

Southampton City Council- Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Summary of Consultation

Timescales

This document provides a summary of the responses received during the public consultation period for the Parking Standards SPD. The consultation was conducted in line with Southampton City Council's [Statement of Community Involvement \(SCI\)](#)¹.

A six-week public consultation on a draft version of the SPD occurred between Monday 11th July and Monday 22nd August 2011. This followed an earlier two week initial stakeholder engagement period held between the 13th and 24th of June 2011 where selected key stakeholders were invited to comment on an initial draft. A summary of responses to this earlier consultation can be found in a separate document (attached).

Consultation activities

During the formal public consultation period, the following activities were undertaken:

- A large number of printed copies were distributed by post to contacts (mostly developers, local businesses and organisations, major transport stakeholders, and residents groups and community representatives) who were previously involved in the Local Development Framework (LDF) consultation;
- A small number of consultees from this group were also contacted via email;
- Statutory consultees (English Heritage, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Highways Agency) were contacted via email - in the case of the statutory environment and heritage consultees, a formal Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) scoping/ screening opinion was sought;
- The document and associated SEA screening statement were made available for download and comment on the Southampton City Council website;
- Copies of the document were made available from all SCC-run libraries and housing offices in the city;
- The document was presented to the SCC Planning and Rights of Way Panel on Tuesday August 16th- a question and answer session was held as part of this panel meeting; and
- There was personal contact between officers developing the SPD and a number of elected members and other consultees throughout the process, to answer more specific questions.

All consultees were asked to review and return comments via post and/or email on the draft of the Parking Standards SPD provided.

A list of all organisations and individuals contacted during this public consultation is provided in *Table 2*. A total of 187 organisations and individuals were included in this consultation.

¹ <http://www.southampton.gov.uk/s-environment/policy/developmentframework/communityinvolvement/>

Consultation responses- general summary and response

A total of 15 individual representations were received at this stage of consultation. Details on individual points raised by each response are provided in *Table 1*.

We received a response from Natural England who agreed that SEA would not be required on this SPD. We did not receive any response from any of the other statutory environmental consultees regarding an SEA scoping opinion within the specified timescale. It has thus been taken that this policy does not need any further SEA work beyond the basic level of assessment required and set out in accompanying documents.

Most responses raised few issues with the content of the document beyond a small number of common complaints. Many respondents were supportive of the content of the draft SPD.

There were a few comments that the document was not easily accessible to lay person. This is a technical document and has been written as clearly as possible, but ultimately the primary audience for this document is developers and their consultants- and none of the responses from these groups raised any issues with document design or presentation.

Some alterations are required, namely making it clearer that:

- These are maximum parking standards and that developers may provide less parking than this maximum if they can justify it;
- Parking Standards for the defined city centre area will be set out in the City Centre Action Plan; and
- Parking Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) will be addressed in the forthcoming HMO SPD.

There were also several responses which questioned the redefined "high accessibility" area criteria and zones, suggesting the definition of a "high accessibility" area was too strict and that areas with as few as 4 buses per hour daytime frequency should qualify as being of "high accessibility". Our response is that in order to reduce parking provision, there needs to be a good enough level of public transport provision to make living without a car (or second car for larger units/ family homes) a genuinely feasible option for a large proportion of the population. This requires a much greater level of accessibility than 4 or 6 buses per hour (potentially along a single route only) during the daytime for the following reasons:

- A location with only 4 or 6 buses per hour may only have a bus service useful for access to city centre and to a limited range of destinations along one axis- whereas a location with 20+ buses per hour will have multiple routes and a much wider coverage of destinations that can be accessed directly without a car;
- The areas with 20+ buses per hour are on high accessibility corridors with high quality waiting and information provision, bus priority etc- this cannot be guaranteed on some stretches of lower frequency route; and
- Many 4-6 bus per hour mon-fri daytime services operate at a frequency of 1 bus per hour or less in the evening and on Sundays. This is an insufficient bus frequency to make car-free living attractive or reasonably feasible for many residents, whereas a corridor with 20+ buses per hour will still enjoy a good service frequency until late at night, and will also have a service on Sundays which still allows a good level of mobility.

