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1.0 Purpose of this Summary Report

This report summarises the responses received to the New Community North of Fareham (NCNF) Options Consultation which was undertaken between 2nd and 31st July 2012. The comments received from this consultation will assist Fareham Borough Council as it prepares a masterplan for the development area and in turn, the first draft of the Area Action Plan.

Fareham Borough Council adopted its Core Strategy, August 2011 which sets out the spatial land-use strategy for Fareham Borough over the next 15 years. The Core Strategy (Local Plan 1) together with the Site Allocations, Development Management and Fareham Town Centre DPD (Local Plan 2) and the New Community North of Fareham (NCNF) Area Action Plan (Local Plan 3) will form the development plan for Fareham Borough.

1.1 Format of the Document

This Summary Report is split into 3 sections:

- **Section 2** summarises the background to the consultation and explains the consultation process and provides an overview of key themes within the responses;
- **Section 3** provides a detailed summary of the responses to the 16 questions contained in the consultation document; and
- **Section 4** sets out how the results from this consultation will be used to inform the next stage in the preparation of the New Community North of Fareham Area Action Plan.
2.0 Consultation Process

What is the New Community North of Fareham (NCNF) Area Action Plan?

The New Community North of Fareham is a new settlement that is being planned to the north of the M27 at Fareham to meet the needs of local people. The new community, which was formerly called the ‘Strategic Development Area’ (SDA) will provide homes and jobs for local people, alongside new community facilities, shops and open space.

Fareham Borough Council adopted its Core Strategy in August 2011. This is the key planning document for the Borough for the next 15 years and forms the first part of Fareham’s ‘Local Plan’. It contained a strategic development location for a new settlement north of Fareham of between 6500 to 7500 dwellings and up to 90,750m² of employment floorspace. To progress the new community through the planning process, an Area Action Plan (AAP) is being prepared by Fareham Borough Council and will, once adopted, become part of Fareham’s ‘Local Plan’. The AAP will develop in more detail the policy approach for the new community. It will also include the concept masterplan for the area, setting out how the community will be built and the distribution and timing of the different land uses that will make up the new community.

2.1 Stages of Consultation

How have the community been engaged so far?

Community groups and the general public have been engaged in the project since 2005, through consultation on the South East Plan and the Fareham Core Strategy, which respectively established the principle and set out the high level planning policies for developing a new settlement.

Since the adoption of the Council’s Core Strategy in August 2011, there has been informal public engagement on a range of issues important for the production of the Area Action Plan. In January 2012 a public survey was undertaken on aspects such as open space, affordable housing and sustainable energy generation. This attracted almost 500 responses. This was followed up by visits to a number of local primary schools in the area and work with the Fareham Youth Council, including a Youth Conference held in March 2012. In addition, a range of local interest and business groups have been visited to talk about the new community and there has been a presence on the Council's Facebook page.

In the summer of 2012 a further round of informal consultation sought views on a range of options for how the new community could be built out. A second public survey was undertaken and was supported by a series of five staffed exhibitions. These offered local people in Fareham, Funtley, Wickham and Knowle four distinct masterplan options to accommodate varying levels of development as well as
associated transport options and a number of variations, such as the location of the secondary school and the district centre.

In accordance with its consultation strategy (Statement of Community Involvement), the Council publicised this consultation by advertising in the Special Edition of Fareham Today that was delivered at the end of June 2012 to all homes in the Borough as well as being distributed to Wickham and Knowle. This publication set out the dates and times of manned exhibitions, whereby officers were available to respond to queries. The dates and times of the exhibitions were also reported in the local press.

Respondents were provided with a variety of ways to comment on the options being presented, including using on-line response forms and paper response forms which were provided in both full and shortened formats. Paper copies of the relevant documents and response forms were made available at Fareham Borough Council offices and at the exhibitions.

Approximately 535 responses were received during the consultation period (02 to 31 July 2012). Section 3 of this report contains detailed summaries of the key points raised by respondents to each of the survey questions. Major themes of the responses received included the future transport infrastructure provision to support the new community and the environmental impacts, such as congestion, potentially resulting from the new development and the impact on the wider landscape. There was support for the extension of the Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) scheme and discussion around the cost implications of future transport improvements and the need for a robust evidence base to support options being put forward to ensure that they are deliverable.

This Options Consultation Summary Report is a factual document and the text and charts that appear on the following pages are designed to illustrate the main issues raised during the consultation in July 2012 and to summarise the responses received to the questions that were contained within the Public Survey (Consultation Document). To assist with summarising the responses, individual representations have been grouped together into relevant issues. At the end of each of the detailed summaries, bulleted ‘key points’ have been provided to offer an overview of the most commonly referenced issues that arose in the responses.
3.0 Summary of Responses

Master Plan Option 1: Includes land at Junction 11 and provides 6,650-7,250 homes and 80,500-87,700sq.m of employment space

Q1a: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Option 1?

Yes: 286
No: 167
No reply: 82
Total responses: 535

Comments on advantages

Locating most of the employment development at junction 11 was identified as an advantage because it frees up land to the west of the A32 for housing development. However some respondents disagreed that this would be an advantage because the land that would be freed up is affected by motorway noise, air pollution, and due to its low elevation would have poor visual amenity, so would not be the most suitable land for housing. It was suggested that locating employment here to act as a barrier to the motorway would be a better use of this land. A few respondents stated that all of the options could provide the opportunity for high quality and well landscaped employment uses, and not just option 1.

Several respondents agreed spreading the additional traffic between junctions 10 and 11 could be an advantage, but others identified a conflict between this and the disadvantage of traffic from the development affecting two M27 junctions. Respondents identified the need for the transport modelling results to help understand how evenly the traffic would be spread between the junctions, and how exactly this would affect the junctions. Many respondents disagreed that this would be the best option to encourage self-containment because the main employment area is segregated from the main residential area. Furthermore, they raised the issue that there is no guarantee businesses will employ local residents.

Some respondents disagreed that option 1 is broadly consistent with the Core Strategy. Although the quantum of housing is within the range set out in policy CS13, the Inspector at the Examination In Public, specifically removed references to the
business park at junction 11 from the policy due to the inconsistent level of detail and environmental and transport issues.

**Further advantages identified**
Within the comments received, a number of further advantages for option 1 were identified. It is considered that advantage of the funding available from the development, could be taken to provide the link road. This could provide better access to the motorway, facilitate downgrading of the existing A32, relieve traffic in Funtley and North Fareham, and reduce rat-running on residential roads. Option 1 could provide the best opportunity for connecting with Portsmouth, and could fulfil the Borough’s housing needs without the need for development of other large sites.

**Comments on disadvantages**
There was broad agreement that the impact of development around junction 11 on the environment and landscape is a significant disadvantage. The area is highly visible and development could impact on the setting of local heritage assets, including the South Downs National Park and the river Wallington. It was felt it could also increase flood risk and potential for groundwater contamination. Some respondents agreed that it is a disadvantage for the majority of employment to be set away from the housing as it would not be as well integrated into the community as in other options, and it would not reduce commuting or promote self-containment. However, several respondents viewed the separation of housing and businesses as an advantage because they would not want to live adjacent to a business park.

There was agreement that the high cost of delivering the link road is a serious disadvantage of option 1 because it could affect the viability and deliverability of the overall masterplan option. The spreading of development traffic across two motorway junctions was seen potentially as an advantage, because both junctions might cope better with a more dispersed traffic load. It was noted that the environmental effects could be worse by spreading the traffic and this would need to be assessed. Some people considered that junction 11 is already at capacity, especially at peak times, so it would be better to focus traffic on junction 10.

**Further disadvantages identified**
A number of further disadvantages for option 1 were identified. The bulk of the disadvantages centred on transport. The fact that option 1 would not provide an all moves junction 10 was seen as a significant disadvantage in comparison to other masterplanning options. There was concern that the new link road may not be as high a quality as the existing A32 and this would affect its ability to cope with the traffic. Several responses indicated that this option would have more of a negative impact on local roads in north Fareham than other options. It was felt that this option would result in more traffic on Portsdown Hill than other options and this would have a negative impact on tranquillity. Option 1 provides for a less extensive BRT route than other options and this was identified as a disadvantage because it would not help to deter people from using their cars. There was also concern that this option would not promote walking and cycling because the site is bisected by the existing A32.
The quantum and scale of development in option 1 was considered too high by many respondents, and it was considered that option 1 would have a greater impact on existing communities in Wallington and Funtley than other options. Many people raised concerns about the loss of more countryside in option 1 than in other options. This would reduce the capacity of the area to provide land for both agriculture and recreation. As option 1 also has the highest amount of employment floorspace proposed, several respondents raised concerns that the employment land may not be occupied because there are already a lot of vacant units in Fareham.

The business park at junction 11 was seen as a disadvantage by many respondents for a number of reasons. It was felt that the business park would be in conflict with the sub-regional ‘Cities First’ strategy and could have a negative effect on the ability to regenerate existing urban areas. Several respondents were concerned that light pollution from the business park would be visible from the South Downs National Park and one respondent stated that development on the slopes of Portsdown Hill would have a negative impact on overall impression of Fareham. It was suggested that the environmental impact of the business park would outweigh the advantage gained from new employment.

Several respondents thought that option 1 does not provide enough green spaces. Green buffers were viewed as important in preventing a loss of identity for neighbouring communities. Some people felt the green buffers around Funtley and Knowle were not large enough, and a few people thought the masterplan should specifically identify a green buffer between the development and Wickham.

One respondent thought that option 1 provided too many school sites and one respondent thought having a school site on Knowle Road would be a disadvantage to existing Knowle residents. Option 1 was considered to increase the flood risk on Pook Lane more than other options. It was suggested that option 1 would not support connections to Southampton as well as other options. Finally, the extent of the land available for development to the east of the A32 is unknown and this was identified as a disadvantage in options 2 and 3, so should also be a disadvantage for option 1.

**Additional Comments**

Within the response to question 1a many comments were made which did not relate specifically to either master planning option 1 or the question being asked. The principal points of these comments have been captured below.

The majority of respondents objected to the principle of developing to the north of Fareham and they feel as though their previous objections have not been listened to by the Council. The main reason why people are opposed to the development is the perceived impact of development traffic on the M27, A32 and other local roads. Respondents are also concerned about air and noise pollution arising from increased traffic flows, and the ability of Fareham town centre to provide facilities for the additional population.

People are keen that infrastructure delivery keeps pace with the development. Roads, bus services, healthcare, schools, sewage and drainage were the main areas of concern. There was a call for the BRT service to be in place early because
otherwise it will not affect travel behaviour. A few people thought a rail halt should be included as it could reduce the impact of traffic. A secondary school should be required early to avoid students having to travel to Henry Cort.

Concerns were raised about the successful delivery of the complete development in the current economic climate. Respondents strongly felt that the supporting infrastructure was critical, and there was also a request for climate change mitigation measures. Some people felt the district and local centres would be too large to be supported.

Some concerns were raised about the consultation process. A few people felt more detail was required in order to appraise the option in comparison to the others, particularly regarding the choice of a link road to junction 11 or an upgrade to junction 10. There was confusion about whether the BRT would connect to Fareham town centre or stop at North Hill as indicated in the diagram.

There was support for retaining Fareham Common and land directly south of Knowle Road as green infrastructure, and it was suggested that the density should not exceed 35 dwellings per hectare to ensure a sense of the countryside. There was support for spreading school sites across community.

Summary of Key Points

- Many people thought that the land freed up along the M27 to the west of the A32 was not suitable for residential development because of its proximity to the motorway and the associated problems of air quality, noise and safety.
- Spreading traffic across two motorway junctions was seen as both an advantage and a disadvantage.
- It was felt that this option would not support self-containment.
- Several respondents said that locating employment at J11 was not consistent with the Core Strategy as the Inspector removed reference to this.
- There was some support for the delivery of the link road but many thought the high cost could prevent it being delivered.
- Many people were concerned about the environmental impact of option 1, especially on the slopes of Portsdown Hill.
- The lack of an all moves J10 was seen as a serious drawback of this option.
- Option 1 was not seen to promote sustainable travel as the BRT route is less extensive and the A32 going through the middle of the site would act as a barrier to walking and cycling.
- The quantum and scale of development in option 1 was considered too high by many respondents and would result in the loss of the most countryside and have the greatest impact on neighbouring communities.
- The business park could be in conflict with the sub-regional ‘Cities First’ strategy.
Masterplan Option 2 includes land at junction 11 but no link road with the same level of homes (6,650-7,250) and employment as option 1

Q2A: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Option 2?

Yes: 278
No: 171
No reply: 86
Total responses: 535

Comments on advantages
Some respondents accepted a case for providing employment along the M27 but without the link road, as long as pedestrian and cycle access from the new community was provided and that the BRT served this area from an early stage. One view was that this was logical as the employment would represent sub-regional provision. However, considerably more respondents were not in favour of this solution and many of these thought that the advantages were incorrect or overstated. A significant number made reference to the current poor economic viability of employment in the Fareham area and questioned why such a large quantity of additional floorspace was required. Others thought that the advantages were too focused on development 'cost savings' and therefore too short term, whilst some thought that costs should not be a factor at all. A few respondents questioned whether this option would prove cheaper than Option 1 in the long term.

A significant number of respondents thought that the advantage that referred to a BRT link to serve the employment area understated the transport problems that this option would be likely to cause. Although some simply sought further detail about how BRT would serve the new employment area, others questioned whether many new community residents would use the BRT at all and predicted that the employment area would have a significant and negative impact on the M27 at Junction 11.
Further advantages identified
Only a handful of respondents suggested additional advantages and all except one of these considered that the separation of employment and residential areas was a benefit in terms of reducing the impact of noise, pollution and day-time traffic movements within the residential areas. One respondent thought that it was an advantage that those who would live within the new community areas to the east of the A32 could easily walk or cycle to the employment area.

Comments on disadvantages
By and large, respondents tended to agree with the stated disadvantages for Option 2, particularly the first, which states that the employment area could operate in isolation from the new community. Whilst a couple thought that this was not necessarily a disadvantage, a much larger number were very concerned that failing to provide a link road would undermine efforts to encourage 'self-containment' and would lead to an undesirable impact on traffic levels on the M27 and Junction 11 in particular.

Many respondents questioned the ability of the new community to achieve any significant level of self-containment, irrespective of whether or not a link road was provided. Some thought that almost all the new residents would already have a job when they arrived at the new community and others considered that most people do not want to live close to their work even if they had the opportunity to. Other comments questioned the ability, in the current and foreseeable economic climate, to secure take-up of employment floorspace and considered that the jobs would lag well behind the new homes which would reduce the potential for self-containment.

There was some concern from a handful of respondents about the lack of certainty over the extent of land availability to the East of the A32 in Option 2. These commented that it was hard to be in favour of an option that the Council was not certain could be delivered.

Further disadvantages identified
A range of further disadvantages were identified and these outnumbered the additional advantages that were put forward. Again, the bulk of the disadvantages focussed on the issue of transport. A large number of comments centred on the potential impact of Option 2 on Junction 10 which was thought to be over capacity already. It was clear that some respondents had not understood the proposal to create an ‘all-moves’ Junction 10 under Option 2 and some called for this to be done. Others who had understood the proposals considered this to be insufficient to cope with the additional traffic that would be generated and some of these sought further access points to be created to reduce the pressure on Junction 10.

The most commonly cited additional disadvantage was the likely impact of Option 2 on existing roads in North Fareham. North Hill, Wickham Road and Park Lane were amongst those roads that were considered would bear the brunt of the additional traffic and a number of respondents thought that this would lead to unacceptable impacts on traffic flow and the quality of life for existing Fareham residents. Other comments centred on the potential for Option 2 to create new ‘rat runs’ in the rural
lanes surrounding the new community site. It was thought that without a new link road, Pook Lane and Boarhunt Lane would be negatively impacted in this way.

Similar to comments on Option 1, the employment area at Junction 11 was felt to be in conflict with the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) sub-regional ‘Cities First’ strategy. Likewise some respondents were concerned that light pollution from the business park would be visible from the South Downs National Park and that development on the slopes of Portsdown Hill would have a negative impact the surrounding landscape and on the 'gateway' views as one approaches Fareham on the M27. Again, it was suggested that the environmental impact of the business park would outweigh the advantage gained from new employment.

One respondent raised the problem of the likely severance of the part of the new community to the east of the A32. They considered that the level of traffic on the A32 under Option 2 would be greater than in the other options and this would prevent the integration of those living in the eastern part of the development. Another respondent commented that Option 2 depended on a range of minority interest landowners which was a disadvantage, as there was no certainty that they would wish their land to be developed.

**Additional Comments**

A large number of additional comments were made under Question 2a and these ranged widely in their focus. Similar to Question 1a, many focused on respondents' opposition to the principle of the new community being developed and some of these sought to suggest alternative ways in which new homes and jobs could be provided. There were also a number of comments seeking reassurance that the development would not proceed ahead of the provision of infrastructure.

Other comments focussed on transport issues, including several who thought the M27 was already over capacity and would not be able to cope. Others considered that the A32 should be improved as a dual-carriageway as far as Wickham. Several requested further details of the transport arrangements before they could draw conclusions. There were also a variety of comments on bus services; with some considering that the various options placed too great a reliance on people using buses (including BRT). Some of these considered that very few people would use these services in reality. One respondent commented that bus services should be improved in Wallington once the new community is developed and another questioned whether new bus routes within the new community would result in service reductions in existing areas of Fareham.

Several comments were made on the depiction of green infrastructure and settlement ‘buffers’ with a number suggesting that more open and green space should be planned and that the buffers between the new community and Wickham and Knowle should be enlarged.

A few respondents sought further details on a range of aspects, including the types and size of homes proposed as well as the range of businesses that would be attracted and the retail offer that would be provided within the district and neighbourhood centres.
Summary of Key Points

Advantages of Option 2:
- Most people commenting on the advantages of Option 2 thought that they were incorrect or overstated
- The key concern was the perceived over-provision of employment floorspace which was thought to be financially unviable and many pointed to the plentiful supply of vacant employment space in the local area
- Some thought that the advantages were too focused on short-term infrastructure cost savings as the expense of long-term traffic impacts
- There was widespread scepticism that BRT would be well used

Disadvantages of Option 2:
- Many agreed with the disadvantages
- There was considerable concern that 'self-containment' would be undermined by the lack of a link road in Option 2
- Many other respondents did not agree that any significant self-containment would be achieved in any of the options.
- The most frequently cited additional disadvantage was the likely impact of Option 2 on existing roads in northern Fareham
- Requiring Junction 10 to cope with almost all of the additional traffic was also seen as a disadvantage
Master Plan Option 3 includes land east of the A32, but none at Junction 11 and provides 6,300-6,850 homes and 76,200-82,850sq.m of employment space.

Q3a: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Option 3?

Yes: 298  
No: 139  
No reply: 98  
Total responses: 535

**Comments on advantages**
Several responses preferred this option to either options 1 or 2 as in their view this offered better containment of the potential development impacts.

This option was also preferred by a number of respondents to options 1 and 2 because it had a lesser impact on the landscape in general, on the setting of Portsdown Hill and avoided potential light pollution from any employment uses located there. Generally, the overall reason why this option was most supported by respondents was that they felt the reduced land take and subsequent reduction in traffic generation would give it an advantage over options 1 and 2.

Although there was a separate opportunity to comment on the transport options several respondents commented that an advantage of this masterplanning option would be improvements to junction 10. And some felt that this option would be preferable in terms of creating less congestion than options 1 and 2.

The comment was made that it provided the best balance between employment and residential. The point was raised by several respondents that option 3 would allow residents the opportunity to walk to work, and that there would be a closer link between homes and jobs thus reducing commuter traffic.

**Further advantages identified**
- By placing the employment close to junction 10 rather than junction 11 the option would not conflict with other polices to regenerate older urban areas.
- It was also felt that this option would provide a better noise buffer between the motorway and new houses.
• This option was considered by some to have less of a visual impact on residents in the Kiln Road area (from which Portsdown Hill is clearly visible) than options 1 and 2, and still provides an open space adjoining this road.
• One respondent considered that there were more advantages than disadvantages to this option.

Comments on disadvantages
The main disadvantage of this option which was highlighted by many respondents was the potential impact on traffic. This was expressed in terms of the impact on the motorway itself, junctions 10 and 11, and on the local road network. In respect of the latter there were concerns that this option puts too much pressure on one road (A32) to the detriment of Wickham and north Fareham. There was also concern that there would be insufficient infrastructure to avoid 'rat-running' particularly through Funtley, and north Fareham

The lack of a new link to junction 11 was seen as a disadvantage by several respondents. This option would still impact on junction 11 which will need improvements

Several respondents pointed to the fact that Junction 10 will need significant improvements in this option, but there is no indication of the costs, or that such improvements are achievable. One of the landowners promoting the site stated that their modelling has put the additional capacity on an improved junction 10 at only 5,000 dwellings, and 90,000 sq m of employment floorspace which would make this option undeliverable.

There was also a lot of scepticism as to whether the new jobs would actually come forward, and that in effect the new community would be a large housing estate.

In some cases there was some confusion that somehow in this option there would be significantly fewer jobs than houses. Whilst other felt that houses were being sacrificed for employment creating a mismatch and over providing job opportunities. *(The reality is that the ratio between employment floorspace and the new houses is the same in each option)*

Questions were also raised as to whether there would be the demand for this amount of employment floorspace given the vacant premises nearby

There were concerns that the levels of self containment would not be achieved, leading to out commuting. It was also felt that the level of employment proposed would attract large numbers of in commuters, and many cited the experience of Whiteley in respect of the likely dislocation between homes and jobs.

One respondent felt that the employment was too concentrated in one location in this option and should be spread around the site more

There were also comments on the extent to which the A32 would in reality form a barrier, with several responses indicating that this was overstated in this option, whilst others felt that the road would form a significant barrier. However, on balance
the majority of responses felt that the A32 would form a major barrier dividing the new community. Many felt that the A32 would weaken the concept of a single community, while others felt that it was something that could be managed, and one respondent felt that the road could be bridged to avoid any barrier effect. Although some form of bridge or pedestrian underpass was also considered by others to be equally divisive.

There was also the feeling that there would be no natural barrier to stop further eastwards expansion, unlike the new route to junction 11 proposed in option 1 which would contain further development. Although one respondent did not think this was an issue at all and strong planning policies and natural boundaries could effectively halt any unwanted growth.

**Further disadvantages identified**

One respondent felt that the employment would be too close to the residential areas which will suffer from overspill car parking, and other environmental impacts.

There is nothing in the proposals which would ensure that residents of Fareham and Gosport would benefit from the jobs created. New businesses are likely to have to recruit from outside of the borough to get the necessary skills.

This option would still impact on local health and education services. And there is a possibility that community facilities would be ‘downsized’ if fewer houses were built.

**Additional Comments**

There were a number of comments which questioned the advantages and disadvantages of this option, and whether they were as clear as implied in the consultation documents. The scope of the advantages/disadvantages could have been more effectively set out.

Several respondents questioned whether the statement that this option was broadly consistent with the Core Strategy (CS) is correct, and if so, to what extent are the other options inconsistent with the CS.

The scale of the plans and their diagrammatic nature made it difficult to identify specific locations.

There was nothing to indicate whether 35-38 density per hectare (dph) is considered high or low density, and there is a general perception that this option is ‘too crammed together’. There was also a concern that constraints on the site area as set out in this option would lead to higher densities. Conversely there was a concern expressed that the development might provide low density housing with large front gardens which would encourage car ownership/usage.

At this stage of planning for the new community the extent of available land should have been identified. It was also stated that there was an understanding that the landowners would not make available the extent of land to the east of the A32 shown in this option.
Several respondents made the same point that this as with all other options provides an insufficient gap between the development area and Wickham.

This option makes no mention of the potential to create a new rail halt at Knowle. The possibility of providing a park and ride in this option should also be considered.

**Summary of Key Points**

**Advantages of Option 3**
- Several responses preferred this option to either options 1 or 2 as in their view this offered better containment of the potential development impacts.
- This option was preferred by a number of respondents because it had a lesser impact on the landscape in general, on the setting of Portsdown Hill.
- This option was popular amongst respondents because of the reduced land take and subsequent reduction in traffic generation.
- It was also felt that this option would provide a better noise buffer between the motorway and new houses.
- This option was considered by some to have less of a visual impact on residents in the Kiln Road area (from which Portsdown Hill is clearly visible) than options 1 and 2, and still provides an open space adjoining this road.

