### DUDLEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

### AREA COMMITTEE – NORTH DUDLEY

### 23<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2005

### **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT**

### PROPOSED SKATEPARK – TENACRE LANE, UPPER GORNAL

### 1.0 <u>PURPOSE</u>

- 1.1 To advise the Committee of the results of the public consultation carried out in respect of the proposed skatepark at Tenacre Lane, Upper Gornal.
- 1.2 To seek the Committee's support for the provision of a skatepark at Tenacre Lane, Upper Gornal

### 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In September 2003 the Council approved a strategy to provide skate/wheeled sports facilities in each of the Area Committee areas. Since that date the respective Area Committees have been attempting to identify the range of possible sites within their respective areas upon which such a facility could be sited. Typically this has involved a long list of possible sites which are then subjected to further technical appraisals as to their suitability.
- 2.2 Following such work at its meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 the Area Committee Working Group authorised that a consultation exercise be carried out with regard to the provision of a skatepark at Tenacre Lane, Upper Gornal, which through both the technical appraisal and geographical considerations was identified as a suitable site.
- 2.1 A feasibility study carried out by the officers in the Directorate of the Urban Environment identified that 2 sites within the open space at Tenacre Lane would be suitable for the construction of a skatepark.
- 2.2 The consultation exercise started on the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2005 and took the following format;
  - Postal consultation with freepost return questionnaire to all residents within 400 metres of site the boundary with a closing date of the 25<sup>th</sup> February. 2407 Households were invited to

participate in the consultation.

- Consultation meeting with the Oval Residents Forum.
- Consultation with the Turls Hill & Swanbrook Valley Residents Association.
- Exhibition panel with Freepost questionnaires in local schools.
- Consultation with West Midlands Crime Prevention Unit.
- Consultation with local youth groups.
- 2.3 The leaflet and questionnaire used in the postal questionnaire are included in appendices A & B
- 2.4 A full report on the consultation responses is included in appendix C. In summary, members are asked to consider the following issues;
  - 642 questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 23%.
  - 62% of respondents supported the proposal for skatepark at the Tenacre Lane open space, 29% opposed it and 9% expressed no opinion.
  - Of those who opposed the proposals, the majority did so on the grounds of antisocial behaviour (58%) and the existing motorbike nuisance (13%).
  - The most popular location for the skatepark was Site A (as shown on Appendix A) with 23% in support, and this also received the least opposition (26% strongly opposed).
  - The most popular response to a question about security of the skatepark was to provide tall perimeter fencing with lockable gates (41%).
- 2.5 Officers attended a meeting held by The Oval Residents Forum on the 8th February 2005 in order to explain the proposals, and leaflets and questionnaires were left with this group. At the meeting, the local residents noted that they would not like to encourage further teenagers to use this site and feel that the provision of a skatepark would do just that. The residents expressed concern at the levels of antisocial behaviour that exist on the Tenacre Lane open space. Other primary concerns were in relation to the use of off road motorcycles illegally using the site. Whilst the group agreed that a solution needs to be found to give local youth something in the area they felt that siting of a skatepark on Tenacre fields would be inappropriate.
- 2.6 The Turls Hill & Swanbrook Valley Residents Association (TH&SVRS) advised that whereas they would not have chosen the provision of a skatepark, they did not object to its construction. A management plan prepared in October 2003 in conjunction with the Council and TH&SVRS with regard to nature conservation suggests areas for improvement across this site. The TH&SVRS consider that the site should be landscaped and adequately secured with fencing and anti motorcycle barriers. The skate/wheeled sports facilities provided thus far by the Council have not been fenced but are open access facilities.

- 2.7 The West Midlands Crime Prevention Unit has supported the idea of the skatepark in principle, however they have expressed concern about whether the existing car parking is adequate. From a community safety point of view the police would like to see the scheme lit for use in winter months (eg. early evening hours). The skate/wheeled sports facilities provided thus far by the Council have not been floodlit.
- 2.8 Should the proposal proceed, implementation will be subject to the determination of a planning application for the skatepark and associated works and funding approval through the Council's Capital Programme. Subject to these approvals and the acceptance of a suitable tender for the work, the skatepark may reasonably be expected to be completed in September 2005.
- 2.9 A letter will be sent to all those invited to participate in this consultation advising the of the outcome of the consultation

# 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 That following the public consultation the committee support a skatepark be constructed at Tenacre Lane on Site A.
- 3.2 That the costs of constructing the skate park and any associated works be established and that a request be made to the Cabinet to include this within the Council's Capital Programme.

# 4.0 <u>FINANCE</u>

4.1 The scheme is to be funded by the Community Facilities capital budget, available section 106 funds and directorate reserves.

