

CONSULTATION STATEMENT - FEBRUARY 2010

**Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Regulations 17(1) & 18 (4)
Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England)
(Amendment) Regulations 2009**

**Havant Borough Local Development Framework
Havant Public Service Village Supplementary Planning Document
(SPD) 2010**

If you have any queries about the Havant Public Service Village Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), or if you would like to purchase a paper copy, please contact us.

Website: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/havant-10257>

Telephone: Planning Policy and Urban Design Team – 023 92 446539

Email: Policy.design@havant.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy and Urban Design, Havant Borough Council,
Civic Centre Road, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2AX

Arrangements for interpretation or translation into alternative formats and community languages are available on request.

Consultation undertaken in accordance with Regulation 17 (1)

The council is required to prepare Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) in accordance with procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 as amended (2008 and 2009). Regulation 17 requires that before an SPD is adopted, a Consultation Statement is prepared, setting out who was consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD, how they were consulted, a summary of the main issues raised in those consultations and how those issues have been addressed in the SPD. In addition, Regulation 18 (4) requires the local planning authority to consider any representations on the Draft SPD and to prepare a statement setting out the main issues raised in representations and how these have been addressed in the SPD which they intend to adopt.

The SPD has also been prepared and consulted upon in accordance with the council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

The SPD has undergone several stages of production and consultation which are explained below.

Pre-production consultation

Havant Borough Council and Urban Practitioners have consulted with a wide range of stakeholders over the last two years in preparation of this document. This includes landowners and service providers in the Public Service Village, local community and interest groups, Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council officers, local councillors and many others. These groups have been consulted through various forms including exhibitions, workshops, meetings and correspondence. This pre-consultation work is summarised as below.

Meetings and Correspondence

Informal discussions with landowners, regarding their ambitions for the future, began in 2007. Havant Borough Council has also extensively engaged with Hampshire County Council and in particular the highways department to help inform the content of the Draft SPD.

Walking Audit - December 2008

A walking audit of the site was carried out in December 2008. A range of stakeholders participated including local schools, members of Havant Youth Council, Hampshire Partnership NHS Trust, Havant Community Partnership and Havant 50+ Association. Attendees are listed in Appendix A. The issues and aspirations for the site were then discussed and helped inform the content of the Draft SPD.

The feedback is summarised in key themes which follows:

- Access and connectivity – stakeholders considered it essential that there were new and improved pedestrian routes across the site to connect up key destinations such as Havant College and the town centre; that the surface treatments in and around the site were improved to make the site more attractive and accessible to everyone; and that these improvements would help attract people into the site and use the green spaces for recreation and leisure
- Movement and transport – it was considered important to make cycling a more attractive option of getting to the Civic Campus/Public Service Village and suggested improvement to cycle routes and parking were needed
- Railway footbridge – people considered it vital to upgrade the existing footbridge to provide better access and links to the train station, town centre, Civic Campus/Public Service Village and Havant College: to encourage people to travel more sustainability

by walking and using the train; and to create an attractive landmark and gateway for Havant and the Civic Campus/Public Service Village

- Landscaping – it was considered important to enhance the existing green space within the Civic Campus/Public Service Village site; and thought the space could be more attractive through landscaping, planting and provision of public furniture
- Design and architecture – stakeholders believed there was an opportunity to improve the image and attractiveness of Havant where new development and refurbishment was taking place through good design and architecture
- Land uses - people thought that the site could be better used through the rationalisation of existing services into fewer buildings creating space for new complimentary public services and community uses.

Test and Review Workshop - June 2009

A test and review workshop was held in June 2009 to review the emerging SPD ideas with stakeholders. Approximately 60 people attended including local residents associations, Horizon Leisure Trust, Hampshire Constabulary and Hampshire Fire and Rescue. Those who attended are listed in Appendix B.

The following key issues emerged and have addressed in the Draft SPD:

- Phasing – people wanted to know if and when development was going to take place, what was certain and what were aspirations. Linked to this were concerns regarding the possible reduction of car parking spaces in light of so many uncertainties
- Sustainable transport – some considered that the borough's public transport was not strong enough to support the proposed parking reductions. Links to the north west of the borough were identified as particularly weak
- Land use - attendees requested further details on the proposed uses of new buildings close to the Civic Offices and how much parking would be generated. It was suggested that the building to the south-west of the Civic Offices could be a fire station or other civic use.
- Pedestrian links and crossings – it was considered that more emphasis should be placed on the importance of improving existing connections, in particular the railway footbridge and the Petersfield Road crossing to Havant College.

Full reports of both the Walking Audit and the Test and Review Workshop are available online at the council's website: www.havant.gov.uk/havant-10258

Statutory Consultation on the Draft SPD

A four week period of consultation was carried out between 30 October and 30 November 2009 on the content of the Draft SPD and associated sustainability appraisal.

The Draft SPD, its supporting documents and representation forms were made available at public libraries, council offices and via the council's website. A public notice was published in the Portsmouth Evening News on 29 October 2009 and a press release with details of the SPD was issued.

Appendix C contains the list of specific consultees that were invited by letter to comment on the Draft SPD and its accompanying documents. A footnote to this table states that in addition all those with an email address on the council's LDF database of contacts (some 678 individuals/organisations) were also informed via the Autumn 2009 LDF newsletter.

A number of consultation events were organised immediately before and during the statutory consultation period. These are listed in Appendix D and included presentations, exhibitions and drop-in sessions which specifically targeted the Local Strategy Partnership,

Community Board, Youth Council, Havant College, Havant Access Group and Havant Borough Council staff working group.

Permanent exhibitions were also held at Havant Borough Council's Civic Offices, Havant and Havant, Waterlooville, Emsworth and Leigh Park libraries during normal opening hours and online at www.havant.gov.uk over the course of the consultation period.

In addition, all borough councillors were sent copies of the Draft SPD and invited to comment. After the consultation period had ended the responses were analysed and as a result, the council decided whether to make changes to the Draft SPD.

Current Position

Consideration has been given to all the representations made during the consultation period. The council received 63 formal responses to the formal consultation on the Draft SPD.

The comments were generally supportive of the SPD. The public supported the principle of improved public services and facilities at the Havant Public Service Village, providing there was no cost to the tax payer. In addition, there was support for improved connections and links to the Public Service Village through public realm improvements.

The main concerns focused on parking and the perceived loss of Havant Leisure Centre. With regard to the former, there were concerns that additional developments and improved service provision would lead to parking problems in the future and that this problem would be compounded by the loss of any parking. The Draft SPD acknowledged this concern and included information on the parking requirements set out by HBC. This section has been reworded in the Adopted SPD for clarity. With regard the latter, there was considerable concern that some of the illustrative images contained in the Draft SPD implied that Havant Leisure Centre would be lost for housing, though the text clearly explained that this was not the case. This image has been removed from the Adopted SPD to avoid confusion. A number of comments also stressed the importance of the public transport improvements to achieving the vision for the Havant Public Service Village and encouraging people to use more sustainable modes of transport. Additional text has been added to the Adopted SPD which refers to this as a priority in the emerging Core Strategy.

Appendix E details the list of comments made during the consultation period and provides an officer response and any proposed changes to be made (Regulation 18 (4)).

