

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
OUTLINE APPLICATION			
Environmental Impact Assessment			
LANDSCAPE			
1	<p>WCC/HBC Landscape discussion points in the meeting held 15/02/11 Clarification on how the information contained in the ES parameter plans was taken forward into the Masterplan for the whole site and Phase 1.</p>	<p>Information contained in the Parameter Plans was incorporated into the design of Phase 1. The ES parameter plans were also carried forward into the masterplan and assisted with identifying the site's constraints and opportunities. They set out the 'Rochdale' maximum extent envelope assessing the worst case parameters. Phase 1 and Masterplan accord with the ES parameter plans and any necessary mitigation.</p>	No change
	<p><i>Hedges</i> – a number of hedges appear to be lost, especially to the west of Plant Row where they are also species-rich.</p>	<p>Savills Landscape Architect at meeting on 15/02/11 explained that the design had sought to minimise the loss of hedgerows by incorporating hedges in gardens and open spaces. However it was inevitable that some stretches may be lost, especially to facilitate the infrastructure network. Later phases would seek to conserve hedgerows wherever possible.</p> <p>There will be unavoidable hedgerow loss associated with the River Wallington due to the work required to restore the River. However, it is proposed that a new hedgerow of 2,660m will be established to mitigate this impact. Even with the inclusion of hedgerow losses associated with the restoration of the River Wallington, the small overall loss of hedgerow habitat would be more than offset when considering tree/ shrub coverage in overall terms, i.e. including new woodland creation and planting of individual trees/ shrubs and thickets/ copses within the various other forms of greenspace. In calculating the balance of hedgerow losses and gains for the entire scheme there would be a net gain in hedgerow length of approximately 7%. Note that a further 690m of hedgerow would also be restored.</p>	No Change
	<p>WCC/HBC particularly mentioned the hedgerow that is shown in the Biodiversity Strategy between the School and the detailed Phase 1</p>	<p>This hedgerow would be retained and is shown as such in the Biodiversity Chapter of the ES. Although the hedge is adjacent</p>	No Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	appears to have been lost in the Phase 1 plans.	to the access road, it is not within the detailed Phase 1, as it is just outside of the Site boundary.	
	Issue raised that page 51 of the Design Code shows an illustrative cross section by Fabrik that shows the creation of artificial bunding and raised the issue that this type of change in levels may result in the loss of hedgerows.	This comment will be addressed when the Design Code is reviewed subsequent to approval of the hybrid application.	On-going
	WCC/HBC noted that the existing public footpath leading towards Waterlooville town centre from Phase 1 should have some advance planting.	<p>A narrow strip (1.5m wide) of species-rich wildflower grassland (MG5 community) would be shown either side of the new pathway. A reviewed plan that demonstrates in greater detail the strategy for the public footpath is provided in this comprehensive response. Please see the Mayer Brown drawing schedule for more details.</p> <p>Any planting would relate to the delivery of the footpath prior to occupation of the first residential dwelling in Phase 1. Planting will also need to be in accordance with seasonal planting timeframes.</p>	Reviewed Plan
	Concern raised over the practicality of community gardens especially due to the lack of evidence in the UK	In the meeting on 15/02/11 Savills Landscape Architect directed WCC to the appropriate sources that show successful community food production in the UK such as Todmorden (www.incredibleedible-todmorden.co.uk)	No change
	WCC/HBC raised concern over the trees being planted in the Newlands SINC which might not be desirable.	<p>Savills Landscape Architect at the meeting on 15/02/11 noted that this SINC is already ruined and so the proposals are for restoring and enhancing it.</p> <p>The vast majority of the Site would be restored to wildflower meadow. The previous destruction of the meadow due to long term ploughing, however, provides a 'blank slate' and the opportunity to diversify the habitats present (benefitting a much wider variety of wildlife including Dormice and amphibians) and to create a more structurally varied and attractive amenity resource. By also providing small woodland copses (selecting species appropriate to local conditions) and a water feature, the length of ecotone would also be greatly</p>	No change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		increased which is of particular value to birds and butterflies.	
	WCC/HBC required confirmation that east-west footpath links to Newlands Lane would not be lost.	Savills, at the meeting on 15/02/11 referred WCC to the relevant ES Parameter plans (Figure 2.7) which show how a minimum of three links would be incorporated towards the lane.	No change
	WCC/HBC concerned that the original Grant Associates tree surveys showed the original road junction at Purbrook Heath and London Road. They asked for confirmation that Mayer Brown had consulted the tree survey when designing their junction and sought to minimise the loss of important trees. In particular they were keen to ensure that trees which had been earmarked as not important for retention, but which no longer needed to be removed for the new scheme, were not just removed needlessly and due to the old scheme. They requested to see the Mayer Brown design with an overlay of the Grant Associates survey to check this.	The tree survey was a guiding principle in determining the road alignment and breaks through tree lines. Wherever possible higher value trees were avoided. Where the tree corridor has already been cleared, just north of the Gables/ Whitehouse, the road alignment ties in with the previous proposals. Mayer Brown to provide an additional drawing (GTWVILLE2/SK/0037).	No change – new supplementary Plan
	WCC requires a site visit with the Tree Officer as the Tree Officer has not yet commented on the application.	Site visit undertaken 22/02/11.	
2	<p>WCC Landscape formal Consultation response</p> <p>Whilst all trees are identified on the Tree:fabrik tree survey plans they are not always clearly identified in Section 2 of the Design Code. The opportunity to identify clearly these isolated features (trees and hedgerows) in the detailed plans of each character area has not been taken.</p> <p>The mature Oak trees are not identified on site and there is concern that they are not being identified in the Design Code for each phase. In order to try and avoid future phases not identifying trees as a constraint it has been agreed with Fabrik that an additional note be put into the Design Code making reference to the retention and protection of existing trees in accordance with the Tree:fabrik plans.</p>	<p>The baseline information for the arboricultural data has been produced and provided with the submitted application. This identifies the quality and value of trees in accordance with British Standards 5837:2005. The reports and tree surveys provide an informed approach as to whether trees are to be retained or removed during development. The masterplan will retain existing trees where possible, in accordance with the open space strategy.</p> <p>The trees plans Tf 784/AIA/100 - Tf 784/AIA/115 were issued with the submitted application. Furthermore, an arboricultural implication assessment TF/AIA/784 (outline) provides an analysis of the potential impact of the proposal on the existing trees, based on tree protection measures recommended in British Standards 5837:2005.</p> <p>Further analysis of trees to be retained will take place for each</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		detailed application submitted.	
	Details required of the advanced strategic landscape planting in order to assess those isolated instances where visual impact is likely to be most severe as identified in the ES (Table 10.17 Potential Visual Effects).	Dialogue has taken place with landscape officers and no request for further information has been received subsequent to this.	
ECOLOGY			
3	HCC Ecology DETAILED RESPONSE PROVIDED IN APPENDIX.	DETAILED RESPONSE TO HCC PRESENTED AS AN APPENDIX TO THIS TABLE.	
RIVER RESTORATION			
4	HCC Ecology Response to ES DETAILED RESPONSE PROVIDED IN APPENDIX.	DETAILED RESPONSE TO HCC PRESENTED AS AN APPENDIX TO THIS TABLE.	
5	Environment Agency – Initial response and Meeting to ES There is a lack of green space allocated around the River Wallington. It is difficult to understand how much green space will be provided as none of the drawings are to scale. There are some drawings showing a 5m buffer which would not be sufficient. Clarity on this is required.	The extent of the River Wallington CNR is shown in Figures 9.8, 9.9 (and zoomed quadrants), and 9.10 of the ES. It was discussed that this amounts to a substantial area of GI (c. 17ha). The EA was satisfied with providing this substantial area and it would be guaranteed as a planning condition. To the north of the river the space is indeed more constrained but it was nevertheless agreed that it would be at least 25m between the river dry weather channel and the northern edge of the CNR. 25m would also be the minimum distance to the south although in certain areas to the south the width would be much greater. The EA was satisfied with these commitments. It was agreed with the EA that these details would be included within the updated design code as well as a reference to the flexible approach to the relationship between the employment area and the river during the detailed design stage. It has been agreed with both WCC and HBC officers that the Design Code will be agreed through a planning condition.	No Change
	Detail is required on how the proposed restoration will be implemented. As understood the restoration will be delivered in two phases, if this is the agreed approach it needs to be secured. It is preferred by the EA that the restoration is delivered up front as it will be a key GI asset and will need opportunity to establish.	As discussed in meeting on 28/01/2011 the construction will be undertaken in two phases, indicated on the proposed phasing plan as phases 6 and 9. It was confirmed that Grainger intends to deliver the strategic infrastructure and any land sales would be serviced plots. Although the construction	No change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>would be phased it is the intention to undertake the detailed engineering and ecological design for the river channel as a single piece of work, approved prior to the initial construction phase. This would include the wider landscaping and ecological mitigation design for the nature reserve element associated with the initial phase. The wider landscaping and ecological mitigation design for the second phase of the river restoration construction would take place prior to undertaking those works, as it would relate to the future built development.</p> <p>The text in the Design Code is currently being reviewed to ensure clarity is provided on the phasing of the River Wallington. It has been agreed with both WCC and HBC officers that the Design Code will be agreed through a planning condition.</p>	
	<p>There is a lack of detail regarding commitment to future management of the wetland areas.</p>	<p>It was confirmed in the meeting on 28/01/2011 that the EA would not adopt the river restoration as stated in the Design Code. The River Wallington would form a key component of the River Wallington Community Nature Reserve (CNR). The management proposals for this reserve would be set out in detail in the site-wide management plan which is expected to be an S106 requirement.</p>	<p>S106</p>
	<p>The focus seems to be on the larger River Wallington restoration, however details for the Old Park Stream should also be provided. The illustrations are not to scale and the EA would require scale drawings to ensure the details are acceptable</p>	<p>There are no proposals to restore or re-grade Old Park Farm stream. Its conservation status should be enhanced by the establishment of the River Wallington CNR. It is made clear in the text and in Figures 9.8, 9.9 (and zoomed quadrants), and 9.10 that the Old Park Farm Stream corridor would form an important and substantial component of this CNR. The width of the River Wallington CNR along the Old Park Farm stream section would be 25m minimum (all on the southern side of the stream) but wider than this in certain sections, as can be approximately seen from the above figures. In total, the area covered by the CNR (both the River Wallington and Old Park</p>	<p>No change</p>

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		Farm stream sections) would be substantial - 17ha. The EA understands that the precise width of the CNR corridor would need to be fine-tuned with respect to each RMA and so was satisfied with these general commitments.	
