

Salisbury Vision

Proud of our past . . . forging our future

Report to: Salisbury Vision steering group

Title: Salisbury Vision – Public Consultation July – October 2007

Date: 13 February 2008

Author: Graham Gould

1 Background and introduction

In April 2007 the council received the final report (Vision for Salisbury: Area Development Framework) from the consultants employed to develop the Salisbury Vision. During June this final report was presented to all four Area Committees and Overview and Scrutiny Panels. In July Cabinet approved proposals for a combined public consultation exercise, entitled 'Our Place in the Future', on the consultants Salisbury Vision document, the LDF Core Strategy Issues and Options and the Community Plan key priorities.

This consultation exercise was managed by a team from the Forward Planning and Transportation unit in conjunction with the council's officer responsible for consultation. The consultation period was for 10 weeks, from 26 July to 5 October.

2 Survey methodology

Three separate surveys were carried out.

	Responses received
Our Place survey	704
Household survey	5,325
Yeahbut website (young people)	102

In the Our Place survey respondents were asked to indicate their support for a series of statements on a five-point scale: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree. In the Household and Yeahbut surveys respondents were simply asked to indicate their support for a series of statements by ticking a box.

Each statement related to a specific project in the consultants final document. It should be noted, however, that respondents were not specifically asked for their views on every aspect of the document's 24 projects. Additionally, due to questionnaire space limitations, the wording of the statements varied slightly between the Our Place and Household/Yeahbut surveys.

Further information on each survey including details of the methodologies used is available in the document 'Salisbury & South Wiltshire Our place in the future: Consultation Methodology and output report' produced by the Forward Planning and Transportation unit.

3 Consultation results

Our Place survey

The results of the Our Place survey show a very high level of support for the overall Salisbury Vision project. 79.5% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that 'the overall aims set out in the Salisbury Vision should be supported'. Just 5.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Additionally the majority of respondents to the Our Place survey agreed with each of the 14 statements relating to specific Salisbury Vision proposals or projects. These headline results together with those for the Household and Yeahbut surveys are shown in appendix 1.

The level of support expressed in the Our Place survey, for individual Salisbury Vision projects ranged from 44.0% to 81.0%. Four of the 14 projects were supported by 80%+ of the respondents,

four projects by 70%+ and a further four projects by 60%+. The remaining two projects (the redevelopment of the bus depot site for a new Salisbury College and the redevelopment of Salt Lane and Brown Street car parks for residential use) received support from 44.0% and 49.1% of respondents respectively. Some 25.7% and 27.5% of respondents disagreed with these two projects.

The Our Place survey also gave respondents an opportunity to provide additional comments on the overall aims of the Salisbury Vision and on each of the three strategies.

	No. of comments received
Salisbury Vision overall aims	176
Public Realm strategy	281
Development strategy	261
Transport and Movement strategy	343

There is little consistency in the comments received, with just three being made by more than 10% of the respondents providing comments. A full analysis of these results is provided in appendix 2.

Most popular additional comments	Comments received as a percentage of:	
	Total comments	Total responses
Removing parking will be bad for the economy of the city. There is a need to retain car parking for evening and night visitors and for residents – park and ride is not the answer. The central car park redevelopment should retain parking. Do not rely on public transport	17.0%	6.4%
The objectives of the Vision are important and it is important to have a bold Vision.	15.3%	3.8%
There is a need to retain, maintain and exploit the city’s historical past, character and distinctiveness. This is not ‘anytown’ UK	11.9%	3.0%

Household and Yeahbut surveys

Respondents to these surveys were not asked to indicate their support for the overall aims of the Salisbury Vision and so a comparison with the Our Place survey is not possible. The level of support expressed in these two surveys for individual Salisbury Vision projects ranged from 20.9% to 70.2% for the Household survey and from 36.3% to 74.5% for the Yeahbut survey. In the Household survey 5 of the 16 projects received support from over 50% of respondents whilst in the Yeahbut survey 8 projects received this level of support. It is not possible to determine the scale of any lack of support for specific projects. These detailed results together with those for the Our Place survey are shown in appendix 3.

4. Conclusion

The results of the Our Place survey show a high level of support for the aims of the Salisbury Vision and for each of the specific project related statements included in the questionnaire. There is particularly strong support for the public realm proposals. The results of the Household and Yeahbut surveys show a lower level of support for the specific Salisbury Vision statements.

