

Lindford's Parish Plan, 2003

Lindford completed its Village Appraisal in March 2002, and the Parish Council decided that we should build on this to produce a Parish Plan, setting out priorities for the village. We are grateful to the Countryside Agency who provided us with a grant to finance this project. The Parish Plan should be looked at in conjunction with the Appraisal. The Plan itself is not meant to be an elaborate or grand document, but rather a practical and concise statement of proposals in response to the findings of the Appraisal.

All residents were invited to the first meeting (on the 27th June, 2002, in the Methodist Church Hall) through a newsletter which was distributed to every household in Lindford. Subsequent meetings, held over the next 12 months, were publicised in a variety of ways, including letters to those who had already attended. At the meetings people divided into groups to discuss particular topic areas and produce recommendations which were then discussed by the whole group. The areas which we looked at were as follows:

- Public Transport
- Traffic calming/speed limits
- Policing/neighbourhood watch
- Preserving the appearance of Lindford
- Enhancement of open spaces
- Planning / proposed development at end of Chase Road/possible planning gain
- Other facilities – village hall, allotments, sports provision

Public Transport

For the majority of households (88.2%) the main means of transport is the private car. However a significant minority are reliant on the relatively poor public transport which is available locally. 15.5% of people do not have daytime access to a vehicle.

The Stagecoach bus to Liphook Station has been a success, and, in line with requests made at a meeting called by LPC, the service has been extended further into the evenings and to cover Sundays. However, recently there have been problems in co-ordinating with trains.

The most regular bus service is the Number 18, and this is valued by many local residents, but it does not stop at the Forest Centre. The Parish Council has asked the responsible authorities to consider either diverting the Bordhill bus to link Lindford with the Whitehill facilities or to divert the Number 18. At the time of writing the evening and Sunday Number 18 services are being withdrawn, however, and we are asking HCC to help to rescue them.

LPC is aware of the possibility of obtaining a Transport Grant to improve public transport locally e.g. to the Forest Centre, Chase Hospital, and the Elizabeth Dibden

Centre. It has been suggested that a small bus might be the most appropriate vehicle to meet this sort of demand. We have had some preliminary discussions with Headley Parish Council about the prospect of a joint initiative, using such funds. However, the funds would only be available for a limited period and there is a need for considerable local input in terms of time and money.

There is also a lack of information about services which are already available – e.g. Dial-a-Ride. LPC has obtained information about such services and advertised them on notice boards. We are also considering distribution of this information directly to households.

Traffic Calming

For several years LPC has been pressing for traffic calming measures and a reduced speed limit on the B3004 (Liphook Road) through the village. This road has a 40mph limit on it and, because it is fairly wide and has 2 fairly long straight stretches on it as it passes through Lindford, traffic speeds are high and many drivers exceed the speed limit. Traffic volumes are also high for a 'B' road. A traffic count by local residents on 25th March 2003, revealed, for example, 596 vehicles travelling south at Lindford Bridge between 5.30 and 6.30 pm. Most of these are split between the Headley Road and the Liphook Road at the Royal Exchange junction. On this occasion there were flows of 313 vehicles moving south down the Liphook Road near Altis Tools during the 1 hour period. The survey was conducted on a Tuesday, which is thought to be a 'typical day', not the day of highest use. The hour chosen is also not necessarily the hour of highest road use.

The Liphook Road is seen by many residents as a major barrier through the middle of our village. Concern is expressed regularly about children having to cross this road on their way to and from the bus stops, Mill Chase School, or the playground. Many older residents and people with physical handicaps protest about the time that they have to wait for the road to be sufficiently clear for a safe crossing.

In the Appraisal 65.2% of respondents said that they saw speeding traffic as a problem in Lindford. 68.8% would support action to improve road safety at the Royal Exchange junction, and large numbers identified the sections of the road by Headley Mill and by the Elmfield Court shops as areas where action is required. 82.1% were in favour of a reduction in the speed limit to 30mph, and 80.2% said that they were mainly or fully in support of the Parish Council's proposals for mild traffic calming on the Liphook Road.

