

| Section | Page | |
|----------------|---|----|
| 1 | The consultation | 2 |
| | • Introduction | 2 |
| | • Consultation methods | 2 |
| | • The survey | 2 |
| | • The report | 2 |
| 2 | Analysis of the survey | 3 |
| | • Executive summary | 3 |
| | • Closed questions | 3 |
| | • Open questions | 6 |
| 3 | Respondents to the survey | 10 |
| | • Residency | 10 |
| | • Male/female | 10 |
| | • Age | 10 |
| 4 | Summary of other (non survey) responses to the consultation | 10 |
| | • Market Traders | 10 |
| | • Local Businesses | 11 |
| | • The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain | 11 |
| | • Others | 12 |

1. The Consultation

1.1 Introduction

In August 2008 an international design competition was launched in conjunction with the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), for the rejuvenation of the Salisbury Market Place – a key Salisbury Vision project. Expressions of interest were received from 46 multi-disciplinary teams and these were shortlisted to six. These six teams were asked to develop concept designs for the Market Place based on a detailed brief and it is these six designs that have been consulted upon from 5 to 30 January 2009..

1.2 Consultation methods

A consultation pack was produced containing information and images on the six shortlisted designs together with an introductory leaflet and a questionnaire. These packs were mailed to 125 statutory and local consultees. They were also given to every Charter Market Trader attending the 6 January market, to 89 businesses around the Market Place, and they were made available for the general public at the Salisbury library, the Tourist Information Centre and from the Vision office.

A three day public exhibition was held in the Guildhall 8 – 10 January 2009 at which the six shortlisted designs were available as A1 boards. The exhibition was attended by 1,246 people, all of whom were offered a consultation pack. Two workshops were held for the Charter Market Traders and for businesses around the Market Place, and a meeting was held with representatives of the Showmen's Guild Western Region.

The public consultation period was promoted in the Salisbury Journal, on Spire FM, in the Salisbury library, on the Vision website and in the Tourist Information Centre.

The six designs were identified by the letters A to F. There were no identifying marks on any of the consultation material to indicate the composition of the teams. The lead members of each team are given below.

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| A | Letts Wheeler Architects |
| B | GEHL Architects |
| C | Land Use Consultants |
| D | Rumney Design |
| E | Halcrow |
| F | BPL Architecture / beswick:dix |

1.3 The Survey

The questionnaire was designed such that it did not ask respondents to identify their favourite design. Instead it concentrated on trying to determine what elements of each design were most and least liked, and which design did respondents think was most appropriate for Salisbury. The questionnaire also asked people to identify what was most important to them in respect of the Market Place and to say how well each team had addressed these issues. Approximately 1,800 questionnaires were issued with 447 completed questionnaires being received by the closing date, giving a response rate of 25%.

1.4 The report

This report summarises the results of the public consultation. As such it provides a summary of the survey analysis, of the other responses received and of the results of the two workshops and the meeting with the Showmen's Guild.

2. Analysis of the survey

2.1 Executive summary

The six designs submitted as part of the stage 2 Market Place design competition have been the focus of a comprehensive programme of public consultation and engagement. The principal methodology used was a two-page questionnaire linked to a heavily promoted and advertised public exhibition. Other activity included workshops, meetings and direct mail targeted at specific groups. The exhibition was very well attended with 1,246 people coming through the doors. Approximately 1,800 questionnaires were distributed either at the exhibition or in response to requests with 447 being returned, giving a response rate of 25%.

The results of the survey show that design A is considered to be the most exciting and original (21.0%) followed by design F (16.8%). Design A is also considered to be, by far, the most appropriate for Salisbury (34.2%); the second most appropriate being design E (15.7%).

There are 10 elements that respondents consider quite or very important to the Market Place. Design A is thought to have shown the best treatment on eight of these elements. Design F is considered to have the overall poorest treatment of these elements. In answer to the question "If you lived in another area which design would most make you want to visit Salisbury?" 28% of respondents chose design A. In second place is design F (11.9%).

