



MINUTES of a **Working Group Meeting** regarding the new **playpark** at **Kelsey Hall**, Ifold held on **Wednesday 14th June 2023** at **18:45**, Winterton Hall, Plaistow.

Present Cllr. Paul Jordan (Chair); Cllr. Doug Brown, Cllr. Sarah Denyer and Catherine Nutting (Clerk & RFO).

IP/23/001 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received and accepted from Mrs Sarah Segar-Thomas, Kelsey Hall Management Committee

To note: at the Parish Council's Annual Meeting in May 2023, the membership of the Playpark Working Group changed; Cllr. Capsey stepped down, and Cllr. Denyer was formally appointed by the Council.

IP/23/002 Purpose of meeting

To take an initial look at the results of the Ifold playpark consultation results, which ran from December 2022 – 31st January 2023.

The results are provided alongside these minutes (separate pdf & Excel documents)

IP/23/003 Results review

- 14 questions in survey
- Delivered to 500 houses in Ifold
- 96 responses
- 19.2% response rate
- Overall conclusion – respondents were in favour of the idea (77.1%)

Q: Is this a good response rate?

A: YES

The meeting considered whether 19.2% is a respectable response rate, which can be trusted to provide an accurate indication of project support to be taken forward. As part of its consideration, it had regard for the following information: -

“The average response rate for external surveys at 10-15%” ([SmartSurvey](#))

“Survey response rates in the 5% to 30% range are far more typical” ([Customer Thermometer](#))

[PeoplePules](#) offer the following: -

SURVEY TYPE	RESPONSE RATES WITH INVITE INCENTIVE:	RESPONSE RATES WITH NO INVITE INCENTIVE:
Post-service Client Survey (short length*)	55-75% (with 1 follow-up)	40-60% (with 1 follow-up)
Post-service Candidate Survey (short length)	60-80%	40-60% (with 1 follow-up)
General Client Satisfaction Surveys: (medium length**)	15-30% (with 1 follow-up)	Less than 10% (with 1 follow-up)

* Short Length surveys consist of up to 12 questions

** Medium length surveys consist of 12-25 questions

The Ifold Play area survey best fits the description of a ‘general client satisfaction survey of medium length with no incentive to complete’ (with no follow-up - other than general reminders via Facebook). Therefore, less than 10% response rate would have been typical.

CustomInsight, a US company that designs and administers surveys offered the following comments regarding the link between response rates and survey types:

*“Response rates vary widely for different types of surveys. Customer satisfaction surveys and **market research surveys often have response rates in the 10% – 30% range.** Employee surveys typically have a response rate of 25% – 60%. Regardless of the type of survey you are conducting, you can have a major effect on the number of respondents who complete your survey.”*

[PeoplePulse](#)

Therefore, a 19.2% response rate can be considered a typical, confident return, which can be trusted to take the project forward.

Q: What is the overall survey conclusion?

A: IN FAVOUR (77.1%)

Q1 was a simple “are you supportive” question. This allowed respondents to answer yes / no.

- 74 respondents said Yes - in favour of a playpark (77.1%)
- 20 respondents said No - against the idea of the playpark (20.8%)
- 2 respondents stated ‘other’ - these answers were ["maybe, see below "] and ["Undecided. See questions."] (2.1%)

Therefore, this is not a ‘close call’ result (e.g., Brexit); this is a comprehensive ‘in favour’ response.

The meeting considered the various comments made by those at Q14 Please expand any of your answers given above as necessary; or provide any other information / comment that you feel will assist the Parish Council in taking this project forward. Thank you.

[appended at A](#)

CONCERNS

The meeting agreed that discussion should focus on the concerns raised by those who were not in favour. Although it is impossible to please everyone, it is important to address (as far as possible) the concerns of those with reservations, to prevent the play area becoming a contentious area for a small minority of residents.

The meeting considered the ‘Areas of Concerns’ ([Appendix B](#)). The 13 issues were drawn out by answers to questions 2 and 14 and have been categorised as: -

Parking / size / appeal / cost / dog fouling / maintenance / litter / antisocial behaviour / noise / garden size / trees / loss of use of area / house prices.