# 5.0 <u>LAW</u>

- 5.1 The Council may provide recreational facilities under section 19 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous) Provisions) Act 1976.
- 5.2 The Council may do anything which is incidental to conducive to or which facilitates the discharge of its functions under s 111 of the LGA 1972.

## 6.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

- 6.1 The proposals take into account the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy
- 7.0

# **RECOMMENDATION**

7.1 That the proposals set out in paragraph 3.1 and 3.2 of this report be approved



Director of the Urban Environment - John B. Millar

Contact Officer: Chris Green ext 4145

# Background documents used in the preparation of this report:-

- i. Feasibility study into the provision of a skatepark at Tenacre Lane
- ii. Report of the Director of the Urban Environment; North Dudley Area Committee Skate/Wheeled sports Working Group 27<sup>th</sup> November 2003
- iii. Report of the Director of the Urban Environment; Skate/Wheeled sports Working Group; North Dudley Area Committee 16<sup>th</sup> September 2004
- iv. Report of the Director of the Urban Environment; North Dudley Area Committee Skate/Wheeled sports Working Group 14<sup>th</sup> October 2003
- v. Report of the Director of the Urban Environment; North Dudley Area Committee Skate/Wheeled sports Working Group 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004

# APPENDIX A

# TENACRE LANE SKATEPARK CONSULTATION LEAFLET



available at the site. Maintenance Autumn 2005. scheme. completion. 

local residents/pedestrians for safety reasons and without causing a nuisance. placed in a discreet location A Skatepark will provide designed space to use skateboards, roller blades The facility is not intended to be fully supervised, but where it can be observed by local vouths with a carefully What is a Skatepark? and BMX bikes.

# Benefits of a Skatepark?

otherwise not be welcome. For instance around shopping centres. Skateparks a keen interest in skateboarding and BMX riding. A Skatepark will focus youths' attention would generally attract youths who have skateboard users would rather use obstacles found on this facility other than benches and kerb edges found in and away from other areas where they may

# Why this site?

to a large residential area in a part of the Borough that has no access to This particular site has been selected for a number of reasons. The site is central skateboarding facilities.

Secondly such a proposed scheme would play a big part in refurbishing parts of this site that are in need of brightening

up. Finally the site once housed a play area This large concrete play area could be near to the road edge on Tenacre Lane removed and the new scheme built further into the site away from residential properties.

# Why have these two locations Large parts of the site are not within the site been chosen? owned by the Council.

Both locations are also at least 50m away from residential Past uses also restrict what can be built above the ground.



# APPENDIX B

# TENACRE LANE SKATEPARK CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

# Tenacre Lane; Proposed Skatepark Questionnaire

# Please fill in this questionnaire and return in the prepaid envelope provided (no stamp required).

# 1. Please tell us which Street you live in, your postcode and gender.

street:
Postcode:
Gender: Male Female
. Which of the following applies to you? (please tick)
At Primary School (4-10)
. Do you support the proposals for a Skatepark on the Swanbrook Valley Tenacre Lane) site? (Please see leaflet or large plan)
/es
No

If 'No' please give reason below?

# 4. Of the two locations shown (A & B), on which site would you agree with a Skatepark being situated? (Please tick one option for each site)

	For ———				Against	
	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Oppose	Strongly oppose	
Site /	<b>A</b>					
Site I	B 🗌					

(Space has been provided below should you wish to make any comments).

# 5. The full design of the Skatepark is also yet to be agreed. In regard to the security of the scheme would you like to see the Skatepark...

...With tall perimeter fencing and gates so that it can be locked up at night...

...Without tall perimeter fencing but with lighting for use during dark nights (up to 8pm). ...Without tall perimeter fencing and without lighting for natural daytime use...

6. The Skatepark is for use with skateboards, roller blades and BMX bikes. Which of the following activities are you most likely to use the scheme for?

Skateboarding		
Rollerblading		
BMX riding		
Watching		
None		
Other	(Please specify below)	

Thank you for your comments! They will help us do decide a final location for the Skatepark at the Tenacre Lane site. Feedback from the consultation will be sent to all who have been invited to participate in this consultation. The information that you provide on this form is subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998. It will only be used for the purposes of public consultations relating to this Skatepark proposal. The data will be destroyed at end of the project, or within 5 years. It will not be passed on to any third party.

# **TENACRE LANE (UPPER GORNAL)**

# **Skatepark Consultation Summary report**

### March 2005

A postal consultation was carried out in February 2005 to all residential properties within 400 metres of the boundary of the site. 2407 households were invited to participate in the consultation. The consultation took the form of a leaflet explaining the proposals and the option sites where the skatepark could be located, and a questionnaire where residents could note their comments on the proposals, to be returned with a Freepost envelope. Copies of the leaflet and questionnaire are appended to this report.

