

# Barnard Park Improvements: Public Engagement Feedback 28 June to 26 July 2021



# Introduction

Barnard Park is one of Islington's largest parks and is a popular destination for children's play, dog walking and sporting activities. The park has a variety of users and caters for many local people's needs. The park has features including a large central hard-surfaced redgra sports pitch with expansive surrounding areas of hard and soft landscaping. There are a large number of mature trees and areas of grass that cover sloping ground falling from Barnsbury Road at the eastern boundary to Hemingford Road forming the western boundary. There is a path network linking most of the entrances with bare soil desire line paths running along the eastern side of the park. The park has a park keeper on site and toilets within the playground.

Public consultation on recent changes to the parks masterplan ran for four weeks from Monday 28 June 2021 to Monday 26 July 2021. This consultation followed targeted engagement on the proposed hub building in March 2020 and consultation with key stakeholders on the 9x9 pitch management plan in April/May 2019. Earlier consultation was also carried out in 2014 and 2015 before a previous iteration of the masterplan was submitted for planning permission in 2016.

The aim of the latest consultation was to get feedback and comments from the public on the changes that had been made to the design for the park over the previous year as part of the formal pre-application process with the Islington Council Planning Department.

# Background

The Barnard Park Improvement Project commenced in its current guise in May 2018 after a way forward for the scheme as a whole was agreed with Sport England and the size of the new sports pitch and other elements of sports provision within the design could be supported.

Previously the original design of the park, which received planning permission in 2016, included a 7-a-side pitch, together with an adjacent recreational green space with natural turf to the north of the pitch. It was decided that a 7-a-side pitch best protects the general amenity and biodiversity of the park as well as protecting and creating a diversity of sporting and recreational opportunity for the whole community.

The planning application was subsequently called in by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government at the request of Sport England who were of the view that the proposed pitch was too small. As a result, a compromise was reached in the autumn of 2017 to include a 9-a-side sized 3G sports pitch in the design for the park and to also include, adjacent and to the north of the pitch, a more informal and open sporting and recreational green space with natural turf.

Consultation was previously carried out in autumn 2014 on four different plans for the park, marked A, B, C and D, with different layouts and options for facilities and features. Plan B was the layout preferred by the public and forms the basis for the current design and park masterplan. A total of 430 questionnaires were received and feedback was obtained on a variety of questions.

A further feedback exercise was carried out in October 2015 on the masterplan for the park that was developed from feedback from the 2014 consultation. The outcomes of this exercise fed into the current park masterplan.

The overwhelming majority of responses to the 2015 feedback process were positive or neutral in nature. Almost 90% of feedback was either positive or neutral.

The feedback from this public engagement was used to develop the Barnard Park masterplan for the initial planning application submitted on 16 March 2016. The application for the park went to Planning Committee on 18 July 2016 and was granted planning permission and referral to the Secretary of State. This takes the history up to 2017 and the call-in from the Secretary of State and agreement with Sport England detailed above.

There were previous designs completed by Latz & Partners and Gensler PLC that were deemed unaffordable and were not well received by the public. Ireland Albrecht were appointed in November 2013 and are the current landscape architects for the project.

## Public Engagement Methodology

The public engagement was launched on Monday 28 June when the consultation webpage and online survey went live and 3,400 8-page leaflets, including a postal survey, were delivered to residents in an area around Barnard Park. –You can view the leaflet delivery area map on our website. A project email inbox was set up and advertised as a means of contact.

Islington Council also announced the consultation launch via a press release that was sent out and published on [www.islington.media/news](http://www.islington.media/news) on Tuesday 29 June. This press release had details of the project and the consultation and a link to the consultation webpage.

The engagement period ran from 28 June for four weeks and closed at midnight on 26 July. The online survey closed for response on 26 July and online survey responses received within this period were taken into account. Postal surveys that arrived after this date were included to account for posting time.

The following text was included in the consultation materials to make clear which were the recent changes that were being consulted on.

Changes to the park masterplan have been made in response to advice from the council's planning team as part of the formal pre-application process in preparation for submitting the final planning application for the scheme. We would like to know your thoughts on the recent proposed changes below. We are only consulting on these changes.