In addition to the table of concerns and resolutions on how to address these (please refer to appendix B) the meeting specifically discussed parking and antisocial behaviour.

Parking

Q5: Parking at the hall is for hall hirers only and not for play area users. How will you/your family/friends/visitors travel to the play area? (multiple options permitted)

The meeting discussed that if someone is minded to drive to a playpark, they would most likely go further afield to a larger park e.g., Plaistow or Loxwood. Anyone with experience of young children understands that getting them into/out of a vehicle is not straight forward and therefore the journey (especially if for recreation) is usually commensurate with the effort.

The results indicate that most people will either walk - 62 respondents (50%), or travel by bike – 26 respondents (21%).

19 respondents (15%) said they would travel by car. Of those 'car users', 61% said they would park in someone's driveway and 11 respondents (39%) stated 'other', which included "park at our house" | "this is totally dependent on the mobility of the users" | "Unsure" | "Not in favour" | "N/A" | "by road blocking".

In terms of parking on either Chalk Road or in the Hall car park, in contravention of signage/permission, the results were: -

Chalk road – 3 respondents (3%)

Kelsey Hall – 2 respondents (2.1%)

Therefore, whilst the meeting accepted that there will always be some who flout the rules, the survey results demonstrate that such people will be very few, and most users will walk/cycle as intended.

The meeting agreed that the draw of the area will be the fact that it can be walked/cycled too. Parents/carers who want to get out of the house / their own garden for a while, can have somewhere to go – a purpose – where they can meet other families and children.

This is a sample of comments made by those in support, which illustrates this point: -

"I think this is a wonderful idea. Ifold has lots of young families, as well as grandparents who look after their grandchildren during the week etc, and having an area specifically for children is important. I'd like to be able to meet up with local families and make new friends (adults and children for play dates) I think it would strengthen the Ifold community for the better. Great idea."

*

"This is an excellent idea to support the local community and has been talked about for a long time amongst parents. It would be lovely to

meet up for a quick play with other parents."

*

"It will be great to have somewhere to go with the kids within Ifold and meet up with other families."

*

"I no longer have preschool age children but feel that it is very important to have equipment that is suitable for younger children as this can be an isolating time for new parents, especially if they have moved to a new rural community. They are more likely to be home during the day, and a playpark you can walk to, albeit small would be a valuable asset to visit to help break up the day, great for grandparents too. If there had been something like this in Ifold when my children were younger, I would have used it most days as had 2 small children who were home for 2 years before old enough to go to local preschools."

The provision of bike racks generally at the Hall was discussed. It was agreed that the KHMC should be encouraged to explore this as a general community asset/service in any event. Ifold suffers from increased traffic movement and speed – if residents had somewhere they could secure their bikes, they might be more inclined to cycle to events held at the Hall, the play area etc.

The PC might consider some funding support – the Working Group can raise this with the Council for consideration, subject to the views of the KHMC & IEL – who have a vested interest in reducing vehicle movement and speed around the estate.

Antisocial behaviour

The meeting agreed that the risk (especially drug misuse) is minimal given the frequent use of the Hall, the area's proximity to Chalk Road and the degree of public movement along the road and the fact that the area is not secluded. The meeting considered some of the examples provided by concerned residents e.g., children using the Hall's car park for cycling and skateboarding. It was agreed that this issue already 'exists' without a play area and is not a major issue for the Hall and/or residents. Access to the Hall has always been unimpeded – the gate is not locked and even if it were, the fence can be readily climbed. If issues develop in the future, then CCTV could be considered.

Q: Will the play area get used and represent good value?

A: YES

Q3: Would you, or your family / friends / visitors use the play area?

Q4: How often would you, or your family/friends/visitors use the play area?

