

# Draft Seafront Masterplan

## REPORT 2020



Research and Engagement Team  
PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL

Contents

1.0 Purpose.....	2
2.0 Background.....	2
3.0 Research.....	2
3.1 Objectives.....	2
3.2 Methodology.....	2
4.0 Response rates.....	3
5.0 Summary of findings.....	3
6.0 Analysis of results.....	6
6.1 Respondent demographic profile.....	6
6.2 Vision and objectives.....	9
6.3 Thematic guidance.....	11
6.3.1 Climate change.....	13
6.3.2 Health and wellbeing.....	13
6.3.3 Heritage.....	14
6.3.4 Natural environment.....	15
6.3.5 Public spaces.....	16
6.3.6 Lighting.....	17
6.3.7 Transport & access.....	18
6.3.8 Economy & attractions.....	22
6.3.9 Development opportunities.....	22
6.4 Area guidance.....	23
6.4.1 Old Portsmouth.....	25
6.4.2 Clarence Pier.....	25
6.4.3 Southsea Common.....	29
6.4.4 Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road.....	29
6.4.5 Southsea Skatepark.....	31
6.4.6 The Pyramids Centre.....	32
6.4.7 Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens.....	34
6.4.8 South Parade Pier & St Helen's Parade.....	36
6.4.9 Canoe Lake Park to St George's Road.....	37
6.4.10 St George's Road to Henderson Road.....	38
6.4.11 Henderson Road to Eastney Point.....	39
7.0 Email responses to the consultation.....	40
7.1 Residents.....	40
7.2 Landowners and organisations.....	41
7.3 Statutory consultees.....	44

## 1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive summary of the Draft Seafront Masterplan consultation. This consultation gave respondents the opportunity to provide their views on an updated masterplan for Southsea seafront.

## 2.0 Background

The draft Seafront Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document sets out guidelines for how the seafront could be improved and conserved. It also makes recommendations on the possible things that could happen along the seafront. Portsmouth City Council (PCC) consulted with local people in 2018 and 2019 before drafting the masterplan, and are now carrying out another survey before creating a final version. The masterplan will be used to guide developers and help PCC make future decisions on proposals for the area. The aim of this consultation was to understand the level of public support for the draft Seafront Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document and to help with creating a final version.

## 3.0 Research

### 3.1 Objectives

- To measure the level of public support for the overall proposed vision and objectives of the draft strategy.
- To gain insight into the public views of the nine areas of thematic guidance and the key objectives that underpin each approach.
- To understand public views of the eleven sections of area guidance and the key objectives that underpin each approach.

### 3.2 Methodology

A survey was developed which focussed questioning around the three key areas outlined in section 3.1. The survey was launched on September 18<sup>th</sup> 2020 and was open for six weeks to enable as many respondents as possible time to complete it. The survey was promoted through various channels including:

- Social media posts
- Portsmouth City Council website
- Southsea Coastal Scheme website
- Media news release
- Email bulletins
- Direct contact with the Community Stakeholder Engagement Group
- Posters along the seafront and in venues (e.g. Pyramids)
- Two unstaffed exhibitions - Central Library and Southsea Library

## 4.0 Response rates

Using various channels of marketing and communication the survey attracted 1,268 responses. It is difficult to calculate the statistical robustness of this consultation because it is unclear how many individuals interact with Portsmouth's seafront. However, assuming a "total population" of 175,205 people (the latest [mid-year estimate](#) from the Office for National Statistics for people aged 16-90+ in Portsmouth) this volume of responses ensures a 95% confidence level with a margin of error of 2.74%, well within acceptable parameters, although this does exclude the visitor population.

## 5.0 Summary of findings

A summary of the analysis undertaken on the data collected from the consultation survey is provided in this section.

### Overall Summary

**Response to the draft Seafront Masterplan was overall very positive - the vision, objectives, thematic guidance and area guidance were all met with strong levels of support. Very small proportions of respondents opposed, only four out of the 21 elements respondents were asked about attracted a disagreement level of over 10%. The average agreement level was very strong at 80% and the average disagreement level was very low at 8%.**

### Vision and objectives

- **Overall the vision and objectives are met with very high levels of agreement; 90% and 81% of respondents respectively (which is equivalent to 1,138 and 859 respondents).**
- 10% of respondents disagree with the proposed objectives; the majority of these (91%) disagree with the objective 'Ensure that the new development, including alterations to roads, seek to minimise space allocated to motor vehicles, in order to better accommodate other users'.
- The bulk of objections towards the objectives are about restrictions on parking for motor vehicles and the area not being accessible to the elderly or people with a disability.
- A number of comments are also made about the risk of congestion and traffic being displaced, as well as the area being less appealing to visitors and tourists.
- Respondents with a disability are less likely to be in agreement with the proposed objectives; 20% of them disagree compared to 9% of those with no disability.

### Thematic guidance

- **All areas of the thematic guidance achieve agreement amongst a majority of respondents (ranging from 79% to 90%).**

- Three areas achieve a majority amongst respondents selecting 'strongly agree'; climate change (53%), health and wellbeing (52%) and transport and access (52%).
- Whilst support is strong for all areas, one area attracts a disagreement level of over 10%; transport and access (15% of respondents).
- The area of the proposed approach to **transport and access** facing most criticism is 'All development should seek to prioritise users in the following order: Pedestrians and cyclists; Public transport users; Private vehicle users'; 62% of those disagreeing (15%) selected it.
- A large proportion of comments made about the proposed approach to **transport and access** mention the need to prioritise cars, or at least not de-prioritise them, and the importance of retaining parking spaces at the seafront. Concerns are also raised about the impact the proposal will have on different groups of visitors to the seafront, e.g. the elderly, people with a disability and tourists.

### Area guidance

- **All areas of the area guidance achieve agreement amongst a majority of respondents (ranging from 61% to 89%).**
- The proposed approach to **Canoe Lake to St George's Road** attracts the most support from respondents; 89% 'agree' or 'strongly agree'.
- Disagreement levels are low and range between 6% and 8% of respondents with the exception of Clarence Pier (13%), Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens and the Rock Gardens (11%) and the Pyramids Centre (24%).
- The proposed approach to the **Pyramids Centre** is least well received; 24% of respondents disagree with it and 61% are in agreement.
- Proposals to change the use of the **Pyramids Centre** are met with the most resistance; 83% of those disagreeing with the proposed approach (24%) disagree with 'Scope for an element of residential development if required as an enabling use', whilst 53% disagree with 'Opportunity to have a building or collection of buildings which could accommodate a mix of uses (e.g. high-quality hotel with spa and swimming facilities, concert and events venue, art gallery space, and food and beverage)'.
- The majority of comments objecting to the proposed approach to the **Pyramids Centre** talk about the need to retain public access to the centre, and concerns about the loss of the leisure and recreational space.
- The 'Re-provision of Clarence Pier and Clarence Esplanade car parks with increased capacity and/or integrated with any redevelopment or within landscape' is the element of **Clarence Pier** met with most resistance; it was selected by 69% of those who disagree with the proposed approach (13%).

