GCSE Geography 1313/3H
Mark Scheme (Final)
Summer 2010

GCSE

GCSE Geography (1313/3H)

A PEARSON COMPANY

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.

- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.

- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.

- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.

- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.

- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.

- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.

- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(a)	Candidates do not have to explicitly contrast the terms by using "whereas" or "but" (i.e. two separate definitions are acceptable): **Green belt** Land where (unsuitable) development/building is not (normally) allowed (1) OR land where development is strictly controlled (1) Do NOT accept "land that is designed to prevent urban sprawl" **Greenfield** Land which (is available for development but) has not been developed / built on previously (1) Do NOT accept just "it is farmland / countryside / open land" Also accept: Green belts include both brownfield and greenfield land (1) Much/most greenfield land lies outside the green belts (1)	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	May be expensive to buy (1) May be contaminated/polluted (from its previous use) (1) May be expensive / time consuming to clean up / prepare (1) Site access may be difficult in inner urban areas (1) Site may not be in a location where people want to live (1) VAT has to be paid on the redevelopment (1) The question is about disadvantages for developers/ builders. Do not accept other sorts of disadvantage e.g. it destroys natural habitats; local residents will be disturbed by the noise.	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(c)	Note: the two types we are looking for are rented and shared ownership housing (not dwelling types like flats, semis, etc) Allow 1 mark for a general definition: Housing that is below the market price/rate (1) OR Housing that is subsidized (1) OR Low cost housing that is <u>aimed at / designed for / provided for</u> people on low pay / first time buyers / key workers (1) Do NOT accept just "low cost / inexpensive / cheap housing" OR "cheap housing that people on low pay can get/afford" Then allow a further mark if <u>both</u> types are briefly mentioned: e.g. It is either rented from a council, or part purchased from a council/housing association (1)	

	Alternatively award the marks for explanations of the two types:	
	e.g. Housing provided at a low rent by a council /housing association / registered social landlord/RSL (1) OR Council/social housing provided at a low rent (1) Housing which is cheap because you can buy only a part of it from a council/housing association (1) OR Housing which is cheap because you can buy only a part of it and pay rent on the rest (1)	
		(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(a)(i)	Unplanned/haphazard/ugly spread/growth (of low density buildings on the edge) of a town or city Do NOT accept just "growth/spread of a town/city"	
		(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(a)(ii)	Green belts encircle/surround towns/cities (1) They stop towns/cities expanding/spreading (outwards) (1) because of (planning) controls on development (1)	
		(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(b)(i)	To replace housing damaged in the war (1) To reduce overcrowding in cities (1) OR to house overspill population from cities (1) Accept other valid reasons not given in Figure 2: To help regenerate areas of high unemployment (1) To provide nearby housing for workers in a specific factory (1) To act as economic growth poles (1)	
		(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(b)(ii)	<table><tr><td>Unplanned settlements</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Mainly built on greenfield sites</td><td>**X**</td></tr><tr><td>Financed by the government</td><td>**X**</td></tr><tr><td>Mainly built on brownfield sites</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Designed to be commuter settlements</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Mainly built on green belt land</td><td></td></tr></table>	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(a)	Simple descriptive points are acceptable here (speed of the change and statistical data are not required): Increase in the (total) number of households (1) Increase in one person households (1) Increase in lone parent households (1) Decrease in married couple households (1) Increase in cohabiting couples (1) Accept answers that focus only on past changes or only on future changes	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(b)	It shows/predicts <u>how many</u> of the different types/sizes of new dwellings/houses will be <u>needed</u> in future (1) OR It shows/predicts the future <u>demand</u> for different types/sizes of new dwellings / houses (1) Accept an answer that focuses on a particular example e.g. More flats will be needed for one person households. Do NOT accept just It shows/predicts the future demand for new dwellings OR It shows/predicts how many new dwellings will be needed in future	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(a)	Housing owned by council / government / housing association / registered social landlord / RSL (1) Housing rented from council / government / housing association / registered social landlord / RSL (1) Accept just "council housing" Do NOT accept just "rented housing"	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(b)(i)	Private rented	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(b)(ii)	Question asks for main changes – do not credit descriptions of minor ones Owner-occupied increased (1) from 30% in 1951 to 70% in 2005 (1) It grew more rapidly after 1981 (1) Social rented increased until 1981 (1) reaching a maximum of 32% (1) and then decreased continually (1) to a low of 18% in 2005 (1) MAX 3 marks on either type of tenure MAX 3 marks if no data (i.e. percentages) are included	(4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark

4(b)(iii)	Owner-occupation increased due to
	  • post-war house building programme (1) *
	  • increased costs of private rented
	   OR relaxation of rent control (1) *
	  • rising incomes (1)
	  • rising aspirations (1)
	  • right to buy council-housing (from 1981)
	   OR sale of council houses to tenants (from 1981) (1) *
	  • greater availability of mortgages (1)
	
	Do NOT accept "it increased because social renting decreased"
	
	Social renting increased due to:
	  • post-war house building programme (1) *
	  • increased costs of private rented
	   OR relaxation of rent control (1) *
	
	Social renting then decreased due to:
	  • sale of council houses to tenants (from 1981)(1) *
	  • lack of finance for replacement building (1)
	
	Credit other valid points
	eg link to changes in government in 1951 (Conservatives started a big house-building programme) and 1979 (Conservatives introduced right-to-buy for council tenants)
	
	 Do NOT credit same point twice (see *).	

		(4)

	True	False
Local councils placed 105,000 people in temporary accommodation		X
The main cause was partners splitting up		X
6% of homelessness was because people could not keep up with the payments	X	
About 0.8% of households were homeless in the West Midlands		X
The region with the lowest amount of homelessness was the South West		X
Homelessness was generally lower in southern England than in the rest of England (London being the only exception)	X	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(a)	Six correct = 3 marks ; four or five correct = 2 marks two or three correct = 1 mark , one correct = 0 mark	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(b)	House prices increased <u>more</u> rapidly than incomes (1) OR rise in incomes didn't keep pace with rise in prices (1) Annual incomes increased six-fold 1975-2006 (1) OR from £5,000 to £30,000 1975-2006 (1) <u>but</u> house prices rose twenty-fold 1975-2005 (1) OR from £11,000 to £200,000 1975-2006 (1) Differential/difference between prices and incomes increased (1) e.g. average house cost 2 or 3 x annual income in 1975/1985 (1) OR income was £5,000 and house price was £11,000 in 1975 (1) <u>but</u> 6 x annual income in 2005 (1) OR income was £30,000 and house price was £200,000 in 2006 (1) Differential/difference between prices and incomes decreased <u>in early 1990s</u> OR <u>in 2008</u> (1) NB The small vertical scale and thick graph lines make it difficult to read off values for 1975 so accept some leeway in data for 1975. 1 mark for a comparison + 2 marks for data OR 2 marks for comparisons + 1 mark for data	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(c)	It is (now) difficult to get onto (the lower rungs of) the property/housing ladder (1) Property/housing is (now) expensive for first time buyers (1) Do NOT accept just "the property ladder is broken"	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(a)(i)	Value of their houses may fall (1) It will encourage urban sprawl (1) <u>Large scale</u> of the development will destroy environment (1) Loss of (animal) habitats / decrease in biodiversity (1) Spoiling scenery / visual pollution (1) <u>Noise/air</u> pollution from (increased) traffic / building work (1) (Increased) <u>road/traffic</u> congestion (1) OR road accidents (1) (Increased) pressure on local services e.g. schools, surgeries (1) (Increased) flood risk (1) MAX of 1 mark for alternative solutions: Empty housing in towns should be used instead (1) Brownfield sites in towns should be redeveloped instead (1) Do NOT accept vague answers such as "environmental damage", "loss of countryside", "congestion/overcrowding" or "pollution" Do NOT accept just "because they are NIMBYs" OR "loss of jobs to newcomers" Do NOT accept statements from the list in Q6(b): "if you run out of petrol it will be a long way to an eco-town", "eco-towns will be isolated settlements and inaccessible by road", "roadworks will delay traffic when an eco-town is being built", OR "cars will be kept out of eco-towns"	(4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark

6(a)(ii)	They could get rich by selling their land to developers* (1)
	Their children cannot afford to buy a house here unless more homes are built* (1)
	OR their children will have to leave the area if more homes are not built* (1)
	They may get employment in the eco-town* (1)
	They will have access to more services/facilities(must give an example: e.g. hospital/cinema) (1)
	They may have a business which will get more custom (1)
	Many people are homeless (1)
	OR there is a need for more affordable housing (1)
	OR it will provide affordable housing (1)
	Rural house prices have risen more quickly than urban ones recently (1)
	
	Some green belt land is of low environmental quality so it doesn't matter if it is built on (1)
	OR town may be built on <u>brownfield</u> land <u>in the green belt</u> (1)
	
	Do NOT accept <u>just</u> "eco-town will be environmentally-friendly"
	BUT award marks (MAX 2) for possible examples:
	e.g. it will have zero-carbon housing (1)
	    it will use renewable energy (1)
	    It will emphasise public transport / cycling / walking (1)
	    It will help combat global warming (1)
	
	Do NOT accept "an eco-town will be safe with very high security"
	
	Accept the argument that NIMBYs should be less selfish but ONLY IF a selfish reason is not credited in (a)ii) (see * above)
		(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6(b)	Eco-towns will have to keep cars out if they are to be truly environmentally-friendly	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(a)	Focus of this question is self-interest – answer must show how person/people will benefit **Property developer** They will make a lot of money if they are allowed to build on Green Belt land (1) They want to build on Green Belt land in order to make a lot of money (1) The value of their Green Belt land will greatly increase if planning permission is given to develop it (1) **Director of the Federation of Master Builders** Builders will benefit from more work/business/money if all homeowners get grants / improve their homes (1) <u>Small</u> building firms/contractors will get little work/business if/when eco-towns are built (by big developers) (1) Accept "It is in home-owners' self-interest to make their homes energy-efficient because they will save money as a result" (1)	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(b)	<u>MAX 1 mark in total</u> for just lifts from Figure 12: - Use empty houses - Discourage ownership of second homes - Encourage elderly people to move into smaller properties - Build on brownfield sites <u>in urban areas/towns/cities</u> (to regenerate cities etc) Do NOT accept "build on green belt/greenfield land", or "build more social housing" (as these are not necessarily different from building eco-towns) Some <u>explanation/elaboration</u> must be given to score two or three marks: e.g. **Refurbish/renovate** empty/unused houses to make them more attractive for occupation (1) **Tax** second homes so some are released for purchase as first homes (1) **Provide tax incentives** for elderly people to downsize so their large properties are released for families (1) **Redevelop disused/derelict land** in existing urban areas (1) OR build on brownfield sites in existing urban areas **to avoid building in the countryside / on greenfield land** (1) Do NOT accept solutions that are not mentioned in Figure 12	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7(c)	Marks are for reasons that support their opinion – they may agree, disagree or have mixed views. Credit **valid** evidence given in support of their opinion. **Reasons For** e.g. Will help curb very high house prices in London/south-east (1) Less expensive homes: • will help first-time buyers in London/south-east (1) • increase London's low level of home ownership (1) • and may reduce London's big homelessness problem (1) Fewer new homes will need building in south-east so reducing pressure on environment there (1) **Reasons Against** e.g. Many southern workers will be unwilling to migrate north (1) If these workers become unemployed it may eventually result in them becoming homeless (1) Migrating workers will increase demand for housing in north (1) which will cause higher house prices there (1) More expensive homes will hit first-time buyers in north (1) and may add to north's big homelessness problem (1) Land still has to be found (in north) for extra homes (1) so this just transfers the problem rather than solves it (1) This policy does not provide any new houses so does not really address the problem of a national housing shortage (1) Credit other reasons provided they relate to the issue in the question: i.e. how to tackle the **housing** problem in England. Any three points (reasons for and/or against)	
		(3)