It is important to note that car ownership is generally distinct from modal choice. A key determinant of modal choice is the cost and availability of parking at the end of a journey, as well as the attractiveness of competing modes. In this regard, there are many parts of Southampton where use of a car for a typical journey (eg a daytime trip from the suburbs to the city centre) is more expensive and less convenient than catching the bus, walking, or cycling, and even if a car is

available, it is expected that a high proportion of travellers will choose alternative options. However this situation still generates a demand for parking spaces in the residential areas.

Our projections indicate a slight increase in total car ownership in the years to 2026 but a reduction in the mileage each car is used over as more trips switch to alternative modes as a result of improvements in these modes and also as a result of rising fuel prices. This situation still requires us to ensure developers can provide an adequate number of parking spaces- and these increased parking standard maxima give developers the flexibility to do this.

There were also some comments that the maximum allowed parking for developments is still too low. This is despite a typically 50% increase in the maximum parking we would allow for a development. We have increased the permissible parking to enable developers greater leeway and ensure that- if they need to- developers can provide one parking space per residential unit anywhere in the area this SPD applies to, as well as increased numbers of parking spaces for larger units.

There is however careful balance which must be struck between effective use of land for development and provision of parking. It should be noted that even with permeable surfaces and sustainable drainage systems, parking areas contribute to increased runoff and flooding problems (a key concern for a coastal city) as well as being often unsightly and an inefficient use of land- a resource that is valuable and in high demand. Allowing extra parking above these levels could result in damage to the aesthetic of areas as well as increased flooding problems etc.

Therefore for the reasons stated above, we have not made any alterations to the parking provision maxima or accessibility areas plan for the final Parking Standards SPD. We have however made some detailed alterations as outlined in *Table 1*.

One area that was flagged up by several members on the Planning and Rights of Way panel was that more should be done in this SPD with regards to provision of charging points for electric vehicles. The draft SPD required developers to ensure that their parking design would enable easy retrofit of electrical charge points to all bays. This was recommended as taking the form of empty cable conduits running under each parking bay and linking to nearby electrical mains, into which at a later date electrical mains cables for car chargers could be installed without needing to dig up large areas of parking bay. Car charge points could then be installed on the surface of each bay and linked to the electrical cable now running beneath the bay.

Whilst SCC is committed to encouraging greener forms of travel, the current level of market adoption of electric vehicles is low (around 20-30,000 electric cars nationwide) and this makes it difficult to justify any requirement to provide EV charge points at time of build. However SCC are aware that the EV market is developing and growing rapidly and will keep this aspect of the policy under periodic review with an eye to making later amendments which do require provision of some EV charge points at time of build. We have also changed the text of the SPD to make it clear that we encourage and support any efforts to provide EV charge points at the time of build.

Table 1- Summary of individual consultation responses

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Southampton	Concerns raised include:	

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Pensioners Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether provision has been made for road safety 	<p>Safety aspects of parking provision are generally a topic for the Transport Statement/ Assessment and review of planning applications; however the car parking design guidance is intended to promote safety through good design.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether developers work to minimum or maximum standards 	<p>These are maximum parking standards for cars and minima for cycles- and this is clearly stated in the tables setting out the standards.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether there is provision for disabled parking spaces 	<p>Section 4.3 specifically addresses the topic of parking provision and design for less mobile people</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How situations of parking demand exceeding supply will be dealt with 	<p>The parking standards set out provide an increase in permitted parking at residential developments of typically 50% compared to the previous parking standards and set strict criteria about use of on street parking specifically to avoid situations of supply being inadequate for parking demand.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That car ownership projections are an underestimate 	<p>The information set out in Section 3 includes projections of car ownership levels which, given the increased cost of car ownership and motoring, coupled with falling incomes and higher levels of unemployment, are deemed highly optimistic by SCC. It is felt that the increased permitted parking for residential developments should be more than sufficient to accommodate these projections, let alone a more likely stagnation in demand for parking.</p>
Keith Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concerns that no parking standards for HMOs are provided 	<p>Parking Standards for HMOs are to be set out separately in the HMO SPD. The Parking Standards SPD will not set out parking standards for HMOs and this will be made clearer in the final version of the Parking Standards SPD.</p>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
R.F. George	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that the criteria used to identify a “high accessibility” area are too strict and that a ten minute interval between buses (6 buses per hour) would be acceptable 	Please see the section above titled "Consultation Responses: general summary and response" for SCC's response to comments on the definition of accessibility areas.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highfield campus is not identified as a high accessibility area despite 10 buses per hour to the city centre from this location 	Please see the section above titled "Consultation Responses: general summary and response" for SCC's response to comments on the definition of accessibility areas.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility area zones should be set to encourage reduction in car use and encourage improvement in bus services 	Please see the section above titled "Consultation Responses: general summary and response" for SCC's response to comments on the definition of accessibility areas.
Highfield Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unhappy about lack of inclusion of parking standards for HMOs 	The Parking Standards SPD will only deal with parking provision for non-HMO residential development. The forthcoming HMOs SPD will address the topic of parking provision for HMOs. Text has been added to the final Parking Standards SPD to reflect this.

