

Appendix A Statement of consultations Moorgreen Hospital Development Brief

The consultation period commenced on 19th December 2014 and lasted until 30th January 2016 .Public exhibitions held at West End Parish Centre on Friday 23rd January and Saturday 24th January. Approximately 130 people in total attended the two events.

Written responses were made by 97 local residents and businesses. Table 1 below reports the significant issues raised. Written responses were also received by 18 organisations. Where these raised issues that were not already raised by residents they are reported in Table 2. In addition 42 signatures were submitted to a petition arranged by Mark Latham: these support issues 1 and 22 in Table 1 below. Some of these signatures are of residents who have also made written responses. These numbers are not included below but have been taken into account in the council's responses.

Table 1 Summary of consultation responses; individual residents, and local businesses

	ISSUE	NUMBERS OF RESIDENTS	RESPONSE; text in bold indicates where a change to the brief will be made
1.	Oppose road link to Monarch Way	1111111111 1111111111 1111111111 1111111111 1111111111 1111111111 1111111111	Vehicular link proposal changed to be emergency vehicle, pedestrian, cycle and underground service use only. General motor vehicles will be prohibited.
2.	Concern regarding increase in population and effect on infrastructure generally	1111111111	Planning gain receipts will be taken from developers to fund infrastructure improvements required as a result of this development.
3.	Concern about increasing traffic demand on Botley/ Moorgreen Roads / High Street and Junction 7 of M27	11111111	Planning gain receipts will be taken from developers to fund highway improvements required as a result of this development.
4.	Opposition to new driveways onto Moorgreen Road/concern re availability of parking on Moorgreen Road	11	The highway authority will permit direct access to Moorgreen Road from new houses on the frontage only subject to satisfactory sight lines, parking and turning facilities.
5.	Call for an integrated transport system	1	The council will seek improved foot, cycle and public transport facilities as part of this development to try to encourage alternative uses to the private car.
6.	Monarch Way not to be	1	The document does not propose general

	used by vehicles from the dairy farm development.		vehicular access to Monarch Way from dairy farm site. However the proposal for a link for pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles will remain.
7.	Concern about proposed vehicular entrance into phase 1A from Botley Road.	1	This will be investigated in depth as part of any planning application and be subject by a Transport Assessment, prepared by consultants on behalf of the developer.
8.	Traffic calming on Botley Rd needed	1	This will be considered as part of any planning applications.
9.	No link between GP surgery and hospital	1	There is not likely to be a demand for a more direct link. However, there will be new pedestrian/cycle links across the site.
10.	Support for widening of existing cycleway along Botley Road	1	Noted
11.	Support pedestrian/cyclist access to Monarch Way	1111111	Noted
12.	Oppose pedestrian/cyclist access to Monarch Way	11	Pedestrian and cyclist links to Monarch Way form an essential part of the sustainable transport proposals for the site.
13.	Exacerbation of overflow parking problem from Ageas	1111111	General vehicular link to Monarch Way will not now go ahead. Monarch Way could be added to the Ageas event traffic management plan if this becomes necessary.
14.	Concern re impact on parking court to far east end of Monarch Way	1	This is a private parking court over which the council has no control.
15.	Concern re parking provision for new development	111	The Council's parking standards will be rigorously enforced for any planning application. A sentence will be added to make it clearer that any non-residential uses, including new hospital building, will be assessed in terms of their parking provision in accordance with adopted EBC policy.
16.	Suggestion for review of all double yellow lines in the area.	1	Noted.
17.	Opposition to more housing	1111111111 1	Most of this site has been a local plan allocation for housing since 2006. The council is obliged by the government to allocate sites for substantial numbers of new homes.
18.	Support for principal of new housing	1111111111 1111111111	Noted
19.	Affordable housing allocation to be adhered to.	1111	Agreed
20.	Affordable housing element to be reduced	1	This is determined by the standard in the local plan and cannot be varied on an individual site-by-site basis.
21.	Affordable housing should	1	The local plan policy calls for some older