### **The recent changes:**

#### Improved biodiversity and ecology

- Remove areas of unnecessary hard surface such as concrete and replace it with plants that encourage wildlife
- Paths will be made permeable where possible to help drainage
- Closed entrances will be planted with biodiverse planting

#### Improved pathways and circulation

- Simplify the path network to make it easier to move around the park
- Give better access to entrances
- Create larger open spaces

## Improved entrances and accessibility

- Close the entrance at Boxworth Grove
- Create a new entrance at Sheen Grove with level access and better sightlines
- The entrance at number 24 on the masterplan will be closed and transformed into a planted wildlife area.'

Also advertised on the leaflet and made available on the consultation webpage were frequently asked questions (FAQs) as a document with answers to what were thought to be likely questions. For example there are answers to the questions 'What changes have been made to the park masterplan?' and 'Why are you changing the entrances at the north of the park?'

You can view the updated FAQs on our [website](#). More FAQs have been added in order to clarify key themes identified in the responses received.

## Summary of responses received

During the engagement period we received a total of 383 responses. This included 314 feedback surveys completed online and 69 paper feedback surveys. Two of the paper responses were blank in the feedback section but did fill in the 'about you' questionnaire.

11 emails were also received to the project email address [barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk](mailto:barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk) and these comments will be included in the analysis of written feedback.

1 letter was also received.

The results were qualitative, as respondents were asked to provide feedback on specific recent changes detailed above. The aim was to establish individuals' feelings and opinions on the proposals, and recognise and evaluate themes that arose from the written responses. While many responses did address the recent changes to the masterplan, many also commented on other key parts of the design or the future use of the park once improvements are complete. The themes of the comments on recent changes to the masterplan are explored in the qualitative analysis below.

## Roller Skating/Skating

A very large number of responses received via the online survey feedback form specifically focused on roller skating and requested a large area of hard surfacing for roller skating. There are 138 comments specifically on this topic. These responses were entered in a cluster between 30 June and 9 July and were from locations across London. These responses did not address the proposals and a large area of hard surfacing such as tarmac is not a possible addition to the park design at this stage.

The paths in the park will be able to be used by roller skaters and there are initial plans to possibly include some skating facilities at another park nearby. It is one of the options to include a skating area at Bingfield Park that sits in between Caledonian Road and Kings Cross. We hope this will address some of these respondents' wishes.

The 138 responses commenting on roller skating were almost entirely positive and neutral in tone but did not comment on the recent changes to the park masterplan. The 138 responses have been excluded from the analysis below as they do not engage with the masterplan proposals for the park and would skew the analysis. There are examples of some of the comments below which represent the general theme of feedback being short and not related to the proposals or Barnard Park itself. Many comments refer to tennis courts being suitable for repurposing and tennis courts are not in the proposals. The sports pitch will be a 3G artificial grass surface and will be used for football, rugby training and games but is not suitable for roller skating. The sports pitch is agreed with Sport England.

### **Examples of short roller skating comments:**

'Please plan to have a large concrete area for roller skaters.'

'I would love to have a good flat space where we rollerskaters can come and bond and develop their talents! It's a great way to get exercise, meet people, and have fun'

'I think this space should be turned into a flat area suitable for rollerskating.'

'London is in dire need of more rollerskate spaces, it would be highly beneficial to get an attributed space to cater for the fast growing skating community.'

'Outdoor Roller Skating Rink'

'It would be great to repurpose the pitch to have a skating rink or otherwise flat, smooth surface for roller skating!'

'I think the design is good so far and believe it would be amazing for the community if there was a flat area dedicated to roller skating and blading.'

### **Examples of longer roller skating comments:**

'I would love to see a space dedicated to roller skaters. We are a respectful community that will drive a significant increase in business to the local restaurants and corner shops. Roller skating serves as a synonym for freedom and we don't have many places at all to be fed. It would be an absolute dream come true if you can consider us in your planning.'

'Due to the huge amount of "Lockdown Roller Skaters" it would be incredible to have a large flat surface for skaters. The London skate community has boomed and there are regular large gatherings of skaters. Places like the o2 and Clapham see extremely large crowds of skaters, but in areas that aren't designated for skating. Having a spot specifically for skaters not only keeps skaters safe but the general public also.'

## **Positive, neutral or negative analysis**

The results were entirely qualitative, as respondents were simply asked to provide feedback and comments on the proposals; they were analysed and grouped in the following way.

**Positive response** – comments were generally supportive of the proposals. Some responses had suggestions of further improvements, or minor changes to existing recommendations. Overall the response was positive about proposed improvements.