The SPD was amended to take these comments into consideration. The council met on 17 February 2010 and approved the Havant Public Service Village Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), February 2010 for adoption.

Appendix A – Attendance at the Walking Audit, December 2008

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| James Bawn | LIFT |
| Andrew Biltcliffe | Havant Borough Council |
| Nick Bishop | Urban Practitioners |
| Cllr Ray Bolton | Hampshire County Council |
| Cllr Jackie Branson | Havant Borough Council |
| John Briggs | Waterlooville South Community Board |
| David Burley | Age Concern Havant |
| Frank Campbell | Havant Borough Council |
| Andrew Case | Havant Borough Council |
| Keith J Chessell | Havant and Bedhampton Community Board |
| Flo Churchill | Havant Borough Council |
| Ruth Eastwick | Church Council |
| John Game | Havant Indoor Bowls Club |
| Judith Gleinster | Havant Indoor Bowls Club |
| Phillip Gooch | Hayling Island Community Board |
| Jan Gough | Age Concern Havant |
| Derek A Green | Havant Community Partnership |
| Ann Griffiths | Havant and Bedhampton Community Board |
| Cllr David Guest | Havant Borough Council |
| Val Hartridge | Havant Access Group |
| Sandy Hopkins | Havant Borough Council |
| Tom Jones | Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service |
| DA Jones | Havant District Liaison Group |
| Betty Marshall | Bosmere Hundred |
| Marie Preston | Oak Park Community Hospital |
| Christine Pylee | Havant Access Group |
| Diana Richardson | Havant Borough Council |
| Andy Rudd | Havant Borough Council |
| Howard Short | Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council |
| Sue Spencer | Havant Council of Community Service |
| B Stillwell | Havant Methodist Church |
| Tracy Vear | Youth Participation Officer |
| Steve Walker | Urban Practitioners |
| Christopher Walters | Urban Practitioners |
| Peter Walden | Havant 50+ Forum |
| Julie Watson-Cowen | Havant Borough Council |
| Cllr Jenny Wride | Havant Borough Council |
| Stewart York | Hampshire Constabulary |

Appendix B – Attendance at the Test and Review Workshop, June 2009

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Enid Ashley | Havant Local Strategic Partnership |
| Helen Bailey | Havant Borough Council |
| Jackie Batchelor | Havant Borough Council |
| Ben Bennetts | Hampshire County Council |
| Cllr Gwen Blackett | Havant Borough Council |
| Cllr Jackie Branson | Havant Borough Council |
| David Bridges | Havant Borough Council |
| Howard Broad | Horizon Leisure Trust |
| John Briggs | Waterlooville South Community Board |
| Cllr Richard Brown | Havant Borough Council |
| Tony Cailes | Havant Borough Council |
| Andrew Case | Havant Borough Council |
| Bradley Churchill | Havant Borough Youth Council |
| Cllr Dave Collins | Havant Borough Council |
| Peter Crane | Horizon Leisure Trust |
| Jeff Crate | Havant Borough Council |
| Cllr Mike Fairhurst | Havant Borough Council |
| Cllr David Gillett | Havant Borough Council |
| Ian Gray | Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service |
| Cllr David Guest | Havant Borough Council |
| Val Hartridge | Havant Access Group |
| Sandy Hopkins | Havant Borough Council |
| David Howells | Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service |
| Tom Jones | Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service |
| David Jones | Bosmere Hundred |
| Cllr Olwyn Kennedy | Havant Borough Council |
| Tony Lee | Havant Borough Council |
| Chris Lyons | Havant Borough Council |
| Adele Maher | Havant Borough Council |
| Betty Marshall | Bosmere Hundred |
| John McDougal | Havant College |
| Joy Okwuadigbo | Havant Borough Council |
| Sue Parker | Havant Borough Council |
| Cllr V. Pierce Jones | Havant Borough Council |
| Cllr Faith Ponsonby | Havant Borough Council |
| Janet Rees | Havant Borough Council |
| Howard Short | Havant Borough Council/Hampshire County Council |
| Tim Slater | Havant Borough Council |
| Nigel Smith | Havant Borough Council |
| Clifford Smith | Warblington and Denvilles Resident Association |
| Richard Solley | Citizens Advice Bureau |
| Sue Spencer | Havant Council of Community Service |
| Cllr Susan Stocker | Havant Borough Council |
| Tracy Vear | Youth Participation Officer |
| Julie Watson-Cowen | Havant Borough Council |
| David Webb | West Bedhampton Residents Association |
| Cllr V. Wilson-Smith | Havant Borough Council |
| Stuart York | Hampshire Constabulary |

Appendix C – List of those formally consulted as part of statutory consultation on the Draft SPD

| | |
|--|--|
| | Government Office for the South East |
| | South East England Strategy Unit, South East England Partnership Board |
| | SEEDA |
| | The Coal Authority |
| | The Environment Agency |
| | English Heritage |
| | Natural England |
| | Dept for Transport |
| | Hampshire County Council |
| | West Sussex County Council |
| | Winchester City Council |
| | Planning Policy, Portsmouth City Council |
| | Asset Management & Housing Development Teams, Portsmouth City Council |
| | East Hants District Council |
| | Chichester District Council |
| | Gosport Borough Council |
| | Fareham Borough Council |
| | Denmead Parish Council |
| | Horndean Parish Council |
| | Rowlands Castle Parish Council |
| | Stoughton Parish Council |
| | Westbourne Parish Council |
| | Southbourne Parish Council |
| | West Thorney Parish Council |
| | Homebuilders Federation |
| | Hampshire Primary Care Trust |
| | The Homes & Communities Agency |
| | The Planning Inspectorate |
| | Highways Agency |
| | Southern Water |
| | Portsmouth Water |
| | Telewest Broadband |
| | NTL |
| | National Grid |
| | Scottish & Southern Energy |
| | Southern Electric |
| | British Gas |
| | Royal Mail |
| | Fujitsu Telecommunications |
| | Cable & Wireless |
| | Redstone Communications |
| | BT |
| | Langstone Harbour Board |
| | Chichester Harbour Conservancy |
| | South West Trains |
| | Fareham & Gosport Primary Care Trust |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| | Mobile Operators Association |
| | Hampshire Partnership NHS Trust |
| | Hampshire Constabulary (Havant) |
| | Hampshire Constabulary (Waterlooville) |
| | Hampshire Police Authority |
| | Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service |
| | Stagecoach Coastline |
| | Emsworth & District |
| | First Hampshire |
| | Solent Forum |
| | CABE |
| | Southern Gas Networks |
| | Havant Indoor Bowls Club |
| | Hampshire Probation Head Office |
| | Havant 50+ Forum |
| | Havant College |
| | South Downs College |
| | Horizon Leisure Trust |
| | Havant Health Centre |
| | JobCentre Plus |
| | Benefits Agency |
| | Age Concern Hampshire |
| Mr Allen | Hampshire Constabulary |
| Mr Anderson | Solent Community Solutions |
| Mr Bawn | LIFT |
| Ms Bode | Hampshire Partnership NHS Trust |
| Mr Bowers | Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service |
| Mr Burley | Age Concern Havant |
| Mr/s Carr | Sport Hants & IOW |
| Mr Cruddane | NHS Hampshire |
| Mr Davies | Warblington School |
| Cllr Ellis | Hampshire County Council |
| Ms England | Hampshire County Council |
| Mr Feetam | Sport England |
| Mr Game | Havant Indoor Bowls Club |
| Ms Gough | Age Concern Havant |
| Mr Gray | Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service |
| Mrs Grout | Havant Health Centre |
| Mr Hall | Guinness Hermitage |
| Mr/s Hartley | Hampshire Partnership NHS Trust |
| Mr Hartley | Trosnant Infant School |
| Ms Hartridge | Havant Access Group |
| Mr Harwood | Trosnant Junior School |
| Ms Hebden | NHS Hampshire |
| Mr Hewitt | SE Hampshire LIFT Strategic Partnering Board |
| Mr Horne | Solent Community Solutions |
| Mr Howells | Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service |
| Cdr Jones | Bosmere Hundred |
| Mr Jones | Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service |
| Mr Jones | Havant District Liaison Group |
| Mr Montgomery | NHS Hampshire |