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unhappy with maximum parking provision allowed- feels this value is still too low 	<p>The maximum parking standards set out in this SPD represent a considerable increase (typically in the 50% region) in the maximum parking that a developer may provide compared to the previous parking standards. Some examples: for a one-bed unit in a high accessibility area, they allow up to a 250% increase in the maximum parking that a developer may provide.</p> <p>For a two or three bed unit in a standard accessibility area, they allow up to a 33% increase in the maximum parking that a developer may provide.</p> <p>Also, the accessibility areas definition has been tightened up so that “high accessibility” areas are identified in a more realistic manner than the previous accessibility areas plan- meaning reductions in parking maxima will apply to fewer areas- and only areas with a genuinely good public transport provision- compared to the previous standards.</p>
Warren Close Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not enough consideration given to motorcycles/ scooters Concern about parking pressure around Southampton General Hospital 	<p>Section 6 sets out basic requirements for Powered Two Wheeler (PTW) parking. However because PTWs require minimal space for parking, spaces for cars can be used by PTWs, and because PTWs have rarely been the focus of conflicts or difficulties due to lack of space, the PTW parking standards are similar to that set out in the previous parking standards.</p> <p>Day to day management of parking in this area is achieved through the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) around the hospital. CPZs are not a direct topic for this SPD; however the content of this SPD should ensure that future developments do not exacerbate existing parking problems.</p>
Mark Miller	Generally welcomed the content of the document but made the following points:	