**Neutral response** – comments did not indicate a strongly positive or negative opinion of the proposals, and generally gave a variety of suggestions about the proposals, or comments on the existing condition of the park. The response neither supported nor objected to proposals.

**Negative response** – comments were generally not supportive of the proposals, with a variety of reasons why the respondent was not supportive of the improvements. These responses objected to the proposals in some way.

**Table 1. Positive, neutral or negative analysis**

Question - Q1: We would like to have your comments on the proposed changes to the design that have been made over the last year in response to advice from the Planning team as part of the formal pre-application process.

Please note – the below table does not include the 138 responses commenting on roller skating or the two responses that were blank. It includes both comments related to the recent changes to the masterplan which the consultation was about, and comments on other topics except rollerskating.

<b>General responses received via feedback form – positive, neutral or negative analysis</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Positive responses	108	44.44
Neutral responses	90	37.04
Negative responses	45	18.52
Total	243	100

The below examples of positive, neutral and negative responses contain both comments relating to the recent changes to the masterplan, and those which do not relate to those changes.

**Examples of positive responses:**

'Utterly brilliant plan! Can't wait to see it implemented'

'The new design looks great. A key are to improving this park for exercise would be a circular running route as the current layout has many people running on the sports pitch.'

'I like the new proposals. Less concrete and more wild flowers and space for biodiversity! Hedgerows and bird boxes will attract birds and other wildlife.'

'We are very favourable to all the aspects of the proposed improvements. We have two young kids and live next to the park, hence we visit it extensively.

The new football pitch will be much healthier (unlike the current one, that fills air with dust when running/playing football, which is really bad when doing exercise to keep healthy lungs and lower risk of asthma and respiratory diseases).

Currently, most level space is consumed by the football pitch. We are delighted to see that the park will implement a fairer use of the space, in particular with a new central level area, something that was really missing in a park of this size. This area will be very appealing to families like ourselves. And the proposal still retains a very large football pitch, that will be perfect for the football school.

The outdoor gym equipment will be very welcome. We are also in favour of the effort and recent changes to maximise green areas.'

'This looks a very good plan with welcoming entrances and catering for a range of needs in the local population. I really like the plan to plant many more new trees.'

### **Examples of neutral responses:**

'Why are there no tennis courts but 3 five a side pitches? There should be a provision for tennis courts.'

'Ban dogs. Make the pitch real grass'

'It would be nice if the 3G sports field had a basketball court similar to the ones at Finsbury Park. Islington is a very diverse community and basketball is a sport rapidly developing and getting popular in London with more and more young British people embracing the sport.

Thank you'

'Not sure why such a large pitch is proposed. I visit several times every day and no one is playing sports everyday on the existing pitch, occasionally I see football with children maximum of once or twice a week and sometimes very small groups of adults.

Why do we need another community centre in addition to 1 o'clock club and Barnard Adventure playground, both of which are massively underused and both look neglected, unkempt and unpleasant (see the wood and containers in their usually empty pitch in the Adventure Playground). We don't need more buildings that are uncared for!

Improved paths and entrances are good, too many dogs for people to sit comfortably on grass.

Will there be staff on site to manage and keep area tidy and free from anti-social behaviour?'

'Football/rugby pitch is still too big however, in the interests of moving forward, please implement this plan as soon as possible. The neighbourhood has waited far too long for improvements to Barnard Park.'

### **Examples of negative responses:**

'Waste of money. Fix the existing pitch and if you have to put pathways in. Follow the trail that people have walked into the grass.

Do not make the pitch smaller.

In short NO!'

'I object to these proposals. Barnard Park is fine as it is. Where are our children and locals supposed to go whilst this is a building site?! Don't fix what doesn't need fixing wasting good money. The football pitch could do with astro turf otherwise the rest is ok. It's absolutely absurd to put an extra 30 odd trees. Arundel Square playground is currently closed as the equipment is unsafe, why not use the money for Barnard Park on replacing what is needed in Arundel Square. That play area clearly needs the works more.'

'I'm quite surprised not to see a playground in the plan.

It feels like young children are being left out in Islington. Much in contrast to neighbouring boroughs such as Hackney and Tower Hamlets.

Very disappointed.'

