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| **West Hendon Masterplan** |
| **Session 1 & 2** | **Friday 28th June - Saturday 29th June** |
| **West Hendon Community Hub and West Hendon Playing Fields**Approximate Total: 26 |
| **Session 3** | **Wednesday 10th June** |
| **Parkside View Nursery**Approximate Total: 34 |
| **Session 4** | **Wednesday 17th June** |
| **West Hendon Community Hub**Approximate Total: 10**West Hendon Residents Group Meeting** Approximate Total: 25  |
| **Session 5** | **Friday 26th July** |
| **West Hendon Playing Fields**Approximate Total: 24 |
| **Approximate Total: 119** |
| **Key Feedback** |
| **Parking and Traffic** | * Traffic flow major concern – particularly along Cool Oak Lane – narrow road (2m), strongly opposed to a new car park along this road – create more traffic, vulnerable and dangerous road as it is for pedestrians (no pathway) and cars – increasing the likelihood of more accidents
* COL car park will only be used as a space for anti-social behaviour, drug users, vandalism – magnet for youths, fly tipping – CCTV coverage would be essential
* Few years ago – car park further along COL was built, closed down because it didn’t work
* Football/school coaches will not be able to fit in the COL car park or make it down the road – a coach drop-off zone is not practical
* There are weight and width restrictions to COL which may be problematic for the proposed new car park
* Concern that commuters might start utilising the car parks – proximity to Hendon station – will be abused, like the current street parking - consider pay and display
* Should be promoting sustainable transport rather than filling the space with more car parks
* Need better transport links to the park
* Others agreed that a car park at the North end of the plan is well needed – particularly for football games
* New and updated car park welcomed at North end of the park – always struggle to get a space
* Should be specific parking spaces for the bowls facility – older people – especially during match days
* Needs to be sufficient disabled parking bays
* Proximity of North car park to the old people’s home – noise from vehicles, doors – mitigate this by planting more trees and plants
 |
| **High Ropes** | * Controversial facility – particularly in relation to the COL car park
* Many thought it was not needed, destroy green belt, vandalised by youths, couldn’t understand where the demand was for this
* Some thought this would make no money in the area and be closed down – low income area
* Would need to be highly supervised
* Popular with younger children
 |
| **Cycling** | * Liked the idea of new cycle routes proposed – however, difficulty in getting to the park – improved cycle routes should not just finish at the park edge – particularly for residents who do not have access to parking facilities in nearby estates and rely on cycling and walking
* For residents trying to access the park from Cool Oak Lane, cycling is not easy
 |
| **Pathways** | * Dog walkers, in particular, were positive about the new walking routes – utilise the park everyday
* Footpaths and cycle routes would need to be surfaced – current paths get very muddy, not very useable in the winter
* Paths are currently in poor condition – would be a good idea to improve these
* Pathways will need to be permeable to avoid flooding
* Woodland walkway well received – ability to walk dogs, feel safe, explore nature
* Would prefer to have a single path shared for walking and cycling within the SSSI rather than additional separate paths/cycle routes
* Path should remain on the same route as the existing in the SSSI
 |
| **Maintenance** | * How can residents expect these facilities to be maintained when nothing has ever been maintained before in the park – litter, vandalism
* Litter in the reservoir should be cleaned up first
* Will need to be well managed – litter after football games, more dog bins
* Fencing at the back of houses in North of fields needs to be re-done first – crumbled away, rotten - should be a priority first before building new facilities – currently poor security for local residents as can be easily knocked down
 |
| **Security and Anti-Social Behaviour** | * Security is absolutely key to the success of the development – car park should be locked up at night, whilst park remains open to pedestrians
* Neglect of the facilities at the moment – e.g. tennis courts, playground – what is stopping these new facilities from being vandalised and abused?
* Proposal would be a disaster due to the amount of anti-social behaviour – facilities would be abused, car parks would be a hotspot – particularly as there will be no policing at night
* Currently nothing is done about anti-social behaviour – motorbikes, late night parties, drugs – residents call the police and nothing is done about it, no one comes – what difference will these facilities make? – creating more of a problem
* CCTV will be key
* More trees should be planted at the back of resident houses – barrier to anti-social behaviour
* Signage is key – e.g. at the playground – who can go in (dogs, age)
* Currently have travelers coming in, burglaries in houses backing on to the park – others thought the proposed facilities would help improve this, as long as there was sufficient management and CCTV
* Lots of drug users at the moment – this plan will help – get young people engaged and out of trouble
* Help prevent anti-social behaviour – things for kids to do, pre-occupied
* Concern that the community garden will be abused
 |
| **ATPs** | * Safety of these and health risks
* Good for football – agree that these will be utilised lots
* Grass not suitable for football at the moment – ATPs will help
* Good idea for kids and low maintenance compared to grass pitches
* Dislike idea that these will be enclosed – less running space in the park
* ATP fences may block the commuter route for badgers
* Concern that ATPs would reduce the openness of the site
 |
| **Football Pitches** | * Questions over whether these would be fully utilised
* Should focus on encouraging women’s/girls’ football
* Junior football pitch shown to the east of the ATPs falls slightly within the LNR
* Located too close to resident houses – would be too noisy, have balls through their garden – needs to be a suitable distance
 |
| **Cricket** | * Raised by many – too many football pitches proposed, no cricket pitch/surface
* Nowhere locally to play cricket – nearest is Kennington
* On weekends and evenings – many playing cricket – shows that it is in demand
 |
| **Nursery** | * What will happen in the interim period when the CSH is being built?
