|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |