



Barnet and King George V Playing Fields Masterplan – Consultation Report

Barnet Council

October 19



Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1	Background	3
1.2	Our Terms of Reference	3
1.3	The Structure of our Report	3
2	OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION PROCESS	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Consultation Plan.....	5
2.3	Stakeholder Engagement.....	5
2.4	Wider Public Engagement	6
3	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM KEY STAKEHOLDERS	8
3.1	Introduction	8
3.2	Stakeholder Meetings.....	8
3.3	Local Schools.....	8
3.4	Email Correspondence.....	10
4	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM WIDER PUBLIC CONSULTATION	13
4.1	Introduction	13
4.2	Online Questionnaire.....	13
4.3	Public Drop-In Sessions.....	21
4.4	Email Correspondence.....	23
4.5	Social Media.....	24
4.6	Summary.....	25
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS	26
5.1	Conclusions	26
5.2	Recommended Next Steps	27
6	APPENDIX 1: STAKEHOLDERS / CONSULTEES	29
7	APPENDIX 2: BARNET SOCIETY RESPONSE	31
8	APPENDIX 3: THERESA VILLIERS MP RESPONSE	32
9	APPENDIX 4: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE REPORT	33
10	APPENDIX 5: PUBLIC DROP-IN SESSIONS FEEDBACK	34

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. In March 2018, the Council appointed The Sport, Leisure and Culture Consultancy (SLC) to develop an options appraisal and initial draft masterplan and feasibility study for the development of a strategic sports hub and wider leisure and community offer at Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
2. The Council's Environment Committee met in March 2019 to review the final draft masterplan and feasibility study and approved for it to be submitted for full public and stakeholder consultation. SLC has subsequently been appointed to manage this consultation on behalf of the Council.
3. A consultation plan was developed through discussion with the Council which identified the various stakeholders and agreed methods of engagement. The stakeholder groups are categorised as follows:
 - **Key occupiers / users** – clubs or organisations currently located on site or near Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
 - **Key stakeholders** – interested parties such as community organisations, the Dollis Valley Partnership Board, Sport England and National Governing Bodies of sport and the Ark Academy.
 - **Under-represented groups** – community groups and organisations providing services for under-represented residents, such as ethnic minorities, disabled people, young people and older generations.
 - **Local schools** – local schools within a 10-minute drive time catchment of Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
 - **General public.**
4. The 8-week consultation exercise was delivered through a combination of face-to-face meetings, email correspondence, workshops, public drop-in sessions and an online questionnaire promoted through the Council's website and social media channels.
5. The key conclusions arising from the consultation on the final draft masterplan for Barnet and King George V Playing Fields are as follows:
 1. The consultation process engaged with over 700 local residents during the 8-week period, which demonstrates a good level of engagement.
 2. The consultation was successful in ensuring a fair representation of different user groups. In particular, the voice of children and young people came through strongly in the online questionnaire, with 32% of respondents under the age of 25. This was supplemented by the workshops held at Totteridge Academy and Underhill Primary School.
 3. The online questionnaire generated 387 responses, with a high level of engagement from residents within 15 minutes of the site (68%).
 4. The results of the online questionnaire show a positive response from the general public to the final draft masterplan proposals with 70% of respondents being either supportive or very supportive compared to 19% being unsupportive. The Council's Facebook page on the draft masterplan also received 91 likes.

5. Throughout the consultation, there was clear support amongst stakeholders and the wider public for the principle of creating a more engaging space which improves opportunities for local people to be physically active and increases use of the playing fields. The most popular facilities were the café (including toilets), outdoor gym / trim trail, Dollis Brook bridge, toddler and adventure play areas and re-provision of facilities for the Rainbow Centre.
6. Young people were very supportive of the proposed masterplan. In the online questionnaire, 78% of respondents under the age of 25 were supportive of the proposals and only 6% indicated that they were unsupportive.
7. The masterplan is well positioned to deliver health and wellbeing benefits to residents, with 57% of respondents noting that the proposed facilities would encourage them to be more physically active and 70% stating that they would be more likely to visit Barnet and King George V Playing Fields if the proposed facilities were provided.
8. The key areas of contention which have been flagged throughout the consultation period are listed in Table ES1.

Table ES1: Key Areas of Contention on the Final Draft Masterplan

Area of Concern	Key Issues
Skatepark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to local residents • Noise pollution • Anti-social behaviour
Green Belt land / Open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusion upon the Green Belt and impact upon the open space • Size and scale of the Community Sports Hub • Central pathway and avenue of trees breaking up the open vista
Car park and traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of open space • Implications upon traffic and congestion • Sustainable transport routes to the site
Management, maintenance and security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of management presence, security and upkeep of proposed facilities

6. It is recommended that the Council considers the feedback obtained during the public consultation and explores opportunities to mitigate any concerns through amendments to the final draft masterplan.
7. In the event that the Council wish to progress the masterplan through to a detailed design stages, it will be appropriate to consider some of the feedback in relation to more specific design elements such as building layout, disabled access, CCTV and landscaping. It will also be essential to maintain regular dialogue with key stakeholders to ensure the final plans meet their requirements.
8. The Council will need to consider how they intend to report back the results of the consultation to stakeholders and the wider public and to advise them on how this process will be used to further inform the plans for the site.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Barnet Council has in recent years, developed a series of key strategic documents designed to shape the delivery of sport and physical activity services and facilities in parks and open spaces across the Borough. These include a Playing Pitch Strategy (2017), a Parks and Open Spaces Strategy (2016-2026) and the Fit and Active Barnet Framework (2016-2021). The documents are underpinned by a commitment within the Council’s Corporate Plan that ‘Barnet’s parks and open spaces will be amongst the best in London’.
- 1.1.2 The Council is seeking to implement some of the recommendations made by these strategies by exploring the development of new sports hubs at three identified strategic sites – Barnet Copthall, Barnet and King George V Playing Fields and West Hendon Playing Fields.
- 1.1.3 In March 2018, the Council appointed The Sport, Leisure and Culture Consultancy (SLC) to develop an options appraisal and initial draft masterplan for the creation of new and improved sports and community facilities at Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
- 1.1.4 Consultation with local stakeholders and residents was undertaken in November 2018 on the initial draft masterplan and the results of this consultation informed the development of a final draft masterplan and feasibility report.
- 1.1.5 The Council’s Environment Committee met in March 2019 to review the final draft masterplan and approved for it to be submitted for full public and stakeholder consultation.

1.2 Our Terms of Reference

- 1.2.1 SLC has been appointed to manage the consultation exercise on behalf of the Council to provide members of the public and other key stakeholders with an opportunity to comment and feedback on the final draft masterplan.
- 1.2.2 Key requirements of the Council’s brief were as follows:
- To deliver a full 8-week public consultation with residents and stakeholders through a variety of methods, including an online questionnaire, public drop-in sessions, stakeholder meetings, targeted workshops and social media advertising.
 - To ensure a fair representation of different user groups, with a particular focus upon children and young people and residents living locally to the sites.
 - A report summarising the comments received during the consultation exercise for the Council to consider further.