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that the criteria used to identify a “high accessibility” area are too strict and that a 10-15 minute interval between buses (4-6 buses per hour) would be an acceptable level of service to define an area as having high accessibility 	<p>Please see the section above titled "Consultation Responses: general summary and response" for SCC's response to comments on the definition of accessibility areas.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that parking standards should be tightened up if significant Travel Plan measures/ alternative transport measures are set out by developers. 	<p>These parking standards are maximum parking standards. Developers may set out a lower provision than the maximum allowed. Implementation of effective Travel Plan and other measures which reduce the need of residents/ users of a development to own or use cars may be used by developers to help justify the amount of parking they provide for a development.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle spaces standards should be written such that infrastructure provision (eg covered cycle parking, secure storage, showers, cycle lanes etc) is provided in addition to the parking spaces 	<p>It is hoped that cycle infrastructure provision beyond the basic parking spaces will be enhanced by developer-sponsored Travel Plans and sustainable travel measures. We do not feel that this Parking Standards SPD should be used to specify measures which should be set out by developers as part of their Travel Plans.</p>
<p>Cllr Terry Matthews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking Standards should force developers (particularly when adding new buildings to existing sites, eg Southampton General Hospital) to provide sufficient spaces on site to prevent overspill onto local on-street parking 	<p>Day to day management of parking in this area is achieved through the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) around the hospital. CPZs are not a direct topic for this SPD; however the content of this SPD should ensure that future developments do not exacerbate existing parking problems. This includes a new set of rules which specify when on-street parking may count towards a new development's parking provision, and when developers will be required to provide sufficient off-street parking and will not be allowed to rely on overspill onto on-street parking. Specifically no development within an existing CPZ would be allowed to use on-street parking</p>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Southampton Federation of Residents Associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unhappy about lack of inclusion of parking standards for HMOs 	<p>The Parking Standards SPD will only deal with parking provision for non-HMO residential development. The forthcoming HMOs SPD will address the topic of parking provision for HMOs. Text has been added to the final Parking Standards SPD to reflect this.</p>
Highways Agency	<p>Noted receipt of consultation document; requested that the Highways Agency be involved in discussions over any applications for developments which may have effects on their network in future</p>	<p>Southampton City Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency on identifying and minimising any risks posed to operation of the strategic road network by future development proposals.</p>
Cllr Les Harris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over lack of inclusion of parking standards for HMOs 	<p>The Parking Standards SPD will only deal with parking provision for non-HMO residential development. The forthcoming HMOs SPD will address the topic of parking provision for HMOs. Text has been added to the final Parking Standards SPD to reflect this.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If on-street parking is to count towards a development's parking provision, only the on-street parking possible along the frontage of the development should count 	<p>The rules set out where on-street parking will be allowed to contribute towards parking provision as part of a development are a considerable step forwards from the situation before and should ensure that on-street parking is not allowed to contribute towards the parking provision for a development in circumstances where there is already high pressure upon on-street parking. However at the same time there is a need to avoid excessive use of valuable land for parking in situations where on-street parking would provide adequate capacity.</p> <p>Restricting on-street parking to the frontage of the development could in some instances lead to developers being forced to provide off-street parking, wasting land and increasing runoff etc, despite on-street parking proving perfectly adequate for the level of demand.</p>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes in some instances the parking maxima are too low, and that there should be a requirement of one parking space per bedroom in many instances 	<p>The maximum parking standards set out in this SPD represent a considerable increase on the maximum parking that a developer may provide compared to the previous parking standards. Some examples: for a one-bed unit in a high accessibility area, they allow up to a 250% increase in the maximum parking that a developer may provide.</p> <p>For a two or three bed unit in a standard accessibility area, they allow up to a 33% increase in the maximum parking parking that a developer may provide.</p> <p>Also, the accessibility areas definition has been tightened up so that “high accessibility” areas are identified in a more realistic manner than the previous accessibility areas plan- meaning reductions in parking maxima will apply to fewer areas- and only areas with a genuinely good public transport provision- compared to the previous standards.</p>
Thornbury Avenue Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports requirement for Sustainable Urban Drainage System provision for all parking areas but would like to know why there is not a requirement to provide permeable paving materials to reduce runoff, as is required for non-residential development parking 	<p>Comment noted- final SPD will include an additional point stating that designers should provide permeable paving materials wherever possible to reduce runoff, as per the Residential Design Guide. This statement is also made in the excerpt of the residential design guidance included as part of this Parking Standards SPD.</p>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that landscaping/ “greening” of parking areas will be insufficient based on experience of current designs- Parking Standards should encourage better provision of greenery in parking areas 	<p>The Residential Design Guide chapter on Parking and Access (included as an excerpt in this Parking Standards SPD) does include some guidance on landscaping, including the statement in section 5.1.11: Large areas of hard surface unrelieved by trees and other soft landscape features will not be acceptable.” Designers are expected to take this requirement into account when designing parking into their development.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement in residential design guide that black tarmac should be used for parking spaces and block paving for circulation areas contradicts a later statement that states permeable paving materials should be used to reduce runoff 	<p>This statement is not contradictory: various types of permeable tarmac are available, including permeable black tarmac (see link below for an example from one manufacturer²). Block paving is also available in permeable varieties (see link below³). It is perfectly feasible to provide a porous/ permeable surface composed of black tarmac parking surfaces and block paved circulation routes. In any case, the statement in section 5.1.11 of the Residential Design Guide is a recommendation that areas which see exposure to tyres, oil leakage, etc be designed using a darker colour surface material, and also that a distinction between circulation and parking areas is made using surface materials. In this regard, there is a wide palette of permeable materials (not restricted to tarmac and block paving) available to designers.</p>

² http://www.tarmac.co.uk/products_and_services/asphalt/tarmacdry_porous_asphalt.aspx

³ <http://www.marshalls.co.uk/transform/Permeable-paving>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Test Valley Borough Council	No comments	N/A

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Neil Holmes, Quayside Architects	Unhappy that requirement for developers to demonstrate that parking provision is adequate (eg through parking surveys, trip rate & parking accumulation estimates, etc) places onus and cost on developers	<p>Through the Transport Statement/ Assessment element of the highway development control process, there has always been an onus on developers to provide evidence of the transport impacts of their development (and how they intend to accommodate/ mitigate these impacts) and this has not changed with these parking standards. Developers must make it clear that they have properly considered the parking demand their developments will generate and this should be considered from the outset of the design process. Therefore we do not accept that this is an unreasonable requirement or will incur extra effort or cost over what should be occurring at present.</p> <p>Regarding use of on-street parking, if developers wish to make the case for use of highway space for parking for their development, again they need to demonstrate to Southampton City Council that this can be done without causing disruption or creating problems. The onus and cost of doing this logically should be on the part of the developer rather than on the part of Southampton City Council as it is the developer who is making a proposal.</p> <p>The cost of carrying out parking/ traffic surveys and some basic measurement of road widths etc is minimal compared to the extra income from a site that a developer could unlock, should they be able to demonstrate that on-street parking is suitable for their proposal, enabling them develop more of their site as housing, office, etc rather than as low value parking land.</p>
	High accessibility zone criteria are unreasonable	Please see the section above titled "Consultation Responses: general summary and response" for SCC's response to comments on the definition of accessibility areas.

