

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

**Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination**

**PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

- Is the PR a discrete review that does not seek to revisit other matters in the Core Strategy?
- The Council has added a modification to Policy CS22 as part of the PR. Does this need to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal?
- As the Core Strategy was adopted prior to the revocation of the South East Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), is it the intention of the Council to review other parts of the Core Strategy, such as the housing requirements for example?
- Can the Council confirm that the PR and the CCAP has been prepared in accordance with statutory procedures.
- Can the Council confirm that the Local Development Scheme (LDS) has been updated and that the PR and CCAP conform with it in terms of timetable and content. A copy of the latest LDS should be added to the Examination Library.
- Can the Council confirm that the PR and the CCAP have been prepared in accordance with the statutory consultation requirements.
- Can the Council confirm that it has satisfactorily resolved the strategic cross-boundary issues identified through co-operation with neighbouring authorities and stakeholders.
- Can the Council confirm that it has fully complied with the requirements of the SEA Directive and associated regulations.
  - Is the Council satisfied that the Sustainability Appraisal Report accompanying the draft plan adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out?
  - Are those reasons still valid?
- Can the Council confirm that the PR and CCAP has been prepared having regard to national planning policy and is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

- Can the Council confirm that the PR and the CCAP has taken account of the Council's other plans and strategies, including the Core Strategy and Minerals Local Plan.
- Can the Council confirm that it has not identified any fundamental procedural or legal shortcomings in the PR or CCAP.
- Has the Council made sure that the Policies Map and other Maps within the CCAP are consistent in terms of their boundaries, their content and that they are correctly numbered?

**ISSUE 1: WHETHER THE CORE STRATEGY PROVIDES A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE CCAP PROVIDES CLEAR POLICIES TO GUIDE HOW THE PRESUMPTION WILL BE APPLIED WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE**

- Whether the CCAP takes account of longer term requirements bearing in mind the guidance of the Framework that it should preferably cover a 15 year time period.
- Whether the CCAP suitably reflects the strategic vision in the Core Strategy. Whether its objectives are realistic and achievable and sufficiently reflect the vision and aspirations of local stakeholders.
- Whether the CCAP carries forward the spatial objectives of the Core Strategy as they relate to development within the city centre.

**ISSUE 2: WHETHER THE RETAIL PROVISION IN THE PR AND THE CCAP IS JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY**

- Whether the need for additional retail floorspace in the city centre over the plan period is properly justified to accommodate the major growth necessary to enhance Southampton's regional status.
  - Is Paragraph 4.39 sufficiently clear about the objective to enhance the regional role of the city centre?
  - Does the evidence base support the proposed reduction in comparison floorspace from 130,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 100,000 m<sup>2</sup> in the PR?
    - ③ In particular are the assumptions, including expenditure growth, market share, special forms of trading, etc robust and have they been properly sensitive tested?
    - ③ Is the proposed floorspace reduction sufficiently growth orientated and forward looking?

- Whether the CCAP sufficiently recognises the importance of the car in terms of the attractiveness of the city centre as a major shopping destination and regional centre for growth.
- Whether Policies AP 5, AP 6 and AP 7 provide a justified and effective framework to guide retail development in the city centre during the plan period in accordance with national policy.
  - Does the CCAP make it sufficiently clear which key sites would meet the scale and type of retail development necessary to ensure that the required retail growth is achieved over the plan period?
  - Is the approach to the expansion of the PSA justified and would it ensure that significant adverse impacts on the existing PSA are avoided?
    - ③ Are the timings for the PSA expansion justified by the evidence base?
    - ③ In view of the “PSA first” approach is the Council confident that all of the retail sites within it will be delivered expeditiously and if monitoring indicates that they are stalling what alternative provision will be put in place to ensure retail needs are met in accordance with the “town centre first” approach?<sup>1</sup>
    - ③ Is the Area of Search clearly identified and appropriate to ensure effectively integrated new retail development?
    - ③ What safeguards are in place to ensure that the extended PSA does not result in overprovision of retail floorspace and detrimental retail impacts on the existing PSA?
    - ③ Should proposals in the extended PSA be subject to sequential and impact assessments?
    - ③ How will “retail need” be addressed in a development proposal in the extended PSA and is it a requirement that is justifiable taking account of national policy?
  - Is the approach to convenience retail development in the PSA justified and does it conform with national policy?
    - ③ Policy AP 26 envisages the future redevelopment of the Asda/ Marlands site but there is no specific requirement for future retail use to be a convenience store.