	all be for old people		persons housing. The Council is unable, at this early stage to confirm whether part of this will be within the affordable allocation.
22.	Concern regarding perceived cut-back in NHS services/Call for increase in health facilities	1111111111 1111111111 1111111111 1	No cut-back in service is proposed in this document. Planning for NHS services is not within the remit of this development brief. The NHS has yet to indicate how it proposes to deliver a modern model of healthcare and make the best use of the land available; however this is likely to involve the development for health of the Donkey Field, which would potentially free up land for much-needed housing. The Council has a duty to plan for the use of land which is no longer needed for health uses, if there is evidence for this.
23.	Suggestion for a convalescent unit to be built on part of the site	1	This is a matter for the NHS and this suggestion has been forwarded to them.
24.	Concern about the high cost of land for the extension to the GP surgery.	1	Whilst the surgery is a commercial concern, the council is working to support the facility as far as it can within its powers.
25.	Accommodation for nursing staff required	1	There is no specific scheme for key worker accommodation nationally now. But nurses would be eligible to apply for affordable housing. The NHS is also free to build nursing accommodation.
26.	Provide public art provision	1	This is included in the document
27.	Air impact study/ concern about increased traffic generated air pollution	11	Environmental health will require assessment of air quality as part of the planning application. The provision in the brief for tree planting will have a beneficial impact on air pollution.
28.	Concern about noise pollution	1	Paragraph 5.6 of the brief addresses noise pollution.
29.	Concern about 'noise tunnel' on Botley Road	1	New houses will be set back by approximately 10m
30.	Frontage of hospital should be retained/ historically important	111111	Already allowed for in the plans
31.	Workhouse building should/could be demolished	11	This building is locally listed and the frontage is planned to be retained.
32.	Support for preservation of distinctive gateposts to south of Hawthorn Lodge	1	Noted
33.	Concern that historical aspect of buildings will be lost. Call for donation to West End Local History	11	A good deal of information about the Workhouse already exists, along with its original archive. The brief requires that records, including a photographic record of

	Society.		the building will be made. The policy covering percent for art would not be appropriate for a solely historical use. However the local plan already has policies covering the preservation/recording of archaeology, areas of historic interest and listed buildings.
34.	Need spaces for wildlife	1111	The council has polices in place to maximise the biodiversity value of new development. However the needs of wildlife must be balanced against the urgent need for more housing.
35.	Existing drainage problems of hospital site/concern about drainage	111	Any development as a result of this brief will be required to produce a sustainable drainage plan. Text will be added to the brief to re-inforce this requirement and to report the flooding incident of 2011/12.
36.	Noise disruption during build	1	A condition will be placed on any planning consent to limit construction and demolition hours and have an agreed construction management plan.
37.	Use site for a new school	1	Beyond the scope of this brief. Comment noted and forwarded to Hampshire County Council.
38.	Drs surgery car park needs enlarging	1	This is already allowed for in the plans.
39.	Can St James School cope with extra demand?	1111111111 111	HCC addressing this issue.
40.	Need for an additional Park and Stride facility	1	Reference to Park and Stride facilities will be added to the brief.
41.	Concern re capacity of GP surgery	11111111	The brief already allows for expansion of the surgery into the phase 1A area.
42.	Concern re capacity of local dentists	1	This is a matter for the NHS.
43.	Small corner shop would be beneficial	11	The brief will the altered to allow developers the flexibility to build a small corner shop if they consider it viable.
44.	Provide or improve sports facilities	11	The local plan addressed provision of leisure facilities. This land has been allocated for health or housing use. However planning gain contributions will be required of developers and these could be used to improve sports facilities subject to the priorities of the local area committee and the parish council.
45.	Concern about crime	11	This is a matter for the Police.
46.	Support for landmark building	11	Noted
47.	Concern about landmark building at junction of Moorgreen/Botley	111	This is a standard urban design response to a significant junction to promote 'legibility' (the ease with which people can navigate around a place). It is also espoused in official national guidance and page 19 of the Council's