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Mr Morgan | Portsmouth City Council |
| Mr Morley | Havant District Residents Liaison Group |
| Ms Preston | Oak Park Community Hospital |
| Mr Price | Network Rail (Southern Region) |
| Ms Pylee | Havant Access Group |
| Revd Cannon Ralph | The Diocese of Portsmouth |
| Cllr Rayment | Hampshire Police Authority |
| Mr Short | Programme Manager - Hampshire Workstyle |
| Mr/s Smith | Angel Radio |
| Mr Solley | Citizens Advice Bureau |
| Ms Spencer | Havant Council of Community Service |
| Mr Steel | Head of Business and Property Services |
| Mr Stillwell | Havant Methodist Church |
| Mr Thornber | Hampshire County Council |
| Mr Ward | Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust |
| Mr Waterland | Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust |
| Rt Hon Willetts MP | Havant Conservative Office |
| Mr Yeo | Hampshire Partnership NHS Trust |
| Mr Young | Age Concern Bedhampton |
| Mr Gare | Warren Park Residents Association |
| I Morley | Havant District Residents Liaison Group |
| Mr D Jones | Havant District Liaison Group |
| P Fisher | Hayling Island Residents Assn. |
| P Turnbull | Langstone Conservation Group |
| P Chapman | Langstone Village Association |
| Mrs Sutton | North Havant Res. Assn. |
| J Creevy | North Hazelton Res. Assn. |
| P Sorab | Northney Res. Assn. |
| D Guest | Parchment Res. Assn. |
| R Faulkner | Wade Court Residents Assn. |
| C Smith | Warblington & Denvilles Residents Assn. |
| C Dibden | CPRE |
| R Cobbett | Friends of the Earth |
| J Goodspeed | Friends of Langstone Harbour |
| C Richards | North East Hayling Residents Association |
| D Webb | West Bedhampton Res. Assn. |
| D Pink | Waterlooville & District Residents' Association |
| P Cooper | Purbrook and Widley Area Residents Association |
| P Hodges | Havant Conservation Action Group |
| J Briggs | Bosmere 100 Havant |
| J Phillips | Bosmere 100 Hayling Island |
| D Jones | Bosmere 100 |
| J Davies | Solent Protection Society |
| V Bird | Manor Close Residents Association |
| A Hames | Campaigns & Development Officer |
| M Rhodes | Friends of Chichester Harbour |
| N Cooper | Springwood Community Partnership |

HBC also contacted everyone for whom we hold an email address on the LDF database of contacts (some 678 individuals/organisations) via the Autumn 2009 LDF Newsletter.

Appendix D - Programmed events in the lead up to and during the statutory consultation

Permanent exhibitions were held at Havant Borough Council's Civic Offices, Havant and Havant, Waterlooville, Emsworth and Leigh Park Libraries during normal opening hours and online at www.havant.gov.uk

Site notices showing the site boundary and consultation arrangements were displayed at various locations on the Civic Campus for the consultation period.

| Date | Organisation/meeting | Event |
|-----------------|--|----------------------------|
| 22 October 2009 | Local Strategy Partnership | Presentation |
| 28 October | Waterlooville South Community Board | Presentation |
| 30 October | Meridan Centre | Exhibition/drop-in session |
| 30 October | Civic Office foyer | Exhibition/drop-in session |
| 2 November | Waterlooville North Community Board | Presentation |
| 3 November | Youth Council | Presentation/workshop |
| 5 November | Civic Office foyer | Exhibition/drop-in session |
| 9 November | Hayling Island Community Board | Presentation |
| 10 November | Civic Office foyer | Exhibition/drop-in session |
| 12 November | Havant College | Exhibition/drop-in session |
| 16 November | Leigh Park Community Board | Presentation |
| 18 November | Havant and Bedhampton Community Board | Presentation |
| 19 November | Civic Office foyer | Exhibition/drop-in session |
| 26 November | Havant Access Group | Presentation |
| 27 November | Havant Borough Council staff working group | Presentation/workshop |

Appendix E – Consultation comments and officer responses by topic (Regulation 18(4))