Question Number	Indicative content
8	No mark for choices. Credit valid reasons for their choices. Criteria on Figure 10 are: - Economic – are there enough varied local job opportunities? - Social and cultural – is it safe and inclusive with a good community spirit? - Environmental – is it considerate to local and global environments? - Equity – are <u>all</u> groups fairly catered for? - Housing and built environment – is it well designed and built? - Services – are they varied and locally accessible? - Transport and connectivity – are transport services adequate? - Governance – is it well run and with good public participation? Candidates do NOT have to use all the criteria in Figure 10. Some may understand sustainability as a 'three legged stool' encompassing environmental, social and economic criteria and focus on them. Some may also use additional criteria eg futurity (concern about the impact of current activity on future generations), regional demand for housing. See Information for Examiners table (at end) for more details.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1 - 4	**Only considers a few relevant criteria.** **May make no reference to sustainability.** **Makes vague comments without evidence or makes simple points lifted from Figures 13 - 16** Eg Lifted strengths: - Town A/B/C will be a zero carbon settlement - One company owns all the land so A can be built quickly - Town A will have a park with created grassland - Most existing hedges will be kept in Town A - Town B will use a disused quarry - A trust with local representatives will help run Town B - Shipton eco-town will be self-sufficient in water - Facilities at Town B's schools are available for community use - Town C will use the site of an old MoD depot - Town C will relieve the building pressure in Stratford's floodplain Eg Lifted weaknesses: - Town A will be built on Grade 3a agricultural land - Town A will engulf the village of Micheldever Station - Shipton quarry is a Site of Special Scientific Interest - Shipton quarry has breeding birds - Much of Town B will be built in the green belt - The Middle Quinton site only has a 'B' road - Middle Quinton is next to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Town C will be built over the habitat of rare butterflies **To reach the top mark** Makes several simple points

Level 2	5-8	**Considers a number of relevant criteria.**
		May use more sources than Figures 10 and 13 -16
		Shows some understanding of sustainability.
		This understanding may be limited to environmental aspects.
		Makes a number of simple points, but also includes at least one <u>developed</u> point (ie elaborates with more detail, or explanation, or makes comparisons).
		Eg Developed strengths:
		• Town A/B/C has its own renewable energy supply
		• Town A/B/C will have zero-carbon buildings which therefore do not contribute to global warming
		• Town A is easily the most accessible by rail and by road
		• Town A will have sustainable drainage systems that reduce run-off and encourage infiltration
		• Town A has the highest share (40%) of affordable homes
		• Town A offers a big choice of schools (5 primary, 2 secondary)
		• Town A's trust with residents who are elected will encourage participation and the growth of a community spirit
		• Healthy green lifestyles will be encouraged by Town A's emphasis on footpaths, cycleways and public transport
		• Most of the green belt farmland taken by Town B will be used as a nature reserve/not be built on
		• The part of Town B's site with a flood risk will not be built on
		• Town C will be built on a brownfield site
		• The tree plantings at Town A/C will improve biodiversity
		• The emphasis on cycleways, footpaths and accessibility of on-site services will reduce car-dependency at Town C
		Eg Developed weaknesses:
		Nearly all of Town A will be built on greenfield land
		• Town A will destroy higher quality farmland than Town B
		• Town A will mean the loss of 520 hectares of food crops
		• Residents of Micheldever Station village will protest because a school is to be built on the fields near their homes
		• Town B will cause urban sprawl in the green belt
		• Many habitats at Shipton Country Wildlife Site will be destroyed so endangering wild plants and birds
		• The lowest part of the Shipton site has a high flood-risk
		• The neighbourhoods in Town B do not have good mixes of housing so this could prevent social cohesion
		• The eastern location of Town B's CBD will encourage car journeys from western housing areas
		• Flights from Oxford Airport will cause noise pollution for Town B
		• Town C will spoil the view from the Cotswolds AONB
		• Middle Quinton is the least accessible of the three towns
		• It is not certain that Town C will get a rapid transit link to Stratford
		• Town C may not attract enough firms to supply 3,000 jobs
		• Out-commuting by car from Town C will congest local villages
		To reach the top mark:
		• Includes several developed points
		• Writes in sentences with a clear, structured style.
	QWC	• Spells, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with some accuracy

| Level 3 | 9-12 | **Considers a range of criteria**
May explicitly prioritise between them.

Shows a clear understanding of sustainability.
May include a definition such as Bruntland's (Sustainable development "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs").