The meeting noted that 26 respondents stated they would never use the area (Q3), whereas only 20 answered they were not in favour. This shows that there are members of the community that can see the value in providing a children's play area, irrespective of their own personal requirements (a sense of community). 13 people answered 'other' (Q4), which illustrated the point that those with grandchildren/visitors would use it on a 'need basis' - *"maybe once a fortnight? (grandchildren who live in Cranleigh)" | "when grandchildren visit" | "If we had visitors with young children - it's good to have the option" | "It would vary through the year" | "a few times a year" | "very rarely" | "possible visitors"*.

44% of respondents said they would use the area either weekly or daily and 23% said they would use it monthly. **Therefore, the area will be consistently well used and therefore is a worth-while investment for PC funds.**

TYPES OF PLAY EQUIPMENT

Age

The meeting agreed that **the specific targeted age appeal of equipment should be up to reception age (5 years)**. 42% of respondents sought equipment for pre-school age (20%) and up to 5s (22%). This age group will be 'at home' during the day and catering for their needs will provide carers with a place to go. Older children, who attend school, can more readily access Plaistow's park at the end of the school day.

However, the meeting agreed that the results show a fairly even split of preferred age appeal - 20% said the appeal should be up to 7 years. However, the meeting agreed – from personal, firsthand experience – that the types of equipment preferred by respondents, which would appeal to children up to 5 years – would also cater for a wider age range too. Children of 6 & 7 will equally enjoy slides and balance bars etc. As a priority, the area should be accessible for younger (pre-school) children; however, older children will also enjoy playing on the equipment.

Equipment

The most popular equipment was: -

- Climbing / balance apparatus (63 respondents/ 1st choice out of 9)
- Balance plants – (52 respondents)
- Small slide (57 respondents / 2nd choice out of 9)
- Small playhouse (51 respondents / 3rd choice out of 9)
- Seesaw (42 respondents)

From experience at the Plaistow park, a small slide and playhouse can be combined, as can climbing and balance apparatus. This would free up more space for other equipment.

It was agreed that although the swing was not unpopular (35 respondents and 4th out of 9 in popularity) the space can only accommodate one small baby swing. The swing 'A frame' would reduce the space available for other equipment. **Therefore, it was agreed not to include a swing.**

The meeting took note of a comment made by one respondent: -

*"Climbing and sliding are good as it changes [?challenges] kids. Most have swings at home. **Make it an adventure worth going on...**"*

The meeting agreed that many people have swings in their garden – if they have any play equipment - and one swing would cause squabbles between children. Therefore, the site should offer more unusual equipment not normally found in private gardens, which would increase its appeal.

The meeting agreed that the montage of rustic play equipment on the [PC's website page](#) illustrates some of the equipment sought and feasible for the site: -



The meeting also agreed that as part of the tendering process, companies will design the space and recommend equipment to meet the brief. Alternative designs can be subject to further public consultation “do you prefer design A or design B?” before a final decision is made.

Disabled use

The meeting agreed that this was an important issue to ensure that equipment is as inclusive as possible. Companies will be asked to recommend and advise as part of the tendering/design process, to ensure the equipment is as accessible to all as possible.

This will also include the width of the entrance gate for wheelchairs, mobility scooters and also double buggies access.

Aesthetic

The meeting agreed that it should be predominantly wooden/rustic in keeping with the wooded feel of Ifold – see picture montage above.

Q: What about seating?

A: BENCHES ONLY

The meeting agreed that given the use of the area - i.e., it is not going to be a ‘day trip destination’ but rather Ifold residents will ‘pop down the road’ to get out of the house for a play – providing picnic seating would be unnecessary and take up too much of the limited available space. Whatever food may be consumed at the site can easily be done sitting on a bench. This will also minimise litter / food debris, which can attract unwanted wildlife.

Benches were the most popular choice – 33 respondents, or 53 respondents if you include those who called for both benches and picnic tables. It was noted that collectively, 37 respondents called for some kind of picnic table (17 in favour of picnic tables and 20 in favour of both tables and benches). However, maximising play equipment in the safe is paramount and the provision of tables will outweigh the benefits.

IP/23/004

Next Meeting

The Working Group agreed that there should be a meeting with the KHMC representative, who was unable to attend this meeting due to short notice; and with IEL, before reporting back to the Council. This will ensure that their views are fully discussed and included. Therefore, a Zoom meeting will be organised as a matter of priority.