| PARKING | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Residents and Horizon Leisure Trust | Quantification of car parking required and concern about shortage of parking in terms of wider aspirations. | No action | At this time it is not known what the future parking requirement of the Civic Campus/Public Service Village will be, or whether there will be an increase or a decrease in parking across the site. This will depend on the type of development to come forward in the future. Therefore the SPD cannot state the exact amount of parking that should be provided, but states that parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council’s Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and future developments need to consider Havant Borough Council’s emerging LDF document Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |
| Havant Disability Access Group | Ensure disabled users are involved at design stage. | No action | Havant Disability Access Group was consulted as part of the pre-consultation and formal consultation of the SPD. Planning applicants are required to consider the needs of disabled users as part of the application process. |
| Highways Agency | SPD should set maximum levels of parking for broad classes of development in the PSV, alongside a package of measures to promote sustainable transport choices, in line with PPG13. | No action | At this time it is not known what the future parking requirement of the Civic Campus/Public Service Village will be, or whether there will be an increase or a decrease in parking across the site. This will depend on the type of development to come forward in the future. Therefore the SPD cannot state the exact amount of parking that should be provided, but states that parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council’s Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and future developments need to consider the council’s emerging Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| Horizon Leisure Trust | 3.21 Adequate parking required if Leisure Centre stays | No action | At this time it is not known what the future parking requirement of the Civic Campus/Public Service Village will be, or whether there will be an increase or a decrease in parking across the site. This will depend on the type of development to come forward in the future. Therefore the SPD cannot state the exact amount of parking that should be provided, but states that parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council's Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and future developments need to consider the council's emerging Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |
| | Report does not mention provision of a multi-storey car park | No action | Although the SPD does not refer to multi-storey parking, it does not prevent this use. However, at this time the council does not consider the Civic Campus to be the best place for a multi-storey car park. |
| North East Housing Residents' Association | Reduction in parking need is unlikely and therefore alternative provision should be made, possibly including a multi-storey car park. | No action | Although the SPD does not refer to multi-storey parking, it does not prevent this use. However, at this time the council does not consider the Civic Campus to be the best place for a multi-storey car park. At this time it is not known what the future parking requirement of the Civic Campus/Public Service Village will be, or whether there will be an increase or a decrease in parking across the site. This will depend on the type of development to come forward in the future. Therefore the SPD cannot state the exact amount of parking that should be provided, but states that parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council's Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and future developments need to consider the council's emerging Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | Parking space will remain a necessity | No action | This is acknowledged in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework, 5 Transport and parking. |
| | Parking is a necessity alongside new theatre | No action | The council is beginning to explore opportunities to provide a cultural centre on the Civic Campus, however at this time there are no proposals for a new theatre. The SPD also acknowledges that parking is a necessity for any new development in Section 3: Development Framework, 5 Transport and parking. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|--|
| | 3.13 No proposals to build over the car parks | No action | The SPD cannot allocate a particular land use or require development to take place. Parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council's Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and the council's emerging Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |
| | 3.14 There needs to be a dedicated 'kiss and go' drop-off area | No action | A reference to a dedicated and well located drop-off appears in Section 3: Development Framework A) Civic Offices and associated land |
| | 3.24 Development on a current car park will create need for more parking | No action | At this time there are no proposals to develop the current car park, though the council has indicated that it intends to review their use in the near future. The SPD also acknowledges that existing parking provides an important, and in some cases, an essential role. Parking will need to be provided in line with Hampshire County Council's Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and in time the council's emerging Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. More information can be found in Section 3: Development Framework A) Civic Offices and associated land and 5Transport and parking. |
| | Page 26 More facilities at the PSV will require more parking | No action | This is acknowledged in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework, 5 Transport and parking. |
| Individual | Concern that reducing parking will create knock-on problems in neighbouring residential areas such as Leigh Road | Action | The SPD does not propose that car parking provision will be reduced in the Civic Campus. At this time it is not known what the future parking requirement of the Civic Campus/Public Service Village will be, or whether there will be an increase or a decrease in parking across the site. This will depend on the type of development to come forward in the future. Therefore the SPD cannot state the exact amount of parking that should be provided, but states that parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council's Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and future developments need to consider the council's emerging document Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. The council requires planning applications for significant developments to produce a travel plan, to help assess and manage travel in a more sustainable way. Travel plans and their recommendations, which could include parking reduction, vary on a case by case basis. Therefore, it is only when individual travel plans have been completed can the council fully consider the impacts. Therefore consideration is beyond the remit of |

| | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | the SPD. Please refer to Hampshire County Council's, A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans, May 2008 for more information. |
| Individual | A better car parking plan is required | No action | At this time it is not known what the future parking requirement of the Civic Campus/Public Service Village will be, or whether there will be an increase or a decrease in parking across the site. This will depend on the type of development to come forward in the future. Therefore the SPD cannot state the exact amount of parking that should be provided, but states that parking should be provided in line with Hampshire County Council's Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and future developments need to consider the council's emerging document the Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |
| Individual | Remove all council staff parking | No action | The SPD cannot allocate a particular land use or require development to take place; this is a matter for individual landowners. Parking should be provided in line with the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards, 2002 and the emerging Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. |
| Individual | 3.16, 3.75 Important to ensure that parking reductions as part of Green Travel Plan do not cause problems for HBC staff. | No action | The council requires planning applications for significant developments to produce a travel plan, to help assess and manage travel in a more sustainable way. This does not assume that existing car parking provision will be reduced. Travel plans and their recommendations, which could include parking reduction, vary on a case by case basis. Therefore it is only when individual travel plans have been completed can the council consider the impact. Therefore consideration is beyond the remit of the SPD. Please refer to Hampshire County Council's, A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans, May 2008 for more information. |

| HAVANT LEISURE CENTRE | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Horizon Leisure Trust | Make Leisure Centre attractive in daylight and after dark | No action | The SPD acknowledges that the design and appearance of Havant Leisure Centre could be improved. However, the SPD cannot require improvements take place or fund improvements; this is a matter for individual landowners. Havant Borough Council plans to carry out a review of the borough's leisure provision in the near future. All comments from the SPD have been referred to the council's head of organisational services who will be leading this review. |
| | Page 10, 14, 20, 25, 32 Leisure Centre airbrushed out. | Action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 contained an image that unintentionally indicated that Havant Leisure Centre was to be replaced. This is not the case and there are no proposals to redevelop or relocate Havant Leisure Centre at this time. However, the council will review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the near future. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| | Page 11 1, bullet point 2 – do this with the existing leisure centre | No action | The council intends to review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the next five years. This review will consider leisure provision and need in the long term. This will guide the council's long term approach to leisure provision at Havant Leisure Centre. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| | 3.32 last sentence misleading – the car park is not leased | Action | This has been deleted for clarity and additional information added to reflect the correct ownership. |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------|---|
| | 3.34 Unlikely due to capital expenditure. Latest council view is that Centre is to remain as a leisure hub. | No action | The council intends to review of the borough’s leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the next five years. This review will consider leisure provision and need in the long term. This will guide the council’s long term approach to leisure provision at Havant Leisure Centre. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council’s head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| | 3.79 Havant Leisure Centre is for the whole borough | Action | Wording changed for clarity. |
| | 2.3, 3.51 Leisure Centre contributes to ‘vitality and life of the area’ | Action | Wording added to reflect this positive point. |
| | 3.33 Not sure why the building is described as ‘unsafe and unfriendly’. The trust has recently submitted a planning application to improve signage and lighting to the entrance and building | Action | This text has been removed and the text amended for clarity. |
| Rowlands Castle Parish Council | Loss of Horizon Leisure Centre without alternative is unacceptable | No action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 contained an image that unintentionally indicated that Havant Leisure Centre was to be replaced. This is not the case and there are no proposals to redevelop or relocate Havant Leisure Centre at this time. However, the council will review of the borough’s leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the near future. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council’s head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| Sport England | 3.34 strengthen text to explain that the loss of the Leisure Centre will be subject to the appropriate replacement of facilities elsewhere. | No action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 contained an image that unintentionally indicated that Havant Leisure Centre was to be replaced. This is not the case and there are no proposals to redevelop or relocate Havant Leisure Centre at this time. However, the council will review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the near future. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| | Sport England would wish to be consulted on the Leisure Options Strategy. | No action | All comments on the consultation draft SPD, October 2009 have been referred to the council's head of organisational development who will be leading this review. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 3.32 and 3.34 Leisure facility unlikely to move | No action | The council intends to review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the next five years. This review will consider leisure provision and need in the long term. This will guide the council's long term approach to leisure provision at Havant Leisure Centre. This is stated in the SPD in Section; 3 Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| | Leisure options workstream is outside terms of study | No action | The council intends to review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the next five years. This review will consider leisure provision and need in the long term. This detail is beyond the remit of the SPD. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| Individuals | Upgrade of the Leisure Centre would be more appropriate | No action | This is beyond the remit of the SPD. The SPD states that Havant Borough Council intends to review the borough's leisure provision and facilities in the near future. This will consider the need for improvements to existing facilities. For more information please contact the council's head of organisational development. |
| Individuals | Concern at relocation of leisure centre | Action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 contained an image that unintentionally indicated that Havant Leisure Centre was to be replaced. This is not the case and there are no proposals to redevelop or relocate Havant Leisure Centre at this time. However, the council will review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the |