* Interested in the nursery having the capacity to expand to include 6 months to 18 months – the nursery would need an additional room
* Sensitive matter – children disrupted by the building work – some kids find it difficult to settle in, takes longer – upheaval would be hard for many of the children
* Essential that the nursery is being re-provided
* Parkside nursery should be a priority throughout the process
 |
| **Community Sports Hub** | * Include badminton inside the CSH – not many places locally to play
* Local fitness instructors interested in hiring out studio space for their activities
* Links to the outdoor space – running fitness sessions in the park e.g. bootcamp, Thai Chi
* Positive feedback on the multi-use studio – need somewhere for daytime classes that local residents can walk to – e.g. dance classes
* Bring the community together, different cultures – which is what the area needs
* Important that this includes somewhere for young people to have a space to go – like Unitas Youth Zone – will help solve problems with anti-social behaviour and vandalism
* Should operate more like a youth centre – more beneficial in helping anti-social behaviour than the proposed facilities
* Café and toilets well received – particularly those with younger children, dog walkers
* Toilets are key – currently come on the weekend but there is no desire to spend long periods of time in the park as children can’t utilise a toilet, no baby changing facilities – puts off people coming
* Soft play is a good idea – accommodate all ages and families
* Welcomed the fact that there were 2 soft play facilities – one for the nursery and public
* Important that the martial arts place is re-provided
* Bowls club – would like to keep the patio just before the bowls green – key, yet small bit of space to walk out onto from the clubhouse
* Positive feedback on the Clip and Climb – for children and families
 |
| **Young People and Children** | * Pleased that the park would be providing facilities for young people and children – currently nothing for them to do
* Current toddler area is poor quality and under-utilised - these new facilities would be welcomed
* Positive feedback on adventure play – for when children grow out of the toddler play
* Need somewhere for kids to play and be safe
* Not enough proposed for teenagers – all for young kids
 |
| **Adventure Golf and Sustainable Drainage System** | * In favour of this idea – particularly families
* Others disliked this facility – would prefer it to remain as open land
* Mini golf is not a popular activity anymore and it is old fashioned – no demand - does not appeal to young people today – would become under-utilised and a waste of space
* Welcomed the new drainage system – both to help access the park in the winter and as a water feature
* Effectiveness and design of the drainage system will be key to the success of the other facilities
* Never visit in the winter – park turns into a ‘lake’, always have to wear welly boots - will be good to be able to access the park the whole year round, across all seasons
* Will dogs be able to swim in the new pond?
* Pond/lake would need to be fenced off – safety
* Opportunity for more biodiversity at the pond/lake
* Sewage is a key problem at the moment – make sure this gets sorted for the drainage system
 |
| **Outdoor Gym** | * Positive feedback on this facility – not one there currently
 |
| **Skatepark** | * Concern over whether this would lose too much green space
 |
| **Tennis Courts** | * Agree that these need a tidy up and refurbishment
 |
| **Green Space and SSSI** | * Giant hogweed – takes 3-4 years to get rid of – would need to be taken into strong consideration – very dangerous to children (e.g. burns)
* Only space within the M25 that has substantial green space and habitats – priority must be to not destroy these or the green belt land
* Liked the idea of new bird hides – don’t get this anywhere else in London
* Key will be not to overdevelop the woodland trail – like the idea, but keep it simple and preserve habitats
* Demand for open space – majority of the flats in the area do not have a garden
* Destroying green space in the North of the park – all we be developed into facilities, along with ATPs – will no longer be a peaceful park that residents want and enjoy – ruin views from windows, residents ability to sit outside on their terrace
* Overdevelopment – all for upgrading facilities, improving the park – but this plan is a significant overdevelopment – become a noisy, busy park
 |
| **Layout** | * Concern that all the facilities were bunched in one corner – too busy and overcrowded
* Facilities should move further south – too close in one area and right at the back of resident houses – create too much noise from tennis courts, MUGA
 |
| **Other** | * Majority positive about the facilities - what the local area needs, positive image – keep open space but also enhance the park – site has so many opportunities and potential
* Facilities are inclusive of all ages and backgrounds – wide variety for residents
* Positive response about developments in the north of the site
* Positive response about orchard – picking fruit, teaching young children
* Some were skeptical over the likelihood of it all happening
* Questions over the demand for these facilities
* Questions over where the funding was coming from
* Not the most affluent part of the borough – not all of these facilities are going to be accessible to people on a low income – those that can afford it will come by car and undermine the local residents who can walk
* Concern that the facilities would not be used – not many people come from outside the area to the park
* As long as the land is not sold off to developers and built into flats – residents welcomed the development
* Concern that in the future the park would be developed into flats and destroyed
* So many consultations going on in Barnet – puts off residents to come along
* Golf course proposal in the past – didn’t go ahead due to strong resident objection, underground gases – this proposal will meet the same difficulties and petitions to stop the development
* Residents would move out of the area if this proposal went ahead
* Residents on the Brent side in particular were unhappy about the proposals
 |
| **Further Suggestions** | * Drinking fountains needed around the park – particularly with a trim trail
* Swimming pool – nothing nearby which is easy to get to (3 bus rides to Copthall) - used to be an outdoor paddling pool years ago
* Water features – splash area for young children, fountains
* Place where local residents who have no gardens can come and have BBQs – more seating areas and deck chairs (like in Hyde Park)
* More benches throughout the park
* Consider having shade across the playground – like at Wembley Park – e.g. a sail
* Proper entrance from Jubilee Park to West Hendon Playing Fields – between 2 and 4 on the map – improve accessibility and provide further walking routes
* Facilities and space could be used to support local employment – e.g. personal trainer, boot camp, food fairs, boot sale
* Lights should be sensitive to movement rather than on the entire time
* Assault course rather than mini golf – provision for older children
 |