

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

### Chapter 5 – Quarters and key sites

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	53	5.1	Business Solent believes that the description of changes in the quarters underplays the potential capacity for small scale, valuable and incremental change within quarter outside the VIP areas and will not assist in redressing the serious imbalance west and east of the QE2 Mile.	Note concern. This is related to the nature of the plan as this would be too detailed to include (and demonstrate deliverability). Small scale development is covered by general policies in the CCAP and the Characterisation Study suggests improvements for each of the quarters. We acknowledge their importance and would welcome these types of improvements.	No change required
Environment Agency	8	5.1	We are supportive of the Plans aspirations for the identified 13 quarters and welcome the opportunity to continue to work with you as these sites are developed.	Welcome support and opportunity to work together on the development of sites.	No change required
Business Solent	54	5.2	It is somewhat confusing that the MDQ is not one of the 13 quarters. Business Solent recommends that consideration be given as to whether or not it is absolutely essential that the nomenclature of the 'MDQ' should be retained within the CCAP.	Accept that this could be confusing. However the MDQ will be the location for much of the development in the city centre and is allocated in the Core Strategy. Although it covers a number of distinct areas and will be developed as a series of developments, there are specific requirements common to its sites which are covered in the MDQ policies instead of in each separate site allocation policy.	No change required
Associated British Ports	17	Map 15	Object - This should be redrawn to exclude the small area of port operational land owned by ABP located behind berth 101. The City Cruise terminal should not be identified as a key destination and it should be assumed, when considering views, that the land use will remain as it today over the plan period.	Agree to amend map to exclude operational port land from MDQ / development site. Views of the Port in general (including but not solely the cruise liners) and of the	Amend map 15.  Policy 18 criterion 6 and Policy 21 – delete ref to the City Cruise terminal in

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>waterfront do and will add significantly to the distinctiveness and interest of the city centre. There is strong growth in cruise passengers, which reduces the possibility of the City Cruise terminal relocating. Nevertheless the point is taken that the terminal might relocate within the Port or that the Port may not wish to or be able to facilitate a direct connection. A balanced approach will maintain opportunities for improved views / links, without over emphasising them, in case port uses change. Therefore the approach should be to create clear local links and views, and general long views (eg over the tops of buildings) rather than focussing the eye on a 'grand avenue' along Station Avenue. (In any case this straight line avenue may be difficult to deliver across different land ownerships). Any destination (eg cafes, etc) near the waterfront should not be a policy requirement, should be a local destination, and be capable of conversion to alternative uses.</p>	<p>relation to the strategic 'Station Avenue' link. Amend policy 21 and supporting text to create a clear local link towards the City Cruise terminal, explaining that the port use might change.</p> <p>Addition to the Western Gateway supporting text to explain that a waterfront destination might be overlooking rather than in the Port, and be local in nature, with uses like cafes etc which are capable of conversion to other uses.</p> <p>Amend policy 19 and text to acknowledge that views are to the port in general, and that views should be designed to be adaptable should circumstances change (eg long views of cruise liners over the tops of buildings which</p>

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					would screen other port uses, and only local views nearby).
LaSalle	11	5.6	We consider the designation of Western Gateway as a new business district is focused on too long a timeframe as it appears reliant on the Station Quarter coming forward and supplying the first element of the district (para 5.34). Without the Station Quarter coming forward there are limited opportunities for the Western Gateway to come forward as envisaged. The development of the Western Gateway should not be dependent on other sites coming forward within the MDQ, it needs to function and be developed on its own merits.	The spatial concept for the business district needs to be explained. However it is not the intention to formally phase the Western Gateway in this way. The plan also promotes a mix of uses. Rephrase para 5.34 to aid clarity. The Plan's office policies promote appropriate flexibility.	Para 5.6: "...and will create a new business district in the Station Quarter and Western Gateway, incorporating major office development as part of a mix of <u>uses</u> . Para 5.34: The quarter will <u>, along with the Station Quarter,</u> incorporate an expansion of the business district <del>from the Station Quarter...</del>
John Lewis	7	5.6	Policies throughout the CCAP should make it clear that sites outside the PSA will need to demonstrate compliance with PPS 4 and other national policy tests.	The relevant plan policies cross refer to the plan's retail policies which are considered consistent with the NPPF. Clarify this paragraph.	Para 5.6, add new 3rd sentence: " <u>The retail development will be phased (see policy X). The MDQ # can also include...</u> "  Para 5.8 – refer to a phased expansion
Hammerson	17	Policy 18	Supports the need to comprehensively plan the phased development of the MDQ for appropriate uses and to ensure that they all integrate with the wider city centre. Policy 18 does however pre-suppose that new retail, leisure and office destinations will be created in the MDQ. Hammerson believe it would be more appropriate, given the other policies in the CCAP that criterion 7 be reworded to read 'new destinations which are created'. This would provide flexibility within the policy and allow proposals to come forward on their own merits in accordance with other policies.	The point is understood, although the list of uses provides useful clarification. Rephrase accordingly.	Policy 18 criterion 7: "new <del>retail, leisure and office</del> destinations which are created ( <u>eg retail, leisure or office</u> )

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
John Lewis	8	Policy 18	John Lewis generally supports the comprehensive planned approach to phased development in the MDQ and considers that the phasing / indicative timescales for when the identified key sites are expected to come forward (in Part 5 of the CCMP) should be identified within Policy 18. The proceeding sections of the CCAP could then be structured around expected phases with key sites within a specific phase grouped together to make it clear when sites are expected to come forward.	The support is welcome. The phasing in part 5 reflects commercial expectations and is not a policy requirement. This should be clarified. The Plan is ordered to set out strategic development opportunities first.	Section 5, phasing maps 30 – 32, clarify these are not policy requirements.
Business Solent	55	Policy 18	Business Solent strongly supports the MDQ policies but would wish to discuss the more detailed design, marketing and delivery approach set out in the policies.	The support and wish for ongoing dialogue is welcome.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	11	Policy 18	<p>Support the principle of MDQ – but reference to remodelling of Western Esplanade needs to state that network will maintain existing capacity (contradiction exists between growth agenda and reducing capacity of road and car parks). Loss of car parking would make the plan ineffective; downgrading road networks around retail parks is a concern – retailers need to be served and accessed by car to prevent trade going to out of centre destinations.</p> <p>Alternative wording - Policy 18 – fourth para amend:</p> <p><u>“The remodelling of the Western Esplanade... and the successful development of the MDQ will be supported... The remodelling of these roads needs to ensure all retailers are easily served and accessed by car as well as public transport”.</u></p>	The city centre location creates the opportunity to promote a modal shift. This is also a commercial benefit given rising fuel costs, etc. A more attractive and interlinked pedestrian environment will create a better location of benefit to all retailers (including those in Aviva’s retail parks, who will benefit from increased pedestrian trade from the station). Narrowing Western Esplanade also facilitates development next to and an enhancement of the station (which will further benefit Aviva). The Plan only affects short sections of highway in the context of shoppers’ overall journey. The general point is understood, and provided it is seen within this overall context its relevant that adequate vehicular access is maintained. Aviva’s proposed wording doesn’t fully address the	<p>Policy 18: “The remodelling of Western Esplanade, West Quay Road, Civic Centre Road and any other road within the MDQ which is in <u>accordance with Policy 16</u>, will be supported where this enhances pedestrian and cycle movements and aids the successful development of the MDQ.</p> <p>See amendments to policy 16 and para 4.153.</p>

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>overall aims. The general issue is better addressed in the transport policy. Policy 18 includes reference to successful development. The capacity of Western Esplanade is significantly greater than current and planned future traffic levels which creates scope for significant improvements. Detailed transport modelling is underway.</p>	
EBRA	3	Policy 18 - 21	<p>Support redevelopment of areas to make better use of land, providing that existing landmarks are protected, there is regard for the views of local residents affected, clusters of high rise buildings do not create canyon like streets and space is allowed for landscaping to prevent the buildings being overbearing to their immediate surroundings.</p>	<p>Neighbours will be consulted and their opinions taken into account. The views (eg lines of sight) of existing occupiers is not a material planning consideration. The support for development is welcome. Strategic views to landmarks is addressed by policy 14 (design) – most of these landmarks are listed so can be protected. Policy 15 (tall buildings) requires them to respond well to their site / context and para. 4.137 refers to the microclimate (eg 'canyon' effect). In a city centre environment a strategic network of parks and green links is considered most appropriate (policies 10 and 17); not necessarily landscaping every major building frontage. Policy 15 (Para 4.138) refers to</p>	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				exemplary standards of design, context and streetscape. Policy 14 refers to an enriched public realm.	
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	4	5.12	CCMP sets out broad parameters – it should not be too prescriptive in its approach as it has not been developed based on detail viability / market testing – the paragraph needs to emphasise that the CCMP is merely a guidance document.  Alternative wording - amend 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: “ <u>The council’s City Centre Master Plan sets out broad development parameters as to how the principles in Policies 18 and 19 could be achieved.</u> ”	The alternative wording might at least partially imply the development parameters in the master plan should be met, which is not necessarily the case. The para. already includes flexibility. However a clarification would be useful.	Policies 18 and 19 <u>(and the relevant Quarter policies)</u> set out the key strategic principles. The Council’s City Centre Master Plan illustrates <u>how in more detail one way in which the these principles in Policies 18 and 19 (and the relevant Quarter policies)</u> could be achieved.....
Associated British Ports	18	Map 16	Object - This should be redrawn to exclude the small area of port operational land owned by ABP located behind berth 101. The City Cruise terminal should not be identified as a key destination and it should be assumed, when considering views, that the land use will remain as it today over the plan period.	Agree to amend map to exclude operational port land from MDQ / development site. The Cruise terminal is not identified as a key destination on the map. See response above.	Amend map 15.
Business Solent	56	Policy 19	Business Solent strongly supports the MDQ policies but would wish to discuss the more detailed design, marketing and delivery approach set out in the policies.	The support and wish for ongoing dialogue is welcome.	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Station Quarter

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	9	5.21	Description of the character of the Station Quarter area should include a mention of the grade II listed Wyndham Court. English Heritage	Ref to listed buildings – agree. Policy 14 refers to respecting	Para 5.21 – to the north the area is

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			welcomes and supports the requirement that development should 'respect the character and setting of nearby listed buildings' but would like to see this incorporated as a requirement in Policy 20.	the heritage of buildings. No need for additional policy but cross refer.	dominated by 1960s / 70s office blocks, small scale shops and restaurants, flats ( <u>the grade II listed Wyndham Court</u> ), car parks and busy roads  Design Guidance 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point: Add at end " <u>in line with policy 14</u> ".
Associated British Ports	20	5.24	Object – The design guidance should not refer to maintaining and creating views to cruise liners and other port operational land buildings within the Western Docks as land uses are subject to frequent change to meet needs of traders and shippers and these enjoy permitted development rights.	See response above.	See response above.
SCAPPS	14	Policy 20	Object – Without more detail object to proposed loss of Blechynden Terrace POS (green space) in exchange for new 'civic squares' north & south of Rail Station (unspecified whether these would be green or paved). Further do not agree that with 5.21 that it is 'under utilised'. Object to loss of valued & significant secluded green space in an otherwise busy area.  Questions what paragraph 5.30 means? Questions whether the statement in 4.103 that the 'new public square to the south of Central Station will be.... One of the largest civic spaces in the City' can be correct given closeness of the Station to Western Esplanade.	The policy is more precise than suggested: the replacement open space has to be to the <u>north</u> of the station, and provide a <u>greater</u> amount of open space. (This is in addition to new space to the south). It is considered Blenchynden Terrace is under used, particularly given the high pedestrian flows in the area, and there is an opportunity to create more useable open space. The point about retaining green space is understood. This may or may not fit with public realm by the station entrance. Nevertheless some green elements should be introduced as part of the wider links	Policy 20: The public open space at Blechynden Terrace can be redeveloped as part of a comprehensive scheme on the northern side of the Central Station which provides a greater overall amount of public open space <u>including where practicable a green space or link</u> .  Add at end of para 5.30: The strategic link from the station to Havelock Road should so far as

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				(including by the station where appropriate). Para 5.30 means that if the loss of the open space is being considered in (say) 2016, new replacement open space which has already been provided since 2011 is taken into account. A minor clarification would be useful. South of the station, the intention is to narrow Western Esplanade to create more open space. Even so, it is right to suggest the phrasing is incorrect.	possible be a green link (see policy 17), to counteract the loss of greenspace at Blenchynden Terrace.  Para 5.30: “In <del>considering</del> <u>determining</u> whether a greater overall amount of open space is being provided with regard to any <u>future</u> development of the Blenchynden Terrace open space....  Para 4.103 – at end, delete “ <del>and one of the largest civic spaces in the city</del> ”
SCAPPS	15	Policy 20	Asks whether enhanced transport interchange facilities could include replacement provision allowing removal of First Bus stand-over-area & ‘office’/accommodation for staff in Vincent’s Walk	It is likely that the Vincent Walk bus facilities would still be needed, although the bus strategy will examine this further.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	12	Policy 20	(and CCMP VIPs) Realignment of Western Esplanade – there needs to be commitment to transport rights of way / management of movement.	See response to Aviva on Policy 18 comment 11.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	11	Policy 20	(and CCMP VIPs) Fails to deal adequately with car parking issues (how managed, relocated, dispersed, or provision outside of area etc).	The Plan and supporting text sets out the general approach to car parking. Further detail would need to be addressed in feasibility studies, etc.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	13	Policy 20	(and CCMP VIPs) New office-led area will need to be underpinned by retail, café and restaurants to encourage quality occupation.	Agree that such ancillary uses will be beneficial – the plan supports appropriate such	No change required



Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				uses.	
Mrs J Starks	1	Policy 20	Surprised at the plan to build more offices when other properties have been vacant for years.	See earlier response to M Baker in “A Great Place for Business” section.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	12	Policy 20, Station Quarter	<p>Support the gateway destination concept but this needs to relate to all forms of transport.</p> <p>Have serious doubts re. viability of quantum of office uses proposed, notwithstanding CSPR. Aware that market testing is underway – and this should be made available for scrutiny to ensure robust evidence.</p> <p>Support the re-provision of car parking, as this is important to Retail Parks, but requires clarification (definition of “surrounding developments” is unclear).</p> <p>Reiterates comments in 55(11) re. concerns at loss of car parking / road capacity.</p> <p>Reference to a detailed masterplan needs clarification.</p> <p>Alternative wording – <u>“The re-provision and enhancement of existing car parking capacity for rail users and users of the all developments within the Station Quarter will be supported”.</u></p> <p><u>“A realignment and/or remodelling of the Western Esplanade will be supported to reduce the impact of the traffic to help enable the development of the Station Quarter and to improve pedestrian links across the street to the wider MDQ and city centre. Any works to this road system must not adversely impact how the Mountbatten Retail Park is served and access by car”.</u></p>	<p>The 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of the policy refers to ‘point of arrival’ without qualification to types of mode. The 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph refers to enhancements for a range of modes, including enhancing existing car parking.</p> <p>The paragraph was intended to specifically address car parking for rail users. Agree there is lack of clarity. Enhancing existing general shoppers car parking is a city centre wide point addressed in the plan’s car parking strategy (eg para 4.161). The Plan does not require or refer to the loss of car parking.</p> <p>Offices – see comments in office section.</p> <p>In terms of displacing existing retail uses the delivery evidence suggests any redevelopment is likely to be in the longer term. A redevelopment could incorporate some (or all) of these occupiers. Others may find other units elsewhere in the city centre. If some displacement of bulky goods</p>	<p>Policy 20 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: “The re-provision and enhancement of existing car parking capacity for rail users and surrounding developments in a multi storey format will be supported”.</p> <p>Para 5.28 – keep ref to how an increase in car parking (for rail users) could be justified. Separate out the point about car parking for nearby development.</p> <p>Design guidance: An overall <del>master plan</del> scheme plan should be prepared for the quarter, in line with paras. 5.12 / 5.13.</p> <p>Amend para 5.12: “...and for surrounding phases of development as appropriate, <u>and to the level of detail appropriate</u>, in</p>

Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				<p>retailing out of centre did occur it would be replaced by more people intensive mixed use / office development adjacent to the Central Station.</p> <p>Road capacity – see earlier comments. Reducing <u>excess</u> capacity is unlikely to have a major effect on vehicular capacity but will have a significant benefit for the overall attractiveness of the city centre. Mountbatten retail park is not within the primary shopping area; and Western Esplanade does not form the main access to West Quay Retail Park. Therefore, do not support the proposed wording. Nevertheless the issue should be acknowledged.</p> <p>A more detailed plan will be needed for the quarter. Clarification would be helpful.</p>	<p>consultation with...”</p> <p>The policy sets out the significant benefits of narrowing Western Esplanade from dual to single carriageway. A highway assessment illustrates that this can be achieved whilst maintaining satisfactory vehicular access. An assessment of the detailed scheme design will be needed to confirm this.</p>
Hammerson	18	Policy 20	The Station Quarter is identified for office, residential, hotel, leisure, appropriate food/drink and retail uses which meet policies 4, 5 and 6. Policy 4 is not relevant as the Station Quarter does not form part of the PSA. Further the policy should be explicit that retail uses will only be acceptable if it is ancillary to the Station itself or if the proposal has been justified with reference to the sequential and impact tests in PPS 4. See also Hammerson comments on Policies 5 and 6.	<p>Agree re policy 4.</p> <p>-cross refer to CS3 which refers to national policy</p> <p>-agree to explicit reference to ancillary retail in policy for clarification</p>	<p>Policy 20 2<sup>nd</sup> para: “...appropriate food / drink and retail uses <u>which are ancillary to the Central Station itself</u> or which meet policies <u>CS3</u>, 4, 5 or 6, will be promoted”</p> <p>Add ref to policy 6 in para 5.29</p>

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
John Abbott	8	Policy 20	For a city of the size and national importance of Southampton, the railway station can only be described as wholly inadequate, particularly when compared with rival city railway stations. The fact that Southampton did not benefit from a large and grandly designed central railway station is now an opportunity as the station has no heritage or architectural significance and can be demolished and replaced with a modern and state of the art railway station and transport interchange facility (as in Western Europe). Such a new building can then be seamlessly integrated in to the planned business quarter surrounding the station to create a really impressive district of the city.	The policy supports and encourages a high quality gateway, enhanced transport interchange and improved connections to the city centre.	No change required
A. Samuels	31	Policy 20	Query to what extent is the business community able and willing to set up around Central Station? The local railway network is poorly used by commuters, “getting up the hill” from the station to the centre is a great deterrent; or indeed to any destination. Query noise for residential units from freight wagons using the line at night.	With regard to the business community, the office policy (as amended) includes appropriate flexibility. The Central Station is a focus for bus as well as rail users and the number of passengers is likely to increase. The plan’s aim is to enhance connections. The development plan controls noise / amenity issues.	No change required
Business Solent	57	Policy 20	Business Solent strongly supports the policy on the Station Quarter but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues including the future station and concourse location.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	5	5.29	Object – Re. further feasibility work to inform Station Quarter development – it should inform CCAP at this stage. The unavailability of the work suggests CCAP is unsound & premature, and not justified. Second part of paragraph re. extent of retail should be amended to reflect the essential part that retail has in the existing offer – the value it creates is fundamental to the ongoing redevelopment of this quarter.  <u>Alternative wording – “...The extent to which retail, or other uses can create the value to secure delivery of the comprehensive vision for the Central Station will be considered against current commercial needs of the city centre, and balanced alongside policies...”</u>	The preferred approach plan has been informed by commercial feasibility advice (eg master plan and dialogue with CBRE preparing the station feasibility study). The finalised CBRE work has informed the submission plan.  The aim of the policy is to promote high density development rather than retain low density development. It is	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				acknowledged that the presence of existing retailers is a key delivery issue. Para 5.29 acknowledges that retail could help deliver new development. This could be additional retail, or existing retail occupiers in a new development format. The paragraph does not preclude this.	

### Chapter 5 – Western Gateway

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Associated British Ports	21	5.32	Object – Description of port operations is incomplete	Minor clarification here with more detail in the Port section.	Para 5.32: "...( <del>primarily</del> currently including the City Cruise terminal)...."
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	14	5.34	The Station Avenue proposed in Western Gateway is sound.	The support is welcome	No change required
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	2	5.34	Whilst the MOD has no objections in principle to the Western Gateway being developed to include the uses stated, DIO safeguarding must be consulted to ensure that any structure and buildings are designed to take account of MOD explosive safeguarding requirements (see General comment).	Agree	Add requirement to consult in supporting text to policy 14 (design) and cross reference in design guidance for Western Gateway.
Associated British Ports	4	5.34	Object – ABP is concerned at references throughout the draft CCAP and CCMP which point to the possibility of making the City Cruise Terminal a new waterfront destination should the Port wish to facilitate this. Unfortunately other than in a carefully regulated situation such as applies around a passenger terminal, it is not possible for ABP to 'facilitate' a proposal for public access to or on operational port land within the customs fence, even if it wished to do so.	See earlier response.	No change required

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Associated British Ports	22	5.34	Object – Reference to a strategic link towards the City Cruise terminal and connections to it are inappropriate.	See earlier response. It is important to retain a strategic link from the Central Station to the Western Gateway. The final link to any future destination in or near the City Cruise terminal could be a local link.	See earlier response
Associated British Ports	27	5.34	Object – Residential use is not, in principle, an appropriate use in this quarter; see comment on policy 21 above.	<p>It is agreed that existing ports are an important piece of national economic infrastructure, and national policy supports their full use. National policy also supports vibrant, and viable mixed use developments in city centres and residential development in this quarter will help achieve this. It is considered the appropriate balance is to allow residential development provided it does not significantly affect the competitiveness of the Port, and to emphasise that this will require careful consideration of design and layout. The Western Gateway is a large area and it is considered some residential development is appropriate.</p> <p>The point is addressed by the new ports policy.</p>	Amend para 5.42 to cross refer to new port policy.
Associated British Ports	25	Policy 21	ABP welcomes the recognition in respect of 'Key connections to be improved' that remodelling of West Quay Road will need to be undertaken having regard to the fact it needs to remain a key vehicular access for the Port. This requirement needs to be brought into Policy	Support welcome. The requirement is already effectively part of the policy, and is introduced into the new	Amend policy 21: "...whilst maintaining <u>key</u> vehicular access <u>routes</u> to the city

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			21.	port policy.	centre and port"
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	11	Policy 21	(and CCMP VIPs) Fails to deal adequately with car parking issues (how managed, relocated, dispersed, or provision outside of area etc).	The overall approach is set out in the transport chapter. Detailed planning at a later stage will address these issues.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	13	Policy 21	(and CCMP VIPs) New office-led area will need to be underpinned by retail, café and restaurants to encourage quality occupation.	Agreed, provided these are ancillary to the office quarter. This is already supported by the policy.	No change required
LaSalle	12	Policy 21	Policy 21 should be widened to incorporate the potential supermarket use on this site.	Parts of the Western Gateway are within 300 metres of a small part of the primary shopping area, separated from it by a busy road, and substantially further from most of the PSA. The site is a relatively poor edge of centre site. A major supermarket is likely to have a significant impact on existing and planned supermarkets in the primary shopping area. Therefore it is not appropriate to promote a supermarket on this site. Any proposal can be considered against general retail policies.	No change required
A. Samuels	38	Policy 21	The Western Gate[way] area seems to be very extensive indeed. Query what are the land ownerships, the current uses, and the intentions of the landowners.	Agreed. The area includes some key land interests. These issues are currently being investigated further.	No change required
A. Samuels	49	Policy 21	The Western Gateway concept should enable arrival and coming out of the Central Station to the south to be a significant occasion.	Agreed. Policy 20 (Station Quarter) requires a high quality and distinctive gateway and point of arrival, and policy 17 (Strategic Links) requires a high quality route south to the Western Gateway. However	Western Gateway design guidance: the gateway concept applies to the approach from the station as well as from the west.

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				an addition to the design guidance would be helpful.	
A. Samuels	56	Policy 21	The use of this phrase Western Esplanade can be misleading. Exactly how does it differ from what is now generally known as West Quay? Certainly linkage must always apply. Relocating the smaller industrial units will be unpopular, and anyway will not be easy. The Western Gateway concept is probably over-ambitious.	Western Esplanade is the name of a specific road. The points regarding deliverability are noted and will be the subject of further work prior to submission.	No change required
Associated British Ports	23	Policy 21	Object – Reference to a strategic link towards the City Cruise terminal and connections to it are inappropriate.	See earlier response.	Policy changed – a potential link will be local rather than strategic in nature.
Associated British Ports	26	Policy 21	Object – ABP are extremely concerned about indications that residential use will be welcomed in the Western Gateway. Current uses are generally compatible with operation of a large port operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The proliferation of residential use in any part of the Western Gateway area has the potential for significant implications for the current and future operation of the adjacent parts of the Port. Residential use is not, in principle, an appropriate use in this quarter in accordance with current national policy.	See earlier response.	See earlier response
Business Solent	58	Policy 21	Business Solent strongly supports the policy on the Western Gateway but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues.	The support is welcome. Further dialogue will be welcome.	No change required
Associated British Ports	24	5.39	Object – Reference to a strategic link towards the City Cruise terminal and connections to it are inappropriate.	See earlier response	See earlier response
Associated British Ports	28	5.42	Object – Residential use is not, in principle, an appropriate use in this quarter; see comment on policy 21 above.	See earlier response	See earlier response

## Chapter 5 – Royal Pier Waterfront

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Associated British Ports	29	Map 19	As the council are seeking to make changes to the boundary through the CCAP process, ABP requests that further changes are made to the boundary of this area to exclude the small triangle of land behind berth 101 and the water area in front of this berth. This is used in	Accept changes proposed	Amend boundary of site

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			manoeuvring vessels to and from this part of the Port estate.		
Associated British Ports	30	Map 19	ABP requests that Town Quay is removed from the pink 'development site' shading since the quay is not in the area being considered for redevelopment.	Accept the justification for excluding Town Quay	Amend boundary to take out Town Quay
English Heritage	10	5.44	Description of the character of the Royal Pier Waterfront should include mention of the listed buildings within this area. The suggestion of a landmark building on the site of the end of the Royal Pier is of concern to English Heritage as it feels that such as building would be likely to harm the setting of the Grade II listed Royal Pier entrance building and any proposal would conflict with criterion (iv) of Policy 22 which English Heritage supports.	Agree to include reference to listed buildings in the description. A landmark building provides a focus for the site from both the water and the land. In accordance with policy 22, its design must respect the listed buildings.	Amend description of the area.  No change to text on a landmark building
John Abbott	1	5.44 – 5.46	This section fails to acknowledge that for one of the World's leading maritime cities, Southampton must have the most inadequate public access to the waterfront. There is a huge opportunity to provide citizens and visitors alike with high quality access to enjoy the waterfront views including shipping movements in and out of the docks. The one location with some current potential is Town Quay but even this is let down by the end of the Quay and the disused former pub/restaurants. A priority should be the restoration of these facilities and the eyesore of the current Red Funnel terminal building.	Agree with the need to deliver public access to the waterfront which is the aim of Policy 22. The council is working with developers to deliver development at Royal Pier Waterfront.	No change required
Associated British Ports	34	5.45	As a neighbouring land use, the Port has a significant influence on the character of this quarter and should be referred to.	Agree with the comment	Amend description of the area to add in reference to the Port
Associated British Ports	37	5.45	This recognises the key road connection between the Eastern and Western docks. The 'Development Goals' and 'Key Connections' for this quarter should be expanded to make it clear that this important access function needs to be maintained and how it will be achieved. 'Development Goals' should also refer to the need to ensure any future development does not have adverse implications for the ongoing successful operation of the Port.	Agree in principle that it is important to maintain access between the two docks. This is now covered by the new ports policy. The key connections generally refer to enhancing pedestrian movements. However given the scale of development proposed a brief reference is appropriate for the Western Gateway, Heart of City, and Royal Pier quarters. The Holyrood / Queens Park	Add reference



## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				quarter should refer to the Platform Road improvements.	
Associated British Ports	35	5.46	There is no marina within the quarter as defined on Map 19 and whilst the entrance into the Western Docks north of Mayflower Park is 'currently little used' in comparison with other dock gates, there is a relative term and certainly does not mean that it is not an important access to and from the port.	Note correction and further information	Amend current mix of uses
Associated British Ports	33	5.47	First sentence is incorrect as parts of the quarter are not within the development site.	Accept. We will revise wording following changes accepted for Map 19 above	Amend text on extent of development site
Business Solent	59	5.48	Business Solent believes that the Royal Pier Waterfront is the single most important site in the city and that it is absolutely essential that the promises of the past several decades are finally achieved.	Agree with the importance of Royal Pier Waterfront	No change required
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	3	5.48	Whilst the MOD has no objections in principle to Royal Pier Waterfront being developed to include the uses stated, DIO safeguarding must be consulted to ensure that any structure and buildings are designed to take account of MOD explosive safeguarding requirements (see General comment).	Agree	Add requirement to consult in supporting text to policy 14 (design) and cross reference in design guidance for Royal Pier Waterfront.
Associated British Ports	36	5.48	The relocation of access to the general dock access including berth 101 in 'Key connections' would require ABP's agreement, which would depend on, amongst other things, the operational acceptability of a replacement.	Note that the need for ABP agreement for access changes	Amend key connections
John Abbott	2	5.48 – 5.49	5.47, 5.48 and Policy 22 – much greater clarity is required about the future plan because this is probably the single most important component of the whole city centre development as the port and waterfront represent Southampton's unique selling point. Surely such plans should include the provision of a port visitor centre to educate and inform and reference the proposed transport heritage complex proposed around the former Trafalgar dry dock.	Policy 22 sets out the key requirements for development. The council would support the inclusion of a visitor centre or heritage complex but not at the expense of a viable development.	No change required
Fang	1	Policy 22	Mayflower Park is one of the few areas where people of all backgrounds mix and it should therefore retain an open space with access to the (open) water and space for people to sit and walk. It should have a 'neutral' area with no shops/offices.	Agree with the importance of Mayflower Park and note comments about the park.	No change required
SCAPPS	16	Policy 22	Says all the right things, but questions whether they can be delivered. Raises doubts that a tall 'landmark building' in this location would be compatible with the objectives & that the type & scale of built	Note concerns raised. The council has been working with developers to progress this site	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			development envisaged could still allow for a reconfigured open space equal in area &, most importantly, in its qualities (extensive waterfront with sense of openness) to the existing Mayflower Park.	and will reassess the viability of the site before the submission plan.	
SCAPPS	17	Policy 22	Has reservations about sustainability of development on reclaimed land adding to the flood risk area & would want City Council to take all steps necessary to ensure no cost to the public purse (including CIL funding) for flood prevention works now or in the future.	Agree with the need to address flood risk.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	16	Policy 22	(and CCMP VIPs) Waterfront is a valuable opportunity to support the city becoming an international destination – and favourable to the city's overall renaissance.	Agree	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	17	Policy 22	(and CCMP VIPs) Needs to be a clearer statement as to the mode of transport and connectivity to the site.	The site will be accessed by a range of transport. It is on the convergence of three strategic links where walking and cycling will be pedestrian and cycle friendly but Town Quay Road is a key part of the road network for Port and other traffic.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	18	Policy 22	(and CCMP VIPs) The council needs to be more specific as to the breakdown of mixed uses envisaged for this site.	The council is working with a developer on this site. The policy provides guidance on appropriate uses whilst retaining flexibility over the mix and scale of various uses.	No change required
Business Solent	61	Policy 22	Whilst redevelopment proposals must include provision for the Southampton International Boat Show, and the reallocation of waterfront open space, these requirements must be compatible with the overall and principal objective of delivering an international world class waterfront development, active 24/7 all year round and provides a suitable and memorable experience for all arriving or departing by sea.	Agree. The policy supports this approach.	No change required
Business Solent	62	Policy 22	Business Solent strongly recommends that linkages and connections with the Ocean Terminal, Trafalgar Dry Dock area and Platform Road frontage should also receive close attention. Consideration might also be given to the possibility of incorporating the proposed fifth cruise liner terminal within the Royal Pier / waterfront quarter. If this is not possible, an alternative visual / physical link between the High Street / Bugle Street and the water / boats / masts must be established.	Para 5.51 includes reference to the importance of views from the Old Town to the water. In response to other comments, more information will be added to the Key connections section about Port	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				access	
Mrs J Starks	3	Policy 22	What will happen to the actual pier? Could we have something along the lines of Southwold viz a smaller structure but with quality specialist shops?	Unfortunately the pier cannot be saved and will be demolished.	No change required
C. Southgate	6	Policy 22	<p>The redevelopment of Mayflower Park needs to include high quality landscaping. Plants which give a tropical tourist appearance will help to enhance the attractiveness of the area and the city as a whole, particularly to tourists. Cordyline trees as grown in Torbay and the city centre parks would fit in small spaces well, large fan palms also grown in the current parks would create more dramatic features as in Bournemouth pleasure gardens, or a more daring but similarly more impressive option of date palms as in Southsea Common (photos attached).</p> <p>Alternative wording – ‘Development will be permitted which: (viii) Proposes a high quality landscaping strategy for the site which enhances the appearance of the area as an attractive destination for tourists and residents through the use of hard and soft landscaping incorporating tropical appearing plants.’</p>	Agree with the importance of high quality landscaping. The detailed design will be a matter for the developers.	No change required
Associated British Ports	31	Policy 22	ABP requests that Town Quay is removed from the policy since the quay is not in the area being considered for redevelopment.	Accept the justification for excluding Town Quay	Amend boundary to take out Town Quay
Associated British Ports	38	Policy 22	Additional development criteria should be added about the importance of maintaining good access for Port traffic throughout this quarter and ensuring that redevelopment does not adversely impact on Port operations.	This is now covered by the new ports policy and an additional reference in the Key Connections section. Also see below.	No change required
Associated British Ports	39	Policy 22	Residential uses will only be acceptable in any Mayflower Park / Royal Pier redevelopment scheme provided that it does not adversely impact on the ongoing successful operation of the port.	This is now covered in the new port policy. Add cross reference into para 5.52.	Add in reference to residential uses not significantly adversely impacting the operation of the Port in supporting text
A. Samuels	33	Policy 22	Mayflower Park is governed by legislation and anything to be done here will require very careful forward planning and negotiation.	Note concerns about changing Mayflower Park	No change required
Gavin Marsh	10	Policy 22	I would like to see greatly increased public access to the waterfront and the redevelopment of the pier as an attraction in its own right.	Unfortunately the pier cannot be saved and will be	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				demolished. Agree with the need for greater public access to the waterfront	
Business Solent	60	Policy 22	Business Solent strongly supports the policy on Royal Pier but would wish to enter into more detailed discussions with the city council, appointed developers and key stakeholders at the earliest possible opportunity.	Welcome support and note request to discuss detailed issues	No change required
EBRA	6	Policy 22	Mayflower Park should be at the waters edge.	Agree. The requirements to maintain views and make provision for the Boat Show will ensure this happens.	No change required
Morgan Sindall Investments Ltd	2	Policy 22	Add text to acceptable uses listed in policy.  Suggestion – Add convenience retail to the list of acceptable uses.	Policy 6 covers convenience retail. It will be amended to clarify that edge of centre sites must be closely linked to the PSA as well as helping deliver the overall approach to development. Small scale convenience is acceptable on this site.	Add reference to small scale retail, and define.
Morgan Sindall Investments Ltd	1	Policy 22 (v)	It may be impractical or impossible to retain all views. Accordingly I suggest the policy allows for some flexibility in approach.  Alternative approach – Where practical retains and enhances strategic views to and from the Old Town and Town Walls.	Supporting text to policy 14 covers this and states when development affecting a strategic view may considered. Revised wording in policy 14 states the need to safeguard views to Bugle Street and/or French Street.	No change required
EBRA	5	Policy 22	Object to high rise buildings on site.	Note objection. Tall buildings are proposed as landmark buildings to provides a focus for the site from both the water and the land	No change required
Associated British Ports	32	5.49	ABP requests that Town Quay is removed since the quay is not in the area being considered for redevelopment.	Accept the justification for excluding Town Quay	Amend boundary to take out Town Quay
SCAPPS	18	5.51	Proposed changes to wording.  Alternative wording – Delete 'seek to' line 3 & 'should consider whether'	This wording is required to provide some flexibility for the developer to create a high	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			line 7 (to do with outward views) & insert in their place 'must retain' as for Old Town & Town Walls in last sentence.	quality scheme and avoid awkward shaped and sized blocks if all views must be retained.	
Business Solent	63	5.52	Business Solent and other partners have previously envisaged a Waterfront Convention Centre with multi-purpose, flexi use space. A multi purpose event venue with a capacity of 6,000 – 10,000 has also attracted interest from major conference management companies.	The council is working with a developer to progress a site but would welcome such a facility and note the interest shown previously. This would be in accordance with the policy and supporting text.	No change required
Morgan Sindall Investments Ltd	3	5.52	Add text to acceptable uses stated in supporting text of policy.  Alternatively wording – Add Sui Generis to list of acceptable uses.	'Sui Generis' covers a range of uses falling outside of the use class order. Most of these would be unacceptable on this site. We recognise however that part of the site is within a late night hub and therefore late night Sui Generis uses would be acceptable here.	Add in reference to late night hub in para 5.52 (and policy?)
Business Solent	64	5.53	Business Solent agrees that the car ferry should be relocated to an alternative position. This should be with the Port in the Berth 50 area, linked in with the Ocean Terminal / Platform Road location.	Welcome support	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Heart of the City

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	11	5.56	Description of the character of the Heart of the City should include mention of the listed buildings within this area and a requirement under Design Guidance (and/or preferably as a criterion in Policy 24) that development should respect the character and setting of these listed buildings. English Heritage welcomes the requirement that 'Materials should be high quality reflecting the location and respecting the setting of the Bargate and Town Walls'	Agree to add reference to listed buildings in the description of the quarter and to the Design Guidance. Cross refer to policy 14 (design)	Amend description of the quarter and Design guidance
SCAPPS	19	5.58	Support for goal of creating 'views of & links to the parks with retail	Welcome support. Whilst we	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			arcades, cafes & restaurants' but disappointment that this intention is not carried through to a specific policy.	would welcome such proposals, we expect that they will occur in the longer term which may be beyond the plan period.	
SCAPPS	20	5.58	Propose additional Heart of the City policy to make environmental improvements resulting in pedestrian priority in existing links of Pound Tree Road & Hanover Buildings, to encourage provision of additional links & for redevelopment in Sussex Road & Vincent's Walk of a scale & quality which will enhance the setting of the Parks, remove inappropriate & unsightly activities (including car parking & bus stand-over areas), better integrate parks with the main shopping street & bring in uses, including cafes & restaurants, allowing better public appreciation & enjoyment of the Parks.	We would welcome environmental improvements in the city centre. However we need ensure that the city centre is accessible for public transport users as well as pedestrians.	No change required
SCAPPS	21	5.58	Support reference in Design Guidance to encouragement of 'active commercial uses' on the Parks' side of Above Bar shopping.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	16	5.58	The eastern side of Above Bar should be redeveloped so as to open out into the parks, instead of being just ugly service points.	The council would support this but have not included a policy as this is unlikely to happen within the life of the plan.	No change required
A. Samuels	57	5.58	Until the extended WestQuay Watermark is built and opening it will be difficult to plan ahead in any detail, because the impact of the new development will need to be assessed first. A large format store is unlikely to appear in Portland Terrace, awaiting this assessment though the site cries out for development. Connectivity with the Parks from the eastern side of Above Bar would be a huge improvement.	The impact on the existing primary shopping area is a key issue when considering new retail proposals outside this area. It is a long term goal to improve connectivity with the parks from the eastern side of Above Bar.	No change required
Business Solent	65	5.58	The priority approach and the developments proposed are strongly supported by Business Solent although there are concerns with regard to the detailed form and content of the East Street and Bargate Centre schemes.	Welcome support. Note concerns with the detailed design of the shopping centre schemes	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	6	5.58	Support the council's aspiration to provide a modern, attractive and vibrant shopping core, in accord with the principles of National Planning Policy.	Welcome support	No change required
SCAPPS	22	5.59	Object - Design Guidance - Delete 'on the park edges' as appropriate location for tall buildings.	Disagree. This is in accordance with policy 15 which states that tall buildings	No change required

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			Alternative wording - 'Buildings on Above Bar should step back above 4 storeys' because on east side stepping back from Above Bar frontage would result in tall buildings against the parks & consequent overshadowing/visual intrusion in East Parks.	would be permitted to provide an edge to the Central Parks. The policy also sets criteria for design including responding well to the site and context.	
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	7	5.59	<p>Whilst supporting the extension of the PSA westwards, a timeframe should be proposed which allows for flexibility throughout the plan period to enable developers to react to market conditions and demands; this is important to ensure that the CCAP is effective and can be delivered.</p> <p>Alternative wording - <u>"A coherent expansion of the shopping area westwards into the MSDQ will also be promoted. This will be phased and integrated to complement and strength the existing shopping area. The timing of this expansion will be monitored and subject to regular review"</u>.</p>	Policy 5 clearly sets out the guidance for the extension of the primary shopping area. It includes reference to monitoring and assessing need.	No change required
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	4	5.59	Whilst the MOD has no objections in principle to the area at Watermark WestQuay being developed to include the uses stated, DIO safeguarding must be consulted to ensure that any structure and buildings are designed to take account of MOD explosive safeguarding requirements (see General comment).	Agree (this affects the DeVere car park, not Watermark West Quay)	Add requirement to consult in supporting text to policy 14 (design) and cross reference in design guidance for DeVere car park.
Associated British Ports	41	5.59	Heart of the City quarter contains an element of the key access route between the Eastern and Western Docks / an existing significant Dock Gate or is adjacent to the operational port. See detailed points on maintaining access of the Port and ensuring neighbouring developments do not have adverse implications for Port operations.	Agree in principle that it is important to maintain access between the two docks. This is now covered by the new ports policy. The key connections generally refer to enhancing pedestrian movements. However given the scale of development proposed a brief reference is appropriate for the Western Gateway, Heart of City, and Royal Pier quarters. The Holyrood / Queens Park quarter should refer to the	Amend Key Connections section

