised retail capacity.	Note concerns (which are addressed in responses to individual comments). The issue of soundness will be assessed at the examination on the submission version of the plan.	No change required (see individual responses)
A. Samuels	4	1.5	The demand for retail shopping space will not increase overall significantly, if at all. Queries what is the prediction, and why, of closure of space as set against opening of space and whether the Portas Review been taken into account?	The latest Retail Study (GVA) identified a need for a similar amount of retail as stated in the CCAP (130,000 sqm gross comparison retail floorspace by 2026). This reflects population growth, economic recovery and Southampton's continuing role as a regional centre. However the plan includes flexibility and will be monitored closely so if there is insufficient demand, there is flexibility for sites to be developed for other uses including residential. Sources of retail supply includes vacant units, there will inevitably be a turnover of retail units and vacancies at any one time.	No change required
A. Samuels	5	1.5	Office space demand is similarly lessening if not levelling out if not diminishing. "Old" or unrefurbished office space is in less demand.	The plan promotes major office growth in line with PUSH economic projections, but also includes flexibility to enable the redevelopment	No change required.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				of older offices in most areas where appropriate.	
A. Samuels	6	1.5	Southampton has traditionally exceeded the new homes targets and could continue to do so, given better infrastructure investment, more attention to windfall and potential windfall sites, and speedier planning process.	The Council is updating the SHLAA on housing delivery, and is planning for improved infrastructure (see delivery chapter and CIL policy).	No change required.
R. Cassy	4	1.6	The city has always struggled to present a coherent narrative about itself, its history, economy, population, aspirations etc so a coherent approach is to be welcomed. A city's economic success is built in part by the pride and desire of its citizens to live/work in it.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	7	1.6	Integration is a key word, in a somewhat fragmented city centre area. Also linkage.	Agree. The plan states out how linkages will be improved and the strategic approach to development, supported by new infrastructure, will promote integration.	No change required
Business Solent	3	1.6	Strongly supports statement which is of critical importance to the success of the CCAP and Master Plan.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	8	1.7	Queries who is to pay for the protection against flooding.	Funding is likely to be needed over the long term, and is likely to be from a mixture of the Government and developers (CIL).	No change required.
A. Samuels	2	1.8	Not enough attention is paid to the problems and difficulties facing the implementation of the plan ideas, the impact of the national economy, the wishes of the developers, and the ways in which the City Council can assist in advancing the local economy. The plan must be flexible and adaptable.	Accept that implementation is a major challenge and there is a need for flexibility. The emerging plan is based on this basis and further evidence on deliverability is being prepared.	Add in further detail on implementation when available
Business Solent	4	1.8	Support - It is absolutely vital that the CCAP and Master Plan are implemented by the public and private sectors in	Welcome support	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			partnership and in a consistent manner which takes a long term view.		
R. Cassy	1	1.8	Questions whether the current figures for growth are any more realistic to those being replaced. It would help to see the evidence base on which 130,000 sq m of new retail space is planned, given the altering nature of shopping habits and the need to upgrade existing retail space before building more. Will sufficient care be taken in allocating specific sites to achieve the stated growth?	<p>Note concerns about delivery.</p> <p>The latest Retail Study (GVA) identified a need for a similar amount of retail as stated in the CCAP. This reflects population growth, economic recovery and Southampton's continuing role as a regional centre. It also considered the growth in internet retailing. However the plan includes flexibility and will be monitored closely so if there is insufficient demand, there is flexibility for sites to be developed for other uses. Sources of retail supply includes vacant units, schemes with permission and the redevelopment of current units and centres to include increased floorspace.</p>	No change required
A. Samuels	9	1.9	The plan must be compatible with the PUSH and LEP policies.	Agree	No change required
SCAPPS	5	1.10	Questions what 'Make better use of the parks' means? Concerned that unmanaged & uncontrolled intensification of use will result in damaging wear. Asks whether this refers to increased use of the parks for 'events' as care would be needed to avoid types of events which add to wear & damage.	The plan seeks to improve the quality of parks and open spaces, protecting them from damage – at the same time the strategy also seeks the provision of	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				new spaces as new development comes on line, thereby reducing the burden on existing parks.	
A. Samuels	10	1.10	The business community must be "involved" in the process, not just "consulted" on the draft plan - and their objections and views "marginalised" by officers.	Agree. The CCAP and Master Plan have been developed alongside the business community and this will continue in the future.	No change required
A. Samuels	11	1.10	The very strong and exaggerated opposition to a biomass power station in the docks belies the support for renewables and the poor recycling record in the city. But overall public feeling is certainly enlightened.	Note comments on renewable energy generation. The sections highlighted support for local generation and measures, not larger scale electricity generation.	No change required
R. Cassy	2	1.10	Welcome the statement that parks, heritage and waterfront are key assets. The council holds assets on behalf of citizens and needs to manage its stewardship prudently and sensitively – this has not always been the case.	Welcome support	No change required

Chapter 2 – Vision and outcomes

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	6	2.1	Business Solent would wish to have further discussions with the City Council, Southampton Connect and others about chapter 2.	Note request for further discussions	No change required
R. Cassy	3	2.1	The plan predicts substantial growth in the city in economic terms with the "liveability" aspect somewhat secondary – the vision states a great place to do business, visit and live in that order. Successful cities have a strong emphasis on being good places to live and not just spaces to work or visit. The emphasis on "buzz" is only part of what is needed	Agree for the need for tranquillity. The approach of splitting the CCAP into quarters highlights the variety within the centre. This could be brought out	Amend 2.3 to include reference to tranquillity

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			– the need for tranquillity doesn't come out sufficiently in much of the text.	more in the plan.	
English Heritage	1	2.1	<p>Southampton city centre has a rich and diverse historic heritage, both above and below ground. As such English Heritage is concerned that this is not reflected in the vision other than in terms of new development reconnecting different parts of the city centre.</p> <p>Alternative wording - Vision should include specific mention to heritage; e.g. 'the city centre's heritage will be conserved and enhanced and the potential of that heritage maximised'</p>	<p>Agree. Change from 'innovative modern architecture which will respect, enhance and maximise the potential of Southampton heritage....' to 'innovative modern architecture. The city centre's heritage would be conserved and enhanced and the potential of Southampton heritage's including the Old Town and Victorian parks maximised'.</p>	Amend 'Attractive and Distinctive' in 2.3 to separate heritage from new developments
A. Samuels	13	2.1	The drift westwards, difficult in any event to resist, is likely to continue, and the Plan largely promotes the drift.	<p>Whilst the MDQ is a focus for development and is located in the west, disagree based on the sites identified and phasing of development.</p> <p>Agree that this may not be clear. Propose adding text to explain that, although the major opportunities are located in the west, the plan will to deliver improvements across the whole city.</p>	Add in text to 1.6 stating that the plan will deliver improvements across the whole city
A. Samuels	12	2.1	Object - A "vision" that ignores the relationship with the district centres is "blinkered".	Disagree. The role of Southampton's centres is addressed in the Core Strategy. The CCAP vision was restricted to cover the city centre for clarity and	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				brevity.	
Natural England	1	2.1	Support - Natural England welcomes the vision for the city centre, the aim to move towards a low carbon city and to re-connect areas so that they are easily and pleasantly accessible on foot are clearly presented and offers an approach which supports our duty to maintain the natural environment.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	7	2.3	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.	A Great Place to Shop was combined with A Great Place to Visit as the CCAP seeks to develop complementary attractions and link this with continuing retail improvements.	No change required
A. Samuels	14	2.3	Query why call the parks are called East Park and West Park instead of Andrews park and Watts Park?	Both versions of park names are equally valid, but agree that there should be consistency in the plan.	Amend park names for consistency (throughout document)
English Heritage	2	2.3	Support - Acknowledges and welcomes the reference to respecting, enhancing and maximising the potential of Southampton's heritage in the cross-cutting theme of 'Attractive and Distinctive'.	Welcome support	No change required
A Mackenzie	1	2.3	Support genuine sustainable policies	Welcome support	No change required
Southampton Action for Access	1	2.3	There appears to be no reference to how people with reduced mobility will get around the city in years to come – not all of them can use public transport, and some need to use a car to access the city area.	Recognise the importance of planning for people with reduced mobility. The themes state that routes will be accessible for all people. This will be made clearer in the Easy to get about section	Add text in the Easy to get about section
Patricia Burnett	1	2.3	Ocean Village / Royal Pier - The waterfront needs to be opened up for walking along.	Agree, notwithstanding the restrictions of port land. This is included in the Ocean Village, Town Depot and Royal Pier Waterfront policies.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Chapter 3 – Development Framework

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	8	3.1	Business Solent endorses this approach with the proviso that all necessary steps must be taken to redress the current serious imbalance between the rise in fortunes of the city centre west of the QE2 Mile and the matching decline to the east of it.	Note concerns. Whilst the MDQ is a focus for development and is located in the west, the plan will to deliver improvements across the whole city.	Add in text to 1.6 stating that the plan will deliver improvements across the whole city
Business Solent	9	3.1	Endorses the types and locations of development proposed but would wish to enter into further discussion with the Council about some of the details involved in chapter 3.	Welcome support and note request for further discussions.	No change required
Patricia Burnett	1	3.6	Support the use of pavements for cafes / restaurant tables but advertisement boards should be disallowed.	Welcome support for outdoor tables. Advertisement boards can help promote local businesses (and may not require permission depending on their location). There is however a need to balance this with protecting the street scene and not obstructing the highway.	No change required
R. Cassy	5	3.8	Support - Given the huge number of flats developed in the city centre a focus on family housing to encourage a more settled population would be very welcome. Community infrastructure initiatives are also welcome provided they do not compromise open spaces in para 3.9	Welcome support.	No change required
Natural England	2	3.9	The value of open spaces and green infrastructure is clearly recognised; we fully support this approach to development.	Welcome support.	No change required
Natural England	2	3.10	The value of open spaces and green infrastructure is clearly recognised; we fully support this approach to development.	Welcome support.	No change required
Environment	2	3.11	We would highly recommend that the CCAP acknowledges	References have been	

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Agency			that there might be capacity issues with the waste water treatment works serving the developments and that early consultation is sought with Southern Water to ensure that developments can connect to the appropriate work without the need for improvement work in the sewerage system or at the works itself. There is currently limited headroom at each of the works in which new development can be connected, until sustainable improvements in treatment technology are developed.	added to the Plan to address the following points.	
Environment Agency	3	3.11	We believe the CCAP should refer to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive in relation to the developments proposed. Under this directive, no development should cause deterioration of designated sites and where possible improvements to water quality should be undertaken. The Council has a role to play to achieve the requirements of this Directive and this should be acknowledged within the Plan.		
Southern Water	1	3.11	Object to the lack of policy to protect existing water and wastewater infrastructure. Development design must avoid building over water infrastructure including water mains, sewers and associated plan so it can confirm to perform effectively and allow access for necessary maintenance and upsizing. Easements of 6 to 13 metres wide are required depending on size and depth of infrastructure. Diversion of underground infrastructure may be possible at developer's expense subject to a feasible alternative route being available. Alternative approach - New policy to protect water and wastewater infrastructure: 'Development proposals will be permitted provided existing underground water mains, sewers and associated facilities are protected so that they can continue to fulfil their function'.		
R. Cassy	6	3.14	When Royal Pier is developed it is imperative that it does not compromise the Old Town to which it is adjacent and that the very late night opening (3am) is only granted if the routes through which revellers will depart are located far	Only part of the Royal Pier development is designated as a Late Night Hub. This is located	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			away from residential areas.	on the end of the site of the pier itself.	
Steven Rice	1	3.14	<p>Redevelopment of the waterfront needs to be supported by good transport.</p> <p>Alternative approach: - Create a transport hub at the Red Funnel terminal connected to the Northam rail junction (with stations at Canute Road & Northam Junction). - Reopen the old South-to-West junction chord at Northam Junction; and reconnect with Marchwood Hythe.</p>	Passenger rail services to the port are unlikely to be viable (although special services do operate). The plan supports improved transport connections at the IoW ferry terminal.	No change required.
Steven Rice	2	3.14	<p>Redevelopment of the waterfront needs to be supported by good transport.</p> <p>Alternative approach - New pedestrian and cycle lane alongside railway from Canute Road to Northam Bridge.</p>	Agree the waterside needs good connections. The rail / cycle route is an interesting idea (feasibility unclear). However the priority is to connect to other parts of the city centre – the strategic links identified in the plan.	No change required
Ann Redding	1	3.14	Access to the waterfront is currently disappointing – Southampton could do more to make the waterfront a vibrant area with shopping / eating / drinking.	Agree. The proposals for the waterfront seek to deliver this development.	No change required
Ruth French	1	3.14	Ocean Village / Royal Pier - The waterfront needs areas that aren't reliant on restaurants and leisure complexes / shops to draw people in. The waterfront needs large areas of green and promenades to walk along; and for areas for young people to play/skate and hold public events. The rates should not be expensive so that smaller businesses and independent shops can flourish.	Agree that there is a need for a variety of attractions at the waterfront including open space and promenades. These are included in the policies for Ocean Village and Royal Pier.	No change required

Chapter 4 – City Centre policies: A great place for business

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
---------------------------	-------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------------	--------------------

