
DECISION - MAKER:	CABINET
DATE OF DECISION:	6TH SEPTEMBER 2004
SUBJECT:	WOOLSTON RIVERSIDE (FORMER VOSPER THORNYCROFT SHIPYARD) PLANNING BRIEF AND ILLUSTRATIVE MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT
REPORT OF:	LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
AUTHOR AND CONTACT DETAILS:	RICHARD SMITH Tel; 023 8083 2588 Email: richard.smith@southampton.gov.uk
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CONTACT DETAILS:	LORRAINE BROWN Tel: 023 8083 2011 Email: lorraine.brown@southampton.gov.uk

A. RECOMMENDATION

1. To receive the comments arising from the consultation process and to note the responses as set out in the report;
2. To endorse the Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan as Interim Planning Guidance for development control purposes as an item contrary to the current policy framework but supported by the Local Plan Review, which will replace the relevant Policy Plans in due course;
2. To recommend that Council at its meeting on 22nd September 2004 approves the Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan as Interim Planning Guidance for development control purposes as an item normally contrary to the current policy framework but supported by the Local Plan Review, which will replace the relevant Policy Plans in due course; and
3. To recommend Council at its meeting on 22nd September 2004 delegates to the Head of City Development and Economy, following consultation with the Leader of the Council, the approval of such detailed amendments to the text and illustrations of the Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan as may be necessary prior to its publication.

B. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Full Council approval is required as the report proposals are contrary to the current Local Plan but in accordance with the Local Plan Review that will replace it in due course.

The Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan are required as Interim Planning Guidance to enable the development of the former Vosper Thornycroft site to proceed in the period prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Review, which will not be before mid-2005. It is not in the interests of the community or the landowner for such a large ex-industrial site to remain vacant when there is a clear need for redevelopment. The Policy Framework implications are addressed in that section of the report.

The process has the important benefit of informing the community about the evolution of the proposals and seeking their input into them at various stages.

C. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

The alternative would be not to approve Interim Planning Guidance for the site and to proceed directly to a planning application. This would not enable the community to become so involved in the process and would lead to the planning authority having to judge the application on its own merits without having developed any brief to guide the development of the site. In practice, this would not be appropriate for a site of this size. The planning application proposals would be a Departure from the Development Plan and would be at risk of being called in by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister for decision, causing a potential delay of two years in the re-use of the site. The approval of a Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan for the site following extensive public consultation will minimise this risk.

D. WARDS /COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:

The development proposed by the masterplan is likely to have a direct impact on residents of Woolston, Peartree and Sholing and an indirect impact on the City as a whole.

SUMMARY

1. The report summarises the comments received about the Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan and provides responses to those comments. Copies of the draft Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan have been placed in the Members' Rooms and can be obtained from the author whose details are shown on the front of this report

BACKGROUND

2. In December 2001 Vosper Thornycroft (VT) announced that they had successfully bid for work on the new Type 45 destroyer that could not be carried out at their Woolston Yard because of the physical limitations of the site. They would be securing the future of shipbuilding on the south coast by consolidating in Portsmouth.

3. Following that announcement, the Council began working in partnership with VT and their planning consultants on a development brief for the whole site. The interim report from the consultants suggested a mixed-use redevelopment of the site including employment and residential uses. This was and still is, consistent with national guidance about the reuse of large industrial "brownfield" sites.
4. The site was identified by the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA), as a key strategic site and a South Hampshire priority in the Regional Economic Strategy. They therefore bought the site in March 2003 in partnership with English Partnerships (EP) and appointed a consultant's team, which includes the Richard Rogers Partnership as masterplanners. SEEDA took possession of the site on 1st April 2004 and view it as a showcase project to embody central government guidelines on the redevelopment of brown field sites.
5. On 11th August 2003 Cabinet agreed that a Cross-Party Members' Steering Group should be established to jointly oversee, with SEEDA and EP, the redevelopment of the site.
6. On 19th April Cabinet agreed the Consultation Draft of The Brief and the consultation programme.
7. Two Community leaflets have been distributed to Woolston, Sholing, Peartree and the Ocean Village portion of Bargate wards. Presentations have also been made to the Annual Conference and the Steering Committee of the South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership, the Peartree Community Action Forum and the Chamber of Commerce.
8. An excellent public exhibition was held on 8th & 9th May, which was attended by an estimated 1000 people. So far approximately 280 responses have been received.
9. It is now planned that the first planning application will be submitted at the end of 2004.

REPORT DETAILS

10. The consultees and respondents are listed in appendices 1 and 2 and the responses summarised under topic headings in appendix 3. The following are the main issues raised, cross-referenced to the main headings in appendix 3.
11. The Woolston Riverside Cross Party Steering Group, that includes the Ward Councillors, has discussed the responses.
12. A large number of the responses deal with detailed points of design that are still being worked upon by SEEDA's team of consultants. SEEDA's team have received copies of them all and will take them into account when preparing the detailed proposals and the Council will take them into account when considering the detailed proposals

13. There are some instances where suggestions are made that are negated by other respondents. It is the Council's role to seek the best balance between potentially conflicting opinions and suggestions.

Main Issue A. Transportation and Traffic

14. Much concern has been expressed about traffic impact. Work has commenced on a full traffic impact assessment that will lead to a transportation plan for the development. The outcome of this work is one of the factors that will influence the eventual capacity of the site. If the maximum predicted number of residential units and jobs produces a transport demand that is impossible or too expensive to cater for, the capacity will have to be reduced.
15. One of the ways of reducing traffic impact is to minimise the necessity for car parking usage and maximise cycling and public transport facilities, including a water taxi service. The Council's current car parking standards, published in the Local Plan Review, are in accordance with modern practice and in accordance with Government guidance in PPG13.

Main Issue B. Architecture and Urban Design

16. Some responses question the concept of tall buildings on the site, primarily because they are perceived to be either out of keeping with the context of Woolston, or would block views. There are also requests for high quality architecture. The concepts in the illustrative master plan seek to address these points. There will be better views through the site than existed all through the 20th century, as the shipyard buildings have become progressively larger. Tall buildings will frame views through the site, not block them and the new streets leading from Victoria Road will open new views.
17. Concern is expressed about the high-density nature of the development, and the implications of living in tall blocks, based upon the experience elsewhere in the area. On the other hand there is an appreciation of the opportunity to make a statement on the waterfront. In response, it is considered that an entirely low-rise development would not make best use of this waterfront location. It is essential that high-quality design standards are applied throughout.

Main Issue C. Impact on Woolston

18. Most of the points raised reflect the objective of the Brief to regenerate Woolston and integrate the new development with the existing community. The main point that will need careful consideration is the way traffic will circulate around the existing district centre and whether the refurbishment of the shopping section of Victoria Road is required.

Main Issue D. Open Space, Play Areas and Public Access to Waterfront

19. The access to the waterfront is generally welcomed, but some people expect a significant amount of green open space within the site adjacent to the river. Weston Shore already provides a substantial amount of open space in close proximity to the site and proposals for its improvement are being developed by through the Weston Shore Programme and Heritage Strategy. The Brief identifies important public footpath and cycleway links to this area. It is considered that a more urban waterfront will compliment Weston Shore. At present the river walk is suggested to be at least 10 metres wide with a sequence of viewing platforms projecting towards the river.
20. There are mixed views about whether Woolston Riverside should provide a regional destination within the City or a more local facility. It is the primary objective of the Brief to regenerate Woolston and integrate the new development with the existing community and the facilities on the new waterfront should reflect this view.

Main Issue E. Affordable Housing

21. There is both support and opposition to the provision of affordable housing. Affordable Housing is a key element of the Councils planning policies as well as being a key objective for English Partnerships. It will be integrated throughout the development, rather than concentrated in inferior locations, providing homes for affordable rent, low cost ownership. Intermediate rent, all for Southampton people and key workers.