NOISE			
6	<p>HBC Environmental Health noise response to ES</p> <p>The site will in time benefit from the industrial areas as described and shown on the plan. A general condition may need to be imposed to control any noise generating outlet, within the area. Noise, vibration, smell should be discussed and agreed in writing prior to any outlets begin trading. To protect nearby residents any noise acoustic reports shall use the noise measurement described within the appendices or prior to any industrial use beginning to operate. General conditions proposed</p>	Agree that the conditions proposed would be appropriate subject to appropriate drafting	Condition
SOCIO-ECONOMIC			
7	<p>HBC Policy Response to ES</p> <p>The first column of table 6.20 on page 34 of chapter 6 is incorrect listing B1a, B1/B2/B8 and B1b,c. There is a duplication here. It would be preferable to provide a split in line with the PUSH and HBC requirements i.e. B1 (offices), B2 manufacturing (including (B1b and c) and B8 warehousing.</p>	<p>The table is taken from the Vail Williams report that calculates office space in this way. Table 6.20 is written in this way due to the fact that Vail Williams wanted to highlight the different B1 uses that could be provided as part of the employment use at Newlands. The other uses (line two of the table) have been grouped in such a way as the actual split of these uses is unknown at this stage. Two additional Tables (Table A and B appended) have been produced by Vail Williams to clarify how the B class uses have been calculated.</p> <p>Table A provides a broad estimation of job capacity, cross-referred with the masterplan plot references to help the council 'navigate' through the workings. It provides a broad picture of employment pending precise definition of land uses (consistent with paragraph 8.58 of the employment report).</p> <p>Table B provides a more precise estimate of job capacity, per use class cross-referred with the floor areas within the market commentary (paragraph 8.16 to 8.40), subject to achievement of the individual land use shown.</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		HBC and WCC are now able to see all the workings for B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 and B8 uses for floorspace areas, worker density rates and resultant job capacity.	
	For table 6.20 it would appear that a 0.4 plot ratio has been applied to calculate the floorspace which is acceptable. It is not clear how the number of jobs have been calculated. Density rates are set out in para 8.18 of the appendix. However these rates are set out as ranges e.g. B1 19-34m ² per person. If ranges have been applied to table 6.20 to calculate the jobs generated then a range of job numbers should have been provided. Further clarification is required.	Further clarification is provided in Table A appended to this comprehensive response regarding how density rates have been calculated. HBC and WCC are now able to see all the workings for B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 and B8 uses for floorspace areas, worker density rates and resultant job capacity.	
	There are a number of discrepancies between the figures provided in chapter 6 and appendix 6, which is a matter of concern. The figures in table 6.20 of chapter 6 do not marry up with the table under para 4.3 of appendix 6. The number of residents stated in appendix 6 is 5,894 rather than 6,360 stated in chapter 6 based on a household size of 2.4. The table below paragraph 6.5 of appendix 6 gives local employment required as 698 and 1,116 which is different to the figures of 760 and 1,216 stated in para 6.5.39 of chapter 6. The figures in para 4.25 of appendix 6 of 13.52ha and 16.45 ha do not marry up with table 6.20. The figure of 7,500m ² of office space in the appendix does not match the figures in table 6.20. Revised information and/or clarification is required as a matter of considerable importance to ensure the employment strategy is fully evidence based.	Table 6.20 for Chapter 6 and para 4.3 (Table). The table in para 4.3 of the appendix is the land area for employment floorspace that could be provided within the MDA which includes B class uses and other employment generating uses across the site. Table 6.20 is the proposed floorspace that is put forward by Vail Williams in terms of the capacity of B class uses for the MDA. Paragraph 4.3 therefore includes other employment uses within the plots shown in the table as well as B class uses, whereas table 6.20 only includes B class uses. Therefore, for instance Plots M1 to M5 and Plots LC1 to LC3 (para 4.3 of appendix 6) include other uses that are not B class. When you take these factors into account the overall B class provision is closely matched across the two tables.	
		Number of residents in appendix and chapter 6. The reason for the variation in the number of residents generated from the development is because Vail Williams has based its calculations on 2,550 units at a resident occupancy rate of 96.3% (2,456) by 2.4 which totals a population of 5,894 and Chapter 6 calculates the population at 2,650 units (maximum parameters tested by the ES) by 2.4 which equals 6,360. The ES tests the maximum parameters in order to ensure the worst case scenario has been assessed.	
		Employment Ratio.	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>The table below paragraph 6.5 provides an employment ratio of 698 to 1,115 based on 5,894 residents. The calculations provided in Chapter 6 para 6.5.39 equate to 760 to 1,216 as this is based on the higher population calculations of 6,360. The ES tests the maximum parameters of the development to assess the 'Rochdale' envelope as the application is in outline. Although the figures are different the same outcome is achieved i.e. a ratio of 25% to 40% self containment can be achieved on-site. Whilst the figures from both tables demonstrate that the employment provision sufficiently caters for residents generated from the development.</p>	
		<p>Amount of employment provision. The total provision of B class uses across the site (which includes the employment area to the north and the mixed use areas across the site) equates to approximately 16.5 ha at present calculation, although this needs to be flexible to account for possible changes to requirements in the future. This is the figure provided in table 6.20 and para 6.5.36 of chapter 6 of the ES. The figure of 13.52 ha solely relates to the B class employment uses in the employment area to the north of the site, as shown in para 4.25 of appendix 6. Further analysis of the table in para 4.25 will show that there are additional B class uses expected to be in the mixed use area which will increase the 13.52 ha figure by around 3 ha (this addresses the same concern as the first element of the response to Point 3).</p>	
		<p>Office Space Figure. The 7,500 sq m of office space referenced in paragraph 8.36 of appendix 6.1 relates to a specific type of office space that would form a focal feature of the employment uses at the MDA. This would be in combination with other B1 and B1a/B1b class uses as listed in the employment report (appendix 6.1), such as move on office units, office centres such as Basepoint and possibly a new headquarter facility</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		should there be the market demand at the time.	
SUDS AND DRAINAGE STRATEGY			
8	<p>WCC Engineering response to ES</p> <p>The drainage strategy is set out in para 7.5.27 of the ES. There have been slight changes in the SuDS strategy whereby SuDS have been introduced within the development areas but provided that these do not prejudice the adoption of the storm water sewers then adequate drainage can be provided. There may be a perceived safety problem with swales and attenuation features but these can be overcome by design and a safety audit.</p>	<p>The adoption of surface water sewers is subject to future changes resulting from Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. It is intended to offer the SuDS and sewers for adoption to the appropriate authority, when the responsibilities are confirmed by the future Regulations associated with the Act.</p> <p>All SuDS features will be designed to CIRIA guidance and the future National SuDS Standards to ensure that slopes into water are of safe gradients and any drops into deep water are appropriately guarded. Designs would be subject to a RoSPA audit.</p>	No Change
AIR QUALITY/ ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
9	<p>HBC Environmental Health Response</p> <p><i>Cemetery Report</i></p> <p>It is considered that further work is required in order to determine an adequate baseline from which a groundwater table mitigation scheme can be designed, or suitable size zoning determined (i.e. for single graves, double graves, green burial, and no burials).</p> <p>The mitigation scheme and/or site zoning will need to be agreed with the LPA/ EA, and suitable conditions should be applied to ensure an appropriate degree of consultation occurs between the relevant authorities and Grainger prior to implementation of the chosen scheme.</p>	<p>The provision of the cemetery is the responsibility of HBC along with future detailed testing regarding the suitability of the proposed site.</p> <p>As agreed at a steering group meeting on 11/02/2011 with Jackie Batchelor of HBC and Steve Tilbury of WCC, Grainger will provide a serviced site for the cemetery as well as the planting screening to the Hospice, boundary fencing and parking. The quantum of parking has yet to be finalised.</p> <p>In addition to this it was agreed Grainger will provide a financial contribution for the site investigation works and environmental monitoring required by the Environment Agency. The financial contribution has to be finalised with HBC.</p> <p>Full details of the works and financial contribution will be set out in the S106 which will be finalised subsequent to the outline approval.</p>	No Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p><i>Geotechnical Report</i> No comparisons between the Masterplan and location of the gas valve compound have been reviewed, or are made within the ground contamination documentation. Previous comments regarding the need to identify the location and routing of any high pressure gas mains pipes served by the pressure regulation plant have been made, and to undertake appropriate consultation with the service provider.</p> <p>Maintenance of gas service easements (where applicable) will ensure the integrity of the pipeline, and ultimately the safety of both site workers and future site occupiers/ employees/ users. Given that the location and routing of the pipeline is presently unknown, it is appropriate to address this issue as early as possible in the design and approval process.</p>	<p>The precise alignment of the HP gas mains is known. They have been traced on site by Southern Gas Networks and added to the GPS surveys. They are included on the Savills constraints plan with easements. This plan is provided within the Design and Access Statement page 37.</p> <p>Appropriate consultation has been undertaken.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
	<p><i>Air Quality, Traffic & Transportation Assessment</i> Discrepancies exist in the average background concentrations quoted for the baseline year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear whether average background figures were used in calculations, or whether location specific figures have been used in modelling. • Modelled baseline concentrations are contrary to expectation, identifying little or no differential between concentrations at areas with lower background and no local sources, when compared with areas with higher background concentrations subject to localised road traffic emissions from busy road junctions. Indeed, in the example cited in the text above, the nominal differential between location types that is identified is opposite to that expected (showing higher modelled concentrations at the 'background' site than at the 'roadside' site). • No data relating to the parameterisation of the AAQuIRE model, nor the assumptions used in its parameterisation are presented in the report. It is therefore not possible to determine if these values and assumptions are appropriate or not. • Validation of baseline results is against a limited number of NO2 diffusion tube results, and has not accounted for different location 	<p>The issues raised regarding the air quality, traffic and transportation assessment are being look into and a full response will be provided to Jonathan Driver and WCC/HBC in due course. This response will not be received with the comprehensive response but will be submitted by the end of week commencing 28/02/11.</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>types. It is recognised that a limited number of validation points are available from HBC data, however there are at least two additional locations for which data is held by HBC, and some trend data is available to validate wider model assumptions (i.e. magnitude and direction of change over time).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No operational year traffic flow figures or road network traffic distribution plots have been presented to demonstrate the anticipated (modelled) scenario with and without development in the operational year of 2021. • It is unclear what traffic figures the model utilised, whether accounting for peak flows only, AADT (annual average daily traffic) AAWT (annual average weekday traffic), 12hr counts, or other. • It is unclear what road traffic composition 'mix' (i.e. proportion of LDV/HGV/Bus/Coach/Car) was used for road traffic modelling; and whether a generic mix was used, mix by road type, or surveyed data for specific roads. • No data is presented regarding average traffic speeds used within the model, at road junctions or on specific sections of the road network. • A figure of 1% per annum is used for determining local road traffic growth for projection of baseline counts to future years. It is unclear from where this figure was derived, and whether it represents a low, medium or high growth scenario. AQ assessments relating to other areas of the borough suggest that local road traffic growth in Havant tends to conform to a 'high' growth scenario (approx 1.5% per annum). • It is similarly unclear in the report how the 1% estimated growth factor was applied, and to what data (i.e. peak average, peak am/pm, AADT/AAWF, 12 hr etc – before or after extrapolation etc). • No indication of the degree of modelling uncertainty is provided for either NO2 or PM10 background projections, traffic projections, or from modelled concentration validation. 		