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	10	4.2	Strongly supports the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership and the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire aims and the PUSH Economic Strategy forecasts.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Business Solent	12	4.3	Proposals for a 'green village' clustering green businesses is considered an extremely viable proposition and one which Business Solent would wish to discuss further with the Council and others.	We will also welcome further discussion.	No change required
Business Solent	11	4.3	Business Solent endorses the Low Carbon City strategy, the CCAP objectives and the Council's work on sustainable development.	The support is welcome.	No change required
M. Baker	1	4.4	Object – There are many empty comparatively recent office buildings in Southampton. Skandia has been reducing the number of employees and is likely to leave Southampton. Surely a large number of new office buildings will be surplus to requirements.	The forecasts factor in changing working practices and the need to replace older vacant office buildings. It is also important to be able to offer a range of available new and secondary (eg vacant) office stock to encourage economic growth. The Plan takes a balanced approach to the protection and loss of existing offices.	No change required
Business Solent	29	4.4	Priorities and timings for retail growth are endorsed.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Business Solent	13	4.6	Aim of promoting office growth in the city centre so as to encourage sustainable travel patterns and support the vitality of the centre is strongly supported.	The strong support is welcome.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	15	4.6	The intention to reduce office delivery in the city centre appears to downgrade the city centre's aspirations (and makes no comment on existing offices / redeveloping lesser quality office space)	Both Plans (CCAP and CSPR) still maintain a clear aspiration for major office growth. The Plans express the reduced target as a minimum, and explicitly support more offices by 2026 or over the longer term if this can be sustained by economic growth. The Plan sets out	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				a managed approach to redeveloping older offices.	
Business Solent	16	4.8	Research carried out by the University of Southampton identified the city as the best place in the UK to develop an international trade centre for international tenants in a signature building for Southampton and acting as a catalyst for further jobs, office tenants, investors and development. Business Solent believes this would be an excellent strategy.	The new business district can help deliver this concept.	No change required
Southampton Solent University	1	Policy 1	<p>Supports the intention to encourage major office growth and the creation of a new city centre business district as per 4.6-4.13. Consider the wording to be inconsistent. The policy identifies sites where development is required to include a substantial proportion of new office development (including East Park Terrace – which does include a caveat that office development need not be provided if the university requires the entire site). Does not consider that this is consistent with the rest of the policy which identifies sites where office development is appropriate but there is no requirement to provide offices. Suggests the policy should be reworded and that the following text be deleted – “The redevelopment of EPT need not provide and office development if the proposals are predominantly for university use”.</p> <p>Development within the following sites, as defined by the proposals map, will include a substantial proportion of new office development: Each phase of the business district: I. Station Quarter II. Western Gateway III. West Quay Western Site B. Office development will be supported as East Park Terrace, Royal Pier Waterfront and Town Depot and at other sites if appropriate; but there is no requirement to provide offices at these locations.</p>	<p>The general support is welcome. Disagree with site comment. The Plan has deliberately taken a different approach for different sites. At Royal Pier / Town Depot offices will be supported but there is no requirement to provide them given the waterfront regeneration objectives for these sites. If at East Park Terrace the University does not develop the site, development should provide a substantial proportion of offices, consistent with sites i – iii. EPT is adjacent to new and existing offices. The Policy and supporting text incorporate flexibility to meet the needs of the University (which is also important for wider economic growth). In addition more flexibility has been introduced into the policy in response to other</p>	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				comments.	
LaSalle	1	Policy 1	Whilst we consider a proportion of office floorspace would be appropriate, we consider that there should be more flexibility of uses within the Western Gateway. The proposed amendments to the Core Strategy acknowledge that there is a much limited amount of office floorspace expected to come forward to 2026 that previously envisaged.	The support for a proportion of offices is welcome. More flexibility is being introduced to the policy. On this site it is important to set out a minimum proportion.	Amend policy accordingly.
A. Samuels	35	Policy 1	The cost of office space in city centre areas can be a deterrent for smaller or creative or starting businesses.	Agree. This leads to a wider point about recognising any particularly strong economic benefits of development.	Add ref. to the importance of proposals which offer strong economic benefits (eg for start up businesses).
Business Solent	14	Policy 1	Supports CCAP office policies but Business Solent would wish to enter into further discussion with the Council and others about the issues involved (para 4.8).	The support is welcome.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	8	Policy 1, Table 1	<p>Aviva supports the principle of new office development; and recognises the Station Quarter would be a good location for this type of use. However we have major concerns over the viability of the quantum of office floorspace proposed notwithstanding the reduction of office floorspace proposed in the CS Partial Review. We note that re. Central Station further market testing is being undertaken. This evidence base should have been made available for scrutiny at this time to inform CCAP policies. At present the CCAP is not based on credible evidence base, and is therefore unsound. If the predicted quantum of office space is too high, we do not consider the plan will be deliverable or effective. The CCAP is premature until the evidence base to support policies can be reviewed.</p> <p>Alternative approach: The floorspace figures in Table 1 should be marked as indicative, and include a caveat that these assumptions will be tested and monitored on a regular basis, in line with national policy. Footnote should say :-</p>	<p>The support in general and for the Station as an office location is supported. The concerns regarding viability are understood.</p> <p>The draft Plan is based on draft and emerging evidence (eg Station Quarter viability testing; Office Background Paper). Agree these will be finalised and published.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy 1 already promotes controlled flexibility. There needs to be a balance between flexibility and achieving office targets. However, agree that more</p>	<p>Policy – still require a significant proportion of offices, but introduce the potential for flexibility into the policy itself.</p> <p>Text – simply refer to a significant proportion as 50% rather than a specific floorspace figure. Introduce a site specific commentary.</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>"Figures are indicative only and will be regularly monitored and reviewed throughout the plan period".</p> <p>Further information is required from SCC to justify the quantum of office floorspace proposed is realistic and viable before further suggestion amendments can be provided.</p>	flexibility is appropriate where it can be justified. The text already refers to monitoring and allows for review.	
LaSalle	2	Table 1	City Industrial Park is identified as being able to bring forward 47,000 sq m of office development. A 40% provision by one site seems to be excessively high and would represent the same quantum as the 5 year total annual take up of office floorspace for central Southampton. Given that there has been no speculative office development since the completion of 1 Dorset Street in 2007, it is highly unlikely there will be an appetite for anywhere near this amount of space in the Southampton market as a whole. Capital values are below the combination of build costs and land value because current net effective rents for prime city centre office accommodation are at an all time low, combined with currently high yields for regional office investments.	See above response. In addition the City Industrial Park is more likely to be developed in about 10 years when market conditions could have substantially improved. If some offices can not be delivered, the Council would prefer the area to remain as an industrial estate and act as a reserve site for longer term office growth.	See above. Also clarify a minimum proportion of offices.
LaSalle	3	4.10	Object – If this sets criteria for assessing if a lower level of office floorspace would be acceptable, it should be provided within a policy and not supporting text. Irrespective, we consider the approach to offices to be overly prescriptive and based on unrealistic development quantum. We are not supportive of Policy 1 or the text or tables which support it.	Agree – see response above. Flexibility is now introduced into the policy wording itself.	See above
Longfleet Engineering	2	Map 3	<p>Object – Map should be amended to exclude No. 8 Southampton Street so the office area surrounds the properties in Carlton Crescent only.</p> <p>Alternative approach – Amend Map 3 (and draft Proposals Map) to exclude No. 8 Southampton Street</p>	Carlton Crescent is considered to be a strong office location. However all the properties to the rear in Southampton Street have a more back land nature so should be excluded.	<p>Map 3: Amend indicative boundary to avoid implying Southampton Street is included.</p> <p>Ensure proposals map reflects this</p>
Business Solent	15	Policy 2	Supports CCAP office policies but Business Solent would wish to enter into further discussion with the Council and	The support is welcome. A meeting will be set up.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			others about the issues involved (para 4.8).		
Longfleet Engineering	1	Policy 2	Longfleet Engineering objects to the inclusion of No. 8 Southampton Street in the Carlton Crescent Office Area. Southampton Street also has a mixed character including residential and office floorspace as well as commercial uses. No. 8 has no functional or visual link with Carlton Crescent and no other properties within Southampton Street are identified as part of the office area so it does not add to the concentration of office uses along Carlton Crescent. Alternatively Southampton Street could be identified as an intermediate office area in 4.16.	Agree. See response above.	See above.
Business Solent	17	4.19	Supporting the growing logistics industry is also considered to be critical (albeit extending beyond the city centre).	Agree. (However major logistics and distribution should generally be located outside the city centre, closer to the strategic road network and / or within the wider Port).	Amend para. 4.19: "...It is important to maintain some industrial / <u>warehouse</u> space within the city centre for local businesses, and to maintain a choice of jobs for local people.
LaSalle	6	4.19	Object – Policy 3 appears to have prejudged that the industrial sites listed, including the Central Trading Estate, are not subject to the provision in policy CS 7 for the release industrial land where a number of criteria are met. This approach does not provide sufficient flexibility for changing circumstances.	Adopted Policy CS7 demonstrates the need for and takes a strong approach to safeguarding employment land. It does promote some flexibility in a similar vein to that proposed by LaSalle. However CS7 is clear that it is the allocation plans (including the CCAP) which will determine which sites will be safeguarded and which 'released'. CS7 does not envisage ongoing flexibility through the development management	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>process post adoption of these plans. The NPPF supports the protection of sites for employment where there is a reasonable prospect of their continued use. If circumstances were to change this is adequately covered by the PINS model 'NPPF policy'. The draft CCAP is proposing the release of a number of city centre employment sites to aid regeneration. However given the general policy context and the nature of the surrounding area it is considered appropriate to safeguard the Central Trading Estate. In line with CS para 4.6.7, the draft CCAP has been informed by a detailed assessment of sites.</p>	
Business Solent	18	4.19	Supports the need to identify and support existing key business premises in terms of creating a safe environment to get to work.	The support is welcome.	No change required
LaSalle	5	Policy 3	Concerns that the policy is centred on the protection of industrial sites with little mention of flexibility for redevelopment within the sites including the Central Trading Estate. It is unclear what is considered as 'other similar employment uses'. Whilst the Central Trading Estate is functioning employment land at the present time, there may be opportunities within the plan period for its redevelopment. Suggests additional text to add in to policy 3 to allow flexibility whilst not contradicting CS 7.	See above. With reference to definitions, see recommended change.	Para 4.20, add after 1 st sentence: " 'Other similar employment uses' are those usually located on industrial estates (see CS section 4.6)' "

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			Suggestion – Add to policy 3; 'In special circumstances where there are strong regeneration benefits a site can be released from industrial use for other justified uses that are appropriate for the proposed area'.		
Environment Agency	4	Policy 3	We support the re-use of previously developed land as this provides an opportunity to improve soil and water quality and prevent further pollution. We expect any contamination to be dealt with in line with national guidance.	The support is welcome. National guidance will be a material consideration, along with the saved local plan (policy SDP22).	No change required
LaSalle	4	Policy 3	Supports the exclusion of City Industrial Park within Policy 3 and its inclusion in Table 2. This acknowledges the ability of the site to support redevelopment and accommodate different uses.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Business Solent	19	Policy 3	Agree that appropriate employment sites, including those for industrial and warehouse use, should be safeguarded and that it is important to maintain some industrial space for local businesses and to maintain a choice of jobs for local people. Agree that there are a number of sites where there are strong regeneration benefits from releasing them from industrial use.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Associated British Ports	1	4.23	ABP welcomes the recognition of the international, national, sub regional and local importance of the Port, and of the importance of maintaining good access to the Port.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Environment Agency	5	4.23	We are supportive of the development of the port and will continue to work in partnership with the City Council on this.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Business Solent	20	4.23	Support – Business Solent believes that it is essential to recognise that the Port of Southampton is an international freight and cruise passenger facility of major economic importance to the UK, South Hampshire and the city.	The support is welcome.	No change required
John Abbott	3	4.23 – 4.25	The Port of Southampton is vital to the future of Southampton both economically and reputationally. The plan needs to be entirely coordinated with future plans for development of the port. I would offer the following comments: 1. Future of cruise passenger parking facilities	The transport policies set out the approach for access to the port, and to enhance the Central Station. The other points raised are outside the	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>2. Access roads to the port and how better use could be made of the road system in the port 3. Need for radical improvement in rail passenger access to/from the port – particularly for cruise passengers</p>	<p>control of the plan (particularly given the Port's permitted development rights).</p>	
Associated British Ports	2	4.24	<p>Although factually correct, the description in the first sentence does not properly reflect the reality of the physical relationship between the Port and the city centre. Specifically it does not recognise that a larger area of the Western Docks than just the City Cruise terminal is within or adjoins the city centre. The CCAP must recognise that the Western and Eastern Docks are port operational land and can be used 24/7 for any port purpose. Operational priorities might change during the lifetime of the CCAP, potentially leading to the introduction of other port uses to the part of the port currently accommodating the City Cruise Terminal.</p>	<p>The description in the first sentence should be amended. Other comments addressed below.</p>	<p>Para 4.24 1st sentence: "Parts of the Eastern and Western Docks lie within the city centre (eg the Oceanography Centre and current City Cruise terminal). In any case the Eastern Docks and part of the Western Docks are adjacent to and accessed through the city centre.</p>
Associated British Ports	5	4.24	<p>Object – The draft 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.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Port is of national significance, and this is recognised by the Plan. By way of context, Southampton is also the 20th largest city in the UK (Wikipedia / ONS). The Plan should not support measures which significantly undermine the competitiveness of the port. It commits to maintaining West Quay Road as a dual carriageway and improving access to the Port. All relevant issues should be taken in the round. Provided there is no</p>	<p>Introduce this approach into a new policy.</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				significant impact on the Port, the Plan can support measures which have some negative effect and a major positive effect on the city centre.	
Business Solent	21	4.25	Business Solent believes that there is a need for a much greater exchange of information and a much closer working relationship between the Port, City Council, business community and local community leading as quickly as possible to a much better integrated built environment especially at the key interface between Port and city centre.	Comment noted	No change required
Associated British Ports	3	4.25	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.	The point is understood. Residential development is appropriate in principle but requires very careful consideration.	Reference is added to permitted development rights and the 24 hour nature of the Port.
Associated British Ports	6	4.25	Object – Issues of access and land use adjoining Port land should not just be considered in respect of development within 50m as indicated.	Agree	The approach is amended to refer to adjoining development across the Western Gateway / Royal Pier, and to transport measures across the city centre.
Associated British Ports	7	4.26	Object – In view of their economic significance, it is insufficient to deal with these matters in the text of the CCAP. They are matters of principle relating to the ongoing successful operation of the nationally significant Port and should be reflected in a policy in this part of the CCAP.	Agree to the principle of the policy. Regarding specific wording – see other responses	Include new port policy.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>Suggestion – Policy ? – The Port of Southampton Development proposals in areas of the City Centre close to the operational Port of Southampton will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that they will have no significant adverse implications for the ongoing successful operation of the Port.</p> <p>Development proposals in such areas and elsewhere within the City Centre should not prejudice access to the Port of Southampton along the key road corridors used to access the Port that runs through the City Centre.</p>		
Tarmac and Hanson	1	4.27	<p>This section recognises the contribution of the wharves, that they are safeguarded and seeks to control nearby development which could conflict with the operation of the wharves.</p> <p>It is particularly important for the economic development of South Hampshire and the maintenance of the built environment that the aggregate wharves continue to operate without restriction.</p>	<p>Broadly agree. This is reflected in the Minerals and Waste Plan, to which the paragraph refers. Minor amendments to refer to development would be useful.</p>	<p>Para 4.27: "...make a significant contribution to the supply of minerals for <u>development, regeneration and economic growth in the South Hampshire economy</u>".</p>
Tarmac and Hanson	5	4.27	<p>Tarmac and Hanson object to the wording in this paragraph</p> <p>Alternative approach – It should be recognised that the wharves are vital for the redevelopment and prosperity of Southampton and South Hampshire. The currently are currently safeguarded are likely to be safeguarded until 2030 and should be protected from nearby development that could be in conflict with their operation.</p>	<p>The Minerals and Waste Plan is a part of the statutory development plan for the city (this should be recognised in paras 4.27 – 4.29). This contains the policies to safeguard the mineral wharves. The City Centre Action Plan should simply cross refer to them, to avoid duplication or inconsistency. Changes are proposed to strengthen / clarify this position and address specific concerns raised. In the main it is considered the Minerals</p>	<p>Para 4.27: The emerging Minerals and Waste Plan <u>will form part of the development plan for the city and</u> generally safeguards these wharves for mineral use. The Plan also <u>supports appropriate investment in infrastructure and</u> seeks to control nearby development...</p> <p>Para 4.28: "...It is</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>and Waste Plan reflects the position sought. It is entirely possible that the mineral wharves will still be needed for most or all of the plan period. However it is also possible, for example, that the planning or delivery of a new wharf in this period would facilitate more efficient mineral operations meaning the existing wharves were relocated and / or no longer needed. The Plan should acknowledge the benefits this would bring to the city centre. Given the uncertainties the Plan does not allocate the wharves for possible redevelopment. Should the mineral wharves within the city centre no longer be needed for that purpose it is considered inappropriate to safeguard them solely for other marine uses (policy RE12 ii). However the proposals map should indicate a safeguarded area, linked to the Minerals and Waste Plan</p>	<p><u>possible that in the longer term...</u>"</p> <p>Para 4.29: "Therefore the emerging Minerals and Waste Plan recognises the importance of <u>safeguarding</u> the wharves whilst maintaining some flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances and facilitate regeneration <u>when and if appropriate...</u>"</p> <p>Box after para 4.29: Add: Minerals and Waste Plan – Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure); Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source); Policy 19 (Aggregate wharves and rail depots).</p> <p>Proposals Map: Include mineral wharf safeguarding designation linked to Minerals and Waste Plan.</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Environment Agency	6	4.27	We are supportive of the Mineral and Waste Plan's intention to safeguard the identified wharfs and appreciate the benefits of their redevelopment.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Associated British Ports	9	4.28	The regeneration of the wharves has implications within the Minerals and Waste Plan period (not dissimilar to the CCAP time period). The CCAP should positively plan for the likely waterside regeneration opportunities of the River Itchen wharves. Policy guidance needs to be provided in the CCAP against which such regeneration proposals can be brought forward.	The Plan sets out the potential for positive regeneration in this area, and general guidance in supporting text (paras 4.27 – 4.29 and the Itchen Riverside section). The timing for the release of the wharves is uncertain. In the meantime it is important to safeguard the wharves for mineral use. A site allocation for regeneration is considered premature. The emerging Minerals and Waste Plan and this Plan includes the appropriate degree of flexibility should circumstances change.	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	3	4.28	Object – It is recognised that the wharves may offer redevelopment potential however this principle is not supported by Tarmac or Hanson.	See above	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	3	4.28	Object – Tarmac and Hanson both operate a variety of dredging vessels and the Itchen wharves provide a very good location to operate from. There is no requirement for deeper berthing facilities. Rail linked wharves are highly unlikely as rail is generally used for longer distance transportation, i.e. well beyond Southampton and South Hampshire. Aggregate needs for these destinations are met by land won minerals. South Hampshire is reliant on marine dredged material. Similarly there is no need or desire to relocate the wharves elsewhere in Southampton, the costs would be enormous and could not be justified in economic terms.	It is recognised that the wharves are adequately meeting local aggregate needs at present, that Tarmac and Hanson have invested in their wharves and currently intend to continue operating them for the foreseeable future. Should a new wharf be developed or become available, this position might change, particularly	See above