- The majority of comments objecting to the re-provision of **Clarence Pier** and Clarence Esplanade car parks stem from concerns about cars being encouraged to the area. The need to improve public transport is also mentioned too.
- The final element of the area guidance attracting a higher level of disagreement (11%) is **Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens**. Both elements of the proposed approach were selected by a majority of respondents when asked which they disagree with; 'Opportunity to pedestrianise a section of Clarence Esplanade that lies south of South Parade Gardens to create a safer and attractive route for walking and cycling' (62%) and 'Enhance Speakers' Corner as a new leisure cluster with a focus on food and beverage, with potential to incorporate cycling hub and associated facilities' (54%).
- Comments reveal that respondents feel that the opportunity to pedestrianise the section of Clarence Esplanade that lies south of **South Parade Gardens** is too cyclist/ pedestrian focussed and is again anti-motorist. Some think this proposal is unnecessary and don't want any more road restrictions implemented.
- The enhancement of **Speakers' Corner** is unpopular because it is already seen as being utilised, some feel that there isn't a need for a more development and in particular a focus on food and drink.

***Full breakdowns are available in the following section of this report.***

## 6.0 Analysis of results

The following sections outline the analysis undertaken on the results from the draft Seafront Masterplan consultation. It is divided into the following five main sections of analysis:


1. Respondent demographic profile
2. Vision and objectives
3. Thematic guidance
4. Area guidance
5. Email responses

Please note that any discrepancies between the figures reported in the charts and the commentary are due to rounding.

### 6.1 Respondent demographic profile

This section provides a demographic profile of the respondents that interacted with the consultation survey - it focuses on the information collected in the demographics section of the survey which included sex, age group, ethnic group, disability and disability type. All questions in the demographics section of the survey were voluntary and included a 'prefer not to say' option, therefore, the base sizes vary from question to question.


*Figure 1: Sex of respondents*



Base: 718

An even mix of males and females was achieved in the consultation sample - see Figure 1.


Figure 2: Age of respondents



Base: 719

Research shows that individuals aged 45 and over are more inclined to interact with public consultations. The age distribution of respondents in this sample (Figure 2) is within expected levels, over two-thirds (68%) are aged 45 and over. This could raise concern for how representative the respondents are of Portsmouth's population, however the profile of seafront users is unknown.


Figure 3: Ethnic group of respondents



Base: 685

The majority of respondents interacting with the consultation survey were white British, as shown in Figure 3 on the previous page. The remainder of the sample are made up from other 'white' ethnic groups (6% combined), 'Asian or Asian British' ethnic groups (1% combined), 'Black/ African/ Caribbean or Black British - other' (0.4%), 'Mixed/ Multiple ethnic groups' (2% combined) and 'other ethnic groups' (0.4%).


Figure 4: Whether or not respondents have a disability



Base: 706

Figure 4 shows that less than 1 in 10 people in the consultation sample have a disability (8%). The vast majority of respondents have no disability (92%). Of those respondents reporting a disability (Figure 5) over half have a mobility disability (55%) and just under half have a physical disability (47%). Other disabilities are reported at much lower levels of respondents; hearing and mental health (both 15%), learning (9%), visual (7%) and other disabilities (9%)

Figure 5: Type of disability respondents have




Base: 55

## 6.2 Vision and objectives

The following section summarises the results from the questions in the consultation survey which asked respondents for their views on the vision and objectives of the draft strategy. The proposed vision is "The seafront's natural and historic assets will be protected, conserved, and enhanced. The seafront will be a beautiful, functional, sustainable and resilient place that is healthy, safe, enjoyable, and accessible to all."

**Figure 6 shows that the majority of respondents support the proposed vision of the draft strategy (90%); 50% 'strongly agree' (637 respondents) and 40% 'agree' (501 respondents). The level of respondents opposing the proposal is very low at just 3%.**


Figure 6: Agreement with the proposed vision



The 3% of respondents who do not agree with the proposed vision (3%) were next asked which elements of the proposed vision they do not agree with. 'The seafront being a beautiful, functional, sustainable, and resilient place that is healthy, safe, enjoyable and accessible to all' is the main element of the proposed vision that respondents disagree with, opposed by 56%.

All respondents were next asked whether they agree or disagree with the ten proposed objectives presented in the Draft Seafront Masterplan (Figure 7 on the following page). **The majority of respondents support the objectives (81%); 44% 'strongly agree' (470 respondents) and 37% 'agree' (389 respondents) with the proposed objectives.** Respondent disagreement levels are at a much lower level, 7% 'disagree' and 4% 'strongly disagree'.

Figure 7: Agreement with the proposed objectives




The 10%<sup>1</sup> of respondents who disagree with the proposed objectives were then asked to select which objectives they disagree with. The majority of this cohort disagree with the objective *'Ensure that the new development, including alterations to roads, seek to minimise space allocated to motor vehicles, in order to better accommodate other users'*. Reasons for opposing this objective include the restrictions on parking for motor vehicles, the area not being accessible to the disabled or elderly (who often rely on motor vehicles), concerns about displaced traffic/ increased congestion, making the area off-putting for visitors/ tourists and a need for measures to include cars due to the volume of people in Portsmouth who drive.

The thematic analysis of the open-ended comments amongst those disagreeing identified concerns about accessibility, therefore a cross-tabulation of agreement with the proposed objectives and whether or not respondents have a disability was undertaken (Figure 8 on the following page). Analysis shows that respondents with a disability are less likely to be in agreement with the proposed objectives; 20% of them disagree compared to 9%<sup>2</sup> of those with no disability.

<sup>1</sup> Discrepancies between the figures in the chart and the commentary are due to rounding

<sup>2</sup> Discrepancies between the figures in the chart and the commentary are due to rounding

Figure 8: Agreement with the proposed objectives by disability



### 6.3 Thematic guidance


The following section provides insight into the response towards guidance for development in relation to the following nine themes included in the draft strategy:

1. Climate change
2. Health & wellbeing
3. Heritage
4. Natural environment
5. Public realm
6. Lighting
7. Transport & access
8. Economy & attractions
9. Development opportunities

These themes were shaped around the masterplan’s vision and objectives, and were informed by the national and local planning policy context, and the context analysis section in the draft Seafront Masterplan.

**All areas of the thematic guidance achieve strong support amongst respondents.** Figure 9 on the following page shows a summary of agreement levels for all nine areas of the thematic guidance. **The majority of respondents in the consultation sample agree with all areas of thematic guidance, three areas achieve this majority amongst respondents selecting 'strongly agree', these are climate change (53%), health and wellbeing (52%) and transport and access (52%).** With strong support in all areas, only one area attracts a disagreement level of over 10%; transport and access (15% of respondents).