1.3 The Structure of our Report

- 1.3.1 The remaining sections of this report have been structured to meet the Council’s requirements included in the brief, whilst ensuring a concise and accessible report setting out the core findings.

Table 1: Report Structure

Section		Key Content or Output
2	Overview of Consultation Process	A description of the approach to the consultation
3	Summary of Feedback from Key Stakeholders	Summary of feedback from consultation with key stakeholders.
4	Summary of Feedback from Public Consultation	Summary of feedback from the online questionnaire, public drop-in sessions, email correspondence and social media.
5	Conclusions and Recommended Next Steps	Key conclusions arising from the consultation exercise and recommended next steps for the Council.

1.3.2 Supporting information is included in a series of Appendices.

2 OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION PROCESS

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This section describes the approach and methodology adopted for the consultation process that was undertaken for 8 weeks between 3 June 2019 and 28 July 2019.

2.1.2 The principle objective of the consultation was to seek views from current occupiers / users, stakeholders and the general public on the final draft masterplan proposals for Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.

2.2 Consultation Plan

2.2.1 A consultation plan was designed in conjunction with the Council. This was critical to ensure all parties agreed the approach and understood each other's roles and responsibilities in delivering the exercise.

2.2.2 The consultation plan included the following elements:

- Identification of key occupiers / users and wider stakeholders, including community and resident organisations, local schools and under-represented groups.
- Agreed methods of consultation with these identified stakeholders including a combination of face-to-face meetings, workshops and email correspondence.
- Agreed approach to the wider public consultation through development of a webpage on the Council's Engage Barnet portal, containing masterplan drawings, supporting information and a link to the online questionnaire.
- Agreed dates and venues for public consultation drop-in sessions.
- Agreed methods of promoting the consultation including roles and responsibilities.

2.3 Stakeholder Engagement

2.3.1 Current occupiers / users of the site and key stakeholders were provided with a link to the Engage Barnet webpage via email and invited to provide feedback on the final draft masterplan. They were also requested to circulate the Engage Barnet link to their members and promote it through their own social media platforms.

2.3.2 The engagement was designed to ensure the views of previous consultees, current users, existing occupiers, local sports clubs, stakeholders and under-represented groups were fully understood and provided them with an opportunity to relay any concerns or issues about the proposals.

2.3.3 The primary form of communication was through email correspondence and SLC also attended a meeting of the Dollis Valley Partnership Board. A full list of stakeholders is provided in Appendix 1.

2.3.4 A total of 16 schools within a 10-minute drive time of Barnet and King George V Playing Fields were sent an email with the link to the Engage Barnet webpage, a copy of the poster for display and a request to circulate the link to parents, staff and / or students in newsletters and bulletins. This was intended to capture the views of young people and parents, who will potentially be key users of the proposed facilities.

- 2.3.5 Facilitated workshops were held with Totteridge Academy and Underhill Primary School to speak directly with the local students about the proposals and seek their views on the draft masterplan.
- 2.3.6 The results of the consultation with key stakeholders is detailed in Section 3 of this report.

2.4 Wider Public Engagement

- 2.4.1 In order to seek the views of the wider public, including current users and non-users of the site, the following activities were carried out to provide opportunities for Barnet residents to review and comment on the final draft masterplan.

Online Questionnaire and Email Correspondence

- 2.4.2 A short, user friendly questionnaire was designed by SLC in consultation with the Council and hosted on SLC's Zoho Survey platform. A link to the questionnaire was provided on the Council's Engage Barnet webpage, which also included background information, electronic copies of the masterplan and floorplans for the Community Sports Hub and Gaelic Football Pavilion and a 'Frequently Asked Questions' document. Hard copies of the questionnaire and an easy-read version were also available upon request.
- 2.4.3 Alongside this, a dedicated email address was created by the Council (BarnetKingGeorgeVMasterPlan@barnet.gov.uk) and displayed on Engage Barnet, allowing the public to provide feedback directly to the Council. This email correspondence was managed by the Council and subsequently forwarded to the SLC team.
- 2.4.4 The questionnaire asked a series of questions about how often the respondent visits Barnet and King George V Playing Fields, what they do there and how they travel there. A range of pre-selected answers were provided, together with a comment box to provide other details. The questionnaire invited a score from respondents on their level of support for each of the proposed facilities (indoor and outdoor), the location and layout of these facilities and the overall final draft masterplan. A scale ranging from 'strongly support' to 'strongly oppose' was used and an additional free text box was provided for further explanation/comment. Respondents were also asked to provide details on their current physical activity levels and demographic information.
- 2.4.5 The online questionnaire was available to complete for the 8-week period and details of the results and further email correspondence is provided in Section 4 of this report.

Public Drop-In Sessions and Posters / Flyers

- 2.4.6 SLC arranged five public drop-in sessions across the consultation period, as shown in Table 2, which were purposely scheduled on a range of different days, times and locations to maximise engagement.

Table 2: Barnet and King George V Public Drop-In Sessions

Date	Location	Time
Friday 28 June	Hope Corner Community Café	10am-1pm
Saturday 29 June	Barnet Playing Fields – By the Playground	2pm-5pm
Wednesday 10 July	Hope Corner Community Café	2pm-5pm
Thursday 25 July	Rainbow Centre	12pm-4pm
Friday 26 July	Barnet Playing Fields – By the Playground	10am-1pm

- 2.4.7 These sessions were designed to provide members of the public with an opportunity to view the plans up close, ask questions and provide feedback to Barnet Council and the SLC team.
- 2.4.8 Information regarding the public drop-in sessions was promoted on the Engage Barnet webpage and printed on a series of ‘Have Your Say’ posters and flyers. These also contained a ‘QR code’ to direct the public to the Engage Barnet webpage.
- 2.4.9 15 posters were displayed at Barnet and King George V Playing Fields, 1 at the Rainbow Centre, 2 at Hope Corner Community Café and were also sent to Greenwich Leisure Ltd (the Council’s leisure operator), Inclusion Barnet and residents on request. Flyers were distributed via post to 438 properties adjacent to Barnet and King George V Playing Fields to maximise residents’ awareness of the drop-in sessions and online questionnaire.
- 2.4.10 The feedback from the public drop-in sessions is provided in Section 4 of this report.

Social Media

- 2.4.11 As well as requests to stakeholders to promote the public consultation on their social media channels, Barnet Council distributed the Engage Barnet link on their Twitter feed (over 17,000 followers) and Facebook page (over 4,000 followers).
- 2.4.12 In the final weeks of public consultation, the Council invested in geo-targeted promotion, where ‘Have Your Say’ advertisements were displayed on the Facebook pages of residents living within 1 mile of Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
- 2.4.13 The Council’s Facebook analytics provided a summary of post views, engagement, reactions, comments and shares. The results of these and the key themes from the comments are provided in Section 4 of this report.