**Disadvantages of Option 3**
- The main disadvantage of this option which was highlighted by many respondents was the potential impact on traffic. This was expressed in terms of the impact on the motorway itself, junctions 10 and 11, and on the local road network.
- The lack of a new link to junction 11 was seen as a disadvantage by several respondents.
- Several respondents pointed to the fact that Junction 10 will need significant improvements in this option, but there is no indication of the costs, or that such improvements are achievable.
- Some respondents felt that houses were being sacrificed for employment creating a mismatch and over providing job opportunities.
- Questions were also raised as to whether there would be the demand for this amount of employment floorspace given the vacant premises nearby.
- There were concerns that the levels of self containment would not be achieved, leading to out commuting.
- One respondent felt that the employment was too concentrated in one location in this option and should be spread around the site more.
- Majority of respondents felt that the A32 would form a major barrier dividing the new community.
- There was also the feeling that there would be no natural barrier to stop further eastwards expansion.
- There is nothing in the proposals which would ensure that residents of Fareham and Gosport would benefit from the jobs created. New businesses are likely to have to recruit from outside of the borough to get the necessary skills.
- This option would still impact on local health and education services. And there is a possibility that community facilities would be 'downsized' if fewer houses were built.
Master Plan Option 4 includes land to the west of the A32 only and provides 5,400 - 5,900 homes and 65,300 - 71,400sq.m of employment space.

Q4a: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Option 4?

Yes: 322
No: 119
No reply: 94
Total responses: 535

Comments on advantages
A large number of those who made comments agreed with the stated advantages. Many of these respondents thought that the overall development size of Option 4 was more suitable and encompassed a better balance of homes and employment. Some who commented thought that the reduced size of the Option would help to reduce the traffic problems that they associated with the other options, whilst others agreed that the environmental impact of Option 4 would be less than for the others. A few respondents thought that it was right to leave out the area to the east of the A32 and one mentioned the benefit to Boundary Oak School in particular.

Of those comments that disagreed with one or more of the advantages, the most common view was that the smaller size would not solve all of the transport problems for existing areas in Fareham, Wickham and Knowle. One respondent disagreed with the advantage relating to avoiding developing the most sensitive land as they considered that the land near Funtley which was still part of the development under Option 4 was more sensitive than land east of the A32. Another respondent questioned whether in fact all the land needed to upgrade Junction 10 of the M27 would in fact be available as the fourth advantage suggested.

Further advantages identified
A wide range of additional advantages were suggested, although there was no clear pattern in terms of the number of times each was suggested. Some thought that the reduced pressure that Option 4 placed on the existing road net work was important whilst others thought that the reduced impact of this option on Wickham and Knowle should have been included. Other respondents considered that the smaller development would result in reduced in-migration which would in turn result in less pressure on resources and 'social infrastructure'.
Other additional advantages suggested included the reduced potential for Option 4 to cause flooding in Wallington and the reduction in the use of high-grade farmland. Others considered that Option 4 would comply more easily with the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) 'Cities First' policy on economic regeneration and also that avoiding a business park at Junction 11 would reduce the impact of light pollution on the South Downs National Park. One respondent referred to the potential for Option 4 to maximise self-containment and improve the commercial viability of the district centre by integrating the homes and employment in a more compact and accessible new community.

Comments on disadvantages
There were a large number of comments on the disadvantages. The first disadvantage, relating to the ability of Option 4 to comply with the Council's Core Strategy, attracted only a few of these comments. These respondents tended to question why this was important and some thought that it should not be stated as a disadvantage.

The second disadvantage relating to potential increase in housing density and reduction of open space attracted the most comments with almost all of these agreeing that this was a very significant disadvantage of Option 4 and something that should be avoided. A large number of respondents expressed concern at the thought of densities reaching a level that would impact on residents' quality of life although a much smaller number of comments also suggested that a limited increase in density would not necessarily be a disadvantage.

A wide variety of comments were made about the third disadvantage on the possible pressure to make up any shortfall in housing numbers at the new community within the rest of the Borough. The vast majority of respondents who commented on this agreed that it was a major disadvantage and sought to urge the Council to resist this pressure by ensuring that the new community was able to meet the need for housing as envisaged by the Core Strategy. A number of respondents questioned where the pressure to build elsewhere would come from and some of these pointed to Government policy to remove regional housing targets and let local authorities decide how many homes to build. Others thought that this was not a disadvantage at all. Some thought this because they considered that it would take many years for the pressure on other parts of the Borough to come to bear, whilst others simply thought that there would be no problem in spreading residential development more widely.

The fourth disadvantage on development viability attracted only a few comments. One of these called for further explanation of the problem, whilst another thought that the option should not have been considered at all if it was not viable. A third comment disagreed that it was a disadvantage and suggested that Option 4 was the most economically viable of all of the options.

The fifth disadvantage covered the ability of Option 4 to help fund infrastructure and affordable housing. Almost all of the respondents who commented on the funding of infrastructure agreed that this could be a disadvantage and expressed a good deal of concern over the possibility that the necessary infrastructure might not be provided. Whilst a couple of those who commented on the affordable housing aspect agreed
that it was a disadvantage, the majority of those commenting questioned why so much priority was being placed on affordable housing, with some suggesting that affordable housing would not be needed or that it should be built in other locations rather than at the new community.

Further disadvantages identified
There were only a few additional disadvantages suggested. A couple related to the view that although smaller, Option 4 would nevertheless still create a range of transport problems for the existing communities surrounding the site, whilst another thought that the noise pollution created by Junction 10 of the M27 should have been listed as a disadvantage.

A handful of respondents suggested additional disadvantages focussing on the employment provision in Option 4. One of these thought that the reduced employment provision was a disadvantage as it would reduce the diversity of businesses that could be attracted and would, as a consequence, allow for a lower level of ‘self-containment’. Another thought that the potential for the employment provision within Option 4 to drop below the objective set within the sub-regional spatial strategy was an additional disadvantage.

Additional Comments
Some asked questions, such as when further details on the transport strategy will be provided and whether there will be any future additional extensions to the new community beyond that shown in the four options. One respondent asked when the schools will be completed and another asked why some much employment floorspace was included.

A couple of respondents commented on the need for affordable housing, with one calling for sufficient provision of smaller starter homes as well as affordable homes for those in housing need. Conversely, another respondent commented that there was too much emphasis in the options on the provision of affordable housing and more market homes were required.

A few comments were made on masterplanning issues that were not explicitly covered within Option 4. One thought that the part of the new community north of Knowle Road would be severed from the rest of the community by traffic on Knowle Road. Two respondents asked for tree-lined buffers around the edge of the new community to be included as part of final masterplan and one other commented that the new community was too close to Funtley in all of the options.

Summary of Key Points
Advantages of Option 4:
- Most who made comments agreed with the advantages and considered the overall size of Option 4 more suitable than other options
- Of those who disagreed with the advantages, most thought the traffic problems created for existing areas would not be solved by the smaller size
- A wide range of additional advantages were suggested with no clear pattern and only small numbers suggesting each
• Additional advantages included, reduced pressure on services and infrastructure, reduced flooding potential for Wallington and less high-grade farmland used

Disadvantages of Option 4:
• There were a large number of comments on the disadvantages
• Many referred to the potential for pressure to increase housing density and were very concerned my this and hoped the Council would resist it
• Most people who commented on the potential pressure to make up numbers within the Borough agreed that this should be resisted by ensuring that the new community provided sufficient homes
• Many agreed that Option 4 could struggle to fund sufficient infrastructure and they were concerned by this
• Although some were concerned at the prospect of fewer affordable homes, more respondents did not think this was a disadvantage
Transport Option 1:

Q1b: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Transport Option 1?

Yes 294
No 158
No Reply 83
Total 535

Comments on Advantages
It was not felt by the majority of respondents that all the advantages associated with the link road and higher quantum of development would be forthcoming in practice. In particular people felt that the link road would not provide adequate sustainable transport links to the employment site for this to be a sustainable location for those living on the development to work at. It was also felt that the majority of residents were unlikely to find jobs on this site and that out-commuting would still be a significant problem.

Many respondents disagreed with the suggested advantage of the A32 becoming a quieter more local road as this being unlikely to be achieved due to high traffic volumes and congestion at peak times.

Those living in North Fareham felt that the main advantage of this option was that it would divert traffic away from Junction 10 onto junction 11, therefore reducing impacts on their homes. This was particularly true of those living very close to Junction 10 who felt that their homes may be under threat of compulsory purchase if the preferred strategy involved expanding the junction to incorporate all moves. This was not however the view held by other respondents, many of whom felt that both the link road and the all-moves Junction 10 would be needed to cope with the level of traffic generated.

Comments on disadvantages
It was not felt that the potential disadvantages had been fully explored and there was considerable concern expressed over current traffic volumes in the area. The environmental impacts on Portsdown Hill was of considerable concern for many respondents, however this was a secondary concern for those living close to Junction 10, who were less concerned about environmental impacts in context of potential adverse impacts on their homes.
Many felt that the lack of available traffic modelling meant that it was difficult to assess how comprehensive the list of disadvantages was, and many thought impacts on Junction 11 itself had been under-estimated. They pointed out that this junction is already at capacity during peak times and that increased traffic in this area could result in grid lock.

As mentioned above, junction 11 was a major concern and it was felt that if traffic was focussed in this area due to the development and employment opportunities, the junction would not be able to cope and a situation similar to that seen at Junction 9 would occur. There was a body of opinion expressed that there is a significant risk of re-creating the access problems seen at Whitleley at the NCNF.

Additional Comments
Comments were quite consistent and focussed on increased traffic and the likely adverse impacts on the local area. It was frequently suggested that this was development at all costs and that the concerns of local people adversely affected by development would not be taken into account.

It was also felt that the lack of evidence available for any of the transport options was a serious problem and that the options had not been fully thought through. Current traffic volumes and hotspots for congestion were frequently mentioned as being of concern due to the huge impact increased traffic would have on these areas. Among these Kiln Road and north Fareham generally was cited as being likely to suffer, as was Wickham.

Road safety was a concern for many, particularly in the rural areas where increased traffic volumes were considered to be particularly dangerous.

Summary of Key Points

Advantages of Transport Option 1
- It was not felt by the majority of respondents that all the advantages associated with the link road and higher quantum of development would be forthcoming in practice.
- The majority of residents felt it was unlikely to find jobs on-site and that out-commuting would still be a significant problem.
- Many disagreed with the suggested advantage of the A32 becoming a quieter more local road as this being unlikely to be achieved due to high traffic volumes and congestion at peak times.
- Those living in North Fareham felt that the main advantage of this option was that it would divert traffic away from Junction 10 onto junction 11, therefore reducing impacts on their homes.

Disadvantages of Transport Option 1
- It was felt that the potential disadvantages had not been fully explored and there was considerable concern expressed over current traffic volumes in the area.
- The environmental impacts on Portsdown Hill was of considerable concern for many respondents.
• A major concern for those living close to Junction 10 was the potential adverse impacts on their homes.
• Many thought Junction 11 is already at capacity during peak times and that increased traffic in this area could result in grid lock.
• There was a body of opinion expressed that there is a significant risk of recreating the access problems seen at Whitleley at the NCNF.
Transport Option 2

Q2b: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Transport Option 2?

Yes: 301
No: 145
No reply: 89
Total Responses: 535

Comments on advantages
The majority of respondents agreed that the advantages and disadvantages of Transport Option 2b have been identified overall but expressed concern over a number of points raised by Option 2. There was significant interest in the "all-moves" Junction 10 and its potential impact on traffic movements and increased traffic congestion throughout the residential areas of north Fareham, areas to the north such as Wickham and onto country roads such as the B2177, A334 and A27, Highlands Road, Titchfield Lane and the Funtley "rat run".

The majority of respondents also expressed concern as to the capacity of the M27 and A32 to cope with the levels of development proposed, the knock-on effects of additional junctions added to the motorway and how this will contribute to increased traffic congestion. Details of their comments are set out below.

Many respondents disagreed that the absence of a new road would lessen the environmental impact of the scheme and cited a range of factors as being significant including the cumulative environmental impact on the South Downs National Park and the countryside; views in and out of Wickham; impact from the employment land onto the downland and the Wallington River Valley; their impact on the setting of scheduled ancient monuments to the east and the south; and the loss of the buffer zone provided by Fareham Common and also the area designated for employment to the north to enable Junction 10 to become an "all-moves" Junction as land on both sides of the existing motorway would be needed.

Advantage 4 provided a persuasive argument, for many, in support of transport Option 2. However, others pointed out that if you improve the traffic flow on the A32 and make improvements to Junction 10 of the M27, this would divide the new community (as with transport Option 3), which is likely to discourage pedestrian
access and possibly isolate this section. Therefore, without meaning to the A32 could act as a barrier to community cohesion.