Figure 9: Summary of agreement with proposed approaches in the thematic guidance




Bases vary (843-1,012)

### 6.3.1 Climate change

Figure 10 shows that the majority of respondents agree with the proposed approach to climate change (83%); 53% 'strongly agree' (539 respondents) and a further 30% 'agree' (302 respondents).

Figure 10: Agreement with the proposed approach to climate change



Base: 1,012


The 8%<sup>3</sup> of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to climate change were then asked which elements they disagree with. Just one element was selected by the majority of this cohort, 'Encourage people to use zero or low carbon forms of transport (i.e. walking, cycling, public transport)' (71%). Respondents oppose this element for a number of reasons; the need for public transport to be improved, concerns around accessibility for the elderly and people with disabilities, a reduction in visitors, a need for parking, and a general need for cars. The remaining elements of the proposed approach to climate change are all selected by less than a quarter of this small cohort (17%-23%).

### 6.3.2 Health and wellbeing

Nine out of ten respondents agree with the proposed approach to health and wellbeing (92%) - See Figure 11. In fact, a majority, 52%, 'strongly agree' (503 respondents) and a further 40% 'agree' (386 respondents). Just 2.4% of respondents disagree with the proposed approach to health and wellbeing, which is amongst the lowest levels seen in the thematic guidance.

<sup>3</sup> Discrepancies between the figures in the chart and the commentary are due to rounding

Figure 11: Agreement with the proposed approach to health and wellbeing




Base: 966

The 2.4% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to health and wellbeing were next asked which elements they disagree with, 'Consider opportunities to install public showers and changing facilities near the beaches and other well-used areas' was the main element selected (50%). The main concerns are that the facilities are unnecessary, could be costly to install and are open to vandalism.

### 6.3.3 Heritage

**There is widespread agreement amongst respondents to the proposed approach to heritage (81%); 37% 'strongly agree (349 respondents) and 44% 'agree' (422 respondents) - Figure 12). Disagreement levels are low with just 4% of respondents selecting 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'.**

Figure 12: Agreement with the proposed approach to heritage




Base: 950

The 4% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to heritage were next asked which elements they disagree with. The majority of this small cohort selected '*A heritage centric approach to development should be taken*' (72%), respondents highlight the needs to be forward-thinking and to not make heritage the focus, they also criticised the proposal for being too vague.

### 6.3.4 Natural environment

Figure 13 shows that the majority of respondents agree with the proposed approach to the natural environment (78%); 38% 'strongly agree' (345 respondents) and 40% 'agree' (367 respondents). Just 5% of respondents disagree with this approach, and 17% 'neither agree nor disagree'.

Figure 13: Agreement with the proposed approach to the natural environment




Base: 912

The 5% of respondents not in agreement with the proposed approach to the natural environment were asked which elements of the approach they do not like. The main element this small cohort disagree with is '*Major construction work avoiding the November to February period and not being permitted within set boundaries of known roost sites and feeding areas of SPA/Ramsar bird species*' (64%). This element was opposed for a number of reasons; some have concerns about implications on timings of construction work and costs, whilst others feel that birds should not be prioritised - there are other places for them to roost/feed.

### 6.3.5 Public spaces

Figure 14 shows that the majority (88%) of respondents agree with the proposed approach to public spaces; 50% 'strongly agree' (441 respondents) and 38% 'agree' (337 respondents). Disagreement levels are low with only 5% of respondents selecting 'strongly disagree' or 'disagree'.

Figure 14: Agreement with the proposed approach to public spaces




Base: 889

The 5% of respondents who disagree with the approach to public spaces were next asked which elements they disagree with. 'Creating an environment where walking, cycling and public transport use are encouraged and prioritised, to better connect key locations within the seafront as well as to enhance connections between the seafront area and the wider city' is the option that attracts the most attention, 69% of this small cohort disagree with it. A number of concerns were raised in relation to this element of the proposal; accessibility issues (e.g. for disabled people, elderly people), the need for better public transport, the need to keep vehicle access, access for visitors, and vehicles being displaced to other areas.

Thematic analysis of the open-ended comments identified some concerns about accessibility therefore a cross-tabulation of agreement with the proposed approach to public spaces and whether respondents have a disability was undertaken (Figure 15). Analysis shows that respondents with a disability are less likely to be in agreement; 75% of them agree compared to 91% of those with no disability.


Figure 15: Agreement with the proposed approach to public spaces by disability



### 6.3.6 Lighting

Support for the proposed approach to lighting is widespread with 89% agreement amongst respondents (Figure 16); 44% 'strongly agree' (387 respondents) and 45% 'agree' (394 respondents). Disagreement levels are the lowest seen so far with just 2% of respondents selecting that they 'disagree' with the proposed approach to lighting.

Figure 16: Agreement with the proposed approach to lighting




Base: 878

The 2% of respondents disagreeing with the proposed to lighting (see Figure 16 on the previous page) were asked which elements they disagree with. 'If the festoon lighting is to be replaced, it is replaced with a design which is less costly to maintain, and offers an attractive, contemporary design and palette of colours to provide a backdrop to other features within the seafront' attracts the most negativity, it is selected by 68% of this small cohort. Respondents do not want it replaced, they feel it is a popular feature, is aesthetically pleasing and has history and heritage.

### 6.3.7 Transport & access

**Over three-quarters of respondents (79%) agree with the proposed approach to transport and access; 52% 'strongly agree' (451 respondents) and 27% 'agree' (231 respondents) - see Figure 17.** Whilst disagreement levels are still at a relatively low level (15% of respondents), they are higher than seen elsewhere in the thematic guidance analysis.

Figure 17: Agreement with the proposed approach to transport and access



Base: 868


Next, respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to transport and access (15%) were asked which elements they disagree with. This in-depth analysis has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. The options for transport and access are displayed in Figure 18 as codes A1-A11, the full wording of the elements they correlate to is shown in Table 1 on the following page.

Table 1: Transport and access key for Figure 26

Code	Element
A1	All development should seek to prioritise users in the following order: Pedestrians and cyclists; Public transport users; Private vehicle users
A2	The car/vehicle road network and parking within the seafront area should be designed so as to avoid or, if unavoidable, minimise any detrimental impact on walking and cycling networks
A3	Cycling infrastructure should be safe convenient and enjoyable for cyclists and safe for pedestrians and other road users. Wherever possible, the design of cycle infrastructure should not be diminished in order to accommodate motor vehicles, should be consistent across the seafront, and should be designed to avoid unnecessary crossing of the carriageway
A4	For the primary cycle route across the seafront, the preferred design is a two-way segregated cycle route preferably of 1.5-2m width each way
A5	To help encourage people to use sustainable modes of transport, opportunities need to be taken to redesign roads, pavements, crossings, parking and other public spaces, so that space is balanced more fairly between users and to encourage modal shift and leisure
A6	Development proposals should take into account the wider walking and cycling networks across the seafront and to other parts of the city, in particular, the aspiration for a safe and convenient cycle route from Gosport Ferry to Haying Ferry
A7	When roads and parking areas are redesigned, these should include appropriate infrastructure to support and encourage the take-up of electric vehicles, such as designated parking bays and both active and passive charging infrastructure
A8	Measures should also be taken to improve public transport or the use of innovative solutions like water taxis or automated shuttle buses to move west-east along the seafront
A9	Secure and attractive cycle parking should be provided at convenient and regular locations
A10	Cycle infrastructure should seek to link the seafront with other parts of the city
A11	As far as reasonably practicable, the seafront should be accessible to those with limited mobility, including ensuring adequate vehicular access and parking for people with limited mobility or disability at points along the seafront

Figure 18 on the following page shows that option A1 'All development should seek to prioritise users in the following order: Pedestrians and cyclists; Public transport users; Private vehicle users' is the area of the proposed approach to transport and access facing most criticism; 62% of this cohort selected it. Also unpopular, but not selected by a majority of this cohort, is option 2 'The car/vehicle road network and parking within the seafront area should be designed so as to avoid or, if unavoidable, minimise any detrimental impact on walking and cycling networks' (48%).