Further Promotion

- 2.4.14 Further promotional activities were provided through publications in the Council’s internal newsletters and bulletins, as shown in Table 3. A summary paragraph about the public consultation and a link to the Engage Barnet webpage was provided.

Table 3: Details of Further Promotional Channels

Name	Details	Date(s) of Issue
Communities Together Network	A forum for the voluntary, community and faith sector, business, the police, public health, education providers and the council. Published a fortnightly news bulletin.	7 June 21 June 5 July 19 July
Barnet First E-Newsletter	Fortnightly newsletter to bring residents the latest news from the council and community. Approximately 18,000 subscribers.	13 June 11 July
Barnet First Magazine	Provides information on council services, local news and community information for the borough of Barnet. Published and delivered quarterly to approximately 147,000 homes.	July 2019
Barnet Council News Hub	Barnet Council webpage listing latest news articles for the borough.	17 June

3 SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM KEY STAKEHOLDERS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section outlines the key findings from the face-to-face consultation, workshops and email correspondence with key stakeholders.

3.2 Stakeholder Meetings

Dollis Valley Partnership Board

3.2.1 Members of the SLC team attended a meeting of the Dollis Valley Partnership Board on 10 July 2019.

3.2.2 SLC provided an update on the consultation process to date, highlighting the key statistics based on resident responses.

3.2.3 Feedback provided by Board members on the final draft masterplan was generally positive and it was felt that such facilities were much needed in the local area, particularly for children, young people and families. Despite some negative feedback from residents regarding the proposed skatepark, Board members noted that such a facility would be beneficial, providing there was a suitable management presence on site.

3.2.4 Board members expressed concern regarding the relocation of St Kiernans Gaelic Football Club to King George V Playing Fields.

3.2.5 Further concern was noted regarding the increased number of visitors travelling to the site by car and the effect upon traffic movement within an already congested area.

3.3 Local Schools

Totteridge Academy

3.3.1 Totteridge Academy is a mixed secondary school and sixth form located on Barnet Lane, approximately a 10-minute walk from Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.

3.3.2 A facilitated workshop was organised with Totteridge Academy on 19 June 2019. 14 students from Year 7 – 10 (aged 11 – 15) attended the session.

3.3.3 A presentation was given by SLC to provide students with a background to the project, an overview of the masterplan and some example images of each proposed facility to aid their understanding. The students were subsequently split into two smaller groups to view the plans up close, ask questions and provide their views.

3.3.4 Despite the school's proximity, the majority of students rarely visit the park due to the limited facilities or activities on the site. Students described the park as 'boring', 'old' and 'worn out', and had no interest in spending time there aside from dog walking.

3.3.5 The overall feedback on the proposed facilities within the draft masterplan was very positive. Students would be keen to use the facilities proposed and visit the park after school with friends and family. A number of students noted that there are not enough things for young people to do in the area and these facilities would help mitigate this.

3.3.6 The most popular facilities were as follows:

- **Skatepark** – Several students requested the skatepark to be built first and were excited at the prospect of using the facility. It was noted that there is only one other skatepark in the whole borough (Friary Park).
- **Clip and Climb** – Students noted that this facility would be a key reason for visiting the park, particularly for those who do not live close by, and it would be a good family activity with younger siblings.
- **Café** – Students agreed that a café was needed in the park and would be a good addition alongside the Clip and Climb facility. Students also suggested that Totteridge Academy could develop a partnership with the café and facilitate ‘grow your own’ initiatives and work experience / youth employment opportunities. It was further suggested that the café should provide healthy food options and be environmentally friendly.
- **Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA)** – Students thought this would provide a good opportunity to play football and basketball.

3.3.7 The main concern raised by students was whether the outdoor gym, skatepark and Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) would be used for socialising rather than the desired purpose. This could potentially intimidate other young people wanting to use these facilities. Students agreed that CCTV and close supervision would be important to stop anti-social behaviour and misconduct.

3.3.8 Other points were raised in relation to the location and layout of the facilities. For instance, the cycle path separating the toddler play and adventure play area was perceived as a possible safety risk for young children. Students also thought that the location of the outdoor gym could be closer to the toddler play area so that parents could exercise whilst supervising their children.

3.3.9 At the close of the workshop, all students completed a hard copy of the easy-read questionnaire, which were subsequently recorded on SLC’s Zoho platform. Totteridge Academy also published the Engage Barnet link in a staff bulletin, displayed posters on school noticeboards and invited Year 10 form groups in computer rooms to complete the online questionnaire.

Underhill School

3.3.10 Underhill School is a primary school and children’s centre located on Mays Lane, approximately a 4-minute drive time and 20-minute walking distance from Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.

3.3.11 A workshop was organised on 15 July 2019 with 6 students from Year 5 and 6 (aged 9 -11) on the Student Council.

3.3.12 A presentation was given by SLC to provide students with an overview of the proposals and example images of each facility. A group discussion was subsequently led by SLC and allowed the students to view the masterplan up close, ask questions and provide their feedback.

3.3.13 The majority of students have visited the park to use the play area, walk their dog and go cycling. However, they do not spend much time there due to the lack of things to do.

3.3.14 Positive feedback was received on all of the facilities, regarding them as ‘really fun’ and ‘exciting’. The students felt the facilities would provide them with more opportunities to play, particularly the skatepark, adventure play area and Clip and Climb. They agreed that it would

be a good place to spend time at the weekend, as their younger siblings could also use the toddler play area.

- 3.3.15 Many of the students will be attending the Ark Academy in the future and thought it would be a 'great place' to go after school and meet with friends. Equally, a couple of students currently use the Rainbow Centre for classes and the holiday club and were pleased that it may be re-provided within the Community Sports Hub.
- 3.3.16 The main suggestions were regarding additions to the play areas, including a splash park, zip line and circular nest swing.
- 3.3.17 At the close of the workshop, all students completed a hard copy of the easy-read questionnaire, which were subsequently recorded on SLC's Zoho platform. Underhill School also displayed a poster in their main reception.