There are some discrepancies in the results, particularly between the Our Place survey and the Household/Yeahbut surveys. It is possible that the difference in the results is largely due to the differences in the questionnaires used. Because of the simplicity of the questionnaire used for the Household and Yeahbut surveys it was not possible to provide any background information on the Vision or on the context of each statement within the overall Vision project. In contrast, the more

detailed Our Place in the Future questionnaire was supported by seven pages of background information and explanation. Thus, respondents to the Our Place survey would have had a better understanding of the overall aims of the Salisbury Vision and of the relationship between the individual projects.

There is also a noticeable difference between the results of the Household and Yeahbut surveys. This is likely to be due to the difference between the respondents. The Household survey, as its name suggests, was mailed direct to householders in the district while the Yeahbut survey was web-based and targeted specifically at young people. A difference in the results (for example the Yeahbut survey showed support of 55.9% for the proposal to relocate Salisbury College to a city centre site whereas the Household survey showed support of only 26.4%) would, therefore be expected.

5. Additional comment

The consultation exercise was not designed to act as a referendum or a project popularity contest. While the views received must be very strongly considered there are other issues that the Salisbury Vision steering group will also need to take into account before approving the final Salisbury Vision document.

For example, there are interdependencies between certain projects. The Salisbury Vision has been designed to be as self-financing as possible with its success, to a certain extent, relying on a particular sequence of project delivery where early projects finance others which may have no commercial value of their own. An example of this would be the re-investment of some of the capital receipts raised through the redevelopment of the Maltings and central car park into the delivery of public realm improvement projects. To deliver those projects most wanted by residents, such as improvements to the public realm, it will be necessary to deliver some projects which have a lower level of public support. From the outset it has always been stressed that the Salisbury Vision should be viewed as a single entity which is made up of a series of sub-projects.

The Salisbury Vision document produced by the consultants, and the subject of the public consultation exercise, was itself developed as a result of extensive public involvement and consultation. There is, then, a strong evidence base showing why specific projects were included in the final document

Salisbury District Council is committed to developing a Vision for Salisbury that will bring real improvements to the city, to the economy of south Wiltshire and to the wellbeing of its residents. The council recognises that this can only be achieved through the delivery of a long-term programme of interrelated and wide-ranging projects. Many of these projects will be complex and will require a significant amount of investment in terms of officer time and financial resources by the district council, county council, new Wiltshire unitary council and others if they are to be successful. As each Vision project is brought forward for implementation it will, therefore, be essential that we carry out additional detailed consultation. This will provide us with the opportunity to further evidence the need for each project and it will also allow us to compare and validate the results of the consultation carried out in 2007.

The consultation results show particularly strong support for the public realm proposals contained in the Salisbury Vision. To help deliver these in a consistent way it is considered that the development of a public realm strategy is a priority.

Policy D6 of the Salisbury District Local Plan limits the height of any new buildings in the Salisbury central area to 12.2 metres (the 40 foot rule). This policy, together with all of the other existing planning policies is being reviewed as part of the development of the LDF. A key part of the Vision is the redevelopment of important sites in the city centre and it is possible that the 40 foot rule will impact on the feasibility of some of the schemes that may come forward. It is, therefore, considered that the Salisbury Vision should support the review of the 40 foot rule and the possible development of a Tall Buildings Policy as suggested in the consultants document.

Project 22 in the consultants Vision document proposes that a new park is established adjacent to the Millstream and the River Avon. Due to its proximity to the central car park and because of the importance of this area within the Maltings and central car park development it is considered that this proposal is removed as a separate project and that it is included within the Maltings and central car park redevelopment project.

Project 23 in the consultants Vision document proposes that an art park is created in the Greencroft Gardens. From comments received it is suggested that city would benefit from more public art but that it would be more beneficial if it were dispersed throughout the city rather than being concentrated in one location. It is considered that this is best achieved through an overall public realm strategy.

6. Recommendations

Based on the above it is considered that the Salisbury Vision will make a significant contribution towards ensuring that the city develops in a number of areas - transport, retail, economy, tourism, leisure, culture, environment - for the benefit of all of its residents. It is, therefore, recommended that the 24 projects contained in the consultants Vision document, and as included in the Our Place in the Future consultation, are incorporated into the final Salisbury Vision document to be placed before the Salisbury District Council Cabinet for approval, subject to the following changes.

