

Consultation Statement: Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

June 2026

Introduction

1. The draft Quality Places SPD was published for consultation between 5 January – 16 February 2026. This statement details the consultation on this document before and during the consultation period and the responses received.
2. This statement has been prepared in accordance with regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
3. The Consultation Statement is structured as follows:
 - Introduction
 - Background on the draft Quality Places SPD
 - Public consultation on the draft SPD
 - Responses on the draft SPD
 - Changes to the draft SPD
 - Appendix - Schedule of comments and EBC responses by section (pages 6 - 47)

Background on the draft Quality Places SPD

4. The Quality Places SPD provides guidance on design and applies to residential development in all parts of the Borough. The general design principles also apply to non-residential development.
5. The SPD is a revision of the Quality Places SPD adopted in 2011. It reflects the new Local Plan policies and updated national policy. It also addresses new issues such as the climate emergency and the need to plan for higher density development. The consultancy Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design were appointed to produce this guidance, working closely with the Council.

Public consultation on the draft SPD

6. The Council published the draft Quality Places SPD for six weeks public consultation from between 5 January – 16 February 2026. An extension was given on request to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to comment.
7. Notification of this consultation was sent to everyone who had signed up to the Council's Local Plan email updates and individuals and organisations on Local Plan consultation database. This included statutory consultees, residents and developers.

8. The documents were available online via links on the Council webpage. Paper copies were also available to view at Eastleigh House, other Parish/Town Council Offices and libraries in the borough.
9. The Council encouraged people to respond electronically using the consultation hub; <https://eastleighboroughcouncil.citizenspace.com>. Representations were also accepted via email and by letter.
10. The Council has undertaken consultation on the draft approach from 2024 onwards. This included public consultation with a survey published and workshops with staff and councillors. This informed the consultation draft SPD. On 27 November 2025, the draft SPD was discussed at the Council's Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel. Their questions and comments are included in Appendix 1, the Schedule of comments and EBC responses.

Responses on the draft Quality Places SPD

Number and type of responses

11. Comments were received on the draft SPD from 12 respondents; five developers/housing associations; three individuals; two infrastructure providers; Eastleigh Ramblers and the Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel. An additional three responses were received from Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England. These responses only commented on the Strategic Environmental Assessment / Habitats Regulations Assessment (SEA/HRA) screening report.
12. The table below provides a summary of the key issues raised. A response to each individual comment is included in the Appendix to this statement.

Key issues raised on draft Quality Places SPD

Summary of issue	Council's response and recommended changes
General support for aspirations and intentions of SPD	Welcome support
Level of flexibility needed in the approach including requests for more standards and the need for appropriate caveats to ensure that general principles are deliverable	The SPD sets the objectives and principles required. It aims to retain flexibility to respond to a wide range of development contexts. Text has been added to note when there is flexibility for developers to consider alternative approaches to deliver these.
Need for the SPD to align with draft and final changes in national policy, guidance and information and for the	The SPD provides guidance on Local Plan policies and has been updated to reflect changing national policy including the emerging NPPF and DPPG. Cross references were also added to relevant

Summary of issue	Council's response and recommended changes
guidance to not go beyond Local Plan policy	other guidance including borough and county council documents.
Need for more clarity on the overall approaches and how they apply to different types of places, clearer explanations/definitions of key aspects and inconsistencies in the SPD to be resolved	Section 3 'Understanding the site' has been rewritten to provide more guidance on how to understand the site and how the guidance applies for different types of places. Inconsistencies in guidance on letter boxes have been resolved. Glossary added to SPD and compact development and other terms are also defined in SPD.
Need for more local and sub regional examples and guidance	Images updated to include more locally relevant examples.
Concerns about specific requirements in the SPD including issues of site layout, access, internal layouts, sustainability and amenity space	Concerns noted. The general approach in the draft SPD is retained in the final SPD. Minor changes are made to clarify the approach or provide more flexibility, see table in Appendix.
Suggested changes to highways and active travel requirements and detailed comments on parking.	Text and cross references added in response to comments from the Highways Authority where necessary. There have been minor changes to the text and to diagrams to clarify guidance on highways, active travel and parking
Comments about the technical aspects of submitting applications	Changes made to clarify points about submitting reserved matters, encouraging early engagement and what to include in a DAS.

Changes to the draft SPD

13. The following changes were made in the final draft version of the SPD:

- a. Updated to reflect emerging National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance (DPPG). Changes include replacing ten characteristics identified in the National Model Design Code and National Model Design Guide with seven features in the DPPPG. These are repeated in the priorities identified in the SPD.

- b. Chapter 3 rewritten to clarify how development should understand its site and respond to its context and provide more guidance on how principles are applied for different types of places
- c. Images replaced with more locally relevant examples where possible. Explanatory text and symbols added to graphics.
- d. Text added to Introduction on alternative approaches. These must be in accordance with the DPPP or providing a clear improvement to the approach in the SPD. References to 'where possible' deleted throughout with design principles setting out what developers 'must do' and design guidance showing what they 'should do'. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate and justify if they cannot meet the requirement.
- e. Amended text on highway issues – setting out the vision led approach; adding references to the Parking Standards SPD and other relevant documents; and clarifying road design issues. Text changes to clarify cycle storage guidance; where references are to unallocated parking; tandem arrangement of parking; and the need to consider safety when designing unallocated car parking.
- f. Specific wording replaced or deleted including references to 'appropriate locations' for development; 'modern' homes; and an 'even distribution' of affordable housing (replaced by text from the Affordable Housing SPD)
- g. Detailed changes to guidance on entrances. Requirement preventing 'poor door' entrances replaced by requirement for all entrances to be equally high quality and location. Requirement for entrances to always be visible from the street amended to state this is a starting point and to provide further guidance on making entrances visible for in-fill or backland sites.
- h. Detailed changes to guidance on internal layout and lighting with requirement to show furnished layout to demonstrate how the maximum number of occupants can live together without crowding. This replaces the requirement for homes of three or more bedrooms to have two separate living areas. Specific 20% glazing requirement by floor area replaced by reference to Building Regulations and addressing daylight and shading issues.
- i. Corrected inconsistencies about guidance for letter boxes in draft SPD. Text amended with requirement to be prominently located near entrances, preferably accessible from the exterior.
- j. Detailed requirements that galleries/decks should only face residential courtyards, not streets, and for indoor planting and seating in communal areas have been deleted.
- k. Text added on the benefits of green space in mitigating the effects of climate change. Extra bullet added to note that roof detailing can add visual interest to design.

- l. Clarification provided on technical aspects of applications covering updating background evidence, Design and Access Statements, community engagement, reserved matters and preapplication discussions
- m. Glossary added with definitions of key terms including compact development
- n. References and cross references added, updated and corrected as required. Further minor changes including corrections and updates made.

Appendix - Schedule of comments on the draft SPD by section and EBC responses

Respondents:

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savills on behalf of Mac Mic • Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes • Luken Beck on behalf of BDW Southampton • Hampshire County Council Highways • Eastleigh Ramblers • Foreman Homes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel • National Grid • Habinteg Housing Association • Individual - Roger Meekley • Individual – David Lange • Individual – Ruth Alli | <p><i>Comments on SA/HRA report only:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England • Environment Agency • Historic England |
|--|--|---|