	<p><i>Cumulative Impact</i> The Officer is concerned that the combination of road traffic from this proposed development, alongside local road traffic growth, and likely</p>	<p>The Air Quality assessment has utilised data provided through the Transport Assessment which incorporates the necessary committed/ cumulative schemes and therefore this</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>retail developments in the vicinity are likely to significantly impact local air quality in this area.</p> <p>Clarification of the modelling procedure as outlined in “<i>Air Quality, Traffic & Transportation Assessment</i>” will address any queries regarding cumulative effects.</p>	<p>combination has been taken into account in the assessment to date. This was also tested at the Core Strategy stage for both WCC and HBC within their SEAs.</p> <p>Mayer Brown will provide clarification of the modelling procedure in writing directly to Jonathan Driver at Havant Borough Council before the end of the week commencing 28/02/11.</p>	
10	<p>WCC Environmental Protection <i>Geotechnical Report</i></p> <p>Please provide a sufficiently large colour copy of figure 2, as it is not possible to differentiate between the report boundaries and corresponding sample locations in the version contained within the report.</p>	<p>A sufficiently large version of Figure 2 is provided within this comprehensive response as an appendix.</p>	
	<p>Please provide further information regarding the GAC calculated by Card Geotechnics for this site. It is noted that the contamination assessment to date has considered a residential end use, and slightly elevated contamination has been dismissed given their location within proposed commercial parts of the development. Where different assessment criteria relating to end use are to be considered, GACs for both residential and commercial/ industrial end uses should be provided.</p>	<p>Copy of the GAC derivation report re v1.06, July 2010 , with Appendices A, B and D, are provided as an appendix to this comprehensive response. (Appendix C is very large. Please can the Council confirm they require a copy of this appendix).</p> <p>For reference and use in specifically assessing commercial areas of development, a copy of current GACS for commercial use is provided.</p> <p>NB: This information is provided to the local authority as 'commercial in confidence' as technical support to the GACs and is not project specific information. The information on GACs is not for publication by the Councils in any form.</p>	
	<p>The limited scope of investigation works undertaken in relation to the scale of the development is recognised in the report, with the need for development specific investigations to validate findings once development plans are finalised.</p>	<p>This confirms a statement in the report, which is still valid, requiring development specific investigation as each phase of the development progresses.</p>	
	<p>The site assessments undertaken to date have revealed that the made ground appears to be the primary source of any elevated contamination, including elevated TPH, PAH, asbestos and ground gas concentrations.</p>	<p>This re-iterates the findings and recommendations of the reports to date and the need for each development phase to address these issues.</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>This has resulted in a number of conclusions and recommendations to mitigate any unacceptable risk from the contamination identified on the site to date. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significantly elevated contamination has been identified across the majority of the site, with elevated contamination being largely confined to developed areas of the site, most notably the land on and immediately surrounding plant farm. • Encapsulation and/or removal of asbestos contained within the made ground. Remedial method to be determined following finalisation of development plans. • Land gas concentrations are notably elevated in areas of made ground, requiring further assessment and/or the installation of gas protection measures (characteristic situation 2) in these areas. • Whilst no evidence of unexploded ordnance has been encountered to date, the risk associated with this cannot be dismissed and the UXO discovery strategy provided in Appendix S must form part of the remedial strategy for all phases of the development. • Given the abundance of topsoil on this site, the need to import topsoil as part of this development is considered unlikely. However, validation testing is required in support of the re-use of site won materials. This should be completed during the additional investigation phase or a specification for re-use of materials must form part of the remedial strategy. <p>These recommendations must be implemented in full as part of the development</p>		
	<p>Access restrictions have prevented a detailed assessment of large areas of the site. Whilst no significant sources of contamination are anticipated, there is the potential for isolated pockets of potentially contaminative materials to be identified that require further investigation. This should be completed once access restrictions to each development phase are lifted</p>	<p>This is confirmation of the requirement for development specific investigation on each phase of the site, as previously confirmed.</p>	
	<p>A range of conditions have therefore been proposed</p>	<p>The planning conditions proposed are bespoke to the development site and take account of previous investigations. Therefore they are considered appropriate subject to further</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		drafting.	
Historic Conservation – Plant Farm			
11	<p>WCC Historic Conservation Response</p> <p>Outline permission cannot be issued on work affecting a listed building. However, there are no details of proposals for Plant Farm included in this application. A review of Buildings at Risk is currently being undertaken. It is intended to add Plant Farm to this register since its condition is deteriorating further and the building is still at risk of vandalism and damage due to its vulnerable and isolated location. Efforts should be made through the planning process to agree a solution for the farm and to ensure that its implementation is seen as a priority.</p> <p>The entire site of the listed buildings and the farm setting needs to be dealt with as a separate phase of work since there is a different permissions regime involved. It is also appropriate to ensure that the restoration and conversion work to Plant Farmhouse and the adjacent buildings is phased to be undertaken before the redevelopment of the farm yard and preferably as an early phase of the development. This is to ensure that the more lucrative development potential is not undertaken leaving the listed building “At Risk”.</p>	<p>The amount of detail shown in the Design Code has been reduced as a result of the site visit and meeting with WCC’s Historic Conservation Officer during the pre-application stage. The Design Code makes it clear that prior to development of that phase a detailed scheme is required for Plant Farm.</p> <p>A full application will be submitted at the appropriate time. Grainger will review the protection works undertaken to date and make good any defects. Thereafter a monitoring strategy will be devised and agreed with the local authorities.</p>	Condition
12	<p>HBC Policy Response</p> <p>Is the barn actually listed?</p> <p>Para 8.4.3 Table 8.5 states that the magnitude and nature of impact would be highly beneficial on the plant farmhouse. However, WCC would advise that this would depend on the acceptability for a proposal of repair, refurbishment or alteration.</p>	<p>The barn is a curtilage building and is not listed in its own right. A Listed building application detailing the proposals for Plant Farm will be required to demonstrate the benefits of the redevelopment. Detailed proposals for Plant Farm will be submitted following the granting of outline approval for Newlands. If Plant Farm is to be put on the Buildings at Risk register, a proposal which removes it from this, which the authority has in its control to permit or not, would be highly beneficial.</p>	
Affordable Housing			
13	<p>WCC/ HBC Joint Response</p> <p>The nature of the hybrid application means that the detailed phase does not sit within a clear framework that sets out how affordable housing will be delivered across the whole MDA. Grainger has agreed to provide a</p>	<p>Grainger is currently in dialogue with WCC and HBC regarding the delivery and funding model for Newlands.</p> <p>A draft Affordable Housing Masterplan has been submitted to</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	high level strategic context in the form of Affordable Housing Statement so it provides the level of detail required by the Reserved Matters Strategy in the existing agreement.	Simon Maggs at WCC for comment.	
Open Space and Recreation			
14	<p>HBC Open Space Officer</p> <p>The design and access statement refers to provision of formal playing pitches for football and cricket but the only football pitch shown on the plan and other documents is an informal one. It was considered that if properly laid out, the cricket outfield could accommodate two football pitches for occasional use by the community. Although only schematic, the layout of the cricket pitch in the plan would not allow for this.</p>	<p>There are no formal football pitches on site as this was not a requirement and was agreed with HBC. At the meeting with WCC and HBC on 08/02/11 it was agreed between WCC/HBC and Fabrik to show a further two informal pitches next to the proposed cricket pitch; this information is shown on the reviewed phasing town plan that is submitted with the comprehensive response. Grainger plc is also making a contribution to artificial turf pitches and Purbrook Heath sports field and will form part of the S106 which is to be agreed post outline approval.</p> <p>Page 81 of the Design and Access Statement states ‘informal football pitch’ in the play strategy. Detailed proposals for play and recreation will be submitted as part of subsequent detailed proposals.</p>	Change – reviewed plans submitted
	WCC research had found a need for at least four tennis courts in the MDA. HBC on the other hand had identified surplus capacity for tennis but had detected a greater demand for bookable 5-a-side football facilities. The term MUSA (Multi-Use Sports Area) was coined in order to distinguish this formal, bookable dual-use <i>sports</i> provision from casual 24/7 <i>play</i> provision. The latter was to be provided by means of a smaller MUGA (Multi-Use Games Area) grouped with other play provision in the Town Park. The two were to be physically separated in order to make the distinction and avoid conflict. This principle seems to have either been forgotten in the current documentation or two bookable courts are shown separately due to the difficulty of finding a compatible surface. Either way, the distinction between sports and play use needs to be made and a MUGA provided adjacent to other play facilities.	In the meeting with WCC and HBC it was agreed that the MUSA and MUGA should effectively be flipped so that the MUSA (courts that can be booked) is next to Plant Farm and the proposed public house, with the MUGA located further away. The principle and location has not changed since Fabrik has been engaged on the Newlands project. Further landscape proposals between the MUGA and MUSA will help to provide a clear separation while still ensuring good natural surveillance is maintained. (Refer to Town Park, Illustrative Town Park Phasing diagram).	Change – reviewed plans submitted
	Although the play strategy in the documents embraces the idea of natural play it still reverts to the NPFA standard and hierarchy with LAPs, LEAPs,	The play strategy reverts to the FIT standards across the site in terms of walking distance to local and neighbourhood areas of	No change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	NEAPs and NPFA travel thresholds. There is no detail as to how strictly these adhere to the NPFA specification in terms of content but in places the documents suggest a large number of equipped play areas and hard surfaces. One map (Design & Access Statement page 79, Masterplan Design Document page 75) shows nine LEAPs and three NEAPs although fewer of these are shown elsewhere (DAS page 80, MDD page73).	play. The play strategy will be addressed through the review and revision of the Design Code that will be submitted subsequent to the approval of the hybrid application.	