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>in the longer term. The new wharf might promote more efficient and flexible operations (ie more 'backland' for processing, larger ships for dredging from deeper areas, and combined operations with hard rock imports [for which rail connections would be important]). A new wharf might form part of a wider port proposal, or become available through the release of port land, either of which could aid viability. These points cannot be stated with certainty – the plan reflects this, and does not allocate the wharves for redevelopment. If the existing wharves are still needed then they are still safeguarded. However the plan should acknowledge the potential regeneration opportunities (so as to be taken into account in considering any new wharves). The Plan cross refers to the approach taken by the Minerals and Waste Plan.</p>	
Tarmac and Hanson	4	4.28	Object – Policies to be replaced / retained – It is proposed to replace Local Plan Review policy RE12 ii which refers to the wharves. This is not supported.	See above	See above
Tarmac and Hanson	6	4.28	Tarmac and Hanson object to the wording in this paragraph – see approach suggested in 4.27	See above	See above

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Cemex	1	4.28	Object – The wharf at Leamouth is an active operational wharf and there are no plans to change its operations which will make it redundant.	See the responses to Tarmac and Hanson. The Plan does not allocate the wharf for redevelopment; rather it refers (in supporting text) to regeneration potential. It is recognised that regeneration cannot be delivered if the minerals wharf is still needed. It is considered the Council does not need to demonstrate deliverability where it is not allocating sites.	No change required
Business Solent	22	4.28	Endorses the approach of generally safeguarding wharves whilst maintaining some flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances and facilitate regeneration.	The support is welcome	No change required
Associated British Ports	8	4.29	Policies to be replaced / retained box should make reference to the application of Core Strategy policy CS 9 to the city centre and should clarify that with such an addition the policies listed are more than just industrial site policies.	Agreed	Add ref to CS9 in box, and rephrase titles: “Which industrial <u>economic related site</u> policies...”
Tarmac and Hanson	2	4.29	The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan places considerable reliance on the ongoing aggregate contribution from the wharves throughout the Plan period to 2030. The importance of the wharves will not end in 2030. Without these wharves Hampshire could not meet the annual apportionment of construction aggregates. This will have a detrimental effect on the economy and on the delivery of the CCAP / CCMP. Tarmac and Hanson have invested considerable amounts of money in the wharf facilities and intend to continue operating them for the foreseeable future.	The Plan does not introduce new policies or allocations; it simply cross refers to the Minerals and Waste Plan, and explains (in supporting text) the regeneration opportunities should these be consistent with the approach in the Minerals and Waste Plan.	See above.
Tarmac and Hanson	7	4.29	Tarmac and Hanson object to the wording in this paragraph – see approach suggested in 4.27	See above	See above

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Cemex	2	4.29	Object to the wording which implies that the emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan recognises that there may be merits in redevelopment of the wharves. Draft policy 19 seeks to maximise existing capacity of wharves and extension of wharf capacity where appropriate. Other paragraphs and policies safeguard aggregate wharves.	It is agreed that a strong strand in the Minerals and Waste Plan is to safeguard and support continued investment in the wharves. There are also aspects of the Plan which support a degree of flexibility and acknowledge regeneration issues.	No change required
Cemex	3	4.29	Object – Any proposal to redevelop the aggregate wharf at Leamouth is in direct conflict with policies 16 and 17 of the emerging Minerals and Waste Plan. Policy 16 states that the wharves are safeguarded against development that would sterilise the wharf or prejudice its use or jeopardise its use by creating incompatible land uses nearby.	See above.	No change required

Chapter 4 – City Centre policies: A great place to visit

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
A. Samuels	44	4.32	The International Boat Show is a “good thing”, but it tends to discourage local people from going anywhere near the city centre if they can avoid it. Any plan?	Inevitably the Boat Show will cause some disruption for its duration. Plans for Royal Pier seek a balance between accommodating the Boat Show and delivering a high quality waterfront. The CCAP also seeks to increase the number and variety of attractions, supported by a range of events.	No change required
Mrs J Starks	9	4.33	QE2 Mile needs a dedicated visitors leaflet	Welcome this idea to promote the city centre.	No change required. Comment passed on

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				We will pass this on to colleagues in our tourism department	to Deborah Edmonds (Visitor Information Centre)
Mrs J Starks	11	4.33	Request that a replacement Lido (pool) be sourced from the city heating district scheme.	Welcome this idea and support attractions that bring people into the centre. We will pass on to colleagues in our leisure and sustainability departments	No change required. Comment passed on to Tina Dyer-Slade (Leisure Projects) and Neil Tuck (Sustainability)
A. Samuels	43	4.34	The Hampshire Discovery Centre just outside Winchester has proved a great success, for young people, and for conferences and something comparable in Southampton would be a good idea. Hopefully the hotel industry will provide really good conference facilities.	Welcome this idea for a new facility. We will pass this on to colleagues in our leisure directorate	No change required. Comment passed on to David Baldwin (Libraries)
Business Solent	23	4.34	Business Solent agrees with the approach to maintain its role as a regional shopping destination and develop complementary leisure, cultural and arts attractions and hotel accommodation. Both the New Arts Complex and SeaCity Museum should provide a major boost in the short term.	Welcome support	No change required
John Lewis	1	4.35	John Lewis considers that the CCAP should plan for and accommodate a reduced scale of additional comparison development in the city centre over the plan period in response to the GVA Retail Study with only limited extension to the PSA from 2021 if it can be demonstrated that it accords with PPS 4. It would be detrimental for the city centre to be flooded with additional retail floorspace for which there is no demand as it would likely result in the decline of traditional shopping streets and the existing retail core as retailers are attracted to and relocate from existing accommodated or as diluted consumer spending across the city centre results in the failure of existing retailers to survive.	Agree that new comparison development should not be at the expense of existing retail. The floorspace figures are based on a range of evidence including the GVA retail study, Donaldson's report and Master Plan. The GVA retail study projections are similar to the Core Strategy targets when comparing gross floorspace and adding in floorspace for IKEA and Watermark WestQuay	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				(which were not included within the GVA projections)	
A. Samuels	17	4.35	A lot of city centre shops are either “chains” or not very good quality, in marked contrast to Bournemouth and Chichester and to some extent to Winchester. This gives a disappointing, even poor, image to the city. “Just another ordinary shopping centre”.	Agree with the need for a variety of retail in the city centre. We also recognise that Southampton offers a different type of retail than places like Winchester.	No change required
V Roberts	3	4.35	Object – Do not believe that we shall need about 130,000 sqm of new comparison shopping before 2026 due to recession, increasing fuel prices and their knock on effects. Alternative approach – Less retail and more residential would be more advantageous to Southampton, its people and existing retail and other businesses.	The latest Retail Study (GVA) identified a need for a similar amount of retail as stated in the CCAP. However the plan includes flexibility and will be monitored closely so if there is insufficient demand, there is flexibility for sites to be developed for other uses including residential.	No change required
V Roberts	4	4.36	There is a need for policies that would bring a return of better quality retail that have left Southampton as well as shops providing goods difficult/impossible to obtain in the city centre (e.g. electrical fittings, general hardware). Also need specialist shops i.e. organic products and food, fresh fish to bring choice and variety to the city.	Agree with the need for a variety of retail in the city centre. However, planning policy cannot specify the type of shops required.	No change required
Arcadian Estates Ltd	4	Policy 4	Supports the safeguarding of ground floor retail uses and promoting active frontages within the defined primary and secondary retail frontages as concentration of existing businesses will benefit from linked trips to the new foodstore and the shift westward in Southampton’s retail offer from the foodstore.	Welcome support	No change required
Hammerson	7	Policy 4	Support the general thrust of Policy 4 where it relates to changes of use in Primary Retail Frontages. However the policy should include an ‘exceptions test’ whereby under certain circumstances three or more adjoining non A1 units may be acceptable to ensure that this is interpreted flexibly	Disagree. The policy is required to protect the retail nature of the existing primary retail frontages. Exceptional cases can be	No change required Amend policy 27 to provide more flexibility on retail

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			and does not bar appropriate and justified investment.	justified on an individual basis. Policy 27 on the Bargate Shopping Centre should include more flexibility to deliver retail or leisure uses next to the Town Walls.	uses within the Primary Retail Frontage
Natalia Kulabuchova	3	Policy 4	There should be more music and food festivals which are fun for residents.	Welcome this idea and support attractions that bring people into the centre. We will pass on to colleagues in our leisure department	No change required. Comment passed on to Craig Lintott (Events Manager)
Business Solent	24	Policy 4	Business Solent endorses these retail policies subject to concerns about the location of any new major food store on the eastern side of the city centre	Welcome support. Note concerns with the location of the food superstore	No change required
John Lewis	2	Policy 4	John Lewis generally supports the Council's approach for supporting existing retail areas and more flexible uses at upper floor levels in the Primary and Secondary Frontages.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	27	4.39	Agrees that there is considerable scope in some areas, particularly those more locally orientated / smaller scale locations for different uses on upper floors including residential. These should be actively encouraged.	Welcome support	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	9	Policy 5	<p>Aviva supports the vision to extend the PSA westwards. However the wording does not provide any certainty as to where this extension will be located (which Core Strategy CS2 4th paragraph states) – the 'area of search' covers a significant area and provides no certainty over where the extension will be. The CCAP formulation should be the time (as CS sets out) to at which the evidence base is presented to allow proper scrutiny. Further work is needed to formulate that area or how that area will be decided upon.</p> <p>No details are provided on how the area of search has been formulated. As a successful destination Mountbatten Retail Park should be included for consideration in the PSA.</p> <p>Re. timescales – for flexibility this should not be too</p>	The area of search has been drawn to provide flexibility for expansion over the plan period. It aims to improve links into the retail core from the central station and integrates with the existing PSA. It reflects proposals in policy 24 for Above Bar West and Harbour Parade. It also includes the Toys R Us store and car park and building to the east.	Amend and restructure policy to clarify that there are 3 criteria for the expansion of the PSA. We expect that these will be met by 2021 but would support expansion if these criteria are met by 2016. Edge and out of centre proposals not meeting the criteria will be assessed

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>prescriptive (i.e. 3rd paragraph of Policy 5 on PSA expansion after 2021). This does not allow sufficient flexibility for MDQ proposals to come forward when viable and deliverable. Development in the MDQ should not be seen as premature if opportunity were to come forward pre-2021.</p> <p>Suggestion – Policy 5 – third para – delete “After 2021” at start of sentence so it reads: <u>“Retail expansion into the MDQ as a coherent extension of the PSA will be promoted, subject to ongoing monitoring”.</u></p> <p>Further work needs to be carried out to establish the precise extension of the PSA.</p>	<p>Mountbatten Retail Park was not included due to the barrier of the electricity substation preventing integration with the existing PSA. Policy 20 also seeks to deliver mixed use development in this area including major office development.</p> <p>Policy 5 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 will be amended to clarify this.</p>	<p>using the impact test in the NPPF. Amend supporting text.</p>
Hammerson	8	Policy 5	<p>Supports town centre first approach advocated in policy but are concerned that the policy repeats policy CS 2 and does not accord with PPS 4. It is not consistent with supporting text in para 4.44 and should be substantially reworded or deleted. If reworded it should refer to findings of the GVA study.</p>	<p>The wording was carried forward from the Core Strategy for consistency. It follows the NPPF approach of planning to meet retail needs and then assessing the impact of proposals outside the centre not in accordance with the plan. Accept that this policy could be clarified further and a</p>	<p>Amend policy and supporting text to clarify approach (see earlier response to Aviva).</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				specific reference added to the NPPF and impact assessments.	
LaSalle	8	Policy 5	It should be noted that City Industrial Park is within 300m from the Primary Shopping Area therefore the site would be suitable to accommodate retail uses. Although the main road currently acts as a barrier, this is intended to be overcome by the construction of new links between the Western Gateway, Station Quarter and the Heart of the City.	West Quay Road forms a significant barrier between the current Primary Shopping Area and prevents the coherent expansion of the PSA here. In addition most of the PSA is more than 300 metres from this site. Therefore the impact test will apply to any retail proposals.	Policy to be amended (see earlier response to Aviva)
John Lewis	3	Policy 5	John Lewis supports the objective for focusing major retail development in the existing PSA but has reservations about the Council's approach for supporting major retail development outside the PSA from 2016 and 2021. The criteria and parameters for when development outside the PSA will be supported should be clarified and it made clear that any such proposals will also need to satisfy PPS 4 and other national policy tests.	<p>Welcome support for focus on the existing PSA.</p> <p>An area of search is identified in order to show where proposals will be assessed on the need for growth and the sequential test, not the impact of individual schemes. Proposals not in accordance with the phasing set out and/or not capable of forming a coherent expansion of the PSA will be subject to an impact test.</p>	Policy to be amended (see earlier response to Aviva)
John Lewis	4	Policy 5	It is not understood what is meant by criterion 1 i.e. whether this means sites can only be progressed via a masterplan approach or whether PPS 4, policy EC 3 (ii) would need to be demonstrated. It is unclear how criterion 3 would be determined / assessed by the council and the timescales for which a development is considered 'unlikely to proceed'	This is explained in para 4.45 with reference to linking with the existing PSA and helping to provide a coherent retail circuit and easy pedestrian	Policy to be amended (see earlier response to Aviva)