Overall there are a number of features in all of the designs that are either liked or disliked to varying degrees. The most liked feature appears to be the single open space proposed by designs A and B and the repositioning of the war memorial as suggested by design D and others. The most disliked feature is the Charter Cross shown in design D followed by the line of light and light totums featured in design F. Water features, across all six designs, are not particularly favoured, largely because of perceived problems with vandalism, maintenance and safety. They are also unpopular with respondents because "children will play in them". Ironically one of the benefits given by the teams for including a water feature is that it will provide enjoyment for children.

Just under 70% of respondents were city residents with 60% being over 60 years of age (Office of National Statistics show that just 25% of the Salisbury District population to be 60 years of age or more). Less than 10% of respondents were under 40 compared to 47.1% of the Salisbury District population. 83% of respondents had visited the exhibition.

The market traders and the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain have similar requirements of the Market Place – basically that it is kept as a large single open space free of obstructions, as best shown in designs A and B. Local businesses also favoured this approach.

2.2 Closed questions

The questionnaire contained seven closed questions relating to respondents' views on the designs and on the Market Place itself. The results of these questions are shown below.

Question 1:**Did you attend the public exhibition held in the Guildhall?**

Yes = 83%

No = 16.3%

No reply = 0.7%

Question 2:**Which design approach do you think is the most exciting and original?**

A = 21.0%

B = 7.4%

C = 10.3%

D = 2.5%

E = 11.9%

F = 16.8%

No reply = 30.9%

Question 5:**Which design do you think is the most appropriate for Salisbury?**

A = 34.2%

B = 12.1%

C = 8.9%

D = 1.1%

E = 15.7%

F = 6.7%

No reply = 26.0%

Note:

The percentages add up to more than 100 because three respondents could not decide between two designs (A&B; C&F; E&F).

Question 6: How important do you think it is to include each of the following elements in the Market Place and Guildhall Square? (all figures expressed as a percentage of the total number of responses)

| Item | Very Important | Quite Important | Neither important nor unimportant | Quite unimportant | Very unimportant | Don't know |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|
| Sculpture / artworks | 10 | 25 | 21 | 13 | 20 | 10 |
| War memorial | 76 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Statues | 26 | 35 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| Water | 20 | 23 | 13 | 9 | 28 | 6 |
| Trees | 77 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Plants | 39 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 7 |
| Benches / seating | 74 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Markets | 86 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Events | 49 | 32 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Fair | 48 | 17 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| Historic information | 48 | 17 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| Tourist information | 40 | 35 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 5 |

Question 7: How well do you think each design has treated the following features?
 (all figures expressed as a percentage of the total number of responses; excludes no replies)

Answer: Well

| Item | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Sculpture / artworks | 10 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| War memorial | 39 | 26 | 16 | 24 | 23 | 9 |
| Statues | 18 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 7 |
| Water | 29 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 20 | 10 |
| Trees | 30 | 19 | 19 | 17 | 21 | 17 |
| Plants | 17 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| Benches / seating | 27 | 24 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 17 |
| Markets | 43 | 36 | 12 | 10 | 24 | 16 |
| Events | 35 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 19 | 12 |
| Fair | 34 | 30 | 9 | 9 | 19 | 12 |
| Historic information | 7 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| Tourist information | 7 | 7 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 5 |

Shaded boxes indicate the designs which are considered to have the best treatment of a particular feature.

Answer: OK

| Item | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Sculpture / artworks | 27 | 22 | 18 | 10 | 26 | 9 |
| War memorial | 17 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 24 | 17 |
| Statues | 31 | 22 | 25 | 24 | 27 | 23 |
| Water | 21 | 22 | 13 | 20 | 19 | 8 |
| Trees | 24 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 29 | 24 |
| Plants | 28 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 29 | 22 |
| Benches / seating | 29 | 26 | 27 | 24 | 31 | 22 |
| Markets | 17 | 19 | 26 | 23 | 28 | 17 |
| Events | 22 | 22 | 26 | 28 | 32 | 22 |
| Fair | 23 | 20 | 25 | 23 | 30 | 19 |
| Historic information | 29 | 28 | 27 | 22 | 26 | 18 |
| Tourist information | 26 | 25 | 26 | 20 | 24 | 19 |