3.4 Email Correspondence

Barnet Society

- 3.4.1 The Barnet Society is an organisation that campaigns for the preservation and improvement of the environment of Chipping Barnet and surrounding areas and for protection of the Green Belt.
- 3.4.2 A written response was submitted by the Barnet Society on 13 July 2019 (Appendix 2) and a summary of the key points are provided below.
- 3.4.3 The Barnet Society welcomes the proposal to restore Barnet and King George V Playing Fields, and to widen public access by providing a café with toilet facilities and play areas for children and their parents or carers.
- 3.4.4 The Barnet Society also welcome improvements to the existing grass pitches, building the Gaelic Football pavilion on the burnt-out footprint, re-homing the Rainbow Centre and a new Dollis Valley footbridge.
- 3.4.5 However, there is strong concern that the development proposed would be a 'gross intrusion' on the Green Belt. The Community Sports Hub proposed does not 'preserve the openness of the Green Belt' (National Planning Policy Framework) and breaches Barnet Council's policy to protect Green Belt land (Policy CS7 Local Plan, September 2012).
- 3.4.6 It is further argued that the Community Sports Hub is too large for its required need and too imposing in height. The proposed scale of the building means it would be visible from all parts of the playing fields and impede on the openness.
- 3.4.7 Equally, the Barnet Society claim that the facilities are a duplication of what is provided at the Ark Pioneer Academy, and which were promised to be made available to the community.
- 3.4.8 Further opposition is expressed regarding the avenue of trees, which the Barnet Society believe would erode the openness of the playing fields, as would the skatepark and car park in the centre of the greenspace. According to the Barnet Society, the car park would disincentivise walking and cycling and exacerbate existing traffic congestion.
- 3.4.9 The Barnet Society include the following suggestions within their response:
 - The Gaelic Football pitch should not have a new fence placed around it, as it would spoil the view and confine users within a peripheral corridor.

- Re-locate the Dollis Valley footbridge to the South East corner of Barnet Playing Fields, to provide convenience for users from Whetstone.
- Given the projected increase in residents and users in the next few years, separation of the pathways for walkers / runners and cyclists is desirable.
- Further plant and wildlife enrichment, for instance, thickening hedgerows and groups of trees to form wildlife corridors between the Dollis Brook and Grasvenor Avenue and thicken up the row of trees by Hadley Wood Sports Trust to mitigate the high fence and floodlights.
- Provide a new building and car park at the edge of the site, where they could be easily accessed and serviced and would not be obtrusive to the parkland view. For instance, alongside Barnet Table Tennis Centre, which could also benefit from tidying up the most neglected part of the fields.
- Any building or landscape features must be of high standards of design and environmental quality.

3.4.10 Overall, the Barnet Society are open to supporting a new building and enhanced landscaping but strongly disapprove of the proposed masterplan in terms of the size and height of the Community Sports Hub and intrusion on the Green Belt. The document concludes by suggesting that a ‘fundamental re-think’ of the building brief and location is required.

Theresa Villiers, Member of Parliament for Chipping Barnet

3.4.11 Theresa Villiers MP provided formal written feedback to the Council on 5 August 2019 (Appendix 3).

3.4.12 The feedback endorses and supports the Barnet Society response and reflects discussions held with local residents, a summary of which is provided below.

3.4.13 The response notes the significance of parks and open spaces in Barnet and their role in contributing to the quality of life of residents, particularly those who have small gardens or none at all. Protecting the Green Belt and defending local green spaces is also noted as a high priority.

3.4.14 The Council’s objective to provide better facilities in this area is welcomed, however, there is strong concern regarding the size of the development and scale of the new building proposed.

3.4.15 The key concerns are as follows:

- ***Skatepark*** – The development of a skatepark is strongly opposed, noting that there is no required need in the area. It is positioned too close to residential properties, which will cause noise nuisance. There is also concern that the skatepark would potentially be floodlit in the future.
- ***Sports pitches*** – The number of sports pitches is regarded as too many and crammed in one area, leaving limited space for dog walkers. Any fencing to the sport pitches would also be unnecessary.
- ***Traffic*** – The extra traffic generated by the opening of the Ark Academy is of deep concern to residents who fear that this development will further exacerbate these problems.
- ***Ark Academy*** – The concern from the Barnet Society that the facilities are a duplication of the provision at the Ark Academy is re-iterated in the response.

- **Local schools** – Concern that local schools appear to have not been contacted about this development.
- **Funding** – There is concern that no Council funding is guaranteed for the project in the future, which means that any new facilities could fall into disrepair. This is a further reason to scale back on the proposals.

3.4.16 Overall, Theresa Villiers MP opposes the masterplan and suggests that the Council revise the proposals in order to retain more of the open space feel.

Ark Academy

3.4.17 Feedback was received via email from the Principal of the new Ark Academy on 26 July 2019.

3.4.18 The Principal supports the development in general but remains concerned about the location of the proposed skatepark and its proximity to the Academy. In addition, the extended school day (until 4.30pm) means that pupils from other schools finishing earlier may cause a disturbance to Ark pupils through use of the skatepark.

3.4.19 The Principal would prefer to see the skatepark located to another area of the site.

4 SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM WIDER PUBLIC CONSULTATION

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section provides a summary of the results from the online questionnaire and comments received from the public drop-in sessions, email correspondence and social media. A full version of the report on the online questionnaire and public drop-in sessions feedback is provided in Appendices 4 and 5.

4.2 Online Questionnaire


4.2.1 The online questionnaire generated a total of **387** responses.

4.2.2 Positively, 32% of respondents were under 25 which shows that the process has been successful in engaging with young people. The majority of other responses came from residents aged 35 – 54 (33%). Less than 9% of respondents were over 65.

4.2.3 There was a broadly equal split in gender, with 48% male and 45% female respondents. In terms of ethnicity, 51% of respondents were White British and the remaining 38% incorporated a diverse split of ethnic origins (11% preferred not to say). 10% of respondents considered themselves to be living with a disability.


4.2.4 68% of respondents lived locally to Barnet and King George V Playing Fields (within 15 minutes walking distance) as shown in Figure 1. This positively demonstrates that the online questionnaire reached and engaged with the immediate locality and those people most likely to use the site.

Figure 1: Residency of Questionnaire Respondents



4.2.5 The questionnaire asked respondents if they were current visitors to Barnet and King George V Playing Fields. 78% of respondents selected ‘yes’ and 22% ‘no’. Of the 78%, the majority visit the site most days or once or twice a week, indicating a good level of usage amongst respondents. The primary reasons given for visiting the park is for walking (63%), followed by enjoying nature (39%), using the play facilities (31%), going for a jog / run (25%) and cycling (25%).

Figure 2: Frequency of Visit to Barnet and King George V Playing Fields



4.2.6 Respondents predominantly travel to the site on foot (68%), whilst 15% travel by car and 11% by bicycle.

4.2.7 For the 22% of respondents that do not visit the site, the main reasons were a lack of relevant facilities, lack of awareness and not living in the area.

4.2.8 The questionnaire also asked respondents to rank their support for the individual outdoor and indoor facilities within the proposed masterplan, ranging from ‘strongly support’ to ‘strongly oppose’. This was designed to reveal whether any particular facilities were more or less popular than others. An additional comment box was provided to allow respondents to explain their choices further.

4.2.9 As illustrated in Figure 3, the outdoor facilities with the highest support were as follows:


- **Outdoor gym and trim trail** (80% selected either strongly support or tend to support)
- **Improved pedestrian routes** (79% selected either strongly support or tend to support)
- **Adventurous play area** (78% selected either strongly support or tend to support)
- **Toddler play area** (76% selected either strongly support or tend to support)

4.2.10 Overall, strong support was received on the majority of facilities, with over 68% selecting either strongly support or tend to support for the improved cycle routes, MUGA and football pitches.