Main Issue F. Uses-General

22. There appears to be every shade of opinion expressed about the uses on the site. There is support for the basic Masterplan principle of mixed-use development of the site, but there is also the suggestion that the whole site should be used for residential development.
23. There are some strong objections to the loss of any marine employment and the lack of clarity about how the site links to SEEDA's strategy for maritime industry across the south coast. The Council has already accepted the principle of a mixed used development of this site in order to make the re-use of a key, prominent, brown field site, viable. As the scheme evolves towards the planning application, SEEDA will be completing their economic analysis of the marine employment uses on the site and this will form part of the environmental assessment that will support the application. The Council will be pursuing with SEEDA ways in which the employment area can be maximised and used to full effect. These might incorporate shared facilities including training facilities and the development of links to the research and technology expertise at the University of Southampton and at the Institute, in developing a world class marine cluster within the economic constraints of redeveloping a brownfield site and availability of public sector subsidy.

This should be clearly set within the context of a Solent Strategy for marine employment uses on other SEEDA owned sites around the Solent. In addition the City Council will be seeking the promotion of the site for marine uses that represent key high growth sectors in line with their own commissioned report by Marintech South that set out an analysis of opportunities in the marine sector.

24. There is significant support for a marina, some respondents arguing that it would stimulate marine employment use on the site. The current view is that a marina is not consistent with a deep-water quay and large-scale shipbuilding or ship repair activity and that it is not required to stimulate demand for marine employment land. Access to the waterfront for leisure boats should, however, be facilitated if possible.

Main Issue G. Community Uses

25. There is a difference of view about whether Woolston requires any more community halls. The trustees of those that exist clearly feel that they cater well for the existing community and their facilities should be enhanced rather than a new “community hall” provided for the new development. Such an approach would be consistent with the master plan’s objective of integrating the new development with the existing community in Woolston. There are opportunities for other community facilities at appropriate locations within the site
26. There is a strong request for the provision of early years education facilities and significant local support for a library. Outline proposals have been submitted for both, plus a proposal for SCC Leisure, Culture and Tourism to manage the entire FOTC building as a centre for community, leisure and cultural activities. These will be discussed further with the people and bodies concerned.
27. The Council has developed a Sustainability Appraisal Framework, which is structured on the Community Strategy Key Outcomes and has the Council’s Corporate priorities embedded in it. This has been shared with SEEDA’s consultants and should be used as a means of assessing community projects. It should be noted, however, that SEEDA have yet to decide how much of the FOTC building will be required for marine employment use.

Main Issue H. Commercial Leisure Uses

28. There are several suggestions for commercial leisure uses, some of which may be appropriate around the public space close to the river. In broad terms there are no proposals to provide large scale commercial leisure uses on the site.

Main Issue I. Heritage Issues and Uses

29. There are suggestions for a major maritime or aviation museum and heritage centre on the site. Sketch proposals have been submitted that suggest using large proportions of the site and the deep-water quay, to display and repair historic ships. Though this will be discussed with the 'Story of Southampton' Working Party, it is unlikely that such extensive proposals would be financially viable and they would certainly prejudice the aims to provide marine employment on the site. The opportunity to incorporate more limited heritage proposals, such as a marine heritage repair facility as part of the employment mix, needs to be explored

Main Issue J. Nature Conservation and Environment

30. An Environmental Liaison Group, consisting of the Environment Agency, English Nature, Council officers and SEEDA's consultants, has been meeting for several months and discussions about the issues raised are well advanced.

Main Issue K. Sewage Works

31. Discussions with Southern Water have already commenced to establish how to deal with odour from the sewage works and its visual impact. A recent Court of Appeal judgement has ruled that odour is a public nuisance so Southern Water is under a greater obligation to act. It is certainly the objective of the master plan to mitigate both.

Other Issues. L&M

32. The comments also covered two areas that are not related to the content of the brief and master plan. Some related to the consultation process and these are useful, are noted and will be used to inform the next consultation stage prior to the submission of the first planning application.
33. The circulation of a "Demolition Leaflet" largely anticipated the comments about potential nuisance during demolition and construction. Procedures are in place to minimise the risk of nuisance and address it should it arise.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

34. The current adopted planning policy for the site is set out in policy E7 of the City of Southampton Local Plan 1991-2001:
"The City Council will safeguard the provision of existing wharves quays on the River Itchen for the import and processing of sea won aggregates, boat building, boat maintenance, and other uses reliant upon the waterside, and will not normally grant planning permission for changes of use that are not reliant upon wharfage and access to the water at the following locations:
Between Crosshouse Hard and Northam Bridge on the west bank;
Itchen Ferry hard and the northern end of Hazel Road on the east bank;
The Vosper Thornycroft shipyard

An exception may be made:

-) Where a proposal entails intensification of an existing waterfront use providing significant additional employment, of which not all the new units require access to the river and where, in appropriate circumstances new public access to the waterfront is incorporated.
-) Where a proposal entails some diversification within the site to ensure the continuing economic viability of the prevailing industrial use.”
The proposals within the Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan do not comply with this policy as they include a substantial amount of residential use as part of a mixed-use redevelopment.

35. The City Council is well advanced with the City of Southampton Local Plan Review. The Revised Deposit Version was published in February 2003. Following the receipt of representations, Full Council agreed proposed changes relating to the site on 11th August 2003.
36. The proposed changes were put before the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector during the Local Plan Inquiry held between November 2003 and February 2004.
37. The Inspector’s Report is expected to be published in late 2004 and the Council aims to finally adopt the Local Plan in mid-2005.
38. The principal policy of the site is Policy MSA25, which is subject to a proposed change. The revised policy forming the proposed change is as follows:

The Vosper Thornycroft site in Woolston is identified for a mixed-use development to include:

- Employment uses B1 and B2, to include maritime-based research and development and light industrial uses, which require access to the waterfront adjacent to and in the vicinity of the existing deep-water quay.
 - i. Residential to include a range of housing types;
 - ii. Local retail that will connect to and enhance the existing District Centre;
 - iii. Leisure and community uses;
- A high quality, publicly accessible waterfront including areas of green open space.

39. The Council supported this policy in its evidence to the Local Plan Inquiry and requested that the Inspector recommends that the policy set out as above and forming the proposed change, be adopted without further change. There were no objectors to the proposed change and therefore it is likely that the Inspector will recommend it.
40. The proposals in this report are contrary to the current Local Plan (part of the Policy Framework) and therefore require consideration by Full Council in accordance with the Constitution. This departure from the current Local Plan is supported by the Local Plan Review process, which will replace the current policy framework documents in due course.

41. The site covered by the Brief is of sufficient size and has potential for community uses to justify its inclusion in the Asset Management Plan 2004 and discussion at the Corporate Asset Group.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

42. As Interim Planning Guidance the Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan will form a material consideration that will aid the development control process in respect of this site, pursuant to Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Planning Policy Guidance note 12 (PPG12). The process of community consultation was in accordance with the guidance in PPG12 and provides the necessary policy support.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

43. Costs incurred are primarily officers' time and will be met within the existing budgets included in the Leader's Portfolio estimates.

CONSULTATION AND CONCLUSIONS

44. All respondents who have left addresses as part of the consultation exercise have received a copy of this report.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Consultees

Appendix 2: Respondents

Appendix 3: Summary of Comments Received and Officers Responses.

Documents in Members' Rooms-

Copies of all responses received

Woolston Riverside Planning Brief and Illustrative Masterplan

Title of Background Paper

City of Southampton Local Plan 1991-2001

City of Southampton Local Plan Review Revised Deposit Version

Documents available for inspection at: City Development and Economy, Floor 3
Marland House, Civic Centre Road, Southampton.