Comments on disadvantages
Transport disadvantage 3 raised significant comment, with many respondents confused with the notion of the A32 being referred to as a "local street" given how busy it is and, it being a key route in and out of Fareham.

Additional Comments
The majority of respondents expressed great concern for the capacity of the M27 to continue to cope with anticipated increases in traffic. They also considered that additional junctions added onto the motorway will only increase traffic congestion and traffic onto country roads and onto Junction 9. Priority should be given to improvements to existing road infrastructure north of the new community before introducing new junctions. Improvements need to address inadequacy of north-south routes and peripheral routes east-west from them.

Summary of Key Points

Advantages of Transport Option 2
- There was significant interest in the "all-moves" Junction 10 and its potential impact on traffic movements and increased traffic congestion throughout the residential areas of north Fareham, Wickham and country roads
- The majority of respondents also expressed concern as to the capacity of the M27 and A32 to cope with the levels of development proposed, the knock-on effects of additional junctions added to the motorway and how this will contribute to increased traffic congestion.
- Many respondents disagreed that the absence of a new road would lessen the environmental impact of the scheme and cited a range of factors as being significant including the cumulative environmental impact on the South Downs National Park and the countryside; views in and out of Wickham and the loss of the buffer zone provided by Fareham Common
- Advantage 4 provided a persuasive argument in favour of transport Option 2.

Disadvantages of Transport Option 2
- Many respondents confused with the notion of the A32 being referred to as a "local street" given how busy it is and, it being a key route in and out of Fareham.
Transport option 3

Q3b: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Transport Option 3b?

Yes: 312
No: 125
No Reply: 98
Total Responses: 535

Comments on Advantages

The majority of respondents were focused on the existing traffic impact and formed a consensus that Junction 10 needs a high level of planning and investment to make it work in reducing traffic impacts on existing roads, specifically the A32 and the M27, to address access into Fareham from the northern part of the town. This access point was already considered to be inadequate in managing existing traffic capacity, whether the new community happens or not.

The majority of respondents agreed transport links to the proposed new community would only work if Junction 10 benefits from access on and off the M27 and if the A32 could be upgraded into a dual carriageway or bypass road rather than a singular means of access to the new community.

Several respondents were focused on the overall impact of the new development and considered this to be the best transport option. In that it is the most likely to mitigate against environmental impacts, inadequacy of local infrastructure to support the new community and the overall costs of development.

Comments on Disadvantages

Many respondents agreed that by providing the new community via junction 10 and by ensuring all development happens in one place this is likely to add to traffic congestion. Furthermore, there is was no guarantee that residents will work in the employment area, and so this is likely to lead to increases in traffic and gridlock along the A32.

Residents of North Fareham were not in favour of transport option 3 and the improvements to Junction 10, as they felt it would have a negative impact on existing residents, with the A32 Wichkam Road, south of the M27 becoming a rat-run for people taking a short-cut to Fareham Town Centre.
Many respondents expressed strong objections to the A32 being referred to as a "pedestrian friendly street" as this does not reflect the volume of traffic movements and the heavily congested roads.

**Additional Comments**
Insufficient consideration has been given to cyclists and other forms of public transport such as rail links by utilising Knowle station to provide access to the north to Eastleigh, Winchester and London.

**Summary of Key Points**

**Advantages of Transport Option 3**
- The majority of respondents were formed a consensus that Junction 10 needs a high level of planning and investment to make it work in reducing traffic impacts on existing roads, specifically the A32 and the M27
- Transport links to the proposed new community would only work if Junction 10 benefits from access on and off the M27
- Several respondents were focused on the overall impact of the new development and considered this to be the best transport option as it would reduce environmental impact and inadequacy of infrastructure to support new community.

**Disadvantages of Transport Option 3**
- Many respondents agreed that by providing the new community via junction 10 and by ensuring all development happens in one place this is likely to add to traffic congestion.
- There is was no guarantee that residents will work in the employment area, and so this is unlikely to reduce traffic
- Many respondents expressed strong objections to the A32 being referred to as a "pedestrian friendly street" as this does not reflect the volume of traffic movements and the heavily congested roads.
Transport Option 4

Q4b: Have we identified the main advantages and disadvantages for Transport Option 4b?

Yes: 315  
No: 119  
No Reply: 101  
Total Responses: 535

Comments on Advantages
The majority of respondents who commented were in favour of Option 4b as it was perceived to have a lesser impact on the already congested strategic and local road network and because it would mean lower transport infrastructure costs. However, other respondents were concerned that this option would not be deliverable or viable. Concerns ranged from inadequate infrastructure to support new development, fears that BRT would not be provided on time and concern about too little assessment or analysis to support suppositions made within the advantages and disadvantages boxes, especially about traffic impacts.

Whilst many respondents supported a reduced scale of development to tackle traffic congestion on both strategic and local roads, there were several respondents who argued that the development was maybe too small to provide local services as part of the new community and hence this may well lead to residents having to travel to get to them, thus adding to traffic congestion on the roads rather than taking it away.

Several respondents expressed concerns about the lack of a traffic assessment for all the development options

Comments on Disadvantages
The majority of comments received related to disadvantages 2 (a reduced amount of retail and other services provided on site) and 3 (smaller development making the Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) unviable to be extended to the new community). Detailed comments are provided below.
Retail Provision
Several respondents felt that it would be more useful if the new development increased the trade in the centre of Fareham rather than detracting from it. There were further concerns about current services being reduced in Fareham and Gosport because of the lack of access and footfall numbers and a fear that by providing additional retail as part of the development could accelerate this further. In addition, provision should be to scale to meet local needs of the new community not major shopping needs which will be within travelling distance at Fareham Town Centre.

However, several respondents disdained the notion of self-containment arguing most people will travel off-site for retail and other services regardless of what local services are provided because of the proximity of major centres such as Southampton (inc. Hedge End Park), Portsmouth and Winchester.

Bus Rapid Transport
Overall there was much interest amongst the community about extending the BRT service to the new community. With many supporting its extension and disputing that a smaller scheme would make the BRT unviable. Conversely several respondents did query the cost effectiveness of the BRT service stating the majority of people commute both to work and for pleasure to the main towns and cities nearby where continuity is more certain.

Summary of Key Points

Advantages of Transport Option 4
- This option was perceived to have a lesser impact on the already congested strategic and local road network
- development maybe too small to provide local services as part of the new community and hence this may well lead to residents having to travel to get to them adding to traffic congestion on the roads rather than taking it away.
- Several respondents expressed concerns about the lack of a traffic assessment for all the development options

Disadvantages of Transport Option 4
- Several respondents felt that it would be more useful if the new development increased retail trade in the centre of Fareham rather than detracting from it.
- The extension of the BRT could prove to be unviable if development is too small to provide local services as part of the new community.
Location of the New District Centre

Q5: Which of the four locations do you prefer for the new district centre and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location 1 - Close to the A32</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2 - Corner of the Knowle Road and A32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 3 - Close to Knowle Road but more centrally located</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 4 - Central, but not near an existing route</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses: 551

Comments on Location 1
Location 1 was the least popular choice for the district centre with 14% of respondents preferring it. The main reason why people preferred location 1 for the district centre is because it offers easy access for residents of the new community, passing trade on the A32, and for deliveries. Locating the district centre on a main road was largely supported as it would be more viable in the long term. This was considered crucial in the light of unsuccessful centres delivered at Whiteley and Knowle. Additionally it would result in a lesser traffic impact for the new residents because it would save visitor and delivery traffic from having to enter the new community to access the district centre. This location would also be the most accessible by BRT.

Location 1 was considered by many to be fairly central to the development, particularly if any development to the east of the A32 is planned as in
masterplanning options 1, 2 and 3. It was felt that smaller local centres would be able to adequately serve the western parts of the development. Being accessible means it could also serve people from North Fareham, Wickham and Knowle. Location 1’s proximity to the employment area and the ability to attract workers during their lunch breaks and was seen as a key benefit. One respondent thought location 1 was best because it would have the least impact on the tranquillity in Knowle. Another respondent favoured this location because it is the least visible from Portsdown Hill.

In terms of delivery, location 1 was considered the most likely to be delivered early because of its position on the edge of the site. If it was built as part of the first phase it would help to establish self-contained lifestyles from the outset, and it would create a meeting place and focal point for the community. It was considered that it might be easier to provide parking in this location on the edge of the site rather than in the centre of the community where space might be more limited.

Some respondents raised concerns that a district centre at location 1 would be more likely to attract shoppers from going to Fareham or Wickham and this may affect the vitality of these existing centres. In contrast, one respondent said that location 1 would have a lesser impact on Wickham due to its location further south.

Comments on Location 2
A similar number of people selected location 2 to location 1 because it was considered highly accessible for both new and existing communities. It would be as attractive to passing trade as location 1, and particularly for residents of Knowle. Location 2 was preferred by some respondents because it could make use of the existing roundabout at the junction of the A32 and Knowle Road. This provides good access, giving the advantage of not drawing visitor and delivery traffic into the development. It would be a busy road junction and on the BRT route so would be an attractive location for businesses. The roundabout could also facilitate early delivery of the district centre.

One respondent suggested that if the centre did not prosper, this would be a good location for employment development. One respondent preferred this location because it is the furthest from Funtley.

Comments on Location 3
The main reason for choosing location 3 is that the district centre would be more walkable for residents of the new community because it is more centrally located and is away from the main road. It would also serve the residents of Knowle. Cars would access the centre from the Knowle Road so it would avoid causing congestion on the A32 and it would keep delivery vehicles away from most of the residential area. A district centre in this location would not be as visible from the main road. However, as it is more central to the new community, people should feel a sense of ownership and it would be more likely to become a hub for the community.

Comments on Location 4
Location 4 was the most popular choice for the district centre and the reasons given focused on its geographically central location within the new community which was
considered to be the best way of serving the new residents. It would afford the
greatest opportunity for walking to the district centre and this would be more
sustainable than a more car-oriented location. Some people also thought that the
central location would make the centre more viable because the proximity to homes
and businesses would encourage more people to use it. The opportunity to take
advantage of the park frontage was also seen as very positive.

By locating the district centre within the heart of the community, it was considered
that the new residents would feel it belonged to them and this would foster a stronger
community spirit. Location 4 was preferred by some people because it is in
accordance with the principle of self-containment and would not be in such a position
to attract passing trade so this would have less of an impact on existing retail
provision in Wickham and Fareham.

Many respondents chose location 4 as it is furthest from the A32 so they perceived
traffic impacts to be less severe. People thought traffic would be more dispersed on
approaching the district centre, and overall this location would consequently attract
fewer external vehicles onto the site because it would be less visible to passers-by. It
was suggested that this location was consistent with trying to make the A32 more of
a local road. Further, it was considered better for pedestrian safety.

Several respondents who preferred location 4 for the district centre were generally
opposed to the principle of the new community, so thought this location would be the
least visually intrusive. This location was supported by people who preferred
masterplanning options 3 or 4, and it was suggested that this location for the district
centre could help to prevent sprawl to the east of the site.

Some respondents picked up on the negative aspects of this location and said it
would be less attractive to passing trade so would only be used by the community.
There was also concern that it would result in more traffic within the residential area
as people try to access the district centre, so a more peripheral location would be
preferred.

**Reasons for choosing none or other locations**
Several respondents did not choose any of the proposed locations. The main
reasons for doing so were because the location of the district centre is dependent on
which masterplanning and transport options will be chosen; a lack of information on
infrastructure to support the selection of a district centre location; or they did not
support any development at all. One respondent said it depended on the type of
centre that it will be.

The two main landowners suggested alternative locations for the district centre,
notably both wishing to locate it on land within their ownership. One suggested a
location to the south of location 1 because it is between the residential and
employment and would reduce the impact on Wickham. The other suggested a
location spanning both sides of the Knowle Road near to location 3 because it is
close to the centre of the site and could be delivered in an early phase. Both
suggested locations are considered easy to access and on the proposed BRT route.
Additional Comments
A range of other comments were received about district and local centres in general. There was concern about the new community being able to support a district centre in the current economic downturn, and that units may remain vacant for long periods of time. Contrastingly if the district centre was successful, it could have a detrimental impact on Fareham and Wickham. Furthermore, it was questioned whether the new community could support three local centres in addition to the main district centre.