| | | | |
|-------------|--|--------|---|
| | | | near future. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |
| Individuals | Leisure Centre is missing from proposals | Action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 contained an image that unintentionally indicated that Havant Leisure Centre was to be replaced. This is not the case and there are no proposals to redevelop or relocate Havant Leisure Centre at this time. However, the council will review of the borough's leisure facilities, including Havant Leisure Centre, in the near future. This is stated in the SPD in Section 3: Development Framework E) Havant Leisure. Please contact the council's head of organisational development for more information on the review of leisure provision. |

| TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Hayling Island Community Board | Greater use of public transport to and from the PSV, coordinated with appropriate bus fare pricing | Action | The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009; however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 to explain this point. |
| | Greater encouragement of cycling to and from the PSV and Havant College | No action | This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 in Section 3: Development Framework, 3 Movement, connections and public realm; and 5 Transport and parking. |
| | Replacement of proposed pedestrian crossing between Havant College and the PSV with an underpass | No action | Best practice urban design recommends avoiding the use of subways or designing these out wherever possible, for safety and security reasons and to improve activity natural surveillance of streets. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--|
| <p>Rowland's Castle Parish Council</p> | <p>Bus connections to Havant are poor</p> | <p>Action</p> | <p>This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 in Section 3: Development Framework 5 Transport and parking. The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point.</p> |
| <p>Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association</p> | <p>Public transport to the PSV runs in one direction only and is therefore minimal</p> | <p>Action</p> | <p>This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 in Section 3: Development Framework 5 Transport and parking. The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point.</p> |
| | <p>3.22 Improved public transport system require in support of sustainable travel.</p> | <p>Action</p> | <p>This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 in Section 3: Development Framework 5 Transport and parking. The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|--|
| | 3.73 These transport issues are only the tip of the iceberg | No action | The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point. |
| | 3.77, 3.78 Reduced car usage is unlikely in the long term SPD should take into account that many people will continue to use private transport | No action | In principle the council would like to encourage people to travel to the Civic Campus/Public Service Village in a more sustainable way. The SPD acknowledges that despite this aspiration, many people will continue to use private transport, whether by choice or through necessity. |
| Individual | Green Travel Plan unfeasible – car use likely to remain high | No action | The council requires planning applicants for significant developments to produce a travel plan, to help assess and manage travel in a more sustainable way. This does not assume that car use will be eliminated. For more information please refer to Hampshire County Council's, A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans, May 2008. |
| Individual | Transport improvements needed between the bus station, train station and Civic Campus | Action | This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 in Section 3: Development Framework 3 Movement, connections and public realm; and 5 Transport and parking. The council also considers it important to improve public transport in the borough including those in an around Havant town. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. |
| Individual | Make provision for electric cars as part of green travel plan | No action | The SPD cannot require planning applicants to provide electric cars as part of their travel plans. The most appropriate actions for encouraging more sustainable methods of travel will depend on the scale and type of development proposed. Electric cars could be one of a number of more sustainable measures recommended in a travel plan. For more information please refer to Hampshire County Council's, A guide to development related Travel Plans, May 2008. |
| Individual | Poor public transport travel | Action | This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 Section 3: |

| | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|--|
| | times to Purbrook/Waterlooville (3.73) should be addressed | | Development Framework 5 Transport and parking. The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point. |
| Individual | Travel Plan should provide frequent services from Havant Station through PSV in both directions. | No action | The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point. |
| Individual | Traffic congestion is a problem | No action | The council does not consider traffic congestion be a significant issue for the SPD. Planning applicants will be required to demonstrate how their development does not lead to adverse effects on the highways network in line with relevant national, regional and local planning policies. In addition the adopted SPD, February 2010 states that applicant for development will also be required to contribute toward the transport improvements identified in Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy. |
| Individual | Suggest whole area becomes a 20mph zone. | No action | The adopted SPD, February 2010 Section 3 Development Framework 3 Movement, connections and public realm, stress the importance of creating a pedestrian and cycle friendly environment in and around the Civic Campus/Public Service Village. However, this SPD cannot allocate a new speed limit in the area, as this goes beyond the documents remit. |
| Individual | Improve bus and cycle connections surrounding the PSV | | This is acknowledged in the adopted SPD, February 2010 Section 3: Development Framework 5 Transport and parking. The council considers it important to improve public transport in the borough, particularly cross borough links. Because this is an issue of high importance, it is being considered at a more strategic level in the Local |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | Development Framework (LDF) document called the Core Strategy and therefore is beyond the remit of this SPD. This was acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009, however additional text has been added to the adopted SPD, February 2010 help explain this point. |
|--|--|--|---|

| LAND USE | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Havant Council of Community Service | Page 17 Court service has announced closure of Havant Magistrate's Court | Action | Text added to updated information. |
| | SA4 Unsure that new residential development will aid education improvement | No action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 did not suggest this. However the improved services and facilities proposed as part of plans for the refurbished Civic Offices, aims to aid educational improvement. For more information on this project please contact the council's property services team. |
| | Important to ensure that the voluntary sector partners are given appropriate priority as part of the mix of PSV services | No action | Assume this comment refers specifically to the Public Service Village project. This detail is beyond the remit of the SPD, as the SPD cannot allocate a particular land use or require development to take place. However, please note that Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Councils' funding bid to DCSF identified the ambition to provide improved facilities for the voluntary service at the refurbished Civic Offices. Please contact the council's property services team for more information. |
| North East Housing Residents' Association | 3.52 Streets and spaces reorganisation dependent on landowners | No action | The introduction to the adopted SPD, February 2010 states that an SPD cannot allocate a particular land use or require development to take place. Therefore the reorganisation of streets and spaces is dependent on landowners. |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 2.3 Only area of 'under-used' land is in front of Civic Offices | No action | Under used land can include open space or brownfield/previously developed land, which includes buildings that use space inefficiently. Havant Borough Council, for example, has assessed the Civic Offices and considers that much of the building is under used. Plans for refurbishment aim to maximise the use of the building. |
| | 3.2 The aim is not to cover all possible uses. Why not add the Fire Station | No action | This paragraph introduces and summarises information contained in Section 3: Development Framework and therefore the list is not intentionally exhaustive. A reference to the fire station is made later in the section. |
| | Page 27 Only the land west of Civic Centre Road is available for civic uses | No action | Havant Borough Council owns land east and west of Civic Centre Road, therefore there is the possibility that this land is available for civic use. However the SPD cannot allocate any particular use. |
| | Public and community uses should take priority over cultural and residential. | No action | The SPD cannot allocate a particular land use. Cultural facilities can be considered as public and community uses. In some case it might be more appropriate to have public sector and community uses in the first instance. However, the SPD cannot require this, rather it is for individual planning applicants to make a case and justify suitability. |
| | Not sure students would use the internet café as suggested | Action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 suggested that students, amongst others, might use the facilities. However, this reference is very specific and therefore it has been removed. |
| Individual | Opportunity for a direct access homeless hostel, as nearest alternatives are in Portsmouth and Chichester | No action | Housing services and providers have not expressed an interest in developing a homeless hostel in this location. Therefore it is considered inappropriate and misleading to include it as potential use at this stage. The SPD does not prevent this use coming forward and therefore it is for individual planning applicants to make a case and justify suitability. |
| Individual | Flats preferable to houses | No action | The SPD cannot allocate a particular land use. Relevant national, regional and local planning policies encourage a mix of accommodation types to be provided rather than limiting it to one type. |
| Individual | Magistrates Court suitable for a cultural hall. | No action | Havant Borough Council has indicated that council land north or south of the Civic Offices is available for the development of a cultural centre. It is likely that HM Magistrates Service would market the facility or land for disposal if it is found surplus to use. This would add to the cost of developing this community facility. More work is required to understand the feasibility of the cultural centre and identifying the most suitable |

| | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | site. |
| Individual | No more houses or offices | No action | The SPD cannot allocate a particular land use. Housing and offices are amongst a number of uses that might be suitable. However, it is for individual planning applicants to make a case and justify suitability. |
| Individual | Housing across the rest of the Civic Campus site | No action | The SPD cannot allocate a particular land use. Housing is one of a number of uses that might be suitable. However, it is for individual planning applicants to make a case and justify suitability. |

| PUBLIC REALM AND OPEN SPACE | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Havant Council of Community Service | Pedestrian routes should follow existing desire lines, as currently visible in grass | Action | A new reference to pedestrian desire lines will be added to reinforce this point in Section 3: Development Framework 3 Movement, connections and public realm. |
| Havant Disability Access Group | No shared vehicle and pedestrian shared spaces | No action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010 do not refer to proposals for shared vehicular and pedestrian spaces. |
| | Do not lose trees | No action | The Civic Campus includes many trees of high value; however it also includes trees of less value. In some cases it might be acceptable to lose trees where there is an overwhelming positive benefit. However, it is for individual planning applicants to make a case and justify any loss. The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010 state this. |
| Youth Council | Please provide open area for younger people | No action | The SPD states that one of the ambitions for the Public Service Village is to provide more usable and attractive spaces for all members of the community. This includes young people. |
| Horizon Leisure Board | Trees obscure Civic Centre. | No action | This is acknowledged in the SPD Section 3: Development Framework A) Civic Offices and associated land; and F) Hampshire Police, HM Court Service and Hampshire Probation Service. |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| | 3.11 If classified as brownfield, green space in front of Civic Offices could be better used. | No action | Making the best use of brownfield land in a sustainable location is a core planning principle, at national, regional and local levels. This is acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010. |
| Warblington & Denvilles Residents' Association | Recreation space is inappropriate to the PSV. Relaxation is more appropriate | No action | It is considered appropriate to have some recreation space on site for relaxation and amenity for people who will be working, visiting and perhaps living in and close to the area. |
| | 2.4 contradict 2.3. Long-term cost of maintenance should be considered | No action | If land is to be better utilised, whether for development or for better used public open space, it will need to be managed and maintained. New building developments should support their own costs. The council already manages and maintains these green spaces and green verges. |
| | 3.10 Village areas not suitable for recreation | No action | It is considered appropriate to have some recreation space to provide for the needs of people who will be working, visiting and perhaps living in and close to the area. |
| | 3.54, 3.57 'play is inappropriate to a civic village; out of place and dangerous. It is strongly suggested that this is removed | No action | Play may be appropriate, particularly considering the number of people who will be working, visiting and perhaps living in and close to the area. Depending upon the uses and proposals that come forward therefore should not be ruled out. Clearly design and location are important to discourage antisocial behaviour. |
| | Under-use of main green space helps preserve it. Better to keep it under-used rather than turn it into a public park | No action | One of the key aims of the SPD to make the best use of land, whether greenfield or brownfield. Open space in urban areas that fulfils a role and provides benefits for the local community should be preserved in line with PPS25. Underused and vacant land without a role or purpose is more likely to be developed in line with the sustainable development principles of PPS1. |
| | Please provide a zebra crossing opposite the Job Centre and near the exit of the public footbridge leading to Havant Railway Station. | Action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010 both refer to the need to improve pedestrian connections including crossing point, to encourage greater links and improve integration with the town centre. The diagrams contained in the Development Framework Section of the SPD indicate that improvements to this crossing point could help achieve this objective. |
| Individual | Ensure good lighting on all pathways | Action | A new reference to the importance of good lighting s been added to the section Development Framework – Movement, connections and public |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|
| | | | realm. |
|--|--|--|--------|

| DESIGN | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Havant Methodist Church | Attractive buildings' are subjective criteria and risk being compromised by pre-existing buildings which remain unaltered | No action | Comment noted. One of the objectives of the SPD is to raise the design quality of new buildings. The principles of good design are widely recognised. Please refer to English Partnership's Urban Design Compendiums 1 and 2 for more information (insert web-link). The SPD cannot allocate uses or require development to take place, and therefore cannot require existing buildings to improve their appearance but it can encourage new developments to do so. This is supported by policies in the Havant District-Wide Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy. |
| | PSV segregated from heart of Havant and therefore isolated for the less mobile. | No action | This is acknowledged in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010. |
| Youth Council | Involve young people in design stage for public spaces | No action | The council have identified young people as a hard to reach group and therefore would encourage applicants to engage with young people as part of their design process. However, the council cannot require individual planning applicant to do so. |
| | Concern at design of the Civic Offices in visualisation. Make offices look less like an office block. | No action | The design of the refurbished Civic Offices, along with any other refurbished public building in the area, should be well designed and in the case of public buildings this means welcoming to the public. The SPD cannot allocate uses or require development to take place, and therefore cannot require existing buildings to improve their appearance but it can encourage new developments to do so. This is acknowledged in the in the consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010. This is supported by policies in the Havant District-Wide Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy. |
| North East Housing | 3.52 Civic Centre and Havant Health Centre 'turn their backs | Action | This sentence has been deleted and replaced for clarity in the section Development Framework – General design and development principles. |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------|---|
| Residents' Association | on Petersfield Road' misplaced, as this road is a busy dual carriageway | | |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 3.50 and 3.10 – frontages of buildings brought forward to Elmleigh Road is inconsistent with maintaining green space | Action | The buildings located on Elmleigh Road are not part of the streetscene and do not have a positive relationship with the street. This could be overcome if the buildings were set further forward and closer to the road. The wide green verge between the road and buildings does not have a particular use, though it includes many fine trees and together they a scenic value. Clearly there is a case for retaining this area and developing this area. The council' would need to carefully consider the positive and negative benefits of any proposal that might come forward and clearly loss of any trees would need to be justified. The wording of paragraph 3.50 has been amended to avoid any confusion. |
| | 3.55 and 3.50 contradict each other | No action | The information is consistent. Both encourage active streets. |
| | Landmark buildings north and south of the offices should be on stilts to allow for car parking | No action | The principles of good design encourage activity on the ground floor, where possible as it provides natural surveillance of public streets and spaces. However, the SPD cannot allocate a particular land use or require development to take place; the design of the buildings is therefore a matter for individual landowners. The council provides design input through the planning application process. |
| | 3.74 Changing facilities for cyclists and secure storage should be mandatory | No action | The SPD acknowledges that applicants may want to consider these measures as a way of encouraging staff to travel to work in a more sustainable way. The adopted SPD, February 2010 refers to this in the section Development Framework – Transport and parking. In addition the appropriateness of these facilities depends on the use proposed. Therefore it would be inappropriate for the SPD require applicants to provide these facilities. |
| Horizon Leisure Trust | No mention of any traffic-calming measures within the site for safety of users. | No action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010 infer this in the section Development Framework – Movement connects and public realm. |
| Individual | SPD should be more explicit on integration with surrounding neighbourhood, including | No action | Achieving better integration is one of the key aims and objectives of the SPD. However, considering the level of unknowns at this time the SPD must avoid being too prescriptive. However, the section Development |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | pedestrian access from the College and from the south. | | Framework includes suggestions of how integration could be improved, in the Site Specific section and General Design and Development Principles. |
|--|--|--|--|

| PSV CONCEPT | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Havant Council of Community Service | SA15 Unsure that new jobs will be created as a result of the SPD | No action | The SPD cannot guarantee that new jobs will be created, however, the refurbishment of the Civic Offices alone will bring jobs and it is hoped that improvements to existing services and facilities in the Civic Campus along with new development could lead indirectly to new jobs being created. |
| Havant Methodist Church | Are there plans to coordinate PSV proposals with parallel regeneration of Havant | No action | Future developments in the PSV and the need to regenerate Havant Town Centre have been identified in the key LDF document called the Core Strategy. For more information please contact the Planning Policy Team or visit the council's website www.havant.gov.uk . |
| | Need more communication between Havant groups. | No action | The council exceeded statutory requirements for consultation in an effort to reach as many members of the community as possible, including representatives of groups in the Havant area. |
| | Place greater emphasis on integration and intercommunication of organisations using the site | No action | The SPD recognises the importance of integration. The council encourages joint working between landowners in the Civic Campus area to achieve the SPD's aims and objectives. This was one of the main aims of pre-consultation events such as the Walking Audit, December 2008 and the Workshop, June 2009. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 4.9 flexible working challenging and unlikely. Online security would be crucial | No action | The SPD suggests flexible working as one of a number of ways of reducing the need to travel as part of individual applicant Travel Plans. Flexible working is being pursued as part of the borough and county councils' plans for the refurbishment of the Civic Offices. Please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |

| PSV COSTS | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Havant Methodist Church | How will these proposals be funded? This has not been explained thoroughly in the document or anywhere else. | No action | The cost of refurbishing the Civic Offices is beyond the remit of this SPD. The purpose of this document is to proactively respond to plans for development on site and have planning guidance to ensure development takes place in a responsible and sustainable way. Please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |
| Hayling Island Community Board | Money could be better spent on refurbishing the Havant skate park or swimming pool | No action | The cost of refurbishing the Civic Offices is beyond the remit of this SPD. The purpose of this document is to proactively respond to plans for development on site and have planning guidance to ensure development takes place in a responsible and sustainable way. Please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |
| | There should be no additional cost to taxpayer from proposals, and fixed-price contracts to suppliers to avoid cost overruns | No action | The cost of refurbishing the Civic Offices is beyond the remit of this SPD. The purpose of this document is to proactively respond to plans for development on site and have planning guidance to ensure development takes place in a responsible and sustainable way. Please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |
| Individual | Concern at project costs | No action | The cost of refurbishing the Civic Offices is beyond the remit of this SPD. The purpose of this document is to proactively respond to plans for development on site and have planning guidance to ensure development takes place in a responsible and sustainable way. Please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |
| Individual | Costs are a concern | No action | The cost of refurbishing the Civic Offices is beyond the remit of this SPD. The purpose of this document is to proactively respond to plans for development on site and have planning guidance to ensure development takes place in a responsible and sustainable way. Please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |

| HAVANT HEALTH CENTRE | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Horizon Leisure Trust | Where is the health centre located? Illustrative images included are misleading and therefore should be removed | Action | The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 contained an image that unintentionally indicated that Havant Health Centre was to be replaced. This is not the case and image has been deleted to avoid confusion. In addition, the adopted SPD, February 2010 includes updated information received from the NHS on their plans for the future and proposals for Oak Park Hospital. |
| NHS Hampshire | NHS intends to keep the current building for at least nine years and requires adequate parking for staff and patients. | Action | The adopted SPD, February 2010 includes updated information received from the NHS on their plans for the future and proposals for Oak Park Hospital. |
| Rowlands Castle Parish Council | Havant Health Centre unlikely to become surplus to requirements as Oak Park Hospital put on hold | Action | The adopted SPD, February 2010 includes updated information received from the NHS on their plans for the future and proposals for Oak Park Hospital. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 3.26 Oak Park Hospital construction deferred | Action | The adopted SPD, February 2010 includes updated information received from the NHS on their plans for the future and proposals for Oak Park Hospital. |
| Individual | Page 32 paragraph 7. Shortage of parking in view of Havant Health Centre's future and the recent retraction of proposals to expand Oak Park Hospital. | Action | More information has been added to the section Development Framework – Havant Health Centre to more accurately reflect the current parking arrangements. In addition, the adopted SPD, February 2010 includes updated information received from the NHS on their plans for the future and proposals for Oak Park Hospital. |

| SUSTAINABILITY | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| North East Housing Residents' Association | Delivery: consultant advice on CHP is unnecessary | No action | The borough council and county council indicated that they were considering the possibility of CHP at the time consultation draft SPD, October 2009 was produced. This has not progressed any further. This specific matter on the councils' plans for CHP is beyond the remit of the SPD and the reference has been removed to avoid confusion. For more information please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | Page 28 decentralised energy – space will be required for plant and maintenance staff will need parking | No action | The borough council and county council indicated that they were considering the possibility of CHP at the time that the consultation draft SPD, October 2009 was produced. This has not progressed further. The specific matter of the councils' plans for CHP is beyond the remit of the SPD and the reference has been removed to avoid confusion. For more information please contact the council's property services team for more details on this specific scheme. In addition, it is worth noting that the SPD cannot allocate land for a particular use. |
| Individual | Provide more details on expected carbon emissions and sustainable design and construction opportunities | No action | This type of policy is strategic in nature and is set out in the emerging LDF document, the Core Strategy. The consultation draft SPD, October 2009 and the adopted SPD, February 2010 both include sustainable principles and aims that new developments should aspire to achieve. These are set out in the section Development Framework: Sustainable design and construction and reflect the information in the emerging Core Strategy. |
| Individual | Café food should be grown on-site | No action | Assume this comment refers specifically to the Public Service Village project. This detail is beyond the remit of the SPD, as the SPD cannot allocate a particular land use or require development to take place. |