4.2.11 In terms of less positive responses, 24% of respondents indicated that they strongly oppose or tend to oppose the skatepark. This was followed by the Gaelic football pitch and training areas (23% strongly oppose or tend to oppose).

4.2.12 On further analysis, it is worth noting that only 14% of under 25 respondents selected that they strongly oppose or tend to oppose the skatepark.

Figure 3: Support for Proposed Outdoor Facilities




4.2.13 The additional comments box received 100 answers. The main themes are as follows:

- **Greenspace** – 12 comments referred to the proposed development intruding on greenspace which is unique to the area and which residents find tranquil.
- **Supportive** – 12 stated their support for the masterplan and specific facilities, noting that it is an under-utilised space and would be a welcome development, particularly for children.
- **Skatepark** – 10 explained their reasons for strongly opposing the skatepark, notably concerns relating to graffiti, anti-social and unsolicited behaviour and noise pollution for adjacent residents.
- **Gaelic football** – 7 raised questions on why Gaelic football was being proposed and its occupancy of a large proportion of land. One comment suggested that the pavilion should be joint use with the football community.
- **Suggestions** – 34 comments suggested additional facilities. In particular, 4 requested tennis courts to be incorporated in the masterplan. Other recurring suggestions

included calisthenic equipment at the outdoor gym / trim trail, splash park and extending the cycle path to connect with Priory Grove.

4.2.14 With regard to the indoor facilities, and as shown in Figure 4, all of the proposals received over 67% of respondents support. The café (including toilets) was the most popular facility, with 83% selecting either strongly support or tend to support.

Figure 4: Support for Proposed Indoor Facilities



4.2.15 The additional comments received 86 responses. The main themes are as follows:


- **Supportive** - 23 of the comments were highlighting their support for the Community Sports Hub, particularly the café, Rainbow Centre provision, Clip and Climb for children and toilets for spending longer periods of time at the park.
- **Green Belt** - 16 raised concern regarding the impact upon Green Belt land and detriment to open space. Similarly, whilst others were not opposed to the building, respondents requested assurance that it would not be too obtrusive or high.
- **Other** - Further comments related to ensuring sufficient disabled access to the building and disability-friendly activities, incorporation of bouldering in the Clip and Climb facility and adequate supervision and management presence.

4.2.16 Questions 8 to 10 were designed to assess respondent’s current levels of physical activity, their desire to be more active and the extent to which the proposed new facilities may help to achieve this.

4.2.17 Question 8 asked respondents ‘How physically active are you?’ with available answers matching the definitions of Sport England’s Active Lives Survey on physical activity. These included less than 30 minutes per week (inactive or less active), 30 – 150 minutes per week (fairly active) and 150+ minutes per week (active).

4.2.18 The UK’s Chief Medical Officer recommends that everyone is physically active for at least 150 minutes per week, with physical activity defined as any moderate intensity activity which raises your heart rate for a sustained period and makes you sweat. This definition was included in the questionnaire to assist completion.

Figure 5: Current Levels of Physical Activity



4.2.19 The results show that less than 13% of respondents are in the less active / inactive group which is below the national average. However, 65% are not meeting the recommended 150 minutes of physical activity each week, much higher than the national average.

4.2.20 70% of respondents highlighted that they would like to be more physically active and 57% confirmed that the proposed facilities in the masterplan would encourage them to be more physically active.


4.2.21 Increasing sport and physical activity levels amongst Barnet residents is a key strategic objective in Barnet Council’s Fit and Active Barnet Framework 2016 – 2021. Based on the results from the online questionnaire, the draft masterplan appears well positioned to assist in achieving this.

4.2.22 70% of respondents would be more likely to visit the park if the proposed facilities were provided, indicating potentially good visitor numbers and resident engagement with the site. Of the 79 respondents who do not currently visit the site, 52% selected that they would be more likely to visit if the facilities were provided.

4.2.23 The questionnaire also asked respondents to rank their support for the proposed layout and location of facilities. This was designed to gather feedback on whether respondents felt that the different facilities were positioned correctly on the site.

4.2.24 Figure 6 illustrates the summary of responses given. Positively, 64% of respondents strongly support or tend to support the proposed layout and location of facilities, compared to the 18% who expressed they were strongly opposed or tend to oppose.

Figure 6: Support for the Proposed Layout and Location of Facilities



4.2.25 The 18% who were unsupportive had the opportunity to justify their response further in an open comment box, which received 51 answers. The main reasons were as follows:

- **Green Belt** - 22 comments were opposed to the development on Green Belt land, noting that there are too many facilities proposed and the space should remain as it is for nature and wildlife. The Community Sports Hub building was of particular concern, noting that it was too obtrusive on the open space and should be better situated elsewhere.
- **Car park** - 9 answers objected to the new car park and its intrusion on greenspace. It would also encourage more people to visit by car and put extra pressure on traffic in the area. Respondents noted that focus should instead be on public transport and improving bus routes. One comment also highlighted that the proposed car park is too narrow for cars to pass and turn, and the extension on a blind corner is potentially dangerous.
- **Skatepark** - 9 of the comments referred to the location of the skatepark. Despite the improved location following previous consultation on the initial draft masterplan, respondents were still dissatisfied with the proximity to residential properties on Grasvenor Avenue. Suggestions included relocating the skatepark closer to the

Community Sports Hub and swapping it with the toddler play area, so that the play areas are adjacent.

- **Other** - Further comments were in reference to the proximity of the football pitches to residential gardens and the proposed additional path and avenue of trees between the junior football pitches.


4.2.26 An additional comment box was also open for further feedback and received 79 responses. The objections to the proposals reiterate the points raised in the comment box above, regarding greenspace and the car park. Other comments referred to the following:

- **Supportive** - 15 comments expressed their full support for the location and layout of the facilities, noting that it will offer more opportunities for physical activity, encourage people to get outdoors, bring the community together and provide suitable provision for young people.
- **Avenue of trees** - Others noted that the avenue of trees pathway is an unnecessary division of the park and spoils the openness of the space.
- **Cycle routes** – It was suggested that the cycle routes will require a clear separation with suitable signage. Similarly, focus should be placed on improving sustainable transport links to avoid further traffic and congestion.
- **Football pitches** – It was also suggested that the number of football pitches proposed is too many and discourages other sports, such as cricket and tennis, and female users.
- The Stables Horse Activity Centre provided comment, raising concern on the impact of the Gaelic football pitches on their operations, particularly with regard to noise, increased traffic and proximity of cycle paths to their boundary.

