

MIDDUPS' FIELD

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING OCTOBER 31ST 2016

Background

A public information meeting regarding the purchase of the Middups' field was held on Monday 31st October at the Village Hall, Lingwood Lane. The meeting took a "drop in" format based on workshops run by Gedling Borough Council. The hall was open between 6pm and 10pm.

Attendees were asked to sign in on arrival, with separate lists for residents and non residents. Attendees were given a questionnaire to be returned on the night, or at any point before November 8th. The questions asked were:

1. What do you like most about the idea of the field being owned by the community?
2. What concerns you most?
3. What do you think are the 3 priority actions once the field has been purchased?
4. Any additional comments?

Attendees were also issued with information on how to sign up for news alerts from WPC, to address concerns of those who felt under informed about the project and when the key decisions had been taken.

In the main hall, 6 members of WPC were available to talk through the plans, answer questions and receive comments. Large maps and plans of the field and the wider village were available, upon which attendees were invited to place their comments written on Post-it notes.

Response

Attendance: 92 residents attended and 4 non residents attended (NCC Cllr Boyd Elliott, GBC Cllr Helen Greensmith, Cllr Jane Walker representing Mark Spencer MP, Cricket Club representative).

Questionnaires: a total of 52 questionnaires were returned (40 on the night, and 12 posted through the Village Hall letter box later). Detail of the answers follows.

Post-it notes: hundreds of Post-it notes comments were placed on the maps and plans, details follow.

Sign up for WPC news alerts: 4 residents signed up following the meeting.

Results

Detail of the feedback received via the questionnaires and the Post-it notes follows in verbatim form and has yet to be discussed, evaluated or prioritised.

1st December 2016

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING OCTOBER 31ST 2016: Questionnaire feedback

53 questionnaires were returned (40 on the night and 13 over the following week). 19 were supportive, 14 were balanced (identifying some positive ideas and/or thoughts, but also raising some negatives and/or concerns) and 20 were opposed. Below I have recorded the raw verbatim data. I have not prioritised the comments nor do the comments or their groupings reflect the views or intentions of WPC. *Averil Marczak WPC Clerk*

Supportive (19 questionnaires)

What do you like most about the idea of the field being owned by the community?

- A green area accessible by all village
- Opens up green space
- Great opportunity to have open space for all
- Increase open space in village
- Leave as meadow/mini park
- An opportunity for a meadow, trees and large park
- A collaborative play and nature environment for all ages and abilities
- An open space for all to enjoy even if it just remains as a grass area for children to play on
- The field can be developed in our interests following due process and with genuine community spirit
- More space for activities – the village wants a MUGA
- Allows village to expand facilities
- Potential to expand facilities
- Scope to improve village facilities
- The community wants the PC to manage/provide better community facilities. Apart from redefining the building line on the south of the village. It allows the PC more flexibility to evaluate the logjam of existing facilities in the village Hall and playing field area.
- The field gives the community options for the future.
- The purchase of the land will be a positive asset to the community which can be developed over a period of time with input from community.
- It will lead to development of the village – we cannot continue to stagnate. We need to encourage young people into the village by providing facilities that will give them a reason to come.
- We are supportive of the purchase of the field for agriculture use, as opposed to more housebuilding in the village. The infrastructure and main services are not adequate for continued development. It could lose its uniqueness as a village.
- Stops housing
- Protection from development
- No house building if it's not required
- In our control – not extreme housing (number or cost)
- We can have more control over how it's developed
- It keeps the development of the land, for whatever use, in the hands of the village.
- Preventing expansion of building houses to south of village

What concerns you most?

