



## Poole Park Life Development Stage

### April public consultation period design review

#### 1. Introduction

Public consultation in the Poole Park Life Development Stage is concentrated in to two phases, the first of which took place throughout April 2016. The purpose of the consultation was to:

- *reach a wide audience of stakeholders, park users and local people with an interest in Poole Park and provide an understanding of the plans for improvement and what the HLF funding will mean in an informative and innovative way.*
- *capture the public's opinion of these plans and use that to influence revisions and final designs.*
- *create a well defined process, being clear on consultation dates and what people can have their say on, how, where, when and the next steps*

The consultation encompassed the events (table 1) where the public and stakeholders were encouraged to have their say on design proposals and complete a formal questionnaire, either on a paper version or on-line.

In total 120 questionnaires were returned and over 500 people attended the events. Following the consultation period, the various proposals have been design-reviewed against all of the feedback, including specific representation from stakeholders or other groups, as follows:

- 120 Questionnaires, with bar graphs of results and comments lists
- Specific comments from events, including on the road closure and traffic-themed workshop.
- Poole Park Heritage Group written comments
- Poole Park Bowls Club written comments
- South Coast Caterers verbal and written comments
- Internal comment from Planning & Regeneration Services and Transportation Services.
- Heritage Lottery Fund case-worker comments

We are grateful for all of the comments and feedback received on the design proposals.

#### 2. Design review purpose:

- Review the design proposals Heritage and Landscape theme and consider all public consultation feedback to inform Stage D final design drawings ready for publication in the July/August consultation period.
- Also consider indicative costs and technical data supplied.
- Record all decision making in order to present findings to stakeholders and the public.

Table 1: Public consultation events in April 2016

Date	Event	Times	Location	Activities	Adults	Under 18's
23/03/2016	Design exhibition - internal colleagues and Councillors	11am to 1pm	Civic Centre	Design Exhibition showcasing the Heritage and Landscape, Traffic and Geese and Wildlife themes for public Consultation	30	0
23/03/2016	Design Exhibition - Stakeholders	5.30pm to 7.30pm	Civic Centre	As above	25	0
06/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation	10am to 2pm	Cricket Pavilion	As above, with Outdoor Living Room, Craft Activities, Youth Team Activities, Story Telling 'Mrs Jennings' and Easter Egg hunt	150	40
09/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation	10am to 3pm	Cricket Pavilion	As Above with additional activities including bird box painting, outdoor living room, outdoor sports games, cycle races, Forest School and Litter Free Coast campaign	50	20
12/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation	4pm to 8pm	Civic Centre	As Above - allowing public to Have their Say in a formal setting	30	0
16/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation	11am to 3pm	Cricket Pavilion	As above - with Victorian themed crafts, Mrs Jennings story telling, outdoor tea and cake party, outdoor sports	60	20
20/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation - Traffic design workshop	6.30pm to 8.30pm	Civic Centre	Workshop Style, booking only event to discuss and focus on the traffic theme	12	0
23/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation	11am to 2pm	Cricket Pavilion	Public exhibition, craft and sport activities, outdoor living room	40	10

30/04/2016	Have Your Say Public Consultation	11am to 1pm	Poole Park	Outdoor Living Room consultation with designs in coffee table book, craft activities	10	5
Total					407	95

### 3. Poole Park Life Design Review – Traffic Theme

18/5/16

BoP:

Martin Whitchurch, Project Manager

Toni Powell, Engagement Officer

Barbara Uphoff, Landscape Designer

Indigo Landscape Architects: Jason Holmes.

Table 2: Traffic review

Ref	Drawing Title/Area	Feedback/comments received		Decisions and actions
		Positive	Negative	
	See the full consultation summary for detailed results. To what extent do you support the traffic related plans (scale 0-10 where 0 is not supportive at all)? 1-5 26% 6-10 68% (5% Don't know) To what extent do you support the proposals for new parking arrangements? 1-5 24% 6-10 75% (3% don't know)			
T1	<b>Seldown Gate &amp; Lodge Area</b>	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 72% of respondents answered 6 or above  Layouts, widened footpaths, all well received.	Remove large shared space at entrance based on costs and negative comments. Public felt there would be confusion for priority at a busy space.  General comment on effectiveness of shared surfaces across all of the proposals. Public felt they can be misleading, difficult to interpret for users and there is local precedent for them	Remove single large shared space, existing table to remain, additional raised table between piers and extending in to park, providing crossing point in the centre and high quality setting for the entrance.  Design of shared surfaces is key to ensure public legibility and ease of use for all users through appropriate materials choices, colours and textures etc.