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	General comment	Support overall aspirations and intentions of SPD	Welcome support, no change	-
BDW	General comment	Query the extent to which viability has been considered in terms of the principles identified	Note comment, no change	-
BDW	General comment	Need to improve its consistency with national policy and guidance and robustness	Agree. Text added in sections 1 and 3 re. emerging NPPF and Design and Placemaking Practice Guidance (DPPPG). National Model Design Code and National Model Design Guide themes replaced with the seven Design and Placemaking Practice Guidance (DPPPG) themes.	Yes
BDW	General comment	This document needs to be more succinct	Note comment, no change	-
Individual (David Lange)	General comment	The whole document is long-winded, full of glossy, utopian images and fake perception of the borough's architecture, streets or living conditions. It is not in plain English, has jargonistic terminology and there is no mention of changes to adjust the policy under the Equality Act.	Note comment. The document provides technical guidance for developers on a range of issues including access (part of the Equality act). It is considered an appropriate length and level of detail. No change required.	-
BDW	General comment	Concerned that it does not reference the specific importance of appropriate and legible urban design in achieving a healthy environment for all, in particular for those with dementia or with a	Note comment. There are references to health, legibility and wayfinding in document. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		visual impairment, where good quality way finding and use of effective design standards are essential to creating an accessible environment. Suggest adding new text on achieving a healthy environment		
Individual (David Lange)	General comment	Comments about the lesser quality of contemporary designs, the destruction of historic buildings and the impact of successive EBC councils, and the need to look at building design that has stood the test of time. When considering planning, councils, developers and architects should prioritize environmental and mental health benefits of well thought out building design that, has quality and architectural integrity.	Note comment. The guidance aims to deliver high quality, well designed development in future. No change required.	-
Individual (David Lange)	General comment	Stated the importance of all local buildings that have been present in the community for more than 50 years. Suggestion for national listing of these buildings with the onus on protection from demolition, structural changes or the retention of certain aspects (to include smaller structures such as finials, stonework etc). These represent generational identity and emotional attachment. Councils should also have the power to enforce rebuilding/repairs to a specified standard of buildings that owners allow to fall into disrepair to the point they become unsafe or 'a mysterious fire' occurs (and compulsory purchase if the owner fails to comply).	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD. No change required.	-
Individual (David Lange)	General comment	Concerns raised about the impact of family homes being turned into HMOs with issues of noise, mess, rubbish, poorly maintained gardens and properties in states of disrepair.	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD. No change required.	-
Individual (David Lange)	General comment	The roads, infrastructure, employment, housing developments have become overcrowded, too many vehicles on the roads, lack of alternative transport and dysfunctional local plans that have no long term stability or foresight included. Local services are overburdened, unable to cope with demand. The aesthetic beauty and design of Eastleigh has been destroyed, suggestion to raze all the buildings and start again. Stated need for more green open spaces.	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Individual (David Lange)	General comment	<p>Concern that EBC have failed to reach out to the humble citizen, hard to reach groups, disadvantaged, mentally/physically impaired when important matters that affect their mental well-being and living conditions. Question if school pupils/student consulted. Comment about the reality of the actual living environment endured by local citizens.</p> <p>Stated need to change everything, suggestion to create conservation zones, restrict buildings in certain areas and preserve what local architecture remains</p>	Note comment. Public consultation was undertaken on both the SPD and Local Plan. The SPD is technical guidance, intended to guide developers. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD. No change required.	-
Mac Mic	General comment	Commented that the SPD is welcomed and complements the developers vision for Allington Garden Village. It provides sound and useful design guidance for the delivery of high-quality places within the Borough, is well set out, with clear sections, and supporting illustrative material.	Welcome support, no change required	-
Mac Mic	General comment - Flexibility	Suggest adding a note that allows for the potential for flexibility of interpretation, of overarching placemaking principles benefit. Variations will need to be clearly demonstrated though supporting design material as part of a planning application, following engagement with officers and stakeholders. One example could be the approach to designing for views of landmarks through the use of sequential vision, as with many traditional towns, rather than direct views (as illustrated within the Draft SPD).	Agree. Text added in section 1.1.3 on alternative approaches in accordance with the DPPP or providing a clear improvement to the approach.	Yes
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	General comment - implementation	Question how much of this guidance can be enforced with large schemes? Query about references to "where possible".	Text amended throughout to remove 'where possible' with the onus on the applicant to demonstrate and justify if they cannot meet the requirement. Design principles set out what developers 'must do', there is more flexibility within design guidance requirements. These are 'should' except where they align with other standards such as the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Individual (Roger Meekley)	General comment - implementation	The SPD places strong emphasis on green infrastructure, SuDS, and multifunctional public spaces, all of which depend on long-term management. However, the document does not clearly set out what maintenance strategies, management plans, or funding mechanisms will be required at application stage. Clarifying these expectations and practical guidance would materially improve deliverability and long-term place quality.	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD and may be covered in other documents. No change required.	-
Mac Mic	General comment - Implementation:	The delivery of the vision for place making would also benefit from additional design training/ skills for officers (and members) to support the implementation process of the SPD.	Note comment, no change required to the SPD	-
Mac Mic	General comment - Implementation:	Suggest a simple checklist to support planning applications and response to SPD. Need to monitor and review success of SPD. Such an approach is often used for delivering Design Codes, such as those used for Berewood West of Waterlooville in Hampshire.	Noted. The purpose of the Quality Places SPD is to provide guidance on design principles and expectations rather than introduce additional procedural requirements for planning applications. No change required.	-
Mac Mic	General comment - A responsive approach to local and sub-regional character:	The SPD can at times be generic in its advice, given that it is covering a Borough with a variety of characteristics. Hence we suggest that more use of local and sub-regional examples could be included. Otherwise, there is a danger that the SPD will be too similar to the new national guidance	Agree. Images have replaced with more locally relevant examples where possible throughout the document.	Yes
Mac Mic	General comment - Design for healthy living:	The SPD has limited guidance on the design of healthy places. This is a significant issue, in particular since the pandemic, and is a key design objective of our proposal for Allington Garden Village. Healthy living needs to be an intrinsic part of the design process for communities, including encouraging walking and cycling, ease of access to facilities, access to fresh fruit and vegetables, opportunities for activities to promote a healthy lifestyle including recreational space and fitness trails.	Note comment, no change – see BDW general comment on page 2	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 4, Section 1.1.1 (or glossary)	Need to explain or define the term 'compact development'. It is requested that a clear and precise definition from a recognised source is included in either this section or in a glossary to the document.	Agree – definition added to glossary and used in SPD	Yes
BDW	Page 4, Section 1.1.1	Support higher density and effective use of land in principle, but it should not be assumed that compact development with a high density development is appropriate on all sites and in all locations. Guidance must recognise that new developments must be designed to be appropriate to the character and appearance of the area and the sustainability of the location, which is not always higher density.	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten to provide more guidance on how the guidance is applied for different types of places.	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 4, Section 1.1.1 Compact development	The key is to ensure a sufficient range of densities and typology, to ensure the development is responsive to context and land uses and assist delivery and viability. Suggest more reference to flexibility and range of densities to ensure a deliverable and responsive development across the Borough, aligning with the NPPF regarding " <i>Location-Specific Densities</i> ", with higher densities (often 50+ dph) in town centres and near transport hubs. In contrast, suburban areas and village extensions are guided toward "gentle density," generally ranging from 35 to 75 dwellings per hectare (dph).	Note comment. The final SPD includes updated information about the emerging NPPF and DPPP	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 4, Section 1.1.1 Climate change	Comment on achieving climate change mitigation targets, that it would further help to state that this is only part of the approach to delivering sustainable development and therefore it is worth some cross referencing to additional guidance and summarising the Council's key mitigation targets with the SPD. Suggest adding a paragraph to explain council's targets.	Note comment. The SPD refers to the guidance helping to meet the targets, no change required	-
Individual (Ruth Alli)	Page 4, section 1.1.1	There is no climate emergency	Disagree, no change required	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 4, Section 1.1.2 Purpose of the Document	Note that the purpose of the document does not accurately or effectively reflect the Local Plan aspirations and intention which recognises that there are circumstances where site constraints or local character justify a lower density (Policy DM23(c))	Note comment. In addition to the reference to a minimum density in policy DM23, policy S1 (1.g) refers to optimising density. This also aligns with updated national guidance. The text has been updated to refer to the emerging NPPF and DPPP.	-
BDW	Page 4, Section 1.1.2 Purpose of the Document	To achieve 'quality places', the effective integration of all development types and styles is essential, including commercial development, retail and mixed-use development	Agree. Text has been added to section 1.1.1 to refer to other uses that support mixed- use neighbourhoods	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 4, Section 1.1.2	The SPD states that this updated Quality Places Design Guide replaces the 2011 version and supports the policies set out in the Eastleigh Local Plan. It focusses on the Council's ambition to deliver compact and sustainable development in <i>appropriate locations</i> . Some clarity should be provided as to what is actually meant by appropriate locations. Suggest removal of reference to "appropriate development" as this is ambiguous. Suggest adding explanatory text that the SPD principles of creating quality places will be relevant to all significant development sites, provided that they are able to meet all criteria of well-connected sustainable development, in particular principles for new communities and urban extensions. This will then relate well to the statement in para 1.1.3.	Agree. Reference to 'development in appropriate locations' replaced with reference to 'development that is appropriate to the location and its future potential – as per the NPPF'	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 5, Section 1.1.3	Reference is (understandably) made to the now out of date National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, though many of the principles remain in place. Recommend an updated reference will need to be made to new <i>Draft Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance (2026)</i> MHCLG (DPPP). This includes reference to the key features of designing successful places, which has been revised down from 10 in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, to seven in the Draft DPPG (2026)	Agree. Text added in sections 1 and 3 re. emerging NPPF and Design and Placemaking Practice Guidance (DPPP). National Model Design Code and National Model Design Guide themes replaced with the seven Design and Placemaking Practice Guidance (DPPP) themes.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Mac Mic	Page 5, Section 1.1.3	<p>The SPD states that regardless of the type or scale of development, all applicants should read all sections of this guide. Hence we assume that all development proposals will need to demonstrate how it adheres to the guidance. It is not clear how the Council will implement the guidance in practical terms, as well as monitor and review delivery.</p> <p>The Council may wish to suggest applicants submit a simple checklist for planning applications which demonstrates how the key requirements of the SPD have been understood and delivered as part of the proposal. Grainger plc, with Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council allowed for a similar approach for reserved matters responding to a Design Code for the Berewood development at West of Waterlooville. This approach also aligns with recommendations previously set out in the National Model Design Code. Example checklist provided.</p>	Noted. The purpose of the Quality Places SPD is to provide guidance on design principles and expectations rather than introduce additional procedural requirements for planning applications. No change required	-
BDW	Page 7, Section 1.1.5 Local Guidance	The Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough (2011) and Urban Character Area Appraisals (2008) are now old, largely out dated and not necessarily reflective of latest settlement or development patterns. These should be updated and reference made here to any later versions that may be published.	Text added to sections 1.1.5 and 3.3.2 to note that applicants can use existing studies as background but would need to create their own evidence if they believe the information is out of date.	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 7, Section 1.1.5	<p>As with many examples of district-wide design guidance elsewhere, it can be difficult to be area-specific to the varying character of the Borough. Hence this SPD would benefit from additional explanation of appropriateness of design principles applicable to varying parts of the Borough (Hamble, Botley, Eastleigh, Hedge End, Chandlers Ford, etc).</p> <p>A broader character areas plan would also help (rather than only landscape character as currently shown).</p> <p>Suggest an update that states: 'Development proposals should clearly explain approach to designing for identity for the development and any supporting rationale, including relevant reference to existing Character Area Studies, Neighbourhood Plans, and Conservation Area Appraisals, and include a hyperlink</p>	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten to provide more guidance on how the guidance is applied for different types of places. No change required	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		to supporting documents’.		
BDW	Page 8, Section 1.2 Process and Collaboration	In accordance with NPPF Paragraph 41, early engagement should not be mandatory. Reference should be made here to the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement, to reflect any potential future changes that may occur. A 3 stage engagement process is unlikely to be realistic in practice.	Note comment. While early engagement is not mandatory, the SPD strongly encourages it and a three stage programme. No change required. NB. SCI are being replaced in the new planning system	-
Mac Mic	Page 9, Section 1.2.3	The SPD sets out a recommended three stage process to engagement (Assessment and Briefing, Defining Design Principles, Design Details). Whilst we have no major concerns regarding this approach, we would contend that it also depends on the approach to consultation undertaken. For example, a more interactive process may result in a more efficient and engaging process where assessment and briefing could be combined with defining design principles. An interactive or workshop approach could be more effective at quickly establishing design principles at a relatively early stage. A collaborative approach to engagement with the Council and stakeholders is essential for the design of successful places, and an approach that continues to be advocated by Mac Mic as part of the emerging proposals for Allington Garden Village. Suggest some flexibility in the stages outlined, and subject to how interactive and engaging the process is, such as the use of workshops and interactive consultation event tasks.	Note comment, the SPD provides guidance on engagement and there is some flexibility about how this is undertaken. No change required	-
BDW	Page 9, Section 1.2.3 Engagement and Consultation	Amend reference to state that community engagement is ‘encouraged’ rather than ‘vital’ in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 41 Amend first para - ‘The Council considers community engagement a vital part of the planning process’ to state ‘community engagement is encouraged’	Note comment. This sets out the Council’s view about the importance of community engagement which has not changed. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