			adopted Quality Places SPD. The dotted, circular symbol used in plan no.23 is an abstract symbol to indicate the approximate position of the building. It does not mean that the building should be cylindrical in form. The land on which the building will be built is lower than the Botley/Moorgreen Road junction. This will reduce the impact of any building here and this has been taken account in the setting building height limits here.
48.	10 metre set-back to frontages on Moorgreen and Botley welcomed.	11	Noted. The brief fixes this, however if the developer can justify very minor and localised reduction of this set back in their design statement, then the council will consider this.
49.	Tennis Court on the rec needs resurfacing/ facilities for older children needed; eg more tennis courts/ contribution to youth club	1	Planning gain receipts towards play/leisure provision will be taken. The parish council will be responsible for prioritising any improvements to the rec.
50.	Provision for a church	1	Land allocation is a matter for the local plan. The allocation is for health and (on any land the NHS deems surplus to its requirements) housing. There are no plans to change this to include religious uses.
51.	Opposition to building on the 'Donkey Field' on grounds of ecology and/or limiting of urban sprawl	11	This land has been a designated development site since at least the publication of the 2001-20011 local plan. Development will, however, be required to mitigate any impact on ecology in accordance with council policy and national legislation.

Table 2 Summary of consultation responses from organisations

Where a consultee organisation has raised an issue previously raised by another consultee (resident or organisation), the issue and response will not be repeated. Only significant issues, relevant to the content and purpose of the brief are listed.

	CONSULTEE	ISSUE	Response; text in bold indicates where a change to the brief will be made
1.	Graham Paisley Network Development Planner, Scottish and Southern Energy	Standard comment made on most development sites which are accommodating local electricity distribution facilitating supplies.	Noted. No change to document.
2.	Steve Carrington	Request to include a small area of	Agreed, subject to increased

	Planning Director Forman Homes-Landowner representative	land outside the local plan allocation within the developable area for Moorgreen Dairy Farm site.	requirement for screening along countryside edge. The capacity figure for this phase will be increased by 3 units to 23 homes.
3.	Mr S Parmer Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service	General, non-site specific advice	Information noted, but is generic advice, not needed in the document.
4.	Helen Batty Assistant Asset Manager Highways Agency	Concern regarding access to the motorway if noise mitigation is required.	Information noted, but is generic advice, not needed in the document.
5.	James Rowley Area Manager North Hampshire Homes and Communities Agency-Landowner	<p>a) Could be more clarity on the vision for the development</p> <p>b) Section on additional design guidance should include architectural guidance.</p> <p>c) Development on HCA site should seek to reflect existing identity and scale of that site, rather than focus the design response to the suburban context.</p> <p>d) Clarification sought on the context of the brief given the demise of the latest local plan.</p> <p>Further comments of relatively less importance relating to points of detail were made. Some of these have resulted in minor changes to the brief. These comments are included in the attached annotated copy of the HCA's response below.</p>	<p>a) This will be addressed in the design code to be produced by the developer and agreed with the council.</p> <p>b) This will be addressed in the design code. Further more detailed advice is not required at this stage in the development process. The HCA was given the opportunity to produce a Design Guide for the site which could have included such advice, which could then have been reflected in the brief.</p> <p>c) The HCA site consists of two pockets of high density development surrounded by lawns and car parks of limited merit in terms of character. Outside of the workhouse frontage and its curtilage area to the south, this overall development pattern is not appropriate for this site.</p> <p>d) The brief has been redrafted to relate principally to the adopted local plan (2001-2012).</p>
6.	Pete Errington HCC	Support principal of access. Suggestion to include more in the brief regarding drainage and Suds.	Additional text is added to address concerns regarding drainage and Suds.
7.	Tiffany Hallett Legal Property Manager Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, and Paula Melhuish Head of Capital Planning & Compliance	Concern regarding parking Displaced from HCA site Statement of future plans for the site, which is in line with the proposals in the brief.	A paragraph is added to explain the council's position in relation to the problem of parking displaced from the HCA site.