- a) Add two new projects – the development of a Public Realm Strategy and the review of the current 40 foot rule.
- b) Remove the consultants' project 22, Confluence Park, and include in the project to redevelop the Maltings and central car park area.
- c) Remove the consultants' project 23, Park Art, and include within the new project to develop a Public Realm Strategy.

Salisbury Vision consultation July October 2007 headline results

Appendix 1

	Household / Yeahbut surveys Statement	Household Survey	Yeahbut survey	Our Place Survey	Our Place survey Statement
1	The creation of new public transport interchange at the railway station for buses, trains and taxis	X	X	X	The Vision proposes the development of a new station interchange, bringing together all public transport in the city
2	Redesigning the A36 Southampton Road	X		X	The Vision proposes the remodelling of the Southampton Road with new residential development, a dual carriageway and relocation of the college
3	Making the city centre more pedestrian friendly	=	X	X	The Vision proposes to extend pedestrianisation of the city centre
4	Redevelopment of the central car park and Maltings for new shops, housing and a car park		X	X	The Vision proposes new shopping development on the central car park with a new park between the watercourses, new square onto Fisherton Street plus a range of shops, homes and leisure opportunities
5	Redevelopment of the bus depot site in Castle Street for a new Salisbury College		X	X	The Vision proposes moving Salisbury College to a new site inside the ring road
6	Redevelopment of the eastern approach and the Friary Estate in consultation with the local residents			X	The Vision proposes the redevelopment of the Friary housing estate in consultation with residents
7	Redevelopment of Churchfields Industrial Estate			X	The Vision proposes the redevelopment of Churchfields Industrial Estate with a mix of residential-led purposes and finding better sites for the existing businesses
8	Redevelopment of Salt Lane and Brown Street for residential use			X	The Vision proposes the redevelopment of some key city locations such as Salt Lane and Brown Street car parks
9	Improvement of the Market Place as a central place for pedestrians	X	X	X	The Vision proposes the enhancement of the Market Square into a high quality public space, which is a major focus for the city and an area for meetings, markets and events
10	The provision of a new Fisherton Square linking Fisherton Street with the rest of the City and arts venues			X	The Vision proposes a major investment in the public areas of the city, such as the Market Square, Chequers, Market Walk and Cheese Market, as well as the creation of new high quality public spaces such as Fisherton Square and Confluence Park

	Household / Yeahbut surveys Statement	Household Survey	Yeahbut survey	Our Place Survey	Our Place survey Statement
11	Enhancing the street scene in the chequers			X	The Vision proposes that the public areas of our city could be upgraded through the implementation of high quality new seats, signs, lighting, surface treatments
12	The development of a Harnham eco-park enhancing access to and understanding of the water meadows		X	X	The Vision proposes the 'greening' of the city through projects such as the planting of a green necklace around the ring road, upgrading our existing parks, enhancing the water meadows as a visitor and educational attraction and the development of a new park between the watercourses on the central car park
13	The creation of a green 'necklace' of trees around the City centre and the ring road	X	X	X	The Vision proposes the 'greening' of the city through projects such as the planting of a green necklace around the ring road, upgrading our existing parks, enhancing the water meadows as a visitor and educational attraction and the development of a new park between the watercourses on the central car park
14	The provision of a new park in the heart of the City adjacent to the Millstream and River Avon			N/A	
15	Redevelopment of the bus station site		X	N/A	
16	Refurbishment and increased use of the Guildhall			N/A	
17		N/A	N/A	X	The Vision proposes the removal of traffic from the historic city centre

X = More than 50% of respondents support the proposal
= = 50% of respondents support the proposal
N/A = Question not asked

Salisbury Vision consultation July October 2007
Results of open questions – Our Place survey

Appendix 2

Vision Objectives Comment	No. of responses	Percentage of total comments (176)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Objectives are important/important to have bold Vision/agree	27	15.3	3.8
Need to retain, maintain and exploit historical past/feel of city/distinctiveness/character - not 'anytown' UK	21	11.9	3.0
Agree with parts of Vision	13	7.4	1.8
More consultation/detail/must recognise consultation	9	5.1	1.3
To much emphasis on developers/making money for developers/will increase property prices to cover costs/housing too expensive	8	4.5	1.1
Requirements of car users must be taken into account/ adequate parking retained	7	4	1.0
Can it be implemented?/will?/funding?/cost?	7	4	1.0
Support majority of Vision	4	2.3	0.6
Parish, Market town and community strategic plans need same weight/to be recognised	3	1.7	0.4
Too much interference/changes are short-lived	3	1.7	0.4
Doesn't go far enough	3	1.7	0.4
Decisions should not be subject to political whim/cost-political?/LGR	3	1.7	0.4
Expensive/unnecessary	3	1.7	0.4
No development in Alderbury, not suburb of Salisbury	3	1.7	0.4
College – move to depot not good idea/use area for housing/very expensive/no need	3	1.7	0.4
Miscellaneous*	59	33.5	8.4
TOTAL	176		