- Ongoing costs
- Spending too much money from the precept on duplicating facilities we already have
- Delay to scout hut

- That scout/community building gets delayed even further – this project needs to be priority
- Any major housebuilds would change the structure of the village. It would increase traffic and become a commuter area of for Nottingham city and districts. Also over the last 10 years through financial restraints at GBC, practices and changes to farming land maintenance and climate variations, the village has been prone to flooding.
- People who are anti and will try to scupper the process
- Naysayers and negativism
- Certain village residents are against the purchase (as evidenced in letter to Woodborough Web) – I hope this negativity will not affect progress
- We have a negative cloud over the village – the PC must try hard to bring all the naysayers together
- Older members of the village trying to prevent progress
- People in the village moaning about progress and any change, creating division
- Needs more than just a field to solve anti social behaviour
- It might not be used much
- That there is no place for teenagers/young people
- Flooding
- Link between the 2 sites
- The Woodborough Tennis Committee are keen to retain 2 courts in vicinity of current pavilion, courts need to be accessed by school for coaching and playgroup for safe area. No demand for 3 courts.
- That a quick cheap job is done missing opportunity to develop a picturesque resource
- Ability of village and parish council to manage a complex project
- No European funding
- Misrepresentation of the PC's views, thoughts and vision.
- It may be a long time before anything happens – for a variety of reasons – and the next PC may not be as good as this one.

What do you think are the 3 priority actions once the field has been purchased?

- Open discussion on what will happen and how it will be funded
- Consult again on future use
- Get consensus for use and develop future plans for 5 – 15 years
- Keep village informed of progress
- Planning facilities – take time to get villagers involved
- Communication and awareness
- Implementing village wishes
- Put together a plan of action to develop the site
- Commission professional studies to detail and cost the options
- Set up a management group to oversee the project
- Suggest those who are negative look to the future of the village and consider the wider benefit to society, in particular young people
- Take time to evaluate priorities and options to then prioritise additional meeting facilities for Scouts etc
- Involve the residents of Charnwood/other overlooking field
- Liaise with residents of Charnwood Way to obtain any positive input
- Publish a budget stating impact on precept
- (a)Retain as agricultural land until other uses are clear, researched, costed and proven to be needed; (b)approach the farm owner of the adjacent field to discuss the feasibility of a land swap/finance adjustment with the Middups field. If possible, the land held by the parish would be more accessible from the village Hall. If (b) is possible, it opens up greater

opportunities to use the new acquisition. You could consider moving facilities from the Governors' Field. Increase parking for parents visiting the school. It may be a better siting for the shop, and relieve much parking on Main Street. Increase the size of the Village Hall or broaden the sports facilities. The scope is open planning for the future. Existing facilities perhaps need to be reviewed for position, scope and growth of the community as it moves from the present to future requirements.

- Let it for grass/hay until everyone has had their say
- Take time to consider best use and keep as farmland in meantime bringing in small income
- For 2017 only, whilst plans sorted rent to a farmer and get income
- Plant trees and put ponds in
- Ensure residents in area do not continue to have gardens flooded
- Dig a decent ditch alongside Charnwood properties
- Drainage
- Prevent flooding
- Ensure drainage/minimise water run off
- Flooding prevention
- Manage water
- Manage access
- Develop facilities
- Build a MUGA and a shelter
- Space that is well maintained and does not invite vandalism
- Ensuring space for sports and also space for play, picnic areas
- Make it secure
- Maintain open space
- Scout/community building
- Upgrade the pavilion – changing rooms, toilets, water and for social events
- Offer a strip of land to all houses adjoining the field and use the money towards maintaining or fencing the field
- Access – disability, cars, people, horses
- Availability to all aspects of village life
- Purchase/access the intermediate land

Any additional comments?

- A really good long term initiative
- Firmly supportive of the parish council's vision in taking this initiative
- Thank you for taking on this project
- PC, keep strong and focused, it is the right course of action – but please do be transparent once everything has been agreed. Involve, engage and endear yourselves with the less supportive elements.
- Please do not let a small minority of villagers who don't like change prevent progress
- Thank you for work put in so far
- Involve and update village regularly with time scale
- 3rd tennis court not wanted
- Cycling area
- Provide nature reserve (pond, trees, wildflower meadow)
- Non tarmac car parking
- Purchase land link to playing field for pedestrian access to school and church
- Consider purchase of land adjacent to existing playing field
- The drop-in meeting should be repeated to inform in a friendlier manner
- Proper drainage needs to be consulted upon before anything is considered

Balanced (14 questionnaires)

What do you like most about the idea of the field being owned by the community?