	It is important to place the emphasis on more natural forms of play and to avoid potential problems with anti-social behaviour, nuisance and unsustainable costs due to over-provision of equipped playgrounds. There certainly needs to be clarification of the quantity, content and location of equipped play provision.	This element will be dealt with at the detailed design stage and through further consultation with WCC and HBC. Emphasis on natural forms of play is provided within the Design Code. However, the town park itself will have more traditional swings and slides facilities.	No Change
	Recognises the high demand for allotments and for space for the growing of food; this is recognised in the strategy. However, a distinction between the two and their respective roles require clarification.	The allotments will be allocated plots, whereas the growing gardens provide opportunities for doorstep growing that is not allocated but involves the community within a specific area.	No Change
	The phasing of the construction, and making available of the town park is not yet clear and would benefit from some discussion.	A phasing plan for the town park has been produced (refer to Town Park, Illustrative Town Park Phasing diagram) to clarify its delivery and timeframes. A draft was discussed at a meeting with WCC and HBC on 08/02/11.	Change – reviewed plans submitted
Social Infrastructure			
15	WCC/HBC Joint Response Steve Lincoln is looking at community planning and development issues in detail.	Awaiting Steve Lincoln's response. However a contribution for a community development worker will be provided by Grainger plc as well as temporary facilities prior to the opening of a community centre. This will be set out in the S106 and agreed post outline approval.	
16	HCC Education The location and configuration of the two primary schools is agreed. Based on the housing trajectory, access and temporary services to the first site will be required upon occupation of the first dwelling and full access and services by the 400 th dwelling.	A meeting with HCC was held on 09/02/11 which agreed these triggers for the delivery of the first school.	Section 106
	So far as the second (southern) primary school is concerned, we will need temporary access and services by the 870 th Grainger occupation (1,230 total occupation), with full access and permanent services for the school to open by the 1,110 th Grainger occupation (1,530 total occupations); this suggests that the school will need to be available significantly sooner than	HCC is satisfied with the triggers agreed for the second Primary School as set out in Ian Lawson's email to WCC (Jacky Wilson) on the 24/02/2011. It is agreed that Grainger will provide temporary access and services by 1,222 total occupations, and full access and services by 1,582 total occupations.	Section 106

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	Phase 12, as suggested by the phasing plan.		
	The northern site is to be designed so that the school can be extended to 3 form entry, if required, by the number of children living in the West of Waterlooville development. A decision needs to be made at about 2,400 total occupation (whole MDA).	<p>Agreed this point at the meeting on 09/02/11. HCC noted that the second primary school will definitely be required, as 3,000 units (including the TW development) will generate approx. 900 school places which is the equivalent of 2 x 2FE schools with 450 places per school.</p> <p>Ian Lawson confirmed in his email to WCC (Jacky Wilson) on the 24/02/2011 that there is no need for either site to be enlarged to 3 FE.</p>	Section 106
	Financial contributions will be required in the form of £5,705,937 for the first and second school (total £11,411,874) and will be index linked from the date of the new S106	Agreed this point at the meeting on 09/02/11. HCC agreed to review the triggers for both schools to align the financial contribution for both schools to the actual delivery of the school site. It was noted at the meeting that apart from the triggers, the wording of the new S106 would be in line with the previous S106 on education.	Section 106
Sustainability			
17	<p>HBC Planning Policy response to Sustainability and Energy Statements</p> <p>Will there be any scope for the community development officer to have an energy remit? One can have efficient equipment in the house but if you do not know how to use it or change how you are living throughout the year it can make little difference.</p>	<p>There will be a Home User Guide provided for each dwelling - see Section 13.1.3 Home and Building User Guides of the Masterplan and Phase 1 Sustainability Statements (pages 75 and 65 respectively).</p> <p>The Home User Guides will be available on the Newlands community website - see Section 11.3.2 Community Website of the Masterplan and Phase 1 Sustainability Statements (pages 66 and 55 respectively).</p> <p>In the Masterplan and Phase 1 Sustainability Statements Section 11.3.3 (pages 66 and 56 respectively) on Community Development Coordinator currently reads: It has been agreed that Havant will use the Community Development Contribution to employ a Community Development Worker. This person shall be based at Newlands and their function shall be to assist in the establishment of a</p>	No change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>successful and cohesive local community within the development and to promote integration with existing communities within the vicinity for a minimum period (expected to be more than 10 years) from the date of occupation of any residential unit at Newlands. Temporary accommodation will be provided for the CDW at Newlands.</p>	
	<p>Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 and for non residential they need to achieve 'very good' in the appropriate BREEAM system. This will be in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (subject to adoption on 1 March 2011).</p>	<p>See the Masterplan and Phase 1 Sustainability Statements: Domestic buildings will achieve a minimum of CSH level 3 with Phase 1 being built to Level 4. See:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2.3 CSH Private Housing timeline (pages 28 and 25 respectively) and • Section 5.2.4 CSH Affordable Housing timeline (pages 28 and 25 respectively) <p>Non-Domestic buildings will achieve a minimum of BREEAM Very Good. See:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2.5 BREEAM timeline (page 29) <p>Note: BREEAM certification is not relevant to Phase 1 as there will not be any non-domestic buildings built in the phase.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
	<p>These requirements should be conditioned so the development complies with these requirements on completion. It would be appropriate for them to submit design certificates to show that they can achieve the required levels prior to completion.</p>	<p>Newlands Phase 1 has been registered with the BRE under Code for Sustainable Homes version 2009.</p> <p>A Design stage pre-assessment for Phase 1 has been undertaken for an average plot (see <i>Appendix E</i> of the Phase 1 Sustainability Statement page 102); it shows that 72.23% out of a required 68% is expected to be achieved. As part of the pre-assessment a design team meeting was held on 5 July 2010 at the Adam Architecture Winchester office to review the credits that can be achieved.</p> <p>Formal Design Stage Assessments for each of the 194 dwellings in Phase 1 are expected to be undertaken by the contractor and the requirement to achieve final certification to CSH level 4 will be conditioned in their contractual requirements.</p>	<p>No Change/ Condition</p>

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		A further Condition could be placed on the outline approval that requires the submission of a roof plan to demonstrate the type and size of PV and exact location.	