Salisbury Vision consultation July October 2007
Results of open questions – Our Place survey

Public Realm strategy Comment	No of Responses	Percentage of total comments (281)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Concerned about losing medieval quality and appeal of Salisbury – development should keep with the character of the city – Don't want another new town!	25	8.9%	3.6%
Public Spaces proposals supported – it will improve the city centre	13	4.6%	1.8%
Opposed to the Water Meadows proposal – leave it alone	8	2.8%	1.1%
Support the greening of the city at all/most of locations	8	2.8%	1.1%
Need more information	8	2.8%	1.1%
Support the removal of car parking from the Market Place	7	2.5%	1.0%
Need Central Car Park / don't want to lose city centre parking	7	2.5%	1.0%
Costs / How will it be paid for? Need more information on the effect development would have on council tax	7	2.5%	1.0%
Agree with enhancement of Market Square	7	2.5%	1.0%
5 tick boxes does not cover all the options / too much information contained in section / problems with the questionnaire	6	2.1%	0.85%
Idea of cultural quarter / Fisherton Square is good / supported in principle	5	1.8%	0.71%
Market Square should have a water feature	5	1.8%	0.71%
Salisbury already has enough green spaces / disagree with greening the city / green necklace	5	1.8%	0.71%

Public Realm strategy Comment	No. of responses	Percentage of total comments (281)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Enhancement of water meadows should not just include Harnham / need to manage Laverstock water meadows as well	5	1.8%	0.71%
Better police presence required / need to design out crime	5	1.8%	0.71%
Cleaner and better maintained streets	5	1.8%	0.71%
Disagree with some elements of the Market Square proposals	4	1.4%	0.57%
Support pedestrianisation of Market Place	4	1.4%	0.57%
More consultation needed	4	1.4%	0.57%
Do not agree with creating distinct character areas in city centre	4	1.4%	0.57%
Market Square is fine as it is / disagree with Market Square works	4	1.4%	0.57%
Street furniture will have to be vandal proof / need to address vandalism	4	1.4%	0.57%
Support Harnham Eco-Park	3	1.1%	0.43%
Parks and gardens hardly attended now so how will enlarged areas be dealt with / Local authorities have a poor record with maintaining anything	3	1.1%	0.43%
Agree in principle with Eco-Park but need to protect water meadows - too much visitation could cause damage / care has to be taken to not over commercialise	3	1.1%	0.43%
Not sure how practical / realistic the proposals are	3	1.1%	0.43%
Encourage the development / expansion on the Salisbury Markets	3	1.1%	0.43%

Public Realm strategy Comment	No. of responses	Percentage of total comments (281)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Proposals just about Salisbury – need to consider wider SW area / should not be at cost to the rest of the district	3	1.1%	0.43%
Need to avoid flood risks at water meadows – provide hard landscaping and drainage systems	3	1.1%	0.43%
Must have a sensitive design – not too much glass, concrete and green lighting	3	1.1%	0.43%
Miscellaneous*	107	38.1%	15.2%
TOTAL	281		

**Salisbury Vision consultation July October 2007
Results of open questions – Our Place survey**

Development strategy Comment	No. of responses	Percentage of total comments (264)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Removing parking will kill city centre/need to retain/replace parking – evening/night visitors/residents park and ride not the answer. Needs more thought. Use of car is inevitable and should be included in plans not removed completely. CCP development must have parking. Don't rely on public transport.	45	17.0	6.4
Need to know where businesses from Churchfields will go	12	4.5	1.7
Unsure of benefits of moving college to new site/don't move college/not convinced gains outweigh cost of losing bus station/why?	12	4.5	1.7
Churchfields – much needed, good location for hotels/conf centre/housing/offices/sports facilities	11	4.2	1.6
Commendable/agree/parts are in desperate of redevelopment	10	3.8	1.4
Agree with/agree with principle of development on Central Car Park	9	3.4	1.3
Proposals need more detail to allow comment	6	2.3	0.9
College inside ring road is an excellent idea/support relocation/depot good idea	5	1.9	0.7