- Depends on usage, better as a park, play area, rather than houses
- If owned by the village, the villagers (via public meetings) and the WPC would control any future development of the field
- Saves the field from being developed
- An investment for the future and stops building
- Secures the land for village use and prevents development by housebuilders etc. Provides a green open space within the village and possibly reduces the chance of overdevelopment of the south-east end of Woodborough.
- It would block further building on that side of the village, but at the moment that value is negated by not owning Kemps' land
- Whilst ever the community own it, no building will take place
- A truly beautiful piece of land, fabulous views back to village, up to Dorket Head and up to Ploughmans. Potential for an oasis of calm for all villagers.
- To allow all Woodborough residents total control of sport and play facilities
- More space for people
- It is a valuable asset which should be safeguarded for the village and maintained as Green Belt and used by all generations of residents in least antisocial way possible
- Extra land for more facilities, tennis etc and for parking would be good – but is this field the answer
- Depends what it is used for and what will be developed.

What concerns you most?

- Flooding and consequences
- Known as a wet field
- Cost of drainage, decent access, levelling (likelihood of rock underneath)
- Increased flooding risk to properties on Charnwood Way, Holme Close, Smalls Croft
- Survey required to ascertain future problems, eg underground springs
- Security, flooding, parking
- Could be used for the wrong purpose
- If it's a play park, impose opening hours in view of close position of housing
- Anti social behaviour
- Nuisance to residents of Charnwood Way, Holme Close, Smalls Croft
- Security, privacy, antisocial behaviour, litter, dog mess, noise – I live on Charnwood Way
- Increased traffic on the Costains Estate
- Do not allow skateboard facilities as that would definitely encourage people from outside Woodborough
- Potential to attract vandals and other youths etc into the village spoiling the community spirit and current nature of the village community. There could be excessive traffic/car parking on Smalls Croft and in the village.
- Dog fouling, litter
- Noise
- Access through residential area
- Gypsies
- I am worried about hidden costs and unexpected extra work and maintenance. I'm worried it will become a white elephant – how will it be levelled?
- Annual cost of maintenance and security

- Huge costs after purchase
- Maintenance and security costs
- Parish council rushing in with plans not well thought through based on survey of post it notes
- That the votes for this will be based on a small percentage of the village who attended this meeting. You should leaflet drop all dwellings with much more details.
- The current proposal and ideas are not widely supported in the village

What do you think are the 3 priority actions once the field has been purchased?

- A statement of intent needed before the land is purchased
- Consultation with community regards development of usage
- Consult with village to draw up a mission statement for the purpose for the field
- Full consultation
- Carry out a cost/benefit analysis on any proposal for use
- Carry on with present arrangements until all possibilities assessed after consultation with villagers. Purchase is long term investment, so no rush.
- Sort out drainage problems in short term, long term will involve levelling/land drainage
- Environmental issues – explore proper drainage/levelling, land analysis etc
- Seek expert advice on how to achieve your requirements
- Review the whole project – survey the land, it may not be suitable for what is required; use a proper civil engineer to evaluate and manage the project; do not rush do it in a timely manner
- Recruit volunteers to continue to put ideas and help the PC to develop an action plan
- Long term agreed action plan
- Resolution of disagreement in its use if no clear agreement. Costs to precept.
- Do not rush into immediate use – farm it for a period while various issues are costed and problems such as flooding are addressed and either resolved or proven to be wrong.
- Do nothing other than let it to existing tenant farmer
- Continue to rent it to local farmer in short term
- Remain as farm land and rent it out
- Remain as farm land
- Stay as it is and rent it out
- Totally secure area with management control.
- Locked at night
- Shelter
- Sports facilities

Any additional comments?