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				Platform Road improvements.	
John Lewis	9	5.59	John Lewis objects to the Council's longer term proposals to redevelop the existing retail warehouse park and adjacent areas to create 'city centre format shopping streets or malls and to form a retail circuit with the existing shopping area'. This area is mainly bulky-goods retail and leisure uses which form a broadly complementary function to the wider 'high-street' comparison retail offer at West Quay, Above Bar, Bargate and East Street Shopping Centre and the overall mix and range of retail available in the city centre.	Note concerns with the redevelopment. The proposals could still accommodate bulky-goods retail within a different format to continue to provide a complementary function. This format is more appropriate to the city centre and higher quality.	No change required
Business Solent	71	Policy 23	Business Solent has a number of concerns about the detailed design of the scheme put forward that does not appear to be consistent with approach in the CCMP or the Public Realm Summary Report. The building forms seem bland and lack any kind of interest and there is no direct visual / physical link between East Street and St Mary Street. Business Solent is not convinced that footfall will increase. This represents the loss of a once in a lifetime opportunity to re-establish the St Mary's/East Street/High Street link.	Note concerns with the scheme proposed	No change required
Business Solent	69	Policy 23	Business Solent strongly supports the production of a master plan for the major elements in the quarter but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues and the detailed content of policies 23 and 24.	Welcome support and note request to discuss detailed issues	No change required
Arcadian Estates Ltd	3	Policy 23	(and para 4.47) Aspirations in the policy for retail-led regeneration of the East Street Shopping Centre are generally aligned with ours. However, the policy refers to a retail mixed use development rather than a new large foodstore. This is surprising given the wording of the policy and the fact that the Council recognises that the "city centre has a below average representation of convenience floorspace" (para 4.47). This uncertainty of the wording does not reflect the extensive consultation and pre-application discussions that have been held between our client and the Council, which included the signing of a Planning Performance Agreement. Accepts the proposal is referred to in supporting, though should be explicitly stated in policy in line with suggested text.  Alternative wording: 'A new large foodstore will be supported at East Street Shopping Centre. Proposals for retail-led mixed use developments will be supported for Queens Buildings, including retail, food and drink.	The policy was drafted to accommodate a food store as part of mixed use development. Accept that the policy should include specific reference to a superstore.	Amend to state that a new superstore would be supported at East Street Shopping Centre



**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			Residential, hotel and office uses will be supported above the ground floor. Development will be permitted provided: (i) Proposed uses are in accordance with the retail policy on primary and secondary retail frontages (policy 4) (ii) Active frontages are provided alongside main routes (iii) Improved links are created through the East Street Shopping Centre redevelopment to St Mary's to include an at-grade crossing across Kingsway / Evans Street.'		
EBRA	8	Policy 23-24	Seek highest quality plans for improving shopping area, with more opportunities for craft or specialist shops, small cafes or restaurants, small cinema with a stage for music performances.	Welcome suggestions. The policies are written flexibly to permit a range of retail and leisure uses. However planning policy cannot specify the type of shops required.	No change required
EBRA	9	Policy 23-24	Should be a prominent Information Centre.	Agree. However there are no proposals for a new development to include an Information Centre and therefore the plan will not allocate a specific site for one.	No change required
EBRA	10	Policy 23-24	Suggest hanging paintings of local views for sale on park fencing like London would increase the number of visitors to the parks.	Welcome suggestion. This goes beyond what planning policies can deliver. We will pass comments on to colleagues in Parks.	No change required. Comment passed on to Nick Yeats (Parks)
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	24	Policy 23 & 24	(and CCMP Heart of the City) There needs to be an economic development appraisal that takes account of sectors, jobs, asset value, quality of floorspace required, mixed use analysis to help support the CCAP.	The CCAP and CCMP were based on commercial advice from Strutt and Parker which supported the Preferred Approach paper.	Further deliverability evidence is being prepared
SCAPPS	23	5.61	Object - Delete in 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence 'could be 7 or more storeys'. Proposes alternative wording  Alternative wording - Replace with: 'of height, massing & scale that does not overshadow or dominate when seen from within the Park'.	Disagree. This is not prescriptive but is guidance about suitable development. The site is within an area identified as appropriate for tall buildings and adjacent to the	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				13 storey Capital House.	
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	23	Policy 24(d)	There are no details on the new geothermal civic square size, uses, anchors or USPs.	The geothermal square is referred to in the policy and the open space section, and uses are specified. Further details will follow at a later stage.	No change required
Mrs J Starks	2	Policy 24	Surprised at the plan to build more offices when other properties have been vacant for years.	The plan covers the period to 2026 and we expect demand for offices to increase with an economic recovery. Office proposals also reflect a wider sub regional approach of directing development to Southampton and Portsmouth city centres.	No change required
Aviva Life & Pensions UK	13	Policy 24, MDQ – North of West Quay Road	<p>Support the use of Harbour Parade Site for expansion of existing shopping area; however timeframes need to be more flexible (and underpinned by market testing and viability appraisals). Reiterates comments made in 55(9) – Development in Harbour Parade should not be seen as premature if opportunity were to come forward pre-2021.</p> <p>The timescales set out in Policy 5 are related to delivery of Policy 24. The nature of the objection requires more information to be provided by SCC as justification of its position. Until this is provided Aviva cannot provide any further amendments.</p>	<p>Welcome support for the development of Harbour Parade.</p> <p>Policy 5 states the criteria for the expansion of the PSA. Proposals coming forward earlier than set out in the phasing 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>The retail approach is based on the findings of the GVA retail study, Donaldson's report and Strutt and Parker's report for the Master Plan.</p>	Further viability work is to be undertaken to support the CCAP
Hammerson	19	Policy 24	Supports criterion a. Objects to criterion d. that relates to the Harbour Parade site. This site is not referred to in the CCMP and Policy 24 effectively allocates the site for retail and town centre uses. It contains	Harbour Parade is within the identified area of search for the extended PSA (see proposed	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			no caveats in relation to the sites release and no requirement for the proposals to be justified against the sequential and impact tests. The policy should therefore be reworded.	changes to policy 5). Policy 5 includes the appropriate caveats for retail development. Although not named in the CCMP, the indicative framework shows the redevelopment of the Retail Parks as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the area.	
John Lewis	11	Policy 24	John Lewis considers that the Harbour Parade site should only be considered for development in the last stages of the Plan period following rigorous PPS 4 sequential and impact assessment and the preparation of an up-to-date Southampton Retail Study.	Policy 5 does not promote the extension of the Primary Shopping Area until after 2021 unless specific criteria can be met.	No change required
A. Samuels	32	Policy 24	The existing retail parks in West Quay area, the "sheds", certainly need redevelopment.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	42	Policy 24	The Marlands building is a very "unsatisfactory" building and is unlikely to be viable after a few more years.	Note comment	No change required
John Lewis	10	Policy 24	Object - John Lewis is particularly concerned by proposals to safeguard the Harbour Parade site (including the Retail Park) for redevelopment, in the long term, for city centre format shopping streets or malls as it would adversely impact on the vitality and viability of the existing PSA and taken together with approved development at Watermark WestQuay and WestQuay site B proposals would shift the PSA and city centre focus to the west.	Note concerns with the redevelopment. The proposals could still accommodate bulky-goods retail within a different format to continue to provide a complementary function. Any retail expansion will be phased to prioritise the existing primary shopping area first.	No change required
Business Solent	66	Policy 24	The redevelopment of the Marlands / Asda area and the Above Bar Parkside are strongly supported by Business Solent.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	67	Policy 24	The longer term expansion of the shopping area westwards into the MDQ is supported, on the condition that positive and proactive steps will firstly be taken to correct the current east-west imbalance in the city centre.	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	68	Policy 24	Business Solent supports an appropriate expansion of the CHP facility.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	70	Policy 24	Business Solent strongly supports the production of a master plan for	Welcome support for a	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			the major elements in the quarter but would wish to discuss detailed design and related issues and the detailed content of policies 23 and 24.	masterplan. Note request to discuss policies on sites North of West Quay Road and on the East Street Shopping Centre and Queens Buildings.	

### Chapter 5 – Itchen Riverside

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	12	5.69	English Heritage welcomes the references to the listed American Wharf building (Chapel Mills) and the remains of the Saxon town in the description of the character of the area but is surprised there is no mention of the Grade II listed Cross House in the Town Depot area nor in para 5.78.	Agree	Design guidance: "...including American Wharf and the Cross House" Para 5.78: "The design should respect the setting of the American Wharf and Cross House listed buildings".
A. Samuels	62	5.69	American Wharf must be internally redeveloped and saved.	Agreed, American Wharf is a listed building. It has planning permission for a conversion.	No change required
A. Samuels	40	5.73	Itchen Riverfront looks to be an unlikely and unpromising site for new shopping. It is traditionally small business; and the old town depot. The current proposed new use is leisure, no doubt with its supporting shopping, and waterside housing, but no more. Ocean Village in the 1980's failed as a shopping centre.	Agreed that general retailing (other than neighbourhood retailing) in this 'out of centre' location is inappropriate. However retailing which is directly related to a leisure use on Town Depot may be appropriate.	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	11	5.73	Object – This identifies the Itchen Riverside Quarter as providing one of the main opportunities for a waterside residential/mixed use community. It also states that the existing marine wharves have the potential to support marine business uses. It should be recognised however that the wharf activity is a marine business use which provides vital raw	The Town Depot site already provides one of the main opportunities for waterside regeneration, without conflicting with the mineral	Para 5.73 -delete the ref to marine businesses -relocate references to redevelopment

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			materials for the built development of the area.	wharves. The point regarding marine businesses is acknowledged. The wharves make an important contribution to mineral supply. If the capacity can be relocated then they can be redeveloped; if not they will continue to be safeguarded in line with the Minerals and Waste Plan (which also allows for improvement of the wharves). The text in the Plan as a whole will be amended to fully reflect this, and be shortened here to cross refer to the earlier paragraphs on mineral wharves.	around football stadium, etc, to para 5.75; explaining this is a “potential” opportunity dependent on the relocation of the wharves. Add ref to “leisure marine industries”.  Para 5.75 -shorten this para., by cross referring to earlier parts of the plan and the Minerals and Waste Plan. -add ref to encourage relocation “to a suitable site” outside of the city
Cemex	4	5.73	Object – The Development Goals for the Itchen Riverside are questioned regarding their deliverability and compatibility with the exiting aggregate wharf uses.	See above response	No change required
Cllr Noon	2	5.73	Ensure the waterfront is open much more for the general public; informal use and for anglers, sailing and rowing clubs.	Agree. Town Depot policy recognises needs of water sports. Policy and para 5.73 set out goal of riverside walkway.	No change required
Cemex	5	5.74	Strongly object to plans to encourage the relocation of wharves outside of the city. This paragraph is in direct conflict with the aims and purpose of the emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and policies 16 and 19.	See above response. This Plan does not add a new policy, it cross refers to the policies in the Minerals and Waste Plan.	No change required
A. Samuels	63	5.75	The future of the aggregate industry must be safeguarded. Coming out of recession the development and construction industry will require substantially increased supplies of aggregate. The proposals for the riverside land to the north of the old town depot land seem far too	It is recognised that delivery is relevant and is likely to be long term – see above response. However if the wharves were	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			ambitious, including a Saints Park.	to be relocated, a residential led redevelopment is considered to be otherwise deliverable.	
Tarmac and Hanson	12	5.75	Object – Tarmac and Hanson have no desire or intention to relocate and therefore object to the principle of redevelopment of the wharf area and to the Council's aim of relocating the wharves outside the City.	See response above	No change required
Cemex	6	5.75	Object – Proposals put forward in the CCAP for Itchen Riverside are likely to be undeliverable because the Leamouth Wharf is not available for redevelopment and there are no current or future plans from the company for relocation.  Alternative approach – Remove reference to redevelopment of the wharves as they will not be available during the lifetime of the plan.	See response above. In addition, the plan does not allocate the wharves for redevelopment, so does not need to demonstrate deliverability. The plan simply explains the regeneration opportunities <u>if</u> the wharves are relocated.	No change required
Associated British Ports	40	5.75	ABP's view is that the Itchen wharf sites do not have a long term future and will be probably be available for redevelopment purposes well within the plan period of the CCAP. The CCAP should assist the process of planned redevelopment by putting forward a definitive policy on the matter.	The long term future of the wharves is at present uncertain. They may still be needed, or they may have been relocated. The Council will support appropriate relocations to facilitate regeneration. However in the light of the uncertainty a definitive policy on redevelopment is currently inappropriate.	No change required
A. Samuels	22	5.76	Question whether proposals (including the Master Plan's "Saints Square") are compatible with the need for wharf side space and facilities for aggregates and such materials? What is the proposed plan for the wharves? Hitherto protecting the Itchen wharves has been the policy. The plan seems to think otherwise.	See response above	No change required
SCAPPS	24	Policy 25	Support intention 'to promote a continuous public promenade along the waterfront'.	The support is welcome.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	19	Policy 25	(and CCMP VIPs) The site potential is understated – there is a wealth of development opportunities beyond the proposed community, sports and recreation uses.	The Town Depot allocation already promotes a wide range of uses (including residential)	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				and a high quality waterfront. The Central Industrial Estate provides local jobs in an appropriate location. However in the longer term, if the wharves were developed this should be reviewed.	
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	20	Policy 25	(and CCMP VIPs) Itchen Riverside vista should use St. Mary's stadium as a backdrop.  Suggestion – Creation of a riverside pedestrian walkway along Itchen Riverside.	It would be appropriate to ensure development creates a positive relationship with the football stadium. The Plan already refers to a riverside walkway.	Add reference to positive relationship with football stadium
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	21	Policy 25	(and CCMP) Transport infrastructure should be re-considered Suggestion – Consider a Stadium / St. Mary's halt station.	The Plan does not prevent a St Mary's halt. The stadium already works successfully in transport terms. The funding for a new station is unlikely to be a priority. Train movements may also cause conflicts with Siemens depot.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	22	Policy 25	(and CCMP VIPs) Building design at Town Depot & Riverside must be of the highest quality; this will influence the commercial viability.	Policy 25 promotes a high quality landmark development and should be read in association with the design policies.	No change required
A. Samuels	26	Policy 25	It is nearly time to rename the "Town Depot" site.	The point is understood, although Town Depot is a widely used name and appropriate for a site allocation prior to a scheme being promoted.	No change required
Cemex	7	Policy 25	The company would welcome the opportunity to comment on the boundary for the Town Depot development site which has been identified for mixed leisure and residential uses.	DISCUSS	
Business Solent	72	Policy 25	Business Solent strongly supports the policy for Town Depot but would wish to discuss more detailed design and related issues with the city council and others.	The support is welcome. Further more detailed discussions can be held as a	No change required