HCC Highways	Page 9, 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	<p>We recommend making the approach explicitly vision-led so applicants must show that streets, access and parking are set by the place vision and target mode share, meaning car trips and parking are limited by design instead of being supplied to match demand.</p> <p>Suggest adding: <i><u>'Demonstrate a vision led approach setting out (a) target mode share, (b) how the street layout, access to active travel and public transport networks, and (c) the parking quantum and management will restrict car trips by design and support the place vision, rather than meeting forecast demand with additional parking'</u></i></p>	Agree, suggested text added to 1.2.4	Yes
BDW	Page 9, Section 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	<p>It must not be a requirement of a DAS to reference community consultation, as this is not a mandatory requirement. Moreover, it should only reference community involvement where this has been undertaken.</p> <p>Suggest clarifying para starting 'The DAS must reference community involvement' to apply only where undertaken.</p>	Note comment. Text in 1.2.4 amended to 'must reference any community involvement undertaken'	Yes
BDW	Page 9, Section 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	The requirements for information to be included within a DAS is set out in national policy and as such it is not necessary to be included in this document.	Note comment. Text has been added to 1.2.4 and to the example checklist to clarify that it is a suggested contents list to address the design principles in this SPD.	Yes
BDW	Page 9, Section 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	Needs definition of 'pedshed boundaries'	Agree, glossary added including a definition of 'pedshed'	Yes
BDW	Page 9, Section 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	Reference to the DAS providing sufficient detail on at least one of the reserved matters at outline stage - not a mandatory requirement of an outline application as all matters can be reserved. Amend reference to reserved matters	Note comment. Reference replaced with 'should provide sufficient illustrative detail to enable LPA officers to make informed judgements of the accessibility of the high level principles and their ability to deliver high-quality development.'	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Bloor Homes	Page 9, Section 1.2.4 DAS – reserved matters	<p>Requirement for Design and Access Statements (DAS) to cover “at least one of the reserved matters”, whilst it is common for further details to be provided on access, these will normally be provided as separate drawings. For an outline planning application most of the information in the DAS is “illustrative” to enable remaining matters to be fixed at reserved matters stage following further technical work. By requiring “at least one of the reserved matters” to be provided at this early stage, this could restrict the ability to achieve an optimum design at reserved matters stage following further detailed evolution of the scheme and could result in the need for unnecessary S96a and S73 applications.</p> <p>We suggest that this sentence be removed. Bloor Homes considers that the content of any DAS should be discussed with officers so that it is appropriate to the type of development and type of location, rather than prescribed.</p>	See response above	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 9, Section 1.2.4	<p>Generally sound advice on the approach to setting out and producing a Design and Access Statement that provides supplementary guidance on the detail and purpose of a planning application. The SPD also states that <i>the DAS for an outline application must provide sufficient detail on at least one of these reserved matters, as agreed with LPA officers during pre-application discussions</i>. The SPD would benefit from clearer guidance on how its expectations apply to different types of planning applications. At present, the reference to outline applications providing detail on at least one reserved matter introduces uncertainty, particularly for applicants who typically submit high-level outlines.</p> <p>We would recommend that there is a clear explanation that DAS is not a design tool but an explanatory document (non-technical), and a note should be added accordingly.</p> <p>Suggest adding a short section clarifying expectations for outline, full, hybrid and reserved matters applications would improve consistency and reduce ambiguity in the submission process.</p>	Note comment, glossary added including a definition of a Design and Access Statement	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 9, Section 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	Pre-application discussions are not a mandatory requirement and it cannot be a requirement for this to be agreed with Officers at pre-application stage in any event and moreover applications may be progressed to meet an applicant's requirements.	Note comment, text amended to highly recommend that applicant engage in pre-application discussions	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 9, Section 1.2.4, final para	<p>The reference to some applications being required to submit a masterplan or design code would benefit from clearer guidance on the circumstances in which this applies such as site size, complexity, sensitivity, multi-phase development or strategic locations. This should be agreed as part of the pre-application process and a collaborative approach to masterplanning is essential to achieve good placemaking, and an approach advocated by Mac Mic as part of its own development proposals for Allington Garden Villages, where a number of parameters and scenarios have been tested with the Borough Council to help achieve the best result for the site and wider benefit of the Borough.</p> <p>Recommend providing indicative examples or criteria would support more consistent decision-making and help applicants prepare appropriately at pre-app stage. The level of detail and any required design tools, such a Design Codes, will be agreed as part of the pre-application process advocated by the Borough Council.</p>	Note comment. While indicative examples may be helpful, the SPD aims to retain flexibility to respond to a wide range of development contexts. The need for masterplans, design codes or other design tools will be considered on a case-by-case basis and discussed through the pre-application process. No change required	-
BDW	Page 10, Section 1.2.4 Design and Access Statements	'Addressing biodiversity net gain' is not considered appropriate for a DAS, as this is addressed in separate calculations and strategies submitted elsewhere with a planning application.	Note comment. Detailed Biodiversity Net Gain calculations are typically provided through supporting ecological reports. However, the Design and Access Statement may still explain how biodiversity considerations have informed the overall design and layout of the development. Text amended in Sample checklist to state 'Integrating nature and achieving Biodiversity Net Gain'	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Bloor Homes	Page 10, sample DAS checklist	Bloor Homes consider this to be very prescriptive and may not follow the evidence led approach to masterplan design that the guidance is seeking. Furthermore, certain sites may warrant a different set of contents. We suggest removing this list and, instead, and setting out broader topics as suggestions that could be appropriate to be covered.	Note comment. Text has been added to 1.2.4 and to the example checklist to clarify that it is a suggested contents list to address the design principles in this SPD.	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 13, Section 2.1	Key themes are set out to help explain the vision and objectives for placemaking within the Borough. These align with the previous National Model Design Code and National Design Guide. Whilst the national guidance has recently been superseded, the principles are still retained in national guidance and have also been interpreted within our own vision for Allington Garden Village, with the masterplan approach being considered for the delivery of a sustainable new community, in particular the approach to nature conservation, climate resilience, and the creation of a well-connected community, with access to community uses and open space. Recommend need to refer to the latest draft Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance (DPPG) Jan 2025. Perhaps wait until the latest draft is adopted before releasing this SPD. This would include adjustments to the design priorities and principles (diagram included)	Agree. Text added in sections 1 and 3 re. emerging NPPF and Design and Placemaking Practice Guidance (DPPPG). National Model Design Code and National Model Design Guide themes replaced with the seven Design and Placemaking Practice Guidance (DPPPG) themes.	Yes
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 12, Vision, playable landscapes	The SPD refers to playable landscapes. These requires ongoing maintenance to function as intended. The SPD tells applicants what to design, but not what management plans must be submitted, whether commuted sums are expected and whether adoption by the council is realistic or assumed.	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD and may be covered in other documents. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
HCC Highways	Page 13, Section 2.1 Priorities – Movement section	<p>We suggest updating the passage from ‘walking and wheeling’ to ‘active travel’, as this term provides a more inclusive and comprehensive description of people-powered mobility.</p> <p>Suggested re-wording: ‘Journeys are short, inclusive, and can be undertaken by walking and wheeling <i>active travel modes</i>’.</p>	Agree, glossary added including a definition of ‘active travel’	Yes
Bloor Homes	Page 13, section 2, Homes and buildings	Bloor Homes consider that the word “modern” should be removed from this. This gives the impression that all homes should potentially look “modern”. Whilst Bloor Homes support contemporary buildings, the existing character of a place may not always lend itself to a modern form of architecture.	Comment noted. The SPD does not seek to promote a specific architectural style. The intention is to support high-quality, context-responsive design which may include both contemporary and traditional approaches where appropriate. Text amended to replace ‘modern’ with ‘contemporary’	Yes
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 13, section 2.1, Lifespan	This sets an ambition for long-term thinking but no delivery mechanism. There is no explanation of who maintains what, how it is secured legally and what happens if management companies fail.	Note comment, this is beyond the scope of this SPD. No change required	-
Mac Mic	Page 16, Section 3.1	<p>Four character typologies are set out within this section (Town Centre, Mixed-use Centre, Urban, Suburban) and the SPD requires planning applications to demonstrate a response of the character relevant to the proposal. There is limited explanation on the key ingredients of these character areas (scale, mix, density etc). There is a partial explanation in para 3.2, though the character types vary (Eastleigh Town Centre, Mixed-use Centres, Urban and suburban). Whilst useful as a starting point, there is an inherent danger in simplifying the character in such a way. Perhaps more relevance is made to context and cues in local character based on a thorough assessment, and the development of a clear design rationale, which is also referred to in Paras 3.3 and 3.4 of the SPD.</p> <p>Suggest that supplementary text is added to explain the likely features of these character areas and where they would be most applicable (scale mix, density ranges etc). Suggest combine and modify Para 3.2 so there is a direct relationship between the two</p>	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten to provide more guidance on how the guidance is applied for different types of places.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		paragraphs. Explain that new development proposals will need to demonstrate a responsive approach to placemaking by creating a sense of place through which addresses site features, local identity, and demonstrates the relationship between form and function of place. Our approach at Allington Garden Village is the create development that is of an appropriate density and scale according to the spatial characteristics of the development, and also site and contextual features. For instance, sensitive lower density development close to habitats and sensitive edges, with a greater density and mix of uses around the village centre.		
BDW	Page 17, Section 3.2 What could change look like?	Support overall approach, however a development should be accompanied by a context and character analysis/design rationale within the DAS to justify the approach. The guidance should be firm on its application of design principles but allow flexibility on the design response.	Comment noted. Section 3 has been rewritten to provide more guidance on how the guidance is applied for different types of places. A Design and Access Statement is expected to include an assessment of site context and character and explain the design rationale for the proposal. The SPD already promotes a principles-based approach while allowing flexibility in the design response. No change required	-
Mac Mic	Page 17-18, Section 3.2	The existing-condition graphics are useful, but they currently lack accompanying explanation. Without descriptive context, it is unclear what issues, qualities or character traits these images are intended to highlight. Recommend provide brief descriptions of the existing development situations illustrated in the black-and-white graphics, explaining the strengths, shortcomings or design considerations they represent. This would make the visuals more meaningful and help applicants interpret them accurately, and so the pros and cons of the before and after illustrations:	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten. Explanatory text and symbols added to graphics.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Bloor Homes	Page 18, section 3, 5 th bullet point	5th bullet point says “provide some local non residential facilities at ground floor, such as local shops, cafes or services (e.g. laundry)”. Bloor Homes consider that this cannot always be provided as there may not always be a need or desire within the area for such facilities, and this may not be possible in the delivery of smaller schemes. Furthermore, this may not always be the best use of the developable area at that time. Suggests placing “generally” or “where possible”, when discussing specific points such as this.	Note comment. ‘Some’ clarifies that this requirement doesn’t apply to all homes. No change required	-
Bloor Homes	Page 18, section 3, 6 th bullet point	On page 18 (left hand page) 6th bullet point relates to Home Zones. Bloor Homes suggest removing reference to Home Zones as this is out-dated and shared streets and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods provide similar outcomes without the ultra-specific requirements of Home Zones.	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten and this bullet replaced. No change required.	-
Bloor Homes	Page 18, section 3, 1 st bullet point	On page 18 (right hand page) 1st bullet point on New Settlements. This refers to “making the best and most efficient use of available land through compact layouts and careful consideration of height and density”. Bloor Homes consider that densities should be considered on a site-by-site basis.	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten and this bullet replaced. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 18, Section 3.2 Urban and suburban (residential)	Delete reference to ‘ <i>local landscape character</i> ’ and replaced with ‘local character’, as there are many aspects to character that can determine the suitability of development, not just landscape character.	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten and this bullet replaced. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 18, Section 3.2 New Settlements	There are ways to deliver efficient and effective use of land other than compact layouts. Local circumstances and characteristics of the wider area should be considered and increasing density around key hubs or services in new settlements would enable a reduced density at edges to integrate into the wider setting. Remove reference to compact layouts	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten and this bullet replaced. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 18, Section 3.2 New Settlements	Support SuDS but the use of SuDS within streets should not be required and a varied approach should be promoted based on local characteristics and specific drainage solutions. Remove reference to SUDs in streets	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten and this bullet replaced. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 19, Section 3.3.2 All development proposals must respond to positive local character	It should not be a requirement for all development to respond positively to local character, as a suitable design solution may be to adopt an alternative character to create a landmark feature or create visual interest (reflective of Section 3.4 principles to 'conserve', 'evolve and enhance' or 'reinvent' character). Remove requirement	Note comment. Section 3 has been rewritten to clarify the guidance. Response can include the creation of an alternative character, where justified, for example where the existing character is poor or weak. No change required	-
BDW	Page 19, Section 3.3.2 All development proposals must respond to positive local character	As outlined above, this section references old documents that are now largely out of date and require review. As such, reference should be made to any subsequent revisions.	Note comment. Text added about developers providing their own evidence if they believe guidance to be out of date.	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 19, Section 3.3.2	The design principles set out are based on sound principles and best practice, in that a successful development should utilise positive attributes of the site and surroundings, where they exist. Given that the SPD is focused on the Borough and South Hampshire, there is an opportunity to provide more bespoke references to the area, such as in regards to colour palette. Text should be added to explain that identity should be developed via a clear design rationale, which may also respond to local positive characteristics, or which seeks to generate its own sense of character. Reference and links to Character Area Studies and Conservation Area appraisals would assist the varied character across the Borough.	Comment noted. The SPD already refers to relevant sources of local character evidence, including Character Area Studies and Conservation Area Appraisals, earlier in the document. These are intended to inform the design rationale and understanding of local context. No further change is proposed.	-