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			as this could undermine the delivery of long term proposals for key sites in the PSA and the MDQ.	<p>access. Design guidance for the Heart of the City quarter states the need for a master plan to be produced for each of the major elements in the quarter.</p> <p>The likelihood of proposals coming forward in the existing PSA will be based on discussions with developers and landowners as well as any planning applications.</p>	
John Lewis	5	Policy 5	Since developments outside the PSA would be 'edge of centre' or 'out of centre', criteria 2 and 3 should be replaced by a requirement to demonstrate compliance with the PPS 4 sequential assessment and other key economic and impact tests.	<p>Disagree. This is a planned expansion of the PSA in order to meet the need for retail uses in the city centre. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should 'allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail... needed in town centres'. Proposals which do not meet the criteria set out in policy 5 and are not in accordance with the phasing will be subject to an impact test.</p> <p>This policy will be amended to clarify the approach and add in reference to the NPPF.</p>	Policy to be amended (see earlier response to Aviva)
John Lewis	6	Policy 5	The supporting text suggests that there is very likely to be a need to expand the PSA and extend Southampton's retail	Accept need to amend policy to state that this	Policy to be amended (see earlier

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>circuit however the preferred wording of Policy 5 does not explicitly state that an extension of the PSA boundary could be considered over the Plan period. John Lewis considers that any extension to the PSA boundary from 2016 can only be considered as a strategic issue through the review of the Core Strategy and Proposals Map. John Lewis recommends additional text addressing this point is included in Policy 5.</p>	<p>would be an extension to the PSA</p> <p>Policy 5 is in accordance with the Core Strategy. As the Core Strategy will be updated before the end of the plan period, it does not need to be reviewed earlier to cover this issue. The Proposals Map will be updated on adoption of each DPD produced which contains site allocations including the CCAP.</p>	<p>response to Aviva). This will clarify that this is a planned extension of the PSA</p>
Gavin Marsh	7	Policy 5	<p>I am alarmed at the proposals to greatly expand the retail shopping space and question whether it will be successful having witnessed the decline of East Street and the Bargate Shopping Centre.</p>	<p>The latest Retail Study (GVA) identified a need for this level of retail floorspace. Some retail development is needed to replace out dated centres such as the East Street and Bargate Shopping Centres and improve existing shopping areas. New retail development will serve the needs of new residents and help maintain the city's regional role. We will be monitoring the health of retail centres to assess any proposals and their impact on existing areas.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
LaSalle	7	Policy 5	<p>Object – Criterion 2 does not comply with national planning policy, contradicting the provisions of PPS 4 which does not include needs testing when assessing retail proposals. National policy now assesses sites sequentially based on</p>	<p>Policy 5 is in accordance with the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should 'allocate</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			availability, suitability and viability and in terms of the impact on other retail facilities and proposals. There is no reason for needs testing and criterion 2 should be deleted.	a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail... needed in town centres'. Proposals which meet the criteria in policy 5 will not be subject to an impact assessment.	
Business Solent	25	Policy 5	Business Solent endorses these retail policies subject to concerns about the location of any new major food store on the eastern side of the city centre	Welcome support and note concerns about superstore.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	1	4.42	Major retail development is defined as 750 sqm or more; further justification is required as to the derivation of this threshold.	This threshold is set out in the Core Strategy (policy 3). The Inspector was satisfied that this provides the necessary level of control for schemes that may threaten centres and that the threshold level had been operating satisfactorily for some years as part of the Local Plan Review.	No change required
Business Solent	28	Map 5	Potential retail routes should be extended in the east to the Evans Street junctions with Houndwell Place and East Street.	Accept due to the car parking and development proposed on the site.	Extend map to include East Street Shopping Centre
LaSalle	13	Map 5	Object – This map does not reflect the retail circuit of the centre as it does not include the current retail warehouses. Whilst traditionally they would not form part of a city centre, their location within Southampton means that they perform an important retail function. Map 5 does not represent the proposed retail circuit in the CCMP and Map 5 should be amended to make the plans consistent.	Accept that the map should be amended to cover more of the West Quay Retail Park. The map is not intended to cover all shopping destinations but to show routes shoppers may take between retail areas and connecting with the Central Station. It is indicative only.	Extend map to cover more of West Quay Retail Park Add in further text to explain that the map shows the impact of new development on Southampton's retail circuit. Change label to 'Potential retail circuit'
Aviva Life &	2	4.44	Timeframes for retail growth within PSA need flexibility in	Accept need for flexibility.	Policy to be

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Pensions UK			<p>long term. A sentence should be inserted stating that these timeframes are indicative and will be monitored.</p> <p>“The first priority for retail growth is the existing PSA, followed by its managed expansion to meet regional need. <u>Indicative timeframes for this (which will be monitored and reviewed throughout the plan period) are:....”</u></p>	<p>Policy 5 states the criteria for the expansion of the PSA and removes the requirement for a retail impact test. 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 will be amended to clarify this.</p>	<p>amended (see earlier response to Aviva). This will clarify that this is a planned extension of the PSA</p>
Hammerson	9	Policy 6	<p>As drafted, this policy is inconsistent with PPS and the adopted Core Strategy by identifying locations in the PSA or ‘closely linked to it’ for the western supermarket. Unless SCC has undertaken a sequential analysis and is proposing specific sites, first preference should be given to sites in the PSA followed by edge and only then out of centre sites.</p>	<p>Agree. The CCAP is not proposing specific sites and a reference to sequential approach will be added to the policy.</p>	<p>Amend supporting policy to add in reference to sequential approach and impact test and the importance of edge of centre sites being closely linked to the shopping area as a whole and helping deliver the overall development pattern.</p>
LaSalle	9	Policy 6	<p>We are of the opinion that the City Industrial Park is equally suited to accommodate a superstore as the Station Quarter. It is located within 300m of the PSA and at a site which is well connected to the city centre and provides good accessibility to pedestrians and cyclists as well as vehicles. The provision of a convenience store in the Western Gateway was considered as a potential use in the CCMP and identifies development capacity for gross retail floorspace. It is unclear why this potential use has not been</p>	<p>The policy and supporting text supports small scale food stores throughout the centre.</p> <p>Larger superstores will be directed to the primary shopping area. Where there are no suitable and</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			taken forward in the CCAP as no explanation is available.	viable sites, preference will be given to edge of centre sites which are accessible and well connected to the town centre in accordance with the NPPF.	
Gavin Marsh	3	Policy 6	Regard should be had for the impact on local traders from the impact of the Morrison's supermarket.	This site is within the primary shopping area and is therefore a suitable location for a supermarket. It is designed to improve links to St Marys.	No change required
Business Solent	26	Policy 6	Business Solent endorses these retail policies subject to concerns about the location of any new major food store on the eastern side of the city centre	Welcome support and note concern about the location of the eastern superstore	No change required
Arcadian Estates Ltd	1	Policy 6	(and para 4.48) Long Leaseholder of East Street. Supports the Council's aspiration for Southampton to become an international City of Culture by 2026 and agrees that strengthening its role as a regional shopping destination and improving the quality of the built environment is the cornerstone for achieving this. Reassuring Council shares our view that proposals for new city centre food stores can help achieve this goal as stated in para 4.48 – "City Centre supermarkets perform an important role in serving both the existing business and residential population and supporting new development".	Welcome support	No change required
Arcadian Estates Ltd	2	Policy 6	(and para 4.49) Support policy which provides support for the proposals to be imminently submitted to regenerate the vacant East Street Shopping Centre, which includes new large foodstore in the east of PSA to rebalance and enhance provision in the centre and "help claw back spending from out of centre stores" (para 4.49).	Welcome support	No change required
Hammerson	10	4.48	Object – Reference to a supermarket in the Station Quarter should be deleted unless it forms part of a specific policy allocation for the site and a sequential approach has been applied to establishing it as the preferred supermarket location. There is no evidence put forward in the CCAP or CCMP that this is the case.	The specific reference to Station Quarter in this paragraph will be deleted. However part of the Station Quarter is within the area of search for the	Amend text in 4.48 to remove reference to Station Quarter and clarify meaning of 'closely linked' to the PSA. It will also

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				extension of the PSA. The supporting text will define 'closely linked' to the PSA (policy text in policy 6) as within the area of search.	clarify how applications will be assessed.
A. Samuels	41	4.49	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.	Agree with the need for a variety of shops	No change required
Anna Redding	2	4.49	The city needs shops that are a bit different (independent and creative).	Agree with the need for a variety of shops	No change required
Business Solent	30	4.52	Business Solent believes that ensuring compatibility between the need to retain the ability to put on the Boat Show each year and yet deliver a world class waterfront development is key to the future success of the city.	Agree	No change required
A. Samuels	18	4.52	The city lacks a good "bourgeois" theatre, such as the theatres at Salisbury, Portsmouth, Winchester and Chichester. The Nuffield is something of an "elite" theatre attracting a minority. The Mayflower does musicals very well. For orchestral music the Guildhall is rarely available or viable or affordable.	Although not specifically mentioned, the CCAP supports new leisure, culture and tourism development in the city centre	No change required. Forwarded to Tina Dyer Slade
Gavin Marsh	8	4.52	Southampton is one of the few cities that does not have a sizeable auditorium / venue for touring bands and other performed and the acoustics of the largest venue, the Guildhall are problematic. Why not a centrally located auditorium?	Although not specifically mentioned, the CCAP supports new leisure, culture and tourism development in the city centre. Previous attempts to deliver such a facility however have been unsuccessful and therefore it is not listed as a requirement for any development site.	No change required Forwarded to Tina Dyer Slade
M. Baker	2	4.52	The Mayflower Theatre provides excellent musical entertainment but there is a need for a city centre venue comparable to the BIC in Bournemouth where good acoustics make it possible for all types of music to be	Welcome views on leisure provision in the city centre. Although not specifically mentioned, the CCAP	No change required Forwarded to Tina Dyer Slade

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			enjoyed. The acoustics in the Guildhall are really poor and the small Turner Sims Concert Hall is out of town and on the university campus.	supports new leisure, culture and tourism development in the city centre.	
William Ashdown	1	4.52	<p>There is a lack of anything on leisure in the city. Need a large entertainment venue for concerts and productions; Southampton needs an alternative to the Mayflower, something that can cater for conferences, exhibitions and topline entertainment.</p> <p>Alternative approach – An entertainment venue could be placed alongside the Quays (parking, access, and proximity to centre).</p>	Although not specifically mentioned, the CCAP supports new leisure, culture and tourism development in the city centre. Previous attempts to deliver such a facility however have been unsuccessful and therefore it is not listed as a requirement for any development site.	<p>No change required</p> <p>Forwarded to Tina Dyer Slade</p>
Business Solent	31	4.54	Business Solent agrees that the night time economy is a key part of a successful regional city centre and that it is important to manage its operation and expansion.	Welcome support	No change required
R. Cassy	7	Policy 7	It is important for people to be able to go out at night and enjoy themselves but also for residents (and businesses) to not be unduly disturbed. Extending opening hours may result in undesirable consequences and will need to be “policed” assiduously. Are there sufficient resources for this to be the case?	The night time economy policy seeks to restrict late night opening close to residential areas. Agree that this must be supported by enforcement action.	No change required
Natalia Kulabuchova	3	Policy 7	Music should be allowed to be played late into the night as there are mostly commercial properties in the centre.	Agree with the need for late night venues playing music in suitable locations. Following further discussions on the night time economy policy, it will be redrafted to focus on opening hours and remove references to specific uses.	<p>No change in response to comment</p> <p>Policy 7 and supporting text to be redrafted to focus on opening hours</p>
C. Southgate	1	Policy 7	Object – This could severely damage the late night economy as the areas proposed seem too small and are	Disagree. The closing hours for zones extend up	No change in response to

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>incredibly remote from the rest of the city centre which will not encourage public transport use to access them. It doesn't sound vibrant or sustainable if people drive/get a taxi to Leisure World and then drive/get a taxi home after.</p> <p>Alternative approach – Enable other late night hubs in sparsely populated parts of the city centre which would be minimally affected by night time activity i.e. Cultural Quarter and High Street.</p>	<p>to 1am; beyond this premises in the hubs can stay open until 3am.</p> <p>In light of other responses, reference to late night uses will be removed and therefore more uses will be appropriate within the zones (providing they operate within set opening hours).</p>	<p>comment</p> <p>Policy 7 and supporting text to be redrafted to focus on opening hours</p>
Hammerson	11	Policy 7	<p>Object – The Watermark WestQuay is identified as falling within the evening zone. As currently drafted this would not allow a cinema (D2 use) to be provided. This is inconsistent with Policy 24 where Watermark WestQuay is identified as appropriate for leisure use and the existing planning permission for the site. Watermark West Quay should be included as a late hub as a cinema, late night opening premises and leisure uses remain a key part of the proposals and should be supported in policy 17.</p>	<p>Agree that this needs to be addressed. Policy 7 will be redrafted to remove reference to specific uses and therefore cinema and leisure uses will be appropriate (providing they operate within set opening hours).</p>	<p>Policy 7 and supporting text to be redrafted to focus on opening hours</p> <p>Set latest closing time for Watermark WestQuay at 1 am</p>
Business Solent	32	Policy 7	<p>Approach of seeking to promote clusters of facilities in identified areas where late night uses are encouraged is supported but the issue of connectivity between them must be addressed.</p>	<p>Welcome support for approach and note importance of connectivity</p>	<p>No change in response to comment</p> <p>Policy 7 and supporting text to be redrafted to focus on opening hours</p>
Longfleet Engineering	3	Policy 7	<p>No. 8 Southampton Street is identified in both the Carlton Crescent office area and the Bedford Place evening zone but office buildings in Carlton Crescent are not. There is a conflict in including this site in both policy areas. No. 8 should be excluded from the office area.</p>	<p>Bedford Place is identified as a location for early evening uses. These uses can co-exist with office uses. However the site is to be removed from the office safeguarding area.</p>	<p>No further change required</p>
Cllr Noon	14	Policy 7	<p>Policies appear about right but consideration should be given to find ways for large licence premises to make</p>	<p>Section 106 contributions are currently collected for</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			additional contributions for policing and a late night bus service.	community safety facilities and this will continue in future.	
Cllr Noon	15	Policy 7	Allow and encourage coffee and good quality café outlets on Above Bar, High Street and Guildhall Square to stay open in line with the late night licensing.	The plan cannot be this specific but we would welcome such cafes and the policy and table support this.	No change required
SFRA	1	Policy 7	(and Para 4.59 Table 3) The revised times for late night uses will allow Police and other agencies to focus on targeting trouble spots to deal with late night amenity issues which disturbs local residents.	Welcome support	No change required
EBRA	11	Policy 7	Support identifying areas where late night and evening uses are encouraged and restricting closing times outside those areas. Concerned about damaging impact on health of drinkers and residents due to prevalence of clubs and bars open to all hours. Policy essential to ensure high quality of life in the mix of housing, new hotels, shops etc planned within the city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
Residents Action (S. Morris)	1	4.59	Support curbing the late trading hours of future bars, clubs and pubs in the area of Bedford Place and London Road (in table 3). Residents Action has publicised the long term damage to the area by antisocial behaviour, crime, damage to cars and gardens, general drunken and rowdy night time behaviour by drunken students returning to their homes in the Polygon. This problem was ignored for too long. Do not change policy to suit bar owners	Welcome support	No change required
Residents Action (L. Barter)	1	4.59	Support limiting the trading hours of bars, clubs and pubs in the area of Bedford Place and London Road (in table 3). Late night use of these bars and the drunken antisocial behaviour by young people who live in Polygon has driven long term citizens, retired people and workers from the area. This problem was ignored for too long. Do not change policy to suit bar owners	Welcome support	No change required
M. Baker	3	4.59	Query whether the midnight latest closing time will be applied retrospectively since the present situation allows the significant number of existing pubs and clubs to close at 3am. Nearby homeowner residents would strongly support	No – this will not apply to existing properties unless they seek to change their opening hours.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			midnight closing.		
Hammerson	12	Table 3	It is unclear which latest closing hours would relate to the Watermark WestQuay site.	Agree. Although physically separated, it was part of the Bargate and Below Bar zone. It will now be listed separately.	Include Watermark WestQuay in table 3 with latest closing time of 1am.
R. Cassy	8	4.60	It is particularly unhelpful that planning and licensing have different criteria and makes it difficult for local people to influence the culture of their area.	Note frustration with different systems. The supporting text seeks to explain the two systems and how they work together.	No change required
Business Solent	33	4.67	Supports the aim of delivering a more diverse range of hotels	Welcome support	No change required

