

SOUTH VIEW CONSULTATION: 19 February – 24 March 2010 ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

1. Introduction

1.1 This report contains the results and analysis of the consultation exercise undertaken for the future of the Borough Council land at South View between 19 February and 24 March 2010.

1.2 The consultation exercise involved:

- 1,378 letters, information leaflets and questionnaires sent out to local residents in the Norden area.
- 322 letters, information leaflets and questionnaires sent out to permit holders at Vyne Meadow car park.
- 19 letters, information leaflets and questionnaires sent out to stakeholders.
- Public exhibition over 2 days (8 and 9 March 2010) at Vyne Community School from 4-8pm.
- Press notice.
- Posters installed in local shops, community facilities and at Vyne Meadow Car Park.
- Information leaflets and questionnaires posted on the Borough website.
- Press notice.

1.3 The quantity of responses is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Quantity of Responses

Type of Response	No. of Responses
Questionnaire	396 responses (287 hard copy, 109 online)
Petition	64 signatures
Emails	5
Letters	2 plus a note of a public meeting
Exhibition	87 attendees over 2 days

2. Analysis of questionnaire

2.1 Tables 2 and 3 summarise the questionnaire responses. Table 3 combines the 'Strongly Agree' with the 'Agree' responses and the 'Strongly Disagree' with the 'Disagree' responses to provide a clearer view of the overall trend of the responses. Tables 6-12 provide more detail on the reasons given for the various responses.

Table 2: Summary of Questionnaire Responses

	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No opinion		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%	No.
Q1 – Option 1 Former Allotments Site: Leave as is	109	29%	84	23%	90	24	42	12%	45	12%	370
Q2 – Option 2 FAS: Neighbourhood Park	156	42%	93	25%	63	17%	31	8%	32	8%	375
Q3 – Option 3 FAS: Mix of houses	21	6%	25	7%	67	18%	220	60%	31	9%	364
Q4 – Option 4 FAS: Mix of houses and a Park	29	8%	55	16%	91	26%	149	42%	30	8%	354
Q6 – Option 5 Vyne Meadow Car Park: Leave as is	286	75%	55	14%	20	5%	9	2%	13	3%	383
Q7 – Option 6 VRCP: Houses	16	4%	21	6%	38	10%	281	77%	9	3%	365
Q8 – Option 7 VRCP: Housing and decked car park	17	5%	36	10%	83	23%	218	60%	9	3%	363

Table 3: Summary of Questionnaire Responses – Combining Responses

	Agree/ Strongly agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		No opinion		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No.
Q1 – Option 1 Former Allotments Site: Leave as is	193	53%	132	36%	45	11%	370
Q2 – Option 2 FAS: Neighbourhood Park	249	66%	94	25%	32	9%	375
Q3 – Option 3 FAS: Mix of houses	46	13%	287	78%	31	9%	364
Q4 – Option 4 FAS: Mix of houses and a Park	84	24%	240	68%	30	8%	354
Q6 – Option 5 Vyne Meadow Car Park: Leave as is	341	89%	29	8%	13	3%	383
Q7 – Option 6 VRCP: Houses	37	10%	319	87%	9	3%	365
Q8 – Option 7 VRCP: Housing and decked car park	53	15%	301	83%	9	2%	363

Commentary on Tables 2 and 3

- 2.2 For the Former Allotments Site, the most popular option was Option 2 (66% for a Neighbourhood Park) followed by Option 1 (53% for leaving it as it is). There was a clear resistance to Option 3 (78% against Housing) with a majority also resisting Option 4 (68% against a mix of houses and a park).
- 2.3 For the Vyne Meadow Car Park, the most popular option was Option 5 (89% for leaving it as it is). There was a clear resistance to Option 6 (87% against Housing) and Option 7 (83% against a mix of houses and a decked car park).

2.4 Tables 4 and 5 rank the options for the 2 sites at the Former Allotments Site and Vyne Meadow Car Park.

Table 4: Ranking of options for the Former Allotments Site

	1 – Most support		2		3		4 – Least support	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Option 1 (Leave as is)	130	37%	113	38%	40	15%	54	18%
Option 2 (Neighbourhood Park)	147	42%	113	38%	43	16%	15	5%
Option 3 (Mix of houses)	20	6%	21	7%	42	15%	214	70%
Option 4 (Mix of houses and a park)	50	15%	48	16%	148	54%	21	7%

Commentary on Table 4

2.5 The Neighbourhood Park received the highest level of support of all the options (42%) but leaving the Former Allotments Site as it is was also well supported (37%). Using the site for a mix of housing was the least supported option (6% supporting this option the most). 15% identified Option 4 (Mix of houses and a park) as the most supported option.