Includes many developed points.
May analyse the eco-town lay-outs to good effect.

Probably acknowledges some weaknesses, as well as strengths, of the preferred option (and vice versa for the rejected ones)
Eg

• <u>Admittedly</u> Town B is in the green belt, but some of this land is ugly or derelict and some of the farmland will be left untouched
• <u>Although</u> it has serious economic disadvantages, Town C has some environmental advantages such as…...

May make points not mentioned in Resource Booklet

Eg Extra information:

• Local MPs and councils are all opposed to building Town A/C so it has little support in the local community
• Town A is in a water-stressed area – so recycling imported water into the chalk and river will top up scarce supplies
• Many are on housing waiting lists in Winchester/Oxford/Stratford so there's a big need for affordable housing in Town A/B/C's area
• Town C has poor accessibility at present - it is 7km from an 'A' road and 20km from a motorway
• Cotswolds AONB contains Meon Hill (a Scheduled Ancient Monument / iron age hill-fort) whose setting will be ruined
• Long Marston airfield is used for music festivals and drag racing so the area near Town C is hardly a quiet rural idyll

May include some well-developed points (i.e. developed points linked together)

Eg Well developed:
• A's population is big enough to support a wide range of activities so it will be economically sustainable. In turn this means limited out-commuting and greater environmental sustainability
• Why does B need a park and ride? Houses should be in walking distance of a bus stop. The linear lay-out with the CBD near one edge will also encourage car use and increase carbon emissions
• C is economically and environmentally unsustainable. Its poor accessibility means 3,000 jobs may not materialise and lots of motorists commuting to Stratford will swamp narrow rural roads.

To reach the top mark:

• Makes some well-developed points in a thoroughly argued, balanced answer. |
| | QWC | • Writes in sentences that are clear, structured and coherent.
• Spells, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with accuracy.
• Uses specialist terms appropriately. |

Information for Examiners

	TOWN A - MICHELDEVER STATION	TOWN B - SHIPTON	TOWN C - MIDDLE QUINTON
SITE • **Land** • **Relief, drainage and geology**	• <u>Mostly greenfield</u> (farmland) • Small brownfield area (sidings) • Not green belt • Undulating = easy to build on • <u>No flood-risk at all</u> (no surface streams on permeable chalk) • <u>Sustainable drainage systems</u> (swales, permeable paving) to reduce run-off	• <u>Brownfield</u> (old quarry) <u>and greenfield</u> (farmland) • <u>Some housing in green belt</u> • Gentle slope = easy to build on • <u>No flood risk where housing to be built</u> (permeable limestone) • <u>Land by R Cherwell has high flood-risk</u> BUT nature reserve here to absorb run-off .	• <u>Mainly brownfield</u> (army depot and scrap yard) • Some greenfield (farmland) • Not green belt • Flat land = easy to build on • Poor drainage (due to clay) BUT permeable drives will reduce run-off • <u>Slight flood risk in north</u> BUT ponds and reed beds to store run-off (<u>no houses there</u>) .
HOUSING and BUILT ENVIRONMENT	• <u>12,500 new homes</u> (most) • 24 houses per hectare • <u>Pop density 55 per ha</u> (lowest) • Traditional building styles and materials will suit local area .	• 5,000 new homes (fewest) • 27 houses per hectare • Pop density 63 per ha .	• At least 6,000 new homes • 25 houses per hectare • Pop density 63 per ha • Tile/stone building materials will suit local area
SOCIAL and CULTURAL	• <u>Neighbourhoods with mix of housing plus schools</u> – should foster community spirit • <u>BUT may be conflicts</u> between villagers and newcomers • Car-free CBD = safer roads	• <u>Residential areas lack mix of housing</u> – less social cohesion • <u>Two 'A' roads crossing site</u> hazardous for children • BUT emergency services in town e.g. ambulance, fire	• <u>Neighbourhoods with mix of housing, community centre and school</u> – should foster spirit • <u>BUT spirit may be low</u> if town is only a dormitory • Car-free CBD = safer roads
EQUITY	• <u>40% affordable homes</u> (most) • Housing for range of incomes • Social clubs for different ages (but <u>adult males less well served than others</u>?)	• 30% affordable homes (least) • Housing for range of incomes and household sizes (especially small ones - 33% housing is flats)	• 33% affordable homes • Housing for range of incomes • <u>Fewer job opportunities for females</u>? (construction and recycling emphasised)
GOVERNANCE	• Trust with <u>elected reps should encourage local participation</u>	• Trust could encourage local participation BUT will reps be elected?	• Trust could encourage local participation BUT will reps be elected?
ECONOMIC • **Jobs and income**	• <u>Population seems big enough (critical mass) for economically self - sustainable town</u> • Good variety of new jobs • <u>16,250 jobs for population of 28,750</u> (so probably very little out-commuting) • Great accessibility for firms - so 16,250 new jobs are feasible • IT-based working from home • <u>Much prime quality Grade 3a arable land built over</u> (400ha?) so food/ job/income losses (larger losses than at B and C)	• <u>Town may be too small to be economically sustainable</u> • Fair variety of new jobs • Some jobs/income in quarrying • Only 2,500 jobs for population of 11,400 (so <u>much commuting to Oxford likely</u>) • Good accessibility for firms • <u>Some good quality Grade 3 arable land built over</u> (120 ha?) so food/ job/ income losses • Switch to bio-crops would reduce local food output	• <u>Town may be too small to be economically sustainable</u> • Fair variety of new jobs • Only 3000 jobs for population of 15,000 (so <u>much commuting to Stratford and Birmingham likely</u>) • Poor accessibility - 3000 jobs and <u>economic lift-off dubious</u> • BUT scope for IT-based work at home • Little farmland lost • Some existing jobs (in freight businesses) to continue