Chapter 4 – City Centre policies: A great place to live

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
R. Cassy	9	4.69	The delicate balance between liveability and economic drivers needs constant calibration. The CCAP is strong on the economic and business elements and rather weak on the quality of life for residents – this should be redressed.	The council considers that the document does achieve a good balance between economic and social (quality of life) aspects. The CCAP has a number of policies that aim to improve the quality of life for residents including but not limited to policies on provision of open space, green links, night time economy, Design, flood resilience etc.	No change required
Cllr Noon	11	4.70	Develop policies that make HMO landlords much more responsible for their property and to the local community.	The council has recently adopted a supplementary	Add reference to the SPD in the preamble

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				planning document that focuses on HMOs. The council has set up a multi-disciplinary 'virtual' team to deal with HMO issues. Many of the management issues can't be regulated by planning but may be able to be dealt with by other departments in the council.	to the 'place to live' section.
R. Cassy	10	4.70	The increase of the student population in pockets all over the city centre will need to be managed carefully by the 2 universities who must retain responsibility for the impact of their "business". Question whether SCC is confident this will be the case?	The universities provide an extremely important function and play an important role in the community. The council is seeking to enable the universities to continue to expand and diversify while trying to reduce some of the impacts such as through encouraging more purpose built accommodation.	No change required
M. Baker	5	4.70	The excellent potential of older family houses to be brought back to their previous occupancy should be encouraged by good publicity from the city council. Large numbers of students may move from 3 bed houses with gardens into new purpose-built student accommodation. The houses in the Polygon area are an important asset to the city which could again provide homes for families and professionals who like to live near the city centre. This would create a better balanced demography for the area.	The council is taking a positive approach to more purpose built student accommodation in order that it will free up some existing rented properties. However we cannot force lawful HMOs to revert to family homes. The council would support proposals to convert an existing HMO to a family home and has an SPD in place to control additional HMOs.	Add pre-amble to the policy to briefly address the family housing issues.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Terrace Hill	2	4.70	Support council's recognition that purpose built student accommodation and hall of residence style accommodation helps to provide an important alternative to private rented housing and help to relieve pressure on this market. Terrace Hill fully endorses the council's view that the city centre is an ideal location for student accommodation. Terrace Hill is currently working with Osborne Developments to deliver a high quality purpose built student accommodation on Mayflower Plaza, and as such fully accords with the council's aspirations for the city centre.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	34	4.72	Supports the further growth in residential accommodation	Welcome support	No change required
Design ACB Architects	1	4.73	(and para 4.74) Encouraging a residential mix of all tenures is welcome where there is demand, although this should not negatively impact proposals for smaller households either. Development should begin now for primary and secondary schools if families are to be catered for in the city centre of any significant numbers if this approach is to be sustainable. Free Schools are not to be relied upon to guarantee the needs of the city's education requirements.	Welcome support, the supporting text to Core Strategy policy CS16 recognises the need for both family homes and smaller properties. The primary school review has identified that the capacity will be expanded at St John's and St Mary's. There are currently surplus places at existing secondary schools in the city and until these are at capacity the council can't justify a case for a new secondary school. The need will be kept under review.	
R. Cassy	11	4.73	This highlights an entrenched difficulty for the city as without a local secondary school families are less likely to stay in the city centre. There are some very good primary schools including St Johns which is expanding rapidly but the travel to school distance for many families once children reach 11 will be a challenge. Question whether it	Comment noted. There are currently surplus places at existing secondary schools in the city and until these are at capacity the council can't	

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			is genuinely not possible to identify a suitable site?	justify a case for a new secondary school. The need will be kept under review.	
M. Baker	4	4.73	Object - The paragraph ignores the presence of the 1,000 pupil St. Anne's School which welcomes girls of any faith and consistently produces excellent examination results.	Comment noted, although near to the city centre the school is not within the CCAP boundary.	May want to consider identifying in the infrastructure section those schools (that effectively) serve the City Centre community.....Yes, either there or in education section once reviewed
Cllr Noon	9	4.74	All new housing developments should be mixed, including social housing, part ownership and family housing with the right design this should not exclude family accommodation in flats. Encourage more families into the city centre by providing more family housing.	Comment noted, this fits in with the policies in the Core Strategy for family housing and affordable housing.	No change required
C. Southgate	2	Policy 8	Support good quality family housing in the city centre. The policy should allow for lower housing densities than currently being built similar to the Redland area of inner Bristol (largely semi-detached, often 3 or 4 stories but included at least 1 parking space and decent sized garden at the back) or to Northland Roads (site of old Cricket Ground). Alternative approach - Identify some housing sites which are better suited to a higher percentage of family/lower density housing.	The council has a specific density policy in the Core Strategy. This sets a general level (for the city centre) of over 100 DPH and identifies a number of criteria that it densities will be assessed against, including the character of the area. The policy also relates to a site as a whole and therefore it does not prevent a mix of types and sizes of properties being delivered subject to design and other matters.	Add pre-amble to the policy to briefly address the family housing issues.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				The Core Strategy policy CS16 sets out the target for family housing provision.	
A. Samuels	45 or 51?	Policy 8	City centre living is desirable in principle, but requires careful planning to prevent problems of noise and disturbance experienced in previous developments. Proper family and social provision is needed for housing in the city centre.	Comment noted.	Add pre-ambble to the policy to briefly address the family housing issues and to city centre living.
M. Baker	6	Policy 8	Object - The sites quoted in 2. are hardly large enough for 'mixed use development'. They will surely lead to more high-density blocks of flats. However the Chantry Hall site could provide houses as it is larger and would complement the already existing houses nearby.	The policy is seeking to reflect the mixed nature of town centres and so while the large proportion of development on these sites is expected to be residential it also allows for some small scale retail/community uses which would be entirely consistent with a city centre location. Core Strategy policy CS16 sets out the councils approach for the provision of family housing.	Add pre-ambble to the policy to briefly address the family housing issues.
Business Solent	36	Policy 8	Endorses this policy together with the need to identify more creative and innovative approaches to introducing family living environments within the city centre, to provide affordable and market housing with a mix of tenures and to provide city centre executive housing encouraging business leaders and other key stakeholders to live in the centre.	Welcome support	No change required
SFRA	2	Policy 8	Concerned that there will be a high number of blocks of flats built in the city centre which will be unoccupied as what happened in the 1990s.	Comment noted. There is a need for additional smaller units.	No change required
EBRA	12	Policy 8	High density housing will not be sustainable, as there will be increased pressure on existing infrastructure and water	Housing will need to be supported by appropriate	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			supply shortages.	infrastructure but this will not prevent high density housing being developed.	
Cllr Noon	10	Policy 8	There are opportunities in Chapel and St Mary's Street for further mixed housing development which should include mostly family accommodation.	Comment noted. Policy CS16 in the Core Strategy sets an overall target for family housing.	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	1	Policy 8	Question - Can the council provide the background documents showing the present value of each one of the 18 key sites and the sites under policy 8?	The council does not have this information at present but will be preparing a proportionate evidence base on deliverability to support the next stage of the document (e.g. submission).	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	10	Policy 8	The council rather foolishly supplies Policy 8 Housing Supply noting sites for development as unscrupulous developers with no affinity to the City or intent to build pick up these sites knowing they are unviable. They then run a legal bank robbery where they refinance based on reduced contributions and leave the site a bomb site. By producing such a list, the council are encouraging this behaviour.	The council is required to identify sites for future development including housing.	No change required
A. Samuels	46 or 52	4.77	The redevelopment of the Holyrood and Golden Grove Estates should be systematically planned. The density of the use at present is below modern attainable levels.	There are no plans currently to redevelop these estates but agree with the need for carefully planning.	No change required
Mrs S Wyatt	1	4.79	There are too many flats being built in the city centre	Comment noted. The council is seeking to encourage more family homes, through policy CS16 in the Core Strategy. However, this is as part of a wider city mix of housing type/size and while we would continue to expect more flats to be developed in the city centre.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Southampton Solent University	2	Policy 9	Supports the principle of the policy and the specific safeguarding of EPT campus and Sir James Matthews Building. Consider that the policy and the proposals map should be amended to include the land to the north of the existing campus.	It is appropriate that Policy 9 safeguards the existing University site; but that Policy 33 introduces a degree of flexibility for the East Park Terrace development site. Policy 33 supports University uses and also, if part of the site is not needed by the University, a wider mix of uses.	No change required
Cllr Noon	16	Policy 9	The city council will encourage both Solent and the City College to develop greater links with each other and with the local community and businesses. Discouraging traffic on East Park Terrace, Palmerston Road and Kingsway could open up the parks creating a campus atmosphere which would include the Cultural Quarter. Develop policies that encourage students to come to the city e.g. student safety, and stay here after finishing university.	Comment noted. This broadly fits in with the council's policy to safeguard land for the university and give greater flexibility to allow for partnership development with businesses. It is hoped that this and other plans in the CCAP to improve the quality of life for residents will help to add to the retention rates of students.	No change required
Cllr Noon	17	Policy 9	City centre schools are becoming full and short of space and therefore there is a need for a further primary school and secondary school to serve the city centre.	The primary school review has identified that the capacity will be expanded at St John's and St Mary's. There are currently surplus places at existing secondary schools in the city and until these are at capacity the council can't justify a case for a new secondary school. The need will be kept under	

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				review.	
Business Solent	35	Policy 9	The need for a secondary school should not just be kept under review but actively promoted and a suitable site within the city centre identified and safeguarded in policy 9	The primary school review has identified that the capacity will be expanded at St John's and St Mary's. There are currently surplus places at existing secondary schools in the city and until these are at capacity the council can't justify a case for a new secondary school. The need will be kept under review.	
Business Solent	37	Policy 9	Strongly supported subject to the inclusion of a requirement to identify and safeguard a future secondary school or academy site.	Welcome support. The primary school review has identified that the capacity will be expanded at St John's and St Mary's. There are currently surplus places at existing secondary schools in the city and until these are at capacity the council can't justify a case for a new secondary school. The need will be kept under review.	