ITEM NO:C2a APPENDIX 1

Consultees

Government Office for the South East
Eastleigh Borough Council
Hampshire County Council
English Nature
English Heritage
Environment Agency
First Southampton
Solent Blueline
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
Southampton Action for Access
Hampshire Fire Services
Hampshire Ambulance Service Trust
Health Authority
Southern Electricity Board
Southern House
Sport England
Sustainability Forum
BT
Cable and Wireless
Transco Southern LDZ
Southampton and Fareham Chamber of Commerce
City of Southampton Society
Southampton Federation of Residents Association
Peartree Community Action Forum
Woolston and Weston Community Action Forum
Southampton Primary Care Trust
South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership Coordinating Group.

Internal consultees

Housing
Education
Community Regeneration
Heritage and Conservation
Planning Policy
Development Control
Social Services
City Design
Planning and Rights of Way Panel

ITEM NO:C2a APPENDIX 2

Respondents

- 1 Comment Card
- 2 Comment Card
- 3 Comment Card
- 4 Comment Card
- 5 Comment Card
- 6 Comment Card
- 7 Comment Card
- 8 Lucy Williams-Crorton, Woolston Clinic
- 9 Comment Card
- 10 Comment Card
- 11 E. Scott, Sholing
- 12 Comment Card
- 13 Mark Lampard, Sholing
- 14 Mr, R.J.Scryminger, Woolston
- 15 Comment Card
- 16 Comment Card
- 17 Comment Card
- 18 Mille Joojeah, telephone message
- 19 Comment Card
- 20 Comment Card
- 21 Comment Card
- 22 Anonymous, Victoria Road, Woolston
- 23 Comment Card
- 24 Comment Card
- 25 Comment Card
- 26 Martin & Co Estate Agents, Woolston
- 27 Comment Card
- 28 Comment Card
- 29 Comment Card
- 30 Comment Card
- 31 Comment Card
- 32 Comment Card
- 33 K. Granger
- 34 Comment Card
- 35 Mrs. J.Honeyman, telephone message
- 36 Comment Card
- 37 Sheila Smith, Williamsons
- 38 Comment Card
- 39 Comment Card
- 40 Comment Card
- 41 Comment Card
- 42 Ian Williams St. Marks Institute
- 43 Comment Card
- 44 Comment Card
- 45 Comment Card
- 46 Comment Card
- 47 Comment Card
- 48 Comment Card

49 Comment Card
50 Comment Card
51 Comment Card
52 Anonymous Victoria Road, Woolston
53 Comment Card
54 Comment Card
55 Comment Card
56 Comment Card
57 Comment Card
58 Mr. Gooding
59 Comment Card
60 Comment Card
61 Comment Card
62 A. Greenwood, Woolston
63 Comment Card
64 Roy Torode
65 Comment Card
66 Comment Card
67 Comment Card
68 Comment Card
69 Comment Card
70 Comment Card
71 Comment Card
72 Comment Card
73 Comment Card
74 Comment Card
75 Comment Card
76 James Harryman, Woolston, Southampton
77 Comment Card
78 Comment Card
79 Comment Card
80 Comment Card
81 Mrs. J. MacLellan, Woolston
82 Comment Card
83 Comment Card
84 Comment Card
85 M. Simmons, Woolston
86 Comment Card
87 Comment Card
88 Irene Hilner, Woolston
89 Harry Gunn, Woolston
90 J. Rowleather, Southampton
91 Irene Hilner, Woolston
92 Comment Card
93 Comment Card
94 Comment Card
95 Comment Card
96 Comment Card
97 Comment Card
98 Comment Card
99 Comment Card
100 M. Docker, Southampton
101 Mr. K. Andrews Woolston

102 Comment Card
103 Comment Card
104 Mrs. P. Rushford
105 Eileen Poulten Southampton
106 R. Grundy, Southampton
107 C. Martin, Netley Abbey
108 R. Taplin
109 Comment Card
110 Anonymous Woolston
111 Comment Card
112 Comment Card
113 Ms. P.J. Fryer, Sholing
114 Comment Card
115 Comment Card
116 Comment Card
117 Barbara Webb, Peartree
118 Comment Card
119 Wendy & Jason Hiscott, Woolston
120 30 Victoria Road
121 S. Gerrard, Woolston
122 A. Gerrard, Woolston
123 Comment Card
124 Mrs. M. Andrews
125 Mr. R. Andrews, Peartree
126 Comment Card
127 Comment Card
128 Comment Card
129 Comment Card
130 Comment Card
131 Hilary Cornick, Southampton
132 Comment Card
133 Steve Fuller, Woolston
134 Comment Card
135 Comment Card
136 Comment Card
137 Comment Card
138 Comment Card
139 Charles Li
140 Carson Li
141 Comment Card
142 Lyn Booth, telephone message
143 Comment Card
144 Comment Card
145 Comment Card
146 Comment Card
147 A. Wallis, Bitterne
148 Comment Card
149 Comment Card
150 D. Sivier, telephone message
151 Comment Card
152 Mrs. Fredericks, Sholing
153 Comment Card
154 Comment Card

- 155 Comment Card
- 156 Comment Card
- 157 C. Rochester, Bitterne
- 158 Betty Bondsfield, Woolston
- 159 Mrs. Ivy Dear, Woolston
- 160 Mr & Mrs Emery, Sholing
- 161 Ricky Yardley, Bitterne,
- 162 Mrs. J.M. Reed, Woolston
- 163 Neil Attenborough, Guildford
- 164 Gwyneth Beavitt, Bitterne
- 165 Mr. E. Edwards, Netley Abbey
- 166 Ian Sandbrook, Executive Director of Lifelong Learning & Leisure
- 167 Chris Wood, Ocean Village
- 168 Ian Barker, Planning Ecologist
- 169 Cindy Wolfenden, Woolston
- 170 Martin Simpson, Hampshire Fire and Rescue
- 171 Richard Evans, Woolston
- 172 Graham Andrews, Southampton
- 173 Dave Hills, Totton
- 174 Craig Chapman, by e-mail
- 175 Colin Staples, by e-mail
- 176 Brian Chapman, Southampton Action for Access
- 177 Joy Butt, Woolston
- 178 Revd. Miles Newton, Churches Together in Itchen
- 179 R. Douglas, Southern Water, Southern House
- 180 Comment Card
- 181 Mr & Mrs B Knight, Woolston
- 182 David Armstrong, Crime Prevention Design Adviser, Hampshire Constabulary
- 183 Comment Card
- 184 Laura Short, Planning Environment Agency
- 185 Graham Moody, Swanwick
- 186 Comment Card
- 187 Comment Card
- 188 Comment Card
- 189 Comment Card
- 190 Eve Holmyard
- 191 Comment Card, Sholing
- 192 Ruby Smith, Sholing
- 193 David Curtis, Woolston
- 194 Stuart Hume, Southampton
- 195 Stephen Butterfield, Humberts
- 196 Comment Card
- 197 Comment Card
- 198 Comment Card
- 199 Mr. Wild, telephone comment
- 200 Betty King, telephone comment
- 201 Mrs. Pratt, telephone comment
- 202 Comment Card
- 203 Richard Lindfield, telephone comment
- 204 Richard Ashman, Itchen
- 205 Sue Robson, Southampton
- 206 Andrew Cunningham, Peartree
- 207 Comment Card