Access			
18	<p>Ramblers Association Non-Car Accessibility Plan GTWVILLE2/TP/0002 Ref.PR02 - The details of this analysis are tabled over two pages and submitted with the response. Grainger’s intention is to integrate a major new residential and development with rectilinear paths/ streets into an essentially rural environment with ancient Rights of Way which reflect earlier farming and rural access requirements. It is also recognised the perceived intention of making many of the paths multi-user. However, the respondent required the retention of footpath only status whenever possible particularly in the Green area and ‘Retained Woodland’.</p>	<p>The drawing number referred to is in fact GTWVILLE2/TP/0004 PR05. The proposals for public footways, footway cycles and multi-use greenways have been the subject of extensive discussions between Grainger’s consultants and the Countryside Services of Hampshire County Council. Inevitably with a development of this size compromises have to be made on the treatment of existing public rights of way. Grainger’s consultants and the Countryside Services of HCC believe that the proposals shown on Drawing GTWVILLE2/TP/0004 PR05 represent the best compromise possible.</p>	No Change
	<p>The results of the analysis of the submitted plans shows seven ‘fine’ or ‘acceptable’ results which indicate that Ramblers would not object to the changes but the five other results would find the Grainger-mapped paths as not acceptable, particularly regarding their changed status, either in part or entirely.</p>	<p>In order to promote the stopping up and diversion orders under the Town and Country Planning Act a Detailed Planning Consent must be in place in the first instance. The detailed planning proposals must also require the alteration to the public rights of way. In this case, the detailed planning consent for Phase 1 of the MDA will enable Orders to be promoted for alterations to Footpaths 11 & 30. The outline planning consent will not be sufficient for promoting orders for any alteration to other public rights of way on the site. Reserved Matters Approval will be required for subsequent phases of the development before this can be done.</p> <p>A response has been sent to Peter Sollars of the Ramblers Group.</p>	No Change
Design			
19	<p>WCC/HBC Urban Design Response Design Codes Both authorities have considered the Design Codes and have considerable concerns. In assessing them we have been assisted by comments from CABE and ATLAS.</p>	<p>A meeting was held on 8 February 2011 with WCC and HBC to obtain initial feedback on the masterplan and codes.</p> <p>The Savills Urban Design team who undertook the master planning exercise is concerned with these comments as CABE</p>	On-going

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>has not commented on the Design Code and in fact one of their recommendations is that a Code is produced.</p> <p>The ATLAS comments were received on 23 February and are being reviewed.</p> <p>A meeting is being held on 28 February to discuss the Design Code further and Savills is currently carrying out an internal review to determine how Codes can address the key issues being raised.</p>	
	<p>In considering the application on 24 November CABA said that the Masterplan exhibits blocks of regular size and shape, which it considers will not realise the vision to create a distinctive place. Blocks of different forms would encourage varied building typologies and therefore add variety to the development. CABA considered that the approach/ pattern put forward across the MDA was homogenous and considered that the proposal is in danger of replicating the ubiquitous ordinariness of Waterlooville. (CABA's letter of 20 December refers).</p> <p>Grainger's design team, Savills, stated that the perimeter blocks shown on the Masterplan are not fixed, save for when they coincide with Phase 1, which is subject of a detailed planning application. In addition, Savills has stated CABA did not have sight of the Design Codes when it reviewed the application, which in Savills' view would have illustrated the flexibility of the blocks and diversity of character.</p>	<p>Savills is currently carrying out an internal review to determine how Codes can be adjusted to resolve the key issues and whether they can in fact code for variety.</p> <p>A further meeting is being held with HBC Urban Design on 28/02/11 to understand its requirements of the Code. Further feedback will be provided once a full review of the Design Code has been undertaken and further consultation with HBC/WCC has taken place.</p>	On-going
	<p>The Design Codes propose nine 'distinct' character areas which are 'based on both the existing site characteristics and the roles and responsibilities of the place being created'. The planning authorities, CABA and the applicant agree that these should be individual and unique areas, which have different characters but which fit together to create a cohesive legible MDA.</p> <p>The shapes and sizes of perimeter blocks illustrated in the submitted Design Codes are based on the Masterplan. However, despite assurances</p>	<p>See above comments. The Character areas are subtle in difference and character. The timescales involved in their development will inevitably create variety. The Code will be monitored and is not fixed; a continual review process is suggested in the Code. The character areas are based on the roles and responsibilities of each development area and their local context. The key physical differences are their relationship to the sites constraints, opportunities and context. For example, the 'Village Quarter' is distinctive because of how</p>	Condition

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>from Grainger’s design team and signposting in the masterplan that these are flexible, in many cases they appear almost identical to the ones shown on the Masterplan drawings. Therefore Officers share CABE’s concern that the scheme is in danger of delivering a homogeneous scheme as it exhibited blocks of regular size and shape (and density) across the whole of the MDA. In addition, it is the Officers’ view that the drawings, matrixes and text contained in the Design Codes could result in character areas, which will not be diverse but will be quite similar in appearance and grain. The guidance does not do enough to encourage diversity within the development by delivering individual character areas with their own identity. We would like to stress that individuality of character areas cannot be achieved solely by architectural styles and the choice of materials.</p> <p>The exception to this is the Newland’s Heart section of the Design Codes, which covers Phase 1. Savills and the architect for Phase 1, ADAMS Architecture have worked closely together and ensured that this area has clear character and diversity. Overall, Officers are happy with this section of the Design Codes bar some minor changes.</p>	<p>it seeks to respond to the existing hedgerow structure.</p> <p>Further work on the Design Code is being undertaken to analyse how or if Codes can design variety without being overly descriptive. This work is on-going and it is proposed by WCC and HBC that the detailed phase permitted is assessed against the submitted Code whilst the formal submission of the reviewed Design Code will take place subsequent to approval of the hybrid application. It has been agreed that the Phase 1 elements are in accordance with the submitted Design Code.</p> <p>Minor changes have been made to the Phase 1 plans to add variety to the Mews Lanes. This includes changes to three prominent buildings within the Mews Lanes.</p>	
HBC DESIGN RESPONSE			
20	<p>HBC Urban Design has raised a range of inconsistencies regarding the Masterplan Design Documents:</p> <p>2.2 The masterplan and development framework</p> <p>2.2.3 Building height strategy, Image 37, page 45 and text page 44</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In text paragraph 2.2.3 its states that there are lower heights on the sensitive rural edges. However Image 37 shows the height of the school as up to 3 storeys. Given its location on the sensitive rural edge consider this should be 2.5 storeys. <p>Local Landmarks, Image 37, page 45 and text page 44</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The image has identified a limited amount of local landmarks. The text should include an exceptions line to allow the creation of local landmarks (potential for 1 storey higher than surrounding heights) in 	<p>The school will be designed in accordance with HCC requirements. Given that this is a one off building along the rural edge and there is no visual impact as determined by the visual assessment in the EIA we believe it is reasonable to set a limit up to 3 storeys high. The site also has a backdrop of the mature woodland belt of Plant Row.</p> <p>Landmark buildings. These are fixed upper thresholds for building heights. The location of these landmarks is a response to the urban design legibility qualities of the development. The Code allows for smaller scale local landmarks</p> <p>A key for the footpaths and cycleways are clearly shown on the Development Framework (Masterplan) and the pedestrian and</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>other additional locations with the agreement of the planning authorities.</p> <p>Pedestrian and cycle strategy, Image 43, page 51</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that all of the proposed pedestrian crossing points should be the beginning of a primary cycle or pedestrian route. All of these are, except the new crossing proposed on London Road between Corbett Road and Mill Road. Would like a primary pedestrian or cycle route to connect from here to the east/west primary cycleway across the Town Park. The town parks most southerly east/west primary cycleway (with footpath) link is not shown in its complete form in Images 62 and 63 on page 69. This link needs to be shown for consistency. 	<p>cycle strategy.</p>	
	<p>2.5 A mix of activities</p> <p>Land Use Strategy, Image 51, page 59</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The colour for the allotments and the green space are hard to distinguish on the plan. Also there appears to be an additional green for woodland (I presume). Should this appear on the key? 	<p>Land use strategy: Concern regarding colours of open space. This issue is clarified under the Open Space and Play Strategies.</p>	
	<p>2.7 Biodiversity (it might be that we can cover this at meeting with UE Associates on Thursday).</p> <p>Biodiversity Strategy, Image 53, page 61</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the new amenity water feature located in the middle of Newlands Farm Meadow SIN. Has this been approved by Hampshire Ecology and Natural England? <p>2.7.1 Community nature reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like an additional paragraph/ line to explain how and who will manage this. For example - it is anticipated that the community nature reserve will be owned by the Parish and managed by volunteers from the local community. 	<p>These issues are covered in the comprehensive response to Sarah Warriss and other areas in the comprehensive response.</p>	
	<p>2.8 Landscape and recreation</p> <p>A Play Strategy, Image 62, page 69</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The east/west link is not complete here, and does not include the primary cycleway (with footpath) identified on the Pedestrian and cycle strategy, Image 43, page 51. 	<p>The play strategy will be addressed when reviewing the Design Code subsequent to the hybrid application going to Committee in March. Of note the diagram illustrates the vision of the landscape, pedestrian and cycle links are covered under a separate diagram.</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would also like to see the proposed new crossing on London road shown, and a direct footpath connection to this. <p>A vision for the landscape strategy for Newlands, Image 63, page 69</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The links described above are missing. • 2.8.3 Play Strategy, pages 72-73 and 2.8.4 Play spaces and walking distance, pages 74-75 • 2.8.4 Play spaces and walking distance sets out the rationale behind 2.8.3 Play Strategy. It needs to come first for the play strategy to make sense. If kept in their existing order they contradict each other (as discussed at meeting 08/02/11). <p>Play Strategy, Image 66, page 73</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For clarity would like the town park to be clearly identified as Town Park – district level of play rather than just sports provision, which sounds weak, like the level of play is below a NEAP, LEAP or LAP. <p>Tree strategy, Image 70, page 77</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orchard trees are shown along the edge of Plant Row. Both landscape officers have made it very clear that this is unacceptable. This should be removed from the image. <p>2.10 Food Growing 2.10.0 Food growing, page 79</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like a line inserted to explain who will own and manage allotments, community gardens and orchards. Therefore suggest an additional line is added to the final paragraph to say, it is anticipated that the allotments, community gardens and orchards reserve will be owned by the Parish and managed by volunteers from the local community. If this is the case. If not, then please clarify and add. • Would also like acres to be replaced by hectares. <p>2.11 Water and Sustainable Drainage</p>	<p>As discussed with WCC and HBC at the meeting on 08/02/2011 the walking distances and overall play strategy will be addressed in the Design Code and will be addressed when reviewing the Design Code subsequent to the hybrid application going to Committee in March.</p> <p>The strategy diagram and images provided will be amended in the Design Code and will be addressed when reviewing the Design Code subsequent to the hybrid application going to Committee in March.</p> <p>The tree strategy diagram will be amended in the Design Code and will be addressed when reviewing the Design Code subsequent to the hybrid application going to Committee in March.</p> <p>Text on Food Growing will be included the Design Code and will be addressed when reviewing the Design Code subsequent to the hybrid application going to Committee in March. Of note a separate management strategy will be submitted as part of the overall management strategy for the site.</p> <p>Text will be added to ensure both acres and hectares are used when reviewing the Design Code.</p> <p>The intention is that these are multi-functional spaces and can potentially incorporate play, food growing and SUDS. The SuDS image is purely an illustration and details regarding the multi-functional spaces will be dealt with in detail by each phase of development.</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>Example of SuDS space incorporated into the master plan, Image 79, page 87</p> <p>Would like to see this image replaced by image of SuDs from detailed phase 1. I am really concerned that this is the same area that has been 'allocated' for potential community gardens. I understand that SuDS has to be incorporated here too and the image is an example, both the authority and Grainger have acknowledged the danger of examples being taken literally and developed. If the community is really going to get community gardens off the garden, then the land needs to be provided ready to go and therefore the SuDS in this location needs to be as illustrated on page 81. If the land is developed for SuDs as illustrated here on page 87, the community will never start a community garden, because the cost and motivation of altering the existing SuDs is just too much, and beyond them.</p>		
SECURE BY DESIGN			
21	<p>Hampshire Constabulary on Secure by Design Bin Stores if enclosed should be lockable</p>	<p>Robert Adam Architect discussed providing lockable bin stores as part of phase 1 with Havant Refuse and Recycle on 07/02/11 where agreed lockable bin stores would be acceptable. This would be through a push button code rather than keys.</p>	
	<p>Several of the dwellings are shown to have car ports; I recommend these are redesigned into garages with lockable doors. Car ports are not secure and have a tendency to be misused; they can become dumping areas and are more prone to arson attacks.</p>	<p>The car port at Plot 32 has been replaced with a timber pergola See drawings 5485/A/07 Rev A & 5485/A/23 Rev A.</p>	
	<p>Some cycle stores within the supplied documents show double doorsets, unless these can be locked independently these are not acceptable to SBD. (Double doorsets are insecure compared to single leaf doorsets).</p>	<p>There are no double doorsets to bike stores, double doors only relate to the bin stores. Doors to bike sheds will be lockable via a push button code. Bike racks within stores allow for individual bikes to be padlocked.</p>	
	<p>Secure by Design also required brick walls where the parking areas are located.</p>	<p>This has been discussed with WCC/HBC and the design team are currently reviewing a range of options to ensure it complies with secure by design as well as WCC/HBC officer request for greater visibility of green areas.</p>	
	<p>Multi Agency Offices can be a focal point of a development and assist residents, visitors and workers who would not otherwise be able to</p>	<p>Grainger will review opportunities to provide this facility within the community centre during the detailed design stage.</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>easily access relevant assistance.</p> <p>It is requested that the applicant and Council advises as to how this could best be achieved, hopefully by agreement with the developers but possibly via Section 106, Community Infrastructure Layout payment or Planning Condition.</p>		
ATLAS Response			
22	Formal ATLAS Response received and appended to this comprehensive response	Response to ATLAS appended to this comprehensive response. This is in relation to the detailed phase 1 comments. Issues relating to design code are being reviewed as part of the wider feedback. Reviewed Code to be conditioned and submitted post planning approval.	