Chapter 4 – City Centre policies: A greener centre

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
R. Cassy	12	4.88	Southampton has some excellent open spaces and these need to be protected. Question whether investment will be	The council will continue to manage the parks	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			made to protect parks from overuse given the increase in population?	taking into account their levels of use	
SCAPPS	6	4.90	Object - Not consistent with the Core Strategy and should read will retain the quantity.	Agree - Paragraph 4.90 is not strictly consistent with the Core Strategy	Amend para 4.90 - "These policies set out that the council retain the quantity of existing open spaces..."
Cllr Noon	18	Policy 10	A number of past developments have included water features and these have gone into disrepair and become unsightly. In the future consideration should be given to ensure very strong commitments from the developers that they won't go into disrepair.	Comment noted	No change required
EBRA	13	Policy 10	Support protection of open spaces which is an asset for city. Support provision of open spaces in new developments.	Welcome the support	No change required
SCAPPS	1	Policy 10	<p>Object - The Plan recognises that new housing & commercial development should be matched by social & community provision but specific proposals do not secure that balance. Open space is not matched to provision of housing & commercial development. Parts of the Central Parks already show signs of wear from intensity of use. The increase in numbers living and working will add to that pressure of use. Para 4.98 asserts 'Large public open spaces are well provided for...' but does not recognise this pressure of use. Para 4.99 suggests that eventual development in the Major Development Quarter might include a substantial new open space. The Plan accepts that the MDQ is unlikely to come forward for development until after 2021. The scale of increased activity from developments in earlier phases of the Plan would meanwhile have increased pressure of use on the Central Parks that could result in lasting damage.</p> <p>Alternative approach - SCAPPS proposes inclusion in the Plan of a proposal to use Community Infrastructure Levy & Section 106 funding for adaptations to layout/planting in the Central Parks to discourage football & 'kick-about' activities in places vulnerable to wear & to improve the resilience &</p>	<p>The council will continue to manage the parks taking into account their levels of use.</p> <p>The proposed CIL Charging Schedule and S106 SPD will in combination provide funding for open space maintenance and improvements. Approaches like those suggested could be incorporated into the management of city parks.</p>	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			durability of areas of heavy use.		
SCAPPS	7	Policy 10	Support the designation of additional existing open space (criterion 2). Object to reconfiguration of Mayflower Park and Blechynden Terrace in absence of firm proposals securing replacement of open space, equal in area and qualities.	Policy 10 criterion 3 of the Plan already requires that any reconfiguration of existing open space at Royal Pier and Blechynden Terrace "provided the quantity of open space is retained". There is reference to enhancing the Mayflower Park and to upgrade the strategic link by Blechynden Terrace. However a clarification would be useful.	Amend policy 10 criterion 3: "...provided the quantity and quality of open space is retained..."
Sport England	1	Policy 10	Generally welcomes the attention paid to the protection of existing open spaces within Policy 10. Although the document does not indicate any loss of playing pitches, Sport England would object to their loss reconfigurations unless specific exceptions are met.	No loss of playing pitches is envisaged in the CCAP.	No change required
A. Samuels	50	Policy 10	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.	Feedback noted. ANDREW: This might be a fair point? Worth a quick discussion with Kay or Richard to see whether we want to put a sentence in	No change required
Natural England	5	Policy 10	With reference to the monitoring within the Sustainability Appraisal, a measure of success is meeting the ANGSt, though the policy does not include consideration of it, and the Green Space Factor does not have a target for green space.	ANGST standards are cited in Para 4.102 of the draft CCAP. The Green Space Factor is a qualitative tool – it does not seek to prescribe quantitative improvements	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				(see Policy 11 for standards / targets).	
Business Solent	38	Policy 10	Strongly support but there are some detailed design matters which Business Solent would wish to discuss further e.g. the proposed Queens Park enhancements and remodelling of Vokes Memorial Gardens as part of the Platform Road improvements.	Welcome the support. The council will consult further on these schemes.	No change required
R. Cassy	13	Policy 10	As a member of FTQP, I endorse this policy and hope that it will be strongly implemented. The protection of existing green space and provision of further green and open space is essential to balance the increasing density of housing. I hope that Mayflower Park will retain its large open green space which is much valued by local families who do not have their own open space.	Welcome the support	No change required
Friends of Town Quay Park	1	Policy 10	Welcome recognition of the importance of open space and commitment to protecting and enhancing existing open space including Town Quay Park (listed in appendix 4).	Welcome the support	No change required
English Heritage	3	Policy 10	English Heritage welcomes and supports this policy.	Welcome the support	No change required
Natural England	4	Policy 10	This supports policy CS 22 in the Core Strategy and is welcomed. The Green Space Factor is an innovative approach to ensuring a net gain in green infrastructure whilst avoiding over prescriptive policy.	Welcome the support	No change required
SCAPPS	3	Policy 10 and 17	Supports the concept (para 4.92 & Policy 10 & Policy 17) of environmental enhancement along routes linking open spaces together, especially that linking the Central Parks via Queensway to Queen's Park. There seems to be a conflict between proposals for Pedestrian / cyclist friendly routes, with extensive green landscaping & water features & the continued use of the same roads as principal traffic routes. Principal traffic routes are not identified in the Plan.)	Welcome support for the concepts in policy; future schemes will consider the balance between green infrastructure and transport considerations on a case by case basis.	No change required.
English Heritage	4	4.95	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to evoking the historic setting of the walls subject to protecting heritage assets.	Welcome the support	No change required.
SCAPPS	8	Policy 11	Support, but questions why there is no requirement (point 2) for shopping development to provide amenity open space. Open space is matching increased demand and it is not 'replacement' (so object to references in 4.99 & 4.102 that it would substitute or compensate for loss of open space	Welcome the broad support for the policy approach. The council is aware of pressure on central parks; but even	No change required.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			elsewhere). 'Pocket' spaces, although valuable, in providing for passive recreation of nearby residents/workers will not ease pressure on the large parks. Welcome reference to CIL contribution (point 4).	given the city centre land values, this approach will help provide a small number of complimentary spaces.	
Sport England	3	Policy 11	Would expect new development to include additional sports facilities made necessary by their development. Sport England would require a contribution to both sports pitches and the built provision of sports facilities to meet the increased demand caused by the additional population envisaged by the Action Plan. Identifies the Sports Facilities Calculator as a tool which can be used to estimate the level of demand for facilities that is created by a given population.	Where schemes cannot provide sports provision on site, the council's proposed CIL charge will provide the funding contribution (see Policy 11 - criterion 4).	No change required
Hammerson	13	Policy 11	Support the thrust of policy 11 although requests further clarification in relation to table 5 insofar as it relates to 'Watermark WestQuay Plaza and part of Western Esplanade'. It is unclear whether the reference is to provide one or two separate spaces within the development and needs to be clarified.	Welcome the support – the wording will be revisited.	Amend wording in Table 5 re. Watermark public space to make clear it is one space.
Business Solent	39	Policy 11	Strongly support as a key objective for the city centre is combining high quality development with good open space provision.	Welcome the support	No change required.
A. Samuels	48	Table 5	The closure of Civic Centre Road in front of the Civic Centre would allow the excellent concept of the Civic Square to be relatively easily achieved, linked in to the cultural quarter and Guildhall Square.	Suggestion noted.	No change required.
A. Samuels	23	4.106	The extension of the district energy network is a fine aspiration, but the cost of extension, the piping and so on, has hitherto proved to be very expensive, if not prohibitively so.	Acknowledge that costs are extremely high but they are generally covered by a connection and/or recovery over a long term contract i.e. normally 20 years. In terms of life time cost benefit and carbon savings District Heating	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>is very positive as pipes will be in the ground without any or very minimal maintenance for circa 50 years. There is great benefit to provide District Heating solutions in the city not only in terms of providing cost effective heat and chilled water supply but also a secure ongoing supply generated locally. This will become more apparent and clear over the coming 3-6 years as we experience issues with the supply of energy and gas nationally.</p>	
A. Samuels	59	Policy 12	It is a pity that nothing much is said about biomass renewable energy plants in the docks and the opportunities for servicing the offshore windfarms proposed in the subregion	<p>The biomass plant is not specifically referred to as it is outside the city centre boundary. The Council does not support the current proposals. When the application is received it will be decided by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>The off-shore wind farm proposals are at an</p>	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				early stage in their development, so their onshore requirements are unknown, although they are unlikely to affect the city centre.	
Business Solent	41	Policy 13	Supported by Business Solent together with the flood hierarchy for the planning of individual new developments.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Business Solent	42	Policy 13	Business Solent would wish to discuss the likely detailed implications of new flood defences integrated into the cityscape and in new developments.	Noted.	No change required
A. Samuels	52	Policy 13	Flood design or flood resilience is an important potential issue, and needs further consideration. Developers are sceptical about the flood risk, and unwilling to pay for extensive flood protection measures.	Agree flooding is a major issue. Major studies have already been completed, and further work is underway. The Plans set out the nature of the flood risk. Developers will contribute to strategic defences via CIL which is viability tested. Developers must provide adequate site based measures but the policy has introduced flexibility and many of the measures are low cost.	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	9	Policy 13	Part 1. - whilst Tarmac and Hanson may not wish to redevelop their wharves they may well want to upgrade or replace buildings, plant and equipment and would not want to be regarded as “developers” who may have to fund some flood defence works. They would simply be continuing with their existing business.	The point is understood. Strategic contributions would be made via CIL. National regulations require standard charge(s) with little discretion. However they only apply CIL to new buildings or extensions of 100 sq m or more; and exclude	Amend criterion 1: “Strategic contributions will be sought from developers towards a flood defence, in line with through the Council’s CIL policy”.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				buildings in which people do not normally go. In addition the Council's draft CIL is set at a low rate for industrial / commercial premises (£10 / sq m). A minor clarification would be helpful.	
Tarmac and Hanson	8	Policy 13	<p>Object - The wharves are located within an area identified for flood defence improvements. It should be understood that wharf use is not a particularly vulnerable use in comparison to residential, office, business and leisure uses.</p> <p>The wharves contain large stockpiles of marine aggregates, 5 or more metres in height, which currently provide an element of flood protection/management. It is also possible that the layout and operation of the wharves could be adapted to provide a greater level of flood protection than simple concrete wall structures or landraising.</p> <p>Landraising would have considerable impact on the wharf operations and would be resisted by Tarmac and Hanson.</p>	<p>A strategic flood defence would protect vulnerable uses in the wider city. However agree that wharves are a "water compatible use".</p> <p>Therefore in some scenarios it is possible the best alignment for a flood defence would be the landward side of the wharves. This should be reflected in the flood defence search zone.</p>	Extend flood defence search zone to include Marine Parade Road
Environment Agency	7	Policy 13	<p>We are supportive of this flood resilience policy and are pleased all comments made in our previous response have been taken on board and reflected in the policy. We strongly support the work which has been done with regard this policy and are satisfied with the way in which Southampton City Council propose to manage flood risk to existing and new communities through the CCAP.</p>	The strong support is welcome.	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	10	4.119	<p>Tarmac and Hanson would be opposed to the principle of landraising at the wharves as the operational and financial impact would be significant enough to close the sites.</p>	<p>The point is noted. The policy already ensures land raising will not be required if it is not practical, viable or appropriate. Paragraph 4.120 already provides some flexibility for minor development, although</p>	<p>Minor or temporary developments <u>which are either</u> associated with the existing use of a site <u>may be appropriate or will not prejudice the future delivery of a flood defence will be</u></p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				this should be clarified.	<u>supported as consistent with policy 13. Development which maintains or improves the operation of, and is within, the existing mineral wharves will also be supported, although where possible this should be located to minimise any prejudice to a flood defence.</u>
Cemex	8	Map 9	Question the deliverability of the flood defence line as part of the wharf appears to be identified as lying within the search zone on Map 9. It is not feasible for CEMEX to raise the whole level of the existing wharf or even the frontage. CEMEX cannot be expected to finance such works; would this be paid for by the council who have identified the zone?	The policy applies to new development, and the supporting text excludes minor / mineral development. It does not in itself require an existing site to be raised when there is no development – a minor clarification would be useful. In wider terms, the future provision of a defence will be discussed with all landowners taking account of all circumstances. There are a wide range of potential funding sources.	Para 4.119: "...This Plan requires that, where the flood defence search zone passes through a <u>development site site where development is proposed</u> , all or part of the site is raised <u>as part of that development</u> to form the flood defence if feasible..."
Associated British Ports	10	Map 9	Support - ABP confirms that the area shown as the 'Flood defence search zone' reflects the position they have put forward during consultation on the emerging Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy being produced by the City Council. ABP would remind the council that any	The support is welcome. Para 4.121 of the Plan already addresses the port access point.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			flood defence works within this zone should have due regard to the need to provide and retain access into the port estate.		

Chapter 4 – City Centre policies: Attractive and distinctive

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	5	4.125	English Heritage welcomes and supports the recognition of the city's many significant assets but would like to see an acknowledgement of the city centre's archaeological heritage as well as above-ground structures.	Agree that assets should include archaeological heritage	Add in reference to archaeology to para 4.125
R. Cassy	14	4.125	Southampton's assets are many but mostly hidden or compromised by poor design.	Agree that some are hidden / compromised and policies for the Bargate Shopping Centre redevelopment for example will seek to redress past mistakes.	No change required
Business Solent	43	4.126	Agree that high quality design is fundamental to accommodating and delivering growth in ways that improve the city centre and maximise its existing assets.	Welcome support	No change required
R. Cassy	15	4.126	High quality design is very important and it is essential this is followed through. Much previous development has been of dreary and depressing blocks of flats.	Welcome support and the need for good design	No change required
SCAPPS	9	Policy 14	Proposed additional wording relating to protected strategic views. Alternative wording - add '& from bottom of French Street, Bugle Street & High Street' to 'River Test from the Town Walls'.	(See comments on Royal Pier waterfront). Agree that views of the water from the Old Town are important and new development will seek to retain where possible. New wording is proposed to safeguard views from Bugle Street and/or French Street. Some	Amend policy 14 to include reference to 'River Test from the Town Walls and the bottom of Bugle Street and/or French Street'. Amend paragraph 5.51 (supporting text to policy 22)