Mac Mic	Page 20, Section 3.3.3	Noted and supported that all new development should have a thorough understanding of site constraints and methods of mitigation and response. That response can often create opportunities for the development, such as creating an interesting responsive approach to topography, creative use of water management and response to landscape features. This is the approach being developed for Allington Garden Village, with landscape and water management creating a highly responsive environment.	Note comment. Text in 3.3.3 amended to refer to '... latest flood risk maps and Eastleigh Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment'	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		<p>On the matter of <i>Flood Risk</i>, it is worth noting that the Environment Agency has recently made changes to this information. There are new boundaries to Flood Zones 2 and 3, as well as a new zone called <i>Flood Risk Plus Climate Change</i> that shows how the combined extent of Flood Zones 2 and 3 could increase with climate change over the next century, notwithstanding the benefits of any existing flood defences.</p> <p>Please refer to Flood risk plus climate change zone that will have an impact on the Borough. The document could be further assisted by the use of hyperlinks to relevant data.</p>		
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	Page 20, Services and utilities	Noted that there is a 400kV Overhead Transmission Line route across the north of the borough (map provided). Although no new infrastructure projects are planned within the area, demand for electricity is expected to rise significant as fossil fuels will be replaced by low-carbon electricity.	Note comment, no change required	-
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	Page 20, Services and utilities	Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets should be aware that it is NGET policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance.	Note comment, no change required	-
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	Page 20, Services and utilities	Noted the need to safeguard assets and access roads for the delivery and removal of Abnormal Indivisible Loads associated with equipment and not compromise these. Also need to support upgrades and national infrastructure projects and to ensure development does not compromise network or future expansion.	Note comment, no change required	-
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	Page 20, Services and utilities	Referred to NGET's: 'Design guidelines for development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines' and Technical Guidance Note 'Third-party guidance for working near National Grid Electricity Transmission equipment'	Note comment, no change required	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 21, Section 3.4	Question if the Conserve / Evolve / reinvent approach is done elsewhere? Does a developer decide which of these they wish to do? If two sites close to each other come forward – apply the same approach?	Many authorities effectively apply a similar approach by identifying areas to conserve and enhance, areas suitable for incremental evolution/change, and areas requiring more	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
			significant intervention or reinvestment. It reflects established practice in place shaping and asset management. Section 3 has been rewritten to clarify the guidance including that a combination of character approaches can be taken in larger developments (3.4). No change required	
Mac Mic	Page 21, Section 3.4	<p>The Conserve - Evolve - Reinvent framework offers a clear, adaptable structure for responding to varying site contexts across the Borough.</p> <p>In terms of precedents, we suggest that more reference could be made to sub-regional and south Hampshire examples. For example, St Paul's Winchester is a case where a mix of conversion of historic non-residential buildings has been successfully converted into residential development has responded to local character in a more contemporary way, whilst still using a traditional palette of materials. Also, further cross referencing and use of existing character areas studies and conservation areas appraisals where relevant would be helpful.</p> <p>On greenfield sites, such as Allington Garden Village, it is possible to celebrate the landscape features of the site and create a strong character through the utilisation of key landscape features. The strong green infrastructure being proposed creates a unique sense of place for the development, ensuring multi-functional spaces form the heart of the community. <u>See emerging</u> masterplan concept below illustrates this point:</p>	Welcome support. Images have replaced with more locally relevant examples where possible throughout the document including from Winchester and Hampshire.	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 23, Drawing – Creating good neighbourhoods	The drawing on page 23, 26 and 36 currently relies on a limited number of pedestrian/cycle routes, which gives the impression of poor network connectivity. We recommend revising the drawing to show continuous pedestrian/cycle routes running alongside the primary street network. Revise to show continuous pedestrian/cycle routes running alongside the primary street network	Note comment. Text added to diagram to state 'Traffic free zones to enhance pedestrian and cycle network'	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 24, Section 4.1 Respond to the Context	Support principles in 4.1.1 and 4.1.2. An additional criterion should be added to integrate within the existing built context and setting, to achieve successful developments in both the town centres and village settings	Welcome support. Section 3 has been rewritten and clarifies how development should respond to its context.	-
Mac Mic	Page 24, Section 4.1	Rightly, there is a strong emphasis on walkable, human-scaled neighbourhoods, supporting sociable, accessible, and safe everyday environments. Constructive guidance on mixed-use and local centres, supporting active ground floors, clustered uses, and neighbourhood-based services. This approach is best practice and a core part of the design rationale for our proposal at Allington Garden Village, where we have a network of highly connected walkable neighbourhoods with access to local facilities, green space via people focused streets and green movement networks. Public transport corridors can be easily accessible, with connections to local urban areas and employment hubs. Recommend guidance remains broad and could be more descriptive, particularly around permeability, neighbourhood identity and what these principles look like in practice. This could be illustrated by including additional sub-regional examples, for example Barton Farm Winchester, Graylingwell Chichester, and also Poundbury Dorchester.	Welcome support. Images have replaced with more locally relevant examples where possible throughout the document including from Winchester and Hampshire. No change required.	-
Mac Mic	Page 24, Section 4.1.1	The site and landscape features should not be seen as a constraint on development but a way in which valued places can be created, with opportunities for multi-functional spaces for biodiversity, water management, healthy living, play, and connectivity. We would contend that the approach is not just about reflecting and responding to landscape, but quality places embrace and celebrate landscape. As we have stated, the heart of the identity of Allington Garden Village is the strong multi-functional web that is intertwined with the compact neighbourhood being proposed. This objective is fundamental in creating a successful garden village. Recommend more reference to be made to the importance of landscape creating identity and valuable placemaking. Landscape	Note comment. Landscape is referenced throughout, no change required	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		<p>features should be a fundamental starting point to the design of places and responding to climate change.</p>		
Mac Mic	Page 25, Section 4.2	<p>The SPD sets out key objectives for connected places, with reference to the Borough's approach to the delivery of strong walking, cycling, public transport, and road links. New developments should connect to this network to access local services and jobs. A safe, convenient, and attractive transport system promotes walking, cycling, and healthier communities.</p> <p>Allington Garden Village will deliver a highly connected place, both within itself and utilising and enhancing existing transport corridors, leisure routes, and public rights of way.</p> <p>SPD could include an additional statement that development proposals should be supported by a clear movement rationale, that identifies existing connection and opportunities for enhancement, with a focus on encouraging sustainable modes of transport, as in the case of our proposals for Allington Garden Village, which also seeks to complement and extend the existing bus network (see extract below from Vision Document 2025):</p>	<p>Note comment. The SPD refers to walking, wheeling and cycling and relevant documents including LTP4, Road User Framework and Movement and Place framework. No change required.</p>	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Eastleigh Ramblers	Page 25, 4.2.1 Walking, cycling and wheeling	<p>There is great emphasis on "walking and wheeling". There is no recognition that not all routes are designed as a multiuser route. Routes that are for pedestrians only can be designed at a narrower width with shorter sight lines and with a different standard of finish. Once you introduce cyclists sight lines have to be increased as do the widths and with enhanced surfacing. If you introduce equestrians then the widths have to be even wider to enable two horses unfamiliar with each other to safely pass and to enable other users to keep at a safe distance and equestrians may seek different designs particularly at road junctions. Equestrian needs do not seem to be addressed. Designs also have to meet wheel chair users requirements at bridges and boardwalks and road crossings. It might be useful to refer to design standards that the Borough Council is expecting developers to refer to in design.</p> <p>There is therefore a hierarchy of users, promulgated by the highway code, and a design has to fit that hierarchy. Walking and Wheeling is not a term the law of England recognises and terms used should only be those defined in the Highways Act 1980.</p>	Note comment. SPD has already reference to wheeling and guidance based on a hierarchy of users (which includes equestrian access). Glossary added with definitions of wheeling and active travel.	-
Eastleigh Ramblers	Page 25, 4.2.1 Walking, cycling and wheeling	The issue of what routes should be built to adoption standard and passed to the highway does not seem to be addressed nor that the Highways Authority has its own standards for design and construction. Who is going to maintain the routes that are not transferred to the highway authority is an issue that needs to be addressed.	Note comment. This is beyond the scope of the SPD. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
HCC Highways	Page 25, 4.2.1 Connect streets and routes into the wider network	<p>We recommend adding that new developments should build on and link to the adopted LCWIP routes and zones.</p> <p>We recommend making the last Travel Plan bullet point under public transport connections clearer - specifically, is it referring to HCC Travel Plan policy.</p> <p>We recommend changing 15-minute walk to 10-minute walk in line with the new Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>Amend text – ‘Where feasible, larger developments should include new public transport routes (e.g. bus services) through the site, ensuring all homes are within 400m of a bus stop and within a 10<u>15</u>min walk of a neighbourhood centre’.</p> <p>Add under ‘Key requirements’: ‘Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan 4 <u>and related policies</u>’</p>	Note comments. As the DPPP has not yet been adopted, no change is proposed to the 15min threshold. Extra reference to LTP4 policies is not required.	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 25, section 4.2	Question whether Sustainable Transport will be prioritised over planning for the car once HCC become involved.	Note comment. The SPD provides clear guidance on sustainable transport and the Council will endeavour to deliver this approach.	-
Individual (Ruth Alli)	Page 25, section 4.2.1, Public transport connections	15 minute city strategy reduces individual freedoms, will drive further inequality and class divisions and makes accessing facilities more difficult for people with disabilities. Healthcare services will become overrun in areas with higher population density, particularly during season illness	Note comments. The Councils supports locating services within a 15 minute walk to ensure that people can access most of their daily needs within a short walk or cycle without being dependent on the private car. No change required	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 25, section 4.2.1, 2 nd bullet	Question about desire lines pictures. Modern estates see people making their own paths based on desire lines - is this something we would be encouraging?	Note comment. The SPD includes reference to ‘Healthy Streets’ which covers desire lines (which may change over time as uses change). The SPD also promotes permeability which reduces the issues. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Officer comment	Page 26, 4.2.2 Create a connected movement network, 1 st bullet	Amend 1 st bullet to state 'Walking, <u>cycling</u> and wheeling should be ...'	Agree. Text amended to state 'Walking, <u>cycling</u> and wheeling should be ...'	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 26, 4.2.2 Create a connected movement network	We recommend making reference to LTP4's 'Road User Utility Framework' (as outlined in Policy C3 and p. 57), to help designers with prioritisation of different road users. Equally, we recommend the inclusion of Healthy Street principals, with the framework able to ensure street designs are safe, well-lit and accessible for all. Please include HCC's <u>Technical Guidance Notes</u> under 'Key requirements'. Add reference to LTP4s 'Road User Utility Framework' and the inclusion of Healthy Street principles Add under 'Key requirements' 'Hampshire County Council's Technical Guidance Notes'	Agree, references added to 'Local Transport Plan 4 (2024) including the Road User Utility framework' 'Highways Technical Guidance' and 'Healthy Streets Manual'	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 26, 4.2.3 Provide a clear hierarchy of streets, where each street has a distinct character and function	The street types will need to connect to HCC's Movement and Place Framework when it is published. Add reference to emerging HCC Movement and Place Framework	Note comment. The Council is waiting to see the draft HCC Movement and Place Framework, no change required.	-
Individual (Ruth Alli)	Page 26, section 4.2.3, hierarchy of streets	Low traffic neighbourhoods measures has already impacted congestion with more traffic and congestion outside of these areas	Note comment, no change required	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 27, Section 4.3 Compact Development	We support the recognition that compact development solutions include reflecting the scale and character of their surroundings, in achieving an efficient and effective use of land. We also support the development of appropriate higher densities and the acknowledgement that this can be achieved without necessarily requiring high rise development, whilst creating vibrant and legible places that promote sustainable travel.	Welcome support	-
BDW	Page 27, Section 4.3 Compact Development, diagram	The use of generic layouts are not helpful or effective as they fail to include any surrounding context to demonstrate how they reflect the scale and character of their surroundings. These images should be deleted or context added, to show how and why they achieve/fail to achieve/ don't achieve good design.	Note comment. The illustration in 4.3 has been removed and more precedent images added	Yes
BDW	Page 27, Section 4.3.1 Compact Development, list of benefits	It is noted that the list of benefits does not recognise landscaping and in particular the importance of street planting or biodiversity enhancements, and consequently fails to achieve the wider principles of good quality design and requirements of the NPPF, to achieve an attractive and healthy environments.	Note comment. The list provides example and is not a definitive list. No change required	-
Mac Mic	Page 27, Section 4.3.1	The SPD encourages to use a range of house types to achieve compact development. The illustration, which seeks to explain best practice for compact neighbourhoods, is limited to a series of regular terraces. This gives the impression that there is a singular regimented approach to creating compact neighbourhoods, and so could be misleading. It is important that some variety is allowed for, given that the SPD also requires development to be responsive to context and site features, including topography, landscape, and heritage (see paras 4.1 and 4.4 in particular). A more organic approach with some variation in building and street typologies will also still enable the delivery of a compact development. Add some variation to the illustration to allow for some breaks within development frontage, opportunities for more organic form of townscape, and show some variations in perceived density.	Note comment. Image has been deleted. Image examples have been updated across the document to include regional examples including from Hampshire, Gloucestershire and more relevant examples from Cambridge.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Bloor Homes	Page 27, Neighbourhood, compact development	Regarding compact development, Bloor Homes suggest removing the diagrams as a) good design is about responding to context (and sometimes the example given on the left hand image is the correct approach (e.g. due to topography or other technical constraints, or local character) and b) the right hand diagram suggests that all development should be in terraced form. Whilst this may be appropriate in some instances, it is highly unlikely to be in all. Perimeter blocks are a valuable and reasonable approach to masterplanning and Bloor Homes consider that specific housing typologies should be subject to discussions as appropriate between Officers and designers through the pre-app and application process.	Note comment. Image in 4.3.1 has been deleted.	Yes