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				scheme evolves.	
David Marden	1	Policy 25	The redevelopment of the area should reflect its industrial maritime past in terms of the wharves and shipping building. This would be the preferred location for the aeronautical museum making use of the waterfront if it does not get built in the docks given the views of the former Supermarine works and Thornycroft shipyard across the river. There should be a heritage centre to reflect the lifestyles of the local people in the industry 1800 to 1900 such as a small row of terrace houses.	It is agreed that development should be of a high quality design and distinctive. The ideas proposed represent one way to achieve this. There may be other ways to deliver good design and a development scheme also needs to be viable. It is important not to be overly prescriptive at this stage. In our view Ocean Village achieves a positive waterfront design. However the policy requires the site's heritage to be respected. This can be amplified in the supporting text.	Add in para 5.78 at end: "...and where feasible reflect the wider maritime history of the area".
Cllr Noon	3	Policy 25	Concerned about the capacity of the Town Depot area to sustain additional traffic for the snow & ski centre. Would like to see these roads take much more of the traffic for the docks and city centre.	Noted. A transport assessment for specific development proposals would be required at the planning application stage. The Plan recognises the importance of access to the docks and city centre.	No change required
English Heritage	13	5.80	English Heritage welcomes in principle the reference to respecting and reflecting the site's archaeology and heritage in policy 25 and archaeological resources in 5.80 but believes that this should be a requirement without the caveat 'wherever possible'.	The policy should conform to Core Strategy Policy CS14 and be consistent with the NPPF.	Amend policy 25: "Wherever possible, the development should maintain strategic views across the site; <del>and</del> <u>Development should</u> respect and reflect the site's archaeology and heritage <u>in line with policy CS14 and the</u>



## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					NPPE". Amend para 5.80 to reflect this
Sport England	2	5.81 and Policy 10	Sport England would seek to protect other indoor and outdoor sports facilities and land uses which are important to sports development. Supports the provision of water sports activities in Policy 25 and the recognition that existing water sports facilities are important community facilities.	The support is welcome.	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Old Town Quarter

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
SCAPPS	25	5.91	Should include reference to importance of outward views to Test from lower French Street, Bugle Street & High Street in linking the Old Town to its past as a port.	This paragraph is a broad overview of the quarter and views / vistas are adequately covered in the Old Town Development Strategy,	No change required
SCAPPS	26	5.91	Delete 'appropriate' in (ii), as open space must be provided to standard in Policy 11. If the intention is to include a greater level of open space provision, then specify.	The approach is consistent with Policy 11. No change needed.	No change required
R. Cassy	17	5.91	Protecting and celebrating the city's heritage is critically important. The small area of old buildings needs to retain its unique charm and any development must be sensitive to its historical importance. The preservation of Town Quay Park is fundamental to celebrating our heritage and protecting essential open space (see comment on Policy 10).	The design guidance and key site policies are deemed sufficient protection.	No change required
R. Cassy	22	5.91	Whilst welcoming much in this plan I remain concerned that the Old Town's character and assets will not be sufficiently protected in future.	The design guidance and key site policies are deemed sufficient protection.	No change required
English Heritage	14	5.91	English Heritage welcomes the recognition of the Old Town and the undertaking and use in informing the approach to proposals for development of the Old Town Conservation Area Appraisal. English Heritage also welcomes the Design Guidance as set out and paragraphs 5.95 and 5.96.	Welcome the support.	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	79	5.93	Business Solent considers that there is somewhat of an absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within certain quarter including the Old Town. Business Solent would wish to explore the possible means by which these concerns might be addressed, perhaps through the mechanism of neighbourhood planning outside of the main shopping area and VIPs.	The design guidance and key site policies are deemed sufficient protection.	No change required
R. Cassy	19	5.93	There is already concern about how sensitively historic assets will be managed with the proposed sale of the freehold of the stonemason's yard bordering the town walls with no protective clauses.	This is not a strategic site, and is covered by the Design Guidance set out in 5.94	No change required
Friends of Town Quay Park	8	5.93	FTQP members suggested the following; 1. Opening up the vaults for tourism i.e. remembrance of city's history, possible historic sculpture trail 2. Developing the gardens i.e. medieval garden, sensory garden 3. Weekend market / farmers market 4. Space for cultural activities including poetry, music, theatre, concerts, festivals 5. Space for social and healthy activities i.e. tai chi, boules, bridge 6. Small refreshment kiosk or ice cream parlour	Welcome the suggestions and the council notes the support for using Town Quay Park site.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
A. Samuels	67	5.93	How to restore "vitality" to High Street below Bar is difficult, though the current efforts are praiseworthy. Opening up to the waterfront is certainly the right policy.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Business Solent	73	5.93	Business Solent strongly supports the overall approach to the Old Town subject to detailed comments on policies 26-30 and smaller scale development.	Welcome the support	No change required
Cllr Noon	7	5.93	Suggest in East Street; parking policies that people to stay and use the shops; planning control that encourages unique and specialist shopping opportunities.	Noted, although these matters are beyond the control of planning policy	No change required
Cllr Noon	8	5.93	Consider closing East Street to traffic creating a village atmosphere and restrict the number of fast food takeaways. As the landlord, the city council could offer low rents for start businesses that offer unique and specialist shopping.	There are no plans to close East Street to traffic. These matters are beyond the control of planning policy	No change required
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	5	5.94	Whilst the MOD has no objections in principle to the Old Town Quarter being developed to include the uses stated, DIO safeguarding must be consulted to ensure that any structure and buildings are designed to take account of MOD explosive safeguarding requirements (see General comment).	Agree	Add requirement to consult in supporting text to policy 14 (design) and cross reference in design

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					guidance for southern end of Old Town.
Associated British Ports	42	5.94	Old Town quarter contains an element of the key access route between the Eastern and Western Docks / an existing significant Dock Gate or is adjacent to the operational port. See detailed points on maintaining access of the Port and ensuring neighbouring developments do not have adverse implications for Port operations.	These issues are now covered by the new ports policy. The key connections generally refer to enhancing pedestrian movements. A reference has been added to the Key Connections in those quarters where the issue is most relevant, but not the Old Town.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	25	Policy 26	Support – This site is long overdue in terms of redevelopment but there needs to be a definitive policy in terms of commercial lettings and business activity.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	26	Policy 26	Development needs to be sympathetic and in line with the medieval walls and medieval lineage of streets (design brief needed).	This is already set out in the Old Town Development Strategy and draft CCAP para 5.94	No change required
Patricia Burnett	1	Policy 26?	The markets need to be got rid of. They are not needed and make the city look run down.	The markets form one part of the city's retail offer	No change required
Mrs J Starks	6	Policy 26	Support – There is nowhere in the city centre to buy fresh fruit and vegetables except stores where the produce is usually old.	Welcome the support.	No change required
English Heritage	15	Policy 26	The area identified as the Fruit and Vegetable Market on Map 22 appears to include the Grade II* Red Lion Inn and Grade II listed property at 56 High Street and be opposite the Grade II listed Head Post Office to the south as well as abutting the Old Town Conservation Area. English Heritage would like to see these heritage assets identified in Policy 26, whilst welcoming the requirement for development of the area to achieve the re-identification of the line of the medieval wall.	As Grade Listed structures these are sufficiently protected. In any case the plan already refers to these listed buildings (as 55-58 and 123-126 High St), and to the Conservation area. Add cross reference to policy 14 (design)	Add cross reference to policy 14 (design)
A. Samuels	66	Policy 26	Fruit and vegetable market land proposals are good. But the vulnerability of residents to abuse from leisure users must always be borne in mind.	Noted.	No change required
Business Solent	74	Policy 26	Support Fruit and Vegetable Market policy in principle but suggests that it should formally acknowledge key issues such as the Market proposals and reinstatement of Brunswick Square set out in the CCMP. Business Solent would wish to discuss proposes for the site in detail	Note request for further discussions. The policy refers to public realm improvements. This relates to green link	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			with the city council and others.	improvements referred to in open space policy. Given Fruit and Veg development is likely to be phased, and the proximity of other parks, this is more realistic and appropriate.	
Business Solent	75	Policy 27	Support Bargate Sites policy in principle but suggests that more consideration needs to be given to, and reflected upon in the policy, such issues as the more precise nature and form of the built development on the site, the requirement for establishing a memorable space immediately north of the Bargate coupled with the removal of the current bus only link and the future redevelopment of Bargate Street linking to the Arundel Circus civic space, why there should be a connection from the High Street to Castle Way continuing the line of East Street, why the Bargate should be directly connected to the surrounding built form and how to re-establish the former Pembroke Square as an entry point to the redeveloped Bargate Centre. Business Solent would wish to discuss proposes for the site in detail with the city council and others.	Welcome support for the policy in principle and note request for further discussions. Agree that these issues need to be given more consideration before the development of these sites. However, it is not possible to include this level of detail in the CCAP and still produce a manageable document which covers the whole of the city centre.	No change required
SCAPPS	27	Policy 27	Propose inclusion of links to Houndwell Park & opening up vista from southern end of the main avenue through the Parks to the City Walls/Polymond Tower.	The principle of improving pedestrian links is clearly stated in the policy. In addition Criteria 7 states the development should include links along the line of the Town Walls.	No change required
Shopmobility	2	Policy 27	Shopmobility currently has an easily accessible central base. We have been reassured in the past that this will continue to be the case but need to see exactly where we feature in the plans.	We accept the importance of the service and the need to reprovide it if its current location is redeveloped. With reference to location, the policy and supporting text contain principles for development but do not set out exactly where different uses will be located.	Add in specific reference to Shopmobility and its reprovision in policy
English Heritage	16	5.105	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to heritage assets in 5.105, 5.109, 5.111, 5.117 and 5.118. English Heritage also welcomes and supports reference to the Old Town Walls in Policy 27,	Welcome support	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			the requirement for no negative impact on the Walls or their surroundings in Policy 28 and Policies 29 and 30.		
SCAPPS	28	Policy 28	Welcome development of Albion Place & Castle Way car parks as 'public space' & that design will improve the setting of Castle Bailey & Town Walls. Design should include line of vision from Maddison Street gap in castle bailey wall to Town Walls over Castle Way.	Welcome support. The design of the open space will carefully consider routes through the castle bailey wall to this site.	No change required
SCAPPS	29	Policy 28	This open space will contribute toward meeting shortfall in open space provision based on new development and should not be considered as mitigation for erosion of open space elsewhere as civic (hard space) serves a different function to parks etc.	It will serve as open space provision in its own right, regardless of whether it is considered mitigation for other developments.	No change required
R. Cassy	20	Policy 28	Creating open space at Albion Place and Castle Way may have some benefits (although loss of parking at this site is regrettable). However such space is not acceptable as replacement for loss of open space at Lower High Street. Open space adjacent to a bus super stop would compromise the value of such space and make it less attractive to sit in and relax but is preferable to mixed use development.	Welcome the support for the principle of open space. Note comment and concerns about the site's location next to a bus super stop. This site will be carefully designed to minimise the impact of buses and provide a high quality settings for the castle bailey and town walls.	No change required
Friends of Town Quay Park	13	Policy 28	Welcome the proposal to create further open space at Albion Place and Castle Way only if this is not a substitute for any loss of open space elsewhere. Question whether open space adjacent to a bus super stop would prove appropriate or attractive.	Note comment and concerns about the site's location next to a bus super stop. This site will be carefully designed to minimise the impact of buses and provide a high quality settings for the castle bailey and town walls. It will serve as open space provision in its own right, regardless of whether it is considered mitigation for other developments.	No change required
Business Solent	76	Policy 28	Supports subject to clarification/resolution of the position regarding proposed urban open space provision, the design approach to be adopted with respect to the proposed bus 'super stop' and related built form issues. Business Solent would wish to discuss these and detailed	Welcome support. This site will be carefully designed to minimise the impact of buses and provide a high quality	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			design issues with the city council and others.	settings for the castle bailey and town walls. We welcome the opportunity to discuss with Business Solent.	
SCAPPS	30	Policy 29	Object to the loss of open space at Town Quay Park. The Old Town is already deficient in local open space. There is no opportunity to find replacement open space which would provide the same unique characteristic of views out to the water & incorporating historic structures. Would support proposals securing the future of the standing ruins & vaults & giving public access, but not at the cost of loss of green open space.	The policy would have only allowed development in limited circumstances. However agree in broad terms – it is important to retain open space and this space has distinctive characteristics. The area will retain its protected open space designation. If there were a 'heritage led' proposal in the future this would be a 'departure' from the open space policy. A decision would depend on the extent of heritage benefit and open space loss (including publically accessible open space – if any). This will be a matter for consideration at planning application stage if this were to occur.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
R. Cassy	18	Policy 29	The Lower High Street Conservation Statement produced by Dr Andy Russel is a key document and should be used to inform the restoration of historic monuments and vaults.	<b>DO WE WANT ANY LOWER CASE TEXT ON THESE ISSUES?</b>	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
R. Cassy	21	Policy 29	The wording of this policy and paragraph is ambiguous. If it means there will be no development or loss of Open Space on Town Quay Park it is welcomed. If heritage led development means any form of development other than perhaps food and drink at a very modest level it is strongly opposed. Any development should be limited to restoring the historic structures and maybe creating a small café or kiosk in the park.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Friends of Town Quay Park	11	Policy 29	Policy seems to conflict with appendix 4 which identifies Town Quay Park as protected open space. If development means purely improving the vaults/ existing structures and bringing some back into use as	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			appropriate visitor attractions this may be supported and would negate the need for alternative open space.	comments above.	
Friends of Town Quay Park	14	Policy 29	There was a unanimous view that more could be done by the council to endorse the value of Town Quay park and its position at the end of the QE2 mile. FTQP would be happy to work with the council on this. Sponsorship and grants could pay to do the work required to the vaults to preserve them and keep them open to the public. The community would work with the council, parks team and historical experts.	Para 5.94 refers to the aspiration to bring the vaults back into use. Given that policy 29 is being deleted, it is agreed that a reference to enhancing Town Quay Park in the introduction to the quarter would be useful.	Para 5.94 – add reference to enhancing Town Quay Park.
Friends of Town Quay Park	15	Policy 29	Other suggestions for enhancing Town Quay Park; improved signage on and of the park, better landscaping, family activities, toddlers play area, seating, start point for historical walks and use as a community garden.	See above	See above
Friends of Town Quay Park	16	Policy 29	The importance of protecting green open spaces increases with growth and very ambitious development plans nearby. The only development should be to improve and sustain the historic structures with no loss of overall open space.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
A. Samuels	68	Policy 29	The claim of an alleged town green to the east of High Street has been hanging around too long and should be resolved one way or the other; otherwise development could be seriously impeded.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Friends of Town Quay Park	12	Policy 29	Object – FTQP members value Town Quay Park as a combination of garden, heritage buildings with a view of the water at the end of the QE2 mile. Reprovision is unrealistic and not feasible.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Business Solent	77	Policy 29	Supports but would wish to discuss detailed design issues for example the possible restoration of the former High Street frontage with the city council and others.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Clr Noon	19	Policy 29	The area around Lower High Street has reached its capacity to sustain further development and all remaining open sites should be kept as open spaces. The city council should be working with the local community and partners to find resources to open the city vaults and bring them back into use.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.  There is a reference to the City vaults in para 5.94.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Friends of Town	7	5.111	Object – FTQP members expressed resistance to the suggestion that a	Noted. This policy is to be	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Quay Park			variety of commercial uses, apart from food and drink, will be sought.	deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	
Friends of Town Quay Park	9	5.112	FTQP reasons for not supporting development; 1. Loss of open space with a sea view 2. Impact on neighbours 3. Overdevelopment of sea frontage 4. Impact on listed buildings and ancient monuments 5. Detriment to the street scene 6. Concerns about size and scale of development 7. Concerns about traffic, car parking and highway infrastructure.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Friends of Town Quay Park	10	5.112	Other comments about development include the role of the park (as a breathing space, local park in a densely populated area, peaceful oasis, area for wildlife), impact on heritage (vaults and views of medieval buildings), the amount of development nearby and problems of traffic levels and noise from Rosso nightclub. It was noted that the CCAP doesn't leave space for non-financially rewarding activities and places for people to enjoy without having to buy anything.	Noted. This policy is to be deleted and the open space designation will remain. See comments above.	<b>Delete Policy 29</b>
Business Solent	78	Policy 30	Strongly supports but would wish to discuss any detailed proposal that may come forward including the proposed hotel on Castle Way.	Welcome support and note request for further discussions.	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Cultural Quarter