208 Comment Card
209 Comment Card
210 Comment Card
211 Stephen Butterfield, Humberts
212 Marie O'Sullivan,
213 Tomas Vronsky, Woolston
214 Mark Prowting, Woolston
215 Peter Shorter, by e-mail
216 Mary Shorter, by e-mail
217 Stephen Blyth, Hampshire County Council
218 Sarah Killworth, Woolston
219 Janine Berndt, by e-mail
220 Mary South, by e-mail
221 Martin Petch, Tram 57 Project
222 Jerry Lewis, by e-mail
223 Chris Wood, Ocean Village
224 Sue Robson, Woolston
225 Graham Steaggles, English
226 Dudley Brown, Harbrown Ltd., Ryde, Isle of Wight
227 T.J. Warren, C.M.C. Ltd., Woolston
228 Peter Davies, Jubilee Sailing Trust
229 Comment Card
230 Comment Card
231 Comment Card
232 P. Emery
233 Comment Card
234 Comment Card
235 Comment Card
236 M. Jay
237 Comment Card
238 Comment Card
239 Comment Card
240 Comment Card
241 Comment Card
242 Comment Card
243 Comment Card
244 Comment Card
245 Comment Card
246 Comment Card
247 A. Coppin, Woolston
248 Comment Card
249 K. Trundell, Woolston.
250 Comment Card
251 Comment Card
252 Comment Card
253 Comment Card
254 Barry Aldred, St. Mark's Institute Trust,
256 Kenneth Gamson, Southampton
257 Comment Card
258 Comment Card
259 Doug Huggins, Sholing
260 Bruce Hartnell, Churches Together in Itchen
261 Derek Bound, City of Southampton Society

- 262 Alex Templeton, Southampton Sustainability Forum
- 263 Leon Gee, by e-mail
- 264 Mary Makinson
- 265 Comment Card
- 266 Mrs. G.C. Moody
- 267 Comment Card
- 268 Comment Card
- 269 Comment Card
- 270 Comment Card
- 271 Helen Miller, Woolston
- 272 Catherine Wright, Southampton and Fareham Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- 273 Kim Adams, Peter Symonds College
- 274 David Ockwell, Woolston
- 275 Maxine Kirk. telephone comment
- 276 Comment Card
- 277 British Marine Federation
- 278 Southampton and Fareham Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- 279 D Baldwin Libraries Arts and Heritage Manager
- 280 Marine South East

Summary of Comments Received and Officers Responses.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
A. TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC			
1	3, 7, 10, 11, 23, 49, 50, 52, 68, 71, 77, 90, 92, 98, 101, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 137, 146, 150, 162, 164, 189, 194, 218,225	Traffic is already very heavy in the area. How will this be resolved if more people are living and working in the area? There is already a need for a pedestrian crossing on Obelisk Road. A one –way system should be implemented around the district centre	These comments and areas of concern will be considered as part of a full traffic impact assessment and transportation plan will be required to support the planning application.
2	274	A roundabout at the bottom of Obelisk Road / Victoria Road ought to be built before the development. The Nat-West Bank could be relocated and a new road could be built linked to the Obelisk Road roundabout.	Details of any junction alterations will be identified by the traffic impact assessment
3	83, 164	Will the charge for the toll bridge decrease? There is a need to encourage usage by the new residents otherwise traffic on nearby roads will increase	The role of the Itchen Bridge will be an important part of the traffic impact assessment.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
4	1, 52,92, 112, 119, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 134, 142, 143, 150, 186, 187, 205, 218, 259, 271	Car Parking concerns. There is a need for 2 car park spaces per household in the new development. Victoria Road should be widened to provide more parking for residents. What provision will be made for the existing parking that will be lost?	The new development will provide parking to the adopted standards. It cannot be required to deal with existing parking problems in the area. It is not intended to remove any existing parking outside the site boundary.
5	182	The parking of transport for disabled persons should, wherever possible, should be within individual garages and stores. If this is impossible then parking of vehicles should be within the curtilage. Parking should never be hidden or unsupervised and communal parking courts or underground parking will only be considered if proper security and access features are in place.	Noted and agreed
6	55	Request for a free parking area	Some parking may be required for public uses adjacent to the new waterfront, but a balance must be achieved so as not to turn the waterfront into a regional destination in a

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			manner which would conflict with the primary aim of its integration with Woolston and encourage excessive car usage
7	212, 271	There is no indication of the level of parking to be provided on the site	Once the number of residential units and the commercial floor space has been established appropriate provision for car parking can be made in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards.
8	91	The Co-op car park should only be used by Co-op customers.	There are no proposals to use the Coop car park, which is outside the remit of the Planning Brief and Masterplan as it is not in SEEDA's ownership.
9	3, 45, 54, 165, 167, 169, 213,223,258	Request for cycle lanes to connect with Hamble and the City Centre via the waterfront	Noted. This is part of the objectives for the development
10	18, 68, 69, 83, 102, 116, 127, 259, 272, 278	Support for river taxis / bus. Is this just a publicity statement to draw attention away from the increase in road congestion? Possible link to Netley / extension to the Hythe ferry. Will they be affordable?	River taxi could be an important part of transportation plan.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
11	62, 194, 218	Opportunity for the provision of additional bus facilities	Bus facilities will be an important element of the traffic assessment and the transportation plan.
12	218	A bus interchange is not necessary and will only increase traffic	Bus facilities will be an important element of the traffic assessment and the transportation plan.
13	181	Support for the diversion of the bus route.	Noted.
14	190	Why has the decision been taken, and by whom, to route public transport along Swift Road? This is a narrow residential road.	This is not proposed and no decision has been taken.
15	194, 213	Opportunity for redevelopment and promotion of the train station	All public transportation facilities will be an important part of transportation plan.
16	263	Develop the ideas for a monorail and tunnels connecting Portsmouth, Gosport, Woolston and Southampton.	The strategic consideration of rapid transit links between Southampton and Portsmouth is not within the remit of this Planning Brief, but is being considered elsewhere.
B. ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN DESIGN			
17	261, 262, 263	Support for mixed use development	Noted

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
18	225	Request for more thought given to the future character of the development and how this might evolve.	The master plan will evolve and form part of the information supporting the planning application in late 2004, which will be the subject of further consultation.
19	176	Opportunity for the site to be a flagship development for being accessibility for all and a learning opportunity for other developers.	Noted and agreed
20	225	Concern about the potential capacity of the city to take further 'key destination' developments	It is not intended that the development will be a key destination within the city. It is primarily intended as an extension of the existing community.
21	133	Query as to what is meant by 'mixed use'.	An integrated development containing more than one use, in this case employment, residential, public access to the waterfront, possible community uses and local scale leisure and retail use.
22	48	Good signage required	Agreed
23	170	Need to take into account the requirements of Building Regulations particularly in respect of Fire Service Facilities and Access for Fire Service Vehicles, with attention for taller buildings. The Fire Service will	Agreed

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		require water and the provision of fire hydrants.	
24	224	Suggestion that a panel of disabled people could be recruited and consulted on access and design issues, for both the outside and home environment	The Southampton Action for Access provides this panel and they have already been consulted and will be consulted further as the proposals evolve.
25	102	Request for a piece of public art that will brand the area.	Public art should be integrated into the whole of the development.
26	218	There should be strict controls on what can be built or altered once planning has been done, and work started, to avoid what is happening at Ocean Village i.e. things changing as work progresses.	Noted and agreed.
27	225	The visual relationship between the development and the Itchen Bridge needs to be considered.	This has been and will be, taken into consideration
28	225	Thought must be given to the space surrounding any tall blocks and should be part of a tall buildings policy for the city. Active street frontages should be a priority.	Agreed. A Tall Buildings Policy is being developed for the City centre and related sites, including this one.
29	128, 194, 231, 263	Don't ruin a potentially wonderful	It is not proposed that this

