

# City Centre Action Plan and Core Strategy Partial Review Consultation Statement

Produced in accordance with Regulation 22 (c) of  
the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)  
(England) Regulations 2012

December 2013



Planning, Transport & Sustainability Division

# Contents

		Page
1	Introduction	1
2	Methodology	1
3	Respondents	2
4	Issues raised in the consultation	3

## Appendices:

1	List of consultees for the Proposed Submission stage (CCAP and CSPR)	10
2	Adverts Proposed Submission stages	11

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report covers the consultation on the proposed submission plans for the City Centre Action Plan and the Core Strategy Partial Review. As the two plans are closely linked, it was decided to consult on them both at the same time. A key background document, the City Centre Master Plan, was also finalised for this consultation and therefore people had the opportunity to view three key documents for the future of Southampton.
- 1.2 This report summarises who was consulted, how and when they were involved, it identifies the key concerns and suggestions raised by those who responded. For information on the previous consultations, please see the separate Consultation Statement published at the proposed submission stage.
- 1.3 This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 22 (c) of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

## **2 Methodology (City Centre Action Plan and Core Strategy Partial Review)**

- 2.1 The formal public consultation on the Proposed Submission City Centre Action Plan and the Core Strategy Partial Review ran for a period of 6 weeks from 6 September – 21 October 2013.
- 2.2 The Proposed Submission plans and supporting documents were produced in two formats; 125 copies were distributed and made available to view (75 CDs and 50 paper copies).
- 2.3 Around 600 letters and emails were sent out informing people that the plans were available for inspection. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, these were sent to the specific consultees (with a CD containing the consultation documents) and to general consultees. The general consultees included amenity and residents groups, local business and individuals, see Appendix 1. This is in accordance with the revised Statement of Community Involvement (2013).
- 2.4 In addition to writing directly to consultees, the joint consultation on the two plans involved the following:
  - Copies of the documents (either paper copies or CDs) were available for public inspection in Gateway (the Council's face-to-face contact centre), Central Library, and the town and district centre libraries (Shirley, Bitterne, Lordshill, Portswood and Woolston);
  - An electronic copy of the documents was available on the Council's website in the Planning Policy homepages;
  - Copies of the documents were available to the general public on request;
  - A notice was placed in a local newspaper (Hampshire Independent) at the beginning of the formal consultation and online at hantsweb (<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/publicnotices.htm>).
- 2.5 A response form was produced to be used for both plans. It included

information on how the plans will be examined and guidance to help people determine whether their comments were likely to relate to legal compliance or soundness issues. Representations which did not use the form provided were also accepted.

### 3 Respondents on the CCAP and CSPR Proposed Submission Papers (September 2013)

- 3.1 The Council received written comments from 36 respondents in total; all responded on the CCAP, 5 also commented on the Core Strategy Partial Review.
- 3.2 A number of respondents had commented directly on the City Centre Master Plan. This plan however was the final version, published as a background document for the City Centre Action Plan. It was therefore decided to include comments which were originally directed to the Master Plan but still apply to the CCAP.

Type of respondent – CCAP	Number of responses
Local Authorities	4
National Agency	6
Voluntary organisations / pressure groups	4
Developers, landowners, consultants, businesses and business groups	14
Residents / Individuals	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>

Type of respondent – who also commented on the CSPR	Number of responses
Local Authorities	0
National Agency	1
Voluntary organisations / pressure groups	0
Developers, landowners, consultants, businesses and business groups	3
Residents / Individuals	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>

- 3.3 Out of the 36 responses, 5 were received after the closing date and marked as late responses. The comments made are included in the main issues table and considered in the proposed changes put forward to the Inspector.

## 4 Issues raised in the formal consultation

### City Centre Action Plan

- 4.1 The City Council reviewed the comments received on the Proposed Submission City Centre Action Plan. In light of the low number of responses, it was decided to include all the main issues raised (not to limit this table to key issues or areas of contention).