Some suggestions were made for planning the district centre including the need for sufficient car parking, BRT access, cycle lanes and pedestrian linkages. The district centre should be located near to community and education uses as this would help to maximise footfall from linked trips and support the district centre’s viability. A district centre within walking distance of Funtley and Knowle could improve the sustainability of these villages. Frontage onto the local park was deemed desirable, and a centre similar in design to Wickham Square was also favoured by a few people. There should be an appropriate range and size of shops for the new residents. It should be recognised that people will not walk to the supermarket as they would have to carry their shopping home. The centre should be designed as much as possible to avoid the problem of youths hanging around and making it feel unsafe.

Summary of Key Points
- Location 4 was the most popular choice because of its central location.
- Locations 1 and 2 offer easy access for passing trade making them more viable but may attract visitors from other centres.
- Locations 3 and 4 would be less visible.
- Locations 1 and 4 are closest to the employment.
- Locations 2 and 3 would be best for serving the residents of Knowle.
- Traffic impact was a key consideration in choosing a district centre location.
- Needs sufficient car parking, BRT access, cycle lanes and pedestrian linkages.
- Early phasing to establish self-contained lifestyles from the outset.
- Frontage onto the local park was deemed desirable.
- Co-locate education and community uses to create a focal point for the community.
Location of the new secondary school

Q6: Which of the two options do you prefer for the secondary school and why?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location 1: East of Funtley</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2: East of A32</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply:</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for choosing Location 1, East of Funtley**
The comments made by those who favouring location 1 were roughly equally divided between positive reasons for choosing that location and reasons why the second location was less favoured. The positive reasons included the suggestion that Location 1 would be within the heart of the new community, closer to a greater number of homes. This, many respondents suggested, would result in Location 1 being very accessible by sustainable travel modes which was thought to be particularly important as many of the new students would walk or cycle to school. Some also drew attention to the proximity of Location 1 to the Bus Rapid Transit route and others considered that the accessibility advantages would discourage car use. A couple of respondents thought that this location, with its proximity to many of the new homes and to one of the proposed primary schools, would encourage the co-location of public and community services at the school site. These also thought the location most suitable for encouraging the sharing of facilities, such as playing fields, with the local community.
Further reasons for option for Location 1 included that it would be well located to benefit the existing communities of Knowle and Funtley and would also enable easy walking and cycle access from the existing residential areas in the north of Fareham, via the existing pedestrian access under the M27 Motorway. Conversely, some commented that Location 1 would be the best location to ensure that the catchment of the new school served the new community as a priority. These respondents considered that if large numbers of students from outside the new community attended the school, this could serve to undermine the principle of maximising 'self-containment' to reduce the overall traffic impact.

The most commonly cited reason for rejecting Location 2 was the perception that it would increase the overall traffic impact of the new community and would make the A32 and Junction 10 busier than would be the case if the school was located at Location 1. Location 2 was thought to be less accessible by pedestrians and cyclists and would be likely to encourage car use. Many also drew attention to the proximity of Location 2 to the east of the A32 and Junction 10 of the M27. This location was thought to create a noisy and traffic pollution dominated site that would unsuitable for a school and unsafe for students to access, as the majority would need to cross the busy A32 to get to the school. These responses considered Location 1 to be a much calmer, quieter and safer location for a school.

Others thought that Location 2 was too isolated and remote from the new community and some considered the land identified to be too steeply sloping to be suitable for playing fields. Location 1 was considered to be a flatter location overall. A few respondents rejected Location 2 due to concerns about its impact on what was considered to be a sensitive landscape east of the A32. Others were concerned about the impact of the school on Boundary Oak Preparatory School, whilst a few thought that there should simply be no development in that area at all.

Reasons for choosing Location 2, East of the A32
A large number of those opting for Location 2 thought the ease of access to the site from Fareham and Wickham was an important advantage so that it could benefit students from those communities. Many suggested that large numbers of students would need to arrive by car or bus and that the proximity to the strategic road network would be of benefit. Some added that this location would assist in the early phasing of the secondary school which could be accessed by works traffic immediately, unlike Location 1.

A significant number of comments centred on the potential for a school at Location 2 to have more space and room for expansion than would be the case at Location 1, which was considered by some to be hemmed-in. It was also thought to have a better interface with the countryside to the east of Location 2 and this suggested to a few that it would be a quieter location for a school.

A few respondents thought that the location of the school next to Boundary Oak School would be of benefit in developing links and potentially sharing facilities. Others considered that Location 2, being more distant from the main residential areas in the new community, would better avoid the problems of noise and disturbance that could be caused by groups of students walking to or from school. A
couple of comments focused on the benefit that a school at Location 2 would be less likely to conflict with the catchment area of Henry Cort School.

One group of respondents opted for Location 2 due to the perception that a school at Location 1 would be accessed from Funtley Road. They considered that such access arrangements would have an unacceptable impact on Funtley. However, this perception is based on a misunderstanding of the masterplan options presented, as no vehicular access to the school site shown at Location 1 has been assumed and the provision of any pedestrian and cycle access would need to be thoroughly tested for impact and safety.

Reasons for choosing both or none of the location options
A number of those who chose both or none of the locations made comments on the issue of secondary school location. Some respondents who opted for both locations expressed difficulty deciding between the two and some thought that the best location would depend on where the greatest number of students travelled from. These considered that Location 1 would be best if the majority of students lived on the new community, whilst Location 2 would better suit a school where the majority lives in the surrounding areas of Fareham, Wickham and Knowle. One respondent thought that both locations would benefit from being located near to the proposed employment areas as this would encourage links with businesses which would benefit both the school and the local employers which located to the site.

A wide range of reasons were cited for not choosing either of the two locations. A small number thought that it was premature to decide where the school should be located before the masterplan option was decided and that there was insufficient evidence to be able to make a choice. Others thought that both proposed locations were too close to the M27 which would result in significant noise and pollution impacts for the students.

A few suggested an alternative location for the school, with some opting for the area to the east of Knowle where a primary school location is shown and others suggesting a more central location, bordering the central park feature. A couple of respondents thought that no secondary school should be built at the new community. One of these cited the unacceptable effect it could have on traffic within the existing road network and the other thought that Whiteley would be a better location for the new secondary school.

Additional Comments
A small number of additional comments were made which did not relate to the location of the secondary school.

- A couple asked for the school to begin very early in the development build-out and thought it was important to complete it ahead of when it would be required.
- One respondent suggested that a large car drop-off area would be required at the school and this should be away from the public highway.
- Another asked for a suitable performance space to be provided within the school that would be suitable for sharing with community groups.
Summary of Key Points

Location 1, East of Funtley
- Many chose Location 1 as it would be closer to the heart of the community and would promote sustainable travel choices
- Other thought it was well located to benefit existing residents of Funtley, Knowle and North Fareham, using the existing M27 crossing
- Some rejected Location 1 as they thought it would be hemmed-in and hard to access by car from Fareham

Location 2, East of the A32
- Those favouring Location 2 liked the ease of access from Junction 10 and the A32
- Many thought that Location 2 would have sufficient expansion room
- A large number rejected Location 2 as they thought it would increase overall traffic impact of the development
- Many also thought that the location was too isolated and dominated by busy roads and would be a problem for students to cross the A32

Neither location
- A wide range of reasons were provided for choosing both or neither options and some expressed difficulty deciding
- A number of respondents considered both location too close to the M27 to provide a suitable learning environment
- Some suggested alternative locations, generally more central within the community or north of Location 1 adjacent to Knowle
Q7 Should the Council give further consideration to any of these five variations for the first draft of the Area Action Plan?

Comments about Variation 1, smaller central park
Most respondents commenting on this variation were in favour of reducing the size of the central park. Some comments suggested that the park shown was large enough or indeed too large already and a few thought that a 10% reduction would not prove significant. Some questioned the practical value of a large central park and drew comparisons with other parks in Fareham which were thought to be underutilised. A number of respondents thought that other existing green spaces, or those to be provided within the new community would be sufficient. A few respondents thought that a smaller park would be easier and cheaper to maintain and would be safe for children and a handful thought that this variation would simply be a better alternative to the others on offer and in particular would be preferable to reducing the size of the settlement buffers.

Some respondents made comments against the variation. A couple of these asked that the park should not be made smaller and suggested that the space would be needed for leisure and sport. Others thought that the park would provide a valuable focal point for the new community and one thought it will be essential as the new community will be home to a large number of children who will require the space for
play. One respondent thought that it was rare for modern developments to contain a large central park and that this should be maintained as a feature of the new community. Another thought that the park would be important to help mitigate the impact of the new community on the protected 'European Sites' such as the Solent coastline.

**Comments about Variation 2, using some of the Knowle buffer**

A wide range of comments in favour of Variation 2 were made, although, for the most part, the positive comments were in favour of using a part of the Knowle buffer for school playing fields rather than for additional housing. A considerable number of respondents who opted for Variation 2 thought that use as playing fields would be a sensible compromise which would still allow the buffer to serve its intended purpose.

A number of respondents thought that the Knowle Buffer was too large and overly generous or was at least large enough to allow some of it to be used as suggested in the variation. Others thought that the buffer size should be reduced as a way of integrating Knowle more closely with the new community and allowing Knowle residents to benefit from the additional facilities that would be provided. Some of these thought that Knowle was presently too isolated and should be provided with more access points. Some thought that the buffer as currently used served little practical purpose and should be provided with a clearer role to benefit Knowle residents as well as those of the new community. A couple of respondents thought that the buffer would eventually be used for other purposes anyway and so it would be better to plan this properly now to ensure maximum benefits.

A range of comments were made by those opposed to Variation 2. Many of these centred on the requirement for the full buffer to ensure that Knowle could maintain its separate identity and retain its village character. Some stated that the proposed retention of a 150m buffer would not be sufficient to serve this purpose. Some commented on the value placed on the buffer by existing Knowle residents and on promises they felt had been made by the Council not to try to erode the buffer. Some simply stated that as the buffer was outside of Fareham Borough, it was 'off limits' in the new community masterplanning process. A few others reflected on the effects of changing the nature of the buffer. These effects were thought to include a loss of views for Knowle residents and reduction in house prices, due to a loss of the 'rural premium' currently paid in Knowle.

**Comments about Variation 3, smaller Funtley buffer**

Variation 3 attracted the least number of comments of all of the variations and these were broadly evenly split between those in favour and those against the option. Those in favour, tended to consider that a 50m buffer would be adequate to protect the separate identity of Funtley, and some questioned why the buffer was needed at all. A couple of respondents thought that reducing the buffer would help to integrate Funtley with the new community and help existing residents to benefit from the new facilities and services that would be provided. One respondent thought that reducing the buffer could help to boost Funtley as a 'local centre’ for that part of the new community.

Comments against the reduction in size of Funtley's buffer tended to simply ask for this variation to be avoided or reflected on the value that residents placed on their
separate identity and the open views to the north of the village. A few commented on
the need to avoid destroying the Funtley Meadows and increasing the flooding
problems that were seen to be an existing problem. One respondent asked for the
full buffer to be retained and planned with native British trees.

Comments about Variation 4, less employment floorspace
A large number of comments were made in favour of Variation 4. Most of these
considered that the level of employment floorspace within the options was
unnecessary and many questioned why so much was needed. A good number of
examples, such as Whiteley and Segensworth, were used to make the point that
there is a large quantity of vacant employment floorspace in the local area. A number
of respondents reflected on the continuing poor economic state and considered that,
even in the longer term, the over-provision of employment floorspace would prove to
be a 'white elephant'. Some contrasted the weak current demand for employment
floorspace with the pressing need for affordable and starter housing and thought that
Variation 4 would help to redress this imbalance.

A significant number of respondents supported Variation 4 because they did not
consider that many of the new residents would work in the employment areas
provided within the new community site. These comments were sceptical about the
concept of 'self-containment' and pointed out that many new residents will already
have jobs when they move to the new community. Some also pointed to the
increasing likelihood that people will change jobs every few years without necessarily
moving home. These commentators tended to suggest that the employment should
be built elsewhere and some used specific examples, such as Daedalus Enterprise
Zone and Southampton. A few respondents considered that housing provision,
particularly for affordable housing, should take priority over the provision of
employment floorspace.

Only a few comments were made against Variation 4 and these tended to suggest
that the provision of employment was essential in order to maximise self-
containment and therefore to minimise the traffic impacts of the development. A
couple of respondents considered that more employment should be provided with a
consequent reduction in housing.