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		opportunity like what has happened to Ocean Village. Blocks of flats do little to contribute to the area. Port Solent is a successful example to follow.	development should be like either Ocean Village or Port Solent
30	84	Request for the tower blocks at Weston Shore to painted in pastel colours like Miami.	This level of detail is not within the scope of the Planning Brief. These buildings are not owned by SEEDA.
31	259	There should be no landmark buildings that would be inappropriate to the site and potential eyesores.	Agreed. Quality of design and construction is essential
32	60, 185	The site lends itself to 1 or 2 storey housing nearer the Itchen and 3 or 4 storey housing to the landward side, thus giving a good view to most. For some unaccountable reason this obvious layout has been reversed in the preliminary plan.	It is also important for the buildings by Victoria Road to respect the scale of the existing housing in order to aid the integration of the new development into the community. The suggested arrangement maximises views through the site and enhances the impact of the site across the river.
33	178	Need to keep a balance between landmark buildings and community sensitive buildings in height and design.	Noted and agreed.
34	225	Consideration must be given to views of the waterfront approach	Views of the site and from the site are an important

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		as a whole – both out to the city but also into the site. Request for some 3D modelling regarding the building heights and potential density and massing illustrated to assist the consideration of views into and out of the site.	consideration within the master plan. A model will be provided as part of the consultation about the planning application.
35	107	Request for views of the river from Obelisk Road and Weston Grove Road.	The Brief seeks to provide these, particularly on the axis of the existing roads such as Weston Grove Road, as part of the objective of linking the new development with the existing community.
36	59	Marine employment buildings will be obscuring the river view.	River views will be provided in several other locations. At present there are no river views across the site.
37	4, 5, 6, 19, 21, 25, 35, 46, 48, 52, 54, 57, 65, 66, 70, 72, 77, 80, 83, 93, 94, 98, 108, 111, 119, 122, 131, 146, 148, 149, 159, 162, 167, 180, 181, 188, 189, 209, 223,256,265,271	Concern over height of buildings and loss of river views – do not want similar landscape to International Way. There is the need to integrate the new buildings with existing area. Request for architecture to be in keeping with Victorian surroundings. Concern that high buildings will restrict natural light for existing housing.	The objective of the brief is for the buildings adjacent to Victoria Road the blend with the existing character. Detailed studies are being carried out to address the issues of daylight and wind. A repeat of the style of International Way is not envisaged.
38	212	The brief states that the overall density supports 150-200	The final amount of housing proposed has not yet been

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		dwellings per hectare however it is not clarified if this is the net site density. There is no indicative figure for the amount of housing to be included within the scheme that would provide a degree of certainty for the community.	decided so it is only possible at this stage to give an indicative range of density. The Brief is clear that high-density housing is proposed.
39	19, 151, 218	Concern over housing density	The proposals for high-density housing follow Government guidelines for the most effective use of previously developed land.
40	207	High-rise living leads to social and mental problems. People need space and privacy.	Modern designs of high-density housing can provide both space and privacy.
41	29, 261	Retain some of the existing buildings. Support for the retention of the FOTC building.	It is envisaged that FOTC building will be retained.
42	58, 59, 77	Disappointment that the FOTC building is staying – should be refurbished to a high standard in keeping with the residential surroundings. The building will be blocking river views.	It is intended to re-clad the FOTC building to a high standard so it enhances the public space.
43	88	The proposed 'focal' point appears to be away from the water but a natural public focal point would be a public jetty.	The proposed focal point is shown in the illustrative master plan close to the water, but further consideration will be given to this relationship.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
44	181	The public space should be peaceful and relaxing. A large and lively public space would introduce noise, particularly at night.	The challenge is to provide the right balance.
45	185	The proposed new dock excavation would cost a fortune and add little to the site, due to its design and it would also tend to silt up rapidly.	The new dock is proposed in the location of one of the existing slipways, limiting the amount of excavation required. Hydrological studies will be required.
46	45, 51, 172, 180, 231, 263	Request for high quality architecture for both employment and residential buildings	Noted and agreed. This is an ambition for the site.
47	172	Suggestion that the architecture could follow San Francisco Pier 39– clapboard buildings	Noted and agreed Detail designs are not being considered at this stage.
48	194	The architecture could incorporate a maritime look	Noted. Detail designs will be considered in due course.
49	194	Request for building materials other than only concrete to be used	Noted. Detail designs will be considered in due course.
50	32, 37, 50	Request for more police presence and CCTV installation	The Hampshire Constabulary Crime Prevention Design Advisor has been consulted and will be involved throughout the evolution of the detailed design
51	148, 182	Natural surveillance should be	Noted and agreed

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		maximised in the areas of public space, congregation areas and children's play areas. The position and size of street furniture and planting needs to be carefully considered.	
52	182	Developmental designs must be discussed with the Crime Prevention Design Adviser, as community safety is a primary concern.	Noted and agreed
53	175	Does not want the development to lead to increased levels of nuisance in and around the public spaces adjacent to Spitfire Court.	It should be possible to alleviate the nuisance suffered by the residents of Spitfire Court by detailed design of the footpath and cycleway routes through the site, but the residents should continue with their existing courses of action: seeking relaxation of planning conditions and trying to acquire the freehold.
C. IMPACT ON WOOLSTON			
54	6, 7, 31, 42, 50, 63, 77, 117, 121, 122, 130, 131, 136, 207, 218, 249, 270, 271	What will the impact of development be on current facilities, i.e. schools, doctors etc.	Using current pupil forecasts, SCC Education Services estimate that all primary and

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		– concern that they may be oversubscribed. Will extra funding be made available?	secondary school children likely to live in the new development could all be accommodated within the existing schools. The need for additional doctors, dentists etc. will be assessed in consultation with the Primary Care Trust and provision made within the development in an appropriate manner.
55	7, 43, 50, 62, 71, 120, 146, 218	Concerns about potential polarisation of new and old communities in Woolston – need to be integrated well	Agreed. This is a fundamental objective of the Masterplan.
56	152	The development will not fit in with Woolston village. There is already a run down high street and a lack of public services. A wasted opportunity.	The development aims to regenerate Woolston and integrate with the existing community and high street.
57	147	How will the broader area up to Mayfield Park / Millers Pond be affected?	No works are proposed to these areas. The footpath and cycle ways within the site will be planned to link with the existing network within the open spaces in the area.
58	3, 90, 137, 153, 154, 199, 240,274	Pedestrianise Woolston precinct	The shopping section of Victoria Road is close to the site and its future as a highway, which includes use

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			by pedestrians, will be considered as part of a full traffic impact assessment and transportation plan will be required to support the planning application.
59	17, 24, 91, 120, 128, 147, 199, 205, 218	Retain character of Woolston High Street, new facilities not to detract from the existing High Street – address current issues of vacant shops and old shops (e.g. Co-op)	Intention is to integrate the new development into existing community.
60	132, 218	Important to conserve a village atmosphere and improve on that. We must stop the demolition of old Victorian style houses in favour of huge amounts of flats.	Agreed. The proposals do not involve the demolition of any houses.
61	181, 276	There is likely to be a stark contrast between the new development and the run down properties on Victoria Road. Suggestion that consideration should be given to demolishing and rebuilding these.	Houses in Victoria Road do not belong to SEEDA and there are no proposals to demolish any. The development proposals will create a better environment for the houses in Victoria Road, which could lead to their renovation.
62	70, 92, 108, 189	Opportunity to improve the	Noted and agreed. The