	<p>University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust Inger Hebden Director of Commissioning, Long Term Conditions and Community NHS West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group</p>		
8.	<p>Alison Appleby Natural England</p>	<p>Several small amendments requested to improve the advice in relation to the impact on Moorgreen Meadows SSSI and other nearby sites. Welcome the reference to deep soakaways to augment water supply to this site and also the stainable drainage paragraph.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
9.	<p>Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water</p>	<p>Request to include a sentence regarding connection to the sewerage network.</p>	<p>Agreed. Included as new paragraph 5.100</p>
10.	<p>St James School</p>	<p>a) Concern regarding the reference to adopted parking SPD regarding the option to reduce parking provision where unallocated parking is provided. b) Concern regarding 'potential deep soakaways'. c) Land ownership plan label, 'countryside'. d) reference to distances to local schools and concern about shortage of secondary school places.</p>	<p>a) This brief cannot change the adopted parking policy, which will stand. All developments will, through the parking SPD referred to in the brief, provide for their own needs in terms of parking. Due to differing car use patterns, unallocated parking is more efficient than normal. b) The drains would be within the site. These would not have an effect at surface level. However the graphic will be tweaked to reassure the consultee. c) This is in fact correct. The term refers to the planning designation and land can be both designated countryside and still be used as school playing fields. However the label will be removed to avoid further confusion. d) Distances to schools corrected. Education is a matter for Hampshire County Council, who have been consulted on the brief and raised no objection in terms of</p>

			this issue.
11.	<p>Andrew Strange Head of Planning and Development</p> <p>NHS Property Services Ltd</p>	<p>a) If the site has not been the subject a tree survey to BS, the SPD should not include detailed proposals in respect of individual trees.</p> <p>b) The SPD should not include specific proposals for "avenues" within the site unless there is some evidence of a need for them in these particular locations. These should be "indicative"</p> <p>c) The SPD should be explicit about the archaeological investigations that the Council will expect in respect of the development of the different parts of the site.</p> <p>d) Decisions about the commissioning of healthcare services for people in this area will be taken by the CCG and NHS England. The commissioners engage with the Council through the Health and Wellbeing Board. It is not clear from this SPD as to the role that the Council, acting as local planning authority, has in determining whether there is a need for healthcare facilities on this site to serve the current and future needs of local people. If the local planning authority will require anything other than confirmation from the commissioners as to the need for the facilities to deliver healthcare, please could the SPD be more specific about the precise nature of the information that will be required?</p> <p>e) The precise area to be retained as open space should be determined via a planning application, rather than be identified specifically on this plan, unless there is evidence why this particular area needs to be retained as open space.</p> <p>f) Objection to the identification of separate parts of the site owned by NHS PS as being suitable for healthcare and residential development. The whole area in NHS PS ownership should simply be allocated for a mix of healthcare and residential development.</p>	<p>a) Not accepted. The council has expert officers who are capable of passing judgement without including all the detail requirements of a survey to full BS standard.</p> <p>b) The council considers there is need for avenues in the locations proposed.</p> <p>c) The document references guidance by Hampshire County Council on archaeology and development.</p> <p>d) Whilst the council does have a role in health planning, democratically representing the views and needs of residents it is not within the remit of this development brief to set out the case for improved healthcare within the borough. This brief merely provides a framework, within which health care can be facilitated and surplus land be developed for housing. The council looks forward to closer engagement with NHS bodies including commissioners and NHS England, through both Hampshire's and Eastleigh's Health and Wellbeing Boards. Further information about the evidence required to support a case for the change of use from Health to other uses will be provided as necessary on a site by site basis. This is likely to include evidence that satisfies the council that adequate and accessible provision is being made across the health system and the local area for older people and for communities that experience health inequalities.</p> <p>e) There are good planning reasons why the main area of open space has been identified where it is.</p>