Answer: Poorly

| Item | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Sculpture / artworks | 21 | 29 | 26 | 45 | 21 | 38 |
| War memorial | 12 | 21 | 29 | 20 | 16 | 33 |
| Statues | 13 | 24 | 21 | 26 | 17 | 26 |
| Water | 18 | 28 | 40 | 33 | 24 | 42 |
| Trees | 13 | 24 | 23 | 21 | 12 | 21 |
| Plants | 15 | 26 | 22 | 24 | 18 | 25 |
| Benches / seating | 11 | 13 | 19 | 24 | 15 | 20 |
| Markets | 6 | 7 | 22 | 24 | 8 | 27 |
| Events | 7 | 8 | 21 | 20 | 8 | 23 |
| Fair | 8 | 10 | 24 | 25 | 11 | 26 |
| Historic information | 21 | 18 | 15 | 26 | 19 | 24 |
| Tourist information | 23 | 22 | 14 | 27 | 23 | 27 |

Shaded boxes indicate the designs which are considered to have the poorest treatment of a particular feature.

Question 8:

How do you think you might use the Market Place and Guildhall Square in the future?

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------|---------------------|---|-------|
| Meeting friends and family | = | 53.5% | Eating and drinking | = | 62.9% |
| Shopping | = | 74.7% | Relaxing | = | 43.2% |
| People watching | = | 41.4% | Route to work | = | 14.3% |
| Enjoyment | = | 46.8% | Events | = | 70.2% |

Note: Respondents were asked to tick all relevant.

Question 9:

If you lived in another area, which design would most make you want to come and visit Salisbury?

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|----------|---|-------|
| A | = | 28.0% | B | = | 8.9% |
| C | = | 6.7% | D | = | 2.5% |
| E | = | 11.2% | F | = | 11.9% |
| | | | No reply | = | 34.9% |

Note:

The percentages add up to more than 100 because four respondents could not decide between two or three designs (A&E; B&E; C&E&F; B&F).

2.3 Open questions

The questionnaire contained three open questions, two relating to what respondents' liked most and least about each design and one for all other comments. A summary of the information given to these three questions is given below.

Question 3:**What do you like most about each of the different design approaches and why?**

The most popular responses, i.e. those receiving more than 10% of the comments received, are shown below.

| Design A: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (593) | As a percentage of total questionnaires returned (447) |
|--|------------|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More room for the market/creation of a large open space/excellent use of space/unification of the Market Place | 106 | 17.9% | 23.7% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linear fountain/water feature/clever use of water | 79 | 13.3% | 17.7% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple, good design, dignified/sensible/uncluttered/pleasing to the eye and easy to manage | 78 | 13.2% | 17.5% |
| Design B: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (488) | As a percentage of total questionnaires returned (447) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comment; negative towards project | 80 | 16.4% | 17.9% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space/unification of the Market Place and flexibility of use/spacious layout for events | 63 | 12.9% | 14.1% |
| Design C: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (431) | As a percentage of total questionnaires returned (447) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comment – negative towards project | 83 | 19.3% | 18.6% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of Cheese Market/Cheese Cross/Cheese Cross sculpture | 62 | 14.4% | 13.9% |
| Design D: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (362) | As a percentage of total questionnaires returned (447) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comment – negative towards project | 123 | 34.0% | 27.5% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repositioning of war memorial/ statue look modern | 68 | 18.8% | 15.2% |
| | | As a percentage | As a percentage |

| Design E: Comments | No. | of total comments received (434) | of total questionnaires returned (447) |
|--|------------|---|---|
| • No specific comment – negative towards project | 76 | 17.5% | 17.0% |
| • Water element/fountains/water jets | 61 | 14.1% | 13.6% |
| • Guildhall/Market Place kept separate/use of Guildhall Square/change of levels in front of Guildhall attractive | 47 | 10.8% | 10.5% |

| Design F: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (290) | As a percentage of total questionnaires returned (447) |
|---|------------|---|---|
| • Line through time | 42 | 14.5% | 9.4% |
| • Modern, adventurous, high visual impact | 36 | 12.4% | 8.1% |
| • Tree management/continuity | 30 | 10.3% | 6.7% |

No comments were made as follows:

| | | | |
|---|-------|---|-------|
| A | 18.4% | B | 23.0% |
| C | 25.3% | D | 27.5% |
| E | 25.3% | F | 31.2% |

Question 4:

What do you like least about each of the design approaches and why?