Recently the County Council has agreed to place 2 pedestrian refuges on this road, one near the Elmfield Court shops and one near Headley Mill, and a pavement by the Mill. In addition, there is to be a visual narrowing of the road through the use of white lines, funded through the Parish Partnership scheme, to which LPC has contributed £1000.

Because of funding difficulties, and perhaps because HCC is aware that Bellway Homes may provide funding, the installation of the Elmfield Court refuge has been delayed until next financial year. The other work was to have been carried out in late

July / early August 2003, but was delayed pending approval by a Government Department for the use of solar powered lighting in the refuge.

It is the hope of LPC that once these measures are in place the Highways Authority, with police support, will be prepared to reduce the speed limit to 30mph. If the police do not consider that the '85-percentile' speed is sufficiently low then we must consider other measures. Suggestions from the Parish Plan group included pinch points, village gateways, road markings and possibly speed humps.

During the Parish Plan meetings it was apparent that there was strong support for road safety measures elsewhere in Lindford. The Headley Road was mentioned by many as a dangerous road to cross, in spite of the 30 mph limit on the stretch near Cricket Lea, and, as the traffic survey shows, flows of vehicles on this road are relatively high for a 'B' road (217 were counted moving south between 5.30 and 6.30 pm at the Royal Exchange junction).

The traffic on Chase Road causes serious concern to many, a problem which will increase if the proposed development at the Whitehill end of this road goes ahead. One practical suggestion which met with general approval was that there should be a raised pavement outside the old Post Office, running along to the church. A 20mph limit was suggested for this road.

The Appearance of the Village

Most residents value the rural nature of Lindford. When asked in the Appraisal survey how important was the quality of the countryside around the village, 76.9% said that it was very important to them. There is great concern that open spaces and features such as hedges, trees and rivers should be conserved (Appraisal, Appendix 2, page 10). Pleas to preserve the habitats of badgers near Pear Tree Farm and water voles on the banks of the River Wey were made at meetings of the Parish Plan group.

There was widespread dismay in 2002 when the EHDC planners permitted the complete destruction by a developer of an old mixed hedgerow which supported bird life, in the heart of the village, at the beginning of Frensham Lane. The Parish Council considered that most of it could have been preserved without detriment to the development, but the planners appeared to consider it to be of little value and ignored local concerns.

Litter continues to spoil the appearance of the village, and broken glass, which the street cleaning contractors seem ill equipped to deal with, occasionally poses a safety hazard. 40.8% of respondents to the Appraisal questionnaire considered that roadside care/street cleaning was 'poor'.

The Parish Council has pointed out to EHDC parts of the village where litter is a particular problem. The Parish Council has also had problems in obtaining adequate standards of litter clearance in areas for which it is responsible, notably the children's playground, and has now made new arrangements for the maintenance of the latter.

The Parish Council is looking at ways in which we can encourage people to take a pride in the village appearance. We intend to publicise and support a 'Pick up Litter

Day', and it has been suggested that we should work with local schools and groups like Pollyanna to change attitudes amongst children.

Ideally we would like to see a more responsible approach by those who drop the litter and break the bottles, but we must be realistic, and the Parish Council is coming to the conclusion that we and the District Council need to spend more on litter picking and street cleaning if we are to address this problem properly. In the meantime it is important that residents report particular problems to the appropriate authorities. Experience shows that this does lead to prompt action. EHDC's 'Litter Hotline' number has been placed on parish notice boards

Infrequent cutting of verges in general and particularly those next to Lindford Bridge contribute to the sense that the village is often untidy. Some footpaths are virtually impassable at certain times, for example the footpath that runs from Liphook Road to Headley Road near Cricket Lea. The Parish Council is considering the possibility of taking over responsibility for cutting verges, provided that appropriate arrangements to avoid 'double taxation' can be made. If we could find a suitable contractor to do the work we might also consider taking over litter picking on a similar basis.