Actions:
Clerk

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting ended at 19:25

Appendix A - Written responses to Q14

14. Please expand any of your answers given above as necessary; or provide any other information / comment that you feel will assist the Parish Council in taking this project forward. Thank you.

[More Details](#)

47
Responses

Latest Responses

"Antisocial behaviour: Older children do "hang out unsupervised" at Kelsey ...

"Many thanks, great initiative."

1. I think this is a wonderful idea. Ifold has lots of young families, as well as grandparents who look after their grandchildren during the week etc, and having an area specifically for children is important. I'd like to be able to meet up with local families and make new friends (adults and children for play dates) I think it would strengthen the Ifold community for the better. Great idea.
2. This is an excellent idea to support the local community and has been talked about for a long time amongst parents. It would be lovely to meet up for a quick play with other parents.
3. Very supportive of a playground in Ifold. Now we have lost the preschool there is not much for children and families and Ifold has lots of young children.

4. It will be great to have somewhere to go with the kids within Ifold and meet up with other families.
5. good idea.
6. I personally thinking parking would be a deal breaker for most people.
7. I no longer have preschool age children but feel that it is very import to have equipment that is suitable for younger children as this can be an isolating time for new parents, especially if they have moved to a new rural community. They are more likely to be home during the day, and a playpark you can walk to, albeit small would be a valuable asset to visit to help break up the day, great for grandparents too. If there had been something like this in Ifold when my children were younger, i would have used it most days as had 2 small children who were home for 2 years before old enough to go to local preschools.
8. a great idea but in totally the wrong place. a complete waste of money at that position
9. I think this is a really excellent idea and very much needed and desired in Ifold. As a mum of 2 young boys who live in Ifold I would love to see something for families to enjoy in the local community. We have many local friends with young families too and it would be great to have somewhere to walk/ride our bikes to meet and let the kids have a play. I wholeheartedly support this proposal.
10. Could you not buy a plot of land to make a much larger play area there is one available
11. A good idea to have a playground, something that Ifold has lacked.
12. Lovely idea for young mums/dads
13. Please can the equipment be rustic / rural in style . I think the car park should be available too .
14. Thank you for asking our opinion. It is much appreciated. The answers were dictated by our five year old granddaughter.
15. How will visitors access the play area given that it is next to the hall car park and alongside a ditch? Will the play area be fenced off?
16. I greatly fear for the area becoming an eyesore. Not what we want for our lovely village.
17. Climbing and sliding are good as it changes kids. Most have swings at home. Make it an adventure worth going on...
18. A small, accessible play area would be a great addition to the community and it's families. There are lots of examples of recycled material or natural material equipment which would enhance the setting.

19. I think it is needed but not the end of the world if my visitors are too old to use it.
20. Somewhere to sit for sure but in summer a space for lunch would be ideal
21. I don't have a young family so would not visit the area, however I am supportive of this being provided for young families in Ifold, providing play space that does not require people to drive out of Ifold to find it.
22. Money should be spent wisely and not on a compromise play area.
23. Great idea!!
24. This would be great for local families and bring the community together. There are now a lot of young families in Ifold as the older generation need to accept this.
25. This will be used by teenagers in the evenings. They already hang out in the area, and head to the disused house behind.
26. Young kids are at preschool all day. This will be used by teenagers and older primary in evenings.
27. I am 100% not in favour of this proposition, I do not see the need in this location to provide equipment for children when most residents with young children have their own. There is a problem with space, noise, and parking. The hall car park is not available for participants, and the road is a bridleway and narrow, believe me we live here and we know. I find the proposal to be completely unnecessary and the money could be put to much better use, improving existing play areas, or in an area where children desperately need something like this
28. This proposed project cannot be compared with 'Little Acorns' when much of the children's time was spent inside the hall.
29. Rats will be a problem with a bin, nesting birds in trees will be removed. There are wasp nests in ground in bank every year. Drug dealing has been a problem in bus stops in Ifold, and will likely move to this area. Who will be responsible to move teenagers late at night? Who will be the out of hours warden? A difference to normal parks is that this is private land on a private road, in a private hall owned by residents. This must not place inconvenience to neighbours due to its location. Local parks are available widely for families with toddlers already.
30. Priority of the limited space should be given to the play equipment. If carers want to sit and chat they could go to Craig's coffee cup afterwards.
31. The original survey (all those years ago!) when people expressed a wish for recreation for children - they were hoping for a large area for ALL ages of children to include teenagers - NOT this postage stamp sized piece of land with play equipment for any child under 7 years of age! No, No, No!