HRA Assessment			
23	UE HRA Response Addressed under separate cover	Please see separate meeting notes and comments addressed under separate cover	
PHASE 1			
PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS			
24	<p>Winchester City Council – Policy Officer</p> <p>Further details of the Pedestrian and cycle routes throughout the site are required including surfacing, treatment of the surrounding area and how the paths will be lit.</p>	<p>Details of the proposed pedestrian/ cycle routes throughout the Phase 1 shown on Drawing GTWVILLE2/TP/0004 PRO5, submitted with the application. The routes have been discussed and agreed with the Strategic Manager of HCC’s Countryside Service. It is intended that they will all be built to adoptable standards. All roadside routes will be 3m wide, with the exception of those between the Main Access roundabout and the first Internal roundabout, which will be 4m wide. They will be macadam surfaced and lit to HCC standards. Routes through landscape areas will be 3m wide, with either macadam or unbound aggregate surfacing (subject to detail design) and lit to HCC standards. The treatment of the surrounding areas will be agreed at the detailed design stage. The multi use greenway will be unlit, and consist of a 3m wide footway/ cycleway with unbound aggregate surfacing and a 3m wide grassed track for horse riders. The greenway will be</p>	No Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		landscaped with details to be agreed at the detailed design.	
	A suggested footprint for the commercial building adjacent to the entrance to phase one is shown on the plans. It is suggested that either they are removed or further details are submitted to show how a building in this location will work adjacent to the residential development. The danger is that an indicated footprint on the plan will be translated into an application when perhaps it is not intended.	These are outside Phase 1 and will be shown in more detail during the relevant phase and following further consultation with HCC, WCC and HBC. Currently this will connect a residential street (Phase 1) to an existing footpath.	
INTEGRATION FOOTPATH			
25	HBC Highways The 'temporary' footway proposed from the housing to Maurepas Way will need to be built to adoptable standards with street lighting. It is expected that HBC will adopt this for the temporary period so that the street lighting costs are paid and that it is maintained and swept.	It is intended that the 'temporary' footway/ cycleways will be built to adoptable standards. They will be 3m wide with macadam surfacing and lit to HCC standards. Details are shown on Drawing GTWVILLE2/GA/0003 PR01.	Change Additional Drawing GTWVILLE2/GA/000 3 PR01.
AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION			
26	Joint response Havant Borough Council/ Winchester City Council The affordable housing mix needs to be amended to increase the number of larger units so the mix reflects need. This should be done on Phase 1 or a combination of this phase and future phases (provided it can be demonstrated through an Affordable Housing Masterplan Strategy how this can be achieved)	The affordable housing mix has been amended to increase the number of larger units to reflect need. Plots 45, 144 and 146 (houses) have been changed from 2 bed (Type A) to Large 3 bed (Type C). There are also 3 x flats in Plot 1 (2 x SR + 1 x SE) that have been changed from 2 bed (3p) to 2 bed (4p). Furthermore, 2 x flats in Plot 139 (2 x SR) have been changed from 2 bed (3p) to 2 bed (4p). Reviewed plans have been submitted as part of this comprehensive response. A copy of the drawings schedule for Robert Adam Architect has been appended to this comprehensive response. The reviewed plans have been provided to Simon Maggs of WCC.	Change Additional Drawings 5485/A/04-A 5485/A/03-A
	It is necessary to ensure that the detailed dwelling design meets required standards, in particular HCA, HQI, Code and SPD standards. The approach to assessing the design against these standards has been agreed with Grainger.	A full set of affordable housing plans have been sent to Simon Maggs to assess the HQI standards	
	The issue of tenure/ tenancies has yet to be resolved. It is possible that the HCA's new Affordable Rent Model will replace the Social Rent Model proposed in the application. Grainger has floated a new model for delivery of an element of the intermediate affordable housing. They are	A full set of affordable housing plans have been sent to Simon Maggs to assess the HQI standards	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	working up ideas to discuss with us in more detail. Issues to discuss surrounding, affordability, accessibility and perpetuity. A meeting is planned early march to discuss this further.		
	There are a number of detailed issues that will need to be discussed for inclusion in the S106 agreement. It is noted that affordable housing is not mentioned in the Draft Heads of Terms. A marker needs to be put down that this will be one of the issues covered by the S106	Grainger has confirmed that the Draft Heads of Terms includes Affordable Housing although some of the details have to be finalised after hybrid has been granted	
LANDSCAPE			
27	WCC/HBC Joint Highways Response A full set of landscape plans for trees and planted areas located within or near to public highway areas must be provided to HCC's Arboriculturalist (Mark Weal).	Winchester City Council to confirm this has been done	
	Tree planting within the Swales areas will need approval from the County Council's Arboriculturalist	As above	
28	WCC /HBC Urban Design and Landscape Comments Need to show robust native planning along Broad Street which will help to provide the sense of enclosure for the area.	This has been discussed with Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey and WCC on 16.02.11 and was agreed that Fabrik will supply a list of native species to be used prior to carrying out the planting plan – oaks have currently been agreed.	Condition
	WCC/HBC request a couple of sections, one taken across Broad Street and one across the Crescent including the SuDS and planting to show how the enclosure of the space will work.	Further to the Sections provided in the submitted Design Code, sections of the Crescent and Broad Street are included in this comprehensive response. Please refer to Fabrik's drawing schedule for details.	Further sections provided
	Apartment 139 is very close to the parking space and it is suggested that there should be a greater buffer with landscaping provided.	Parking for plot 139 has been amended. See drawing 5485/A/03 Rev A. The landscape space that has been provided on the architect's layout has been filled with proposed planting. However a ground floor private space would benefit from additional planting. Drawing D1821.L.203 Rev B shows this additional planting.	
	Further details of boundaries which provide visual permeability.	Details of rear boundary walls will be provided on reviewed drawings. See drawing 5485/A/23 Rev A for detail.	
HIGHWAYS			
29	WCC/HBC Joint Highways Response	Mayer Brown Response	Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>HCC Section 38 Engineers have highlighted the following concerns which they consider need to be addressed prior to the agreement to the adoption of the proposed highways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns regarding the restricted width of the shared space areas and the potential conflict between pedestrians and motorised traffic. For this reason they will require a Stage 1 Safety Audit to be undertaken prior to the agreement of adoption. 2. No areas are included in the design to allow future access to occur in order to complete future maintenance works of the carriage edge. 3. Many areas exist where it is considered insufficient space to satisfactorily accommodate the turning characteristics of the Phoenix 2 Du02 refuse freight, which is larger than 9.44m long 4. The specification and construction details of those areas that are considered suitable for adoption in principle. All surface materials in the adoptable highway areas must, in particular any proposed Porous Paving areas, be approved by HCC's Minerals Engineer. 5. Concerns were raised regarding the close proximity of some buildings to the adoptable highways e.g. plots 110 and 33. There may also be problems with windows opening out over the highway and/or service box doors. Sufficient space should be provided. 6. The layout details of the entrance junction to the Mews Lanes should be amended in order that pedestrian priority is maintained. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stage 1 Safety Audit and Designer's response was prepared and issued to HCC on 12 October 2010. HCC confirmed in meeting on 15 February 2011, that they had received this and would endeavour to provide a formal response. In the same meeting WCC Highway Officer, Ian Elvin confirmed that from a planning perspective, he is satisfied with the geometry of the Lanes. 2. This refers to areas where buildings are tight up to edge of highway. The layout has been amended to set back all elevations with active frontages (windows, doors, downpipes, meter boxes, porticos etc). Blank elevations are acceptable tight up to the highway. This was agreed at meeting on 15.02.11. 3. This is not the case. Vehicle tracking has been carried out using the worst case vehicle in AutoTrack library, such that future changes in vehicles could be accommodated. The vehicle used is 11.35m long with a turning diameter of 22.66m. Havant's current refuse vehicle is 11.3m in length and has a turning diameter of 19.1m. It was agreed at meeting on 07/02/11 with HBC that the Lanes are suitable for refuse and recycling access. 4. This is a statement. Construction Details were submitted with the application, which HCC has not reviewed, and wishes to defer to the S.38. No Action required. 5. See 2 above. 6. Agreed. MB to supply updated Plans. 	<p>Reviewed GA drawings and vehicle tracking drawings.</p>
LAYOUT - MEWS LANES			
30	<p>WCC/HBC Urban Design Response</p> <p>Officers require further information on the provision of additional windows/ doors to overlook the Mews Lanes.</p> <p>It is not clear that each of the Mews Lanes has its own identity and further details are required.</p>	<p>There will be no larger windows at end elevations due to privacy and secured by design. Stylistically redesigned elevations to Plots 21b, 49 and 94. These provide a more modern aesthetic and provide further variety and individual identity to the Mews Lanes. See drawings 5485/A/22 Rev A & 5485/A/23 Rev A.</p>	<p>Change</p>
	<p>Garages of units 70 and 71 are set forward of the building line when</p>	<p>These garages have been moved back in line with the houses.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	generally they would be expected to be set back. We suggest that these garages are set back from the building line of the dwellings.	5485/A/03 Rev A.	