Table 5: Ranking of options for Vyne Meadow Car Park

	1 – Most support		2		3 – Least support	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Option 5 (Leave as is)	335	89%	18	7%	17	5%
Option 6 (Houses)	21	6%	68	25%	229	73%
Option 7 (Mix of houses and decked car park)	21	6%	180	68%	70	22%

Commentary on Table 5

2.6 Leaving Vyne Meadow Car Park received the highest level of support by far (89% supporting this option the most). Using the site for housing was the least supported option (6% identifying this option as the most preferred).

3. Summary of responses contained in the petition, emails, letters, note of public meeting and exhibition

Petition

3.1 A petition of 64 signatures was received dated 26 March 2010 stating:

“We the undersigned want a park and to retain all of the South View land as open space. We also want to retain the Vyne Meadow Car Park as it is”.

Emails

3.2 Five emails were received raising the following issues:

- Concern over accessibility for pedestrians from the South View area to the town centre.
- Concern that adequate allotments provision should be made available for the local area.
- Concern over the loss of open space and wildlife habitat on the Former Allotments Site.
- Concern over the adequacy of local infrastructure to accommodate new housing.
- Concern that there will not be enough parking for the station.
- Concern that there will be an increase in on-street parking in the local area by commuters and shoppers.

Letters and note of public meeting

3.3 Two letters and a note of a public meeting were received. A letter from the Ward borough councillors raised the following concerns:

- The future of South View should only be decided once a strategic review of the capacity of the local infrastructure to accommodate development, and once a Norden Design Statement has been undertaken.
- Concern that the consultation methods do not allow for a true reflection of the complexity of the residents' views.
- Concern over the capacity of the local road network to accommodate the increase in traffic.
- Inability of the local infrastructure to accommodate increased demand from additional housing.
- Concern that there will be an increase in on-street parking in the local area by commuters and shoppers.
- Objection to any loss of car parking.
- Objection to a loss of open space. There should be an increase in the quality and accessibility of open space.
- Concern over the piecemeal approach to development.

3.4 The Ward Borough Councillors also submitted a summary of the views raised at a public meeting held by them on 5 March 2010 and a selection of written comments submitted at the meeting. The main points raised in the comments were:

- Support for a strategic approach to development in Norden.
- Concern over there being not enough open space in Norden or that existing open spaces would be developed.
- Concern over the capacity of the local road network to accommodate the increase in traffic.
- A preference for family housing and bungalows over flats.
- Concern over the capacity of the local infrastructure to accommodate development.

3.5 A second letter was received by the Basingstoke Heritage Society raising the following points:

- Concern over the impact of housing and a decked car park on the Vyne Meadow Car Park on the character of the South View conservation area and on the amenity of residents of Glebe House.
- Concern that there will not be enough parking for shopping in the town centre.
- The suggestion is put forward that most of the commuter parking could be located south of the railway line to prevent non-local traffic through Norden.
- No objection to a mix of houses and open space on the Former Allotments Site. It is suggested that this housing could be for older people.

Exhibition

3.6 Eighty seven people attended the exhibition over 2 days. Their verbal comments at the exhibition were not noted systematically. However, most of the comments made reflected concerns over: the impact on infrastructure and an increase in traffic caused by housing development; concern over the potential loss of open space; and concerns over the loss of public car parking.

4. Conclusions

- 4.1 The following conclusions draw upon all the comments received but attach most weight to the questionnaire responses as these represent the vast majority of views expressed.

Former Allotments Site

- 4.2 The greatest support was for creating a Neighbourhood Park followed closely by leaving the site as it is. Consistent with this view was a strong resistance to the option of a mix of houses on this site. The reasons given for choosing these options are predominantly a wish to retain greenspace and resist more housing. There was concern over the capacity of local infrastructure to meet the additional demand created by new development. There was greater support for the mix of houses and a park on this site compared with just houses.

Vyne Meadow Car Park

- 4.3 There was a very strong response in favour of leaving the car park as it is. The predominant reason given for supporting this option was that there is a need for car parking. It was considered that parking is needed to serve the nearby station and wider parking needs and to minimise on-street parking by commuters and shoppers. Consistent with this view was a strong resistance to housing on this site. There was concern that a decked car park would be out of character with the conservation area to the north and would have an unneighbourly relationship to nearby properties.

John Dawson
Urban Design Team
4 May 2010