Figure 18: Elements of the proposed approach to transport and access respondents did not agree with



Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to transport and access (124)

A qualitative analysis of open-ended responses explaining why respondents did not agree with elements of the proposed approach to transport and access was undertaken. This in-depth approach has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. The main themes that emerged from these responses are shown in Table 2 below and on the following page.

Table 2: Reasons for disagreeing with the proposed approach to transport and access

Proposed approach	Themes
A1 - Prioritising users	Should prioritise cars. Need to keep parking spaces. Balance priority between car drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. This will discourage visitors and non-Southsea residents. Do not prioritise cyclists. Improve public transport first. This will displace vehicles to other areas. Accessibility issues - need cars to access the area.
A2 - Seafront road network and parking	Unnecessary. Car drivers should be prioritised. Need to balance priority between car drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. Need to keep parking. This would discourage visitors. Cycle laws are not properly enforced currently, would need to change. Call to ban cars entirely. Accessibility issues.

Table 2: Reasons for disagreeing with the proposed approach to transport and access (continued)


Proposed approach	Themes
A3 - Cycling infrastructure being safe, convenient and enjoyable	Need to allow vehicle access. Not enough cyclists to warrant this proposal. Unnecessary. Need to enforce cycle laws, currently people cycle dangerously. Will discourage visitors. Need for a safer cycle path.
A4 - Primary seafront cycle route	No space for this. Need to keep parking spaces. Not enough cyclists to warrant this proposal, would need to enforce use of the lane. Pedestrians should be the priority. Cycle route should avoid the seafront. This will displace traffic. Not needed here.
A5 - Encouraging sustainable modes of transport	This needs to be done fairly and should include car drivers. Need to keep parking spaces. Accessibility issues. Unnecessary. Visitors will struggle to access the area. Need to improve current public transport. This will displace vehicles. Unachievable. Costly to the public. Will be designed poorly.
A6 - Wider walking and cycling networks	Change the route: avoid the seafront/ do not go as far as Eastney Ferry/ built it off the roads. Cyclists do not currently use cycle paths and will not use this one. Unnecessary. Too expensive. Do not close any roads. Penalises car drivers. Current cycle lanes along seafront are dangerous. Need to keep parking.
A7 - Redesign of roads and parking to encourage electric vehicles	Electric vehicles are costly, need provisions to help more people afford them and use them. Proposal is impractical. Do not have the infrastructure currently for electric vehicles. This would encourage cars, do not want to do that. Unnecessary.
A8 - Improve public transport	Unrealistic proposal. Too expensive. More important to improve current public transport. Would spoil the environment/disturb this area. Unnecessary.
A9 - Cycle parking	Unnecessary. Not enough cyclists to warrant this proposal. Need to keep parking. Accessibility issues. Lack of space for this.
A10 - Cycle infrastructure linking seafront and city	Unnecessary - a small number of cyclists use the current cycle lanes as it is. Wider cycling infrastructure improvements across the city are needed first. Need to keep parking spaces.
A11 - Seafront being accessible	Split between those arguing that proposals should prioritise disabled people, and those saying it is already adequate and they should not be prioritised. Call to ban cars.
Something else	Too much emphasis on cyclists. Keep vehicle access. Need other options to driving. Need to make sure residents can still park. Need to include electric scooters in proposal.

Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to transport and access (124)

### 6.3.8 Economy & attractions

Figure 19 shows that just over three quarters of respondents (76%) are in agreement with the proposed approach to the economy and attractions; 30% 'strongly agree' (254 respondents) and 46% 'agree' (397 respondents). A small proportion disagree (4% of respondents).

Figure 19: Agreement with the proposed approach to economy and attractions




Base: 855

The 4% of respondents who selected 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' were then asked which elements they disagree with. Two-thirds of this small cohort disagree with the only element of the proposed approach which is 'Supporting development within the identified 'clusters', which have sites suitable for enhancement, and could accommodate a range of uses that could have a positive impact for the seafront as a destination'. Some respondents mention not wanting over-development, whilst others report that the proposal is unclear.

### 6.3.9 Development opportunities

Three-quarters of respondents agree with the proposed approach to development opportunities; 27% 'strongly agree' (228 respondents) and 48% 'agree' (405 respondents) - see Figure 20 on the following page. Just 5% of respondents disagree.

Figure 20: Agreement with the proposed approach to development opportunities



Base: 843

The 5% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to heritage were next asked which elements they disagree with. Neither element of the approach to heritage was selected by a majority, reasons for disagreeing from this small cohort either talk about wanting more development, or not wanting more development.

## 6.4 Area guidance


The following section provides insight into the response towards guidance for the following eleven areas of the seafront included in the draft strategy:

1. Old Portsmouth
2. Clarence Pier
3. Southsea Common
4. Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road
5. Southsea Skatepark
6. The Pyramids Centre
7. Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens
8. South Parade Pier & St Helen's Parade
9. Canoe Lake Park to St George's Road
10. St George's Road to Henderson Road
11. Henderson Road to Eastney Point

**Figure 21 on the following page shows that support for the proposed approach to the area guidance is strong; the majority of respondents agree with every area.** The proposed approach to Canoe Lake to St George's Road attracts the most support from respondents; 89% 'agree' or 'strongly agree' and only 4% 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. The proposed approach to the Pyramids Centre is least well received; 24% of respondents disagree with it and 61% are in

agreement. Agreement levels for all other approaches are positive and generally on a par with one-another, ranging from 75% of respondents (Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens and the Rock Gardens) to 83% of respondents (Old Portsmouth). Disagreement levels range between 6% and 8% of respondents with the exception of Clarence Pier (13%) and Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens and the Rock Gardens (11%).


Figure 21: Summary of agreement with proposed approaches to the area guidance



### 6.4.1 Old Portsmouth

Figure 22 below shows that the majority of respondents are in agreement with the proposed approach to Old Portsmouth (83%), 39% 'strongly agree' (322 respondents) and 44% 'agree' (370 respondents).