The most popular responses, i.e. those receiving more than 10% of the comments made are shown below.

| Design A: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (392) | As a percentage of total responses returned (447) |
|---|------------|---|--|
| • Water channels will result in many maintenance and health and safety problems | 74 | 18.9% | 16.6% |

| Design B: Comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (423) | As a percentage of total responses returned (447) |
|---|------------|---|--|
| • Water channels will result in many maintenance and health and safety problems | 76 | 18.0% | 17.0% |

| | | As a percentage of total comments | As a percentage of total responses |
|--|--|--|---|
|--|--|--|---|

| Design C: Comments | No. | received (503) | returned (447) |
|---|------------|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water channels will result in many maintenance and health and safety problems | 153 | 30.4% | 34.2% |
| | | As a percentage of total comments received (464) | As a percentage of total responses returned (447) |
| Design D: Comments | No. | received (464) | returned (447) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike the Charter Cross/ intrusive and inappropriate/ out of character | 212 | 45.7% | 47.4% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of water feature/cost/ maintenance | 49 | 10.6% | 11.0% |
| | | As a percentage of total comments received (394) | As a percentage of total responses returned (447) |
| Design E: Comments | No. | received (394) | returned (447) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water feature will result in many maintenance and health and safety problems | 44 | 11.2% | 9.8% |
| | | As a percentage of total comments received (450) | As a percentage of total responses returned (447) |
| Design F: Comments | No. | received (450) | returned (447) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line of light, light totums are gimmicky and inappropriate/ out of character | 109 | 24.2% | 24.4% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water feature too large/ no room for the market or fair | 102 | 22.7% | 22.8% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly complicated; fragmented; too busy; design will date | 46 | 10.2% | 10.3% |

No comments were made as follows:

| | | | |
|---|-------|---|-------|
| A | 22.8% | B | 20.4% |
| C | 18.6% | D | 16.8% |
| E | 24.2% | F | 18.8% |

Do you have any other comments?

A total of 562 additional comments were made; most were individual comments or were repeated by less than five respondents. A total of 76 respondents made no additional comments. The most repeated comments are shown below.

| Additional comments | No. | As a percentage of total comments analysed (562) | As a percentage of total questionnaires returned (447) |
|--|------------|---|---|
| • Project is not needed and/or is waste of money | 57 | 10.1% | 12.8% |
| • Important that design is practical and appropriate for Salisbury | 36 | 6.4% | 8.1% |
| • Schemes are too ambitious and/or expensive; concern about cost | 31 | 5.5% | 6.9% |
| • Concern about water features and vandalism/safety/maintenance | 30 | 5.3% | 6.7% |
| • Concerns and issues about maintenance | 28 | 5.0% | 6.3% |
| • Comments concerning the toilets | 24 | 4.3% | 5.4% |

3. Respondents to the survey

Are you a:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------|----------------|---|------|
| City resident | = | 68.9% | Business | = | 1.1% |
| South Wiltshire resident | = | 23.3% | Market Trader | = | 0.2% |
| Visitor from outside area | = | 1.8% | Other/No reply | = | 4.8% |

Gender:

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|-------|--------|---|-------|----------|---|------|
| Male | = | 41.4% | Female | = | 49.7% | No reply | = | 8.7% |
|------|---|-------|--------|---|-------|----------|---|------|

Age:

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------|----------|---|-------|
| Under 16 | = | 0.9% | 16 – 24 | = | 0.9% |
| 25 – 40 | = | 7.6% | 40 – 60 | = | 28.6% |
| Over 60 | = | 60.0% | No reply | = | 2.2% |