Comments about Variation 5, more homes per hectare
Only a small number of those who commented on Variation 5 were in favour of it
being considered further, although these provided a number of different reasons for
their support. A few thought that increasing residential density had the greatest
potential to make a difference in the total number of homes that could be provided
and a couple thought that this would make the development more financially viable.
Some considered that increasing densities would reduce the pressure to develop
other areas around the Borough. One respondent considered that raising densities
would be acceptable only in the central part of the new community and only if these
areas were very well designed. Another thought that higher densities made sense
given that household sizes were becoming smaller and reflecting the continuing
constraint on mortgage finance. Yet another considered that higher densities were
likely to result in a more compact and energy-efficient development which would be
more sustainable.
A great many respondents made comments against increasing residential densities. Many of these considered that densities were already too high and should not be increased further. A larger number pointed to a range of problems that they considered would result from higher densities. These included reduction in quality of life and happiness as well as an increase in conflict with neighbours and greater prevalence of anti-social behaviour and even crime. Some pointed to the pressure that high densities would place on residential parking and on storage space in the home and another to the inability for people to grow food in their own gardens.

For many of those who were against Variation 5, the important issue was the ability to ensure that the new community would be a high quality and nice place to live. Some thought that the densities being considered amounted to 'cramming' development and this was thought to be incompatible with a high quality place that people would enjoy living in. There was a widespread consensus that the residential density within the four masterplanning options was quite high enough and any more would be to go too far. Some respondents asked for reductions in the overall density shown, with one suggesting that 35 homes per hectare should be a maximum average.

**Reasons for choosing none of the variations**

A range of comments were made by those who opted for none of the variations. Some of these thought that the development was large enough or too large already without further housing numbers being added. Some thought that all of the options amounted to 'cramming' in one form or another and that the new community should be planned to have sufficient space, buffers and parks for people to enjoy; again, this was thought to be a quality of life issue. A couple who were opposed to the new community being developed considered that if it was to be built, it should at least be spacious and pleasant for the new residents. A few respondents suggested that none of the variations would make a significant difference to the overall housing numbers but all came with significant problems or impacts and so none of them should be further considered. A few others thought that none of the variations should be considered further until the full infrastructure needs were identified to ensure the additional homes would be supported by infrastructure.

**Summary of Key Points**

**Smaller central park:**
- Most comments were in favour of this variation
- Some considered the park large enough to absorb a 10% reduction and others questioned the value of such a large park
- Those against this pointed to the need for sufficient leisure space and play space for children.
- Others thought it was a valuable focal point for the new community that should not be eroded

**Using some of the Knowle buffer**
- Almost all of the positive comments related to the use of part of the buffer for playing fields rather than additional homes - thought to be a good compromise
- Some considered this an opportunity to integrate Knowle more with the new community
• Many were opposed to any use of the buffer and thought that it was essential for settlement identity and was greatly valued by residents
• Some referred to promises made by FBC and to the commitments of WCC to leave it undeveloped

Reducing the size of the Funtley buffer
• Attracted fewer comments than other variations and these were evenly split between those for and against
• Those in favour questioned the need for the full buffer while those opposed focussed on the value residents placed on separate identity and the rural setting

Reducing the proportion of employment floorspace
• Most comments made were in favour of this option - few spoke out against it
• Large numbers considered the level of employment provision too much and unnecessary given the high level of vacant floorspace locally
• Many were sceptical about the ability to achieve any significant level of self-containment. It was thought that nearly all new residents would already have jobs on moving in
• However, those against the variation thought that it would undermine self-containment and increase traffic levels

Raising the average density
• Large majority of those commenting were against this variation, but those in favour thought that it would have the greatest effect on housing numbers
• Many thought that densities should not be increased or were too high already
• Those against considered that increased densities would lead to a range of problems, such as reduction in quality of life, pressure on parking and neighbour conflicts

None of the variations
• Many of those choosing none of the variations thought that the new community was large enough without the additional homes
• Some commented that most of the variations amounted to cramming development and had the potential to reduce the quality of the development
Masterplanning Options

Q8: Which of the masterplanning options would you like to see developed further and why?

Comments on which option should be developed further and why
There were a large number of respondents recorded as 'no replies'. These were individuals who objected to the principle of the development as a whole. Several respondents suggested a hybrid option, including an option which minimises the scale of the development (option 4), whilst still providing a link road to junction 11 (option 1).

Masterplanning Option 1
Of all the options this was the option preferred by the largest number of respondents (95), although it would be fair to say that only 240 respondents wished to see any of the options developed further.

The main reason given for preferring this option was the provision of a new link road to junction 11, and the possibility of downgrading the A32 to 'a more local road'. Committing to creating the link with junction 11 was seen as a forward looking and positive move by many respondents. Many felt that it would be wrong not to provide the road at this time as with the level of development proposed it will be needed at some time in the future, and will be more difficult to provide if not properly planned for now. Splitting the traffic impacts between two junctions was also seen by many as a benefit.
This option was felt to offer the potential to improve the transport links into Fareham.

There were concerns that other options would put too much strain on Junction 10 and that this option would have less of an impact on the motorway itself than the other options.

This option was considered by many to provide the best balance between homes and jobs. The view was also expressed by many respondents that this option allowed for more housing to be provided. A similar view was expressed that this option maximised job opportunities which are much needed in the Borough.

PUSH supported this option as it provides the greatest number of new homes.

The separation of the employment from the housing was seen as a benefit by some respondents, as this would divert commercial traffic away from residential areas.

Several felt that the proposed scale of the development in this option in terms of both the housing and employment would relieve pressure for development elsewhere in the Borough. This can be summarised by the view that if this level of development is really needed then it is best that it is located in one place.

Several residents of Wickham and Knowle felt that this option would have the least impact on these settlements.

**Concerns**

Concerns were expressed that this option would effectively cut off the new employment from the community, which would attract commuting.

If this option is going to succeed then the housing needs to match the needs of the workforce, including the need to provide affordable housing.

There were also concerns that junction 10 would also need improving, and this was not properly set out in this option. Likewise many residents in the new community will need to access employment at Whiteley and Southampton.

Although it was felt by many that this option provided the best balance between jobs and homes, several question whether there was the need/demand for this level of employment floorspace.

**Masterplanning option 2**

This option was by far the least favoured, with only 17 respondents wishing to see this option developed further.

Where there was a preference for this option it was predicated on improvements to junction 10; however a number of the responses appear to be under the misapprehension that option 2 also includes a new link to junction 11.

It was also considered to be less costly that option 1 while providing the same number of homes and jobs.
This option was also considered to have less impact on environmental and ecological interests than option 1.

This option was felt by HCC Education to provide good links with the proposed secondary school by BRT

**Concerns**
While this option still maximises housing and employment and therefore gained a measure of support, there were concerns about creating a single entrance to the new community, and the ability of the M27 to cope with the additional traffic.

There was a view that this option has no links between the community and the employment.

One respondent raised the issue that modern employment uses do not keep to a 9 to 5 schedule, and often operates through the night, making bus access difficult outside of peak times.

**Masterplanning option 3**
This option did not find much favour with the respondents and only 39 wished to see it developed further. Those who did prefer this option felt it provided the best balance between housing and employment without splitting the community from the new jobs.

Many felt that while providing a good balance between jobs and houses it would still be able to provide the required infrastructure, which was felt by some to be less than other options. The ability to fund the necessary infrastructure was given by many as a reason for preferring this option to option 4.

While preferring this option questions were raised as to whether the level of employment floorspace proposed was justified given the vacant floorspace locally including the vacant floorspace at Whiteley.

This option was preferred by Gosport BC as it provides closer integration between employment and housing. It also enables more efficient transport options and an improved bus service.

Winchester CC also preferred this option as the basis for further consideration, to ensure that there is a proper balance between housing and employment with the later meeting regional economic objectives. Winchester would also encourage the development of smarter choices sustainable transport options; and the inclusion of a stronger buffer to the north between the new community and Wickham in taking forward this option.

There were considered to be wider benefits from making junction 10 all moves and allowing greater access to the west. There were also concerns that improvements to junction 11 would not be effective and this option reduces the impact on this junction.
Concerns
Concerns were raised as to whether this option would provide the necessary infrastructure, including the improvements to junction 10. The single access point was also questioned by many, although one respondent did not see this as a major issue given the relatively smaller scale of the development.

It was recognised that this option would potentially divide the community between those on the east and those on the west of the A32, but questions were also raised over the likely effectiveness of the measures implied in option 1 to turn the A32 into a more local road. Several suggested that this issue could at least in part be addressed by traffic calming.

Some responses seemed to imply that the land to the east of the A32 should be kept in reserve and only released if needed. This land could therefore accommodate the future growth of the new community.

Masterplanning option 4
This was the second favourite option for taking further (89 responses). The main reasons given were the reduced impacts and greater deliverability. The majority of the responses can be summed up as preferring this option as the smallest development option, which was therefore considered to be the least disruptive.

Many felt that this option was more closely aligned with Fareham’s needs

Confining the development to the west of the A32 was considered by many to have a lesser environmental and visual impact. It avoids the environmentally and ecologically sensitive Portsdown Hill and the Wallington Valley and avoids splitting the new community. This option also requires less agricultural land.

This option was considered by many to have the least traffic impact because of the reduction in both employment and housing.

It was felt by many to still provide the necessary social and physical infrastructure to make the new community more self contained, but with a reduced impact.

Concerns
There were some concerns about the ability of this option to fund and meet all its infrastructure requirements including the improvements to junction 10.

Summary of Key Points

Masterplanning Option 1
- This was the most popular option. The main reason for its popularity was the provision of a new link road to junction 11, and the possibility of downgrading the A32 to ‘a more local road’.
- Several residents of Wickham and Knowle felt that this option would have the least impact on these settlements.
- Although it was felt by many that this option provided the best balance between jobs and homes, several questioned whether there was the need/demand for this...
level of employment floorspace and others suggested for this option to succeed the housing needs to match the needs of the workforce, including the need to provide affordable housing
- There were also concerns that Junction 10 would also need improving and this was not properly set out in this option.

**Masterplanning Option 2**
- This option was the least favoured. It was popular on the basis of improvements to Junction 10.
- Other reasons for its popularity was that despite providing for the same number of homes and jobs as option 1, the environmental impact were lesser.
- This option was felt by HCC Education to provide good links with the proposed secondary school by BRT
- There were concerns about creating a single entrance to the new community, and the ability of the M27 to cope with the additional traffic

**Masterplanning Option 3**
- This option did not find much favour with respondents overall. Those in favour choose this option because it provided the best balance between housing and employment without splitting the community from the new jobs.
- The ability to fund the necessary infrastructure was given by many as a reason for choosing this option rather than option 4.
- While preferring this option questions were raised as to whether the level of employment floorspace proposed was justified given the vacant floorspace locally including the vacant floorspace at Whiteley.
- This option was preferred by adjoining authorities as it provides closer integration between employment and housing, enabling more efficient transport options and the inclusion of a stronger buffer to the north between the new community and Wickham in taking forward this option
- It was considered there would be wider benefits from making Junction 10 all moves and allowing greater access to the west.
- Concerns were raised as to whether this option would provide the necessary infrastructure, including the improvements to junction 10. The single access point was also questioned by many.
- It was recognised that this option would potentially divide the community between those on the east and those on the west of the A32
- Some respondents suggested that the land to the east of the A32 should be kept in reserve and only released if needed.

**Masterplanning Option 4**
- This was the second favourite option for taking forward.
- The majority of the responses can be summed up as preferring this option as the smallest development option, which was therefore considered to be the least disruptive.
- Confining the development to the west of the A32 was considered by many to have a lesser environmental and visual impact.
- This option was considered by many to have the least traffic impact because of the reduction in both employment and housing and it was felt by many to still provide the necessary social and physical infrastructure to make the new community more self-contained, but with a reduced impact.
- There were some concerns about the ability of this option to fund and meet all its infrastructure requirements including the improvements to Junction 10.
Q9: Are there any other options or variations for the new community that you think the Council should consider?

A wide range of comments were made to this question which covered many different aspects of the development. These have been grouped into the categories below.

**Overall development and masterplan options**

A large number of respondents suggested alternatives to building the new community. Some suggested ensuring that all of the available brownfield sites in the Borough should be developed first, whilst others went further and suggested that unused employment floorspace should be utilised for housing. Others suggested spreading the development needs around the Borough more widely and some mentioned specific locations, including Warsash, Locks Heath, Whiteley, Stubbington and the Daedalus former airfield site. A number of respondents suggested reducing the scale of the new community with various sizes suggested ranging down to two or three hundred homes.