Figure 22: Agreement with the proposed approach to Old Portsmouth




Base: 835

The 7% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to Old Portsmouth were asked which elements they disagree with. Half of this small cohort do not agree with '*Pedestrian movement being prioritised in the road space parts of Broad Street/ Bath Square through either pedestrianising the area or implementing access-only road restrictions*'; reasons for disagreeing vary from viewing this element as unnecessary, to concerns about the need for vehicular access including accessibility issues (e.g. for elderly people, disabled people) as well as concerns about traffic displacement and the need to retain parking spaces.

### 6.4.2 Clarence Pier

Three-quarters of respondents are in agreement with the proposed approaches to Clarence Pier; 35% 'strongly agree' (290 respondents) and 40% 'agree' (332 respondents) - see Figure 23 on the following page). 13% of respondents disagree; 10% 'disagree' and 3% 'disagree strongly'.

Figure 23: Agreement with the proposed approach to Clarence Pier




Base: 827

Respondents who do not agree with the proposed approaches to Clarence Pier (12%<sup>4</sup>) were asked which elements they disagree with. This in-depth analysis has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. The *'Re-provision of Clarence Pier and Clarence Esplanade car parks with increased capacity and/or integrated with any redevelopment or within landscape, subject to further assessment of city-wide parking capacity provision'* is the element met with most resistance; 69% of this cohort did not agree with it. (Figure 24 on the following page). Just over a third of this cohort (35%) selected *'Consolidate Clarence Pier as a premier leisure and recreation destination, including a wider mix of uses such as restaurants, bars, leisure, hotel, and residential'*. The remaining options were all selected by less than a fifth of respondents in this cohort.

<sup>4</sup> Discrepancies between the figures in the chart and the commentary are due to rounding

Figure 24: Elements of the proposed approach to Clarence Pier respondents did not agree with



Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to Clarence Pier (103)

Respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to Clarence Pier were next asked why they dislike each element selected in Figure 24. This in-depth approach has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. Table 3 on the following page shows the main themes identified from qualitative analysis of the open-ended responses to these questions.

Table 3: Reasons for disagreeing with the proposed approach to Clarence Pier


Proposed approach	Themes
Re-provision of Clarence Pier and Clarence Esplanade car parks with increased capacity and/or integrated with any redevelopment or within landscape, subject to further assessment of city-wide parking capacity provision	Will encourage cars to the area. Need to improve public transport. Need parking. Accessibility issues.
Consolidate Clarence Pier as a premier leisure and recreation destination, including a wider mix of uses such as restaurants, bars, leisure, hotel, and residential	Unnecessary. Keep the fun fair and character of the area. Need improvement. Do not want residential building, this would cause traffic. Demolish the pier. Investors will not be interested.
Development in the area should promote walking and cycling, through designing and allocating maximum space for pedestrians	Accessibility issues. Need vehicle access. Need a balance between prioritising pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers. Need parking.
A redesigned Hovercraft terminal building to incorporate a wider range of uses and facilities	Unnecessary. Too expensive.
Any redevelopment of Clarence Pier should be high-quality and contemporary, with the distinctive design of the existing buildings	Do not keep the existing buildings. Keep the history of the area.
Something else	Need to redesign area. Contradictory proposal as this will encourage cars so there should be less parking and vehicle free areas. Unique character of area should not be lost.

Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to Clarence Pier (103)

### 6.4.3 Southsea Common

Figure 25 shows that the majority of respondents (80%) agree with the proposed approach to Southsea Common, 40% 'agree strongly' (326 respondents) and 40% 'agree' (330 respondents). Fewer than one in ten respondents disagree (6%).

Figure 25: Agreement with the proposed approach to Southsea Common




Base: 823

The 6% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to Southsea Common were asked which elements they disagree with. The majority of this small cohort of respondents selected the only element shown to them, 'Any development proposals that affect the Common or its setting will need to take a 'heritage-centric' approach' (84%). Respondents mention keeping the Common as open space only, not focusing on heritage and the need for a better understanding of what is meant by 'heritage'.

### 6.4.4 Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposed approach to Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road. **Figure 26 on the following page shows that the majority of respondents are in agreement (79%); 41% 'strongly agree' (331 respondents) and 39% 'agree' (318 respondents).** A small proportion (8%) are in disagreement.

Figure 26: Agreement with the proposed approach to Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road




Base: 817

The 8% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road were asked which elements they disagree with. Changes to Avenue de Caen are the least popular proposals; over three-quarters of this cohort (76%) selected *'Alter the north part of Avenue de Caen between Ladies' Mile and Clarence Parade to prioritise cyclists and pedestrians'*. As there are a number of reasons why respondents disagree with this element, some feel it is unnecessary and penalises drivers whilst others see a need to retain parking and prioritise access for visitors, accessibility issues were also mentioned. 46% of respondents selected *'Redesign the junction at Avenue de Caen/ Clarence Esplanade to complement recent improvements to the public space around D-Day Story, and to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety'*. Again respondents see this element as unnecessary and highlight the need to balance priority amongst walkers, cyclists and drivers, accessibility issues were also raised.

Thematic analysis of the open-ended comments about reasons for disagreeing identified a number of concerns about accessibility, therefore a cross-tabulation of agreement with the proposed approach to Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road and whether respondents have a disability was undertaken (Figure 27 on the following page). Analysis shows that respondents with a disability are less likely to be in agreement with the proposed objectives; 14% of them disagree compared to 7% of those with no disability.


Figure 27: Agreement with the proposed approach to Southsea Castle to Palmerston Road by disability



### 6.4.5 Southsea Skatepark

Over three-quarters of respondents (77%) agree with the proposed approach to Southsea Skatepark; 32% 'strongly agree' (263 respondents) and 44% 'agree' (359 respondents) - Figure 28. Just 7% disagree.

Figure 28: Agreement with the proposed approach to Southsea Skatepark




The 7% of respondents who do not agree with the proposed approach to Southsea Skatepark were next asked which elements of the proposal they disagree with. The only option selected by a majority of this small cohort is 'Primary use of skate park to be retained but scope for uses that complement the skate park and wider leisure focus, including aspirations for a stronger evening economy' (68%). This element raised concerns about local residents being disturbed, the possibility anti-social

behaviour might be encouraged and make the environment unpleasant, and those who feel should just be left as a skate park. Just under half of this small cohort (48%) selected *'Around the skate park, a new landscaped seating area and adventure play park'*, reasons included not wanting the play area or feeling it is unnecessary, feeling that the green space should be retained and that the location is unsuitable for a play park.

### 6.4.6 The Pyramids Centre

**Figure 29 shows that the majority of respondents (61%) agree with the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre; 24% 'strongly agree' (194 respondents) and 37% 'agree' (299 respondents).** However, this is the lowest level of support seen amongst all eleven sections of the area guidance. Almost a quarter of respondents (24%) do not agree with the approach; 7% 'strongly disagree' and 17% 'disagree'.