Main issues	Raised by
<p>Different opinions about the scope of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan is too long, difficult to navigate, repeats the master plan, provides inconsistent / conflicting approach and selectively quotes from evidence base.</li> <li>The Plan focuses too much on major sites and provides insufficient guidance for the whole area and smaller sites</li> <li>Additional policies are required for each quarter addressing quarter identity, smaller scale development and the overall built environment</li> </ul>	<p>Hammerson;  SCAPPS;  Business South</p>
<p>Policies and Quarter guidance should say 'will' or 'must', not 'will be expected to' or 'should'</p>	<p>SCAPPS; City of Southampton Society</p>
<p><b>Vision:</b> Omissions in the vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References to the Port</li> <li>Reference to conserving and enhancing heritage</li> </ul>	<p>ABP; English Heritage</p>
<p>The Plan is heavily dependent on development which will increase pressure on transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Southampton and District Green Party</p>
<p>The vision is not place specific and does not refer to connectivity. It should paint a picture of the future city centre its streets and spaces, who will live and work there. There should separate theme for 'great place to shop'.</p>	<p>Business South</p>
<p><b>Offices:</b> There is no justification for requiring a significant proportion of offices on the sites specified in AP 1, for this proportion being 50%, or for the inclusion of the City Industrial Park. Other sites have more potential and it is inconsistent not to include Central Station / Royal Pier. The office market is weak.</p>	<p>LaSalle Investments</p>
<p><b>Industry;</b> There is no justification for policy AP 3 safeguarding the Central Trading Estate for industry without the policy recognising that this would not apply should the adjacent mineral wharves relocate or should the football stadium wish to expand.</p>	<p>LaSalle Investments</p>
<p><b>Port:</b> Amend policy AP4 to introduce clearer tests, identify alternative solutions which have less impact on the Port and - broaden out policy to any development proposal on a wider range of sites which might affect the Port or the access to the Port.</p>	<p>ABP</p>

Main issues	Raised by
<p>Amend the supporting text to better describe the Port, its access and relevant policies affecting it; clarify the interpretation of policy AP 4; and address views of the Port (these comments also apply to the design and relevant site specific policies).</p> <p>For all relevant quarter descriptions and site policies, add a reference to the proximity of the Port and the strategic / secondary road routes to the Port; not adversely impacting on the Port and maintaining appropriate access to the Port Design guidance: add reference to not adversely impacting on Port</p>	
<p>Policy and text have swung too far towards supporting the Port. Detailed amendments proposed.</p>	Business South
<p>The whole of the Eastern Docks should be included within the city centre boundary in order to provide policy guidance for redevelopment should part of the docks be released.</p>	Simon Hill; SCAPPS; City of Southampton Society
<p><b>Retail:</b> Different opinions raised about shift westwards; suggesting either more flexibility in secondary retail frontages where retail uses will diminish or restoring the east-west balance of the centre and the attractiveness and vitality of more traditional shopping areas</p>	LaSalle Investment; Business South
<p>Concerns that the retail figures are too high and do not reflect retail trends e.g. the internet and threaten the existing Primary Shopping Area</p>	Hammerson; Solent LEP; Catherine Wright
<p>Need for flexibility within primary retail frontage including an 'exceptions test' to allow three or more adjoining non-A1 units under certain circumstances</p> <p>Need for flexibility about retail expansion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In area – to include Western Gateway which could take relocated car based bulk shopping and West Quay Shopping Centre multi storey car park</li> <li>• Over time - with regular monitoring due to difficulties predicting beyond 5 years ahead</li> <li>• In size – major retail should be 1,000 sqm or larger instead of 750 sqm</li> </ul>	<p>Hammerson: Aviva</p> <p>LaSalle Investment; Hammerson;</p> <p>Aviva;</p> <p>LaSalle Investment</p>
<p>There should be no policy presumption outside the existing PSA in the 'Area of Search'</p>	Hammerson
<p>Concerns about restrictions on convenience retail</p>	LaSalle Investments; Hammerson
<p>Suggestions of further uses lacking in the city centre (discovery centre theatre, conference facilities)</p>	Alec Samuels

Main issues	Raised by
<b>Night Time Economy:</b> Need to extend Royal Pier zone to include site with development potential on Town Quay road	Henderson Global Investors and Berwick Hill Properties
There is a conflict between Leisure World late night hub designation in Western Gateway and plans to secure mixed use redevelopment including residential uses – designation should be removed	LaSalle Investments
Concern raised about 3am opening hours at Royal Pier Waterfront and potential damage to Town Quay Park as they leave the hub	Friends of Town Quay Park - Late rep
<b>Residential:</b> Request to change figures and location of symbol for Royal Pier Waterfront	Morgan Sindall
Additional housing site proposed on 5-7 Town Quay road	Henderson Global Investors and Berwick Hill Properties
Concern about the use of prime city centre sites for student housing	Alec Samuels
<b>Open Space:</b> There is concern regarding the impact the proposed scale of development and level of activity will have on limited green space provision, in particular Central Parks. New policy proposed.	SCAPPS
The lack of open space within Solent University means that the students are using the Central Parks, overusing them, and this is a serious risk.	Alec Samuels
<b>Water</b> - Additional policy required to secure the necessary improvements to local water supply / waste water infrastructure.	Southern Water
It is likely water infrastructure will be required for the level of development and SW consider should the need arise, these special circumstances would apply for water infrastructure. Specific wording proposed.	Southern Water
<b>Ecology:</b> Need to clarify that mitigation measures will be required. Additional certainty required that a detailed programme of mitigation measures will be prepared.	Natural England
<b>Design / Tall Buildings:</b> Tall buildings should be defined as significantly taller than their surrounding context instead of over 5 storeys and there should be a separate tall buildings or skyline SPD	Business South