Plans showing the proposals were exhibited at the following schools:

- High Arcal High School,
- Ellowes Hall High School,
- Dormston High School and
- Roberts Street Primary School.

These schools were given A3 posters, leaflets and questionnaires available for return. Other schools were also invited to take part. Leaflets and questionnaires were also issued to the Youth and Community officers working in the area for distribution at local youth centres.

Officers attended a meeting held by The Oval Residents Forum on the 8<sup>th</sup> February in order to explain the proposals, and leaflets and questionnaires were left with this group. At the meeting, the local residents noted that they would not like to encourage further teenagers to use this site and feel that the provision of a skatepark would do just that. The residents were particularly concerned with the high levels of antisocial behaviour that already exists on Tenacre Lane and the proposed site (also known as Tenacre Fields). Other primary concerns were in relation to the use of off road motorcycles illegally using the site. Whilst it is generally agreed that a solution needs to be found to give local youth something in the area it was felt that siting of a skate park on Tenacre fields would be inappropriate.

The Turls Hill & Swanbrook Valley Residents Association (TH&SVRS) advised that whereas they would not have chosen the provision of a skatepark, they did not object to its construction. A management plan prepared in October 2003 in conjunction with DMBC and TH&SVRS with regard to nature conservation suggest areas for improvement across this site. Recent responses from TH&SVRS request that the site should be landscaped and adequately secured with fencing and anti-motorcycle barriers. The TH&SVRS consider that the site should be landscaped and adequately secured with fencing and antimotorcycle barriers.

West Midlands Crime Prevention Unit has supported the idea of the skatepark in principle. The only concern was with the provision of car parking and the safety of the users if this is not correctly located. From a community safety point of view the police would like to see the scheme lit for use in winter months (eg. early evening hours).

A total of 2,800 questionnaires were issued as a result of the above, and by the closing date of the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2005 **642** had been returned. The response rate may therefore be expressed as 23%.

A summary of the consultation responses is shown below. For the purposes of data protection any information identifying individuals is not shown in the summary.

Q1	Gender	
	Male	43%
	Female	57%
Q2	Social data	
	4-10	3%
	11-18	13%

# Q3 Do you support the proposals for a Skatepark at the Tenacre Lane site?

Yes	62%
No	29%
No opinion	9%

If no, reasons given:
Antisocial behaviour
Wrong site
Wrong proposal
Increased users/visitors to the park
Value for money
Noise
No demand
More Traffic in nearby streets
Too near to properties
Motorbike problem already existing

Adult in household with children

Adult in household no children

# Q4 Of the three locations shown (1, 2, & 3), on which site would you agree with a Skatepark being situated?

	Strongly	Agree	Don't	Oppose	Strongly
	agree		mind		oppose
Site A	23%	18%	29%	4%	26%
Site B	16%	14%	32%	8%	30%

Additional comments referred to;

Agree to facility / much needed Needs supervision (inc. lighting, general security) Impact on the park Antisocial behaviour 19%

65%

58% 4% 3% 4% 9% 1% 3% 1% 1%

Wrong site proposed	9%
Increased visitors to the park	2%
Value for money of the proposals	4%
Noise	3%
No demand for this facility	3%
To close to properties	3%
Prefer other facilities - Play area, Football pitches	3%
Accessibility – more paths and better lighting	9%

# Q5 In regard to the security of the scheme would you like to see the Skatepark;

with tall perimeter fencing and gates so that it can be locked up at 41% night without tall perimeter fencing but with lighting for use during dark 24%

without tall perimeter fencing but with lighting for use during dark nights (up to 8pm)

without tall perimeter fencing and without lighting for natural daytime use No response

# The Skatepark is for use with skateboards, roller blades and BMX bikes. Which of the following activities are you most likely to use the scheme for?

Skateboarding Rollerblading BMX riding Watching None Other (specified below)

Responses; *'It's a good idea' (other comment)* Too old to use A family member will use the facility Won't use Wildlife Walking Football Skateboarding/rollerblading Motorcycling track required *'Too much antisocial behaviour' (other comment) 'Value for money of the proposals' (other comment)* 

11%	
9%	
12%	
14%	
51%	
3%	

5%

30%

9%
11%
20%
4%
4%
2%
2%
8%
15%
17%
8%

In addition to the responses shown above 7 letters and 2 telephone calls were received in response to the consultation. The content of these are categorised as below;

In favour of proposals Not in favour of proposals In support of the proposals if supervised

0
7
2