		g) Objection to the retention of the gate piers to the south of Hawthorn Lodge	f) Not accepted. There are good planning reasons why the land uses have been identified for different areas. g) Not accepted.
12.	Robert Lloyd-Sweet Historic Places Adviser (South East England) English Heritage	Support the proposal to provide green open space as a landscape setting for the barrow. Support retention of locally listed buildings. Request clarification that land between receiving lodges is to remain undeveloped.	Noted Noted Agreed
13.	West End Parish and Moorgreen Rd Res Assn	a) Object to max allowable building height fronting park of 3 storeys. b) Proposed footpath improvements within MG rec. c) Object strongly to new footpath proposed along east side of Moorgreen Road along side the rec where there is currently no footway. d) There is a need for an overview of all developments in the area and the impact of these all together on West End and surrounding areas including the environment and the infrastructure. e) no suggestions of any factors to ameliorate the extra traffic	a) There is currently no significant informal surveillance of the park from surrounding houses. It is good design practice to have natural surveillance on at least the lengths of 3 sides of a park, for the safety and security of its users. The brief proposes surveillance along only a short section of the park. It is not ideal to rely on CCTV for safety (as suggested by the consultees) and the proposed new paths alongside the south and east sides of the park would need surveillance. No change to the brief is proposed. b) Change suggested route of new footpath to introduce paths along southern and eastern boundaries. The council would expect this to be delivered by the developer. c) The scheme is on the HCC / EBC Transport Scheme Inventory list as TSI 678, and was prioritised as High by HEWEB on 30.9.13. As such the scheme will remain in the brief. d) This comment will be passed to the planning policy team. e) These can only be determined after a Transport Assessment

		<p>generated by this site</p> <p>f) The Recreation Ground is also at a higher level than our properties (along Moorgreen Road) and the drainage ditch that runs along this boundary must be retained</p>	<p>(funded by developers) has been carried out.</p> <p>f)Agreed</p>
14.	Botley Parish Council	<p>The document should be strengthened to include a specific requirement for the positive enhancement of the medical facilities available.</p> <p>Lack of clarity regarding parking for re-provided hospital building.</p>	<p>Whilst the council does have a role in health planning, democratically representing the views and needs of residents it is not within the remit of this development brief to set out the case for improved healthcare within the borough. This brief merely provides a framework, within which health care can be facilitated and surplus land be developed for housing.</p> <p>All new development on the site must serve its own parking needs. This is existing council policy and will not change. It is not the purpose of this brief to provide detailed information regarding parking requirements that is already provided within existing documents. However for the purpose of clarity a sentence will be added to the brief to clarify that new hospital buildings will be required to provide their own parking.</p>
15.	Eastleigh Southern Parishes Older People's Forum and Bursledon Parish Council	<p>Various issues also raised by above organisations or residents.</p>	
16.	HEWEB local area committee	<p>Consider the co-location of GP services with a re-provided 'hospital' to deliver the benefits of an integrated service to residents.</p>	<p>The brief will be amended to recommend this as a long term plan.</p>
17.	Eastleigh Borough Council officers and	<p>Potential for social and therapeutic horticulture on the site.</p>	<p>The brief will be amended to facilitate the option for the</p>

	Eastleigh Borough and Romsey MENCAP		inclusion of an horticultural therapy (or similar) facility on the site.
--	-------------------------------------	--	---

Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Comments on Eastleigh Borough Council's " Land at Moorgreen Hospital Draft Development Brief" Dated November 2014. EBC response added in bold at the end of each paragraph or issue.

Thank you for providing the HCA with the opportunity to comment on the draft development brief for this site. Please find below a summary of our comments. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these with you at your earliest convenience.

1. Background

HCA took over the 2.65 Hectare site (shown in plan 1 outlined in red p3 of the draft brief) from the NHS in April 2014. Following this transfer, we met with the council to discuss submitting a formal pre-application and have had extensive pre-application discussions since this was submitted in August 2014. In September, we produced and shared the Moorgreen Developers Brief with Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), which was used as part of our tender process. This has been a collaborative design process to date, which in our view forms part of the context for the preparation of the Draft Development Brief SPD, although we recognise this covers a wider area.