'I am worried about the location of the new football pitch, especially its impact on all the houses in Barnsbury Road: the noise, the light pollution, the litter, the ugliness and visual intrusion of the retaining walls..

I strongly object to having the Alma Grove cobbles removed. They are the original early 19th century ones and, surely, they are listed as being of Historical interest. If not, they ought to be..'

## Analysis of results

A considerable majority of responses were positive or neutral in tone and content. 81.48% of the responses were either supportive or positive in regard to the proposals or did not indicate a strongly positive or negative opinion of the proposals. The positive comments largely focused on an improved layout and entrances, and biodiversity improvements. Neutral responses often asked for an additional facility, asked a question or had some positive and some negative comments. There were still a considerable number of negative responses and many of these were focused on the proposed sports pitch and its future use and management. There is more detailed analysis of the key themes in the feedback below table 3.

### Table 2. General feedback relating to recent changes to the masterplan

Question - Q1: We would like to have your comments on the proposed changes to the design that have been made over the last year in response to advice from the Planning team as part of the formal pre-application process.

<b>Feedback comment with five or more occurrences. 381 respondents gave written feedback via online or postal survey</b>	<b>Number of occurrences</b>
Positive comment on biodiversity/ecological improvements	25
Positive comment on new paths	14
Comment on trees. Do not remove trees/trees should not be lost	13
Positive comment on the design of the park specifically	11
Positive comment on the proposed entrance changes at Boxworth Grove/Sheen Grove	11
Negative comment on the proposed entrance changes at Boxworth Grove/Sheen Grove	10



Do not remove cobbled street/Alma Grove. Keep cobbles	8
Copenhagen Street entrance. Please do not close/why close it?	8
General positive comment on entrance changes	7
Positive comment on the proposed layout of the park	6
It is good to see new trees in the design	5
It would be good to have more trees in the design	5

**Table 3. General feedback not relating to recent changes to the masterplan**

The following comments were also submitted in response to question 1, although they do not relate to the recent changes to the masterplan.

<b>Feedback comment with five or more occurrences – 381 respondents gave written feedback via online or postal survey</b>	<b>Number of occurrences</b>
Comment about the size of the sports pitch	37
Specific comment on future pitch management/concerns that the new pitch will be pay to play	35
Proposed sports pitch is too big	24
Request for a space to play petanque/boules in the park	17
Comment on safety/more lighting/CCTV	15
The playground should not be removed/is the playground being removed?	14
Dogs should continue to be allowed in the park	13
There should be a dog free area	11
The playground should be improved	11
Comment on adventure playground. Why is it not included in proposals? It would be good to improve it	10
Comment on café. Good to have a café/would like a café	10
Comment on money. Proposals a waste of money/not good value for money	9

<b>Feedback comment with five or more occurrences – 381 respondents gave written feedback via online or postal survey</b>	<b>Number of occurrences</b>
Dog fouling is a problem in the park	8
Comment on litter/rubbish being a problem currently or in future	7
Can there be provision for a tennis court?	6
Is it possible to have a basketball court?	6
It would be good to have space for cricket/cricket nets	6
Positive comment on outdoor gym	5
Toilets are needed	5
Negative comment on a pond for safety reasons	5

Comments have been grouped together where they refer to a certain point but have used various ways to make the point. For example 'Comment on safety/more lighting/CCTV' covers comments relating to safety such as 'is there any provision for low-intensity lighting around paths?' and 'I am in favour of the plans as long as there are park wardens and CCTV security'.

Where a comment is mentioned five or more times it is included in the tables above. Where it is a feedback response to recent changes to the masterplan, it is analysed below as a feedback theme. If the comments address the recent changes to the masterplan, they will be considered in relation to the designs for the park as they are finalised prior to the planning submission. Where the comments do not address the recent changes to the masterplan, they have been addressed in separate FAQs to be found on our [website](#).

## Feedback themes relating to recent changes to the masterplan

The analysis of the key feedback themes below is focused on the feedback received that addresses the recent changes to the masterplan as detailed on pages 3 and 4 of this document and in the consultation materials. Other comments have been addressed in the updated FAQs that can be found as a drop-down menu on our [website](#).

# Improved entrances and accessibility

## General entrance changes

There were 8 comments on general entrance changes where there was no specific mention of a particular entrance. There were many comments on specific entrances as detailed below. There were 7 positive comments on proposed entrance changes generally and one negative comment. This shows generally they are well received.