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
	<p>Specifying parking bay sizes is unreasonable and the bay sizes specified are too large; example vehicle sizes are smaller than the bay size specified; standard bay size should be 5m x 2.4m.</p>	<p>This proposal was motivated by the fact that the size of cars is growing due to safety legislation. Some common vehicles (eg Ford Mondeo Estate, 2010 model, 4.8m long by 2.0m wide) are the same size as a standard bay and thus may struggle to park in such a bay, particularly if an equally large vehicle is parked in the bay alongside.</p> <p>In such instances drivers may decide to park elsewhere, thus defeating the purpose of providing the bay in the first place. It is a common complaint that inadequately sized parking bays in some locations have resulted in many drivers not using parking bays provided.</p> <p>However we do agree that the proposed bay size could end up being wasteful in terms of land use and appearance and as a result, we have altered bay sizes to a more standard dimension, but for non-residential developments, have introduced a requirement that 10% of bays be sized for larger vehicles- but that these bays be located furthest from the entrance to the building.</p>
	<p>Requirement that parking areas should be constructed using permeable materials is unreasonable</p>	<p>This is not an unreasonable requirement given that provision of parking using impermeable materials increases the already significant flood risk in some areas of the city, and given that permeable materials are widely available and widely recommended for use elsewhere. There has however been a wording alteration to bring the Parking Standards SPD content fully into line with the Residential Design Guide SPG.</p>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
	<p>Maximum parking standards will disadvantage Southampton as a business centre by preventing commercial applicants from providing the levels of parking they require.</p>	<p>This consultee's response also acknowledged that developers are not keen to (and are not expected to) provide more parking than they need to.</p> <p>The maximum standards for non-residential developments are generally similar to those set out in the previous Parking Standards. Many of these maxima are the maximum we can legally allow based on the content of PPG13. We would be unable to legally increase these parking maxima even if we as a council desired it. Additionally, the setting of maximum standards is the normal method of setting parking standards- it is important that we balance the need for parking with the need for efficient use of land.</p> <p>Also, non-residential developments generally attract trips and are also generally located where there are a variety of options for access. As a trip end-point, the availability and cost of parking at these locations will have a strong influence on the choice of mode used on that trip. Providing additional (or excessive) parking would be likely to result in unnecessary encouragement of single occupancy car use, with negative effects for congestion, air quality, carbon emissions, etc.</p>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Jean Wawman, East Bassett Residents Association	The consultee questioned whether or not the car ownership trends include students, and suggested that student car ownership needs to be added to the car ownership trends.	<p>The car ownership trends provided are based on data in the DfT's TEMPRO⁴ database, an industry standard traffic trends resource. The TEMPRO data is derived from the National Transport Model which in turn takes its population data from the Census and other Office for National Statistics data sources which make up the mid-year population statistics. These population data statistics DO take into account student numbers in their term time location (please see link below⁵).</p> <p>Therefore the population and car ownership trends do account for term-time students. Additionally, we expect that-given the rapidly-falling numbers of young drivers⁶ and increasing cost of university education, we believe that numbers of students owning a car is likely to decrease (possibly considerably) in the short to medium term.</p>
	Controlled parking zones plan does not include all CPZs in area and appears to be out of date	An updated version of the plan will be provided in the final version of the document.
	Doubts that reduced parking provision at trip destinations will result in more sustainable mode choice	<p>There is a considerable body of evidence that parking availability and cost at the destination of a trip has a strong influence on the choice of mode for that trip. This includes transfer from car to cycle and walking as well as public transport.</p> <p>There is a considerable body of transport economics research which backs this up, eg that published by the Commission for Integrated Transport⁷, and the contents of the DfT's own WebTAG transport guidance⁸.</p>