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				flexibility is required for the Royal Pier waterfront developer to create a high quality scheme and avoid awkward shaped and sized blocks if both views must be retained.	
Hammerson	14	Policy 14	The views to the river Test and Mayflower Park from the Town Wall are one identified view as shown in Map 10. The view as shown if protected would preclude all multi-level development on the Watermark West Quay and Royal Pier Waterfront sites and is conflict with other policies in the CCAP. The policy wording should be clarified and the policy expended to acknowledge that in exceptional circumstances protected views could be lost if the wider benefits of a scheme coming forward are considered to outweigh its loss.	<p>We recognise that Watermark will significantly reduce views of the water over the site. However the redevelopment should seek to retain some views of water from the site along the Town Walls and looking over towards the cruise liners as shown in the Master Plan. If this is not possible, exceptions for development affecting a strategic view are covered in paragraph 4.131.</p> <p>Map 10 will be amended to show one arrow south from Catchcold Tower (removing the arrow to Mayflower Park). The key will be amended to show that there are both specific views and vistas of the water.</p>	<p>Combine two arrows to show one arrow from Catchcold Tower to the water.</p> <p>Add separate category of 'Views of the water' to the key</p>
Gavin Marsh	9	Policy 14	It is high time the city has an architectural masterpiece. There is precious little of merit in the city and from what I see in the plan that looks set to continue.	The plan supports high quality design. However, its policies need to be deliverable and, whilst we	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				would welcome it, such a masterpiece is unlikely to be viable in the current economic situation	
Business Solent	44	Policy 14	Supports design policy but Business Solent would wish to discuss the details of the policy and any accompanying guidance.	Welcome support. We will continue to attend the Future Southampton Action Group monthly meeting and will take updates to this meeting	No change required
R. Cassy	16	Policy 14	Key views are particularly important for the Old Town. It is essential to honour earlier commitments to retain views (not glimpses) of the water. Previous proposals for the Royal Pier/Mayflower Park would have compromised the key views down Bugle Street, French Street and lower High Street.	Agree with the need to protect strategic views in the Old Town. New wording is proposed to safeguard views from Bugle Street and/or French Street. Some flexibility is required for the Royal Pier developer to create a high quality scheme and avoid awkward shaped and sized blocks if both views must be retained.	Amend policy 14 to include reference to 'River Test from the Town Walls and the bottom of Bugle Street and/or French Street'. Amend paragraph 5.51 (supporting text to policy 22)
Friends of Town Quay Park	2	Policy 14	Welcome commitment to respect the heritage of buildings and spaces and enhance their settings.	Welcome support	No change required
English Heritage	6	Policy 14	English Heritage welcomes and supports the requirements of this Policy that development should 'respect the heritage of buildings and spaces and enhance their settings' and 'seek to strengthen the unique distinctiveness of the city's heritage...'	Welcome support	No change required
Design ACB Architects	2	Policy 14	(and para 4.134) A "City Style" if rigorously imposed could weaken future proposals. Success stories such as Future Systems Selfridges Bull Ring in Birmingham would not be possible for the city. Consistent features within the public realm to create a unique character for Southampton would be more successful, illustrated well by Barcelona's approach to this.	Agree. The Streetscape Manual has sought to provide guidance for Southampton. The city style would set out broad principles and provide a starting point for the	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				majority of developments but could still accommodate exceptional quality proposals and will have flexibility.	
SFRA	5	Policy 14	Resident Groups must be given the opportunity to comment on individual developments.	Agree. This is in line with the Localism Bill requirement for applicants to consult communities prior to the submission of their planning application	No change required
English Heritage	7	4.129	English Heritage welcomes and supports the statement that 'the design of new development should complement and enhance areas of high quality and established character'.	Welcome support	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	3	4.132	Object - Wording is too prescriptive. The suggested structure of development may not prove deliverable, and we do not consider it is effective. The paragraph should be more flexible so to not stifle development opportunities. <u>Alternative wording - "...New developments should where possible seek to provide active frontages onto primary streets and open spaces. Developments can take a variety of building types and forms. The design and scale of gateway and corner sites should reflect their context and location within the hierarchy of streets..."</u>	Disagree. This clearly sets out the structure required. Development that doesn't follow this structure should be the exception and must be justified individually.	No change required
Business Solent	45	4.134	Business Solent would wish to further discuss the design agenda with the city council and others which should include working with the private sector to further develop (sponsor) and enhance the public realm.	Welcome offer of working with Business Solent and others	No change required
English Heritage	8	4.134	English Heritage welcomes and supports the use of the City Centre Characterisation Study.	Welcome support	No change required
John Abbott	4	Policy 15	The physical geography of the City Centre means the city centre shares many similarities with Manhattan. Could the city not benefit from this by seeking to develop some large and iconic looking very tall buildings possibly in a new business district. This would provide the City Centre with real skyline presence which it currently lacks. Careful location of such buildings would not obstruct views of	Agree with the need for tall buildings in the city centre. The appropriate height of buildings will be assessed individually but could include very tall buildings of exceptional	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			historic buildings and indeed public access to viewing areas could provide wonderful panoramic views along the full length of Southampton Water, the city centre itself, the port and surrounding countryside, a fantastic new visitor attraction. (I appreciate careful siting would also be required in terms of the airport approach/departure).	high quality design if market forces allow.	
A. Samuels	47	Policy 15	The concept of a skyline round the Central Parks has been too long ignored; though in the short to medium term it is too late to do much to remedy the situation. But at least an awareness of the concept would help for the future. Tall buildings, excellent in themselves, should fall into some sort of pattern within their surroundings.	Policy 15 seeks to provide this framework by supporting tall buildings to provide an edge to the park. The supporting text provides detailed advice on how buildings should respond to their context and design challenges.	No change required
A. Samuels	51	Policy 15	All new buildings should be alive to their context, and height is very relevant but prescribing "up to 6 storeys" is simply arbitrary and foolish. Why not 5 or 7, or any specific number?	In order to provide useful guidance it is necessary to define what constitutes a tall building. For Southampton the description reflects the context of buildings in the city which are primarily low level. It also takes forward the standard used in the local plan and other documents. Accept that this definition will cover a range of tall buildings and individual buildings must respond to their context.	No change required
Business Solent	46	Policy 15	Supports in principle approach to the planning and location of tall buildings but would wish to discuss the details of the policy and guidance shown on Maps 10 and 11.	Welcome support and note request to discuss the detail of the policy	No change required
LaSalle	10	Policy 15	Support the inclusion of Western Gateway as an area suitable to accommodate tall buildings and structures. This	Welcome support	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			demonstrates that Western Gateway has the opportunity to provide landmark buildings that will make a positive impact on the city centre.		
Design ACB Architects	3	Policy 15	(and Map 11) In accordance with CABE's guidance the height of tall buildings should be defined and each individual application should be reviewed on its own merits in its immediate context. Design standards must remain imperative.	Agree. The plan identifies appropriate locations for tall buildings and defines these as 5+ storeys or equivalent. Beyond this, individual applications will be considered on their own merits and against any more detailed guidance such as development briefs.	Add in reference to CABE 'Guidance on Tall Buildings' in supporting text in paragraph 4.136.
SFRA	3	Policy 15	Blocks of flats should not be built if they obscure views and prevent the opening up of the waterfront.	Agree with the need to protect views of the waterfront. The CCAP aims to balance protecting views with delivering high quality developments such as Royal Pier waterfront.	No change required
SFRA	4	Policy 15	Clusters of tall blocks however desirable must be tempered by the traffic and parking problems they will generate.	Agree that transport infrastructure and parking needs to be considered when assessing tall buildings	No change required
SCAPPS	2	Policy 15 & Map 11	Objects strongly to inclusion in Policy 15 of unqualified acceptance of tall buildings adjacent to the Parks which will increase the sense of enclosure to the central parks. Tall buildings would not respond to the scale of the parks but would be out of scale and unsympathetic to the human scale of the park. The objective should be to maintain the openness. Proposes a policy giving consolidated design guidance for development fronting the Parks. Alternative approach - Development fronting the Parks should be of a high quality design which enhances the setting of the Parks & which, by height & massing, avoids	Disagree. Tall buildings are defined as 5 or more storeys and this will not be, in principle, out of scale to the parks. They also can provide a sustainable location due to the amenity of parks and can facilitate high quality development. Proposals for individual buildings will consider their visual	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			obtrusion in views from within the Parks. New frontage development facing the Park should respect the historic scale of Victorian development when the Parks were laid out & should be of between 3 & 6 storeys. On deeper sites (e.g. East Park Terrace), higher structures may be acceptable stepping up from that frontage height.	impact alongside other considerations.	
SCAPPS	10	4.138	Object - Tall buildings are not necessary to define parks.	Disagree. Due to the scale of the parks, tall buildings can be developed which are not overbearing and which are a positive addition to the skyline.	No change required.
Natural England	6	4.139	We welcome the requirement to consider the flight paths of coastal birds when planning for tall buildings and the council is ahead of other authorities in this regard. However reference to the text would be improved if it were a separate paragraph to the reference to the requirements of BAA.	Welcome support for approach and agree this would be clearer in a separate paragraph.	Split paragraph 4.139 in two

Chapter 4 – City Centre policies: Easy to get about

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Southampton Cycling Campaign	1	4.140	The statement that “there are good walking and cycling routes into the centre from many parts of the city” is only a partial picture. There are also dangerous and unpleasant routes for cyclists on the major roads, including Portsmouth Rd, Bitterne Roads East and West, Winchester Rd, Romsey	Agree. There are a number of routes which are in need of improvements - as set out draft Policy 16(6). The examples given are	Add to quote: “although some others would benefit from improvements”.

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			Rd and Shirley High Street/Shirley Rd.	outside the city centre although a brief acknowledgement will be useful.	
Southampton Cycling Campaign	2	4.141	Good bicycle and pedestrian links between residential areas and retail and business areas and between the residential areas themselves are necessary to reduce motor vehicle use. To improve cycle links, light controlled crossings over major roads should be toucan crossings wherever possible and footbridges over railway lines should be adapted or replaced to include facilities for bicycles.	Agree in terms of the principle of improving cycle routes. The CCAP document sets this out in 4.155 and funding is being sought through the LSTF (para 4.145) and LTP3.	No change required.
Southampton Solent University	3	Policy 16	Supports the promotion of enhanced crossing points, routes and urban spaces for pedestrians and cyclists by managing vehicular movements and re-designating streets in the inner ring road area, including Charlotte Place and the Six Dials area. Supports the principle but notes the policy is not supported by detailed information about how these re-designs of streets and junctions might take place. In order to be effective and secure stakeholder support a greater level of detail is required. SSU requests to be involved in detailed development/design stages. The retention of safe and convenient vehicular access to East Park Terrace for visitors and deliveries is essential to the successful operation of the campus.	Southampton City Council will work up the detailed implementation measures after extensive consultation. Agree that relevant stakeholders should be involved.	No change required.
SCAPPS	11	Policy 16	Support the removal of Queensway gyratory to enhance the park.	Welcome support	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	10	Policy 16(6)	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 reclassification of roads should take account of requirements for future development; therefore policy should state that enhancements will maintain capacity. 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	Disagree with wording change: The objective is to free up more development land in the area and to improve pedestrian cycle access. The realignment will be part of a wider strategy to manage vehicular movements, and access to	Policy 6 criterion 6: "...by managing vehicular movements <u>appropriately</u> ..." Para 4.153: " <u>It is important to promote appropriate adjustments to the road network to support the key aims of creating high quality spaces and</u>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>city centre.</p> <p>We note that this view is supported by paragraph 4.163.</p> <p>At point 6 of Policy 16, insert the following:</p> <p>“...redesigning streets in the following locations:</p> <p>a.) <u>Western Esplanade adjacent to Central Station – realignment and/or narrowing to single carriageways provided this does not adversely affect how the Mountbatten Retail park and other established retail destinations are served and accessed by car.</u>”</p>	<p>the retail park will be considered as part of the approach. More detailed work to be undertaken – will include impact assessment. Paragraphs 4.141 and 4.153 refer.</p> <p>Any change in layout has yet to be proposed and will be subject to consultation.</p> <p>Nevertheless some clarification would be useful in policy, with fuller explanation in text.</p>	<p><u>pedestrian / cycle links.</u></p> <p>Microsimulation modelling work will be undertaken in 2012 to refine these proposals, and ensure that appropriate vehicular access is maintained whilst <u>achieving these key aims.</u> This is <u>important essential</u> to maintain the ongoing success of the city economy and <u>support new development.</u></p>
The Health Insurance Group	1	Policy 16	<p>(and Policy 17, 4.140 / 4.141) The transportation plans revolve around large use of bicycles... this has to be supported with another green and modern transportation link up.</p> <p>Alternative approach - Bigger plans for getting about in the future need to be considered. E.g. monorail.</p>	<p>The current and anticipated restrictions in funding for infrastructure mean it is very unlikely that larger schemes like Monorails would be considered. One of the merits of focusing on cycling and improving public transport is that it does not require large funding mechanisms and provides value for money.</p>	No change required.
C. Southgate	3	Policy 16	<p>Generally support. Suggestion – provide a well designed footbridge over Town Quay Road between Mayflower Park and the Town Walls/Old Town to replace pedestrian crossing. This would create a much stronger pedestrian link between them, be a gateway to distribute pedestrians and cyclists around the Town Walls / Old Town and reduce severance by the road. This could be funded from</p>	<p>The Policy is for at-grade controlled crossing improvements.</p> <p>There are also issues related to the historic setting.</p>	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>developer contributions in the area and as part of Mayflower Park redevelopment. There is already a well-designed footbridge connecting the walls over Castle Way.</p> <p>Alternative approach –</p> <p>8. Support a feasibility study on providing a pedestrian footbridge for enhancing connections between Mayflower Park and the old town which will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage active travel • Enhance access to and use of the historic environment • Enhance access to the waterfront • Provide a sense of place between different parts of the city centre 		
Associated British Ports	14	Policy 16	Policy 16 includes reference to access at Dock Gate 4. ABP suggest that an additional element is added to make clear that the council will work with ABP to ensure the maintenance of good access generally to the Port.	The criterion concerns the Platform Road scheme which relates specifically to Dock Gate 4. The wider point is addressed by the new port policy.	Add brief reference in supporting text to importance of access to port (in introduction and car sections).
John Abbott	5	Policy 16	Point 2 contains no reference to significantly increasing the volume of visitors and commuters accessing the city by train.	This is already covered sufficiently in paragraph 4.151	No change required
A. Samuels	19	Policy 16	The closure of Civic Centre Road and New Road in the city centre, except for emergency and public transport and essential access, would greatly "pacify" the city centre and greatly improve the ambience around the Civic Centre and Guildhall Square and Upper Above Bar.	The opportunities to do this are already covered by 6b.	No change required
A. Samuels	24	Policy 16	Little more than an adequate embarkation and disembarkation point is necessary for a coach station; lengthy parking of lots of vehicles should not be permitted. Drivers' rest stops should not be in crowded city centres. There is much logic in a transport hub at Central Station.	The support for a Central Station hub is welcome.	No change required
A. Samuels	25	Policy 16	Access to and from the station to and from West Quay is imperative. An overhead travelator with escalators and lifts is the answer.	Disagree. The interchange and civic square will prioritise pedestrian and cycle links from the station to West Quay.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
A. Samuels	54	Policy 16	The plan is very weak here with little, if any, attention to the big problems i.e. Park and ride, bus priority, especially at junctions, encouragement of commuter train travel, network of run-around the city centre free or cheap buses and preservation of lines for supertrams.	Adopted Policy CS18 sets out the approach to park & ride, and the impending Bus Strategy 2012 will look at the bus-related junction and infrastructure requirements.	No change required
Business Solent	47	Policy 16	Supports this overall approach to transport and generally endorses this policy, subject to further discussions with the city council and others such as the Hampshire Chamber of Commerce (Southampton) who are currently undertaking a business-led strategic transport review.	The support is welcome. Future transport strategies will be shared as they emerge.	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	3	Policy 16 (6)	Light controlled crossings should give priority to non-motor vehicle movements and waiting time should be reduced and be consistent. At present pedestrians and bicycles wait longer at busy times and on certain roads pedestrians and cyclists wait over two minutes to cross to the middle of the road and a further two minutes to cross to the far side. Crossings that require pedestrians to wait in the middle of the road should be replaced with pedestrian-friendly crossings. If roads are narrowed consideration should be given to adding cycle lanes.	Agree to the principle of improving cycle access. The detailed comments have been passed to Transport Policy.	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	4	Policy 16 (6d)	Signage for cyclists in city centre should be improved. Barriers on cycle paths should be removed from most locations.	Agree. This will be included as part of the council's LSTF work.	No change required
Norman Watts	1	Policy 16	The re-routing of the Blue Star number 18 service away from Kingsland and Debenhams area has left a large number of disabled people who live in St. Marys area and Golden Grove isolated and without easy access to the shopping area of the city centre. The nearest bus stop is about ½ mile away. Pressure should be put on Rail Track to repair and strengthen the railway bridge at the top of St. Marys Street to allow buses to re-use the street.	To be passed on to SCC Transport Policy.	No change required. Comment passed on to Transport Policy
Cllr Noon	12	Policy 16	Restrict the amount of traffic on East Park Terrace, Palmerston Road, Queensway and Kingsway, this would open up the centre for pedestrians and the parks to both City College and Solent University creating a campus	City Centre Masterplan (Green Mile) will go some way to addressing / considering these issues.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			atmosphere for both and the local community. Introduce 20mph speed limits for most city centre roads. Establish safe pedestrian and cycling routes. Encourage docks and ferry traffic to use Canute Road from the east and Western Esplanade from the west with traffic management tools.	Consultation will follow. 20mph considered on a case by case basis.	
A Mackenzie	2	Policy 16	Support safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists	Welcome support.	No change required
Patricia Burnett	1	Policy 16 & 17	More cycle lanes are needed throughout the whole city. Cyclists are at risk from cars.	Agree. This will be included as part of the council's LSTF work.	No change required
Mrs S Wyatt	3	Policy 16 & 17	Public Transport – need to reinstate a reasonable bus service to the General Hospital from the city centre (esp. Sundays).	To be passed on to SCC Transport Policy.	No change required. Comment passed on to Transport Policy
Mrs S Wyatt	4	Policy 16 & 17	The city needs a bus station, due to the congestion caused by waiting buses.	The impending Bus Strategy 2012 will look at the bus-related junction and infrastructure requirements. The Super Stops will provide a network of places that will provide the facilities of a bus station.	No change required
Mrs S Wyatt	5	Policy 16 & 17	Park & Ride is needed for the city centre.	Adopted Policy CS18 sets out the approach to park & ride, and the impending Bus Strategy 2012 will look at the bus-related junction and infrastructure requirements.	No change required
Mrs J Starks	7	Policy 16 & 17	Bus station needed. If there is no station then visitors will go elsewhere where the system is based on bus stations (Winchester, Salisbury etc)	The impending Bus Strategy 2012 will look at the bus-related junction and infrastructure requirements. The Super Stops will provide a network of places that will provide the facilities of a bus station.	No change required
Associated British	11	4.142	Object - The 'Easy to get about' section of the draft CCAP	The point is addressed by	Add brief reference