2. Overall Comments

We would like to make the following comments provided in response to the brief: The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) provides useful guidance, but we suggest that there could be adjustments which could improve its clarity. In particular, it would be good to give more clarity on the vision for the development, as there is a real opportunity to create a quality landmark development at this site. To illustrate what can be achieved by other case studies, we would be a happy to provide further details of precedent HCA and/or local schemes or arrange a tour of comparable sites where high quality former hospital/workhouse conversion schemes have been achieved. Similarly, we also felt that 'Additional Design Criteria' (p73) focusses on distances from trees, set-backs, hedge width, etc. rather than on the type of place that will be designed and should provide some architectural guidance. We feel that the SPD analysis rather underplays the range of locally listed buildings in the local context, as well as the variety of land uses (especially south of the site) and scale of development. As a result, at present the SPD may not be picking up the opportunity to do something different and create a landmark development within an area of suburban development. Due to the presence of the locally listed Workhouse and lodge buildings being there before any of the suburban development, the HCAs site has always been substantially different to the local context. We are of the view that it has always had its own identity and the new development should seek to reflect that identity and scale, rather than focus the design response to the suburban context.

In terms of character assessment, we suggest that West End is clearly identified as a series of character areas, illustrating different age, form, scale and land use.

See main schedule for responses to the points raised in in this section.

3. Specific comments

Our specific comments are made as follows:

Plan 1 refers to Dawson Lodge as an 'Old People's Home' – should this be referred to as a residential care home? **Agreed.**

Plan 2 shows an old aerial photo of the site which does not reflect its current appearance. We suggest the plan should annotate date this aerial photo was taken and/or replace it with a current image. **Agreed**

Plan 4 should show Dawson Lodge shaded as NHS Property Co. as Dawson Lodge land is leased from NHS (similarly Countess Mountbatten has a Southampton University Hospital Trust lease from NHS Prop Co). **Agreed**

Plan 5 is a little confusing and we suggest it could be broken up into a couple of plans to help emphasise key contextual matters. No building heights have been provided to coach depot or leisure development. This also shows Ageas Bowl land – should that not be shaded blue too? Also, if this is a Site Context plan could the existing hospital buildings be coloured to denote building heights to maintain consistency with surrounding area? **Not accepted**

Plan 12 references Principle hedgerows. These are not all of a high quality or to be retained on phase 1 and we suggest this is reflected. **Not accepted- this level of detail is for the application stage.**

Plan 13 should distinguish the range of sensitivity along the boundary with Countess Mountbatten House. We are of the view that the most sensitive edge is along the boundary with the eastern block, which is the actual Hospice accommodation. **The text already distinguishes between the different levels of sensitivity. However the graphic will be altered to reduce the area of highest sensitivity in the vicinity of the training block.**

The plan shows principal sections of hedgerow and that species rich hedgerow must be retained. This includes hedging next to the GP extension land which would prevent its expansion, so suggest this is amended. **Agreed**

Plan 17 & 23 should be amended to include updated requirements for additional land for GP surgery, following recent discussions. **Agreed**

Plan 19 may be better as a single phasing plan? **Not agreed.**

Plan 20 proposes density ranges are rather prescriptive and lend more rigidity to a scheme coming forward. We suggest a simple site wide density may be more effective and good design will achieve appropriate site wide density to respond to constraints and opportunities. **Not accepted.**

Plan 23 - The planting details suggested along the sensitive area of Hospice should allow more flexibility. **Not accepted.**

Under Development Principles Exec Summary (p7) our detailed comments are:

1st bullet – 215-230 dwellings is quite a narrow range of development permitted. Can the wording be revised to say can accommodate approximately 230 dwellings or alternatively at least 215 dwellings to provide more flexibility. **Partially accepted. The word ‘approximately’ will be added.**