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		aspect and amenities for existing residents.	removal of the industrial buildings will improve the aspect.
D. PUBLIC ACCESS TO WATERFRONT, OPEN SPACE AND PLAY AREAS			
63	60	Why do away with land by creating more water inlets?	The objective is to create a more natural interface with the river and the SPA than a hard concrete or steel pile retaining wall. The sea defences in this area require reconstruction and the loss of land is small.
64	3, 45, 48, 65, 81, 117, 135, 149, 153, 154, 159, 167, 169, 180, 189, 209, 218, 223, 241, 248, 256, 258, 259, 263, 265	Request for green space / gardens, and trees – request for native English trees. Request for bird boxes. Request for water	The intention is to create an urban environment to compliment the considerable amount of green open space

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		features in the open spaces.	that exists nearby at Weston Shore. Detailed elements of the design will be considered at the next stage.
65	137	Request for full disability access and a sensory garden.	Full access for disabled persons will be provided. A sensory garden could be incorporated in public space.
66	12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 45, 48, 54, 62, 67, 73, 82, 88, 93, 94, 102, 105, 108, 110, 113, 118, 131, 134, 143, 149, 153, 155, 156, 167, 178, 180, 194, 16, 165, 169, 209, 223, 227, 241, 256, 258, 259, 261, 263, 270, 272	Public access to waterfront / public right of way/recreational square/waterfront walkway (possible link to Weston Shore). Suggestions for a wide promenade (with wheelchair access) and grassed area.	Public walkways adjacent to the river with links to Weston Shore are a key objective of the development. Details are still being designed, but at least 10 metres are envisaged.
67	278	<p>It is considered that the waterfront access is limited to strolling past residential towers and so there is not an adequate exploitation of this precious opportunity to maximise access to the waterfront for the people of Southampton.</p> <p>The development of a publicly accessible waterfront lifestyle is a highly valuable City asset that the business community would support being developed.</p>	<p>The Masterplan suggests a significant, high quality river side promenade, at least 10 metres wide with several viewing points built out over the river which will link with existing important footpath routes along the River Itchen to the north and south of the site. Public accessibility should be in line with the primary objective of the Brief to link the site with the existing community.</p> <p>Opportunities to provide a</p>

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			regional waterfront destination for Southampton exist at waterfront site adjacent to the City Centre.
E. AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
68	8, 31, 62, 83, 111, 145, 153, 154, 193, 218	Request for affordable housing. Affordable housing should also benefit from good river views and not just be focused in the most unappealing parts of the site. Affordable housing should be available for people on average incomes not just those on benefits.	SCC policy is to provide at least 25% affordable housing in new developments and English Partnerships intend to provide more affordable than the policy requires, integrated into the development.
69	52, 212, 263	Will the social housing all be lumped together or spread across the site? Need to ensure a good mix to avoid creating a ghetto of rich or poor.	It will be integrated throughout the site in a variety of locations to avoid creating the "ghettos".
70	108, 202	What is the balance between low cost housing and other types of home ownership? Expressed concern over social housing integration – SCC policy does not work.	SCC policy is to provide at least 25% affordable housing in new developments and English Partnerships intend to provide more affordable housing than the policy requires, successfully integrated into the development by the use of good design
71	259	Request for rental only council	The development will provide

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		housing	homes for affordable rent, low cost ownership and intermediate rent, all for Southampton people and key workers.
72	278	If the housing is a mix of private and social housing care must be taken to get good tenants.	Noted
73	34, 51, 57, 118	Affordable housing should not be increased above the statutory requirement as it gives an unfair advantage to tenants and people on low incomes. Woolston already has a problem with crime from the local social housing estates.	SCC policy is to provide at least 25% affordable housing in new developments and English Partnerships intend to provide more affordable housing than the policy requires, for affordable rent, low cost ownership and intermediate rent, all for Southampton people and key workers , integrated into the development.
74	15	No gated residential areas	It is not the intention to develop these.
75	29	Southampton is short of 3 bedroom houses	A mix of house sizes will be necessary.
76	87	Ensure that some properties are suitable for disabled persons to live in them.	Agreed. The building of "Homes for Life" will be encouraged.
77	280	Maximising the site for residential, particularly affordable housing may prove	It is considered that there is significant demand for both private and affordable

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		unsustainable as significantly more local employment opportunities would need to be created for the estimated 3000 new residents.	residential development in the area and that the suggested mix of a maximum of 1500 residential units and up to 900 jobs is felt to represent the best balance for the site.
F USES -GENERAL			
78	262	Support for SEEDA examining the ability of the development to create permanent jobs and training opportunities for local unemployed people.	Noted and agreed
79	207	With the loss of VT there is a priority to bring employment to the area and to keep the existing shops/businesses open	Noted and agreed
80	272, 277, 278, 280	There does not appear to be any links to a strategy for maritime industry across the South coast. Apportionment of land for industry does not appear to be	SEEDA are developing such a policy and the site will be addressed in accordance with it. Economic analysis is being used as part of the continuous

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		backed up by economic analysis.	process of assessing the viability and impact of a variety of different mixes and levels of use that could be accommodated on the site. The final application will be supported by appropriate evidence.
81	263	The employment usages should provide opportunities for all skills levels.	Noted and agreed
82	41	Request to fulfil the commitment made by VT to maintain education and training inks with Southampton. This could be done in partnership with the Marine Technology Centre which already has a site in Woolston	Education and training links are under consideration and will be encouraged.
83	278, 280	The existing slipways should be retained and the GRP facility should be retained.	The slipways were designed for launching ships only and there are no facilities for hauling ships out of the water. They also adjoin the SPA. The viability of retaining existing buildings on the site has been assessed and it has been decided to demolish all except the FOTC building.
84	278	The extension of the mud north	The SPA is not being extended

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		will limit the marine employment uses	north.
85	114	Concerns that provision for exclusively marine related employment will not create opportunities for women	SCC encourages equal opportunities and this point will be borne in mind for investigation
86	48, 57, 189, 228, 259, 263	Support for marine employment. The Jubilee Sailing Trust will be seeking office accommodation in Woolston in 3 years time and it could be an anchor tenant to kick-start the marine business environment. Support for continued shipbuilding and ship repairing on the site.	Noted and agreed although SEEDA have the primary responsibility to secure the marine business tenants and must do so using sound commercial judgement.
87	177	Site should be kept for industrial purposes, possibly as a new container berth facility.	The eastern part of the City has not got the capacity to provide the necessary infrastructure for a container port. Job creation is, however, a key objective.
88	55, 198	Will there be marina facilities / leisure use now there will be no need for turning space for VT ships?	No leisure marina berths are proposed as this would interfere with the objective of using the deep water quay for marine employment rather than marine leisure use. Opportunities for small leisure craft are, however, being considered.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
89	206, 227	Suggestion for a marina complex: to provide jobs and additional facilities within the yachting industry.	See above.
90	195, 211	The Crown Estate owns the seabed adjacent to the wharf. They are interested in developing pontoons & moorings possibly in conjunction with a maritime centre.	SEEDA are in discussion with The Crown Estate about this.
91	259	There should be no marina to spoil the overview of the water for the general public.	See above.
92	228, 263	The deep water area should be reserved for visiting vessels and cadet ships of a size that are too large to be accommodated in local marinas and too small to be berthed comfortably in the main Southampton docks area. The berths should be available all year round for short periods and should not be blocked by static marine exhibits that could be accommodated in less crucial waterfront areas.	The deep-water berths are considered to be a valuable asset for the marine employment uses proposed. The possibility of using the quay will be borne in mind.
93	212	The site is proposed for mixed use, though there is no indication of the approximate level of retail, leisure and employment uses	The level of uses has yet to be determined. There will be a maximum of 1500 residential units and the provision of up to