- If purchased, could there be a walk created? Also a few trees added?
- Cllrs should visit neighbouring parks/playing fields for ideas re layout for field – suggest Southwell Memorial Park and East Bridgford
- Car parking should be well away from houses.
- Prohibit skate boarding
- Planting wild flowers to encourage bees, butterflies etc
- An extra hall to take the Preschool would give the villagers their village hall back
- Make sure all the village understand what is involved and the costs
- What information have you used to set the use in 20-40 years time
- The field should provide pleasure and recreation for all Woodborough residents, youngest to oldest

- The field would need levelling to avoid flooding
- What plans are there for existing playing field
- What is wrong with Governors' Field and Playing Field
- What happens if planning permission for new buildings is turned down
- Why not buy the Methodist church when it comes up for sale
- Protect privacy of those living on Smalls Croft from excessive parking of visitors
- Very concerned for the residents who back onto the field if it is developed
- Do not rush the decision process on use – do we really want it as a village?
- Do not forget the silent majority
- It is appreciated that there are constraints of the confidential nature but the WPC really needed to consider the residents of the village.

Opposed (20 questionnaires)

What do you like most about the idea of the field being owned by the community?

- There is no real evidence that the village needs this field.
- Not much. In the long run it might be a worthwhile asset.
- I like nothing about the idea of the field being owned by the community.
- Not a lot, the playing field this size is just not needed in a small village. We would be catering for outsiders, we no longer have a football team and cricket team has only one Woodborough resident on it.
- Very little. We already have very good facilities in what is a small village. Let's improve these so we gain most from it. Consultation seems rather late now the offer has been made.
- I don't like anything about it, I feel the Parish Council acted with unseemly haste over this. The notice was extremely short for village views to be fully listened to – holidays and other commitments precluded many people. If it was so rushed why by 31st of October was the purchase still not complete.
- I am opposed to the buying of this field as there's currently no need for an extra 9 acres of recreational ground.
- I am opposed to the purchase.
- I do not like the idea.
- I can see no merit in it at all. The motives of WPC for the purchase, however, are of considerable interest. In
- I disagree with the community owning a field without first having a plan of what to do with it. I do not expect our council to spend our money on land to mitigate unknown or uncertain usage in the future.
- I feel that the existing recreational facilities in the village are more than adequate. Consequently, I am not in favour.
- I don't really see the need for it. The playing field we have is underused. I know from 11 years dog walking. More pressing priorities e.g. Governors' Field equipment.
- Good idea, wrong place. Flooding at access.
- I don't agree with it at all. This is a small village and so far served the community well.
- Nothing at all. Public money should not be used for any project where the objectives have not been clearly established, the costs have not been quantified, and the benefits matched against the community's priorities.
- I do not like the idea.
- Nothing at all, as this will be a burden on the village and WPC for many years to come. It is entirely unnecessary for the community to own this particular field.
- Wildflower meadow

What concerns you most?

- The manner in which the PC has gone about the purchase this land without proper consultation; the financial implications of the purchase –no information provided; safety and security concerns; this field floods. Proper drainage would cost huge amounts.
- Parish Council
- I have been dismayed at the way the purchase has been carried out. The PC is supposed to represent its residents. I have to be convinced that this is the case.
- Waste of money and lack of discussion before the vote being taken.
- There were no costings of the council's preferences i.e. sporting facilities. The village has to bear the cost but what is it. I am concerned regarding security. The village has suffered vandalism recently, and there have been problems with glue sniffing and needles being left on the ground. Also increased traffic by a designated play area, who will supervise.
- That you have imposed the cost of this purchase on all of us is.
- The short/medium and long-term cost of the purchase and any future development. The disruption to nearby residents. The security of the site and the potential of inappropriate use. The added traffic flow. The potential duplication of leisure facilities already in existence.
- Development such as this takes time, which could mean a change of Parish Council, increased interest rates, reduction of available grants due to Brexit. These things would all conspire to the parish having a white elephant to contend with.
- Residents not given sufficient time to make a properly and professionally informed decision on the wisdom of purchasing it.
- The absence of any longer term plan for the development of village facilities. No effort has been made to rationally assess and quantify the needs of all residents for a range of sporting and recreational facilities. There has been no assessment of how these needs can be met at a cost effective way. Indeed, with finite resources, the community would need to debate the relative priorities before any projects are decided on. Basic good practice has been ignored and this has created a divisive climate to the detriment of the village.
- The whole consultation process. In future, any such consultation should be based on 1. an information leaflet giving all the facts, 2. having a public meeting to discuss, 3. carry out a village referendum, all done in that order.
- Infringement of residents' security, safety and freedoms. Traffic issues.
- Everything about it. Costs, upkeep, access.
- Costs, location, extra traffic via Smalls Croft. Lack of proper consultation.
- Privacy and security.
- The cost involved which will be ongoing if we are to develop the facilities properly. Will we need to employ a caretaker. Who will we call if there are problems.
- Lack of planning; what is security of field equipment; what will be supervision of field and all users; flooding at access; danger from wells.
- A complete and utter waste of local residents' money.
- Increase in noise, lack of privacy for local residents, security issues, vandalism, travellers. Public access 24/7. Increased traffic through the quiet residential area where children play on the green space. Service water flooding. Building pavilions and car parking on the green belt by houses.
- Increased traffic in Smalls Croft area, and really behaviour, flooding. Field needs to be secured at night to stop vandalism and we could be at risk from travellers causing a lot of damage.