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Business Solent	80	5.123	Business Solent fully supports the approach taken to development in the quarter and will continue to be proactively involved with future events as appropriate.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Terrace Hill	1	5.124	Development of this site has failed to come forward despite a mixed use allocation and recent resolution to grant planning permission. The CCAP provides the opportunity to facilitate the development of this prominent site and end 2 decades of planning blight and uncertainty, through its focus on delivery and providing a flexible framework for development and this is supported and is to be embodied in the forthcoming NPPF and its presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Agree to refer to student accommodation in policy	Change accordingly



## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			Alternative approach – The council's development goal should acknowledge the potential for the site to support a development for purpose-built student accommodation, as identified at para 5.129 of the CCAP.		
English Heritage	17	5.124	English Heritage welcomes and supports the requirement for development proposals to respect the character and setting of nearby listed buildings and parks and the strategic view to the Civic Centre campanile. English Heritage also welcomes and supports para 5.133 and the reference to the setting of the listed Parks in Policy 31.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Cllr Noon	1	5.124	Develop safer crossing for pedestrians trying to cross Havelock Road, Cumberland Place and Civic Road.	Support – see para 5.132.	No change required
SCAPPS	31	5.124	Object – Delete 'tall buildings are appropriate on the park edges'; support other Design guidance. Support 5.127 'In design terms the frontage to East Park should be treated as being of equal importance to the frontage to Above Bar Street'.	Welcome the overall support for design guidance – the council is of the view that tall buildings are appropriate on this site (see City Centre Masterplan).	No change required
SCAPPS	32	Policy 31	Concern that <b>Policy 31</b> gives no framework for rest of the defined Northern Above Bar Development site; propose that Policy 31 should include principles in preceding Design guidance, & reference to need for continued provision of service area for park maintenance.	The first paragraph of policy 31 applies to the whole development site. However its agreed that some design guidance is needed for the whole site. Agree to a reference to East Park Depot.	Amend accordingly.
Mrs J Starks	4	Policy 31	Most people do not have much left over to spend at an Arts complex. Will it be multi-cultural?	The Draft Plan provides flexibility for many cultural elements in this quarter, which will draw a variety of economic benefits to the city.	No change required
A. Samuels	58	Policy 31	The premises on the east of Above Bar (north of the proposed Arts Complex) are poor and need sensitive comprehensive redevelopment, using the Park aspect to the east to maximum advantage.	Policy 31 (c) & (e) provide the requisite criteria to achieve this.	No change required
Business Solent	81	Policy 31	Supports policy on Northern Above Bar but would wish to discuss future design issues with the city council and others including the treatment of	Welcome the support and note request for further discussions.	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			East Park frontage, removing traffic from the Guildhall Square section of Above Bar Street, enhancing the public realm (the former 'rose garden' area) and treatment of Above Bar junctions with New Road and Commercial Road.		
EBRA	7	Policy 31	Support to recently approved development coming forward and more events taking place in Guildhall Square to attract residents and visitors.	Welcome the support.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	27	Policy 31 & 32	(and CCMP VIPs) Further work needs to be undertaken to improve pedestrian, cycle and transport links / needs to be commitment to open civic space.	Agree. Other policies in the CCAP will tackle transport and open space.	No change required
Business Solent	82	Policy 32	Supports policy on Mayflower Plaza but would wish to discuss detailed design for the site with the city council and others.	Welcome the support and note request for further discussions.	No change required
Theatre Trust	1	Policy 32	Support the policy to enhance the area around the theatre and the provision of mixed use which will give further support to the Mayflower Theatre. Theatres make a major contribution to the vitality of town centres and the evening economy they also make places more attractive to businesses and residents as well as having tourism benefits.	Welcome the support.	No change required
SCAPPS	33	Policy 32	Object to 'edge of park location' means 'potential to provide a tall building'. The location requires careful design to avoid visual intrusion & over-shadowing & to secure a building of quality on this prominent frontage which will enhance the setting of Watts Park.	The council is of the view that tall buildings are appropriate on this site (see City Centre Masterplan). The CCAP and CCMP provide requisite design guidance.	No change required
Terrace Hill	3	5.128-5.133	Support inclusion of a site specific policy relating to the development of Mayflower Plaza. The introduction of a more flexible approach to the sites development, in particular to purpose built student accommodation is supported. Terrace Hill's proposal provides a real opportunity to act as a catalyst for further regeneration and demonstrates that the council is open for business.  Alternative approach – The recognition in para 5.129 that Mayflower Plaza could support a purpose built student accommodation scheme should be elevated to within policy 32 to ensure the policy fulfils the CCAP objective for focussing on delivery and providing a flexible framework for delivery.	The support is welcome. Agree to refer to student accommodation in policy	Change accordingly

## Chapter 5 – University Quarter

**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

<b>Organisation / individual</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Para / Policy etc</b>	<b>Summary of comment</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Recommended change</b>
English Heritage	18	5.134	Reference should be made to the five Grade II listed buildings on New Road and Palmerston Road.	Agree	Ensure buildings are referred to in text, and cross refer to policy 14 design
SCAPPS	34	5.137	Support intentions in Design Guidance & in Policy 33 that development should enhance the Park, but oppose the suggestion in 5.142 that tall buildings may be appropriate. Tall buildings would obtrude in views from within the Park. Consideration should be given to similar design guidance to that for Above Bar, that frontage development toward the Park be kept below 4 storeys but increase in height stepping back from that frontage.	Disagree. This is in accordance with policy 15 which states that tall buildings would be permitted to provide an edge to the Central Parks. The policy also sets criteria for design including making a strong architectural statement and enhancing the setting of the parks.	No change required
Southampton Solent University	6	Policy 33	Support the principle of identifying the area as a University Quarter. SSU supports the range of uses in paragraph 5.137 but suggests that the use classes could be widened to provide additional flexibility to the University. SSU links with businesses are important and it is conceivable that an opportunity for a joint venture on part of the site could arise e.g. media/arts, research and development linked to industry none of which would fall within the range of uses identified in the policy. SSU needs flexibility as the exact future of the site is unknown at this time. Reiterate the comments above for paragraph 5.141.  Alternative approach – If all or part of the site is not needed for Solent University's expansion then a mixed use development would be acceptable, providing the proposed uses are suitable for a town centre location and/or are related to the activities of the University.	The council would seek to encourage other uses where they were related to the university and where they are compatible with surrounding uses .	Change wording to make reference to joint ventures between the university and private business; and research, development, media / arts / cultural facilities.
Mrs J Starks	5	Policy 33	With tuition fees going up will there be sufficient students to warrant an expansion?	Comment noted. The University is best placed to know its future requirements and it is understood that development is not just about catering for an increase in numbers but also about having better facilities.	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
A. Samuels	20	Policy 33	Query what is the plan now for the undeveloped site adjoining Andrews Park along East Park Terrace and the intentions and opportunities of Solent University.	Policy 33 will set out the policy for this area of land. As for the intentions of Solent University it is understood that they are in the process of producing a Masterplan to guide how they see development taking place on the site.	No change required
A. Samuels	59	Policy 33	The future ownership and use of the land to the north of the University needs to be resolved before meaningful planning can take place.	Comment noted. As the council understands matters there are no ownership issues that need to be resolved.	No change required
A. Samuels	60	Policy 33	Downgrading East Park Terrace for traffic is a sound idea. Andrews Road and Kingsway are underused.	Welcome support.	No change required
Business Solent	83	Policy 33	Supports policy on East Park Terrace but would wish to discuss detailed design issues with the city council and others.	Welcome support and note request to discuss detailed issues	No change required
EBRA	4	Policy 33	Upgrading the Solent University buildings would better compliment the Parks but concerned where if the funding for development is secured.	Comment noted. The East Park Terrace is a vacant site that would be well suited to providing additional facilities in the long run. It is understood that the University are looking at a Masterplan for both the East Park Terrace site and the existing campus and that the longer term ambitions would be to redevelop / refurbish the existing campus as well.	No change required
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	28	Policies 33 & 34	(and CCMP VIPs) Any buildings on the proposed extension sites must have a positive relationship with all of the frontages (the park, Charlotte Place etc).	Site policies refer to any key site specific design principles. Policy 33 requires a strong architectural statement that enhances the setting of the parks. Other general design principles are covered by policy 14 (design).	No change required
Hampshire Chamber	29	Policies 33	(and CCMP VIPs) St. Mary Street and Northam appear to be severed	The introduction to the Quarter	Policy 17 – east west

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
of Commerce		& 34	from St. Mary's Road / Newtown; there needs to be a definitive statement re. linkage and connectivity.	– Key Connections sets out the need to improve these connections. This is also covered by strategic links, although an added reference would be useful.	link: add reference to Six Dials and Northam.
Business Solent	84	Policy 34	Supports policy on St Mary's Road but would wish to discuss detailed design issues with the city council and others.	Welcome support <i>and note request to discuss detailed issues</i>	No change required
Southampton Solent University	7	Policy 34	Supports the flexible approach and range of uses identified.	Welcome support.	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Holyrood / Queens Park

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	19	5.147	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to the Park, listed buildings and conservation area in 5.147 and 5.148, the Design Guidance as set out and the requirement to protect and enhance the setting of the adjacent conservation area and listed buildings in Policy 35.	Welcome support	No change required
Associated British Ports	43	5.151	Holyrood / Queens Park quarter contains an element of the key access route between the Eastern and Western Docks / an existing significant Dock Gate or is adjacent to the operational port. See detailed points on maintaining access of the Port and ensuring neighbouring developments do not have adverse implications for Port operations.	Agree that the proposals for Platform Road should be included in the Key connections section	Add in reference to Platform Road improvements and Dock Gate 4
SCAPPS	35	5.151	Propose inclusion in Design guidance point 2 that development should also respect the character & setting of Queens Park & in Key connections that advantage should be taken of removal of the Queens Park gyratory to secure improved visual & pedestrian links from the Oxford Street area to the Park & that Queen's Terrace should be included as an extension of the Plan's proposed 'Green Mile'.	Agree	Add reference to respecting the setting of Queens Park  Add reference to Queens Park gyratory  Extend Green mile along Queens