3rd bullet – states frontage block and lodges must be retained and re-used. Whilst structural surveys have been done which demonstrates they can be retained and re-used, a viable scheme will need to be worked-up so this is achievable. The use of ‘should’ is preferable. **Not accepted.**

- 4th bullet – ‘must provide for future expansion’ of the surgery. Again we support the principle for this, but expansion is not yet certain. Revised wording would be ‘should allow for the potential future expansion of the surgery’. **Not accepted.**
- 8th bullet and Para 5.17 (p56) – we would prefer that the brief refers to development exploring the potential for enhancements to the strategic cycle network as this maintains flexibility. **Not accepted.**

9th bullet – it is not in our control to improve visibility of the Recreation Ground, given that the boundary fence/planting appears to be in the parish councils ownership. The policy also ‘requires’ a new access into the park. This is understood, but would be contingent on the parish agreeing to an entrance being provided and need to avoid any ransom situation. We suggest wording such as to ‘explore the potential for a pedestrian/cycle access into the recreation ground’. **Sentence added to make this contingent on the parish council making the land freely available.**

11th bullet – this states development must provide 35% affordable. Policy DM28 of the draft local plan refers to a target of 35% so please can this be amended. **Agreed**

15th Bullet - we don't feel that adjoining frontages offer sufficient consistency to be justify being mirrored. **Not accepted.**

These comments on the principles will also apply to the relevant bodies of text in the SPD which refers.

Paragraph 2.7 Townscape (p13) - In terms of character assessment, we suggest that West End is a more diverse area, clearly identified as a series of character areas, illustrating different age, form, scale and land use. We feel that the locally listed buildings on site are most relevant as the reference point. **Comment noted, but no change to document.**

Paragraph 2.42 (p32) – the HCA has carried out more than “partial” ecological surveys including an extended Phase 1 habitat survey, an invasive plant survey, assessment of buildings on site for bat roost potential and a bat emergence/re-entry survey to gather outline information on the likely presence/absence of roosting bats. Further details can be provided if required and we would request that this is included in the text. **Agreed**

Paragraph 2.44 (p32) refers to nesting birds within buildings on site. Please confirm which buildings are affected. Similarly this applies to 2.45 – please confirm where slow-worms been found on site. **EBC ecologist to action later in the development process.**

Paragraph 2.53 (p37) refers to noise pollution adjoining the M27, this comment really only applies to the east of overall site nearer to M27. **Air pollution will still apply.**

Paragraph 3.9 (p42) -This refers to evidence that no healthcare need is required on site. As we have discussed before, the HCAs site is a de-commissioned site and therefore this policy requirement is therefore unnecessary now. Please can this wording be amended, because as discussed during the pre-application process, HCAs land is a de-commissioned site, there is Ministers letter confirming this and therefore can we agree that quoting this policy requirement is therefore unnecessary now? **Wording added, but any planning application will still need to be supported by robust evidence.**

Para 3.18 (p43) - Reference is made to ‘probably’ not allowing individual access to plots from Moorgreen Road should be supported by highway evidence. This needs to be clarified as a couple of driveway accesses serving a few properties here may not give rise to highway concerns. The main site access will be from Botley Road. Paragraph 5.16 (p56) refers to a

missing footpath along Moorgreen Road, towards the Primary School. This is outside of the site and is not directly related to the development so we suggest this proposal is removed. The development itself however will provide for safe routes through the site. **Clarification made.**

Paragraph 5.16 (p56) refers to a missing footpath along Moorgreen Road, towards the Primary School. This is outside of the site and is not directly related to the development so we suggest this proposal is removed. The development itself however will provide for safe routes through the site. **Not accepted.**

Paragraph 5.25 (p.58) - Shared surface streets may serve more than 15 dwellings. **Already allowed for in paragraph 5.26.**