Finally the point was made at several Parish Plan meetings, as well as in responses to the Appraisal questionnaire, that Lindford residents want to preserve the integrity and rural character of their village, and do not want to see further large housing developments, or extensive 'infilling'.

Policing

Faced with a list of types of crime and anti-social behaviour a majority of respondents (74.7%) named vandalism as their top priority. The police tell us that examples of wilful damage to property in Lindford are not commonly reported to them, however, and, in general, Lindford is seen by the police as a 'low crime' area.

Informal discussions with residents, particularly in the vicinity of the Triangle indicate that, underlying the concern about vandalism, is a very strong anxiety about anti-social behaviour in the form of disturbances, including noise and threatening behaviour as well as occasional criminal damage, caused by young people, often under the influence of alcohol, which are particularly common on Friday nights.

There is a feeling, too, that there is a lack of police presence in Lindford. When asked about this, the police cite the lack of evidence of reported crime in the village and point out that, with limited resources, they have to give priority to other areas. Lindford does now have its own 'beat officer', but he does, of course, have many other calls on his time. He is aware of the Friday night problems, and the police are now visiting the Triangle on Friday nights on a regular basis. LPC has stressed in newsletters and other forms of communication with residents the need to report anti-social and threatening behaviour to the police.

The Appraisal indicated considerable interest in 'Neighbourhood Watch' schemes. The police are very willing to help with the establishment and maintenance of such schemes and residents interested in setting one up should contact them. However, the initiative does need to come from residents.

The Wide Open Spaces

There are 3 major ‘open space’ areas in Lindford: the Triangle, Pear Tree Green, and Mimosa Green. All 3 are managed by the Parish Council. They are grassed areas with some trees. Pear Tree Green and the Triangle have some seating. The Triangle also has a small children’s playground. There was a sort of mini ‘adventure playground’ on Pear Tree Green, but this was recently removed on safety grounds. 59.4% of respondents to the Appraisal questionnaire indicated that they thought that there should be more play areas in the village.

Considerable funds are available from developers’ contributions for the improvement or purchase of open spaces in Lindford. In addition it is possible to obtain grants from various sources, including the Hampshire Playing Fields Association, for the enhancement of the amenity value of such areas. In 2002, the Parish Council planted 14 trees on Pear Tree Green with the help of a Tree Grant from EHDC, and, in 2003, we used developers’ contributions to fund the installation of a lamp post next to the playground on the Triangle. The police suggested that the lamp post, and the provision of a shelter for teenagers, might reduce problems in the playground.

One of the Parish Plan groups drew up proposals for adding seating and play equipment to each of the three areas and carried out surveys of residents who live next to each of them (See Appendix 1). Residents were asked whether or not they supported individual proposals and the whole ‘package’, and they were given the opportunity to comment. They were also asked if there were young children in the household. The questionnaires were delivered and collected by volunteers and this resulted in a high response rate.

The results were as follows:

PEAR TREE GREEN 112 questionnaires given out; 84 returned (75%)

	YES	NO	NO OPINION/ RESPONSE
1. Are there any children in your household aged 18 or less?	31	50	3
2. Do you support the proposals?	60	7	17
• Children’s cradle swings?	65	7	12
• Seat?	72	6	6
• Goal posts?	44	24	16
3. Do you think that we are catering for all age groups?	48	14	22

THE TRIANGLE 124 questionnaires given out; 79 returned (64%)

	YES	NO	NO OPINION/RESPONSE
1. Are there any children in your household aged 18 or less?	26	46	7
2. Do you support the proposals?	45	9	25
• Lamp post	72	0	7
• Seating	66	6	7
• Basket ball net	49	16	14
• Goal post	45	20	14
• Youth shelter	38	24	17
3. Do you think that we are catering for all age groups?	37	14	28

MIMOSA GREEN 101 questionnaires given out; 74 returned (73%)