### **Example of positive comments:**

'I do agree to the changes in the entrances and that it can give clear sight throughout the park and reduce anti-social behaviour.'

## Boxworth/Sheen Grove

There were 21 comments that directly referred to the proposed entrance changes at Boxworth Grove and Sheen Grove. This is a key change to the design of the park and the layout of paths in the north of the park. There were 11 positive comments on the proposed changes to close Boxworth Grove entrance and create a new entrance at Sheen Grove. There were also 10 negative comments on these proposed changes so it was balanced. When looking at the general comments on entrances it gives a more positive response overall to proposed entrance changes. There were 3 comments suggesting both current and proposed entrances at Boxworth Grove and Sheen Grove should be open.

### **Examples of positive comments:**

'I like the proposed Sheen Grove entrance – it looks less secluded and safer than the present one at that end'

'- large open spaces at the entrances are key to reducing crime, as various shady/hidden entrances to the park are currently crime hot spots. For that reason it is a very good idea to close the Boxworth Grove entrance. You should also install CCTV at all the entrances, as police say that they are dependent on Islington to do this and this would help the police reduce the amount of drug dealing going on in and around Barnard Park.'

### **Examples of negative comments:**

'I am not sure why the Boxworth Grove entrance needs moving as this will cause additional expense although at the moment the actual thoroughfare here is narrow.'

### **Example of comment supporting both being open:**

'Pls consider keeping the Boxworth Grove entrance open to the public, as well as creating a welcome new entrance from Sheen Grove. The Boxworth Grove entrance has a kind of charm and atmosphere, and it would be a pity to lose it altogether.'

## Copenhagen Street entrance

There were 9 comments that directly referred to the proposed closure of the Copenhagen Street entrance. 8 of these were negative and asked what reason there was for closing this entrance or objected to the closure.

### **Examples of negative comments:**

'Query why you would want or need to close the entrance to Copenhagen Street? What possible reason is there for that?'

'Would like to keep entrance in Copenhagen Street open. I use that entrance frequently as I cross the park from Barnsbury Street (21 on the masterplan) and go to the Santander cycle stand in Copenhagen Street and either walk or cycle to the Regent's Canal entrance just south of the tunnel to head to Kings Cross or along the Regent's Canal. If this entrance is no longer open it requires a detour for anyone heading towards the canal in a west/east direction.'

'Please reconsider closing of entrances to the park. The current plan only gives access from one side of the park, reducing access from Copenhagen St.'

### **Examples of positive comments:**

'Closing the entrance behind the CT houses is a good idea. But please plant no allergenic trees or grasses, as several of us are allergic to birch trees and flowering grasses.'

It is clear from some of the comments that there is some confusion about which entrance is proposed for closure. The entrance at the end of Charlotte Terrace, also the main entrance to the park and a vehicular entrance will remain open. The small pedestrian entrance behind the residential properties on Charlotte Terrace is the one proposed for closure. Access to the park from the south will be maintained and the closure will not adversely affect commuting routes through the park.

The reasons for proposing closure of this entrance is that it is not accessible and has poor sightlines making it an unsafe entrance by secure design principles that aim to make places safer by designing out crime where possible. There is a large amount of paving at this entrance and this will be removed to increase planting and biodiversity.

## Entrances and accessibility feedback summary

There were 41 comments in total relating to proposed entrance changes which shows a good level of interest. The feedback was mixed and showed both support for changes and objection to the changes for a variety of reasons. This feedback does not show a clear outcome in either supporting or objecting to the changes. The changes at Boxworth/Sheen Grove were evenly split for positive and negative comments while there were many more positive comments on overall entrance changes and many more negative comments on the proposal to close the entrance from Copenhagen Street. You can find a more detailed response to the feedback on entrance changes in the FAQs on our [website](#).

# Biodiversity and ecological improvements

## General comments on biodiversity/ecological improvements

There were 25 positive comments specifically mentioning the proposed improvements for biodiversity or mentioning ecological improvements in a positive way. There were two responses that refer to the biodiversity/ecological improvements in a negative way and specifically mention ecology or biodiversity.

### **Examples of positive comments:**

'I support the changes, makes the park more multi-functional for different ages and uses, great that there is a biodiversity net gain.'

The green roof and ASHP for the community centre is a positive approach but more could be done to make the community hub more sustainable (e.g. Passivhaus standard).'