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		sought. This would provide more certainty to the local community.	900 jobs.
94	212	Para 7.4.4 refers to relevant studies being required to justify the type and amount of retail / leisure facilities. Are these studies to address the test of need and the sequential test?	Yes
95	192	Suggested putting sand along the water's edge to create a beach	The river should be left to create its own natural environment for indigenous wildlife. A beach would not be sustainable, as it would be washed away by the tide.
96	169	A scheme similar to Hythe Pier (inscribed board walks sponsored by local businesses) could be introduced to help fund a tourism initiative.	Noted. It is not the intention to create a tourist destination, although a similar naming idea has been used at the Millennium Garden and could be used again within this site. This suggestion will be borne in mind.
97	171	Could the site be used as a permanent site for travellers?	No.
98	128, 194	Don't continue to make Southampton a place known for Debenhams, Marks and Spencer's and John Lewis	Southampton has an important role to play as the regional retail capital of the south. However this development will perform an entirely different

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			role. Large scale retail would not be appropriate.
99	157	Request for a market place in the development	There are no plans for a fixed market, though occasional specialist markets in the public space could be considered..
100	248, 263	Request for some shops on the site – small / medium shops selling newspapers, postcards, and take away drinks & snacks	There is the opportunity for some small shops on the site, complementing those in the Woolston district centre
101	174	Would like to moor a classic boat within the development and convert to residential units or holiday flats.	All deep-water facilities will probably be used for marine industrial uses. Further dredging is precluded by SPA designation.
102	39	The development should have no marine activity and be all private housing	It is considered important to maintain marine employment use on the site to provide work and wealth for the local community as well as addressing affordable and private housing needs.
103	248, 277	The proportion of the site given over to housing at the expense of marine employment is excessive.	The remediation cost of the site mean that residential development is essential to produce the opportunity to retain employment on the site
104	68	The level of vandalism in the area is already a concern. Will this increase with an increase in population?	The objective is to reduce the opportunity for crime and vandalism through good design.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
105	269	Request for a public landing stage for boats. Deep water for dropping off and picking up.	This may be possible linked to the landing stage for a river bus.
G. COMMUNITY USES			
106	144 43, 108, 218, 240, 276	In a development of this size there should be a large '106' contribution to community projects including refurbishing the existing facilities. The existing local community would benefit from inclusion and assistance from any funding available. Finance should be given towards a garden funded by the community association.	There are opportunities for community facilities within the development that will be assessed against the objectives of the community expressed through the Southampton Partnership and the South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership
107	208	Request for a riverside boating pool for the local model boat club.	This facility can be considered but might be better provided in Weston Shore adjacent to the model racing car track.
108	8, 27, 28, 31, 47, 75, 97, 108, 115, 117, 166	Request for nursery provision with indoor play facilities – neighbourhood nursery. Early years education and childcare	There are opportunities for community facilities, including nursery provision, within the development that will be

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		need to be taken into account in the development.	assessed against the objectives of the community expressed through the Southampton Partnership and the South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership
109	8, 53, 58, 75, 77, 93, 122, 134, 139, 140, 151, 153, 154, 160, 169, 178, 204, 210, 218, 219, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 259, 260, 264, 266, 267, 271, 279	Request for new library - with disability access. A library would provide the opportunity for public use on the site on a more frequent basis, and an opportunity to stay on the site rather than pass through. PC facilities, training opportunities, rooms for local use and a café should be incorporated. Easily accessible children's department required.	There are opportunities for community facilities within the development that will be assessed against the objectives of the community expressed through the Southampton Partnership and the South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership. The suitability of the site for library provision will be considered.
110	279	A proposal from SCC Leisure, Culture and Tourism manage the entire building to deliver a centre for community, leisure and cultural activities. The Centre would provide access to: Library resources for pleasure, learning, information Free access to Information	There are opportunities for community facilities within the development that will be assessed against the objectives of the community expressed through the Southampton Partnership and the South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership. These proposals will be

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		Technology A focus for community activities The history of Woolston The history of the city Food drink and relaxation Resourced by SCC and HLF.	evaluated.
111	9, 16, 76, 85, 88, 89, 143, 155, 161	Request for public slipway	This is under consideration but there are existing slipway facilities at Itchen Hard and there could be a conflict with the SPA.
112	44, 48, 54, 88, 89, 183	Request for access to the frontage to fish	Fishing can be considered, but is not always consistent with other uses of river walks. Shore fishing facilities exist at Weston Shore.
113	138	Keep the deep water bays for visiting cadet ships, etc.	The deep-water berths are considered to be a valuable asset for the marine employment uses proposed, but visiting ships are not precluded.
114	61	Request for drinking water fountains	Noted.
115	53	Request for a community arts centre	There are opportunities for community facilities within the development that will be assessed against the objectives of the community

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			expressed through the Southampton Partnership and the South Southampton Neighbourhood Partnership
116	50, 58, 122, 137, 153, 154, 169, 222, 259	More community buildings providing activities for all ages (including current Woolston youth group)	Noted for future consideration.
117	259	Request for a teenager's club	As above.
118	144	Woolston already has a large, well used community centre in Church Road managed by Woolston Community Association	Noted. Any new community facilities will compliment not compete with the existing community facilities in Woolston.
119	254	Provides details of community facilities currently provided at the St. Mark's Institute. Currently the Institute has some spare capacity however if extra facilities or additional capacity were required then a site within the development would have some advantages.	As above.
120	55	Do we need another church?	There would appear to be no need for another church in the area.
121	42	There is no need for another church as there is enough capacity at existing facilities in the area	See above.
122	148, 188	Water sports should be limited to	There are no proposals to

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		minimise the noise caused.	promote water sports. Noise will be carefully considered in relation to the residential development.
123	181	Playgrounds should be avoided. They act as a gathering place for jobs at night. Open space should be designed in such a way to deter skateboarders.	Play facilities will be required for the new residents, but should be designed so as to avoid the problems identified.
124	1, 8, 54, 61, 74, 78, 108, 113, 117, 122, 141, 153	Request for adequate play and exercise facilities (e.g. adventure playground)	See above.
H. COMMERCIAL LEISURE USES			
125	3, 4, 12,29, 30, 54, 38, 79, 93, 122, 141,151, 154, 156,158, 177, 189, 194, 222, 231, 241, 248, 263, 271	Request for water sports / sports / leisure facilities for people (roller skating, small cinema and ice rink, swimming pool - possibly on top of the sewage works.	It is not intended to cater for large scale commercial leisure uses within the development because it is considered that these would not be consistent with the primary aim of the Brief to integrate the development into the existing community of Woolston.
126	24, 9, 40, 54, 61, 122, 127, 156, 271	Affordable activities for young people – Sega park, skateboarding, ten pin bowling, sports facilities	See above.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
127	17, 18, 78, 93, 95, 48, 104, 113, 131, 135, 169, 188, 194, 258, 259, 263, 270	Request for facilities such as public toilets, seating, cafes, water front restaurant, wine bars, family friendly pub, retail.	These are all uses that could be accommodated in or around the public space, but in a manner that integrates with and compliments the existing facilities in Woolston.
128	158, 241	Request for a lido	It is not intended to cater for commercial leisure uses within the development. Such facilities are usually tidal and their provision could come into conflict with both the SPA and the deep water berths
129	135	Request for an outside auditorium for public entertainment	This is not considered to be an appropriate use for the site. Although some street entertainment could be appropriate in the public space on suitable occasions. It could also conflict with proposals for the City centre.
I. HERITAGE ISSUES AND USES			
130	48	Street names to reflect the past of the site	The Planning and Rights of Way Panel will eventually deal this with. It is a good idea and

