

Hampstead Projects – Liddell Road – Condition 9 - Feedback Report (May 2023)

The public consultation was held from Thursday 27th April and Thursday 11th May 2023. During this time, 673 resident addresses were contacted with a letter, notifying them of the consultation, and inviting them to provide their feedback on Condition 9 of the Liddell Road project. On top of this, BECG notified the wider CWG (54 members) that the consultation will be taking place during the set dates and invited them to provide their feedback via the online form.

There was one respondent via the online feedback form, and there were three emails that were submitted to the feedback@liddellroadconstruction.co.uk email address, where they provided their comments and feedback on Condition 9 of the Liddell Road development.

In total we received 1 completed feedback for:

- The respondent stated that they did support the provision of a 24/7 play space as part of the wider Liddell Road development.
- The respondent stated that they did not like the current proposals, as they 'lacked imagination'.
- When asked if there was anything that they disliked about the proposal, they stated that the current proposal does not provide sufficient provisions for children.
- Based on the various comments made on the project, both via the online form and the emails received at the project inbox, the most popular concern of respondents was the lack of provisions for children, and the insufficient design of the play space area.
- MILAM Residents Association provided their thoughts on the proposal via email, which has been incorporated into this feedback report.

Question 1: Do you support the provision of an accessible 24/7 play space as part of the wider Liddell Road Development?



The one online respondent stated that they supported the provision of an accessible 24/7 play space as part of the wider Liddell Road Development.

Question 2: Is there anything you like about the proposals?

Based on the respondents of the online feedback form, as well as the emails received from local residents, the key areas that were welcomed can be grouped into the following themes:

Support for the covered gazebo – One respondent commented that the design of the covered gazebo was nice and that it would fit into the local area quite well.

Provision of an accessible space for local residents – The majority of the respondents were supportive of the provision of an accessible play space for the local community.

Question 3: Is there anything you dislike about the proposals?

Based on the respondents to the consultation, the main concerns and dislikes for the play space proposal can be grouped into the following themes:

Insufficient provisions for young children – The respondents argued that there are not enough play materials and facilities within the new development that will provide suitable amenities for young children.

Lack of imaginative design for the play space area – Some respondents argued that the overall design of the play space area is insufficient in comparison to other similar provisions for local communities, and that the overall design is quite uninspiring.

Doesn't address local needs and demands – One of the respondents commented that the play space provision is not necessary, as the area already has an excellent park and children's playground. On top of this, they raised concerns parking and that the space should be used to create a car parking space for local people.

Question 4: Is there anything else you would like to see as part of the play area?

Based on the respondents to the consultation, the main additions that respondents would like to see as part of the play area can be grouped into the following themes:

Additional play space equipment for young children – Some respondents argued that since the current design lacks sufficient amenities for young children, that the addition of more child friendly equipment and facilities would be welcomed.

Question 5: Is there anything else you would like to share with us about the proposals?

Further comments from email respondents:

"My feeling is that the play area is not adequate. A pergola, that takes most of the space can hardly be considered as a play area, with no play equipment at all. Not sure how a willow dome with a few steppingstones can also be considered as a play area, when no other play equipment is provided. And the 1.5m tiger poles again are hardly fit for a play area, again in isolation." - **MILAM Residents Association**

“I see that you are proposing a fully accessible play area for the local community. Why? We have an excellent park, kiddie’s playground, outdoor gym, football pitch and an adventure area already. This is just a PR exercise to get the locals on your side. This proposal is totally unwanted and absolute rubbish. Build a car park so that the new residents do not park on our estate as the council will not give them street parking permits.” – **Respondent 2**

“The current proposals are lacking any real play facilities (actual games, slides, swings, etc for toddlers and younger children) which would be better than things like Gabion walls which look nice and encourage wildlife but don’t really “serve a purpose” to engage / occupy kids. It’s basically a wall.

The timber play weaving poles seem like nothing more than some poles in the ground you can’t move. How is that fun for kids? We need something much more hands-on they can actually do, like climbing walls, musical instruments, etc” – **Respondent 3**