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					Terrace (also amend Map 13)
SCAPPS	36	5.151	Platform Road highway improvement scheme still needs to identify replacement open space for loss of Vokes Park: can open space be included in development of College Street car park site?	The Platform Road scheme will not involve a net loss of open space. Policy 10 also refers.	No change required
A. Samuels	37	Policy 35	The surface city car park next to Duke's Keep should be redeveloped, perhaps retaining one or two levels of car parking.	This site is identified within Policy 35 for development.	No change required
Business Solent	85	Policy 35	Supports policy on Duke Street area but has significant concerns regarding the absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within the quarter. Business Solent would wish to explore the possible means by which these concerns might be addressed, perhaps through the mechanism of neighbourhood planning outside of the main shopping area and VIPs.	Note concern. This is related to the nature of the plan as this would be too detailed to include (and demonstrate deliverability). Small scale development is covered by general policies in the CCAP and the Characterisation Study suggests improvements for each of the quarters. We acknowledge their importance and would welcome these types of improvements. We also welcome the opportunity to explore concerns with Business Solent.	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Ocean Village

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	20	5.159	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to heritage assets, including archaeology, in 5.159, the Design Guidance as set out and reference in Policy 36 to respecting the surrounding heritage assets.	Welcome support	No change required
Associated British Ports	44	5.161	Ocean Village quarter contains an element of the key access route between the Eastern and Western Docks / an existing significant Dock Gate or is adjacent to the operational port. See detailed points on	The issues are covered by the new ports policy. They are not particularly relevant to this	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			maintaining access of the Port and ensuring neighbouring developments do not have adverse implications for Port operations.	quarter (connections do not pass through them).	
SCAPPS	37	Policy 36	Support creation of 'a continuous route for public access along the waterfront'.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	36	Policy 36	Opening up NOC by enabling public access would be real help. A pedestrian bridge from Ocean Village is needed; and much improved vehicular access and parking.	Note suggestions. The CCAP seeks to improve access within the quarter and to the waterfront whilst recognising that the NOC is on operational port land.	No change required
A. Samuels	64	Policy 36	Pedestrian access to NOC from Ocean Village is required; and better vehicular access. The huge new multi-storey car park must be made more known and visible and accessible and Admiral's Quay must be completed.	Welcome suggestions although please note that the Ocean Car Park is privately operated. The CCAP seeks to improve access within the quarter and to the waterfront whilst recognising that the NOC is on operational port land.	No change required
A. Samuels	65	Policy 36	The risk of extensive letting and subletting of the flats to students and others not too concerned about the quality of the living experience in Ocean Village needs to be countered so far as possible.	This is beyond the scope of the council and planning policy to address.	No change required
Business Solent	86	Policy 36	Strongly supports policy on Ocean Village but would wish to discuss future design issues with the city council and others including the inter-relationships and connectivity between the Royal Pier/Waterfront location to the west, the intervening Port area fronting Platform Road (which is not included in any of the quarters) and Itchen Riverside to the east.	Welcome support and note request for further discussions	No change required
English Heritage	21	5.164	English Heritage welcomes and supports the requirements of para 5.164 but would like to see these also set out in Policy 36.	Policy 36 (e) includes the requirement to 'respect the surrounding heritage assets'. The supporting text in paragraph 5.164 provides guidance on how to meet this requirement.	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

### Chapter 5 – St Marys

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
English Heritage	22	5.169	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to the archaeological importance of this area in 5.169, the Design Guidance, Policy 37 and 5.177.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	87	5.173	Business Solent has concerns regarding the absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within St Marys.	Note concern. This is related to the nature of the plan as this would be too detailed to include (and demonstrate deliverability). Small scale development is covered by general policies in the CCAP and the Characterisation Study suggests improvements for each of the quarters. We acknowledge their importance and would welcome these types of improvements.	No change required
Cllr Noon	5	5.173	Suggest in St Marys Street and Old Northam Road; parking policies that people to stay and use the shops; planning control that encourages unique and specialist shopping opportunities.	Welcome ideas to improve St Marys. These go beyond what planning policies can deliver. We will pass comments on to colleagues in parking services.	No change required. Comment on parking passed on to Ken Byng (Parking Services)
Cllr Noon	6	5.173	Northam Road and St Marys Street are cut off by the Six Dials junction and Kingsway from the rest of the city centre. If this area is to regain more of what it lost and keep what remains of its specialist shopping, this area must be open to the city centre. This could be done by restricting traffic on Kingsway with more controlled pedestrian crossings and closing the under pass between Northam Road and New Road.	Welcome suggestions. As stated in para 5.176, the council will investigate the remodelling of Six Dials.	No change required. Comment passed on to Phil Marshall (Transport)
Gavin Marsh	1	Policy 37	The supporting text does not represent an impartial and objective overview of the area.	The supporting text reflected the physical state of the area and the lack of significant change in the area when the Preferred Approach paper was written. This will be updated to note recent regeneration in Northam Road.	Update text to reflect the progress on development proposals



**Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)**

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Gavin Marsh	2	Policy 37	The views raised by local residents in previous public involvement to regenerate St Marys were ignored by the Council. The CCAP consultation meeting used displays which did not make any reference to the proposals in the area and only the rest of the city centre.	We accept that there has been a long history of regeneration and community involvement in the area and this has not delivered the improvements hoped for. However, as the CCAP covers the whole of the city centre and St Marys has a limited number of development sites, there is a limited amount of detail which the CCAP can include. Although not focused on St Marys, the display highlighted improvements and opportunities close by and major developments which will directly affect its residents and businesses.	No change required
Gavin Marsh	4	Policy 37	Should be more promotion of the significance of the area's historic part of the city and cultural quarter.	Note comment. This goes beyond what planning policies can deliver. We will pass comments on to colleagues in Arts & Heritage.	No change required. Comment passed on to Lisa Shepherd (Arts & Heritage)
Gavin Marsh	5	Policy 37	There should be a feasibility study into having a local museum.	Welcome suggestion and would support this. However this goes beyond what planning policies can deliver. We will pass comments on to colleagues in Arts & Heritage.	No change required. Comment passed on to Lisa Shepherd (Arts & Heritage)
Gavin Marsh	6	Policy 37	The proposals underwhelm and sell the area short. The Council is embarrassed by the area and has little interest in promoting it.	Disagree. The city centre boundary was amended to include St Marys to recognise that it is an important part of the city centre, to integrate it better with the rest of the centre and help regeneration. The proposals reflect the lack of major development sites in	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				St Marys and the appropriate detail in a plan covering the whole of the city centre. The text will be updated to reflect recent regeneration activity.	
A. Samuels	27	Policy 37	The attempts in the past to revive the St Mary's Quarter, including the old Northam Road, have failed. Queries what the new proposals are.	The guidance for St Marys provides criteria for development which must respect the character of the area, protect strategic views and retain commercial uses in St Mary Street (albeit within a reduced area). Retail uses are supported in Old Northam Road. Development should also deliver environmental improvements and improve linkages with other areas.	No change required
A. Samuels	69	Policy 37	The St Mary's Church environment needs a real uplift, so as to become a pleasing "park", rather than a "cut through" and a partial car park. Though of course the consent and co-operation of the Church will be required. Question if the proposed Ice or Skating Rink envisaged as a likely reality and if it were to materialise, what its impact would be.	St Mary's Church yard is identified as an area of open space and we would support any improvements the church can make to this open space.  Outline Planning Permission was granted for the Ice rink in 2010. No further applications have been received and it has been reported that the developer had not been able to gain funding for the ice rink.	No change required
ONR Traders Association	1	Policy 37	Object - The proposed dramatic reduction to the St Marys protected shopping area will without doubt irreparably damage the economic viability of the area. We do not understand the motivation behind these proposals as all of the shops within the area where protection is to be lifted house successful trading businesses which are providing a service and employment to local people.	This change gives more flexibility to bring empty units back into use. Existing shops can continue to trade under these proposals. Outside the protected area, we would still permit shops but would also	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				consider a wider range of commercial and residential uses which met the criteria for development in the policy.	
ONR Traders Association	5	Policy 37	Object - We have been informed that if the planned relaxation of the protection to the shops goes ahead, Grays will pull out and this would be disastrous.	We have received further information from Grays since the Preferred Approach paper was written. Before we received this, we could not justify retaining the current policy in the light of further decline and a high proportion of vacant units. The text will be updated to reflect recent regeneration activity.	Update text to reflect the progress on development proposals
Business Solent	88	Policy 37	Supports policy for St Mary Street and Old Northam Road but Business Solent would wish to explore the possible means by which these concerns might be addressed, perhaps through the mechanism of neighbourhood planning.	Welcome support. We also welcome the opportunity to explore concerns with Business Solent.	No change required
ONR Traders Association	2	5.175	Object - This paragraph is completely misleading as huge progress has been made. Old Northam Road has attracted one of the biggest names in the Antiques and collectibles trade in the UK and Europe. As an agreed demonstration of their commitment to Old Northam Road, Grays agreed to purchase a portfolio of properties in the road, in exchange discussions have been progressing to carry things forward. Included in the discussion was the need for a robust planning policy to protect the local shops and therefore Grays investment.	We have received further information from Grays since the Preferred Approach paper was written. Before we received this, we could not justify retaining the current policy in the light of further decline and a high proportion of vacant units. The text will be updated to reflect recent regeneration activity.	Update text to reflect the progress on development proposals
ONR Traders Association	3	5.175	Object - The statement that 'proposals for an antique centre in Old Northam Road have not progressed' is completely incorrect. The site has been purchased from the initial developer by Grays along with freehold interests on other properties. At our request we have seen their plans for the area and their strategy is to carry our work in two phases; firstly renovating the existing derelict building followed by the construction of the Auction house / antique centre. Phase one works are already well underway and a draft agreement between Grays and	We have received further information from Grays since the Preferred Approach paper was written. Before we received this, we could not justify retaining the current policy in the light of further decline and a high proportion	Update text to reflect the progress on development proposals

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			the council's regeneration team has already been issued. Grays informed us that numerous internal refurbishments are already completed and that the Spring launch of their advertising campaign for the shops is still on schedule.	of vacant units. The text will be updated to reflect recent regeneration activity.	
ONR Traders Association	4	5.178	Object - We are aware that Grays are about to commence the restoration of 37-49 Old Northam Road and plan to restore the facades completely. If the proposed relaxation of the protection of shop units proceeds, the owners of properties let out as residential units will without doubt officially turn their shop units into residential units with the inevitable destruction of shop frontages.	We have received further information from Grays since the Preferred Approach paper was written. Before we received this, we could not justify retaining the current policy in the light of further decline and a high proportion of vacant units. The text will be updated to reflect recent regeneration activity.	Update text to reflect the progress on development proposals

## Chapter 5 – Bedford Place

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Mrs S Wyatt	2	5.180	Bedford Place – is dominated by bars and take-away outlets which cause litter and anti social behaviour.	Note comment	No change required
Business Solent	90	5.182	Business Solent has some concerns about the identification of this quarter as suitable for larger office development and the precise scale, nature and location of such proposals. Business Solent would observe that some existing developments have resulted in a number of unfortunate local visual impacts due to massing and density.	Only parts of the Bedford Place Quarter are suitable for major offices – fronting Cumberland Place.	Amend to explain major office areas are retained along Cumberland / Brunswick Place – see policy 2.
Business Solent	91	5.182	Business Solent has concerns regarding the absence of more specific detail and guidance on smaller scale development, the encouragement of local investment and the overall upgrading / enhancement of the built environment within Bedford Place particularly as there is no location / quarter specific policy.	Note concern particularly for Bedford Place. This is related to the nature of the plan as this would be too detailed to include (and demonstrate deliverability). Small scale development is covered by general policies in the CCAP	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				and the Characterisation Study suggests improvements for each of the quarters. We acknowledge their importance and would welcome these types of improvements.	
A. Samuels	39	5.182	The future of Bedford Place must remain in doubt. It is paradoxically both too close to and too far from the city centre, with the inevitable consequences. Adequate short term parking is a problem here.	Note concerns	No change required
A. Samuels	70	5.182	Protecting and preserving Bedford Place will be a challenge as the small shops find trading difficult. The traders opposed the business improvement district BID scheme, and are uncooperative. The office accommodation is usually of quite poor quality, and not much in demand. The only possible “change” could be a change of use at Bedford House if the City Council were to vacate.	Note concerns	No change required
Business Solent	89	5.182	Business Solent supports this broad approach to Bedford Place.	Welcome support	No change required
English Heritage	23	5.182	English Heritage welcomes and supports the design guidance as set out.	Welcome support	No change required
Cllr Noon	4	5.182	Suggest in Bedford Place; parking policies that people to stay and use the shops; planning control that encourages unique and specialist shopping opportunities.	Welcome ideas to improve Bedford Place. These go beyond what planning policies can deliver. We will pass comments on to colleagues in parking services.	No change required. Comment on parking passed on to Ken Byng (Parking Services)
Patricia Burnett	1	5.182	Bedford Place – needs to be returned to a pleasant variable shopping area; it is currently dominated by drinking and take-away areas.	Note comment	No change required
SCAPPS	38	5.182	Design Guidance – Object to additional or replacement tall buildings on park frontage.	Building heights adjacent to the parks are covered in policy 15.	No change required

## Chapter 5 – Central Parks

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Patricia Burnett	1	5.183	The parks are beautiful and kept in excellent order.	Agree	No change required
Mrs J Starks	10	5.183	Watts Park trees need to be numbered with an explanatory leaflet.	Note comment	Pass on to tree