	YES	NO	NO OPINION/ NO RESPONSE
1. Are there any children in your household aged 18 or less?	33	41	0
2. Do you support the proposed plan?	31	27	16
• Swings	42	25	7
• Basket ball net	36	28	10
• Goalposts	36	34	4
• Seats	46	17	11
3. Do you think that we are catering for all age groups?	26	21	27

A summary of comments written on the questionnaires is given in the Appendix, along with maps and sample questionnaires. For all of the proposals there were more in favour than against, but some of them aroused strong feelings. Those who were against the plans were more disposed to comment than those who were in favour, and this may indicate that opponents felt more strongly than supporters. In particular, many felt that proposals to put permanent goal posts on these relatively small open spaces could seriously damage the appearance of the areas, by giving rise to large areas of eroded grass. There were some similar concerns about basketball stands.

The recommendations of those who chaired this group are as follows:

PEAR TREE GREEN

A bench and 2 cradle swings (Items 1 and 3) should be placed in the North East corner of the Green to the west of what is at present Pear Tree Farmhouse (soon to become flats). If possible these should be enclosed by a fence and gate.

Goal posts should not be erected at present. If the Chase Road development goes ahead this sort of facility may be provided there.

THE TRIANGLE

The lamp post has already been placed next to the playground (Item 1).

Benches (Item 2) should be placed on the southern (Lindford Wey) end of the Green to the north of the trees, at a reasonable distance from any houses.

Some form of covered seating should be placed close to the eastern boundary approximately mid way between the playground and Lindford Wey (Item 4). There should be a basketball stand next to this.

It was felt that the Triangle was too small to accommodate a permanent goal post (Item 3). This sort of facility may eventually be provided at the end of Chase Road. Since the surveys were carried out it has been suggested that we should consider placing some extra items in the existing playground, which will, in any case, need re-surfacing soon. There is unused space there. The suggestion is that 2 extra swings and either a small roundabout or some sort of 'rocking horse' should be put there, and possibly an extra bench. These are suggestions for the Parish Council to consider.

At present the Parish Council is unwilling to place extra items on the Triangle, with the possible exception of benches, until and unless the disturbances which have been occurring on Friday nights have been overcome.

MIMOSA GREEN

2 cradle swings (Item 1) and a bench (Item 4) should be placed in the north east corner of the Green. We need to consider whether or not to enclose the swings with a fence and gate.

Another bench should be placed either in the same corner of the Green or to the north east of the shrubs in the south western corner of the green. In either case care should be taken to ensure that seating is not too close to houses.

It was felt that the Green was rather small to accommodate a goal post.

A basket ball stand might be provided in the future but this facility could possibly be provided at the end of Chase Road

Sports facilities

There are no formal sports facilities in the village. However there are cricket and football pitches at Lindford Sports Association's grounds just outside the boundary and good provision at Mill Chase School. It was therefore felt by the Parish Plan group that the main need was for informal sports facilities. Some of this provision may be on existing open spaces, and some may become available through the Chase Road development. It is important that we are aware of what is required so that we can press developers in an informed way. Some surveys have already been done.

Allotments

If a number of people request the provision of allotments the Parish Council is obliged to attempt to meet this demand. An area of land may be set aside for allotments on the Chase Road site if this is requested. If the Chase Road development does not go ahead then there is a problem: Lindford has very little open land. It is possible, however, for the Parish Council to use developers' contributions to buy land outside the parish boundaries and this is a possibility which could be investigated.

Is there a demand for allotments within Lindford? In the Appraisal 125 people expressed an interest. However this is not the same as a request to have an allotment. At a Parish Plan meeting the proposal that we should advertise, asking people to let us know if they wanted an allotment, met with general approval. The Parish Council proposes to do this by asking the question in a newsletter distributed to all households.

Village Hall/ Community Building

Villages of a similar size to Lindford usually have some sort of publicly owned community building, and difficulties in booking rooms in Lindford Club or the Church Hall indicate that there is a demand for such provision. In the Appraisal, 58.6% of people said that they would like to have this sort of amenity here. If the Chase Road site is developed there will also be a requirement for some sort of building with changing facilities, and indeed the Chase Road Development Brief proposed that a building with changing rooms should be provided by developers. The Chase Road Steering Group suggested that a community building should be provided.