Main issues	Raised by
Tall buildings should not surround the Central Parks and changes should be made to the map to delete designation around parks in St Marys quarter where policy restricts tall buildings	City of Southampton Society; SCAPPS
Clarification requested about strategic views and the Port and across Watermark WestQuay	ABP; Hammerson
<b>Transport / Streets and Spaces:</b> Policies AP18 and AP19 should clearly cross refer to the policy approach for the Port. The importance of the strategic and secondary routes to the Port should be clearly identified.	ABP
The importance of the Port (globally) and city centre (sub regionally), and of sustainable development, is acknowledged. Should be greater reference to vehicular access.	Solent LEP
In light of growth agenda, and to maintain competitiveness, policy should maintain current road capacity and access to retail destinations	Aviva
Support principles but there should be more detail on how these measures will be implemented.	Business South
Concerned about identifying secondary access to the Port.	City of Southampton Society; Business South
Comments proposing specific transport measures / modes (e.g. trams, monorail, park and ride, bus station, car sharing, etc)	Various
The strategic links should be identified as indicative	Hammerson
<b>Quarters / Sites – General:</b> There should be a policy for each quarter.	Business South
Cross references required to the Port (see Port comments)	ABP
References to retail development in site allocations should be consistent	Hammerson
<b>MDZ Overarching policies:</b> Refer to integrating with all surrounding areas. References to the Port should apply to all road remodelling, not just West Quay Road. Introduce reference to safety / security of Port. Cross refer to Port (see Port section).	ABP
Existing road capacity to the West Quay Retail Park should be maintained.	Aviva
The MDZ policies should be relocated to the relevant quarter polices.	Business South



Main issues	Raised by
<b>Station Quarter:</b> Cross refer to Port and amend references to Port views (see Port section).	ABP
Retail development should be truly ancillary or meet the impact / sequential tests	Hammerson
Blechynden Terrace open space should be retained.	SCAPPS; City of Southampton Society
<b>Western Gateway:</b> Cross refer to Port and amend references to Port views (see Port section). Delete references to creating the potential for a connection to a waterfront destination at the cruise line terminal. Delete reference to narrowing of carriageways and strategic pedestrian link along West Quay Road. Amend references to the potential for development and description of the area.	ABP
Support reference to residential uses, but more flexibility should be introduced in terms of its relationship to the Port. Residential uses should not be restricted to West Quay Road. Should recognise the potential to accommodate 'large footprint' retail uses. (See comments on offices).	LaSalle Investments
The site provides the opportunity to reconnect with the waterfront, introduce biodiversity and improve walking / cycling infrastructure.	Southampton and District Green Party
<b>Royal Pier Waterfront:</b> Cross refer to Port (see Port section). Amend description of port access to dock gate.	ABP
Royal Pier should be included in the MDZ	Morgan Sindall
Concerns about the design of the scheme; loss of waterfront and visual connection to the water loss of waterfront views landmark building on the end of Royal Pier, casino, loss of pier, exclusion of Town Quay from site boundary and inclusion of a marina	Various
Request for further clarity about the land reclamation and impact on the Port	Environment Agency; ABP; New Forest District Council
Corrections to site and quarter boundaries and request that quarter is expanded to include site with development potential on Town Quay road	ABP; Henderson Global Investors and Berwick Hill Properties
Redevelopment should improve ferry facilities	New Forest District Council; Hythe and Dibden Parish Council; and Isle of Wight council