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
					officer
Natural England	3	5.183	The value of open spaces and green infrastructure is clearly recognised; we fully support this approach to development.	Welcome support	No change required
A. Samuels	21	5.185	The removal of the bus layover in Houndwell Park would enormously improve the appearance and ambience of the Park and its surroundings.	The bus strategy will determine whether the bus layover is still needed, although it is anticipated that it will be needed. The design of the area could be improved to enhance the park.	Add to para 5.58 a ref to enhancing the Vincents Walk bus interchange.
A. Samuels	71	5.186	Houndwell Park improved as a sitting-out area. The pavilion in Hoglands Park needs renewing.	See above	See above
English Heritage	24	5.186	English Heritage welcomes and supports para 5.186.	Welcome support	No change required
Business Solent	92	5.187	Business Solent supports the overall approach for the Central Parks but also considers that there is a need to explore their possible wider use in terms of potential events (which could be run on a commercial / ticket / fee paying basis), performance space, arts space, increased use and promotion of all parks generally with flexibility and less restrictions / obstacles to use.	Welcome support	No change required. Additional comments passed on to Tim Dyer Slade
Cllr Noon	20	5.187	Make much more use of the city parks for music and other festival events to encourage more visitors to the city and make Southampton a better place for residents.	Note comment	No change required. Pass on comments to Tim Dyer Slade
SCAPPS	40	5.188	Last point under Key connections says 'Enhance the permeability within the parks', what does this mean? Reservations if this is about more paved paths.  The Objective should instead be to take steps to enhance the ability of the Central Parks to stand up to increased pressure of use.	Agree	Delete reference

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

### Chapter 6 – Delivering the Vision

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Concept Design & Planning LLP	5	6.1	Concerns raised that the CCAP is not based on the ability to deliver and that viability has not been considered (sketch up images coupled with stock precedents do not wash with lenders).	The NPPF seeks proportionate evidence on delivery. The Council is working on a number of feasibility studies. Where it is proportionate to do so, these will be informed by the types of issue that this representation raises. For some small sites or longer term sites the evidence may be informed by a more general commercial commentary. The emerging CIL evidence is also relevant. These will inform the ongoing preparation of the plan as it moves to 'submission', and will form part of the evidence base at that stage. We look forward to further comments from the full range of developers when this is available.	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	6	6.2	We understand that land values are negative in the city due to over zealous planning policies. If the council do not have any viability information we will seek to provide a sample for the information of the council in later dialogue.	See response to 6.1	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	8	6.2	As local agents and developers we understand the economics of this city and will then rebut the viability studies the council will provide.	We will consider further comments once interested parties have had the opportunity to consider and form an opinion on additional studies.	No change required
Business Solent	93	6.3	Business Solent accepts and supports these propositions in principle but believes there are a number of key areas that could be strengthened and enhanced to better define the vision for major growth and how to deliver it. Business Solent would wish to discuss these with	The support is welcome.	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			the city council and others.		
Business Solent	94	6.8	Business Solent believes partnership working and delivery to be all important. At present the delivery plan section lacks sufficient detail and substance.	Agree that partnership and delivery is vital. The Council is preparing further delivery evidence. The Plan's delivery section is inevitably an overview for a wide range of different projects which will have their own delivery / partnership programme. With this in mind, we would nevertheless welcome further specific comments about what should be included.	No change required
A. Samuels	28	6.9	Compulsory purchase should be seen as a last resort. They can result in much delay and expense and resistance and hostility, and bad feelings can exist for a long time, even after the issue has been resolved.	The points are understood. The potential use of CPO should be acknowledged, and can help inform negotiations with landowners.	No change required
A. Samuels	29	6.9	Question how far land assembly, e.g. in the Central Station area has been investigated? Without the co-operation of landowners planning can become futile.	Agree that working in partnership with key land interests is important. There is ongoing dialogue in this regard, re Central Station and other key sites.	No change required
A. Samuels	30	6.10	Query what is likely to be the Docks Plan for the next 5-10-15-20-25 years and how much of their land do they and will they require for their own purposes as opposed to letting to "outsiders".	We do not anticipate any general release of port land. However it is important to work with the Port on issues in the wider area, e.g. traffic.	No change required
A. Samuels	71	6.10	A single central unified business forum is essential and the business community must play a much more active part in city planning. The plan is weak on infrastructure, especially transportation and the relationship with the transport operations is disappointing. Funding needs much more careful calculation.	Noted. It is considered policy CS18 sets out the key transport infrastructure and policy requirements. A number of these are the subject of more detailed studies. The Council's emerging CIL provides more	No change required



## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
				analysis of funding measures.	
Business Solent	95	6.10	Strongly supports the CCMP proposal to establish a City Centre Forum for the delivery of the CCAP and CCMP. Initial informal discussions on how this might be taken forward should be continued as a matter of urgency.	Noted.	No change required
Friends of Town Quay Park	3	6.10	Welcome commitment by the council to work with local people and for local interest groups to contribute views and commitment of specific issues. FTQP are very keen to work with the council to protect and develop the heritage and usage of Town Quay Park.	Noted. See responses re policy 29 (Town Quay Park).	No change required
Associated British Ports	45	6.10	ABP welcomes and endorses the identification of the Port of Southampton as an organisation that will help the council deliver the CCAP. ABP will continue to work with the City Council to help it maintain and grow a successful and buoyant city centre (with the caveat that ABP will be unable to support or proposals that could prejudice or undermine the competitiveness of the Port).	The overall support and engagement of ABP is welcome. See also earlier responses re Port.	No change required
A. Samuels	72	6.15	The scale of growth in offices and warehouses and retail seems unduly optimistic, in view of rapidly advancing technology, requiring less office space not more, and more warehousing and less shop space in retail.	Noted. Retail – the forecasts have recently been updated to take account of the recession and latest internet trends. Offices – the forecasts are revised through the CSPR to take account of the recession and deliverability. It is appropriate that planning for the city centre is based on a aspirational albeit realistic basis. The Plans commit to the ongoing monitoring of both.	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	2	6.17	Question - Can the council then provide the evidence that there is a planning uplift from the proposal in 2012?	See response to 6.1	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	3	6.17	Question - If the site or sites do not show a planning uplift based on 2012 values can the council provide the trajectory over the 15 years to show that the site could possibly come forward for development.	See response to 6.1	No change required
Concept Design & Planning LLP	4	6.9	Question - Can the council provide the viability studies with the CIL requirements to show that the CIL does not further negate	See response to 6.1	No change required

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			development?		
Southern Water	2	6.22	<p>Object to the lack of an infrastructure policy. Additional water supply and wastewater infrastructure will be required to service the level of development proposed in the CCAP. Investment to increase capacities will be necessary at a strategic level (funded by five yearly reviews of prices) and local level (funded by new development taking into account future income). There is no recognition of the infrastructure need, contrary to para 5.2 of PPS12. There is a risk that local infrastructure required to service new development will not be delivered in time to service the development.</p> <p>Significant areas in the older quarter discharge surface water to the foul / combined sewerage system. Redevelopment should take the opportunity to sustainably dispose of surface water and remove it from the foul / combined sewerage system.</p> <p>Suggested New policy:                      'Local on-site and off-site water distribution and sewerage infrastructure will be required to serve new development. Development proposals must be accompanied by a foul drainage and water distribution assessment to identify whether existing capacity is sufficient to serve the proposal. If existing capacity is insufficient, the development must connect off-site at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as identified by Southern Water.</p> <p>In order to reduce the risk of flooding and release capacity in the sewerage system, every opportunity must be taken to remove surface water which currently drains to the foul or combined sewerage system.'</p>	Further references have been added to the Plan to address these points	
Friends of Town Quay Park	4	6.26	Welcome statement that the council will protect existing designated open space	The support is welcome.	Add: "In line with policy X
Tarmac and Hanson	13	Table 8	Object to the Council's aim for redevelopment of the wharves.	See earlier responses.	No change required
Tarmac and Hanson	14	Table 8	Object - Clear guidance should be provided to ensure the continuance of existing uses will not be affected by Action Plan policies.	See earlier responses.	No change required
Friends of Town Quay Park	5	Table 8	Welcome statement that there will be retention of an equivalent amount of open space at Mayflower Park and good pedestrian links across Town Quay Road.	The support is welcome – this is a summary of policy 22.	No change required
Friends of Town Quay Park	6	Table 9	Object - FTQP members unanimously agreed that there should be no A1, A2, A4, A5 uses on Lower High Street. There is considerable	The policy is to be deleted	Delete from Table 9

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			support for a small café or even an ice cream parlour and strong support for development of the open space to create more community use. No support for a variety of commercial uses, apart from food and drink.		
Business Solent	96	Maps 30-32	Business Solent supports the broad pattern of future development as set out in these phasing maps.	The support is welcome	No change required

## Appendix 2 – HRA and Sustainability Appraisal

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Natural England	7	Appendix 2	Whilst the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment are given in Appendix 2, the conclusions are not developed to refer back to how the development of the plan will be managed whilst a number of issues remain outstanding i.e. traffic flow generated by new residential development.		
Natural England	8	Appendix 2	The data required to make a full assessment of the CCAP's process contribution to atmospheric pollution are not available and therefore the impacts to international sites cannot be defined and monitored. Natural England's advice is that to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulation further work needs to be undertaken and this needs to be tracked against the plan so the results can influence it as necessary. In the short term consideration needs to be given to allowing the pace of development to reflect that of behavioural change to ensure that critical loads are managed.		
Natural England	9	Appendix 2	Recreational disturbance – policy 21 and 22 of the Core Strategy allows the authority to provide alternative recreational space to avoid disturbance to designated species within protected sites where necessary. CIL contributions will also allow for access management measures where necessary. We are aware that the authority is expecting advice from Natural England as a result of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation project and that it will support any recommendations as a result of the work which will help allow for the assessment of the CCAP to draw a more appropriate conclusion.		
Natural England	10	Appendix 2	Recreational disturbance – We are aware that the authority is working		

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			with Test Valley Borough Council and PUSH to bring forward the Forest Park, though there is no delivery timetable for this. To support the HRA we would advise that a clear plan and timetable for the Forest Park is adopted. If we are able to assist in this regard we would be happy to do so.		
Natural England	11	Appendix 2	Water disturbance – Natural England is currently being consulted on work being undertaken by Southern Water, which will inform a way forward in terms of maintaining the environmental base flow and guaranteeing potable water supply from alternative sources if necessary. It is not anticipated that this will be an issue at this time, though the matter should be revisited on any review of the plan.		
Natural England	12	Appendix 2	With regards to the monitoring of conserving and enhancing biodiversity, the current suggestion is to estimate the population size for key BAP species. This may be rather difficult and there is no detail the plan to encourage particular BAP species. Perhaps a better measure would be the increase in area of native vegetation which is able to provide a food and habitat resource for other species. Such a measure would allow the authority to monitor whether green infrastructure is maintained and successful in the longer term.		

## CCAP / Sustainability Appraisal

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para No. etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Natural England	1	Table 4.3	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.		
Natural England	2	5.1	Whilst the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment are given in Appendix 2, the conclusions are not developed to refer back to how the development of the plan will be managed whilst a number of issues remain outstanding i.e. traffic flow generated by new residential development.		

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

### CCAP / Habitats Regulations Assessment

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para No. etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Natural England	1	5.3.3	The data required to make a full assessment of the CCAP's process contribution to atmospheric pollution are not available and therefore the impacts to international sites cannot be defined and monitored. Natural England's advice is that to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulation further work needs to be undertaken and this needs to be tracked against the plan so the results can influence it as necessary. In the short term consideration needs to be given to allowing the pace of development to reflect that of behavioural change to ensure that critical loads are managed.		
Natural England	2	6.4.1	Recreational disturbance – policy 21 and 22 of the Core Strategy allows the authority to provide alternative recreational space to avoid disturbance to designated species within protected sites where necessary. CIL contributions will also allow for access management measures where necessary. We are aware that the authority is expecting advice from Natural England as a result of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation project and that it will support any recommendations as a result of the work which will help allow for the assessment of the CCAP to draw a more appropriate conclusion.		
Natural England	3	6.4.2	Recreational disturbance – We are aware that the authority is working with Test Valley Borough Council and PUSH to bring forward the Forest Park, though there is no delivery timetable for this. To support the HRA we would advise that a clear plan and timetable for the Forest Park is adopted. If we are able to assist in this regard we would be happy to do so.		
Natural England	4	7.1.1	Water disturbance – Natural England is currently being consulted on work being undertaken by Southern Water, which will inform a way forward in terms of maintaining the environmental base flow and guaranteeing potable water supply from alternative sources if necessary. It is not anticipated that this will be an issue at this time, though the matter should be revisited on any review of the plan.		
Natural England	5	9.5.1	With regards to the monitoring of conserving and enhancing biodiversity, the current suggestion is to estimate the population size for key BAP species. This may be rather difficult and there is no detail within the plan to encourage particular BAP species. Perhaps a better measure would be the increase in area of native vegetation which is able to provide a food and habitat resource for other species. Such a measure would		

## Officer Responses – CCAP 2012 (from start of Section 5)

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para No. etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
			allow the authority to monitor whether green infrastructure is maintained and successful in the longer term.		

## Proposals Map

Organisation / individual	Comment No.	Para / Policy etc	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
Hammerson	6	Proposals Map	Object - Hammerson has consistently expressed concerns that the defined Primary Shopping Area does not include the Quays Swimming and Diving Centre car park so it reflects the full extent of the Watermark WestQuay planning permission. Also the PSA should not cover the West Quay retail units and part of the car parks for these and for IKEA. The evidence base and PPS4 do not support their identification within the PSA. The PSA should be redrawn.	<p>Agree to amend PSA as this was initially drafted to include the site of WestQuay 3.</p> <p>Disagree with the suggestion to amend the identified Primary Shopping Area to delete the West Quay Retail Park and IKEA. There are established links between the Retail Park, IKEA and WestQuay. These units provide comparison shopping complimenting the goods offered by WestQuay and function as part of the Primary Shopping Area.</p>	Extend PSA to include The Quays car park