Figure 29: Agreement with the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre



Base: 806

Respondents who do not agree with the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre (24%) were next asked which elements of the approach they disagree with. This in-depth analysis has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. Figure 30 on the following page shows that proposals to change the use of the centre are met with the most resistance. *'Scope for an element of residential development if required as an enabling use'* is the least popular aspect of the proposed approach, selected by 83% of this cohort. Over half of respondents in this cohort (53%) disagree with *'Opportunity to have a building or collection of buildings which could accommodate a mix of uses (e.g. high-quality hotel with spa and swimming facilities, concert and events venue, art gallery space, and food and beverage)'*.

Figure 30: Elements of the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre respondents did not agree with



Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre (193)

Respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to the Pyramids Centre were next asked why they dislike each element selected in Figure 30. This in-depth approach has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. Table 4 on the following page shows the main themes identified from qualitative analysis of the open-ended responses to these questions.

Table 4: Reasons for disagreeing with the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre


Proposed approach	Themes
Scope for an element of residential development if required as an enabling use	Need to retain public access to the area. Wrong location, do not build residential buildings directly onto the seafront. Keep open space, proposal would ruin the scenery. Any residential homes here would be too expensive. Oppose over-development, risk setting precedent for more development. Against more residential developments in Portsmouth generally. Would encourage cars and require more parking. Would increase pollution and be bad for the environment.
Opportunity to have a building or collection of buildings which could accommodate a mix of uses (e.g. high-quality hotel with spa and swimming facilities, concert and events venue, art gallery space, and food and beverage)	Do not want over-development, keep open space. Do not want a hotel. Need to remain as public facilities which are low cost and accessible to all. Not needed. Demolish The Pyramids, in bad condition. Wrong location.
Building or buildings should have strong frontages onto the promenade and Clarence Esplanade	Keep open spaces, this would be too imposing. Not needed or wanted. Proposal is too vague. Disagree with 'strong' frontages.
Public space around the Pyramids buildings should be enhanced as part of any development, including consideration of how it integrates with new sea defences	The Pyramids should be demolished. Leave the area as it is, as open as possible. Do not destroy the rock gardens. Make it accessible for wheelchair-users. Concern about local wildlife. Develop the area in line with the rest of Southsea.
Creation of a physical and/or visual 'green link' between Castle Fields and Rock Gardens	No need for this, the area should be left as it is.
Something else	Keep The Pyramids, need for a pool that is affordable. Get rid of The Pyramids, demolish it entirely. Upgrade The Pyramids. Concern about where additional visitors would park. Redevelop the site into a hotel/conference centre.

Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to The Pyramids Centre (193)

#### 6.4.7 Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens

Support for the proposed approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens and Rock Gardens is high with three-quarters of respondents selecting that they are in agreement with it (Figure 31 on the following page). 35% 'strongly agree' (282 respondents) and 39% 'agree' (312 respondents). 11% of respondents do not agree with the approach.


Figure 31: Agreement with the approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens



Base: 797

Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens (11%) were asked which elements they disagree with (Figure 32). This in-depth analysis has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. Both elements of the proposed approach were selected by a majority of respondents; 'Opportunity to pedestrianise a section of Clarence Esplanade that lies south of South Parade Gardens to create a safer and attractive route for walking and cycling' was selected by 62% of this cohort and 'Enhance Speakers' Corner as a new leisure cluster with a focus on food and beverage, with potential to incorporate cycling hub and associated facilities' was selected by 54%.

Figure 32: Elements of the approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens respondents did not agree with



Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens (85)

Next this cohort were asked why they do not agree with the elements of the proposed approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens selected in the previous question (Figure 32 on the previous page). This in-depth approach has been undertaken in the interest of the council wanting to be thorough and transparent of the issues at hand. Table 5 shows the most common themes identified from the qualitative analysis undertaken on the open-ended responses to these questions.

*Table 5: Reasons for disagreeing with the proposed approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens*


Proposed approach	Themes
Opportunity to pedestrianise a section of Clarence Esplanade that lies south of South Parade Gardens to create a safer and attractive route for walking and cycling	Proposal is too pro-cyclist/pedestrians, and too anti-car drivers. Unnecessary. Need parking provisions here. No more road closures/restrictions wanted. Lack of accessibility. Would discourage visitors. Need to keep vehicle access.
Enhance Speakers' Corner as a new leisure cluster with a focus on food and beverage, with potential to incorporate cycling hub and associated facilities	Do not want a focus on food and drink. This space is already used by different groups for activities. Do not want a cycling hub. No development wanted here in general. Cycling facilities would be good, not other suggestions.
Something else	Keep the open space. Improve the rock gardens. Keep the approach simple. Link Speakers' Corner with the Pyramids.

Base: Respondents disagreeing with the proposed approach to Speakers' Corner, South Parade Gardens & Rock Gardens (85)

#### 6.4.8 South Parade Pier & St Helen's Parade

Figure 33 on the following page shows that the majority of respondents (80%) agree with the proposed approach to South Parade Pier and St Helen's Parade, this is split between 37% selecting 'strongly agree' (294 respondents) and 43% selecting 'agree' (338 respondents). Only 6% of respondents disagree with the proposed approach.

Figure 33: Agreement with the proposed approach to South Parade Pier and St Helens Parade




The 6% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to South Parade Pier and St Helen's Parade were asked which elements they disagree with. 'Opportunity for better integration with cycle route at Eastney Esplanade' was selected by a majority of this cohort (61%). The main reasons for disagreeing are that this element is unnecessary or a poor choice of location. Some respondents commented that they want more details on the proposal whilst others expressed anti-cyclist attitudes.

#### 6.4.9 Canoe Lake Park to St George's Road

Response to Canoe Lake to St George's Road is very positive; 89% of respondents in the consultation sample agree with the proposed approach to this area (Figure 34); 45% 'strongly agree' (352 respondents) and 44% 'agree' (348 respondents). Just 4% disagree with it.

Figure 34: Agreement with the proposed approach to Canoe Lake Park to St George's Road




Half of the 4% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to Canoe Lake Park to St George's Road disagree with the element *'Proposals that seek to increase the quantity of food and beverage floorspace within Canoe Park should consider the overall food and beverage offer within Canoe Lake Park and avoid over-provision'*. The main reasons for opposing this element are a feeling that there is no need for more food and beverage floorspace and that there should be an emphasis on quality over quantity.

### 6.4.10 St George's Road to Henderson Road

The proposed approach to St George's Road to Henderson Road is met with widespread agreement (78% of respondents); 35% 'strongly agree' (273 respondents) and 43% 'agree' (333 respondents) - see Figure 35. Less than one in ten respondents disagree with it (8%).

Figure 35: Agreement with the proposed approach to St George's Road to Henderson Road




The 8% of respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to St George's Road to Henderson Road were asked which elements they disagree with. Over half of this small cohort disagree with *'The former Royal Marines Museum could be converted to hotel use with complementary ancillary uses, such as offices and residential'* (55%). The main reasons respondents disagree with this element is because they want it kept it as a museum/art space, they are concerned about increased traffic, feel it is a poor location and that more decent and affordable housing is needed.