Main issues	Raised by
<b>Heart of the City:</b> Requests to retain 1950s stone clad buildings and to replace the ribbon development with imaginative architecture	Alex Lawrence; Southampton and District Green Party
<b>Itchen Riverside:</b> There should be policy guidance for the whole quarter, not just Town Depot	LaSalle Investments
This area offers a major opportunity to reconnect the city to the waterfront and introduce spaces for wildlife.	Southampton and District Green Party
<b>Old Town:</b> Lower High Street policy should not be deleted	City of Southampton Society
<b>Fruit &amp; Veg Market:</b> Policy AP 28 has little relevance to land on the western side of Map 26. There is clear overlap between the Fruit and Veg market area and the Holyrood / Queens Park area and it would be helpful to be clear how this link could be redeveloped in the long term. Current development goals for the Old Town do not mention any preferred land use proposals for Orchard Place.	1865 Club – late rep
AP 28 does not carry through the City Centre Master Plan's leisure and night time economy theme of mixed uses and a thriving mixed economy. The plan should be changed to clarify what land uses will be encouraged and how different uses can be planned and managed to co-exist.	1865 Club – late rep
The 1865 club has existed for 30 years and should be recognised with policies that encourage job creation and business expansion and which facilitates businesses to migrate to another part of the city when current establishments are outgrown.	1865 Club – late rep
<b>Ocean Village:</b> Ocean Village was virtually thrown together decades ago. It is essential that there should be a much greater emphasis on creating a seamless link and a meaningful connection with the waterfront and the historical configuration of the area.	Southampton and District Green Party
It is unclear why the shaded development areas shown on Map 27 have been chosen and should be removed from the map or reconsidered to include all potential sites.	MDL
It is important that the wording regarding public access to waterfront and a public space note that these are conditional on health and safety and security issues. Ocean Village is private land and rights of access are not public rights, with the area sometimes being closed for events.	MDL
<b>St Marys:</b> Parks could be used as common space linking St Marys and Bedford Place	Southampton and District Green Party

Main issues	Raised by
Restriction of less than 5 storeys height on St Marys Street and old Northam Road is inappropriate and inconsistent with the tall building policy	Rabbi Meisels – late rep
<b>Central Parks:</b> New policy requiring preparation of master plan for parks	SCAPPS
<b>Delivery:</b> Further detail required on delivery working / partnership arrangements	Business South
Master plan floorspace figures should only be indicative	Hammerson
Detail mapping issues including confirmation of operational Port land and boundaries of development sites and inconsistencies noted between maps	Various

4.2 In response to comments received, the City Council is proposing a number of changes. These are split between minor modifications and main modifications. Minor modifications are factual updates; corrections; and minor changes for consistency and clarity. Main modifications affect the soundness of the plan; change the approach or involve major changes in text or maps. A table of proposed changes accompanies the CCAP.

#### Core Strategy Partial Review

4.3 The City Council reviewed the comments received on the Proposed Submission Core Strategy Partial Review and has set out all the main issues below (proposed changes are set out in a separate table accompanying the CSPR):

Main issues	Raised by
Support the presumption in favour of sustainable development	Aviva; Hammerson
The retail targets should be clarified (e.g. net or gross, completed, commitments, etc). It is inappropriate to include a table of sites. Proposals should be tested against CS1 and CS3, with proposals outside the primary shopping area complying with the impact / sequential tests.	Hammerson
Welcome the reduction in the retail targets, which should be regularly monitored.	Aviva
The retail and office targets are too optimistic	Alex Samuels; Southampton and District Green Party
Policy CS22 (biodiversity) should be amended to comply with the NPPF.	Natural England

## **APPENDIX 1 – List of consultees for the Proposed Submission stage (CCAP & CSCR)**

The list of consultees was further refreshed to reflect the new Statement of Community Involvement (adopted in April 2013) which is prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

At the Proposed Submission consultation stage of the City Centre Action Plan the Council will notify the organisations and individuals within the following 3 groups which it considers may have an interest in the subject of the proposed local plan.

- specific consultation bodies
- general consultation bodies
- residents or other persons carrying on business in the area

### **Specific consultation bodies include:**

- The Environment Agency, the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage), the Marine Management Organisation, Natural England, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587), the Highways Agency; the Homes and Communities Agency.
- Adjoining local authorities and Parish Councils
- Hampshire police and crime commissioner
- Utilities providers– e.g. electronic communications; electricity; gas; sewerage; water suppliers.
- Primary Care Trust

### **General consultation bodies include:**

- voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area
- bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the local planning authority's area,
- bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the local planning authority's area,
- bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority's area
- bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area


### **Residents and local businesses include**


- Residents associations
- Other Area – based groups (e.g. churches, local voluntary groups)
- individual businesses and residents

## APPENDIX 2 – Adverts at Proposed Submission stage

**Hantsweb** Hantsweb Home A-Z Services Contact us Help

You are here → [hantsweb home](#) → [public notices](#)