⁴ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/tempro/importantinfo.php>

⁵ <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/Product.asp?vlnk=601>

⁶ <http://www.parkers.co.uk/News/Motoring-Costs/Young-drivers-priced-off-the-road/>

⁷ http://www.plan4sustainabletravel.org/downloads/cfit_background_report.pdf

⁸ WebTAG Unit 3.10.3- Variable Demand Modelling:
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/webtag/documents/expert/unit3.10.3a.php#7>

Consultee	Topic raised	SCC Response
Natural England	<p>Generally supportive of SPD, particularly the improved detail and requirements on SUDS, permeable surfacing, cycle parking, travel plans and EV charge points.</p> <p>It is agreed that this policy does not need to undergo further SEA.</p>	

Table 2: List of consultees

Please note: In a number of cases where a major property developer has been listed, we have contacted the planning consultant representing that developer to seek an opinion on the SPD, rather than directly contacting the developer themselves.

Consultee Name (if addressed to a specific individual)	Organisation	Method of Contact
Peter Court	Bovis Homes Limited	Paper letter
	Banner Homes	Paper letter
Mr Wilks	Barratt Southampton	Paper letter
	Crayfern Homes	Paper letter
Ms Parker	Hallam Land Management Limited	Paper letter
Mr Hull	Persimmon Homes	Paper letter
	WSP Consultancy	Paper letter
Mr Holmes	Quayside Architects	Paper letter
Ms Caines	Fairview New Home Limited	Paper letter
Mrs Fountain	W M Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Paper letter
Ms Cross	CGNU Life Assurance Limited	Paper letter
Mr Naylor	Kier Property	Paper letter
Ms Blunstone	Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	Paper letter
Ms Ager	La Salle Investment Management	Paper letter
Mr Bannell	Ordnance Survey	Paper letter

Ms Morton	Rokeyby (Southern) Ltd	Paper letter
Mr O'Donovan	Pressmile Limited	Paper letter
Ms Cusa	GVA Grimley LLP	Paper letter
Ms Jackson	Trustees Of The Barker Mill Estate	Paper letter
Ms Taylor	Swaythling Housing Society Limited	Paper letter
Ms Page	Morley Fund Management Limited	Paper letter
Mr Templeton	Ever Marketing Limited	Paper letter
Mr Hall	Dorepark Limited	Paper letter
Mr Hall	Wilky Property Holdings Plc	Paper letter
Mr Court	Bovis Homes Limited	Paper letter
	John Lewis Partnership	Paper letter
Mr Staddon	Lafarge Aggregates	Paper letter
Mr Zanre	David Wilson Estates	Paper letter
	White Young Green	Paper letter
Ms Cusa	John Lewis Partnership	Paper letter
Mr Hull	Clerical Medical Investment Group Limited (CMIG)	Paper letter
Mr Avery	Arlington Property Investors	Paper letter
Mr Hall	Kilmina Properties Limited	Paper letter
Mr Hall	Marina Developments Limited	Paper letter
Mr Kemsley	WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Paper letter
Mr Hansen	European Property Systems Limited	Paper letter
Ms Churchill	Atisreal	Paper letter
Mr Milner	Architectural Design Services	Paper letter
	AWD Design	Paper letter
	Banner Homes	Paper letter
Mr Wilks	Barratt Southampton	Paper letter
	BCA Architects	Paper letter
	Crayfern Homes	Paper letter

Ms Webber	Hyde Housing Association	Paper letter
Ms Bennion	Hyde Housing Association	Paper letter
Ms Donovan	Indigo Planning Limited	Paper letter
	Kings Oak Homes Limited	Paper letter
Mr Robin	King Sturge	Paper letter
Mr Culwick	La Salle	Paper letter
Mr Nash	Lennon Planning Limited	Paper letter
Ms Gibbs	Linden Homes Southern Limited	Paper letter
Ms Weaver	Level	Paper letter
Mr Waldron	Mursell Limited	Paper letter
Mr Sennitt	Orchard Homes And Development Limited	Paper letter
	Roxan Construction Limited	Paper letter
Ms Haddaway	Stoneham Housing Association	Paper letter
Ms Waddington	Swaythling Housing Association	Paper letter
Mr Smith	Terence O'Rourke	Paper letter
Mr Beck	The Luken Beck Partnership Limited	Paper letter
Mr Oldfield	Tony Oldfield Architects	Paper letter
Mr Dudman	Trant Construction Limited	Paper letter
Mr Slade	Wildern Homes	Paper letter
Mr Harris	Wilson Bowden Developments	Paper letter
	Atlantic Housing Group	Paper letter
	Go-Ahead Group Plc	Paper letter
Mr McIntyre	GVA Grimley	Paper letter
Mr Blaxland	Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Paper letter
Mr Atfield	Amsprop Estates And Harding Holdings	Paper letter
Mr Neate / Mr Quigley	Commercial Estates Group (CEG)	Paper letter
Ms Jardine	Kilmartin	Paper letter
Mr McFarland	Aldi Stores Limited	Paper letter