4.2.27 The final two questions, prior to the Diversity Monitoring questions, were intended to capture respondents' overall opinion of the draft masterplan. As illustrated in Figure 7, 40% of respondents stated that they 'strongly support' and 30% stating that they 'tend to support' the draft masterplan. Conversely, 12% 'strongly oppose' and 7% 'tend to oppose'. **70% of all respondents therefore positively support the final draft masterplan compared with 19% who stated that they were unsupportive.**

4.2.28 Further analysis on responses from under 25s revealed that 78% positively support the draft masterplan and just 6% oppose it.

Figure 7: Overall Support for Barnet and King George V Playing Fields Draft Masterplan



4.2.29 This question allowed the 19% of unsupportive respondents to justify their response in an open comment box, which received 45 answers. These comments re-iterated concerns raised previously in the questionnaire, 20 of which were in relation to erosion of the Green Belt and keeping it ‘as is’. Other comments were concerned with the extra traffic and congestion in the area, maintenance and management of the site and opposition to Gaelic football.

4.2.30 The closing question asked respondents to highlight if there was anything missing from the masterplan. 38% selected ‘yes’ and were asked to specify in a comment box. This received 100 suggestions on a wide range of facilities. The most common proposals were:

- Tennis courts (12)
- Swimming pool (11)
- Splash park (8)
- Further tree planting and flower beds (6)
- Additions to the play areas – zip wire, swings, disabled access (5)
- Cricket pitch (4)
- Barnet Football Club (4)
- Cycle path to Ark Academy / Priory Grove (3)
- Further security measures (3).

4.2.31 An additional comment box was available at the close of the questionnaire for respondents to note any further final feedback. 54 answers were recorded and re-iterated the points explained previously. In particular, respondents noted that effective management and security of the site will be key to the success of the development.

4.3 Public Drop-In Sessions

4.3.1 The five public drop-in sessions which were hosted during June and July 2019 received an approximate total attendance of 118 members of the public. The draft masterplan, floorplan of the Community Sports Hub and accompanying detailed area drawings were displayed and members of the SLC team and Barnet Council were available to explain the draft masterplan and answer questions.

4.3.2 Local residents were invited to give verbal feedback, which was subsequently recorded by SLC in a written format. A record of the feedback received is provided in Appendix 5.

4.3.3 The drop-in session hosted at the Rainbow Centre was particularly useful to discuss the Community Sports Hub and gain insight from under-represented members of the community, including young people, those from Black and Asian Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups, low income households and disabled people.

4.3.4 The feedback provided through the public drop-in sessions has been divided into some overarching and recurring themes, a summary of which is provided below:

- **Parking and Traffic.** Residents concern with the effect of the proposed masterplan on traffic and congestion in the area was repeatedly raised. It was noted that this is already a significant problem and will be exacerbated by increased visitors to the park, the opening of Ark Academy in September and housing development at High Barnet station. Similarly, the proposed 66-space car park was one of the least popular facilities. The inadequate provision of car parking installed at the Ark Academy heightened residents worry that the proposed car park will be abused by staff members and parents. An efficient monitoring model will need to be in place.

Equally, residents highlighted that the width of the car park is insufficient to handle cars arriving, leaving and parking, alongside pedestrians and cyclists, and the blind corner will only lead to potential accidents.

Suggestions were made to revise the accessibility to the park and focus on sustainable travel by facilitating more cycle paths beyond the site boundary and improving bus routes. In particular, the Rainbow Centre highlighted that not many of their members are able to drive and therefore to retain their client base, ease of access is vital.

- **Young People.** Positive feedback was received from parents on the masterplan, noting that the play areas are currently poor quality and need refurbishing, and the proposed facilities would provide well needed activities for young people. The proposals would encourage young people to get out of the house, make new friends, be more physically active and improve their health and wellbeing, particularly as many of the houses in the local area do not have a garden. The young people at the Rainbow Centre were also very positive about the plans and felt it would bring the community together.
- **Skatepark.** Of all the facilities, the skatepark was met with the most opposition across the sessions. Concerns were raised by residents on the extent of noise pollution and anti-social behaviour. Some residents felt that the unwelcome behaviour which currently occurs in the park, such as motorbike racing and drug dealing, would worsen with the addition of a skatepark and be a 'hotspot' for gangs and vandalism, particularly if it is not lit or patrolled at night. Some local residents on Grasvenor Avenue strongly objected to the position of the skatepark at the back of their house

and requested the facility to be re-located, such as swapped for a junior football pitch, or abandoned completely.

- **Security and Management.** Linked to the concerns on the skatepark, several members of the public noted that the success of the masterplan will depend upon adequate security measures and strong management to ensure a clean and safe site. This included suggestions such as more CCTV and extra bins, including dog bins.
- **Green Belt / Open Space.** The preservation of the green, open space was of vital importance to the public. Many of the residents welcomed the proposed facilities, on assurance that the Green Belt was protected as much as possible, and the park remains as open as possible. This was coupled with suggestions to enhance the landscaping further, such as around the Dollis Valley stream, a wildflower meadow behind the oak tree and additional tree / shrub planting.

Others noted that too many facilities were being proposed and it would erode the green, peaceful space, particularly as land has already been lost to the Hadley Wood Sports Trust and Ark Academy.

- **Community Sports Hub.** The facilities provided within the Community Sports Hub were largely welcomed by the public. In particular, the provision of a café with outdoor seating was very popular, particularly with families and elderly residents. Likewise, toilets were viewed as essential to allow extended use of the park and remove the worry for parents with young children.

Others noted that the building was too large, too high (Clip and Climb sub-section) and intrusive on the park. Suggestions were made to re-locate the building closer to the Ark Academy, on the site periphery or down-scale in size.

Further suggestions were made to improve the disabled access of the building, including enlarging the assisted changing room and providing access from the outside, installing a second disabled toilet and re-locating these closer to the café / entrance.

- **Rainbow Centre.** The re-provision of the Rainbow Centre within the Community Sports Hub was received very positively to allow their community services, classes and holiday club to continue. The key issue raised was the extent to which the community rooms, studios, interview / counselling room and office would be available for Rainbow Centre use. Members of the Rainbow Centre requested assurance that their services be prioritised, and any multi-use managed efficiently. Equally, the size of the rooms should at least match the Rainbow Centre's current provision, particularly for hosting the martial arts and holiday club. The martial arts club also require a storage room for equipment (approximately 2m x 4m).

The Rainbow Money Advice service requested an additional interview / counselling room as their service is currently over-booked and predicted to expand further. In addition to the mental health service, one room may not be sufficient to provide these pivotal community services. Similarly, the layout of the interview / counselling room was noted as requiring re-positioning to the periphery of the building to allow for windows and natural light, which plays a large role in helping vulnerable people. The finer details inside the room were important to the service and they would appreciate further input at a later design stage, such as including a glass panel door and CCTV.