Some respondents suggested variations to the overall masterplanning options. A few of these thought that Option 4 was the best option, but should be combined with Transport Option 1, to provide a link road to Junction 11. Others thought that all of the options should have been shown with the Junction 11 link road. One respondent sought Option 1 to be accompanied by a further downgrade or removal of Junction 10. One other asked for further options to be developed to act as alternatives in case the options presented proved to be financially unviable.

**Transport and access**

A range of variations to the presented transport and access arrangements were sought. These included a few suggestions for a vehicular access to Funtley Road which was thought to be able to relieve pressure on Kiln Road. Other respondents asked conversely for traffic calming to be provided in Funtley to reduce the potential for ‘rat-runs’. A number of respondents thought that insufficient access point to the new community had been shown and asked for more, including additional access points on the A32, with one suggesting a road from Knowle through the north of the new community to the A32 near Haytesbury Farm. Another asked for a road linking to Whiteley.

A handful of suggestions were made about public transport arrangements. The most frequently suggested was the provision of a rail halt at Knowle which some thought should be accompanied by an upgrading of the single line track. One suggestion was made for a ‘park and rail’ facility for commuters. A few also suggested extensions to the BRT route which was shown on the masterplanning maps. A couple suggested linking to the far west of the new community so existing Funtley residents could benefit from BRT and another suggested that it should link to a new rail halt at Knowle. One respondent thought it was important that the BRT linked to all of the employment areas shown on the maps.

A small number of requests were made for additional off-road cycling routes, including one that could link Fareham and Wickham via the disused railway line. Others simply sought more pedestrian and cycle links to be shown and one called for
more consideration of sustainable travel options in general, including residential travel plans.

**Specific areas within the new community site**
A range of comments were made about variations affecting different areas within the new community site. Some suggested that the Funtley buffer be extended fully around the eastern edge of the village. Others sought assurances that consideration would be made of the clay soils at Funtley and the need to maintain the water table to avoid subsidence. One respondent thought that Funtley should be more integrated with the new community.

There were a few contrasting comments about Knowle, with some seeking an increase in the buffer for the village by extending it into the Fareham side of the boundary. Others, however, called for the Knowle buffer to be better utilised for the benefit of both new and existing residents and one sought the full integration of Knowle with the new community. Only a few made suggestions in relation to Wickham. One of these was to avoid developing the area north of the Knowle Road to ensure the separate identity of Wickham was maintained. Another sought the removal of the residential area shown north of Haytesbury Farm.

Some suggestions were made in relation to Fareham Common. A couple of these were to use that area for residential development in order to relieve the pressure on Knowle buffer and on Wickham. One thought that a small portion of Fareham Common should be used to provide more homes.

Suggestions for the area east of the A32 included removing the housing area shown just south of Albany Farm. Another suggested replacing the residential area shown near Junction 10 with employment provision. Other suggestions included moving the primary school shown south of Charity Farm to the East of the A32 and using a portion of the area to the east of the A32 to provide for Gypsy and Traveller needs.

**Community facilities, open space and ‘green infrastructure’**
A wide range of comments were made about community and other facilities that were thought to be necessary. A number of respondents called for a community centre building to be shown with a couple of suggestions that this should be located within or next to the central park. Others suggested a need for community facilities in general although various specific uses were mentioned, such as a cultural centre, cinema and theatre. A few respondents commented on the need for health facilities, including a large GP surgery as well as a dentist practice and at least one pharmacy. Several suggestions were also made for the provision of places of worship at the heart of the new community.

A few respondents asked for sports facilities to be provided, including leisure centre space. A couple suggested that these sorts of community facilities should be co-located with one or more of the new schools. Two respondents asked for the provision of a centre for homeless young people which was considered to be an existing need within the Fareham area.

Comments relating to open space and ‘green infrastructure’ included suggestions for more open space to be shown, including sufficient green space for children to be
able to play and enough open space to absorb the overall recreational needs of the new community, which would help reduce the impact on protected European sites. Other suggestions included leaving the area between Knowle and Funtley free from development and used only for outdoor sports provision and a call for more ‘green routes’ to be shown. One respondent suggested the provision of an outdoor gym in the central park and another asked for a council-run 9-hole golf course.

Types of housing provision and design issues
Some suggestions related to the type of housing provision and the design of the new community. The most frequent suggestion was for the provision of warden-attended housing areas for the ‘active retired’ or ‘independent elderly’. Some detailed suggestions were included about how these should be designed, but the benefit most frequently suggested was the potential for older people in the Borough to move into these communities which would make a wide range of large family-sized housing available.

Other frequent suggestions related to the provision of sufficient parking spaces with some calling for at least two per home. One respondent however, called for restraint on parking to be considered. A few respondents referred to housing densities, generally to seek lower densities than those considered within the options and one of these suggestions was that 35 homes per hectare should be the maximum average density. Other suggestions included a priority for the provision of family homes and houses of a ‘traditional’ design and for the provision of flats to be kept to a minimum. Other respondents suggested that self-build plots should be considered and also that further consideration be made of gypsy and traveller provision within the new community.

Summary of Key points

Overall development and masterplan options:
- Many suggested that building homes in other locations should be further considered, including on Brownfield and vacant employment sites and as small extensions elsewhere in the Borough
- A number sought a combination of Masterplan Option 4 with the Junction 11 link road

Transport and access:
- A range of access variations were sought including onto Funtley Road as well as additional access points on to the A32
- Some called for provision of a rail halt at Knowle and others for an extension of BRT to the far west of the new community

Specific areas within the new community site:
- A range of suggestions made about Funtley buffer, generally to extend it further
- Contrasting comments about the Knowle buffer with some seeking its extension into Fareham Borough and others suggesting it should be better utilised or minimised to better integrate Knowle with the new community
- Some suggestions made to use all or part of Fareham Common for additional homes
- A range of suggestions for the area east of the A32, generally to avoid using this for housing, but focus on education or employment instead

Community facilities, open space and 'green infrastructure':
- Wide range of suggestions for new community facilities, and in particular a large central community building and a large GP Surgery and for places of worship
- Other suggestions for sports facilities which some though could be co-located with schools
- A number of requests for additional open space and for outdoor sports provision

Types of housing provision and design issues:
- Significant number of suggestions for warden-attended communities for the 'active elderly' which could free-up large homes in the Borough
- A number of requests for sufficient parking to be included
- Further requests for lower housing densities and a priority for family homes rather than flats
Green Infrastructure Strategy

Q10: Does this emerging strategy reflect the existing landscape character of the site and surrounding area?

Yes  222  
No  125  
No Reply  40  

Total Responses  387

Comments on whether the strategy reflects landscape character
A number of comments felt that the strategy makes a reasonable attempt to provide adequate green infrastructure (GI). Several responses felt that the strategy provides a reasonable level of GI and encourages informal as well as formal open space, and provides for good access to the countryside.

Whilst broadly supporting the GI strategy several respondents questioned whether it was ambitious enough. One suggested that a standard of 8 hectares of semi natural accessible open space per 1000 population should be adopted. The GI should be adequate to take the pressure off of all the nearby vulnerable sites of ecological interest.

Many thought that the strategy would help encourage wildlife. The potential to link north Fareham with the adjoining countryside was considered a benefit.

Reasons why the strategy does not reflect landscape character
Many respondents considered that the impact of a development of this scale would have such a fundamental impact on landscape character and that there would be insufficient open space left to make much difference.

There were concerns that the different areas were either insufficient or not in the right place, but no one put forward an alternative. Although one respondent expressed a preference for larger open spaces to the concept of corridors, and another felt that if the spaces were too small then they would attract rubbish and dog mess.

Some felt that the strategy is not linked to the need to provide habitat for specific species including skylarks, deer and hares. And the strategy has not been informed by a proper ecological study. There were also comments that the GI strategy would result in the loss of high quality agricultural land.

Winchester City Council felt that insufficient account has been taken to incorporate the landscape characterisation work previously undertaken, and that even at the strategic level, important landscape features should be identified. WCC would like to see the strategy explore ways of strengthening links to the surrounding countryside and improving the local footpath network.
Additional Comments
Several respondents found this a complicated question and did not feel that they had sufficient knowledge to comment. Concerns were expressed that the strategy is silent on when and how it would be delivered, and by whom. The need to ensure sufficient funding to manage the GI was highlighted.

HCC Countryside Service were concerned that the multi functional nature of GI was not stressed strongly enough in the strategy. The county is keen to work closely with FBC to provide access to the countryside and minimising the potential impacts on biodiversity.

Summary of Key Points
- A number commented on the importance of protecting areas like Portsdown Hill, Knowle and Funtley, but in many cases did not say whether they felt the strategy achieves this.
- Questions were raised as to whether the green corridors would be sufficient to encourage wildlife and that they should have sufficient width to be effective.
- There were also concerns that there would be sufficient space/buffers to deal with flood risk and surface water management. Surface water runoff into the Wallington must be avoided.
- Some respondents erroneously thought that the strategy would destroy/harm ancient woodland, whereas in fact it is to be retained and enhanced.
- One respondent questioned whether sufficient open space was being left between the motorway and the potential development area to mitigate noise impacts.
- One respondent questioned whether it was being proposed that employment would be built in a wetland corridor, and whether this would lead to flooding. Development in the flood plain should be avoided.
- The use of ‘evergreen’ trees to screen and buffer the development was suggested by one respondent.
- The role of private gardens to improve biodiversity, and prevent flooding was raised by one respondent.
- The development of the GI strategy should actively involve the Meon Valley Partnership.
- Green roofs should be considered to help link the different areas of GI with the developable areas, specially the employments areas.
- The importance of providing guidance on how to ensure the GI enhances biodiversity was highlighted by one respondent, who recommended the approach taken in Eater with the production of a SPD providing Residential Design Guidance.
**Energy**

**Q11: Which of the energy options would you like to see developed further and why?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Site Wide Energy Generation</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Individual Building Energy Generation</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses:*  635

*Several respondents selected multiple options.

**Comments on Option 1, Site Wide Energy Generation**

20% of respondents wanted to see the option for site wide energy generation developed further, and this represented the lowest level of support of all the energy options presented. According to the comments, the options that were chosen seem to have been heavily influenced by the type of energy technology that people would like to see at the new community, and this includes a strong reaction against wind turbines, which are associated with option 1.

It was mainly environmental factors that led respondents to select option 1 as they felt that a site wide approach was the best way to cut carbon emissions in the long term and this would help to meet the government’s targets. One respondent did however indicate that transmission losses through a heat network could affect the actual emissions.
It was recognised how difficult it is to retrofit a district energy system, so the opportunity to install one across the whole site during the construction phase of the development was identified as a significant benefit of option 1. Some respondents felt that the developers owed a site wide approach to the long term sustainability of the new community, despite the potential upfront cost. A few people suggested that if such a scheme was in place from initial occupation, that residents would be more likely to be supportive of it, especially as they would not be responsible for maintenance of energy generation kit like they would be in option 2.

A few respondents suggested option 1 provided the best opportunity to be an exemplar model for future schemes and that it would be easier to connect new developments up as they emerge. Several respondents stated that this type of approach works in other countries. A site wide network for distributing energy could initially be fuelled by natural gas, but in the future could be fuelled by more sustainable sources of energy. Respondents suggested biomass, waste incineration, geothermal, wind, and solar as sources of heat or power. A few respondents suggested a solar farm, and one person said that alongside the motorway would be a good location for this.

Some respondents were either wholly for or against particular technologies that could help to deliver a site wide energy approach. Biomass was generally supported because of the opportunity to enhance local supply chains and make it more sustainable. A few people were against biomass because its efficacy has yet to be proven and some opposed it because it would result in delivery vehicles needing to access the site causing traffic.

Wind energy was very unpopular among respondents and some people chose options 2 and 3 solely because they were against wind turbines being used as part of delivering a site wide energy scheme. The main reasons for opposing wind turbines were their visual impact on the landscape, their failure to produce energy efficiently, the noise that they emit, and long pay-back periods. By contrast, a small number of respondents would like to see wind power being generated in the local community.

Several respondents were in favour of a site wide energy generation strategy because it could be combined with the other two approaches – microgeneration or increasing energy efficiency of buildings. This would help to achieve further carbon reductions.

A number of reasons were put forward against site wide energy generation, the most frequent of which was that it could limit consumer choice for energy supply. Some respondents were concerned about the initial start-up and ongoing operational costs of such a scheme which could be passed onto the end users in their bills. A few people raised concerns about the risk of break-down of a site wide scheme. The landowners were very concerned about the delivery of a site wide scheme, particularly funding and phasing issues. One person was concerned that option 1 would lead to a high density development.
Finally, people thought that the energy solution should benefit the whole Borough, and not just new community, and option 1 has the potential to do this.