Mr Serra / Mr Martin	Crest Nicholson Regeneration	Paper letter
Mr Tear/Ms Hayward	RTA Limited	Paper letter
A J Nairn	Chilworth Parish Council	Paper letter
Mr C Bowden	Eastleigh Borough Council	Paper letter
Mr T Davison	Hampshire County Council	Paper letter
	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Strategic Health Authority	Paper letter
Mr P Robinson	Highways Agency	Paper letter
Ms M Bernard	Marchwood Parish Council	Paper letter
	Network Rail Southern Region	Paper letter
Ms Ives	New Forest District Council	Paper letter
	New Forest National Park Authority	Paper letter
Mr M Gordon	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Paper letter
Mr P Crew	Southern Electric	Paper letter
Mr C Kneale	Southern Water Services Ltd	Paper letter
	Strategic Rail Authority	Paper letter
Ms S Crocombe	Test Valley Borough Council	Paper letter
	Totton & Eling Town Council	Paper letter
Mrs Connell	Underwood And Redhill Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Amrit	Portswood Residents' Gardens	Paper letter
Ms Marcia Stacey	Banister Park, Freemantle And Polygon CAF	Paper letter
Mr David Brown	Peartree Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Rosalind Rutt	Trustee Of Portswood Residents Gardens	Paper letter
Mr Jerry Gillen	Bassett, Highfield And Swaythling Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Jean Wawman	East Bassett Residents Association (ebra)	Paper letter
Mr Jerry Gillen	Highfield Residents Association	Paper letter

Mr Jerry Gillen	Flower Road Residents And Tenants Association	Paper letter
Mr Jerry Gillen	North West Bassett Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Jerry Gillen	Old Bassett Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Withens	St Mary's Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Jill Starks	Bitterne Grove Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Grafton	Freemantle Community Association	Paper letter
Mr Brown	Peartree Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Ms Baker	Peartree Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Mrs Warbrick	South Front Tenants Association	Paper letter
Mr Staples	Spitfire Court Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Costin	St Denys Community Association	Paper letter
Lorraine Barter	Residents Action	Paper letter
Mrs Barker	Flower Roads Residents And Tenants Association	Paper letter
Ms Baker	Freemantle And Polygon CAF	Paper letter
Mr Wittington	Maytree Residents Link	Paper letter
Mrs Donald	Millbrook Towers Tenants Association	Paper letter
Ms Baker	Polygon Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Mr Etheridge	Holly Hill Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Tizzard	Harefield Tenants And Residents Association	Paper letter
	Harefield Sheltered Accommodation Tenants Association	Paper letter
Mr George	Herbert Collins Estates Residents Association	Paper letter
The Secretary	Lordswood Community Association	Paper letter
Miss Vaudin	Maybush And District Community Association	Paper letter
Mr Fuller	Maybush Community Association	Paper letter
Mrs Leng	Swaythling Residents Association	Paper letter

Mr Peter Wirgman	Southampton Federation Of Residents Association	Paper letter
Mrs Woodford	Bitterne Park Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Brown	Bitterne Manor Community Association	Paper letter
Mr Mundy	Fitzhugh Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Ash	Sholing Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Mr Curtis	Sholing CAF And Study Centre	Paper letter
Ms Godfrey	Freemantle And Shirley Community Association	Paper letter
Ms Jarvis	Howards Grove And Vaudrey Close Tenants And Residents Ass.	Paper letter
Mr Warwick	Upper Freemantle And District Residents Assn	Paper letter
Ms Gara	Freemantle And Polygon Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Ms Bennett	Lordshill Community Association	Paper letter
Mrs Milton	Mansbridge Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Humphries	Northam Tenants And Residents Association	Paper letter
Mrs Milne	North West Bassett Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Hastings	Old Bassett Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Harris	Federation Of Southampton Tenants Residents Associations	Paper letter
Ms Walker	Graham Road Resident Association	Paper letter
Mr Knight	Highfield Residents Association	Paper letter
Dr Smith	Hill Farm Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Gale	Newlands Area Tenants And Residents Association	Paper letter
Mrs Saxton	Redbridge Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Spiers	Redbridge Wharf And Park Association	Paper letter
Mrs Defty	Sholing Residents Association	Paper letter