- **Football Pitches.** Improvements to the existing football pitches were welcomed as the current ones are poor quality. A few residents felt that they will be too noisy and should be relocated away from residential properties. The number of football pitches compared to other sports, such as tennis, was also queried.
- **Gaelic Football.** Many of the public were unaware of Gaelic Football, however, the pitch and training area was generally accepted providing the pitches would not be fenced off. The extension to the car park was welcomed as was making use of the existing footprint for the pavilion. It was suggested that the pavilion should also be made available to other local sports teams.
- **Avenue of Trees.** There were mixed opinions on this proposal. The majority disliked the idea, noting that the addition of trees would erode the expansive feel of the park and open vista, and the extra pathway is not required. Others were satisfied with the path but would prefer the trees to be low shrubs or flower beds.
- **Cycle and Pedestrian Paths.** Improvements to the existing paths was received very positively, particularly the proposed Dollis Valley bridge to extend walking route opportunities. Suggestions were made to extend the cycle route up to Priory Grove, ensure there are clear markings for cycling / walking separation and implement a cycle speed limit to avoid accidents.

Requests were also made to prioritise cleaning up the Dollis Valley Stream during construction of the bridge.

- **Outdoor Gym and Trim Trail.** This was one of the most popular facilities, noting that the existing outdoor gym is largely under-used and there is potential to replicate good examples in other parks such as Primrose Hill and Westminster Park. Requests were made to include calisthenics equipment.

A suggestion was also made to relocate the outdoor gym closer to the toddler play area and Community Sports Hub.

- **Further Suggestions.** Other suggestions which were made included tennis courts, a splash park, zip-line in the play area, non-tarmac car park, extra disabled parking bays and solar panels on the Community Sports Hub roof.

4.3.5 Overall, concerns raised by members of the public attending the drop-in sessions were predominantly associated with the skatepark, car park and protection of the Green Belt. The other proposed facilities were received very positively, particularly the toddler and adventure play, outdoor gym, Rainbow Centre, café and toilets and the pedestrian bridge.

4.4 Email Correspondence

4.4.1 The email feedback which was received via the dedicated email address (BarnetKingGeorgeVMasterPlan@barnet.gov.uk) received two responses from residents.

4.4.2 The first raised concerns that the football pitches were situated too close to residential gardens, resulting in noise pollution, balls being kicked over and subsequent health and safety hazards to children. The proximity of the pitches to the footpath was viewed as a risk to dog walkers, runners, cyclists and young families.

4.4.3 The second submitted a detailed response, with the following key points:

- The masterplan is an overdevelopment and ‘urbanisation’ of Green Belt land and erodes the openness of the space.
- The increase of car parking spaces from the present 134 to 249 is unacceptable on Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Improved cycle routes and a skatepark should also not be included in greenspace and instead re-located to streets and industrial areas.
- A Community Sports Hub is not required as there are other buildings in the area which can provide equivalent services.
- The risk of vandalism is high, particularly if the car park entrances are not locked at night.
- Suggestion for pedestrian-only paths to avoid accidents with cyclists and overcrowding. All pedestrian paths should also be as natural as possible or incorporated with recycled rubber for safety and porosity.
- Suggestion to self-contain the public toilets, with outward opening doors to the outside space and appropriate security features.

4.5 Social Media

4.5.1 Following the Council’s social media promotion, the Council’s Facebook analytics revealed that the multiple posts promoting the Engage Barnet link accumulated a total of 422 clicks, 99 reactions, 30 shares and 65 comments.

4.5.2 The breakdown of post ‘reactions’, as shown in Figure 8, indicate that 91 people ‘like’ and 2 ‘love’ the proposed masterplan compared to 6 ‘angry’ users. This is a positive response, particularly as the majority of these reactions will have been from the targeted promotion to residents living within one mile of the playing fields.

Figure 8: Summary of Facebook Post Reactions



4.5.3 A selection of feedback from the comments provided is detailed below. In particular, providing facilities for disabled children was repeatedly noted. The negative comments received were largely directed towards Council services more generally, such as road maintenance and recycling.

Positive:

- *“Brilliant! The current play area is awful, this is what the local area needs!”*
- *“Will be a fantastic idea and improvement that we need.”*
- *“Please! Put the right amount of money into the skatepark, they are so beneficial to not only the youth but the area around it when executed properly. Skateboarding not only provides a purposeful pass-time and exercise but also creates dialogue between teenagers of different backgrounds to create a community.”*

Negative:

- *“I’d like to see a lot more green areas where we can just walk quietly. This looks like it’s going to be expensive and exclusive.”*

- *“The Junior football pitches right next door to the local residential gardens seem to be very close to the footpath.”*
- *“The whole area is going to be a massive no go zone, as soon as the school opens, as the area is going to be massively grid locked.”*

Suggestions:

- *“Are there any facilities for the disabled? They too need to enjoy various sports in a safe environment.”*
- *“This is a great start, but we need more inclusive play areas, such as special needs swings and wheelchair accessibility.”*
- *“Summer splash park please, plus a sensory garden.”*
- *“There should be a cricket pitch and / or cricket nets factored in that are free to use for the public.”*

4.6 Summary

- 4.6.1 The public consultation exercise has secured good levels of engagement and was successful in capturing the views and opinions of a wide range of residents and stakeholders on the final draft masterplan for Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
- 4.6.2 The results from the online questionnaire indicated a positive response to the final draft masterplan with 70% of respondents strongly supporting or tending to support the proposals compared to 19% strongly opposing or tending to oppose.
- 4.6.3 The public drop-in sessions were successful in providing an opportunity to discuss the plans with the general public face-to-face and engage in a more in-depth conversation than the online questionnaire.
- 4.6.4 The email correspondence and social media analytics have equally supplemented the results and added value to the engagement.
- 4.6.5 The exercise has revealed a good level of support for the proposed development to revitalise an under-used park. However, recurring concerns were highlighted throughout the process with regard to the skatepark, car park, traffic congestion and erosion of Green Belt land.
- 4.6.6 It was repeatedly re-iterated that the development would need to be sensitively planned to respect and retain the green, open space and ensure that effective management and security is established on site to protect against anti-social behaviour.
- 4.6.7 A large proportion of the comments received through the public engagement were suggestions for the Council to alter the masterplan. Predominantly, these were in relation to the avenue of trees, location of the skatepark and football pitches, cycle routes and public transport, tennis courts and the layout of the Community Sports Hub.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