BDW	Page 28, Section 4.3.2, <i>Amenity Space and Privacy (second and third bullet)</i>	We support the recognition in the second bullet point to a mixed approach to provision of amenity space. We are concerned however by the promotion of reduced back to back distances in the third bullet point to protect internal amenity within homes as well as privacy within amenity space.	Note comment. Reduced back-to-back distances are intended only for compact developments where appropriate and are not a universal requirement. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 28, Section 4.3.2, <i>Privacy (third bullet)</i>	If reduced back to back distances are to be acceptable, then clear guidance should be provided on distances that the Council will accept, to enable suitable designs to be progressed and ensure consistency in approach. In compact developments, there may be greater variation in building heights and the relationship of buildings with different storey heights may require different approaches to protect amenity.	Note comment. Reduced back-to-back distances are proposed only for compact developments, where efficient use of land is required. This approach has been carefully considered to maintain internal amenity and privacy, aligns with NPPF principles on high-quality, efficient design, and reflects good practice in compact housing layouts. No change required.	-
Bloor Homes	Page 28, Neighbourhood, <i>Privacy (third bullet)</i>	In 3rd bullet point, the wording in respect to private amenity space and back to back distances will allow for flexibility to reduce distances, as appropriate. This is a positive approach and is supported by Bloor Homes.	Welcome support	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 28, Section 4.3.2, <i>Car parking (fourth bullet)</i>	We support a varied approach to parking provision, however it is noted that no reference is made to on-plot parking and this should be an option. Opportunities for garage parking should be acknowledged as an important parking source demanded by residents and providing space for cycle storage.	Note comment. This is a summary para with more details elsewhere including diagrams with different on-plot parking arrangements and garages.	-
BDW	Page 28, Section 4.3.2, <i>Car parking (fourth bullet)</i>	This section heavily references approaches in Bristol and London, which are large cities and urban settings with high quality public transport connections. This is not reflective of the local context in Eastleigh Borough, which is more suburban in nature, and as such these large cities are in no way comparative.	Note comment. Image examples updated across the document to include regional examples including from Hampshire, Gloucestershire and more relevant examples from Cambridge.	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 28, Section 4.3.2 Demonstrate a high quality of design resolution addressing built form, amenity, privacy and parking	Car parking – Alignment to LTP4 policies HP3, PT2, PT3, and BTD1, could help ensure development is highly accessible by public and active travel modes, thereby increasing the feasibility and acceptance of the flexible parking strategy as outlined.	Note comment. There are references to the LTP4 in the SPD. For clarity, reference added to the Parking Standards SPD	Yes
BDW	Page 29, Section 4.4.1 The layout, orientation, and scale of development blocks and buildings should help to shape and reinforce local character	We agree that the arrangement of buildings and spaces can add character and respond to local character. We also support the use of perimeter block typologies as a good urban design principle to promote active frontages and natural surveillance. The effective integration of open spaces and play spaces into developments is particularly supported in accordance with the latest Fields in Trust Guidance (December 2024), which removed recommended separation distances with dwellings, to secure effective integration and promote inclusive design to avoid play spaces being located on the edges of developments.	Welcome support and note comment. No change required.	-
Mac Mic	Page 30, Section 4.5.1	Creating a legible environment through a series of connected street and spaces, with varying scale and characteristics is a sound approach to development and avoids the creation of “anywhere” places. The approach is generally sound and supported. In terms of the designing for landmarks, one observation is that good townscape also allows for a “ <i>sequential vision</i> ” approach, where	Note comment. The SPD does not prevent this approach and references mini landmarks, street corner. A specific reference is not required. No change	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		views of landmark buildings and spaces are gradually revealed via a series of interventions, as is the case of many historic towns and cities.		
Mac Mic	Page 30, Section 4.5.1	The SPD guidance should allow for a variety of approaches and flexibility in creating legible places, provided that it can be demonstrated that the overall objective of quality townscape and placemaking is achieved through a clear hierarchy of street and spaces.	Note comment. There is some flexibility built in, therefore no change is required.	-
BDW	Page 31, Section 4.5.2 Carefully design corner plots to enhance their prominence in the streetscape	We support the careful design of corner plots, to provide dual frontages with active frontages appropriate to their setting, however the reference to 'standard house types are rarely appropriate in these locations' should be deleted. The use of standard house types is important in achieving well designed and efficient homes that are economic to build and provide a high quality standard of accommodation that have been rigorously tested to meet good quality living standards. It is incorrect to make a blanket statement that standard house types are rarely acceptable in these locations, when developers, including BDW, have a range of house types specifically designed to respond to these situations and positions. Indeed, standard house types can also improve site efficiency and promote the principles of 'compact development'.	Note comment. Text added to state: 'Use only non-standard house types or standard types specifically designed to address the issues at corners'.	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 32, Section 4.6	Suggestion to add further clarity to the statement that "incompatible uses" must be carefully managed to encourage increased compatibility through design solutions, such as changing the approach to path lighting and designing buffer areas to significant habitat zones. We would also again encourage further engagement with the adoption officers at the relevant authorities, in particular Hampshire County Highways.	Note comment. The paragraph provides examples, no change required.	-
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 32, Section 4.6.1 Create multifunctional public spaces and landscapes	The SPD requires infrastructure such as multifunctional public spaces. This requires ongoing maintenance to function as intended. The SPD tells applicants what to design, but not what management plans must be submitted, whether commuted sums	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD and may be covered in other documents. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		are expected and whether adoption by the council is realistic or assumed.		
BDW	Page 32, Section 4.6.1 Create multifunctional public spaces and landscapes	We agree that all spaces within a development must have a defined purpose and management/maintenance responsibility. However it should be recognised that this may be a functional purpose or an amenity purpose.	Note comment. Amenity is a functional purpose if configured as useable space or as an appropriate complement to, for example soft landscape in the private realm or movement corridors. No change required.	-
Officer comment	Page 32, 4.6.1	2 nd paragraph – add sentence to end of para ‘Co-locating these..’ with reference to the benefit of green space. Add text - ‘These include mitigating the effects of climate change by providing shade, managing water and conserving energy.’	Agree. Add text to 4.6.1	Yes
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 34, Section 4.7.1 Address BNG	The SPD requires development to deliver biodiversity net gain. This requires ongoing maintenance to function as intended. The SPD tells applicants what to design, but not what management plans must be submitted, whether commuted sums are expected and whether adoption by the council is realistic or assumed.	Note comment. The proposed changes are beyond the scope of the SPD and may be covered in other documents and given on a site by site basis. No change required.	-
Officer comment	Page 34, Section 4.7.2, 2 nd para and Key requirements	Amend – ‘Water should be managed at the surface and on-site where possible, avoiding complex underground systems and mimicking <u>natural</u> nature pathways’. Add to Key Requirements - <u>National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) July 2025</u>	Amend and add text to 4.7.2	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 36, (5) Streets and spaces, Movement hierarchy	A Movement and Place framework is currently being developed by the County Council that will help ensure that streets and spaces work for people, create better places, and also meet the needs of vehicles where this is a priority. Once published, this will realise the vision, objectives and policies set out in the SPD. Request reference to HCC Movement and Place Framework	Note comment. As the Council is waiting to see the draft HCC Movement and Place Framework, no change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Mac Mic	Page 37, Section 5.1.1	The principles set out for the design of streets and parking are supported; it is not clear what support there is from HCC Highways, in particular regarding the adoption of highways and infrastructure (green and blue).	Note comment, no change	-
Mac Mic	Page 37, Section 5.1.1	The SPD has just one street section of a local street; it would help to have different ones for the other different types. That way there is a clear understanding of the spatial relationships such as footway-cycleway-carriageway-bus lanes proportions, tree placement, and parking arrangements. Suggestion to set out clearly where the relevant adopting authority (such as Hampshire County Highways or equivalent) has endorsed the design approach.	Note comment. HCC Highways have responded to the consultation and their comments and the Council's response are reporting in this table. There are other documents which provide the guidance proposed such as the Tree SPD and Manual for streets. No change required	-
Officer comment	Page 37, Section 5.1.1 Integrate soft landscape and drainage	Correction, 10 th bullet – should be Sustainable Drainage, not Sustainable Urban Drainage'	Agree. Correct text in 5.1.1	Yes
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 37, Section 5.1.1 Integrate soft landscape and drainage	The SPD requires infrastructure such as SuDS integrated into streets. This requires ongoing maintenance to function as intended. The SPD tells applicants what to design, but not what management plans must be submitted, whether commuted sums are expected and whether adoption by the council is realistic or assumed.	Note comment. This is addressed in section 4.7.2 'Be durable'. No change required	-
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 37, Section 5.1.1 Integrate soft landscape and drainage	Section refers to soft landscaping in streets, rain gardens, integrated drainage and reduced hard infrastructure. These elements are maintenance-intensive, prone to failure if neglected and often poorly managed by private companies yet the SPD does not require a funded, enforceable maintenance strategy.	Note comment. This is addressed in section 4.7.2 'Be durable'. No change required	-
HCC Highways	Page 37, Section 5.1.1 Integrate soft landscape and drainage in the design of all	We recommend referencing Healthy Streets in relation to trees on both sides of the street to provide shade and shelter for people walking, cycling, and wheeling.	Note comments. This is addressed elsewhere. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
	streets			
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 38, Section 5.2 Walking, talking, meeting and wheeling	Sustainable Transport – can we protect some areas that need wider pedestrian paths / footpaths but they are not there currently and ensure paths provided in any future development?	The SPD includes a movement hierarchy from major roads to informal pedestrian paths. It is beyond the scope of the SPD to consider detailed requirements for footpaths.	-
HCC Highways	Page 38, Section 5.2 Walking, talking, meeting and wheeling	The Local Transport Authority recommend explicit reference to DfT Inclusive Mobility standards, including those using mobility aids and adapted cycles, to make guidance and codes more robust.	Note comment, there is reference to wheeling already in SPD and reference to 'walking and wheeling' amended to 'walking, wheeling and cycling' with a definition in the glossary. No change required.	-
HCC Highways	Page 38, Section 5.2 Walking, talking, meeting and wheeling	The inclusion of wheeling is welcomed. We recommend clarifying that this includes mobility scooters, wheelchairs, and non-motorised scooters (commonly used by children for school travel), to ensure inclusive design.	Note comments, definition added to glossary 'Inclusive' added into 5.2.1 title	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 38, Section 5.2.1 Designing streets and active travel routes that feel safe and convenient to use	As per LTN 1/20, on carriageway cycling is only appropriate where traffic speeds are 20mph or lower and traffic volumes are below 2000 vehicles per day. We suggest clarifying this in the text. We recommend adding a requirement to include the LCWIP network. Suggested changes: 'On secondary, local, or tertiary streets, cyclists may <i>be able to</i> share the carriageway (<i>depending on vehicular flows</i>), but road design should prioritise their movement over vehicles'. 'Recreational cycling should be supported through connections to the National Cycle Network, <i>LCWIP network</i> , bridleways, and off-road tracks, expanding cycling options beyond functional journeys'. 'Pedestrian crossings should be safely located and accessible for all users, providing at-grade movement <i>which is on the desire line to provide the most direct and convenient route</i> '. We suggest adding under key requirements ' <i>Designed in</i>	Note comments, text in 5.2.1 amended to state: 'Road design should prioritise the movement of people walking, wheeling and cycling over vehicles. The design of secondary, local, or tertiary streets, should reflect the volume of traffic of all modes.' 'Recreational cycling should be supported through connections to the National Cycle Network, <i>LCWIP network</i> , bridleways, and off-road tracks, expanding cycling options beyond functional journeys.' 'Pedestrian crossings should be safely located and accessible for all users, providing at-grade movement <i>which is on the desire line to provide the most direct and convenient route</i> '.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
		<u>accordance with LTN 1/20'.</u>	Specific reference to LTN 1/20 is not needed	
Mac Mic	Page 38, Section 5.2.2	Numerous European precedents are used in this section; this will either make developers more aspirational or deter them. Suggest that a number of sub-regional best practice examples are used such as Berewood Waterlooville, Poundbury Dorchester, and Graylingwell Chicester, for instance. This will help demonstrate that the approach can be delivered within the local context.	Image examples updated across the document to include regional examples including from Hampshire, Gloucestershire and more relevant examples from Cambridge.	Yes
Bloor Homes	Page 39, Streets and Spaces, 2 nd bullet	In 2nd bullet point, it suggests only 1 space should be allowed within the building curtilage. Bloor Homes do not consider that this allows for sufficient flexibility. This could lead to large expanses of hardstanding and parking courts, particularly on larger schemes, where continuing to enable more than one parking space within the residential curtilage of a dwelling breaks up the hardstanding in street scenes. Suggest removing this point or adding "where appropriate".	Note comment. Text amended to add 'or up to two cars where they are located in a tandem arrangement'. Nb. text 'where possible' has been removed from the SPD.	Yes
BDW	Page 39, Section 5.3.1 Implement a place-led approach to integrating safe and functional car parking	We support a flexible approach to parking and effective integration into developments, however market demand must also be a consideration in parking design, to reflect the demands of future occupiers. As outlined above, despite not being recognised as parking spaces in the current parking standards, garages should nevertheless be recognised as a source of parking and providing flexible opportunities for parking and cycle storage, especially as garage provision is often demanded by future occupiers. Garages can also be used as important tools in street scenes to provide visual enclosure, continuity in built form, and as such have an urban design function.	Note comment. There is more detail elsewhere in the SPD including diagrams with different on-plot parking arrangements and garages. No change required.	-
HCC Highways	Page 39, Section 5.3.1 Implement a place-led approach to integrating safe and functional car parking	Policy FM2 of the County Council's LTP4, around accelerating the transition to low and zero emission vehicle use could support goals to increase on-street EV charging points. Suggest adding reference HCC LTP4	Note comment. There is reference to LPT4 in Key Requirements. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 40, How to deliver different parking arrangements	Comment about Radburn Estate design with car parking behind houses that aren't overlooked and the crime potential. Does this SPD address this?	New bullet point added to 5.3: Parking should.. 'Be overlooked and well connected to improve safety through passive surveillance. Whether in the public realm or in parking courtyards, careful consideration of the functions of the space and people's safety are key to their design and implementation'.	Yes
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 40, How to deliver different parking arrangements	Question if car parks be places underground and covered by lawn / vegetation?	Yes, car parking can be underground and covered by lawn/vegetation.	-
Bloor Homes	Page 41, Streets and Spaces, sketches	Suggest that the sketches are removed as a requirement. We do not believe that it is reasonable or achievable to have private front gardens in front of all on street parking spaces.	Text added to diagram to clarify this refers to unallocated parking or cars belonging to other households.	Yes
HCC Highways	Page 41, On-street parking	We recommend including wording that encourages drivers to reverse into parking bays rather than reversing out, as reversing out can create conflicts with people cycling.	Note comment. While we recognise the danger, this is beyond the scope of the SPD.	-
BDW	Page 41, Section 5.3, On-Street Parking	It is noted that this section specifically references 'unallocated on-street parking' and not to frontage parking allocated to plots, as such it is assumed that the referenced principles would not apply where the parking spaces are allocated. This is because in these circumstances, the same design aspirations would not necessarily apply and reduced separation distances to dwellings may be acceptable.	Text added to diagram to clarify this refers to unallocated parking or cars belonging to other households.	Yes
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 42, Car ports	Comment to instruct car ports not garages	Image updated to show car ports instead of garages.	Yes
Bloor Homes	Page 43, Streets and Spaces, 1 st bullet	1st bullet point, question if it is necessary to limit the number of dwellings cycle storage can be shared by and request further justification of why this point is required.	Text amended to clarify that this relates to external communal cycle storage provided for houses only	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
HCC Highways	Page 43, Section 5.4. Provide secure, accessible and well over-looked cycle parking	We recommend referencing other appropriate cycle parking facilities as per LTN 1/20 alongside HCC's technical guidance notes (TG10 will shortly be updated to include on street cycle parking).	Note comment. Reference added to Parking Standards SPD which provides local cycle parking guidance.	Yes
Bloor Homes	Page 43, Streets and Spaces	The guidance here is generalised and it may not be possible to provide integrated bin storage in every instance.	Text 'where possible' removed from SPD. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate and justify if they cannot meet the requirement.	-
BDW	Page 46, Section 6.1, 'Clear fronts and backs'	We support the provision of active streets with good quality levels of natural surveillance, however this is not achieved by prescribing a need for main entrances to be concentrated on main street frontages. Carefully designed properties with forward facing windows can provide for good quality streets with easy wayfinding to access doors and help make the most efficient use of a site, without the need for the main door to be on the front elevation. Remove requirement for main entrances to be on the front elevation	Note comment. This should be the starting point. There is flexibility within the SPD to provide alternative approaches (see new text in 1.1.3). No change required.	-
Foreman Homes	Page 46, Section 6.1, 'Access to homes and circulation space'	Detailed comments about gallery/deck access including the following issues: difficult access for emergency vehicles, moisture build up and damp from overshadowing, poor natural surveillance, unwelcoming with limited visibility, lack of privacy and noise, difficult access for people with movement affecting disabilities, impractical in extreme weather conditions, security and safety issues and a lack of legibility. Limiting size of decks is a slight safety improvement however a large number of issues remain.	Note comment. There are many very good examples of deck access in contemporary award-winning developments. Deck access can provide more surveillance than internal corridors and also provide natural ventilation. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 46, Section 6.1, 'Access to homes and circulation space'	It is not considered that gallery/deck access properties create a desirable or appropriate form of development, with these areas often linked to anti-social behaviour. The reference to these not facing streets further compounds the problems, with a lack of natural surveillance and active frontages.	Note comment. Deck access is referenced in the DPPP, page 124. Requirement that galleries/decks 'should only face residential courtyards, not streets' removed.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 46, Section 6.1, 'Access to homes and circulation space'	Support the creation of attractive and pleasant communal areas within apartment buildings, however these should not be required to include indoor planting and seating, due to ongoing maintenance issues. Delete requirement for indoor planting and seating in communal areas	Agree, requirement deleted.	Yes
BDW	Page 47, Section 6.1, 'Ground floor homes (and corners)'	1 st bullet - It is not considered necessary for homes on ground floors to have direct access onto the street, this is especially in flats where access via a communal entrance and core allows for improved social interaction with neighbours and enables for improved rhythm in the external appearance of the building. 3 rd bullet - it will not always be possible to locate kitchens facing the street, and as such should not applied as a requirement and may not always be advantageous to achieve good quality natural surveillance. Suggest removing requirements in bullets 1 and 3	Note comments. These requirements are not mandatory and written as a suggestion. It is beneficial for interaction and have been achieved in many proposals. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 47, Section 6.1, 'Upper floor homes'	It is noted that reference to provision of lifts 'where needed' is made. We agree that lifts should be provided where required by Building Regulations, to meet certain needs and specifications, however these should not be provided where not needed, due to the on-going maintenance costs for residents.	Noted comment. Lifts are not mandatory. No change required	-
BDW	Page 47, Section 6.1, 'Tenure Blind'	We support the provision of a tenure blind approach to design and the distribution of affordable housing to achieve social cohesion, but this must be in an appropriate and acceptable way that is manageable by an RP. We are concerned by the reference to 'even distribution' of affordable housing on sites and request that this terminology is changed to reference distribution in appropriately sized and manageable clusters.	Note comments. Text amended as follows to reflect Affordable Housing SPD terminology – 'distributed in small clusters of no more than 10-15 dwellings throughout the site'	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 47, Section 6.1, 'Tenure Blind'	We have noted the reference to 'poor design' entrances, where separate entrances are used for different tenures. This however is not an acceptable or workable or reflective of housing delivery, where RP's will not accept mixed tenure cores for affordable housing, which necessitates the provision of separate accesses. As such this aspiration cannot be practically delivered and it is therefore requested that this bullet point is removed.	Text amended to state 'all entrances, regardless of tenure, should be of equally high quality and location'	Yes
Mac Mic	Page 47, Section 6.1	The approach is supported and this could be reinforced further by using more local examples (as previously listed). Much of the detailed guidance is already contained within the Building Regulations, though we agree that is important to highlight some of the qualitative requirements.	Note comment. The SPD has been revised to include more locally relevant examples.	-
BDW	Page 48, Section 6.2.1 Demonstrate adaptability, liveability and comfort	We fully support the delivery of all new homes meeting NDSS standards, to ensure a good quality living environment for occupiers.	Welcome support	-
Mac Mic	Page 48, Section 6.2.1	Strong focus on internal layout quality, through providing spaces for different generations, storage, and access to amenity space. Much of this guidance was previously included within the Lifetime Homes Standards, which has since been superseded by Part M of the Building Regulations. Suggest add references to Part M of the Building Regulations which sets out key spatial standards and para 6.7.2 is also combined with para 6.2.1 for ease of reference.	Comment noted. The SPD provides general guidance on accessibility and references Part M where relevant but does not repeat technical requirements. Applicants are expected to comply with the latest Building Regulations, ensuring the SPD remains up to date. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 48, Section 6.2.2 Enable residents to adapt homes to changing needs over different stages of life, 3 rd bullet	We support the delivery of homes that meet the changing needs of occupiers, however we do not support homes with 3 or more bedrooms as necessarily requiring two separate living areas. It is important that there is a range of different housing types and styles, with different approaches to accommodation (which may include two or more living areas), to provide choice to meet different household sizes and compositions. It is also not appropriate to assume that a house with 3 or more bedrooms will necessarily accommodate a larger household.	Note comments. Requirement for homes of 3 or more bedrooms to have two separate living areas removed.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 48, Section 6.2.2 Enable residents to adapt homes to changing needs over different stages of life	The provision of well-designed open-plan layouts that combine kitchen, dining and living is supported and can provide a popular layout of accommodation for modern style living, although open-plan layouts are not necessarily compatible with the earlier aspiration for multiple living spaces, but demonstrates the need for choices in layout design.	Note comments. Text amended to remove requirement for two separate living areas. Text added to note that layouts must be shown furnished and illustrate how the maximum number of occupants can live together without crowding.	Yes
Habinteg Housing Association	Page 48, Section 6.2.2 Enable residents to adapt homes to changing needs over different stages of life	Strengthen the current approach to accessible housing by increasing the requirement for M4(2) homes from 80% to “all new homes”, with the exception of those specifically designated as M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings. With the current 80% target and it's supporting wheelchair target, 1 in 10 new homes would still be built without higher accessibility features—creating long term barriers for disabled and older residents and locking in future adaptation costs. This would ensure the entire new housing stock is designed to be adaptable from the outset.	Note comment. The text reflects adopted Local Plan policy DM29. This will be reconsidered in the next Local Plan. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 49, Section 6.2.3 Provide well-sized and well-located storage space	We support the provision of good quality levels of storage space, however storage provision forms part of NDSS and consequently the requirement to meet NDSS will ensure adequate storage space is provided. The document is however far too prescriptive and it will not always be possible to integrate ‘smart design’ into every home (i.e. built in wardrobes) and storage to extend to full height is totally impractical, especially for those with disabilities.	Note comments. Text amended to refer to NDSS and include suggestions to integrate storage.	Yes
BDW	Page 50, Section 6.3.1 Maximise natural daylight and sunlight	We support the provision of dual aspect homes, which is a conventional dwelling style, however this should not necessarily be the starting point for all new homes, as the use of back-to-back style of accommodation can provide a good quality solution, especially in achieving the aspirations for higher density development.	Note comment. Dual aspect homes should be the starting point and back to back homes can also have dual, over the corner, aspects. There is flexibility within the SPD to provide alternative approaches (see new text in 1.1.3). No change required.	-
BDW	Page 50, Section 6.3.1, Floor to ceiling heights	The identification of a minimum 2.5m floor-to-ceiling height is not considered appropriate, with a ceiling height of 2.3-2.4m often successfully accommodated within new homes, whilst still achieving a good quality and spacious feel. It is requested that a reference to 2.5m ceiling heights is removed, although references to creation of comfortable accommodation would be supported.	Noted, requirement changed to 2.3m.	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 50, Section 6.3.1, Balancing light and overheating	The origin for the reference to glazing equally 20% of the room's floor area is unclear and the source should be referenced. It is unclear whether such a standard would balance light/overheating in every instance, as this is likely to vary depending on location and orientation, it is also unclear whether this is achievable/ being achieved.	Note comment. Requirement replaced by reference to complying with Building Regulations and addressing daylight and shading issues	Yes
BDW	Page 50, Section 6.3.2 Manage ventilation and acoustics to maintain a comfortable indoor environment	It is agreed that the use of natural ventilation is desirable, however this is not always possible due to environmental considerations and the benefits of alternative systems where required should be recognised in achieving a satisfactory living environment. Suggest removing requirement for natural ventilation.	Note comment. Natural ventilation should be the starting point. There is flexibility within the SPD to provide alternative approaches (see new text in 1.1.3). No change required.	-
BDW	Page 50, Section 6.3.2, bullet point 2	This references chimneys as part of the ventilation strategy, however open chimneys affect the ability to achieve required air tightness of homes and are not a desirable solution to achieve those requirements.	Note comment. Reference to chimneys as part of ventilation strategy has been moved to 6.7.3 which addresses the function of chimneys.	Yes
BDW	Page 51, Section 6.4.1 Ensure an appropriate degree of privacy for all internal and external spaces	We fully support the design of new developments respecting the amenity of existing and future residents. It is recommended that the Council identify suitable design standards, such as minimum back to back distances, front to front distances and front to side distances etc, to achieve a high quality living environment and appropriate levels of privacy.	Note comments. With a shift towards compact development, more flexibility is required. No change required	-
BDW	Page 51, Section 6.4.1 Privacy	We support the provision of private amenity space having an adequate level of privacy and that this can be achieved through well-designed perimeter blocks, however this must be aligned with the aspirations for 'compact development' at higher densities, with acceptance elsewhere in this document that separation distances may be reduced which may affect the ability to achieve maximum levels of privacy.	Welcome support. No change required	-
BDW	Page 52, Section 6.5.1 Private amenity spaces	Although we support the provision of outside amenity space and a flexible approach to provision, such as through private garden space, communal space or balconies, it is not necessarily essential that all homes are provided with amenity space – such as in town centres or where dwellings are well related to other open spaces.	Note comment. Section 6.5.1 provides guidance about when the minimum private amenity space may be reduced. No change required.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
BDW	Page 52, 6.5.1 Private amenity spaces	We support the identification of standards for the provision of private amenity space in gardens and balconies, to provide clarity on expectations, however these must be flexible, especially where higher density development are promoted. Furthermore, as developers are not responsible for planting/ landscaping private space and there needs to be opportunity for occupy choice, change over time and ability to respond to changing needs, then whilst principles like 'space for planting' are generally supported any specific requirements should be flexibly applied.	Note comment. The SPD provides flexibility for developers to consider alternative approaches as set out in 1.1.2. No change required.	-
Bloor Homes	Page 52, Buildings and Homes, last bullet	Last bullet point states that "for houses, the minimum private amenity space of at least 60% of the total floor space will be expected. This minimum may be reduced in urban areas when the dwelling is either within 100m (by safe and convenient route) of a public open space, or demonstrated to meet the criteria for compact development". Question how this will be achieved when the council seeks higher densities and seek for this to have a more flexible approach.	Note comment. The text specifically refers to developments that meet the criteria for compact development. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 56, Section 6.7.2 Provide safe and accessible entrances to all buildings	We support the general principles, however it is not considered that entrances should always be visible from the street, as along as appropriate and suitable way finding through legible building design is employed (1 st bullet). We have noted that it is suggested that door width and lobby spaces should exceed minimum standards (3rd bullet), however this reasoning is not qualified and it is not clear the minimum standard being referenced – however it should not always be appropriate to exceed minimum standards to achieve optimum design objectives.	Note comments. The SPD seeks door width and lobby spaces that exceed the minimum to meet the general principle of safe and accessible entrances. Caveat added that entrances visible from the street should be a starting point and 'on in-fill or backland sites clearly legible, safe and well-lit routes to the main entrance should be demonstrated'.	Yes
BDW	Page 56, Section 6.7.2 Provide safe and accessible entrances to all buildings	Final bullet - the reference to letter boxes being located to the exterior of the building contradicts section 6.1.1 that references mail and parcel storage in communal lobbies. A consistent approach should be applied.	Agree. Text amend text to 'be prominently located near entrances, preferably accessible from the exterior, next to the entrance(s)'. Requirement for lobbies to 'include mail and parcel storage' removed from section 6.1.1.	Yes
BDW	Page 56, Section 6.7.3 Design roof forms to be	We agree that roof design is important and in larger developments, a varied approach to roof form can enhance visual interest in street scenes. In addition, roof detailing, such as dormers, gables and	Agreed. Extra bullet added to note 'In addition, roof detailing, such as dormers, gables and hips as well as varied ridge and eaves height	Yes