What do you think are the 3 priority actions once the field has been purchased?

- Do nothing for 1- 2 years and have a proper consultation with the whole village.

- Time - longer than one week for full consultation with all costings for proposals by qualified experts. Plus the maintenance and security costings. Some thought for the actual residents who back onto the field.
- Any further development should be left until there is an identifiable need for it. Then again a properly and professionally costed proposal should be put to the village without any bias.
- Wait until there is a clearly demonstrated need and then consultation.
- Any future development must be for benefit of Woodborough residents and should not attract large number of non-residents.
- An open meeting to discuss/hear WPC rationale for purchase; WPC plans for development; full costings for purchase and a budget for future development, which will define the same.
- Deciding how to use the field.
- Publish financial details.
- Antisocial behaviour.
- Secure the field against travellers.
- I think security and vandalism issues must be addressed.
- What facilities might there be for the scouts and guides?
- The Parish Council should liaise with GBC to get them to foot some of the costs since this will no doubt be a Gedling Borough wide facility; do a serious feasibility study on the viability of the project; be prepared to walk away – sell the field.
- Put it on the market; take stock of your impulse buy; say sorry.
- Sell it, sell it, sell it.
- Not applicable because I hope it doesn't happen. Yet again, it seems, WPC have acted without due consultation. Yet again.
- Leave it as farmland for the foreseeable, it has been well managed for a number of years by local farmer.
- Complete stop – time must then be devoted to having a comprehensive land and environmental survey done, with the impact to drainage and flooding be assessed on both Middup's field and surrounding land. This is of paramount importance as any development could adversely affect the present land and drainage characteristics and may then rule out specific projects. Publish the above findings and consult with the village as these findings will determine what possible projects are feasible. Consultants engaged carry out this work must be competent and have no connections whatsoever with any member of WPC and the costs should be in the report.
- Rent the field out for continued agricultural use. Plan and establish what the unmet needs of the village actually are in consultation with local residents, villagers and experts.
- Re-start the whole project from square one. Rent out the field for continued agricultural use. Work to build a consensus across the community with a vision that ensures long-term, widespread support and engagement.
- Plant a wild flower meadow.

Any additional comments?

- The cost of developing any further facilities should not fall upon the residents of the village.
- Woodborough is expected to have its share of housing in the future. Along with development comes 106 agreements which means money for the parish to use on such projects as this.
- Privacy strip for residents – no car park.
- Resell the field. We just don't want or need it.
- Call the field Woodborough Country Park.
- Maybe the field could be rented out for farming and have a cycle track around the field.
- Project too rushed, still time for second thoughts. Be absolutely certain you have village interests at heart, not just your own. Further consultation and/or new vote.
- I got the impression at the consultation that the large majority were strongly against proposals.