Development strategy Comment	No. of responses	Percentage of total comments (264)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Not a priority – council to concentrate on key tasks/what is the issue?/unnecessary	5	1.9	0.7
Churchfields with improved access could be a better site for college/nearer to transport hub	4	1.5	0.6
Road/cycle/bus links from Churchfields need improvement	4	1.5	0.6
Need Churchfields relief road/explore other option for link road (previously rejected)	4	1.5	0.6
Salt Lane/Brown St car park – needed for Bourne Hill, Salvation army, Methodist Church, Arts Centre, Catherine St, elderly	4	1.5	0.6
Small retailers are an important part of the mix in Salisbury/protect niche shops who can't afford new high rents	4	1.5	0.6
Where will money come from? Council tax?	4	1.5	0.6
Shortfall – lack of respected tertiary education facility/university – need campus to provide 21 st C facilities	4	1.5	0.6
Development (CCP) should depend on quality and aesthetic components of design/buildings should be in keeping (traditional style)	3	1.1	0.4
Salt Lane good idea/but still need parking	3	1.1	0.4
Friary – development depends on how residents view what new redevelopment offers. Consultation must be exercised. Biased and interested politics and media will frighten vulnerable tenants from even the most enlightened schemes.	3	1.1	0.4
Fisherton St is one of Salisbury's attractions – proposed square should not destroy specialist shops or increasing rents destroy commercial viability. Small businesses add character	3	1.1	0.4
Needs careful consultation and planning/must be genuine consultation	3	1.1	0.4
Miscellaneous*	117	44.3	16.6
TOTAL	264		

Salisbury Vision consultation July October 2007
Results of open questions – Our Place survey

Transport and Movement strategy Comment	No of Responses	Percentage of total comments (343)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Disagree with relocating the college / unnecessary	30	8.7%	4.3%
Agree with dualling / widening of Southampton Road / road improvements	28	8.2%	4.0%
Want Salisbury / A36 bypass	14	4.1%	2.0%
Too far from city centre to be major transport hub / need bus station to be close to city centre	13	3.8%	1.8%
Agree with remodelling of Southampton Road	12	3.5%	1.7%
Do not believe in anymore pedestrianisation/Disagree with removing cars from city centre / should be more car friendly / need access to city centre without relying on P&R	11	3.2%	1.6%
Need more information	11	3.2%	1.6%
Removal of traffic from centre will bar elderly and disabled / remember those who can't walk far	9	2.6%	1.3%
Supports pedestrianisation	9	2.6%	1.3%
Disagree with new residential at Southampton Road	8	2.3%	1.1%
Support the development of a transport interchange	7	2.0%	1.0%
Costs? How will it be funded?	6	1.7%	0.85%
Strongly encourage more public transport alternatives to the car / need improved bus services	6	1.7%	0.85%
Station interchange should provide shuttle service to city centre / need link between centre and interchange	6	1.7%	0.85%
To achieve aims a major change for Salisbury and south Wiltshire's transport systems is needed / Without improving transport rest of Vision will struggle / Transport must come first	5	1.5%	0.71%

Transport and Movement strategy Comment	No of Responses	Percentage of total comments (343)	Percentage of overall responses to the consultation (704)
Problems of a residential development next to dual carriageway / main route into the city?	5	1.5%	0.71%
Need to retain some parking in city centre / near transport interchange	5	1.5%	0.71%
Southampton Road is flood area	5	1.5%	0.71%
A36 Park & Ride should be situated at Whaddon / further than Petersfinger	4	1.2%	0.57%
If traffic removed from centre it would adversely effect shops / businesses	4	1.2%	0.57%
opening up north side of station to passengers	4	1.2%	0.57%
Agrees with removal of traffic from city centre	3	0.87%	0.43%
Extension of residential to Alderbury is not supported / keep Alderbury separate from Salisbury	3	0.87%	0.43%
Protect historic heritage /don't destroy old buildings / celebrate uniqueness of city	3	0.87%	0.43%
Southampton Road should never have been made into this mess in first place	3	0.87%	0.43%
Where will college go?	3	0.87%	0.43%
Miscellaneous*	126	36.7%	17.9%
TOTAL	343		