'I am pleased to see the high emphasis placed on biodiversity.'

One minor change requested is that sparrow terraces should be changed to universal nesting bricks such as Action for Swifts S-bricks as these have been shown to be much more effective for sparrows and also more flexible than sparrow terraces –'

'Larger open spaces and plants that encourage wildlife are a very good idea. However, we do not need more sports facilities (of which there are already plenty in Islington, e.g. the similar facilities in nearby Market Road). We need some greenery, places to walk and sit, nature, flower borders, etc.'

### **Example of negative comments:**

'We have almost no natural, large open green spaces and this plan looks overbuilt and not very ecological or environmentally conscious.'

Sometimes less destruction and change is better than the huge project that this seems to be involving earth moving and destruction of mature trees'

## Comments on trees

Trees and the new planting and removal of trees relates directly to the specific comments on biodiversity/ecological improvements. There were a number of comments mentioning trees directly.

There were 13 comments that referred to the loss of trees in the masterplan. There were also 5 comments that expressed pleasure for the proposed new trees and 5 respondents that want to see more trees planted than the 51 new trees proposed. There were also three responses that commented on there being no need for more trees and that there were too many trees in the park. There was a range of opinions but as a proportion of the number of responses, the comments overall did not represent a large number of comments relating to trees.

### **Examples of comments on loss of trees:**

'Please don't cut down any of the lovely mature trees in the park and please, no artificial pitch, which will just add to micro plastic pollution!'

'We visit Barnard Park every day. We have lived in this area across from the park for 30 years. We like the plans for the improvements in the park as a family. I would just ask if the established trees are to be saved. We like that the football pitch is being used, the one o'clock club remains and the children's park is still available. We like the café area and seating.'

### **Example of positive comment on proposed new trees:**

'Very pleased about the intention to increase the number of trees and reduce hard footpaths.'

### **Example of comment about more trees:**

'Great to see that Barnard Park's layout will finally be enhanced. I would have liked to see more trees planted and a tennis court added to the project. Other than that the project looks promising, well done'

## Biodiversity and ecology feedback summary

The response to the proposed improvements to biodiversity and ecological enhancements is mostly positive.

## Improved pathways and circulation

### Comments on improved paths

There were 14 positive comments on the paths. There were also an additional 3 comments on the path material.

There were three negative comments on paths with focus on the new paths being not in the best location and laid out incorrectly.

### **Examples of positive comments on new paths:**

'Good to see: New orchard, hedgerows and wildflower meadows. Improvements to paths (which are currently in a poor state of repair).'

'Glad to see permeable paths and less hard space.'

'As an older person, luckily still fit, I know how vital it is to get our ageing population out into the park. At last with safe all weather paths and lots of seats it will be possible to walk around the park and not just across it. Even in mid-winter the new seats at the north end will catch the sun.'

### **Example of comments on path material:**

'Agree with 11 (informal permeable paths) – a path that doesn't get muddy.'

### **Example of negative comments:**

'The paths do not look well thought out in terms of where people actually want to get to. I use the park on a weekly basis to walk through to get somewhere. If the paths are not in the right place people will walk/cycle across the grass and it will soon be destroyed. Imagine the people who walk from Boxworth Grove to the Copenhagen end of Barnsbury Terrace – that journey is now doubled.'

## **Feedback on layout and design**

There was a largely positive response to the recent layout and design changes that have been made to the masterplan in response to advice from the council's planning team as part of the formal pre-application process. There were 11 positive comments on the design of the park and 6 positive comments on the proposed layout. There were also 4 negative comments on the design for the park. A large number of comments focused on the sports pitch and how it relates to the layout and design of the park.

### **Examples of positive comments:**

'The new design looks great. A key area to improving this park for exercise would be a circular running route as the current layout has many people running on the sports pitch.'

'Broadly I like and support the design. I know it has been contentious over a long time and I think this achieves a good balance. I think it will be important that the new football pitch is not overly dominant. I would also like to see a path round the whole of the outside edge of the park (or most of it) that could be used for walking or running laps and also to observe children playing semi- independently.'