32. The project needs to be brought to a close in order to avoid ratepayers money being wasted. Parish council funds need to be spent in areas which benefit all, not just a few. Not a good idea to introduce new regular maintenance costs. All householders in Ifold have more than enough room for their own play areas. Why not offer them the chance of having a Parish council funded play-park in their garden?
33. Been living in Ifold for 4 years and have always felt the only thing missing is a play park that we can walk to.
34. Lovely idea for the Ifold community as there is currently nothing there.
35. No options above to say no to any of the options showing a bias towards the project rather than an open mind.
36. Ifold needs more children focused things to do, which get children and parents together. The roads are busy and so biking and walking is not safe and stressful. We would love a park to meet up at.
37. A lovely idea! Not before time!,
38. Bench for bottle/breastfeeding/pregnant people
39. I have two grandchildren aged 5 and 8 and often take them to Plaistow and Loxwood parks which have a huge green area as well as plenty of playground equipment . We can easily spend an hour there . Two or three bits of equipment at Kelsey hall will not hold their interest so I will continue to drive to the other parks
40. Would endorse this idea and am amazed nothing like this exists in Ifold already given the amount of houses here.
41. This has been a long time coming! Looking forward to being able to use it with my children.
42. Many thanks, great initiative.
43. Having somewhere to go to socialise is mentioned in your pamphlet. This is not in the miniscule area that Ifold can offer . In 10 years social activities have changed. Parents and guardians want to sit and chat with coffee facilities whilst their children play. The demographics of childrens ages in this area have changed since the survey was taken. Not a deprived or in need area to warrant this. All detached houses with large gardens with play facilities adequately covered. A walk around will display tree houses and slides in abundance. Parents etc use the facilities after school at Plaistow. Not enough toddler age group now as I believe even the playgroup that were using the hall no longer are there possibly due to lack of attendees. A complete waste of money please use this to put play facilities where it is most needed and that is not here in Ifold.
44. Antisocial behaviour: Older children do "hang out unsupervised" at Kelsey Hall. And "from experience, those looking to engage in antisocial behaviour" do not worry about "spaces

open to public scrutiny". We and the other neighbours of Kelsey Hall actually experienced this in a major way about 8 years ago. Every day when the preschool wasn't open, a group of up to 8 twelve year old boys started to come to Kelsey Hall with their bikes, skate boards and radio. They were zooming around the car park and up and down Chalk Road, shouting and playing their music loudly. If people went by they would go quiet. All the neighbours were getting quite annoyed (one said he'd mentioned it to Ifold Estates) and so, as the only neighbour to know the boys (they were in my children's year at school), I asked the boys why they had taken to doing this and they said that they'd written to the parish to say that there was somewhere for little ones to play in Plaistow, but nowhere for older children to go and they'd been ignored. I asked them to play more quietly and to maybe move around different parts of the estate, but they just turned up their music and carried on coming. It got so that it was scary to go in the front garden or to leave the house as they would jeer at us through the car windows and on one occasion one of them rode into our drive. After a couple weeks I told them I would have to speak to their parents. One boy immediately rang his dad, who immediately came round in his car and had a go at me, saying they weren't doing any harm and had a right to be there and then he drove off while I was in the middle of explaining what they had been doing. I didn't dare talk to any other parents, but luckily after a few weeks, one of the mums suspected and asked me about it. Thankfully, she had a word with them twice and they stopped coming. That was decidedly not good for mine and the neighbour's wellbeing!! And since then, I still get concerned when children start zooming around outside. My concern is that if older children see the 8 year old's equipment, they will see the area as a hanging out area! That happens in the Plaistow Park. In conclusion: I feel that those who have asked for this Play Area aren't those who would be negatively affected by it. A lot of effort (understandably) has been put into financial and practical implications, but no effort into thinking about the wellbeing of those of us that live near Kelsey Hall. I feel we are just being dismissed as a minority in the community. Thank you for your attention.