* Miscellaneous are other comments made by not more than two people

Salisbury Vision consultation July October 2007 detailed results

Appendix 3

	Statement	Household Survey (base 5,325)		Yeahbut survey (base 102)		Our Place Survey (base 374 – 395)		
		No reply	Support	No reply	Support	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree	Statement
1	The creation of new public transport interchange at the railway station for buses, trains and taxis	38.8%	61.2%	25.5%	74.5%	80.5%	9.4%	The Vision proposes the development of a new station interchange, bringing together all public transport in the city
2	Redesigning the A36 Southampton Road	29.8%	70.2%	52.9%	47.1%	67.3%	17.8%	The Vision proposes the remodelling of the Southampton Road with new residential development, a dual carriageway and relocation of the college
3	Making the city centre more pedestrian friendly	50.0%	50.0%	28.4%	71.6%	73.4%	13.9%	The Vision proposes to extend pedestrianisation of the city centre
4	Redevelopment of the central car park and Maltings for new shops, housing and a car park	63.8%	36.2%	36.3%	63.7%	60.2%	20.4%	The Vision proposes new shopping development on the central car park with a new park between the watercourses, new square onto Fisherton Street plus a range of shops, homes and leisure opportunities
5	Redevelopment of the bus depot site in Castle Street for a new Salisbury College	73.6%	26.4%	44.1%	55.9%	44.0%	25.7%	The Vision proposes moving Salisbury College to a new site inside the ring road
6	Redevelopment of the eastern approach and the Friary Estate in consultation with the local residents	72.1%	27.9%	53.9%	46.1%	64.1%	4.0%	The Vision proposes the redevelopment of the Friary housing estate in consultation with residents

	Statement	Household Survey (base 5,325)		Yeahbut Survey (base 102)		Our Place Survey (base 374 – 395)		
		No Reply	Support	No reply	Support	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree	Statement
7	Redevelopment of Churchfields Industrial Estate	52.9%	47.1%	63.7%	36.3%	74.2%	9.3%	The Vision proposes the redevelopment of Churchfields Industrial Estate with a mix of residential-led purposes and finding better sites for the existing businesses
8	Redevelopment of Salt Lane and Brown Street for residential use	76.0%	24.0%	54.9%	45.1%	49.1%	27.5%	The Vision proposes the redevelopment of some key city locations such as Slat Lane and Brown Street car parks
9	Improvement of the Market Place as a central place for pedestrians	48.3%	51.7%	41.2%	58.8%	81%	9.6%	The Vision proposes the enhancement of the Market Square into a high quality public space, which is a major focus for the city and an area for meetings, markets and events
10	The provision of a new Fisherton Square linking Fisherton Street with the rest of the City and arts venues	62.0%	38.0%	56.9%	43.1%	72.2%	12.3%	The Vision proposes a major investment in the public areas of the city, such as the Market Square, Chequers, Market Walk and Cheese Market, as well as the creation of new high quality public spaces such as Fisherton Square and Confluence Park
11	Enhancing the street scene in the chequers	79.1%	20.9%	57.8%	42.2%	77.2%	7.8%	The Vision proposes that the public areas of our city could be upgraded through the implementation of high quality new seats, signs, lighting, surface treatments

	Statement	Household Survey (base 5,325)		Yeahbut Survey (base 102)		Our Place Survey (base 374 – 395)		
		No reply	Support	No reply	Support	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree	Statement
12	The development of a Harnham eco-park enhancing access to and understanding of the water meadows	58.7%	41.3%	49.0%	51.0%	80.3%	7.8%	The Vision proposes the 'greening' of the city through projects such as the planting of a green necklace around the ring road, upgrading our existing parks, enhancing the water meadows as a visitor and educational attraction and the development of a new park between the watercourses on the central car park
13	The creation of a green 'necklace' of trees around the City centre and the ring road	48.1%	51.9%	38.2%	61.8%	80.3%	7.8%	The Vision proposes the 'greening' of the city through projects such as the planting of a green necklace around the ring road, upgrading our existing parks, enhancing the water meadows as a visitor and educational attraction and the development of a new park between the watercourses on the central car park
14	The provision of a new park in the heart of the City adjacent to the Millstream and River Avon	57.9%	42.1%	52.9%	47.1%			
15	Redevelopment of the bus station site	60.3%	39.7%	36.3%	63.7%			
16	Refurbishment and increased use of the Guildhall	62.3%	37.7%	52.0%	48.0%			
17						62.1%	24.2%	The Vision proposes the removal of traffic from the historic city centre