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
	efficient and in harmony with the surrounding roofscape	hips as well as varied ridge and eaves height should be recognised as adding visual interest.	can add visual interest.'	
BDW	Page 56, Section 6.7.3, 6 th bullet	We have noted the reference to flat roofs having a purpose such as amenity space, greening or energy production, however whilst these may be options and opportunities, it should not be a requirement, as a flat roof in itself can be a specific design decision to respond to the local context and should not be necessary to perform an additional function.	Note comment. The bullet points uses 'should'. The SPD provides flexibility for developers to consider alternative approaches as set out in 1.1.2. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 56, Section 6.7.3, 9 th bullet	The reference to chimneys being functional, not merely decorative, for vents or nesting sites is not realistic. Chimney detailing can add visual interest and help to create character and differentiation, but as outlined above due to the need to achieve specific air tightness testing then a functional chimney is unlikely to be achievable or desirable for many occupiers. Furthermore, there are a range of options to achieve nesting opportunities within the fabric of the building, that a chimney is not necessarily required for this function.	Note comment. The bullet points uses 'should'. The SPD provides flexibility for developers to consider alternative approaches as set out in 1.1.2. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 56, Section 6.7.3, 13 th bullet	Green roof being used to enhance the outlook from upper floors is a laudable design aspiration, although unrealistic in practice, especially on larger scale developments where this is not practical.	Note comment. The bullet points uses 'should'. The SPD provides flexibility for developers to consider alternative approaches as set out in 1.1.2. No change required.	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 57, section 6.7.4	Support flat roofs suitable for green roofs and this is encouraged in the SPD. Comment that the Council are not using these on our own local developments	Welcome support and note comment	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 58, section 6.8.1	Use this documents to express the importance of a varied palette of materials and would be good to have large scale builders being more adventurous and use more than the normal / traditional red brick.	Note comment. Section 6.8 provides guidance on the palette of materials suitable for different contexts. No change required	-
BDW	Page 58, Section 6.8.1 Introduce materials that reflect and enhance the	We support the use of materials that are appropriate to their context, although contrasting materials may be appropriate, especially in circumstances where an approach to 'reinvent' character as set out at Section 3.4 is being progressed. We support the recognition that a broader palette of materials in larger	Welcome support and note comments	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
	character of surrounding buildings	development can help create distinct characters, although a balance must be struck between creating and reinforcing character and losing cohesiveness through an excessive palette.		
BDW	Page 59, Section 6.9.1 Maintain consistent and cohesive boundary treatments	Support the use of positive interfaces between public and private spaces, however whilst low walls and hedges may be suitable in suitable circumstances, there are instances where alternative treatments such as railings or open boundaries are appropriate, depending on character. It is not necessary for gated accesses to be provided in all instances, where a varied approach should be adopted. In addition, it should not always be necessary for boundary hedgerows to be supported by railings, to create a more informal appearance.	Note comment. The text states 'can be supported through..' and then provides examples. No change required.	-
BDW	Page 59, Section 6.10.1 Prioritise energy efficiency through sustainable design to reduce environmental impact and lower user energy cost	Support the use of sustainable methods of construction and a fabric first approach to building design with the use of renewable energy technologies to achieve energy efficient and sustainable developments to meet Building Regulations requirements. Although Passivhaus is a laudable aspiration, it is not realistic, especially on larger development sites and goes beyond the requirements of Building Regulations.	Note comment. This reflects the text in adopted LP policy DM2. No change required.	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 60, Section 6.10.2, Support wider development decarbonisation by using low-carbon heating systems and photovoltaics (PVs)	Efficiency and energy- battery / EV -currently cant insist on this in planning? How do we ensure this happens?	While current national planning policy and building regulations limit the extent to which planning authorities can mandate specific technologies in all circumstances, the SPD can set clear expectations and encourage higher standards around energy efficiency, EV charging infrastructure, renewable technologies and sustainable design.	-
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Panel	Page 60, Section 6.10.2, Support wider development decarbonisation by using low-carbon heating systems	Smart meters could they be mandatory? Do all properties need EV charging points?	EV charging is already required in many forms of new development through Building Regulations and emerging standards, although not every property type or circumstance is necessarily suitable for individual charging points.	-