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Ports			only indirectly refers to the importance of good access to the Port. In paragraphs 4.146 - 4.153, no consideration is given to road-based freight movement that are the life-blood of any successful Port.	the new port policy.	in supporting text to importance of access to port (in introduction and car sections).
V Roberts	1	4.143	Must drive out polluting traffic to make walking, cycling and waiting for buses / taxis a more pleasant and less health-damaging experience so that people want to enjoy these activities with their health and financial benefits both to individuals and to the NHS and tax payers.	The draft policies 16 and 17 seek to achieve these	No change required.
Southampton Cycling Campaign	5	Figure 1	Southampton Cycling Campaign believes that there should be a target to increase cycling rates from 2% to 20%, bringing Southampton in line with cities such as York and Cambridge.	The draft plan seeks to boost cycling rates; the degree to which this is possible will vary from city to city.	No change required
SCAPPS	4	Figure 1	Seeks clarification on presumed modal split; figure 1 pg 64 indicates no increase in trips by car into the city centre at morning peak hour 2006-26. Wants to know whether the same apply to all trips as considers it unlikely that increased levels of activity in the city centre will result in no increase in car usage. Paragraph 4.159 states the aim to maintain the existing level of provision but although various proposals remove parking capacity there is no reference to replacement spaces. Concerned at the apparent abandonment of park-&-ride.	The graph does show a small increase in car trips but other modes show a much larger increase in journeys – clarification will be provided in Background Paper. See Para 4.167	No change required
Highways Agency	1	4.144	(and CSPR) The agency looks forward to further discussions with both TFSH and SCC should the Sub Regional Transport Model identify any transport interventions impacting on the Strategic Road Network.	Welcome the co-operation offered on this.	No change required
Business Solent	48	4.144	Business Solent considers that use of the Transport for South Hampshire strategic transport model should be a key aspect of further discussions with the city council.	Agree.	No change required
V Roberts	2	4.147	Move all unnecessary polluting traffic to outskirts of city centre. Other suggestions; include boosting sales of electric vehicles, installing charging points. Alternative approach - Restrict access to emergency vehicles, public transport, electrically-propelled vehicles,	Detailed options will be evaluated as part of the outputs of the Sub Regional Transport Model	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			cycles and disabled only to encourage healthier and environmentally beneficial behaviour.		
H. Barron	1	4.148	Has suggestions to improve pedestrian and cycle links in the city centre by providing segregated lanes on major routes – Avenue, Millbrook Lane, West Quay Road, Itchen Bridge, Northam Road. On wider roads and dual carriageways a separate (Dutch style) path could be provided separate from the road and pavement, potentially by taking a lane from the carriageway. On narrow roads such as Hill Lane and Shirley Road segregated lanes could also be put in. Shared pavements should not be a solution due to safety and obstructions (lamp post, bus shelters etc.). Lanes need to be of suitable size (1.5-2m single, 2.5-3m two-way).	Detailed options will be evaluated as part of the outputs of the Sub Regional Transport Model	No change required
H. Barron	2	4.148	Supports shared space schemes that lower speeds and help traffic flow such as outside the Guildhall and recommends that East Street and Bedford Place would be good places for these schemes.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	6	4.148	Cycle routes into the city centre should be continuous, safe and direct.	Agree.	No change required
V Roberts	7	4.149	Need local bus link with coach station. Suggest existing free bus could detour between rail station and WestQuay to provide service to coaches until better arrangement can be made.	The impending Bus Strategy 2012 will look at the bus-related junction and infrastructure requirements. The Super Stops will provide a network of places that will provide the facilities of a bus station.	No change required
V Roberts	8	4.149	Suggestion to use one building i.e. East Street Centre to combine shopping levels, one level for coaches, one for buses including ticket office / information, café etc to service local and long distance travellers as in Northampton.	East Street Centre has a redevelopment scheme already in progress.	No change required
Mrs J Starks	8	4.149	SeaCity bus should also call at Art gallery, The Common, Sports Centre etc. to allow people to visit other locations.	This is beyond the scope of planning policy	No change required. Comment passed on to Tina Dyer Slade
Associated British	12	4.150	Introductory paragraphs should include reference to	The point is addressed by	Add brief reference

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Ports			ensuring good access is maintained to the Port.	the new port policy.	in supporting text to importance of access to port (in introduction and car sections).
SCAPPS	12	4.150	Objects to a Bus Super Stop in Vincent's Walk and suggest Above Bar Street north of Pound tree Road as an alternative. The present facilities and clutter is unsightly adjacent to the park and the movement of buses heighten the separation between the shopping centre and the parks.	This stop is still required – Design aspects will be considered – finalised after Bus Study. To be considered as part of emerging Bus Strategy 2012.	No change required
John Abbott	6	4.151	This contains little of substance and therefore suggest changes: 1. Reference to the potential for a regular passenger service on the currently under-utilised freight branch line to Fawley. The Association of Train Operating Companies recently published a report confirming that reopening the Fawley line to passenger trains has the strongest such business case in the country. This would provide substantial relief on the roads from the waterside. 2. Major improvements are required for cruise passengers arriving by train which is extremely low quality, primitive and reflects poorly on the city. Short and long term measures could radically improve the situation, including provision of baggage handling and transfer facilities, introduction of dedicated transfer arrangements, reintroduction of regular through trains to passenger station facilities in the docks.	1. Being considered as part of the wider South Hampshire area. 2. Central Station improvements should allow for better transfer arrangements for cruise passengers – there are dedicated cruise trains on some ships.	No change required
Business Solent	50	Map 12	Business Solent generally endorses the proposals shown on Map 12 subject to further discussions with the city council and others.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Business Solent	49	4.152	Business Solent would also be keen to examine with the city council the benefits of preparing and implementing a water taxi strategy, linked to other modes but particularly the bus and pedestrian networks.	The Plan does not preclude this although is unlikely to be viable.	No change required.
John Abbott	7	4.152	Para 4.152 the current Hythe and Red Funnel high speed boarding arrangements at Town Quay are very poor. An early requirement of the waterfront development plan	The Royal Pier redevelopment will take full account of the needs of	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			should be the radical improvement of boarding and alighting facilities.	Red Funnel ferries, and the council is in discussions over this aspect.	
Associated British Ports	13	4.153	Additional paragraph suggested for after 4.153: <u>'Road freight</u> – the city centre contains two main routes that provide access to parts of the operational port estate namely, a route to/from the north-west which provides a connection to the M271 and a route to/from the north which provides a connection to the M3. The importance of maintaining good access, including by road, to and from the Port is recognised. Development within the city centre will not prejudice access to the Port along these road corridors.'	The point is appropriately addressed by the new port policy.	Add brief reference in supporting text to importance of access to port (in introduction and car sections).
Southampton Cycling Campaign	7	4.153	Speed limits should be reduced to 20 mph in the centre and traffic calming measures installed where necessary	See response to Cllr Noon comment 12	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	8	4.154	Improved signage for cyclists on routes to city centre from all directions.	This is covered by the provisions in Para 4.148	No change required
Natalia Kulabuchova	1	Policy 16 and 17	There should be a parking permit for residents and their visitors living in Portland Street like Bedford Place which is only 300m walk from the former. The number of parking spaces for West Quay, IKEA, etc is disproportionately unfair compared to local resident spaces.	This is beyond the scope of Planning Policy.	No change required
Southampton Solent University	4	Policy 17	Supports the principle of a green link along the route of the central parks via Queensway to Queens Park but considers the precise detail will be fundamental to its acceptability and would therefore wish to be involved in the detailed design/development process. With regard to paragraph 4.157 the status of further "specific development plan schemes should be clarified", e.g. will these be SPD?	Welcome the support – future MDQ developments will include details on these routes as part of development scheme plans – see para. 5.12.	No change required
C. Southgate	4	Policy 17	'The Green Mile' is not ambitious enough – it should be a high quality Paris style urban boulevard which would encourage walking and cycling, provide an attractive green infrastructure link, improve image of Southampton and contribute to environmental sustainability. The footpaths should be expanded and made symmetrical on either side and green verges should be included down the centre of the road (or footpath if necessary). Significant trees and maintained shrubs should be planted to enhance the	Do not disagree with the sentiment, but the alternative wording suggested does not add much to the criteria already proposed in 17ii.	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			<p>character of the area and provide a green corridor. A uniform building height range and style should be agreed and developer contributions help finance enhancements. (Photo included of Santa Cruz de Tenerife to show example of a boulevard).</p> <p>Alternative wording - 'Green Links': ii) 'The Green Boulevard' – From the Central Parks via Queensway to Queens Park This Green Link will include an enhanced streetscape incorporating shrub and tree planting at the side of and in the centre of the road carriageway. Active frontages will be supported at the northern and southern ends of the road in accordance with policy 7. Development proposals must be of a high quality that matches the style of the street and in general should be taller than 3 stories but not more than 5.</p>		
Hammerson	15	Policy 17	Whilst Hammerson support the principle of protecting strategic links, it is imperative that routes shown on Map 13 are acknowledged as indicative only and are not definitive / fixed routes. It is necessary to allow some flexibility to allow development proposals to incorporate these and/or alternative routes as part of the scheme. For example, the Watermark WestQuay scheme makes provision for key routes on a different alignment to that shown on Map 13.	Agree.	Need to indicate on plan which routes are indicative
Associated British Ports	15	Policy 17	In accordance with CS 18, the development of strategic links should not prejudice access to the Port along the key road corridors.	The point is addressed by the new port policy	Add brief reference in text to port policy
A. Samuels	34	Policy 17	Open space and a feeling of openness are good things, but in inclement weather there is often a need for a degree of cover for shoppers; and in a somewhat fragmented city where linkage is so important this issue needs to be considered overall.	The city centre already has a reasonable level of covered areas during poor weather (e.g. Marlands, West Quay) but new developments can also look to incorporate these features where appropriate.	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	9	Policy 17	The bylaw prohibiting cycling in all city parks and green spaces should be repealed. Cycling should be prohibited	This is beyond the scope of planning policy.	No change required. Comment passed on

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			only where necessary for safety reasons. In many cases cycle paths should have priority when they cross roads.		to Active Travel Officer
Associated British Ports	16	Policy 17	Object to the description of the Station Avenue linking the Central Station with the waterfront. As previously explained, public access to the operational port estate is not something ABP are able to facilitate.	The potential to maintain a local link should be maintained but not a strategic link – see response elsewhere.	Delete reference to City Cruise Terminal from strategic links.
Business Solent	51	Policy 17	Supports in principle the policy and strategic links map (13) but notes a number of detailed differences with the CCMP. Business Solent would wish to discuss these and other detailed issues.	Welcome the support and note request for further discussion.	No change required
A Mackenzie	3	Policy 17	Green links and corridors are needed, especially getting into the city centre i.e. addressing missing links from the university (crossing Winn Rd, Westwood Rd and Archers Rd). Unconfident cyclists won't start to cycle around the centre if they can't get there easily.	The council believes that the CCAP will provide the key routes that are needed.	No change required
Business Solent	40	Map 13	The Green Mile is shown in a different location from the CCMP and this should be clarified and Business Solent would wish to discuss this further together with the omission of East Street and the absence of a Central Bridge / Bernard Street / Terminus Terrace strategic link.	<p>The route of the Green Mile was amended in the CCAP to follow Palmerston Road and Queensway. This is a better used pedestrian route with scope to create a greener route as it passes alongside the Central Parks. An explanation will be added to the text.</p> <p>The strategic links identified reflect programmes and funding available and the need to improve connections between sites. Other improvements will be sought in addition to these links i.e. with the redevelopment of the East</p>	Amend paragraph 4.156 to explain why the Green Mile is a different route to that shown in the Master Plan

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>Street Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Whilst a strategic link has not been identified along Central Bridge / Terminus Terrace / Bernard Street (east of Oxford Street), there are links identified along Bernard Street (west of Oxford Street) and over the Central Bridge (from Marsh Lane).</p> <p>Note request for further discussions.</p>	
Hammerson	16	4.157	Reference to flexibility to certain routes should also apply to route v). and be referred to in policy 17.	Agree that flexibility will be needed.	Map 13 title should say " indicative Strategic links" or the map legend should denote indicative next to I & iii & v.
Business Solent	52	4.159	Business Solent would wish to discuss the proposed parking strategy and other detailed parking issues with the city council and others. One element which needs to be examined closely is the relationship between parking and inward investment.	Welcome further discussion.	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	10	4.159	Movement of car parks from the city centre to surrounding areas will increase motor vehicle movements in these areas and therefore potentially danger to cyclists.	Traffic passes through the outer areas of the city centre now to reach the inner areas, so in general there will be no increase in traffic. Any increases in traffic will be in the immediate locality of car parks. The shift will be gradual and managed so as to minimise the danger. Traffic will be removed	No change required

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				from central areas.	
C. Southgate	5	4.159	<u>Car parking</u> Minimizing car use within the ring road makes logical sense and providing parking on the edges of the centre does not demonise car users. In my opinion and from experience talking to people the city benefits from low levels of congestion and good levels of accessibility, not many British cities can say that and it should be recognised as an asset to the future growth of the city as a whole, not something to be resented and removed.	Comments welcomed.	No change required
Southampton Solent University	5	4.159 - 4.168	SSU supports the intention for a balanced approach to car parking having regard to the specific needs of each development. Wish to be consulted on the city centre parking strategy in due course. SSU supports the principle of the approach to Park and Ride set out in paragraph 4.168.	Welcome the support – and the opportunity to discuss further.	No change required
V Roberts	6	4.160	Push traffic out of the city centre. People will first complain but soon come to like pedestrianisation. Pollution is a health hazard and makes walking and cycling unpleasant and discourages visits to city centre, also costs NHS and employers. All city centre roads should emulate Above Bar with access only for emergency vehicles, public transport, cycles, electric vehicles and disabled badge holders vehicles.	Welcome the broad support.	No change required
V Roberts	5	4.160	Support closing and redeveloping some of the existing car parks and relocating them to the outer city area.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Southampton Cycling Campaign	11	4.161	On-road parking should be removed where it prevents a continuous cycle lane, representing the prioritisation of car parking over cyclist safety (such as in Hill Lane and Portswood Road).	This is beyond the scope of planning policy	No change required. Comment passed on to Active Travel Officer
A. Samuels	55	4.162	Maximising public parking provision rather than private is not a sound policy. The use of public land for parking is often uneconomic. Nor is it a good idea unduly to restrict parking in private developments, which can make them undesirable and unviable, and can deter developers.	The 2012 Parking Strategy will confirm the approach which is to be taken and any standards which are set.	No change required
Cllr Noon	13	4.164	For many city centre residents, parking is a major problem for themselves and their visitors. The city council should look at ways of providing residential parking permits for all city centre residents who need them and for their visitors.	This is beyond the scope of planning policy	No change required. Comment passed on to Active Travel Officer

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (to end of Section 4)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
SCAPPS	13	4.167	Object - There are already parking problems which will increase if the park and ride is deferred beyond 2027.	The council is confident that the proposed measures have been modelled and are based on a sound evidence base.	No change required