---

<sup>1</sup> See CD24, Paragraph 4.2.6.

- ③ If such redevelopment occurs what other provision is made to meet the need for convenience floorspace in the longer term?
- Does Policy AP 5 include sufficient flexibility to ensure a wider complementary offer so that the PSA retains its vitality and viability over the longer term?
- ③ Is the range of uses appropriate to secondary frontages too narrowly drawn?
- ③ Should the requirement relating to three non-A1 units in primary retail frontages include a viability consideration or other exceptions test?

**ISSUE 3: WHETHER THE OFFICE PROVISION IN THE PR AND THE CCAP ARE JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY**

- Whether the need for additional office floorspace in the city centre over the plan period is properly justified to accommodate the major growth necessary to enhance Southampton's regional status.
  - Does the evidence base support the proposed (net) reduction in office floorspace from 322,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 110,000 m<sup>2</sup> in the PR?
    - ③ Is the revised target properly justified by the evidence base, including the South Hampshire Strategy?
    - ③ Is the revised target sufficiently growth orientated and forward looking to provide a step change in office provision or is it overly reliant on past trends and recessionary growth rates?
- Whether Policy AP1 provides a justified and effective framework to guide new office development in the city centre during the plan period in accordance with national policy.
  - Does the CCAP make it sufficiently clear which key sites are required to deliver the identified need for office growth over the plan period?
  - Is the CCAP sufficiently clear about how it will achieve a high quality and accessible office quarter which provides the critical mass necessary to generate a step change in the city as a regional office destination?
  - Is the CCAP so flexible in its provisions for new office development that it has resulted in a lack of clarity and introduced uncertainty about where offices should go in order for the office growth targets for the city centre to be achieved?

- Whether the CCAP is likely to deliver the identified quantitative need for office floorspace by 2026.
  - Are the assumptions about the rates of delivery of office floorspace on key sites realistic both in the short and longer terms?
  - Is the predicted loss of office floorspace between 2006 and 2026 of 55,000 m<sup>2</sup> properly justified and robust to be confident that the office requirement will be delivered over the plan period?
  - What contingency arrangements does the CCAP put in place if key sites fail to come forward as envisaged?
  - Is there any likelihood that the longer term “reserve” sites could come forward more quickly at the expense of the key sites? Rather than providing flexibility would this result in uncertainty?
  - Is Policy AP 24 (Royal Pier Waterfront) sufficiently robust to ensure that the necessary office floorspace is delivered?

**ISSUE 4: WHETHER THE CCAP ADDRESSES THE SPATIAL IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGE IN A SUSTAINABLE WAY**

- Whether the CCAP is sufficiently site specific. Also, whether the related policies clearly set out the opportunities for development and give a clear indication of what will be permitted, when and where.
  - Is it necessary to provide additional guidance for development within individual Quarters outside of the development sites?
  - Are there any areas outside the Quarters that require specific policy guidance?
  - Is the role and purpose of the MDZ clearly set out and are its boundaries justified?
- Whether the supply of sites within the city centre are sufficient to deliver the Core Strategy housing requirement both in the short and longer term? Also, whether the sites on which this will take place are deliverable or developable and clearly identified.
  - Should there be any specific policy provision for student housing?
- Whether the CCAP addresses the parks and open spaces in a suitably positive way, recognising their important contribution to the attractiveness of the city centre and the health and wellbeing of its residents, workers and visitors.