If the Chase Road development does go ahead then we must consult residents further about this, and the Appraisal suggests that a majority would be in favour of the provision of a village hall. However this must be suitably located – not in or near to the flood plain at the far end of the housing development. If the development is stopped then other options must be considered if we want a village hall.

Planning and the Chase Road proposals.

The overwhelming majority of residents are opposed to the proposed large development on land at the Whitehill end of Chase Road. In response to the Appraisal questionnaire 92.7% said that they wanted either no new houses or fewer than 50 over the next 5 years. The proposal to build 100 houses on this site is considered by most people to be one which would put an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure and have undesirable environmental effects. Of course, the suggestion that this allocation should be increased from 100 to 165 dwellings in the new Local Plan and the application from Bellway Homes to build 233 dwellings are generally considered to be a real threat to our community and LPC, with the support of residents, is fighting these proposals strongly.

The Parish Council has engaged the services of a planning consultant and presented a strong case against the increased housing allocation (and, indeed against any large development of this site) at the Public Inquiry. In addition, prompted by the Parish

Council and the Parish Plan group, we now have a pressure group (SOIL), which is campaigning actively against the development. Together we are fighting the planning application from Bellway Homes, and have held a well-attended public meeting at Lindford Club. Since September 2002 LPC has spent approximately £3,500, drawn from reserves, on this campaign. In order to continue it we will have to increase the precept next year.

We have also asked EHDC to involve us in any future discussions about planning gain, and the research undertaken in preparing our Village Appraisal and Parish Plan should help us to make informed choices.

Lindford Parish Council, with the support of residents, is also asking for strict limits on ‘infilling’ in what is the most densely populated village, and the second most densely populated parish, in Hampshire.

ACTION PLANS FOR LINDFORD, NOVEMBER 2003



PUBLIC TRANSPORT

PROBLEM/ OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>Work to improve public transport, especially to Bordon shops and doctor's surgery</i>	Ask for diversion of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. 18 to go to Forest Centre • Bordhill bus to cover Lindford 	2003-5	LPC, HCC, Stagecoach
	Consider application for Transport Grant, and working with Headley PC	2003-8	LPC
<i>Many people do not know about services like Dial-a- Ride which are available</i>	Obtain details from HCC and advertise on notice boards; consider circulating a leaflet directly to households.	2003-4	LPC

TRAFFIC CALMING

PROBLEM/ OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>Reduction in speeds & improvement in safety on Liphook Road, seeking 30mph limit</i>	Press for implementation of measures already agreed: white lines, refuges, railings, pavement by Mill; ask for re-assessment of speed limit; consider future measures e.g. another refuge, pinch points village gateway(s), humps, road markings.	2003-6	LPC/HCC
<i>Press for 20mph limit on Chase Road and improved safety</i>	Ask for raised pavement outside old Post Office; consider other traffic calming measures on Chase Road and Headley Road.	2003-6	LPC to discuss with HCC

PLANNING/APPEARANCE OF VILLAGE

PROBLEM/ OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>Better and more regular grass cutting</i>	Consider taking over management of grass cutting if appropriate financial arrangements with EHDC can be made; press for improved coverage of key areas – e.g. Lindford Bridge.	2003-6	LPC/ EHDC
<i>Litter picking</i>	Consider alternatives to existing contractor for LPC areas. Arrange ‘Anti-Litter Days’; contact schools and local organisations and ask for support in changing attitudes, especially amongst children.	2003-6 2003-future	LPC LPC, residents, schools, local groups
<i>Conservation</i>	Protect badger run at Pear Tree Farm and water voles in river banks.	2003- future	LPC to make EHDC’s Conservation Dept. aware
<i>No more building of large Housing Estates - Limits on ‘infilling’.</i>	Fight Chase Road Development proposals; LPC to assist pressure group (SOIL); submit comments on Chase Road application to Planning Committee with help of planning consultant; continue to campaign; press for limits on infilling.	2003 – foreseeable future	Lindford residents with support of SOIL and LPC