• **Finance**	• Won't divert investment from regeneration of Portsmouth and Southampton • <u>No government spending on housing subsidies or infrastructure will be needed</u>	• Unlikely to divert investment from regenerating other cities (as quite remote from these)	• Unlikely to divert investment from regenerating other cities (as quite remote from these) • <u>Government will get money from the development value of their former MoD property</u>

TRANSPORT and CONNECTIVITY
 	
• **External**
 	
• **Internal**
	• <u>Accessibility NOW is excellent</u> (M3, 'A' roads, rail and bus)
	• Local airfield (private flights)
	• Great access could encourage commuting (e.g. to London) BUT few residents may need to (as many local jobs available)
	• Accessibility will be improved:
	  * Upgraded train station
	  * New rail freight depot may attract industry
	
	• Priority in CBD for public transport, pedestrians, cyclists
	• Bus services, cycleways and paths throughout town will encourage <u>sustainable travel</u>
		• Accessibility NOW is good (by 'A' roads and bus)
		• <u>Commercial airport</u> readily accessible (unlike A and C)
		• Accessibility will be improved:
		  * <u>New train station with shuttle to Oxford</u> (quicker than car)
		  * <u>Park 'n ride</u> for 500 cars
		  * Bus services to local towns
		• Quarry fill brought by rail - no lorries causing traffic jams
		
		• All daily needs in walking distance from housing
		• <u>Car club</u> may reduce car use BUT <u>edge locations of CBD and park & ride</u> may encourage residents in west to use cars
			• <u>Accessibility NOW is poor</u> (no 'A' roads or passenger station)
			• Local airfield (private flights)
			• Accessibility will be improved:
			  * <u>Passenger station</u> with rail link south and possible <u>new rapid transit link</u> north
			  * More frequent bus services
			• Car commuters may jam roads BUT funds for Stratford relief road and better access to M40
			
			• CBD pedestrianised and each housing area easily walkable
			• <u>Electric car pool</u>, cycle paths and shuttle bus services will encourage <u>sustainable travel</u>

