

Findings from the 2016 Issues and Options Consultation

The consultation elicited 484 responses. The findings in relation to individual questions are summarised below.

Q1 – Do you agree that Sites 43, 49 and 51 should be treated as a single site?

Responses	Agreed	Disagreed	% split	Ratio
479	310	169	64.7 / 35.3	1.83 to 1

Q2 – Do you agree that this site (combined site 43, 49 and 51) should be the primary preferred site for development?

Responses	Agree	Disagreed	% split	Ratio
470	325	145	69.1 / 30.1	2.2 to 1

Q3 – Given that Site 50 abuts Salem Thrift ancient woodland we believe it should be removed from the preferred list of sites. Do you agree?

Responses	Agree	Disagree	% split	Ratio
149*	72	67	51.8 / 48.2	1.07 to 1

*10 of the responses did not directly address this question.

An ecological report has now been commissioned for this site.

Q4 – Do you agree with the preferred list of sites in Section 3.3 (of the Issues and Options Consultation)?

Responses	Agree	Disagree	% split	Ratio
464	301	163	64.9 / 35.1	1.84 to 1

Q5 – Details were provided of the proposed development of a partly brownfield site in Lower Farm Road which forms part of the Bromham Park Estate. Consultees were asked whether having seen the proposals they had any views on why the development should not appear among the list of preferred sites. Space was provided for test to explain views.

Responses	Support	Against	% split	Ratio
188*	88	75	53.9 / 46.1	1.17 – 1

* 25 of the responses did not directly address this question

Q6 – Provide a map showing the locations of the new sites that had come forward in the 2015 Call for Sites (after our 2015 questionnaire). Consultees were asked whether they considered any of the new sites better met residents’ aims. Space was provided for text setting out views.

There were 109 responses, of which 25 did not directly address the question. Of the others -

12 related to site 46, which is a site for a railway station
 28 suggested spreading development around the village
 6 related to Site 540, the former Bromham Hospital site
 18 related to various of the new sites but no ‘dominant’ site emerged; and
 20 considered that the new (2015) sites offered no more value than the 2014 sites

Q7 – Asked whether respondents agreed with the proposal to seek a Rural Exception Site Policy to accommodate the genuine need identified in BRCC’s Housing Need Survey of 2015.

Responses	Agreed	Disagreed	% split	Ratio
432	380	52	88 / 12	73 to 1

Q8 – Asked whether consultees agreed with the proposal to seek developers’ agreement to the construction of c.25 bungalows or retirement properties to help older residents move to accommodation more suited to their needs.

Responses	Agreed	Disagreed	% split	Ratio
436	402	34	92.2 / 7.8	11.8 to 1

Q9 – Provided two options for addressing the additional educational need at primary school level. Option 1 was to extend the existing school: Option 2 was to look for a Greenfield site to accommodate a school for 420 children.

Responses	Option 1	Option 2	% split	Ratio
449	358	91	79.7 / 20.3	3.93 to 1

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.