'Great to see that Barnard Park's layout will finally be enhanced. I would have liked to see more trees planted and a tennis court added to the project. Other than that the project looks promising, well done'

### **Example of negative comments:**

'Overall a note on design. In 2021 this cannot be the most exciting design out there?! We live largely in a conservation area where the design of the streets is cherished. We must be striving to meet that standard with the design of our park. There is nothing appealing about the entrance, no clever/playful tricks throughout the park, the cafe looks kind of fine, but really the whole thing looks dated before it has even been built.'

## **Improved pathways and circulation feedback summary**

The feedback on the proposed improvements to pathways and circulation, and simplifying the layout of the park was mostly positive with 34 comments referring to the paths, path material, layout or design in a positive way. There were 7 negative comments that referred specifically to the layout or design of the park. This shows that when looking at the recent changes to the park masterplan the response was positive on the whole and people showed more support than objections.

## Removal of section of cobbled street/Alma Grove

The proposal to remove a section of cobbles that formed part of Alma Grove was a recent change to the park masterplan. There were 8 comments in the survey feedback and also 4 comments via email and a letter on this proposed change. All of the comments were negative about this proposal and some commented on the need to reference this historic street with an information board. This specific change was intended to link up green spaces but the feedback has been looked at and addressed in more detail in the feedback response FAQs on our [website](#).

### **Examples of comments on cobbled street:**

'I like the plans on the whole and think it will be a big improvement. However, I feel sad that you are removing the cobbles from one of the old streets.

Would it be possible to have a plaque somewhere in the park commemorating the people who lost their lives when the area was bombed?'

'I strongly object to the removal of the historic cobblestones that make up the 'ghost street' on the east of the scheme. This is a unique historic asset that acts as an amazing lens through which to tell the story of WWII. This should be retained, restored and competition for an art installation take place that uses the ghost street as a canvas.'

'But please! Leave in place the remains of the cobbled street! It's a last relic of what was there before and is doing no harm. With an informative notice about war damage and the opportunity for flowers to sprout between the cobbles, it could become an attractive and educational feature'

## Other feedback received

### Letter received

One letter was received during the consultation period. The letter primarily concerned the historical significance of Barnard Park and the streets that occupied the area before they were destroyed in 1940 during the bombing in the Second World War. The letter asked for this history to be referenced in an information board with the former street layout from that time. The other main feedback comment was that the cobbles that form part of Alma Grove should remain. This feedback can be added to the comments on the cobbled area received via feedback forms. This letter was a neutral response to the proposals.

### Feedback from emails received to project inbox

11 emails were received to the project email ([barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk](mailto:barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk)) or were received by email intended as a response to the consultation within the consultation start and end dates. The project email was advertised in consultation materials, on the consultation webpage and on posters displayed in the park.

The emails received were more evenly split between neutral/positive and negative in either expressing support for the proposals and asking questions or objecting to the proposals for a



variety of reasons. Some neutral emails asked a question or wanted more information generally. One email gave clear support for the proposals.

Some of the emails came from people who had also given feedback using the online or paper survey. The emails are analysed in the same way as the other feedback and with key themes detailed below.

Where the email sender was asking an urgent question or asking to be contacted they received a response from a Council Officer.

#### **Table 4. Positive, neutral or negative analysis: emails**

This table includes both comments relating to the recent changes to the masterplan and comments on other topics.

Email response – positive, neutral or negative analysis	Number of responses
Positive responses	1
Neutral responses	5
Negative responses	5
Total	11

#### **Example of positive response:**

'We welcome the design of the circular paths, the new hub building and the general ecological improvements. We would like to see the cobbled path at Alma Grove retained as it is part of the history of the park.'

#### **Examples of neutral response:**

'Dear Consultation team, thank you for sending the well set out brochure on proposed Barnard Park work.

I have looked carefully at these and also searched through the Frequently Asked questions on your website.

I see no reference to Dog walking.

Many people walk their dogs peacefully on the Park.

I would be very grateful if you could comment on your proposed access for Dogs and their owners.

Thanks and best wishes'

#### **Examples of negative response:**

'I am absolutely aghast at the plans for this park. We already have more than enough trees and certainly do not need another 38. These trees are shading the park from sunlight causing mud

patches everywhere. You seem to forget this park is surrounded by flats where the residents have no garden access so like to use the park. These plans are taking away grass areas. The people that use this park on a regular basis are not bothered about hedgerows, wildflowers or wildlife habitats. They just want a nice open space to enjoy with their families, as they do now.'