- There seems to have been an unnecessary haste to this entire process and inappropriate timing of consultation/voting processes.
- Why were Middups' fees paid? On the subject of overages does the parish Council intend to sell the field for profit? We already have a cricket and football pitch. We have no football team and the cricket club quite happy where they are.
- If the parish council insists on going ahead with the purchase, despite the clear opposition to it, then I think the land should be given over to an area of parkland with a few trees.
- The PC should improve existing facilities.
- Very concerned about my privacy and security - should make sure the field is properly secure and who will be responsible?
- We have no football team and no likelihood of it being resurrected.
- Your ideas for the field seem to keep changing and therefore unclear. We do not know how much you have spent, or what you plan to spend in the future. People have limited funds. They cannot keep having the precept raised to cover council costs.
- The amenity of surrounding residents has not been considered. There has been no approach to establish what potential impacts there may be. Well used facilities require good access. Increased pedestrian and car traffic through a quiet residential area of some 80 houses and an existing play area with only one road onto the Main Street is thoughtless. Increased traffic along a narrow Main Street, with restricted width due to the required parking for the important village shop close to the junction adds to the issues. The risk of flooding is ever present.

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING OCTOBER 31ST 2016: Post-it note feedback

Hundreds of Post-it notes were filled out at the Public Information Meeting held on October 31st and were positioned on large maps and plans. Below, I have clustered the comments under theme headings. Where identical comments were made, I have recorded the comments once. Where comments were similar but nuanced, I have recorded the comments separately. This is raw verbatim data and I have not prioritised the comments nor do the comments or their groupings reflect the views or intentions of WPC. *Averil Marczak WPC Clerk*

Key themes

Security: needs secure gate; needs locking at night; safeguard against travelling communities; who will be responsible for security; who will supervise this area?; who will be the contact when problems arise?; security of residents' property on Charnwood Way and Smalls Croft; what security? Rushcliffe Park is beautiful, varied, popular and huge – there are no police patrolling that.

Access & neighbours: detrimental effect on the whole of the estate and particularly the residents backing onto the field; inadequate access; shouldn't access a play area via a residential area, access should be from a main road; create barrier zone between field and houses; how will you ensure that cars coming and going will not cause accidents; traffic and parking problems; will affect residents; people looking in my bedrooms; safeguard security and privacy of residents on Charnwood Way and Smalls' Croft; no car parks at the bottom of the gardens on Smalls Croft and Charnwood Way; ask what screening neighbours want; sell neighbours strip of land; create access on foot

Parking: any car park must be well way from houses; non tarmac surface

Flooding: adequate flood defences for existing houses; address flood risk; build a ha ha; create a pond to act as flood overflow and create wildlife haven; consider rainwater capture and use in any facility built on the land (and grey water for that matter); who will be responsible when gardens and homes flood; ditch being canalised and culverted without NCC approval increasing flood risk; bottom left hand corner doesn't drain even when ditch empty – work out how to sort

Costs: insurance costs; levelling; how can we make it self sustaining; concerns about financial implications and lack of financial clarity; initially implement non sport related ideas which might be fairly low cost to develop; learn from other parish councils how they maintain open spaces & the costs; not happy to pay for pitches for use of teams outside village; we cannot afford it; why not build a Disney theme park as money is no object; do it well – a cheap job will ruin the facility

Need to evaluate & take stock: plan for 1-2 years; full and professionally done survey to assess risk of flooding; what strata underlie the surface; impact on surrounding fields and property; leave as farmland for time being and do a proper job; cost benefit analysis of levelling, drainage, security, services, parking, access, noise, litter, insurance; people of the village to decide use later on; assess village hall future requirements and build new hall to suit

Status quo: leave agricultural; leave as farmland; rural area not urban so leave for agricultural/crops; farm the land and just create village walk around perimeter with seating & shelter

Planting: wild flowers; butterfly meadow; trees around open boundaries as field is very windy; tree/hedge shelter belt (native species) and swales to manage risk of run off of rain water; tree areas (our own Ploughmans Wood); small community orchard; sympathetic planting of trees; maze; sensitive planting of trees and shrubs along Charnwood Way and Smalls Croft to protect privacy and security