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			is normal practice.
131	248, 259	Support for a museum / heritage centre on the site	Extensive use of the site for large museums requiring a large floor space are unlikely due to the conflict with the marine employment objections for the site. It will be further considered as part of the Story of Southampton project.
132	2, 69, 77, 113, 137, 138, 156, 169, 177	Create a new home for the Aviation Museum / Spitfire Museum	See above
133	64, 69, 77, 95, 99, 100, 108, 116, 137, 138, 153, 154, 156, 163, 165, 169, 106, 173, 185, 206, 208, 221, 267	The Small Boat Museum require a site to continue their work / maritime heritage facility, possibly incorporating workshops to foster traditional skills and generate visitor income.	See above
134	215, 216, 220, 222	Please explain why proposals for a heritage centre are missing from the current plans?	Publicity for such ideas has come from third parties, purely speculatively. See above no 131.
135	225	Possible archaeology and recording of the site should be investigated	Archaeological standard recording of the existing buildings on the site is taking place prior to their demolition, investigation will take place during site works and an oral history project is being run.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
J. NATURE CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENT			
136	16	Housing should be energy efficient	Noted and agreed.
137	68	The green areas are used by dog walkers and this will increase leading to an increase in dog mess making the areas less usable.	Noted. Appropriate safeguards will be provided.
138	103, 169	How will the artificial light at night from all the new development impact on the wildlife in the area?	Light pollution will be minimised by design
139	78, 81, 104, 116	Attractive natural areas where existing should be left unspoilt. Request for creation of a wildlife pond. Creation of a wildlife sanctuary.	This is one of the objectives of the proposals in protecting the SPA.
140	264	Request for a recycling bin nearer than the further end of Woolston car park	This is not within the scope of the Brief, but the request will be passed to City Cleansing.
141	262	The Brief should seek to guide developers in greater detail about all aspects of sustainable development.	The Councils current policies on sustainable development form part of the Brief
142	226	Move the Maritime Technology	This is not within the scope of

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		Centre to within the Woolston Riverside site. Their existing wharf could then be joined to the Aggregate Industry wharf which would give enough space to construct a modern waste transfer station to enable household waste to be transferred to the Marchwood Incinerator by river from rather than road, giving positive environmental benefit.	the Brief. It may be possible to relocate the Maritime Technology Centre to within the site, but the future of any vacated site will have to be considered carefully in accordance with the planning policies for it.
143	212	Is the scheme to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in accordance with the advice in PPG25?	The Councils current policies on sustainable development form part of the Brief and include a requirement for developers to address the issues of sustainable drainage.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
144	184	Support for proposals to retreat the current sea defences into the site. The construction of inlets and promontories will help buffer the sensitive SPA zone while providing supplementary habitats that will improve the overall biodiversity value of the site and its aesthetic appearance.	Noted. This comment is made by the Environment Agency comment and is being discussed with them.
145	184	The design of the waterfront public access should address continuing disturbance to birds by pedestrians and dogs i.e. screen planting which opens up into predetermined vantage points with interpretation boards.	Noted. This comment is made by the Environment Agency comment and is being discussed with them.
146	184	Clarification is needed into existing decisions and consents for dredging on the site. The impact on salmon populations needs to be addressed if pontoons and moorings are to be included.	Noted. This comment is made by the Environment Agency comment and is being discussed with them.
147	184	Consideration needs to be given to the potential disturbance that could be incurred on birds within the inter tidal areas due to the presence and potentially imposing outline of buildings. The design and choice of buildings may also pose a threat.	Noted. This comment is made by the Environment Agency comment and is being discussed with them.

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		Highly mirrored effect can cause fatalities due to collision.	
148	184	Green roofs are a proven yet progressive approach to mitigating the impact of development while facilitating the enhancement of biodiversity with the urban environment.	Noted. This comment is made by the Environment Agency comment and is being discussed with them.
149	225	The residential units are most likely to have an impact on the SPA	Similar to Environment Agency comments that is being discussed with them
K SEWAGE WORKS			
150	15, 25, 35, 38, 167, 218, 223, 271, 272, 278	Will the sewage works be able to cope with the additional people in the area? – the works already emit a constant smell which should be eliminated.	The effect on the capacity of the sewage works has been assessed and it is capable of coping following some modifications that are normal for the circumstances. Discussions are taking place with Southern Water to agree a means of dealing with odour.
151	33	Get rid of the sewage works and its jetty.	Current indications are that this is unlikely to be possible due to cost and the lack of a suitable alternative site. Alternative measures, including odour control and capping over, are being fully investigated.
152	48, 258, 271	Support for covering/landscaping of the sewage works. Who will pay for the alteration for	Noted. Cost will be borne by the development and/or Southern Water, subject to

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		the sewage works? The taxpayer should not pay, as they did not ask for the development.	negotiation
153	179	The development has not been taken account in the Final Business Plan of Southern Water, which covers 2005-2010. Additional water mains and rearrangement of water supply zones would be required and the developer would largely fund this. The Water Treatment Works are close to design capacity and investment required for improvements cannot be programmed until post 2010. Funding to cover the WTW would come from the developer.	SEEDA are in active discussion with Southern Water.
L. CONSULTATION PROCESS			
154	271	Why is no one from Woolston involved in the planning?	The exhibition and the consultation process were designed to highlight the

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			analysis of the site and the opportunities it presented so that the people of Woolston could become involved. All three Ward Councillors for Woolston sit on the SCC/SEEDA Steering Group.
155	20, 92	Disappointed with exhibition – nothing to take away and study, no model, no copies of the information panels	Any dissatisfaction with the exhibition is regretted. Such feedback will be used to inform the pre-application consultation process
156	112	Did not have enough time to talk and look at the information boards.	Noted. The exhibition was open for 11 hours.
157	110	Request for visual aid – model or video of what the development will look like.	Model will be provided at the pre-application consultation stage.
158	243	Support for the St. Patrick's School competition	Noted
159	212	Is it the Council's intention to prepare a supplementary planning document once the emerging local plan is adopted?	This will depend upon the progress on dealing with planning application when the final approval of the Local Plan takes place in mid 2005. If detailed consent has been granted there would be to be gained
160	259	Consultation process should include public meetings before detailed decisions are taken.	The pre- application consultation process has yet to be decided, but the exhibition

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
			was very successful and probably allowed more people to ask questions than a public meeting.
161	217, 261	The document's publication is welcomed and supported	Noted
162	26, 33, 69, 86, 213, 214	Good useful information, look forward to future plans being released	Balances out criticisms above.
163	109	Request for the analysis of public consultation and comments made to be made available.	The Cabinet Report is a public document. All respondents who provided addresses will receive a copy.
165	276	What is the timescale for the development?	The demolition will take until November 2004 approximately and the remedial works until May 2006 approximately. Building work will take a further 5-10 years.
166	36, 77, 115	Criticism of process – only one option has been produced, no choice given	Noted. However there is still considerable scope for modification.
M. DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION			
167	22	There is currently vibration from the demolition – concerns about	This response has been forwarded to SEEDA and the

Comment Number	Respondents Reference	Comments	Officers Response
		fractures to the gas pipes	demolition contractors.
168	172	Make sure the construction site is well protected by security	Agreed
169	197, 203	Construction / demolition concerns and start date? Will all the buildings be demolished?	Demolition commenced on 1 st April 2004. The only building that is likely to be retained is the Fitting Out Trades complex (FOTC)
170	96, 101, 122, 218	Concerns that demolition and construction traffic will take short cuts through residential areas. Please ensure that this traffic will only use major roads.	Demolition has commenced and traffic routing is being monitored. All the steel will be taken off site by barge. Every effort will be made to major roads.
171	112	Concerns about the environmental issues of chemicals and metals burning on the site.	All treatment of contaminated material on the site will be carried out in accordance with best practice and regulations and monitored by the appropriate agencies.
172	201	What will be the environmental impact: dust / noise?	The environmental impact during demolition and remedial works will be kept to the minimum by adherence to with best practice and regulations