### 6.4.11 Henderson Road to Eastney Point

There is widespread agreement amongst respondents to the proposed approach to Henderson Road to Eastney Point; 37% 'strongly agree' (284 respondents) and 40% 'agree' (312 respondents) - Figure 36. Disagreement levels are low with 8% of respondents selecting 'strongly disagree' or 'disagree'.

Figure 36: Agreement with the proposed approach to Henderson Road to Eastney Point



Base: 771

Next, respondents who disagree with the proposed approach to Henderson Road to Eastney Point (8%) were asked which elements they disagree with. None of the elements of the proposed approach to Henderson Road to Eastney Point are selected by a majority. *'Should the Fraser Range site come forward for redevelopment, consideration should be given to how a scheme could be sensitively designed in relation to its proximity and relationship with Fort Cumberland and its setting, in terms of building heights, style, materials, and opportunities to improve physical connections to Fort Cumberland and other routes, such as Natural England's England Coast Path'* attracts the most attention, 39% of this small cohort disagree with it. Reasons for opposing include wanting to keep it as an open space, not developing the site, concerns that the current road system will not be able to cope with the traffic and requests to not change the nearby beach. *'Should the RNL facility be relocated elsewhere, the site could be redeveloped for other uses, such as a café with public toilets facilities, integrated with a local nature and ecology information and visitor centre'* is also unpopular amongst this small cohort (38%). Respondents disagreeing with this element feel it is already well-located, they want it left as it is, some want more detail is needed on the proposal whilst others are concerned about more traffic being encouraged and accessibility issues.

## 7.0 Email responses to the consultation

This section provides details about the email responses to the consultation received. In total, 45 emails were received from a mixture of residents, individuals on behalf of landowner organisations, and individuals on behalf of statutory consultees. The breakdown is as follows;

- 33 residents
- 10 landowners and organisations
- Two statutory consultees

A thematic analysis was undertaken on the email responses from residents which can be found in section 7.1. Emails from landowner organisations and statutory consultees were in some areas very lengthy and specific, so sections 7.2 and 7.3 contain summaries of the emails received from these individuals.

### 7.1 Residents

Emails were received from 33 residents. The main themes that emerged surround opposing development on the Fraser Range site/ Eastney beach area, keeping vehicular access to the seafront, improving lighting, enhancing Canoe Lake, and opposing the loss of swimming pools such as at the Pyramids and Eastney. A number of specific suggestions were also left by residents which can be found at the bottom of section 7.1.

The key theme emerging from these emails is opposition to over-development of the seafront. In particular, 42% of residents who emailed objected to the proposed development on the Fraser Range site/ Eastney beach area. Reasons for opposing this development include:

- A preference to maintain green open spaces as Portsmouth is a densely-built and populated city, particularly in light of the coronavirus pandemic where outdoor areas have taken on more importance.
- Concern over development-creep into others areas of the seafront.
- The area is vital for flora, wildlife, bird and other animal habitation.
- The area is unique and provides a tranquil space.
- Development being contradictory to the city's Climate Emergency and resulting in increased emissions and environmental damage.

Suggestions to enhance the area, rather than develop it, are common with re-wilding; emphasising the area's heritage such as by improving the setting and access to Fort Cumberland; and creating a new walking route around the Fort. A handful of local residents note that they have not been consulted about the proposed development in this area and emphasise the need to be consulted early in planning stages, as well as being kept regularly updated (27%).

In terms of other themes that emerged from the emails, three residents comment on the need to keep vehicular access to the seafront area, emphasising that the importance for disabled people, elderly people and families with small children. Two residents further highlight the need to improve lighting in the seafront area, including repairing and maintaining the festoon lighting, "spinnaker" design lamps, vintage style lamps, and LED lighting at Hotwalls. Another two residents also explain that they support enhancing Canoe Lake, and a couple more are against losing facilities such as

the fun pool at the Pyramids and Eastney swimming pool, with a preference for investing in these centres instead.

Nine residents gave further specific suggestions which have been listed below:

- Level out the paths along the seafront stretch near the bandstand field and introduce a cycle lane here.
- Improve the promenade, build an open air lido, increase water sports and introduce a seasonal bus or road train to transport people from Clarence Pier to Eastney.
- Make the seafront road one-way which would allow for parking, one lane of traffic and a cycle lane.
- Make clearer the history of the area, especially for tourists, through a facility on Point to inform the public with visual displays and information.
- Better landscaping needed, such as by putting in a rock garden in the section adjacent to the Pyramids going west along the Prom.
- Need better access to Old Portsmouth from The Harbour station/ The Hard/ Gunwharf.
- Need to involve English Heritage Garrison Church and Portsmouth Cathedral (St Thomas) when thinking about Old Portsmouth.
- Clear signage of the swim zone so all users of the sea are aware.
- Maintain the historic streetscape of Broad Street and do not implement a pedestrian crossing here.

Finally, it is worth noting that eight residents who emailed state that they are broadly in support of the Seafront Masterplan, with several noting that they are pleased with the emphasis on cycling and pedestrianisation.

## **7.2 Landowners and organisations**

The following section provides a summary of the email feedback received from 10 landowners and organisations.

### Gosport Borough Council

Gosport Borough Council support the general principles of the Seafront Masterplan, but in particular agree with enhancing the local tourism offer and creating a safe, convenient cycle route from Gosport ferry to Hayling ferry. They also welcome all measures to improve the signage, lighting and walking and cycling routes at Portsea Hard leading to Southsea Seafront. They suggest that enhancing the Millennium Promenade would be positive and are very keen for additional water taxi links between Portsmouth and Gosport.

### Highways England

Highways England do not want an increase in traffic on the strategic road network (SRN - the A3(M), M27 and A27) as a result of planned growth within Portsmouth City without careful consideration of mitigation measures. They therefore want to ensure that seafront development progresses only with the appropriate infrastructure in place, but agree with proposals which will reduce demand on the SRN infrastructure.

## SGN

SGN suggest that reinforcement of the Portsmouth Low Pressure (LP) network may be necessary to support the various potential developments highlighted in the Seafront Masterplan, and these will be dependent on the final point of connection to SGN's network. Where required, SGN will look to manage the provision of any off site infrastructure improvements, in line with the overall development growth and / or timescales provided. SGN would therefore request that, where the Council are in discussions with developers via the Local Plan, early notification requirements are highlighted.

## Isle of Wight Council

The Isle of Wight Council are supportive of the masterplan, but suggest considering connectivity wider than just within the masterplan area, such as how the plan can influence and facilitate the movement of people between the masterplan area and the Isle of Wight (particularly Ryde). The Isle of Wight should also be referenced in terms of being an important point of access between the two authority areas.