Mr Davis	Waterside Park Residents	Paper letter
Ms Turley	Woolston And Weston Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Mrs Cleverly	Woolston And Weston Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Mr Patching	Townhill Park Community Association	Paper letter
Mr Robinson	Townhill Park, Bitterne Park And Midanbury CAF	Paper letter
	Weston Shore Tenants And Residents Association	Paper letter
Mrs Gates	Thornbury Avenue And District Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Johnson	Warren Close Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Latham	Bisley And Bowman Court Tand RA	Paper letter
Mr Spake	Bishops Crescent Tenants And Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Walker	Gray Beech Tenants Association	Paper letter
Ms Webber	Gray Beech Tenants Association	Paper letter
Mr Sillence	Kinloss, Cardington And Cramwell Court Tenants Association	Paper letter
Mrs Gill	Millbrook And District Community Association	Paper letter
Mrs Vickers	Milner Court Tennants Association	Paper letter
Mr and Mrs Wake	Woolston Community Centre	Paper letter
Ms Key	Westwood Park Community Association	Paper letter
Ms Store	Wynter Road Community Group	Paper letter
Mr Hennessey	CIDTRA	Paper letter
Mr Gallacher	Chapel Community Association	Paper letter
Ms Conlon	Cliff Residents Association	Paper letter
Mr Melrose	Eastchurch Close and Odiham Tenants Association	Paper letter
Ms Baker	Freemantle & Polygon Community Action Forum	Paper letter

Mrs Presland	Friends of Peartree Green	Paper letter
Mrs Gillam	Harefield Community Association	Paper letter
Ms Lawrie	Merryoak Community Association	Paper letter
Ms Kapma-Saunders	Peartree Forum	Paper letter
Mr Harper	Pensioners Forum	Paper letter
Ms Carnegie	Sholing Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Ms Harryman	Waterside Park Residents Association	Paper letter
Ms Berry	Weston Court Community Group	Paper letter
Mr Hitchcox	Woolston & Weston Community Action Forum	Paper letter
Mr G Hall	MDL Developments Limited	Email
Mr A McIntyre	GVA Grimley	Email
	Development Securities Plc	Email
	Linden Homes Southern Limited	Email
	Hammersons UK Properties Plc	Email
	McCarthy And Stone	Email
	Armill Properties	Email
Mr M Holmes	Madison Property Developments Limited	Email
Mr R Hull	RMG Properties Limited	Email
Mr K Roberts	Broadleaf Homes Limited	Email
Mr R Singh	Rathor Singh Property Developers	Email
Ms A Clifford	Chrama Homes Limited	Email
Mr R Smythe	Bayview Developments	Email
Mr A Patel	Heywood Homes UK Limited	Email
Mr G MacLean	Mott MacDonald	Email
Mr T Cuthbert	MVA Consultancy	Email
Mr G Brown	Upton McGougan	Email
	Concept Design and Planning	Email
Mr N Farthing	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Email

Ms Hannah Blunstone	WYG	Email
	Paris Smith LLP	Email
Mr P Basham	Paul Basham Associates	Email
Mr D Mason	Transportation Planning Partnership	Email
Mr A Burns	Allan Burns Consultancy	Email
Ms S Smart	Meyer Brown	Email
Mr I Dix	Savell Bird and Axon	Email
	ADL Highways	Email
Mr C Mullett	Ramboll	Email
Mr S Garner	Scott White and Hookings	Email
Mr A Tewkesbury	Southampton University	Email
Mr G Ellis	Ellis Transport Services	Email
Mr D Brown	Peartree Community Action Forum	Email
Mr G Gittins	Natural England	Email
Ms C Stride	Environment Agency	Email
Mr S Williams	English Heritage	Email
Dr P Holmes	Hampshire & Isle Of Wight Wildlife Trust	Email
Ms Taylor	Swaythling Housing Society	Email