Community building: replace scout/community building; provide new facilities for preschool and free up the village hall; relocate tennis courts to enable village hall to be extended and car park to be extended; knock down pavilion and rebuild a combined cricket pavilion/scout hut

Suggestions natural/minimalistic: a walk for all, like the fishing ponds; a country walk; nature reserve; seats and wild flowers; shelter and seating to look up to Ploughmans and sunset over Dorket Head; pond to attract wildlife; a sculpted beautiful garden of grasses and year round flora– get the gardeners to teach the next generation; wildflower meadow and plants to encourage bees, butterflies; trees, long grass with cut area for paths; develop non-sporting area as lower cost; picnic area; seating formal and informal eg logs; additional allotments; wildlife trail for children; wild life habitats and stations; lovely area for walking and jogging paths; proper paths; keep approaches attractive, no fences, wild flowers and hedgerows; wooded area with picnic area; an area for dogs and an area not for dogs

Suggestions for leisure facilities: pitch and putt golf course; proper size pitches; bowling green; fit trail for adults and children; outdoor gym; MUGA; a big shelter; cycling area; skate park; dog agility course; transfer units from Governors' Field to this site

Suggestions for events: Bonfire night; party field; annual party in the park; hold a community “fuddle” to get public spirit back and celebrate, even if it’s not ideal yet

Access for all: engage and empower old and young; disabled access; non sporting/non competitive recreation; children will not use this field in the way they may have done a generation ago (ipads and parental fears prevent freedom) – so develop it for use of all ages

Don'ts: nothing that can be abused or cause antisocial behaviour; no dogs please; don't let it become the most expensive dog toilet in Gedling; future facilities should be for village residents and not attract large number of non-resident; no football teams invading our peaceful village; don't attract outsiders e.g. football teams from Arnold/Calverton;

Not required: already loads of open spaces to walk and have a picnic; no evidence of need; current field hardly used

No: no to skate park; no to big car park; no football pitch; no cricket pitch; no pitch and putt; no dog agility

Process past & present: parish council has failed to consult adequately; no real evidence the village needs this field; lack of financial clarity; I felt unwelcome at the Oct PC meeting

Process future: set up a committee of cllrs and residents to work on project; ask Woodland Trust & Notts Wildlife; engage with Woods School for ideas

Conflict/Older vs younger?: there are very few young people at the meeting (Oct 31) – where are they if they are so keen on the project?; where are the young families tonight?; where were the young fit people who want football and cricket tonight?; village activities are supported by people over 40; average age of the residents making comments is not young!; where are the youngsters we are buying the field for?; I blame the PC for pulling the village apart; what a load of negativity, I am ashamed of some of these comments

Links: create pedestrian access from Village Hall car park; link to Lingwood Lane site; link the 2 fields so we can walk to school off road; negotiate with neighbours to buy/exchange strip of land that links to existing playing field; footpath 6

Alternatives: buy or rent Methodist church for use by Scouts and Guides; Methodist Chapel would be good place for Scouts; buy the field adjacent to playing field instead; buy an extension to current field and culvert the dyke; buy the Co-op site for a car park linking to school

Name: how about “Woodborough Country Park” or 2nd choice “Middups Country Park”

Grants: Wildlife Trust

Governors’ Field: replace play equipment at centre of village near school; play equipment needs upgrading before cricket and football pitches built

Existing playing field: Not possible to relocate existing cricket square without digging up part of existing field – it would not be possible to play on any of the field then for at least 3 years

Vision: glad the PC is pro-active; positive to preserve Green Belt; Woodborough’s own mini country park; it is a pity about people with no vision; engage and empower old and young – “Big Community”; the village has expanded so much it needs to improve its infrastructure and this is a good start; a great opportunity – let’s not think negatively, this is good for our village, don’t leave option for housing; is this the start of the beautiful village of Woodborough being spoilt with all farm land and Green Belt disappearing?

Trust: I trust the PC to manage the acquisition in our interests and interests of future generations; PC is a disgrace; dreadful idea – lessons need to be learnt by PC