SERVICES	• Wide range of shops + market • 7 schools + their sport facilities for community use • <u>Community groups for all ages</u>: e.g. cubs, teenagers, mums and toddlers, WI, U3A • Park, playing fields and local greens for recreation • Allotments	• Range of shops + market • 4 schools + their <u>facilities (e.g. IT, sport) for community use</u> • <u>Wide range of other services</u> e.g. hotel, health centre, fire, police, ambulance • Playgrounds, open-air gym, lake & maybe marina for recreation • Allotments and orchards • <u>Eco-education centre</u>	• Range of shops + market • 4 schools + sport facilities of one for community use • Range of other services e.g. medical centre, fire, police • <u>Possible Eden Project-style eco-tourist amenity</u> • Green spaces for recreation • Allotments • <u>University eco-town centre</u>
ENVIRONMENT • **Energy and carbon emissions** • **Waste** • **Water** • **Biodiversity**	• <u>Renewable energy</u> – <u>solar</u> plus town waste, also wind • Carbon-neutral buildings • Few carbon emissions from cars (commuting limited) • <u>Composting</u> and storage of sorted waste (for <u>recycling</u>) • Some waste for energy recovery • <u>Biofuel</u> from waste cooking oil • Treated wastewater recycled • Piped in and then recycled into chalk/river - <u>will top up supply in this water-stressed region</u> • Rainwater harvested • Grey water reused • <u>Habitat lost (threatened species)</u> • BUT hedges kept and trees planted = <u>wildlife corridors</u> • New habitat - chalk grassland • R. Dever's biodiversity boosted	• <u>Renewable energy</u> – <u>bio-crops/ waste</u> plus solar & ground heat • Carbon-neutral buildings • BUT many carbon emissions if there is much commuting by car rather than train • Reduce, reuse and recycle waste • Some waste for energy recovery • <u>Fertiliser</u> is by-product of anaerobic digestion • <u>Self-sufficient in water</u> from aquifer and recycling - useful as this is water-stressed region • <u>Drinkable and recycled water piped separately</u> to dwellings • <u>CWS habitats lost</u> • BUT lake kept for waterfowl • Trees with bat and bird boxes BUT falcons don't nest in trees • New <u>wetland habitats</u> created	• <u>Renewable energy</u> – from <u>town waste and sewage</u>, also solar • Carbon-neutral buildings • <u>BUT much commuting by car will increase carbon emissions</u> • Maybe <u>biofuel</u> tram/bus • Buildings vacuum-connected to <u>recycling</u> centre (no waste trucks needed) • <u>Sewage for energy recovery</u> • <u>No waste to landfill</u> • Rainwater harvested (for use in toilets and washing machines) • Grey water reused • <u>Not in a water-stressed region</u> • <u>Rare butterfly habitat ruined?</u> BUT new habitats – lakes and plantations (<u>wildlife corridors</u>) • Habitats further threatened if more than 6,000 homes built

• **Noise**	• Little noise from extra cars • Little noise from aircraft at local airfield (flight paths avoid Micheldever Station village)	• Some noise from extra traffic • <u>Take-off flights from Oxford Airport</u> go over eco-town site – so <u>noise pollution for residents</u>	• Much noise from extra traffic • BUT local airfield <u>already</u> has music festivals and drag racing • Little aircraft noise (flight paths avoid Long Marston village)
• **Landscape**	• Rural scenery will be spoilt especially for existing villagers • <u>Largest area of land lost to buildings</u> (site totals 520ha)	• <u>Ugly works demolished and derelict quarry reclaimed</u> BUT rural scenery in west spoilt • <u>Much of SSSI will be buried</u> BUT six limestone exposures saved for public to see fossils	• <u>Views from hills of Cotswolds AONB will be spoilt</u> BUT army depot and scrap-yard are <u>already</u> eyesores
DEMAND	• Local MPs and all councils anti so <u>little local support</u> • Protests by local villagers • <u>BUT many people on housing waiting lists in Winchester, Basingstoke and Andover</u>	• Local MP and most councils anti (only one in favour) so <u>only limited local support</u> • Protests by local wildlife group • <u>BUT many people on housing waiting list in Oxford</u>	• Local MPs and all councils anti so <u>little local support</u> • Protests made by local CPRE and local villagers • <u>BUT many people on housing waiting list in Stratford</u>
DELIVERY	• Built quickly as all land belongs to just one owner	• Delay to house-building due to quarrying and then infilling BUT 3200 built by 2016 and town still complete by 2020	• Built quickly as land belongs to only two owners who are working together