[Back to top](#)

Appendix B – Areas of Concerns

These are the comments made by those who were not in favour (Qu2)

2. If you answered No to Q1 above, please can you explain your concerns and what can be done to alleviate them? If you answered Yes, please enter 'not applicable'.

Given the longstanding aspiration for a children's play area in Ifold, the Parish Council wishes to understand how it can deliver this project to the satisfaction of everyone.

[More Details](#)

96
Responses

Latest Responses

"In response to your newsletter, I have a few concerns and you do say you wi...

"Great to add value."

The concerns can be categorised as follows (see bold type below): -

Concern	Resolution
Parking	This is where some analysis of the results will come in. Most respondents stated they will walk / cycle and of those who said they would drive, the majority said they would park at a friend's house. As with all things in life, you cannot prevent a handful of people doing what they want – that's just a fact of life. However, signage / possible bike racks or other 'out-side-the-box' initiatives can reduce what is already a small issue.
Size (too small)	Something is better than nothing. Due to prohibitive land costs in Ifold there is no alternative to purchase land for a play area. In the absence of any other viable option, we must work with what we have. The area is big enough for 3 – 6 items of equipment (depending on type/size). For comparison, the Plaistow park has 8 items; therefore, if the site holds 4 – 6 pieces of equipment, it is (given its comparative size to Plaistow) a viable/healthy number.
Appeal (limited)	The survey results provide an indication of the types of equipment sought – which will go to the number of bits of equipment/cost and age appeal. However, firsthand knowledge / experience tells us that the types of equipment sought (climbing/balance apparatus; playhouse with slide) will appeal to children from toddler to 8 years (inclusive).
Cost (linked with size & appeal – unable to provide 'decent' equipment)	The PC has a duty to support all residents, including children and families. This project is not to the exclusion of its other expenditure/responsibilities. The Council can support its £20,000 budget with grant applications. The cost to upgrade the Plaistow Park was £55,000 – which has much bigger equipment, including a zipwire; therefore, the budget is sufficient to create a viable play area.
Dog fouling	It is unlawful to allow dogs into a play areas. This is almost universally known. Signs (provided by the PC) will support this. The area is more at risk currently than it will be once play equipment is installed.
Ground / equipment maintenance	The PC's grounds maintenance contractor will include the site in the annual contract and manage the leaves / grass cutting etc as they do for the Plaistow play park. The area will be safety inspected regularly and equipment maintained in the same way as the PC does at Plaistow. The trees will be included in the PC's tree survey schedule, to ensure their

	safety.
Litter	A bin will be provided. The PC contracts with CDC for public litter bins in any event, including at the Plaistow play park. The bin design will be such as to prevent foxes / rates etc.
Antisocial behaviour e.g., drugs & vandalism	The area is public – regular hall use/footfall and sight of Chalk Road. This is not an area which naturally lends itself to antisocial behaviour e.g., drug misuses and vandalism.
Noise	There will be some; but limited given the age of the children at play and the times of usage. Adult supervision and signs “please respect our neighbours” will help. It is already a community venue / hub, which is used by a variety of people/ages at varying times (including evenings with cars ‘coming and going’ until 10pm at times) throughout the week/weekend.
Ifold residents have large gardens and are not ‘disadvantaged’.	Some carers e.g., grandparents do not want to install permanent equipment in their gardens. Isolation is a key issue for parents. Having somewhere public to visit / meet up / meet new people (with children) is paramount for the welfare of children and their careers as borne out in studies from the Pandemic and the survey results. It strengthens a sense of community and cohesion.
Trees	These will not be felled and will be better cared for by regular surveys.
Loss of space to be used for other things	The area can still be used by other hall users – parties / fetes etc. The area will offer young children a facility which is lacking in Ifold.
Impact on house prices	Nothing. The hall is a community venue – house prices of near neighbours already reflect proximity to a community centre. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration within the planning process in any event.