Respondent	Section	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response	Change?
	and photovoltaics (PVs)		Smart meters are generally controlled through building regulations / utility provision rather than planning policy, so it would be difficult to make these mandatory through the SPD alone.	
BDW	Page 60, Section 6.10.2 Support wider development decarbonisation by using low-carbon heating systems and photovoltaics (PVs)	It is recommended that this section is amended to require larger developments to be accompanied by a sustainability statement that includes an options based approach to minimise energy usage through low carbon/renewable energy to identify the preferred solution, appropriate to its setting. This may include air/ground source heat pumps and/or PV in addition to fabric first measures.	Comment noted. The requirement for sustainability statements is addressed through national policy and Local Plan policies. The SPD focuses on design guidance and does not introduce additional submission requirements. No change required	-
Individual (Roger Meekley)	Page 60, Section 6.10 .3, Energy, efficiency and whole-life carbon	<p>This is the only place where lifecycle is explicitly mentioned in technical terms. There is a focus on materials and carbon, not operational management, replacement cycles and long-term performance of communal systems (e.g. heat pumps, PV, EV infrastructure).</p> <p>The SPD assumes good long-term behaviour, but does not secure it. In practice SuDS fail because nobody clears them, landscapes degrade, management companies underfund maintenance and residents inherit costs they never understood. The document recognises the problem in principle — it just doesn't close the loop.</p>	Note comment. This is addressed in section 4.7.2 'Be durable'. No change required	-
BDW	Page 60, Section 6.10.3 Consider the whole life cycle of buildings, including embodied carbon and opportunities for material reuse and recycling	Support ambition to deliver genuinely sustainable developments that achieve measurable carbon reductions, however the requirement to consider the whole life cycle of a building is not in the Local Plan and should not be introduced through this SPD. It is unclear where the requirement for an 80+ year assessment life is derived. Consideration must also be given to development costs and viability when applying additional environmental standards so the SPD does not unnecessarily undermine or constrain housing delivery.	Note comment. The Local Plan seeks flexibility to enable the life of buildings to be extend (policy DM2). Existing and emerging national guidance also cover the lifespan and resources of development. No change required.	-

Responses on the Strategic Environmental Assessment / Habitats Regulations Assessment (SEA/HRA) screening report

Respondent	Comment and any proposed change	EBC Response
Natural England	No comments	Note comment. No change required
Environment Agency	Agree with Eastleigh's conclusion within the SEA and HRA screening statement that the draft Quality Places SPD is unlikely to have significant effects on the environment that have not already been assessed as part of the Local Plan and therefore it does not require SEA. Natural England should be consulted regarding the Habitats Regulations Screening.	Note comment. No change required
Historic England	Concur with your assessment that this document is unlikely to result in any significant environmental effects, we endorse the Authority's conclusions that it is not necessary to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of this SPD.	Note comment. No change required