

**SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL**  
**EXAMINATION OF CORE STRATEGY PARTIAL REVIEW (PR) AND**  
**THE CITY CENTRE ACTION PLAN (CCAP)**

**Further Suggested Modifications**

1. At the Hearing sessions held on 31 March, 1, 2 and 4 April 2014 I raised a number of Matters, Issues and Questions which formed the basis of further evidence and discussion. During these sessions a number of possible changes to the PR and CCAP were discussed. My role is only to consider changes necessary to ensure that the plans are legally compliant and sound. In order to be sound the plans must be positively prepared, justified and effective as well as consistent with national policy. At this stage I have no reason to consider that, subject to modifications, there is likely to be an issue with the soundness of the plans.
2. Before the Hearings began the Council prepared a list of modifications that it is proposing to advertise. At the same time the Council may also wish to consider making the further modifications set out in the tables below. These reflect the additional changes that I consider at this stage are needed to make the plan sound. They should not come as a surprise as they concern matters discussed during the Hearings sessions.
3. At the end of the consultation period the Council should send the responses to me, together with a brief analysis. I will take all the representations into account before finalising my report to the Council.

**Partial Review**

Para/ Policy	Reason	Suggested change
Policy CS 1 (2) and other relevant references in the PR and CCAP	To reflect the evidence base, in particular the Retail Update	Reduce the figure to 90,000 m <sup>2</sup> comparison goods floorspace
Table 1	The time period appears as a phasing and does not reflect the "PSA first" approach or that sites may come forward earlier as economic growth strengthens	Remove the phasing from Table 1 and consider placing the table in the CCAP
Para 4.6.4	Some of the figures	This is not a soundness issue but it

	in this paragraph are hard to understand when considered against the evidence base (including the South Hampshire Strategy and Background Paper on Offices)	does need to be checked
Maps	This site, which is outside the CCAP boundary, is relied on to deliver significant office floorspace in the CCAP	Change the city centre boundary to include the Station Quarter (west of Southern Road) site

## CCAP

Para/ Policy	Reason	Suggested change
Para 4.6	Some of the figures in this paragraph are hard to understand when considered against the evidence base (including the South Hampshire Strategy and background Paper on Offices)	This is not a soundness issue but it does need to be checked
Policy AP 1	It is unclear at present which sites are expected to deliver the significant office development necessary to meet the office requirement. The Framework is clear that local plans should address the spatial implications of economic change. Only those sites that are deliverable within the plan period should be relied on	Change Policy AP 1 to clearly set out those sites that are expected to deliver the office requirement over the plan period.
Maps	This site, which is outside the CCAP boundary, is relied on to deliver significant office floorspace in the CCAP	Change the city centre boundary to include the Station Quarter (west of Southern Road) site
Policy AP 4	To reflect discussions at the hearings	Replace the policy and its supporting text with the policy and text put forward by the

		Council in relation to Issue 5
General	Ancillary retail use would not normally require planning permission.	Consider whether "ancillary" should be replaced by "small scale"
Policy AP 6	The "need" has already been identified in the retail assessment	Change the second criterion to remove the requirement to demonstrate retail need
Policy AP 6	The Framework provides guidance for dealing with out-of-centre or edge-of-centre retail development. Convenience shopping is dealt with in Policy AP 7	The last paragraph of the policy could be deleted
Policy AP 7	There is no control over changes between different types of retail use. The first part of the policy is a statement and could be placed in the supporting text	The first sentence of the policy could be deleted
Table 4	To bring the plan up to date	Consider updating the table to include 2013 completions
Policy AP 16, Bullet 4	In response to comment by SCAPPS	Include reference to the parks
Paragraph 4.162	Conflicts with Policies CS 12, AP 16 and AP 24 where the importance of key/ strategic views are recognised and should not be compromised	Consider replacing the last sentence with: "High quality development may however be considered if the strategic view is one of a number of similar views or part of an open vista which is largely retained".
Map 12: Tall buildings	To reflect the intention of Policy 17 as proposed to be modified	The Council is intending to delete one of the sections of the purple line on the map. The legend should make clear that this is indicative of where individually designed buildings could be located
Policy AP 23	The Council should consider how it would deal with a proposal to redevelop the existing industrial estate with the current policy wording	If the Policy sees the longer term future of this site in uses other than industrial, then consider re-wording the first paragraph
Map 20	There was much discussion about where the outer (river) boundary of the development site (and	Consider whether the outer boundary should be as originally shown in the submission plan. Further explanatory text or a policy criterion could be added to

	Quarter) should lie. It has been drawn more tightly in the proposed modification. However this may not allow sufficient flexibility or space to undertake construction works and permanent fixings to the river bed	explain that the boundary has been drawn in such a way as to allow associated construction activity and fixtures to the sea bed. It should be made clear that such works would require consultation with the Harbour Master and Port Authority and Port operations should not be adversely affected.
Policy AP 28	To ensure that new residential development takes account of existing nearby noise generating uses. The Council may though consider that this is unnecessary in view of the planning permissions that have already been granted	Consider whether a requirement for appropriate noise mitigation measures should be included as an additional criterion
Paragraph 5.97	To reflect the existing situation and the likelihood that the current industrial/nightclub uses will not move away until later in the plan period	Include reference to the B2 use and nightclub on Orchard Place
Delivery	To ensure that the delivery of the office and retail policies is properly monitored	Consider whether sufficient key indicators have been included to effectively monitor the amount of new office floorspace coming forward on the Policy AP 1 sites and the amount of retail floorspace coming forward in the PSA
Appendix 4	To reflect the evidence given at the Hearings	Amend table to reflect the 600 homes on the Royal Pier site

*Christina Downes*

INSPECTOR  
16 April 2014