31	Initial feedback from ATLAS conveyed by WCC Are the Mews Lanes still intended to be adopted	It is still the intention for the Mews Lanes to be adopted.	
LAYOUT – BROAD STREET			
32	WCC/HBC Urban Design Response Need to show details of robust native planting to Broad Street which will help to provide the sense of enclosure for the area.	This has been discussed with Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey and WCC on 16.02.11 and it was agreed that Fabrik will supply a list of native species to be used prior to carrying out the planting plan.	Condition
LAYOUT – ENTRANCE SQUARE			
33	WCC/HBC Urban Design Response Further response is required on the treatment of the square with particular reference to the single storey buildings.	As a result of these consultation comments the north side of the Entrance Square has been redesigned to give more enclosure (Plots 59, 60 & 60a). The substation and refuse/ bike store has been relocated to the north of East Street (south) to accommodate these changes. Please see Robert Adam Architects drawing schedule for details of the reviewed elevations.	Change Reviewed Plans
LAYOUT – CRESCENT LANE			
34	WCC/HBC Urban Design Response There is concern about the two breaks and vehicular routes through the crescent. It results in the over permeable layout and questions whether the gap between plots 58 and 57 should be closed.	The stated breaks and vehicle routes through the crescent are required to allow permeable access to crescent frontage.	No Change
	Would like to know the details of public art proposed to be able to assess its contribution to the success of this public area.	The approximate size and height of the public art has been specified on plan reference number 5485/A/02-A. However, final form of artwork is to be the result of a local consultation.	
	There is a concern that plots 52, 56 and 57 do not make a positive contribution to the scale of the enclosure that the crescent is intended to have.	It is felt that the scale and enclosure of the crescent is appropriate for the scale of development in this location.	No Change
CAR/ CYCLE PARKING			
35	WCC/HBC Highways Response The total number of car parking spaces accords with WCC Parking Standards. However, most car parking occurs to the rear of the units they are intending to serve. Many rely on “tandem parking” for two vehicles	There is a generous provision of on-plot parking within Phase 1, it is also anticipated that the narrow width of the Lanes should discourage parking.	No Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>and up to three in several instances (plots 17, 85, 86, 89-93, 116-119). Relies heavily on vehicles parking in their allocated space and not simply parking on access roads. Where three tandem spaces are provided it is likely that overspill parking will occur.</p> <p>Other concerns are the limited spaces to allow for the manoeuvring out of vehicles (i.e. 18, 90 to 93) where it is considered the six metre wide aisle width normally required will be simply occupied as an another informal parking bay. On street parking is likely to take place near to the following properties – plots 3-4, 28-31, 75-80, 99-105, 130-137.</p>	<p>Tandem parking was discussed with Ian Elvin, WCC Highways Officer in meeting on 15/02/11. He stated that three in line parking spaces would be acceptable, although his preference would be for a maximum of two in future (possible future design code update). The road width at 5.5 metres will enable on-street parking. Tandem spaces and on-street parking will be available to both residents and visitors and it is down to the occupant over how they wish to manage private spaces.</p> <p>The areas stated as limited manoeuvring space are the private drives. The space required to exit the drive would be demised to the dwelling, in this way we feel that the issue will be self-policing.</p>	
	<p>No identification of cycle parking is shown on the layout plan. Garages where provided can accommodate 2 long term secure/ undercover cycle parking spaces. Other cycle parking can be provided by the use of garden sheds and/or lockers in the rear garden areas.</p>	<p>The response was clarified at the meeting on 01/02/11 where Robert Adam Architect directed Ian Elvin to the plan that shows cycle storage for Phase 1 (submitted with the hybrid application ref number: 5485/41,42,43,44). Further clarification was provided in meeting with WCC/HBC Highways officers on 15/02/11.</p>	No Change
REFUSE COLLECTION			
36	<p>WCC/HBC Highways response</p> <p>A need appears to exist for more temporary refuse pick up points to store wheelie bins on collection days to ensure they do not cause an obstruction; these areas must not be within areas that are offered as adoptable highways. A specific problem seems to exist at plots 12-15, 28-31, 75-80, 100-105, 131-135 where allocated space will prevent bins from being wheeled out.</p>	<p>The width of the Lanes and the addition of a 0.5m private strip to house properties would provide sufficient margin for wheelie bins on collection day as agreed in meeting with Havant Refuse and Recycling on 07/02/11. There may be some hold ups on collection day as discussed with Havant Refuse and Recycling. However it was agreed that these periods would be short due to the short length of the Lanes, and would be mitigated by them being through roads. The only issue considered to be a potential operational problem, with respect to the flats (and some houses), was the width of the private drives, currently indicated as 3.5m. It was agreed in meeting on 07/02/11 that the minor widening to a minimum of 4.0m would be sufficient for these straight lengths of private drive.</p>	No Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>Queries over access to bins in the rear gardens of properties with parking across the rear were discussed – Robert Adam Architect confirmed that the bays are 2.5m wide, 100mm wider than standard parking bays and the end space had additional width. Decided in the meeting on 02/07/11 that this should be sufficient to wheel bins between. HBC collection officers happy for bins to be left at the rear of these bays. There are also bin collection points for parking courts where it would not be possible to get the refuse vehicle close to the properties.</p>	
FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES			
37	<p>Hampshire Fire and Rescue Services Access roads should be provided to comply with Section 16 of Approved Document B to the Building Regulations to ensure access for fire-fighters. HFRS would strongly recommend that consideration be given to include the installation of Automatic Water Suppression Systems (AWSS) as part of total fire protection package.</p>	<p>The proposal provides the development with a water supply, which will include fire hydrants. This is provided on the submitted plans (GTWVILLE2/UT/A001-A003). Initial discussions have taken place with Portsmouth Water and detailed discussions to secure supplies will be carried out post consent.</p> <p>All Access roads will comply with the approved document.</p>	No Change
SUSTAINABILITY			
38	<p>WCC/HBC Urban Design and Landscape Officers & initial feedback from ATLAS Require details of how Phase 1 will meet Code Level 4.</p>	<p>Formal Design Stage Assessment for each of the units in Phase 1 is expected to be undertaken by the contractor and the requirements to achieve final certification to CSH Level 4 will be conditioned in their contractual requirement.</p> <p>A design stage pre-assessment has been undertaken for an average plot (see Appendix E of the phase 1 Sustainability Statement) which shows that 72.23% points are expected to be achieved.</p> <p>Formal Design Stage Assessments for each of the 194 dwellings in Phase 1 are expected to be undertaken by the contractor and the requirement to achieve final certification to CSH level 4 will be conditioned in their contractual requirements.</p>	Condition and reviewed plan submitted

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>Furthermore, Figure 7 on page 30 of the Phase 1 Energy Statement and Figure 112 on page 143 of the Design and Access Statement demonstrates which roofs in Phase 1 cannot have PV panels installed and are required instead to apply PV tiles or slate. This image has been updated to account for the changes to phase 1 and is submitted with this comprehensive response.</p> <p>An additional statement will be provided to WCC that states that PV Panels and where not possible slate or tiles will be used within phase 1. A condition will be placed on the consent that requires future phases to provide details of how dwellings will reach Code 4 and the likely roof materials used.</p>	
GENERAL			
39	<p>WCC/HBC Urban Design and Landscape Response & initial feedback from ATLAS Require a Statement of Conformity for Phase 1</p>	<p>A statement of conformity has been produced and is provided as part of this comprehensive response. It is important that the Council is mindful that some of the Design Code may be conditioned and therefore the compliance schedule should only relate to the elements of the Code that will be adopted by the Council as part of the hybrid submission.</p>	Statement of Conformity submitted
40	<p>Initial feedback from ATLAS conveyed by WCC There are discrepancies between the layout and elevation plans. Some of these issues are causing problems with the engineers due to opening windows over highways etc. Please can someone check these?</p>	<p>A thorough internal audit of all plans has been undertaken by Adam Architect.</p> <p>It is important that all plans are read in conjunction with the Building Matrix. The matrix identifies the different types of dwellings and their architectural detail within each typical building plot.</p> <p>Whilst there weren't discrepancies, due to the engineer's comments relating to the location of Plots 33, 34, 110 & 144 these have been moved 500mm back from the back edge of the pavement. Reviewed plans have been submitted with this comprehensive response. A drawings schedule has been provided by Robert Adam to identify reviewed plans. The</p>	Change Reviewed plans submitted

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		500mm change can be identified on all plans showing Phase 1 in detail which relate to these sections.	