## The Southsea Clarence Esplanade Pier Company Ltd.

The Southsea Clarence Esplanade Pier Company Ltd. support the Seafront Masterplan goals to improve and enhance current facilities at Clarence Pier, but this area needs to be incorporated and defended within sea defences. They also write that the Clarence pier pavilion building should not be retained as it will not improve or enhance the area. They note that there are no provisions for access to freehold property for their large amusement ride loads, and the area adjacent to their property has been proposed as a pedestrianised area with only open space which could attract anti-social behaviour.

The Southsea Clarence Esplanade Pier Company Ltd. also indicate that it seems as though the masterplan is based around Victorious festival (e.g. pedestrianising a lot of the area), but argue that businesses still require visitors by car and therefore parking provisions are needed. They point out that the closure of the seafront proved pedestrianising doesn't work for this area - there was a decline in visitor numbers. Furthermore, they object to plans to enlarge Hover travel as this will not generate investment and is subject of many complaints (such as damaging nearby buildings). Ultimately, they suggest that Victorious festival and the hovercraft terminal are moved to a different location.

## RSPB

The RSPB emphasise that it is critical for developers and local authorities to work collaboratively to ensure that mitigating climate change, enhancing green infrastructure, and seeking opportunity to increase biodiversity are core elements of design within Portsmouth's Local Plan. Specifically, they highlight that careful consideration will need to be given in the design and construction phase of developing The Pyramids Centre, given its position adjacent to Castle Field which is a candidate site for dark-bellied Brent Geese to inhabit through winter months. They also note concern about development at Fraser Range and the impact this could have upon wildlife/ecology.

## CBRE Limited (planning advisors to Premier Marinas Limited)

CBRE Limited welcome the Council's identification of Southsea Marina as a development area. They support the stated ambitions to increase the provision of leisure uses and facilities at the Marina, including food and beverage uses. They also welcome the Council's identification of the site

as suitable for providing watersports equipment and cycle hire facilities, and would work to support their aspirations for increased leisure uses across waterfront.

CBRE Limited also encourage the Council to acknowledge the significance of the site as a local skilled employment centre and hope the Masterplan is updated to acknowledge that expanded employment uses at the Marina are encouraged. They agree with the reference to the ability of the site to accommodate holiday-lets as part of a sustainable leisure destination. However, they do not want the period of occupation of accommodation to be restricted as this is rarely successful. Premier's approach to delivering residential accommodation in waterside locations encourages stewardship of the local environments through management approaches that are sensitive to the environments and so they report that they would be happy to support the Council with this.

### Southampton City Council (SCC)

Southampton City Council confirmed its continued support for the development of the new Portsmouth Seafront Masterplan and acknowledge the importance of working together to maintain and enhance the interconnectivity of the entire Solent region. They welcome the 10 key objectives and in particular support the intention to replace sea defences. They agree with encouraging walking and cycling access routes to the seafront, noting that they are planning to do something similar in Southampton and so will look to PCC as a good example.

SCC broadly support the principles and objectives for transport and access in, and around, Portsmouth Seafront, and reaffirm the need for good transport connections between Portsmouth and Southampton to offer a viable alternative to car travel, and to tackle congestion on the M27. A key factor in the potential creation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes and other future proposals will be their ability to integrate with, and contribute to, the future expansion of the BRT network in South Hampshire. Such a system could better connect Portsmouth Seafront to the surrounding region and to Southampton in particular, thus providing a wide range of economic and environmental benefits for both cities and South Hampshire as a whole.

### Portsmouth Cycle Forum (PCF)

The Portsmouth Cycle Forum fully endorse the vision behind the Seafront Masterplan. They have some specific suggestions made in light of recent legal/ Government Guidance changes:

- A recent national consultation on the review of the Highway Code sought to confirm pedestrians as the most vulnerable highways users. If approved, this change will come in during the duration of this Masterplan and may therefore change the plan's prioritisation of users through law.
- The summer of 2020 saw new Government Guidance issued for Cycle Infrastructure design in Local Transport Note 1/20 alongside its vision for transformational change in transportation through its Gear Change Strategy. They trust that the reference to Manual for Streets 2 will be updated to reflect the new guidance and anything that may be issued during the life of the plan.

PCF emphasise the need for a joined-up, safe, segregated, two-way route along the entire seafront, and a ferry to ferry segregated link which would encourage an uplift in cycle tourism through the city. Consideration to cycle parking, especially near main attractions, is also important. They also highlight the need for a dedicated cycle route to access the ferry to Hayling Island. They detail how Pier Road needs to be made more appealing to cyclists and pedestrians, such as by removing street

car parking; the existing cycleway needs to be extended where seafront road meets Henderson Road as it is currently hazardous; and they note that future development at the Fraser Range should not make cycling more hazardous.

### PCC Public Health

PCC Public Health are encouraged to see active travel, physical activity, quality of public realm and equality of access as core principles of the Seafront Masterplan. They are fully in support, but recommend that a Health Impact Assessment should be undertaken for all major development proposals that come forward, in accordance with the Portsmouth Local Plan. They suggest that inequality should be a fundamental consideration for all proposals brought forward, and that reducing car reliance and vehicle movements to access the seafront for all is vital. They urge further consideration of improved beach access for wheelchair users and those with limited mobility, and finally seek reassurance that future development proposals for Pyramids and Eastney swimming pool do not impact on swimming provision for the city; any redevelopment of swimming facilities need to ensure that public use is the priority.

## **7.3 Statutory consultees**

Two statutory consultees sent emails which have been summarised below. No response was received from Natural England.

### Environment Agency

The Environment Agency are pleased to see that the proposed Southsea defences are an integral part of the proposed vision for the seafront. However, they point out that new defences will not completely remove the risk of flooding and so residual impact from flood risk will still need to be considered. They are also happy to see the potential significant impacts of climate change being recognised at the forefront of this document. They are particularly supportive of the consideration of flood risk when deciding about development location and use, the promotion of water efficiency measures, and the recognition of the importance of Sustainable Drainage; these are important issues in adapting and mitigating the effects of climate change. They highlight that any redevelopment of Fraser Range needs to carefully consider the significant flood risk issues associated with the site itself, and surrounding area, in relation to access. A thorough assessment and understanding of flood risk should be developed to ensure that any proposal on this site is deliverable in terms of flood risk.

### Historic England

Historic England welcome the recognition of the importance of history and heritage in the Seafront Masterplan. They make a number of specific comments which include having any reference to replacing Blue Reef or other buildings address Southsea Castle's west battery and improve the setting of the castle, as well as the negative effect of parking on Avenue de Caen on Ladies Mile as a part of Southsea Common both visually and on its leisure function. They would welcome the opportunity to provide further comments when any future redevelopment of the Pyramids Centre occurs, in reference to its impact on the setting of Southsea Castle and conservation area, and wider townscape and landscape. Finally, they suggest that the range of uses of Fort Cumberland should be constrained to co-working offices, start-up hubs, studios and workshops because an activity

centre or entertainment venue would be an inappropriate use of the area. To support these uses, an enhanced internet connection would be needed.