Comments on Option 2, Individual Building Energy Generation
Generating energy at individual building scale was supported by 26% of responses, which is 6% more than the site wide approach. Quite a few people stressed that they had chosen option 2 because it provides more control, choice and flexibility for residents than option 1. In particular, they were opposed to wind turbines and a lack of consumer choice about energy supplier. Many respondents strongly felt that being able to choose their energy supplier was important and option 2 allows this whereas option 1 may not. They also supported option 2 because it promotes a degree of self-sufficiency from the energy companies, and did not want to be beholden to any further steep price rises.

Although a few people were against the use of solar panels on site because of their visual impact, the majority of respondents showed support for solar panels accepting that they are becoming the norm, and technology is enabling them to become less conspicuous. Many respondents said that they are easy to maintain, and support them because residents benefit directly from the energy they generate through cheaper fuel bills. Several people suggested widespread use of solar PV and solar thermals on the site in order to capitalise on the site’s south facing slope and any forthcoming subsidies.

Contrastingly some people were opposed to an individual building approach because the technologies tend to have a shorter lifespan and can be more expensive to maintain, with that cost landing on residents. Additionally, residents may choose not to make the most of their energy output and this will make the new community less sustainable; whereas with a site wide approach, all residents would make use of sustainably generated energy.

The landowners were in favour of an individual building approach to energy generation where possible, and preferred it to a site-wide approach because it allows flexibility in the build programme and does not require such significant upfront cost.

Comments on Option 3, Energy Efficiency
The majority of respondents felt that high levels of energy efficiency should be the starting point for new build developments in order to reduce energy consumption before any options for energy generation are considered. A few people suggested that there should be minimum standards for building fabric, and indeed these are being brought in nationally. Several respondents were in favour of setting Passivhaus standards to be achieved at the new community.

Energy efficient construction will last the lifetime of the building, does not require a lot of maintenance, results in lower heat and power bills for occupiers, and could reduce dependency on energy companies. All of this contributes towards a more sustainable energy solution for the new community.

A few people supported option 3 because they thought that low carbon energy should be generated off-site. This option was considered to be more credible and
viable than the alternatives. Furthermore, people thought that this option would generate less traffic than other options.

Some people thought that the disadvantage of not being able to adapt or extend a home was very serious and must be overcome, whereas others felt that if the houses were designed to an adequate size in the first place, they would not need to be adapted or extended.

A minority were opposed to energy efficiency measures because it could negatively impact on the architecture of the new community, perceived health issues of living in a very air-tight home, and the problem of summer overheating.

**Reasons for choosing multiple options or none**
Several respondents ticked multiple options in response to question 11 indicating that there is support for both energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation. Many people said that all three options should be investigated further, and an equal number of people said that a combination of options 2 and 3 should be taken forward for further investigation. Only a handful of respondents suggested other combinations, which corresponds with option 1 being the least popular approach. Some respondents suggested that certain energy technologies would be best used for in certain circumstances. For example site wide energy is better for flats but housing would benefit more from individual building and efficiency approaches. Overall, a large number of respondents thought that a combination of these three energy approaches would provide the optimal solution for the new community.

19% of respondents did not choose any of the options and the main reason for this was that people felt unable to answer the question at this stage due to a lack of knowledge and understanding about energy issues. A few respondents expressed concern about a lack of evidence upon which to base their choice, particularly with regard to the cost of energy in the different options to end users and also where the energy infrastructure (for example wind turbines or a CHP plant) would be located on site. Some people did not respond because they do not support the principle of development.

**Additional Comments**
A number of other comments that broadly relate to energy provision at the new community were made in response to this question.
- Some people were cynical about the effects of these sustainability measures.
- A couple of respondents felt it was not worthwhile to tackle climate change issues at the new community because the results would be insignificant in relation to the carbon emissions from other countries.
- One respondent stated that local communities should do their best to reduce energy consumption, but that the generation of low carbon energy should be dealt with on a national scale.
- Another respondent echoed this and suggested nuclear energy was the only green solution.
- One point that was repeatedly made was that the installation costs for any of the options are significantly reduced if done during construction, rather than afterwards. Some respondents said that energy and materials used in the
construction process should meet high standards, and that there should be a policy to keep construction waste to a minimum.

- A few respondents said that energy consumption needs to be measured in a more customer friendly way at the new community to encourage greater energy efficiency.
- The landowners both agreed it was too early to commit to one of the three options because energy policy is changing. They suggested a phase-by-phase approach to dealing with energy. They also referred to evidence that house buyers will not pay more for high energy performance standards in their homes.

Summary of Key Points

- Energy efficiency was the most popular option and should be the starting point for the development because it will last the lifetime of the home.
- Many respondents thought the optimum energy solution should include a variety of two, or even all three options.
- Many respondents were against wind turbine development at the new community as it would have a detrimental impact on the landscape.
- There was support for having sustainable energy measures installed in the development from the beginning so that residents would know what they are buying into.
- There is a desire for the new community to be exemplar in its use and generation of energy.
- Lack of consumer choice about energy supplier was considered a serious problem and led some people to reject a site wide energy approach.
- Individual building generation was supported by some because it provides a degree of energy self-sufficiency from the energy suppliers
- There was general acceptance of solar panels and several respondents thought they should be widely used in the new community to capitalise on its south facing slope.
- The problem of not being able to extend or adapt the home easily if it is very energy efficient would be a serious barrier for some people.
Water

Q12: Which of the three options for saving and re-using water would you prefer to see at the new community?

Option 1: Rainwater Harvesting  309
Option 2: Grey Water Recycling  176
Option 3: Black Water Recycling   66
No reply:  112
Total responses:*   663
*Several respondents selected multiple options.

Comments on Option 1, Rainwater Harvesting
Rainwater harvesting was the most popular choice for re-using water with nearly half of the respondents supporting the idea, giving a wide range of reasons. The majority of people in favour of rainwater harvesting preferred it to other forms of water re-use because the technology is easy to use and effective with low maintenance requirements and costs to residents. Other benefits to the homeowners are lower water bills and greater levels of householder control than grey or black water recycling. It is has been widely accepted and is trusted to work.

The environmental benefits of rainwater harvesting were also cited as reasons for preferring this form of water re-use to others. Rainwater harvesting was considered by many people to be sustainable because rainwater is available so it is just making use of a naturally available resource. Harvesting rainwater can also help to prevent flooding as it collects run-off which would otherwise enter the watercourse. It was considered to be more sustainable than grey or black water recycling because the water requires less processing and it would not emit odours like black water.
recycling. Some people also thought that it would encourage greater awareness of sustainable water usage.

A large number of respondents indicated that rainwater harvesting systems are affordable to install so are likely to be viable for the developer. Several people said rainwater storage tanks can be buried in gardens to save space. A couple of people suggested back up was needed and one person suggested investigating the potential for rainwater harvesting at commercial scale.

**Comments on Option 2, Grey Water Recycling**
Around one quarter of respondents would prefer to see grey water recycling systems installed at the new community, but it should be noted that a number of these respondents selected a grey water system as part of a combination of water re-use measures, particularly alongside rainwater harvesting which many people supported. There were a range of reasons for preferring grey water recycling including that it is a forward-thinking and efficient way to re-use water, it could be a good balance between cost and water savings, and if installed during construction of the development, residents would automatically be re-using water without having to collect rainwater. Some people preferred grey water to black water because black water requires dual supply and could be too complex and expensive to install. Others preferred grey water to rainwater harvesting because the rainfall supply is unreliable and it requires large storage space. One person was opposed to grey water recycling because they perceived this type of water re-use to be a health risk.

**Comments on Option 3, Black Water Recycling**
Black water recycling was the least popular form of water re-use with only 10% of respondents selecting it. Those that did prefer it did so because it re-uses all water and is sustainable in the long term despite the cost of installation and infrastructure. A water company responded saying that the costs may not be as high as perceived and it could result in lower charges to customers. One respondent felt that using potable water for cleaning was wasteful so supported dual supply. A few people supported black water recycling over the other options because it is not the homeowner’s responsibility to maintain it.

**Reasons for choosing multiple options or none**
Quite a lot of respondents said they would prefer all three types of water re-use at the new community because it would help to recycle as much water as possible and would be most sustainable. Some respondents felt that a combination of all three could be feasible across different forms of development, depending on the cost. Many who wanted to see either grey or black water recycling on site, also felt that rainwater recycling should be standard in new developments as it is relatively low cost.

Some people preferred a combination of just rain water and grey water recycling because they were against black water recycling as they wanted more independence from the water companies and less energy to be used in processing water. The space needed to store rainwater was also a reason for preferring a combined approach. The combination of grey and rain water recycling also means that
homeowners have more personal responsibility for water consumption and re-use which was seen as a positive.

Some people did not pick any of the options for water reduction and re-use because they either did not support the principle of development at all, they felt there was not enough information available to inform their choice, or they thought it was too early in the process to make that decision. Many people suggested that there should not be any development as this is an area of serious water stress, a problem which the development will exacerbate. Some respondents felt that the best water solution would depend on which masterplan option was taken forward.

**Additional Comments**

A couple of respondents said that any excess surface water should flow into sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and that this would contribute towards enhancing biodiversity on site.

However one respondent pointed out that the development lies within a Source Protection Zone of a chalk aquifer so SUDS design will need to prevent any possible ground water contamination, and the cost of this could be prohibitive.

One respondent stated that the quantity and quality of water leaving the site should not exacerbate nutrient levels in the Solent European sites.

One person suggested that reducing the density of development on site would create less non-permeable spaces making rainwater collection more difficult, but it would reduce flood risk. Several respondents raised concerns about flooding, and one sought for the Council to plan to mitigate the potential increased flood risk brought about by climate change. One person suggested a large soakaway to the north of Fareham.

One respondent said that the Council should use the scale of the new community to try to roll out measures to encourage water efficiency and water re-use to other parts of the Borough. Another respondent suggested that an education programme would help to raise awareness of water usage and the importance of water recycling. Quite a few respondents were keen to ensure that the new properties all have water meters to discourage wasteful use of water.

One of the landowners said that the water demands of the development will be met firstly by reducing consumption by installing water efficient fittings to meet requirements of Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM standards. However a couple of respondents said that homeowners are likely to replace water efficient fixtures and fittings so water re-use options should be explored seriously to ensure long term water sustainability. Some people were concerned about the cost of water efficiency and water re-use measures to the developer and/or the cost to the occupier.

A few respondents raised concerns about how infrastructure would be upgraded to ensure all of the development’s sewage would be treated.

Two respondents suggested desalination should be investigated.
Summary of Key Points

- Rainwater was the preferred measure of water re-use because it is easy to use and cost effective. Many people have already adopted this approach to recycling water.
- Grey water recycling had a reasonable amount of support because it is reliable and seen as a further step towards sustainability from rainwater harvesting.
- Blackwater recycling had a very low level of support due to the sceptism that it would work effectively and perceived risks about dual supply and odour. The main reason for supporting it was lower water bills and no maintenance responsibility for homeowners.
- Quite a few respondents favoured an optimum sustainability solution combining all three types of water re-use.
- There was a great deal of support for water efficiency in the home, but concern that fixtures and fittings could be replaced by future residents.
- Alleviating any flood risk was a priority for many respondents.
4.0 Next steps

Informal consultations, including responses to public surveys, such as those detailed above are extremely valuable to the Council in helping to understand the views of the local community and other interested parties. The Comments received during the July 2012 Options Consultation were wide-ranging and insightful. They will be used to help inform the preparation of a concept masterplan for the new community, including a 'preferred option' for how the development will be built out. The responses will also inform the preparation of the planning policies being prepared as part of the first draft of the Area Action Plan.

The first draft of the Area Action Plan will be published for public consultation in early 2013. Details about how people can get involved at this stage and comment on the draft AAP will be available on the Council's website. Following this consultation, we will take into account what the local community and others tell us about the first draft of the plan to produce a second draft, called a ‘Pre Submission Draft’. There will be a further opportunity to make representations on this second draft later in 2013.

The second draft Area Action Plan will then be considered at an ‘examination in public’ by an independent government inspector, in 2014. Finally, after the Council has taken account of any changes recommended by the inspector, the Area Action Plan is likely to be adopted by the Council later in 2014.