1. **no parking** available - should people walk to the 'park' major impact to the surrounding houses space available is far **too small** and a total **waste of time, money and effort** no real proper and **decent play equipment** would be available because the amount of space is too small poor access to the proposed park danger from **falling leaves** in autumn winter - who will collect and clear need to have area for prams etc which cuts down equipment space **dog fouling**
2. A few small items of equipment will only **appeal to a very small minority** of relevant users. Irrespective of the locality, users will undoubtedly **drive** (example note the number of

parents that drive to pick up children from the school bus stop at end of chalk road). There is no suitable road **parking** available in the immediate vicinity without causing blocking of the road, especially given the road pinch point a few yards up from the Kelsey Hall entrance, before the bend. I would have less issue with a usage that perhaps appealed to a broader range of age groups - eg a basketball hoop setup etc that could become something more communal. There is already a sizeable play area at Plaistow - has any research been conducted into how much this actually gets used to gauge its value to the community before created a limited version at Ifold?

3. Use the money to reinstate the bus shelter you removed. Ifold children need it for the WINTER
4. Most properties in **Ifold have large gardens** and therefore no need for play area. It will potentially create **unsociable behaviour** and **parking** is a huge constraint. Money would be better spent on renewable energy for Kesley Hall.
5. I feel the area designated would be **too small** for significant child friendly equipment to be installed. It could soon become an **eyesore** when the toddlers and parents do not tidy up after being there. things could be left for the next visitors, who would possibly be reluctant to tidy others mess. Mess grows!!!!
6. Difficult maybe go with the needs of people likely to use it the most. Pick equipment that can be used by more than one child at the same time.
7. Well it is so **small** and barely room to swing a cat with so many beautiful trees surely limiting the movement of more than 2 or 3 toddlers at any given time.
8. There is already an issue of **drugs** being dealt at the bus stop. That will move the park.
9. **Noise, litter** and **drugs** in evening There are so many better things to spend money on, or keeping council tax lower as everyone struggling financially Damage to verges by cars **parking** on them will have to be paid for by Ifold residents
10. several reasons, firstly we **live opposite the hall** and we moved to this area for peace and quiet in a very pleasant location. 2. I really don't feel it is required, almost everybody has a **large enough garden** on the estate and provides play equipment for their own children. 3. We do not need to provide play equipment for underprivileged children with small gardens, nobody on the estate falls into that category, there are plenty of footpaths and open spaces locally. 4. The area described for the play equipment is small as is the whole car park, what about the **loss of this space being used for other general events** for adults and children, we must be inclusive of the whole community. I can see nothing that would alter my opinion about this
11. It depends on whether the plan includes **cutting down any trees** on the plot? If so, then I'm not supportive, but if not, then it depends on the local demand and **traffic** increase. With the age range so limited, demand is reduced, but I'd still be concerned about additional traffic on Chalk Road as some people do seem to drive even within Ifold and we

already have an issue of speeding and a tight blind corner. Also, value for money... should analyse how much the Plaistow park used and it's much bigger.