Paragraph 5.29 (p60) Although we liked this affordable housing image, it does suggest a higher density approach. We suggest the document should be consistent generally on density by indicating that flexibility will be allowed within its different sub-areas. **Not accepted.**

Paragraph 5.40 (p60) - Could we discuss why the planting screen needs to be 'at least 5m'? We would like to see wording that will enable some flexibility in a scheme coming forward. **Not accepted.**

Paragraph 5.34 (p63) – States that the 1st phase of site has capacity for in the region of 110-115 homes. Following the HCAs capacity work, we consider that the site could accommodate at least 120 homes and have given wider range in the HCAs Developers Brief. We would like for the range stated here be more flexible than stated, including up to 120 homes. Final numbers will have to be determined by the consideration of submitted detailed scheme and range of house types included. **Not accepted, but wording clarified.**

Paragraph 5.51 (p66) - the hedge row along Botley Road has been surveyed and found and not to be species rich as part of survey work undertaken by Peter Brett Associates and this was reported back to project meeting. Can this please be stated in the brief. **Detail not required in the brief and not yet confirmed by EBC ecologist.**

Paragraph 5.56 (p66) provides prescriptive requirements for bird and bat boxes. Could the first sentence should be retained but the remaining sentences requiring 50% of houses to have bird boxes and 50% to have bat bricks, etc be removed. **Not accepted.**

Paragraph 5.59 (p67) refers to floor to ceiling heights. Normally, apartments would be in the region of 2.5-2.6m floor to ceiling heights. Could this please be amended to allow more flexibility. **Clarification made for 2.5 storey buildings.**

Paragraph 5.61 (p69) - using large house types is only one solution which could be appropriate adjoining the eastern section of the hospice accommodation. Can this paragraph be consistent the revised wording in the pre-application response which seems more flexible and appropriate. **Additional wording added.**

Paragraph 5.66 (p73) Botley and Moorgreen Roads are different in terms of noise exposure and visual context. The set back along Moorgreen Road will probably be played at the corner focal point building as shown in your plan 22, but there seems to be no justification for this to be 10m set back along the short remaining frontage up to West End Surgery. Please can this be clarified. **Not accepted.**

On Botley Road frontage, the HCA understands the council's ambition to introduce an avenue of trees, but the wording provided in the pre-application response is less prescriptive and we would prefer for this to be used. **Not accepted.**

Paragraph 5.80 (p76) -There are a number of solutions possible to create a sensitive relationship between the developments. This has been reflected in the updated wording within the pre-application response (see comment 5.61 above) and should be reflected in this paragraph also. **Wording added to allow for older persons homes to be accommodated adjacent to Countess Mountbatten Hospice as an alternative solution.**

Para 5.98 (p81) - The development of an energy centre will not be feasible or viable for a development of circa 120 homes on phase 1 of the site unless the council can guarantee connection and provide an indemnity to the house builder should there be any delays. **Noted, but the wording in the brief doesn't commit the developers to build one.**

Appendix D (p87). The public art ideas reflecting the history of the workhouse are welcomed and we would like more discussion on this. **Noted.**

3 Conclusion

We would like to thank Eastleigh Council for providing the opportunity for us to comment on this brief and believe that by working together (including the selected developer) we can ensure a quality residential scheme is delivered on HCA's site. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss our comments.

With regards to the development timetable, the HCA expects to be able to confirm the selected developer partner for Moorgreen shortly following the 10 day standstill period ending 9 February. Going forward after then, we would like to move forward in the discussions regarding both the pre-application process and development brief. We have suggested to Dawn Errington in the planning team that there is a round table meeting with all key officers, HCA and the preferred developer.

At this meeting we would also like to clarify the context of the SPD given that the emerging Local Plan is being withdrawn, will this require the SPD to be re-drafted as these draft policies are now not going to be in place? It would be useful to have clarification from how Eastleigh propose to advance the SPD in light of the withdrawal of their Local Plan and the implications this may have on developers. **The brief has been redrafted to relate principally to the previous local plan.**