 **Hampshire**  
County Council



### Public Notices

Public Notices

**All Notices**

Search Notices

Email Updates

### Current notices

#### Your Search Results

**between**  
Sep 6 - Oct 21

#### City Centre Action Plan & Core Strategy Partial Review Proposed Submission

[Planning - Local Plan](#) from [Southampton City Council](#) in [Southampton](#), [Basingstoke and Deane](#), [East Hampshire](#), [Eastleigh](#), [Fareham](#), [Gosport](#), [Hart](#), [Havant](#), [Isle of Wight](#), [New Forest](#), [Outside of Hampshire](#), [Portsmouth](#), [Rushmoor](#), [Test Valley](#), [Winchester](#) areas.

The Council has placed the above plans on deposit for 6 weeks public consultation. The consultation period will begin on 6th September 2013 and end on 21st October 2013 (12 noon).

#### What are public notices?



Public notices are pieces of Local Government information that we traditionally placed as adverts within local papers. Now, we offer these same adverts online and in a free printed publication called the Hampshire Independent.

Find out more about [public notices in the Hampshire Independent](#).

#### I want to

- > [Search for notices](#)
- > [Get email updates](#)
- > [Subscribe to RSS feed](#)

[Accessibility options](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Privacy & Cookies](#) | [Service availability](#) | [Call charges](#)

 [Share](#) | 

Hampshire County Council, The Castle, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 8UJ  
This page was last updated on 4 September 2012. © [Copyright](#) Hampshire County Council 2013.

Full text of hantsweb public notice:

### **Current notices**

## **City Centre Action Plan & Core Strategy Partial Review Proposed Submission**

[Planning - Local Plan](#) from [Southampton City Council](#) in [Southampton](#), [Basingstoke and Deane](#), [East Hampshire](#), [Eastleigh](#), [Fareham](#), [Gosport](#), [Hart](#), [Havant](#), [Isle of Wight](#), [New Forest](#), [Outside of Hampshire](#), [Portsmouth](#), [Rushmoor](#), [Test Valley](#), [Winchester](#) areas.

The draft City Centre Action Plan sets out the policies which appear most suitable to address the issues facing Southampton city centre and guides development of key sites. The draft Core Strategy Partial Review updates part of the adopted Core Strategy. It is a citywide plan that reduces the target for office and retail development to reflect the impact of the economic recession.

This is the final chance for you to comment on these plans before they are submitted to the Government for independent examination. Any comments received will be passed onto an independent Planning Inspector who will consider whether the plans are 'sound' – if they are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

The two plans and supporting documents are available online at <http://www.southampton.gov.uk/s-environment/policy/>. They can also be viewed at Gateway (One Guildhall Square) and at the following libraries: Central Library, Bitterne, Lordshill, Portswood, Shirley and Woolston.

Representations should be made using the response form on the website (which can be filled in electronically) and sent to [city\\_plan@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:city_plan@southampton.gov.uk) or to:

Planning Policy, Planning, Transport & Sustainability, Southampton City Council, Civic Centre, Southampton SO14 7LY

*Please note that copies of all comments will be put in the public domain and are not confidential (apart from the personal data on the front sheet).*

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified of:

- > the submission of the plan(s) for independent examination;
- > the publication of the recommendations of the inspector;
- > the adoption of the plan(s).

### **Contact**

Planning Policy  
02380 917824 / 02380 833828

- > Email: [city\\_plan@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:city_plan@southampton.gov.uk)

Advert placed in Hampshire Independent local newspaper (6<sup>th</sup> September 2013):

### **CITY CENTRE ACTION PLAN AND CORE STRATEGY PARTIAL REVIEW PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS**

The Council has placed the above plans on deposit for 6 weeks public consultation. **The consultation period will begin on 6th September 2013 and end at noon on 21st October 2013.**

The proposed Submission City Centre Action Plan and Core Strategy Partial Review and supporting documents are available online at <http://www.southampton.gov.uk/s-environment/policy/>. They can also be viewed at Gateway (One Guildhall Square) and at the following libraries: Central Library, Bitterne, Lordshill, Portswood, Shirley and Woolston.

The council accepts representations by letter and by email. Representations should be made using the response form on the website which can be filled in electronically. Comments should clearly specify the matters to which they relate.

Representations should be sent to [city.plan@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:city.plan@southampton.gov.uk) or to: Planning Policy, Planning, Transport & Sustainability, Southampton City Council, Civic Centre, Southampton SO14 7LY