- Does the CCAP set out an effective and coherent strategy for the Central Parks, including design guidance for development around their edges such as tall buildings?
- Should the CCAP address linkages between open spaces and rights of way within the city centre and outside of it?
- Is there potential for creation of a riverside walk along the River Itchen?
- Whether the CCAP sufficiently supports a pattern of development that facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport<sup>2</sup>.
  - Should the plan include provisions for the improvement or relocation of the bus and coach station?
- Whether the CCAP include robust and comprehensive design policies that ensure that high quality development is achieved across the city centre?
- Whether the CCAP deal effectively with the protection of important views to and from the waterfront and whether it is justifiable to include circumstances when such views could be lost or interrupted?
- Royal Pier Waterfront:
  - Is the boundary of the Quarter justified in terms of its relationship with the MDZ, Town Quay and the Port?
  - Are the proposed uses in Policy AP24 sufficiently flexible to ensure that development will be delivered effectively?
  - Is this a suitable place for a landmark building bearing in mind the requirement to protect and enhance views of the waterfront?
  - Is the expectation for residential uses unrealistically low?
- Itchen Riverside:
  - Is the safeguarding of the Central Trading Estate justified under the terms of Policy AP 3 and does it provide a development opportunity that should be recognised through a policy in the CCAP?
- Fruit and Vegetable Market:
  - Is Policy AP 28 an effective spatial policy which relates to the whole of the development site, most of which appears to lie within the

---

<sup>2</sup> NB Port issues are dealt with separately under Issue

Holyrood/ Queens Park Quarter and includes a thriving nightclub and a long standing B2 use.

- What implications would there be for the future growth of the business uses and employment generation?
- St Marys
  - Is it justified to limit the height of buildings on St Mary Street and Northam Road to 4 storeys?

**ISSUE 5: WHETHER THE CCAP WOULD SUPPORT THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH AND COMPETITIVENESS OF THE PORT IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY**

- Whether the CCAP strikes a reasonable balance between the need to deliver growth in the city centre and the need for the growth of the current and future operations of the Port?
- Whether Policy AP 4 sufficiently clear about where the balance lies and how it will be applied to development proposals in the city centre, including residential.
- Whether the requirement relating to views, including of the waterfront, the cruise liners and Solent Flour Mills would compromise the safety or security of the Port. Also whether these views could realistically be achieved taking account of the Port's permitted development rights?
- Whether all operational port land should be excluded from the Quarter boundaries.
- Whether it would be justifiable for the CCAP to include policies to guide development in the event that operational Port land, such as the Eastern Docks, became surplus to requirements during the plan period?
- Whether the remodelling of West Quay Road and the enhancement of the pedestrian and cycling environment along and across parts of the strategic and secondary port access routes are compatible with the requirements of the Port to maintain good road access for freight traffic?

**ISSUE 6: WHETHER THE PLAN GIVES SUFFICIENT GUIDANCE ON THE PROVISION OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT IS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE ENVISAGED DEVELOPMENT**

- Whether the CCAP includes robust planning for infrastructure to support the delivery of development and whether it articulates what, when and by whom it will be provided?
- Whether the plan makes sufficient provision for foul and surface water drainage to accommodate development proposed in the plan.
- Whether it necessary to include a policy to provide the context for developer contributions?

**ISSUE 7: WHETHER THE CCAP MAKES ROBUST PROVISION FOR THE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE MONITORING OF ITS EFFECTIVENESS AND INCLUSION OF FLEXIBILITY AND CONTINGENCY MEASURES.**

- Whether the CCAP sufficiently addresses how it will be monitored to ensure the effectiveness of its policies?
- Whether Annual Monitoring Review includes appropriate performance indicators and measurable targets against which the effectiveness of plan policies can be judged, particularly in relation to the office and retail provision.

**Christina Downes**

*February 2014*