4. Summary of other (non survey) responses to the consultation

4.1 Market Traders

A workshop for market traders was held on 20 January 2009. It was attended by 29 people representing 23 different market businesses. The traders expressed concern that the popularity of the market and thus the livelihood of the traders could be affected during the construction phase. It was, therefore, considered essential that the market should continue to trade from the Market Place (there was opposition to a move to a temporary home) and that no construction work should take place on market days. The traders were also very keen that the market retains its current layout with individual stallholders maintaining their existing locations and that there should be no plans to 'prettify' the market, i.e. through the use of pop-up stalls and/or through the introduction of standard stalls and canopies, or through the removal of their vehicles on market days. The following additional comments were also made.

- Blue Boar Row should be
- One large, level open space was preferred

- closed to cars – buses only
- The war memorial should be re-located
- The toilets should be improved and should be open and clean from 7.00am
- Power points should be provided
- No water features in the main market area
- Retain the diagonal path
- No Lime or London Plane trees
- Non-slip surfaces to be used
- Signage needed to direct people to the market

The features of the six designs were discussed. Designs C, D, E and F were considered impractical from the perspective of the market although the timeline in design F was liked. Overall designs A and B were preferred although these, too, had some features which were of concern, principally water features, too many trees and benches.

4.2 Local businesses

Invitations to a workshop on the 14 January 2009 were given to 89 businesses in the streets surrounding and adjacent to the Market Place. The meeting was attended by just seven people representing four businesses, including the Guildhall. Despite this poor attendance some useful information was gained. The following answers were given in response to the question 'what do you most and least like about the Market Place'.

Most like

- Range of cafes and restaurants
- Events and entertainment
- Charter Market
- Watching the world go by
- To have somewhere to sit
- Trees
- Old buildings

Least Like

- Wheelie bins
- Not enough seats
- Not enough entertainment/organised events
- Diagonal path is restrictive/aggressive
- Area is split by trees (Guildhall Square and Market Place)
- Some trees are overgrown and shade the buildings
- The sunny side of the Market Place is not fully utilised

The merits of each of the six designs were also considered. Many of the features of designs A and E were particularly liked. Overall it was felt that a single space was preferred and this was best achieved by design A. Designs D and F were considered inappropriate for a medieval city such as Salisbury and design B was thought to be 'boring'.

4.3 The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain

A meeting was held on 29 January 2009 with the Chairman, Secretary and two other representatives of The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain. Their requirements of the Market Place are summarised below.

- One large, open, level space ideally larger than the current area
- Must be free of obstacles
- There should be two or preferably three access points for very large vehicles
- Provision needs to be made for emergency access when the fair is on site
- The diagonal footpath is not important
- Construction of the Market Place needs to be such that it can withstand very heavy loads

Additionally it was noted that:

- The fair could reduce the number of vehicles (generators) it needed if electric power could be provided on site
- The timing of the construction should be such that no work takes place in October; best time to start construction would be in November

Of the six design proposals, C, D, E and F were considered to be totally impractical as far as the fair was concerned. The fair could not take place if any of these four designs were implemented. Designs A and B both had merit but the overall preference was for design B because it more closely met the required criteria.

4.4 Others

A total of 26 written responses were received. These responses contained approximately 80 general comments on the design competition or on the Market Place itself. The five most repeated general comments are shown below.

| Comment | No. | As a percentage of total comments received (80) | As a percentage of total responses received (26) |
|---|------------|--|---|
| • Good to have more trees/seats/water | 10 | 12.5% | 38.5% |
| • Waste of money/spend the money on other things/delay the project because of the recession | 10 | 12.5% | 38.5% |
| • Retain the toilets/provide better more accessible toilets | 8 | 10% | 30.8% |
| • Water features are expensive to maintain/prone to vandalism | 6 | 7.5% | 23.1% |
| • Support the relocation of the war memorial | 6 | 7.5% | 23.1% |

There were also approximately 90 comments made which were specific to particular designs; most comments were made by just one, two or three respondents. More people stated that they disliked designs D and F, or parts of them, than any other design. The most disliked (five people) feature was the Charter Cross in design D.