**Table 5. General feedback themes from emails received: themes relating to recent changes to the masterplan**

Feedback comment occurrences from emails received at barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk	Number of occurrences
Design needs to be rethought/no change to the park needed	4
Negative comment on project cost	2
Cobbled area/Alma Grove should be retained	2
Too many trees	1
Please include more adaptations for climate change	1
Negative comment on entrance changes	1
Positive comment on biodiversity/ecological improvements	1
Negative comment on consultation	1
Negative impact on global warming	1

**Table 6. General feedback themes from emails received: themes not relating to recent changes to the masterplan**

Feedback comment occurrences from emails received at barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk	Number of occurrences
Specific comment on future pitch management/concerns that the new pitch will be pay to play	3
Proposed sports pitch is too big	2
Will dogs be allowed?	2
Current pitch too big	1
Concern over inclusion of a pond	1
Increased security needed	1

Feedback comment occurrences from emails received at barnardparkimprovements@islington.gov.uk	Number of occurrences
Keep the sports pitch as it is/the proposed pitch is too small	1
Please include a tennis court	1
Running routes needed	1
Lighting should be as low as possible	1
Please include drinking fountains	1
Playground needs improvement	1

## Analysis of feedback themes from emails

### Design layout

Four of the responses received via email raised concerns about the overall proposed design for the park and either stated that the park required little or no change, or that the proposals were not suitable and needed to be changed.

#### **Examples:**

'Essentially there seems to be no unifying theme or concept behind the present masterplan and the worst kind of 'municipal muddle' will be the likely result.'

'Why can we do to get you to abandon your plans?

Will the football pitch be getting any smaller?

Why can't the pitch be left where it is?'

### Specific comment on future pitch management/concerns that the new pitch will be pay to play

Three of the email responses referred to concerns over the future management of the new sports pitch and pay to play. While this does not relate to recent changes to the masterplan, it is one the key themes in the wider feedback received and has therefore been addressed in the information provided on our [website](#), including the suggested pitch management plan and programme as well as the FAQs.

## Summary

**Table 7. Positive, neutral or negative analysis – all responses**

All responses (excluding blank and roller skating responses) – positive, neutral or negative analysis	Number of responses	Percentage %
Positive responses	109	42.74
Neutral responses	96	37.65
Negative responses	50	19.61
Total	255	100

Total number of responses - **395** (including 138 roller skating responses and two blank responses)

The collated responses received during the consultation period covered a wide range of themes and were often strongly supportive of the proposals or had a strong objection to make. There were a large number of responses that asked a question or had a balanced view and were neutral. Most responses when collated were positive or neutral with just 19.61% of the responses negative about or objecting to proposals.

The feedback received that comments on recent proposed changes to the masterplan has been discussed with the Project Team and will be taken into consideration in the final design where possible.

It is not possible to respond to each individual's feedback but there are updated FAQs on our [website](#) addressing the main themes of feedback in detail. They will answer some of the questions and also correct some assumptions and misunderstandings about the proposals.

## About you survey

The results of the 'about you' part of the survey are included below. There were a total of 383 survey respondents.

Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Disability	Do you visit the park
Female – 229	12-17 – 5	Asian/British Asian – 13	No – 315	No – 35
Male – 132	18-24 – 70	Black/African/Caribbean/British Black – 77	Prefer not to say – 34	Yes – 348

Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Disability	Do you visit the park
Non binary – 3	25-44 – 148	British White – 234	Yes, my disability is – 32	
Other - 3	45-64 – 81	Other please specify – 56	Blank – 2	
Prefer not to say – 15	65+ - 77	Blank – 3		
Left blank – 1	Blank – 2			

## Next steps

- Development of final masterplan for Barnard Park and preparation for planning submission – November/December 2022
- Barnard Park – Public Engagement Feedback published – December 2021
- Submission of planning application – December 2021

You can find the Barnard Park – Public Engagement Feedback and the following supporting documents on our [webpage](#).

1. Consultation leaflet
2. (Barnard Park) Greening and Environmental Enhancements
3. Updated FAQs
4. (Draft) Barnard Park 3G football pitch management plan
5. (Draft) Barnard Park 3G football pitch programme
6. (Draft) Barnard Park hub building management plan
7. Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
8. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
9. Ecological Enhancements Summary
10. Updated Arboricultural Report
11. I-Tree Eco Inventory Report for Barnard Park
12. Updated Barnard Park Masterplan