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH/POLICING

PROBLEM/OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>Criminal damage on the Triangle and other areas</i>	All damage should be reported to police, or they have no idea of problems; also councillors should be informed so that they can liaise with PC Bass.	Future	Residents, LPC and PC Bass
<i>Interest in Neighbourhood Watch</i>	Inform public about help available – e.g. through notice boards.	2003-4	LPC, residents
<i>No police patrols</i>	Resolved: now have local beat officer		

SPORTS FACILITIES

PROBLEM/OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>There are no formal sports facilities</i>	Investigate demand; press for Chase Road developers to include appropriate provision.	2003-future	LPC, EHDC, Lindford Sports Association
<i>Demand for informal sports facilities: goalposts, basketball stands, skateboard, kickabout wall and covered meeting place for teenagers</i>	Do surveys; use developers' contributions; apply for grants from Hants Playing Fields Association; consult with EHDC about Chase Road planning gain.	2003- 2008	Parish Plan Committee, LPC

ALLOTMENTS

PROBLEM/OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>125 people expressed interest in having allotments in Lindford</i>	Ascertain number of people who would like allotments: advertise in newspaper or newsletter.	2003/4	LPC
	Seek provision through Chase Road development if applicable.	2003/4	LPC
	Alternatively, investigate other possible sites – perhaps outside village boundaries.	2004/8	LPC

VILLAGE HALL

PROBLEM/ OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>Village Hall/ Community Building - 58.6% expressed interest in Appraisal survey</i>	Press for inclusion in planning gain; survey residents about exact requirements. The Chase Road development may provide playing fields, changing rooms, and a community hall. If Chase Road development is stopped then investigate other possible sites and cost.	2003-6	Residents/ LPC/EHDC
<i>Management Committee</i>	Find interested people if decision is made to proceed.	2004-future	Residents, LPC

ENHANCEMENT OF OPEN SPACES

PROBLEM/ OBJECTIVE	ACTION	WHEN	BY WHOM
<i>Lack of play equipment and seating on open spaces</i>	Triangle. <u>Add</u> Lamp post next to playground; 2 benches near to Lindford Wey; basket ball stand to east of Green. <u>Consider</u> Placing teenage shelter towards east of Green; adding to equipment in playground.	Now in place 2004-5	LPC, using developers' contributions and other grants “
		2004-8 – if Friday night problems cease	“
	Pear Tree Green. <u>Add</u> 2 cradle swings and seat next to Pear Tree Farmhouse. <u>Consider</u> Another seat; goal posts to south, near trees.	2004-5 2004-8	As above “
	Mimosa Green . <u>Add</u> 2 cradle swings and seat in north east corner; second seat either in north east corner or south west. <u>Consider</u> basket ball stand.	2004-5 2004-8	As above “

Acknowledgements

The Parish Council would like to thank on behalf of the village all those who turned up, often in bad weather, and contributed to the production of this Parish Plan, and to those who carried out the open space surveys. We hope that its production will make a significant contribution to real improvements in Lindford.

Lindford Parish Council, November, 2003.
Tel. 01730 895674
parishclerk@lindfordpc.fsnet.co.uk

APPENDIX - SURVEY COMMENTS AND MAPS

Triangle - comments on plans

Mainly in favour

Difficult to keep teenagers entertained in Lindford.

Need another lamp post near to shelter.

Also need a coffee bar for young people and a bus to take them out occasionally

Yes, but could be more inspired – present equipment boring.

Yes to shelter, but needs regular checks by adults.

Need a better playground for under-10s.

Yes, but need traffic calming in Chase Road and litter bin next to shelter.

Fence also needed around Triangle to keep cars off.

Good to give youngsters something to do.