12. The car park is not of sufficient size to accommodate the cars of existing hall users. Car **parking** in Chalk Road is a nightmare of an evening in the dark with concealed drainage ditches to stumble into. A community hall with restricted car parking is a retrograde proposal. It is for **parents to provide for play equipment in their own gardens** not look for the Parish Council to divert existing facilities. It is unreal to expect the old and the elderly to walk to the hall.
13. Has a project been completed on what may be the impact on **house prices** in Chalk Road?
14. I am a neighbour and it would negatively impact us. **Noise** early and late, **litter, drug** dealing are a real concern.
15. A complete **waste of money** to satisfy the whim of a handful of people. The area is too **small** to make a useful play space.
16. **Ineffective use of public money** to serve the very few young children of the area who all have **large back gardens** to play in.
17. The proposed play **area is used already**. People do use the seat, without need of an enhanced discloser or the like; the area IS used for other events, with occasional **use by vehicles** at these events. Not often, but the area is used for events for all residents, not just a minority. The money could be better spent.
18. Why would people go there? It would make much more sense to use the area they call the "wild" area where the bus shelter (still not replaced) used to be, then at least they would have a reason to visit ... with the shop on hand to supply refreshments. the rewilding involved taking a tree down that only benefited the occupants of the lodge, dug out a number of wild plants and put a bunch of others in its place - not really rewilding, but farming.
19. This is not a suitable location, given the **small** area available. The **car park** is already used after hours by teenagers with cars as a meeting point and there is now **vandalism** and **littering** of empty alcohol containers to the bus stop. This will only serve to exacerbate this issue as well as causing **disturbance to neighbours** of the hall who didn't have this when they moved in. If parking is not allowed at the hall car park then more cars will park outside the hall which is not allowed under Ifold Estate rules.
20. Too **small** an area. No **parking**. Will encourage parking on road and verges. Ifold is surrounded by woods lots of adventures for children (mine played in woods) all houses in **large plots sufficient for own play area**
21. The area is too **small** to make a substantial play area . Most of the homes have a **bigger back garden** than the proposed site so can have their own swings etc

22. The survey for this was in 2013. These parents now have children who are possibly 12 - 14 years old. They will want a hard standing football goal and basketball net not toddlers toys so the survey is not relevant! There are very **few families with young children on Ifold** now. Concerns being the area is too **small**. The hall committee are very precious about the grounds of the hall and would not like young children straying any where near their hall. so how do you keep toddlers on the allotted area. People **parking** in the narrow road near the hall. Concerns of **people are not encourage to use the one bench there how will toddlers help this situation?**
23. In response to your newsletter, I have a few concerns and you do say you wish to implement this to the satisfaction of everyone. **Traffic:** Families on the other side of Ifold aren't going make their little ones walk all the way to Kelsey Hall and will park on the roadside, which will cause restriction for other traffic and pedestrians and making it more difficult for us residents to get out of our drives. If you let them park in the car park they will leave the gate open **encouraging skate boarders and bikers to hang out there** (see antisocial behaviour below). **Social interaction:** For both the children and their carers, this is **not in short supply**, as they attend school/the school run and visit each other's houses. I believe the community would be **better served with a nature area in that spot**, which would give the community a good chance to work together on an environmental project, be good for health and relaxation, social bonding between all ages and could especially good for giving the elderly who really do feel isolated, some much needed company!!!! **Play equipment will deteriorate** with time and need replacing. A nature area, perhaps helped by the Gardening Club, could last for generations. We live right by Kelsey Hall and we are very concerned about the **noise** and **antisocial behaviour** that would be introduced by the Play Area. Noise: We are very upset by the comment in your newsletter that we and our "surrounding neighbours are already familiar with the noise of playing children". Clearly stated by someone who doesn't live near the hall and it should be rescinded from the newsletter/parish reports as it isn't true! The Preschool only runs in the mornings, on week days and during school terms. We are at home all the time and we hear very little noise from them, apart from a short while playing outside under supervision. The rest of the time we don't hear a peep from them as they are mainly inside the hall. So you are proposing to introduce the noise of not just preschool children, but those up to 8 years old (who incidentally have much louder voices; I know as I helped for 8 years at the local primary school) in every daylight hour, 7 days a week, all through the year! It only takes 2 children to start screaming and shouting as they play! You seem concerned about the "wellbeing and positive mental health... for everyone", but that doesn't seem to extend to the Kelsey Hall neighbours having to listen to other people's children at any time throughout the week/weekend. And it's not like we can ask the Play Area visitors, like we can our own neighbours, to please be a little quieter if we have our own visitors, an important work meeting via zoom or just aren't feeling well. I don't suppose you will be sound proofing the Play Area! Please see the box in question 14 for a real example of Antisocial Behaviour. Thank you.

[Back to top](#)