	WCC/HBC require a plan that has every overlay showing, e.g. housing layout, landscaping and SuDS.	A plan has been produced that provides a range of layers including landscape, SuDS and the Phase 1 units. Please see Robert Adam Architect drawing schedule for reference.	Additional plan provided
Highways			
41	<p>Highways Agency</p> <p>Given that there were a large number of slight accidents at A3(M) Junctions 3 and 5, it is necessary to examine whether or not the proposed development is likely to worsen the accident rate, and if so what sort of mitigation measures are proposed. In line with the Guidance on Transport Assessment the accident records should be compared with appropriate national statistics.</p>	<p>The accident statistics for the A3(M) Junctions 3 and 5 have been considered in detail and the results shared with the Highways Agency (HA) for their consideration.</p> <p>At Junction 3 there were 2 slight personal injury accidents on the southbound offslip over 3 years, which is considered to be a good safety record. One of these was a rear shunt on entry to the roundabout whilst the other accident was as a result of adverse weather. With no queues predicted for 2021 with development scenario (see A3(M) North arm in Table 10.3 of TA), the likelihood of rear shunts, which are a common form of accident associated with this type of link, are not expected to increase.</p> <p>At the Junction 3 northbound offslip, there were 9 slight personal injury accidents with all but one being rear shunt incidents on entry to the roundabout. The other accident was also a rear shunt but at the diverge. As part of the Old Park Farm development, the northbound offslip approach to the Junction 3 roundabout will be signalised, which is expected to reduce the likelihood of accidents occurring as this will regulate the movement of traffic at this point of conflict. Analysis indicates that there are no other clusters of reported accidents that are likely to impact on the SRN (Strategic Road Network).</p> <p>At Junction 5 southbound offslip, there were 9 slight personal injury accidents reported with all but one rear shunt incidents</p>	No Change

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
		<p>on entry to the roundabout. As part of the Harts Farm Depot site development, this approach will be signalised, which is expected to reduce the likelihood of accidents occurring as this will regulate the movement of traffic at this point of conflict. The other isolated incident on the southbound offslip involved a cyclist colliding with a broken down car. Analysis indicates that there are no other clusters of reported accidents that are likely to impact on the SRN.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, the HA subsequently concluded that with regard to the Junction 3 northbound off-slip and the Junction 5 southbound off-slip, given that the rear shunt accidents are on-the-whole at the entry to the roundabout, they are content that the signalisation of the off-slips (committed through other schemes) could help to reduce the likelihood of rear shunt accidents occurring at these points of conflict.</p>	
	<p>It is not certain when mitigation measures for Junction 3 and Junction 5 will be implemented and it is requested that further details about timing and certainty of provision of these measure be provided to HA. The Transport Assessment should potentially consider the capacity and safety scenarios where one or both of the mitigation measures are not delivered, relative to each of the proposed development phases.</p>	<p>The Junction 3 improvement is written into the Old Park Farm development S106 agreement with a trigger of 200 dwelling occupations and the Junction 5 improvement is currently being constructed.</p>	<p>No Change/ S106</p>
	<p>It is suggested that the potential Junction 12 Purbrook Way (West) queue (80 vehicles) could extend across the overbridge and reach back to Junction 11. The HA requests further details about how the Junction 12 Purbrook Way (West) queue will affect the Junction 11 Purbrook Way (West) queue in the AM peak. This analysis should consider the potential knock-on effects of this queuing on the A3(M) northbound off-slip.</p>	<p>As agreed with the HA, Mayer Brown has developed and submitted an S-Paramics traffic model that considers the interaction of Junction 11 and 12. The model output indicates that queuing on the A3(M) Junction 4 northbound off-slip is not predicted to interfere with the operation of the SRN and this has been reviewed and approved by Parsons Brinckerhoff, on behalf of the HA. Mayer Brown are currently awaiting a formal response from the HA, who we understand are in direct contact with WCC and have agreed a response timetable.</p>	<p>S-Paramics traffic model submitted to HA</p>
	<p>Whilst the HA recognises that flexibility is required when it comes to remedial action, the HA requests that the Travel Plan includes site specific</p>	<p>As with the consented scheme, enforcement measures will be negotiated with Hampshire County Council (HCC) as part of the</p>	

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>measures that could be considered for implementation in the event that Travel Plan targets are not met. Please refer to Chapter 9 of the DfT’s (2009) <i>Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process</i> for a list of potential sanctions that could be included in the Travel Plan and form part of a S106 agreement. For the integrity of the Travel Plan to be secured, it is essential that should any failure to achieve agreed levels of implementation be identified, the means should be available to enforce implementation.</p>	<p>S106 agreement, as will development triggers for introducing mitigation measures.</p> <p>The HA noted that the enforcement measures will be negotiated with HCC.</p>	
42	<p>Hampshire County Council Highways <i>Main Access</i> – concerns about the length of the merge on the exit of the roundabout into the site have been raised by HCC Highways. Whilst the provision of a single carriageway is supported, the design requires vehicles to merge to the single lane in a short length. HCC would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the developers transport consultant. The safety Audit undertaken does not seem to address this issue.</p>	<p>Grainger’s transport consultants, Mayer Brown, are in dialogue with HCC where the horizontal geometry of the merge on the exit from the Maurepas Way main access roundabout on entry to the site is to be agreed.</p>	<p>Change New Drawing GTWVILLE2/SK/0032 pending HCC response.</p>
	<p><i>Southern Access</i> – the southern access layout is acceptable in principle. However, HCC requires a cost estimate to be prepared for the bus priority works shown on drawing GTWVILL2/GA/0903 Rev PR04 and GTWVILL2/GA/0904 Rev PR01 which should be checked by HCC in lieu of agreeing contributions.</p>	<p>Cost estimates have been prepared and sent to HCC for agreement at the next HCC S.106 meeting on 01/03/11.</p>	S106
	<p><i>Milk Lane</i> – the use of Milk Lane should be restricted to 246 dwellings before the southern access road is open. This should be secured through the S106 Agreement. As Milk Lane will now be accessed by all modes a contribution will be required towards bus infrastructure improvements to mitigate against the loss of this important piece of bus priority.</p> <p>Provision of the crossing for this junction should be dealt with by way of contribution to enable the County Council to deliver the most appropriate facilities based on the demand from the development. HCC requests that the developer confirms they are willing to deal with this provision of a crossing by way of contribution as it is no longer shown on the drawing.</p> <p>The Milk Lane Access will incorporate an Interchange. The applicant is</p>	<p>Details of the Milk Lane junction, the Bus/Cycle Interchange and any associated contributions are the subject of ongoing discussions with HCC. Meeting proposed for 01/03/11.</p>	S106

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>considering how best to deliver this facility and it seems likely that the Interchange will be constructed by the applicant as part of the Milk Lane access works. Details need to be secured in S106.</p>		
	<p><i>Transport Assessment</i> – The impact of the Newlands development has been modelled in detail at a total of 17 junctions and the scope has been agreed with HCC.</p> <p><i>Junction 10</i> – concern raised over banning the right turn from Stakes Road into Crookhorn Lane and HCC is concerned about the impact of this ban on buses that currently use the route. A plan is required that shows buses will be permitted to turn right at the junction.</p> <p><i>Junction 11</i> – concerns have been raised about the interaction of junction 11 with the junction of Purbrook Way and College Road. Require a plan that shows a junction improvement for this junction which includes the installation of signal to address HCC's concerns.</p> <p><i>Junction 12</i> – HCC questions the results of the modelling for this junction. HCC would like to discuss the modelling for this junction further with the applicant's highway consultants. The impact of the development will necessitate an improvement in this location as the additional traffic generated by the development cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure in this location.</p>	<p>Junction 10 – a revised scheme incorporating a right turn lane from Stakes Road into Crookhorn Lane has been submitted to HCC for their consideration.</p> <p>Junctions 11 & 12 – The output of the S-Paramics traffic model has also been shared with HCC for them to review. Any potential improvements to these junctions are the subject of ongoing discussions. Meeting proposed for 01/03/11.</p> <p>The bus contribution has now been agreed with HCC</p>	<p>S106</p>
	<p><i>Residential Travel Plan</i> – Paragraph 1.12 suggests that the Community Co-ordinator will be in position after the first employment unit is occupied. This is not acceptable and likely to be a mistake. Paragraph 6.5 indicates that this person will be in place two months prior to first residential occupation. Please make the necessary amendments and ensure reconciliation.</p> <p>Table 2.1 on page 2 schedules 2,645 dwellings to be built; It is understood that this is actually 2,550; the plan will need to be amended.</p> <p>Further information on how to encourage residents to participate in</p>	<p>The Residential Travel Plan has been reviewed to take into consideration these comments and re-submitted along with funding information to HCC. HCC has approved the reviewed Residential Travel Plan which has been provided as part of this comprehensive response.</p>	<p>S106</p>

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>surveys should be provided in the Travel Plan.</p> <p>The existing measure set out in the Travel Plan that the Community Co-ordinator should also be responsible for promoting sustainable travel events in line with national or local events.</p> <p>Please remove reference to ‘obligation’ and also prefix table 2.5 with ‘Suggested’ Development bus service provision and table 2.6 with ‘Suggested’ implementation of services to ensure the bus strategy is flexible.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8 should be extended to include, ‘and the area would be constructed using high quality materials as part of the Section 278/38 works at the Milk Lane junction’.</p> <p>There is currently no information on the estimated funding which will be required to implement the Travel Plan. Details should be provided along with the likely source of funding.</p>		
	<p><i>Employment Travel Plan</i> – Paragraph 1.2 on page 1 of the draft plan states that an additional 1,100 dwellings are to be built. It is understood that this is actually 1,000; the plan will need to be amended.</p> <p>Funding information on: community co-ordinators cost in preparing individual Full WPTPs as per paragraph 1.4; Plans measures such as the website set up costs, the cycle user events, the development of a visitor transport leaflet and the plans proportional logo; details of the costs associated with the management and monitoring of the plan should also be included.</p> <p>This information is required in order to ascertain how effective the plan is likely to be and in order to bond the Travel Plan to a future S106 agreement.</p>	<p>The Employment Travel Plan has been reviewed to take into consideration these comments and re-submitted along with funding information to HCC.</p> <p>HCC has now approved the reviewed Employment Travel Plan which has been provided as part of this comprehensive response.</p>	S106
	<p><i>Integration</i> – the integration scheme is solely needed to support the development of the Newlands development and other smaller scale</p>	<p>This is the subject of ongoing discussions with HCC. Mayer Brown has written to HCC with a proposal on which to base a</p>	S106

Item	Consultee Comment	Grainger plc project team response	Change/ No Change
	<p>developments to the west of Maurepas Way. It is therefore considered reasonable by HCC to expect local development to substantially fund the scheme. There is currently no agreement with the applicant over the funding arrangement for this scheme.</p>	<p>Grainger contribution. Good progress was made in a meeting on 15/02/11; HCC to review the proposal and another meeting is planned for 01/03/11.</p>	
43	<p>HCC Highways – Integration A letter was sent to the applicant concerning contribution requirements towards works outside the site which will necessitate the integration of the development with the town centre.</p> <p>A range of integration options were considered by HCC with no preferred option being proposed by HCC. They therefore proposed an appropriate contribution towards a typical integration solution is provided. The aggregate cost is £3.05m and as the MDA is the largest contributor this would result in a contribution by the applicant of £2,306,435. Further letter from HCC Highways received on 07/02/2011 rebutting letter sent from Mayer Brown regarding the long term adequacy of the proposed stand alone staggered crossing on Maurepas Way. This proposal is not seen by HCC as an acceptable integration between the MDA and the town centre.</p>	As above	S106