| FOOTBRIDGE | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Havant Council of Community Service | New footbridge should ensure that bicycles are pushed across. | No action | This detail is beyond the remit of this SPD. Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council would like to improve the footbridge; ideally these improvements would accommodate pedestrians, disabled personal vehicles and cyclists. The scope of the improvements is dependant on the amount of funding secured. However, there is no funding at present therefore the wording has remained more flexible and less prescriptive to ensure there is scope for a range of improvements. |
| North East Housing Residents' Association | Measures to reduce the rail crossing closure time at Fairfield Road are important | No action | This detail is beyond the remit of this SPD. Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council would like to improve the footbridge; ideally these improvements would accommodate pedestrians, disabled personal vehicles and cyclists. The scope of the improvements is dependant on the amount of funding secured. However, there is no funding at present therefore the wording has remained more flexible and less prescriptive to ensure there is scope for a range of improvements. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | Page 26 4 th paragraph insert 'The improved footbridge to accommodate pedestrians, disabled personal vehicles and cyclists' | No action | This detail is beyond the remit of this SPD. Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council would like to improve the footbridge; ideally these improvements would accommodate pedestrians, disabled personal vehicles and cyclists. The scope of the improvements is dependant on the amount of funding secured. However, there is no funding at present therefore the wording has remained more flexible and less prescriptive to ensure there is scope for a range of improvements. |
| | Footbridge reference repeated | Action | Wording changed for clarity. |

| POLICY | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Hayling Island Residents Association | Poorly designed questionnaire, last page was not detachable | Action | Planning policy will improve the design of questionnaires in future to ensure this point is addressed. |
| National Grid | None. Suggest that HBC consult with utility companies, as well as Distribution Network Operator (Southern Gas Networks, and Scottish and Southern Energy. | No action | The council exceeded statutory requirements for consultation in an effort to reach as many members of the community as possible, including relevant gas, electric, telecommunications, sewage and water companies. These authorities will also be consulted where relevant as part of any planning application within the site. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 1.16 'Key issues' have not been addressed | No action | It is considered that the SPD does address these issues. |
| Individual | Overall approach is not consistent with national, regional and county policy. | No action | It is considered that the SPD is consistent with national, regional and local policy. |

| PHASING AND DELIVERY | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Horizon Leisure Trust | There is limited inclusion of timescales other than for phase 1 | No action | The council considers it misleading to included timescales for areas where there is no certainty. |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | Assumption that users to the north and east of Civic Centre Road are likely to move in the time frame of the document, but sites unlikely to be vacated. Only the Civic Offices site can be reliably considered for development | No action | This is acknowledged in the SPD in the sections Development Framework and Delivery. |
| | Pages 17 and 18 – organisations have stated they are unlikely to move | No action | This is acknowledged in the SPD in the sections Development Framework and Delivery. |
| | Possible (no certainty) - reorder muddled paragraphs | Action | This has been changed for clarity. |
| | Future potential – Release of sites unlikely to happen in the life time of the HBC Core Strategy | No action | The Core Strategy covers a 15-20 year period and many landowners have indicated that they may redevelop/relocate in the future. |
| Individual | Insufficient consultation with stakeholders from arts, cultural and heritage groups who were not invited to the early stakeholder workshops | No action | The council exceeded statutory requirements for consultation in an effort to reach as many members of the community as possible, including representatives of the arts, culture and heritage. |

| UTILITIES | | | |
|---------------------|--|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Southern Water | Insert text after 3.62 to ensure that underground utility infrastructure is protected. | Action | A new paragraph has been inserted in the section Development Framework: Sustainable design and construction, which summarises the comments made by Southern Water. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--------|--|
| | Should development increases in the Budds Farm waste water treatment facility catchments lead to capacity issues before 2026, major investment would be required by Southern Water which could impact the timing of new development. | Action | A new paragraph has been inserted in the section Development Framework: Sustainable design and construction, which summarises the comments made by Southern Water. |
| | Insert text after 3.62 to ensure that developers of individual sites submit sewerage capacity checks early in the planning process to ascertain whether capacity is available and provide infrastructure required to service their sites through the formal requisitioning process. | Action | A new paragraph has been inserted in the section Development Framework: Sustainable design and construction, which summarises the comments made by Southern Water. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 3.62 Rain water in Havant goes into a surface water drain system, not a sewer | Action | This sentence has been amended for clarity. |

| CULTURAL CENTRE | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Hayling Island Community Board | An additional cultural venue to the Arts Centre is not required | No action | The development of a cultural centre on the PSV site is an aspiration at this stage. The council currently has no funding to support this; however the council's art and heritage team is exploring sources of government grant funding. A new facility would need to justify the appropriateness of its location based on national, regional and local policies, including Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) and the emerging Core Strategy. The concept of the cultural centre is intended to compliment existing |

| CULTURAL CENTRE | | | |
|------------------------|--|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| | | | <p>facilities and have a positive rather than negative effect on Havant Town Centre.</p> <p>The progression of any plans for a cultural centre will need to include discussions with cultural service providers and stakeholder groups including Havant Arts Centre Company.</p> |
| Individual | Support development of a theatre, so long as it does not compete with cultural uses offered at Leisure Centre or Havant College. | No action | <p>The development of a cultural centre on the PSV site is an aspiration at this stage. The council currently has no funding to support this; however the council's art and heritage team is exploring sources of government grant funding. A new facility would need to justify the appropriateness of its location based on national, regional and local policies, including Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) and the emerging Core Strategy. The concept of the cultural centre is intended to compliment existing facilities and have a positive rather than negative effect on Havant Town Centre.</p> <p>The progression of any plans for a cultural centre will need to include discussions with cultural service providers and stakeholder groups including Havant Arts Centre Company.</p> |
| Individual | How will cultural centre be funded? | No action | <p>The development of a cultural centre on the PSV site is an aspiration at this stage. The council currently has no funding to support this; however the council's art and heritage team is exploring sources of government grant funding. A new facility would need to justify the appropriateness of its location based on national, regional and local policies, including Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) and the emerging Core Strategy. The concept of the cultural centre is intended to compliment existing facilities and have a positive rather than negative effect on Havant Town Centre.</p> <p>The progression of any plans for a cultural centre will need to include discussions with cultural service providers and stakeholder groups including Havant Arts Centre Company.</p> |
| Individual | New cultural provision should | No | The development of a cultural centre on the PSV site is an aspiration at |

| CULTURAL CENTRE | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------|--|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| | complement the existing facilities in Havant, including 'The Spring', including a 300-500 seat theatre for Havant Symphony Orchestra. | action | <p>this stage. The council currently has no funding to support this; however the council's art and heritage team is exploring sources of government grant funding. A new facility would need to justify the appropriateness of its location based on national, regional and local policies, including Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) and the emerging Core Strategy. The concept of the cultural centre is intended to compliment existing facilities and have a positive rather than negative effect on Havant Town Centre.</p> <p>The progression of any plans for a cultural centre will need to include discussions with cultural service providers and stakeholder groups including Havant Arts Centre Company.</p> |

| HAVANT METHODIST CHURCH | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---|
| Organisation | Comment | Action | Response |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 3.30 Church unlikely to relocate | No action | This is acknowledged in the SPD in the sections Development Framework and Delivery. |
| Warblington and Denvilles Residents' Association | 3.3 If housing is built, the Methodist Church will be needed even more | Action | The adopted SPD, February 2010 includes a new sentence referring to this point. |