Mainly against

Will attract more youths, causing disturbances, often drunk and taking drugs.

Better to spend money on trees.

Put play equipment on other open spaces.

Nets and goal posts will be vandalised.

Would add to problems in evenings – mentioned by several people.

Shelter would attract trouble.

Seat 2 is too near houses.

Goal post would be augmented by another at opposite end.

Well-intentioned but will be vandalised.

Triangle not big enough for football. Must stop use of balls, including golf balls.

Problem of balls being kicked into gardens of Liphook Road houses, causing damage and disturbance. Will Council pay?

Too near to Senior Residents.

Pear Tree Green – comments on plans

Mainly in favour

Good idea, but would also like slide and older children's swings.

We need more seats – several requests.

Yes to seats but should be concrete with wooden slats, and should be litter bins nearby.

Yes, but consider bollards along road edge & taking action against dog owners who leave mess.

More needed for children of 5-10/12 – several requests.

Could we also have a climbing frame?

Could we have a skate park?

Children need more than this.

Mainly against

Lack of level surfaces for swings and goal posts in particular.

Has traditionally been used for variety of informal activities, and this should continue.

Want to maintain its natural state, including wildlife – appropriate for rural community.

Danger of vandalism to equipment. Will attract vandals, disturbances and litter.

Goal posts not needed. Traffic cones, jackets etc. more apt. Fixed posts will lead to eroded areas of grass.

Mimosa Green might be more apt location for fixed equipment – not a through route and intended for village hall and play equipment.

Just because money available for this purpose doesn't mean we should spend it.

Use money to improve Washford Lane footbridge and prevent cars driving on the Green (e.g. low fence).

Goal posts are available at Mill Chase.

Should use money to upgrade Triangle equipment – already established and patrolled at night.

Even seats encourage groups of teenagers.

2 Cradle swings and a seat would be considered inadequate – if anything is to be provided (writer is basically against) should be more variety. Dog mess and broken glass make it unsafe as a play area anyway.

More for older people needed.

Spend money on brightening up village – e.g. hanging baskets.

Cradle swings likely to be damaged by older children using them – may need swings for older children.

Spend more on clearing litter, not encouraging it.

Will these proposals lead to exclusion of dogs?

Mimosa Green – comments on plans

Mainly in favour

Good idea – adults can watch children from seats.
Would like baby swings.
Would help to maintain a happy community.
Could put swings on site for basket ball stand if latter not supported by survey.
Great idea!
For it, if benefits community.
Yes, but only one goal post and basket ball net may lead to disputes.
More needed for under-5s – e.g. slide, activity equipment, as in Headley.
Yes, but needs to be carefully monitored.
More seats needed + waste bins.
A welcome addition to the village – to take grandchildren to.
Would also like skate board/roller blade/water park.
Good idea, apart from goal posts.
Would also like a pond + flowers and shrubs.

Mainly against

Will attract older children who could easily walk to facilities elsewhere.
Would encourage vandalism.
Need a litter bin.
Would need adult supervision. Residents would have to police it.
Basket ball net should not be near parked cars.
Seat should be near Mimosa Close, not Champion.
Basket ball hoop not appropriate. Goal would be too small to be used.
Don't want seats outside my house.
Don't want Green to look like public park.
Danger of breaking windows.
Will attract outsiders and make area less safe.
Children enjoy the Green as it is.
Illegal to play with a hard ball in a densely populated area.
Spend money giving Lindford a face lift – e.g. by Millennium Bridge.
Moved to house because of quiet open area – don't want a children's playground which would attract problems associated with Triangle.
Do not need permanent facilities.
Are dogs going to be kept off?
Don't want screaming kids.
Children have already damaged trees by Mimosa – need protective fencing if scheme goes ahead.
Leave it alone. Bad for neighbourhood – will attract trouble. Should be left as it is – for all residents.
Area not big enough for goal posts.
People round Green should have final say.
Ball games would cause broken windows, etc. Supervision needed.