5.1 Conclusions

- 5.1.1 The public consultation exercise on the draft masterplan for Barnet and King George V Playing Fields was developed in partnership with the Council and delivered through a combination of face-to-face meetings, email correspondence, workshops, public drop-in sessions and an online questionnaire promoted through the Council's website and social media channels.
- 5.1.2 The process has been successful in gathering feedback from a wide range of interested parties and stakeholders and provides a solid evidence base from which the Council is able to consider the next steps.
- 5.1.3 The key conclusions arising from the consultation on the final draft masterplan for Barnet and King George V Playing Fields are as follows:
1. The consultation process engaged with over 700 local residents and stakeholders during the 8-week period, which demonstrates a good level of engagement.
 2. The consultation was successful in ensuring a fair representation of different user groups. In particular, the views of children and young people came through strongly in the online questionnaire, with 32% of respondents under the age of 25. This was supplemented by the workshops held at Totteridge Academy and Underhill Primary School.
 3. The online questionnaire generated 387 responses, with a high level of engagement from residents within 15 minutes of the site (68%).
 4. The results of the online questionnaire show a positive response from the general public to the final draft masterplan proposals with 70% of respondents being either supportive or very supportive compared to 19% being unsupportive. The Council's Facebook page on the draft masterplan also received 91 likes.
 5. Throughout the consultation, there was clear support amongst stakeholders and the wider public for the principle of creating a more engaging space which improves opportunities for local people to be physically active and increases use of the playing fields.
 6. The most popular facilities were the café (including toilets), outdoor gym / trim trail, Dollis Brook bridge, toddler and adventure play areas and re-provision of facilities for the Rainbow Centre.
 7. Young people were very supportive of the proposed masterplan. In the online questionnaire, 78% of respondents under the age of 25 were supportive of the proposals and only 6% indicated that they were unsupportive.
 8. The masterplan is well positioned to deliver health and wellbeing benefits to residents, with 57% of respondents noting that the proposed facilities would encourage them to be more physically active and 70% stating that they would be more likely to visit Barnet and King George V Playing Fields if the proposed facilities were provided.
 9. The key areas of contention raised throughout the consultation period are listed in Table 4.

Table 4: Key Areas of Contention on the Final Draft Masterplan

Area of Concern	Key Issues
Skatepark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to local residents • Noise pollution • Anti-social behaviour
Green Belt land / Open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusion upon the Green Belt and impact upon the open space • Size and scale of the Community Sports Hub • Central pathway and avenue of trees breaking up the open vista
Car park and traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of open space • Implications upon traffic and congestion • Sustainable transport routes to the site
Management, maintenance and security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of management presence, security and upkeep of proposed facilities

5.2 Recommended Next Steps

- 5.2.1 It is recommended that the Council considers the feedback obtained during the public consultation and explores opportunities to mitigate any concerns through amendments to the draft masterplan.
- 5.2.2 In the event that the Council wish to progress the masterplan through detailed design stages, it will be appropriate to consider some of the feedback in relation to more specific design elements such as building layout, disabled access, CCTV and landscaping. It will be essential to maintain regular dialogue with key stakeholders to ensure the final plans meet their requirements.
- 5.2.3 The Council will need to consider how they intend to report back the results of the consultation to stakeholders and the wider public and to advise them on how this process will be used to further inform the plans for the site.

APPENDICES

6 APPENDIX 1: STAKEHOLDERS / CONSULTEES

6.1.1 This appendix provides the details of the different groups of current occupiers / users and stakeholders that were engaged with throughout the consultation period.

6.1.2 These groups are categorised as follows:

- **Key occupiers / users** – clubs or organisations currently located on site or near Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.
- **Key stakeholders** – interested parties such as community organisations, the Dollis Valley Partnership Board, Sport England and National Governing Bodies of sport and the Ark Academy.
- **Under-represented groups** – community groups and organisations which provide services for under-represented residents, such as ethnic minorities, disabled people, young people and older generations.
- **Local schools** – local schools within a 10-minute drive time catchment of Barnet and King George V Playing Fields.

6.2 Key Occupiers / Users

Table 6: Stakeholder Engagement – List of Key Occupiers / Users

Occupier / User
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barnet Table Tennis Club • Buggyfit Barnet • Hadley Wood Sports Trust • St Kiernan’s Gaelic Football Club • The Stables Horse Activity Centre

6.3 Key Stakeholders

Table 7: Stakeholder Engagement – List of Key Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Contact
Rainbow Centre	Steve Verrall, Centre Manager
Hope Corner Community Centre	Julian Desborough, Secretary
Dollis Valley Partnership Board	Nigel Eade, Chairman
Barnet Society	Robin Bishop, Chairman
London and Quadrant Housing Trust (L &Q Group)	Simone Taylor, Regeneration Co-Ordinator
Greenwich Leisure Limited (Better Leisure)	Gillan Kelly, Partnership Manager
Sport England	Mark Furnish, Planning Manager
Middlesex Football Association	Craig Nicholson, Head of Participation and Development
Ward Councillors for Totteridge and Underhill	Alison Cornelius; Richard Cornelius; Caroline Stock; Jess Brayne; Paul Edwards; Tim Roberts
Community Engagement, Barnet Council	Danusia Brzezicka
Strategic Planning and Regeneration Service, Barnet Council	Cali Ibrahim
Barnet Youth Foundation, Barnet Council	Janet Matthewson

Family Services, Barnet Council	Kerry Hodges; Mark Vargeson; Karen Ali
Older People Engagement, Barnet Council	Claire Desouza; Sarah Perrin

6.4 Under-Represented Groups

Table 8: Stakeholder Engagement – List of Under-Represented Groups

Organisation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age UK Barnet • Chipping Barnet Day Centre • Friends in Need • High Barnet Good Neighbours • Inclusion Barnet • MENCAP • Rainbow Centre • Young Barnet

6.5 Local Schools

Table 9: Stakeholder Engagement – List of Local Schools

School
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ark Academy • Cromer Road Primary School • Danegrove Primary School • Foulds Primary School • Grasvenor Avenue Primary School • Lyonsdown Preparatory School • Manor Hill Greek School • Queen Elizabeth’s Girls’ School • Queenswell Junior School • St Andrew’s Church of England Primary School • St Catherine’s Primary School • St John’s Church of England Primary School • St Margaret’s Nursery School • St Mary’s Church of England Primary School • The Pavilion School • Totteridge Academy • Underhill Primary School

7 APPENDIX 2: BARNET SOCIETY RESPONSE

7.1.1 A copy of the Barnet Society response is provided as a separate document.

8 APPENDIX 3: THERESA VILLIERS MP RESPONSE

8.1.1 A copy of Theresa Villiers MP response is provided as a separate document.

9 APPENDIX 4: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE REPORT

9.1.1 A report on the online questionnaire is provided as a separate document.

10 APPENDIX 5: PUBLIC DROP-IN SESSIONS FEEDBACK

10.1.1 The public drop-in session notes are provided in a separate document.



This report has been written by The Sport, Leisure and Culture Consultancy (SLC). SLC was established in 2009 and advises organisations by developing effective strategies, planning sustainable facilities and procuring successful operational partnerships.

PHONE

01444 459927

EMAIL

info@slc.uk.com

WEBSITE

www.slc.uk.com

HEAD OFFICE

**The Sport, Leisure and Culture Consultancy
2nd Floor, 3 Boltro Road, Haywards Heath
West Sussex, RH16 1BY, United Kingdom**