			<p>not being well received. Question materials choices on ramps and turning spaces re. future maintenance. Consider a median strip (BoP transportation)</p>	<p>Assess materials choices for visual appeal and robustness.</p>
<b>T2</b>	<b>Carriageway trees</b>	<p>Trees could be sponsored to provide income. Would be certificate only and not a plaque in situ. Issues to resolve over long term maintenance (in case of damage, death, disease?).</p>	<p>Public concern over loss of Horse Chestnuts. Explanation of limited life span, poor health and the opportunity this project brings to replant within significant resources and the size of replanting generally off-sets these concerns.</p>	<p>Min. size of 20-25cm dbh. Tree pit construction shall preferably link to northern boundary and soft verge to maximise rooting volume. Budget decision to follow on specification and system to use. Identify tree establishment cost, liability of specimens and maintenance.</p>
<b>T3</b>	<b>West gardens Area</b>	<p>Good public support for the new pathway and benches in wide fine turf bed.</p>	<p>No requirement for central linkage to pavement, just have the curved path. Removal of knee rail and drainage gap allows easier access.</p> <p>Poole Park Heritage Group (PPHG) comments: 'Would like to see the raised planter retained as a heritage feature and added to with interpretation of archive photos showing old designs.'</p> <p>There is pressure on revenue</p>	<p>Remove the central path that returns to the pavement as not required and extra materials.</p> <p>.</p>

			<p>budgets to maintain the area adequately and no identified volunteer interest to maintain the bed. Chestnut Nursery do not want to extend their interest. The proposal raises the quality of the space and allows increased use.</p> <p>There is a balance across the park in creating new access to gardens elsewhere and retaining bedding elsewhere.</p>	
<b>T4</b>	<b>Arrival Space &amp; West Field</b>	Well received new layouts and designs to aid pedestrian crossing of the drive and provide a meeting point etc.		As proposed.
<b>T5</b>	<b>Fountain &amp; Car Park Area</b>	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 68% of respondents answered 6 or above for formalising parking around the fountain</p> <p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 66% of respondents answered 6 or above to re-design the car park near to The Kitchen</p> <p>Radius corners are tighter and much</p>	<p>Significant comment from South Coast Caterers (SCC) against the loss of parking spaces which is felt will damage the footfall to their business.</p> <p>To help mitigate this: Increase disabled spaces to the whole prom frontage and consider overall number of disabled spaces in the park. Assess full parking strategy to ensure no net loss of spaces across the park and enhance</p>	<p>Allow for increased numbers of disabled bays.</p> <p>Consider use of marked bays for 'families only' or sign car park as 'for park users only'.</p> <p>Parking enforcement to include Westfield car park at 2 hours limited time.</p> <p>Min. x3 spaces required as part of SCC lease for 'Staff' but not required to be marked.</p> <p>Retain kerb lines but carry pavement surfacing through to provide increased</p>

		<p>improved; however line of paving can be narrowed to reduce quantity of hard surfacing.</p> <p>Planning comment: 'Measures do not go far enough, car park size should be reduced and increase pedestrian links further.'</p> <p>HLF comment: 'They would support fewer car parking spaces and a smaller footprint and agree with principle of pushing parking to periphery or preferably out of the park. Funding should not be used to increase car parking.'</p>	peripheral parking.	<p>pedestrian priority.</p> <p>Narrow pavements on corners</p>
<b>T6</b>	<b>Norton's Gate Link</b>	<p>Existing fence to be removed around the putting green in favour of either low decorative knee rail or leaving large gaps along boundary. This will encourage use and access.</p> <p>Path on Eastern side has been slightly realigned to maximise parking spaces, resurface path, retain vista from steps.</p>	<p>Comments ref. cars in new parking arrangement will block views from opened up garden in putting green area. Aspect, gradient and boundary treatment negate these issues.</p> <p>Bowls club issues. Impact on their parking numbers. Seeking a compromise by maximising spaces under the trees where possible (10 spaces) and allow double-stack parking for events.</p> <p>Trees need protection through defined parking bays/areas.</p> <p>Can provide a drop-off zone;</p>	Further discussion with the Bowls club required

			<p>allow bollards and chains to control space when in use. Better parking enforcement required.</p> <p>A proposal was made to park on current grass area in between the avenue and the bowls club. This is not practical because: it would extend the hard landscaping area, very limited access through mature trees (closed canopy) for both in and out vehicle movements, would reduce parking spaces under the avenue, crosses the footpath, significant falls and levels issues.</p>	
<b>T7</b>	<b>Middle Gate Car Park (roundabout)</b>	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 62% of respondents answered 6 or above.</p> <p>New paths around car park are good and improve access and circulation, making it easier to access the prom. Radius corners are tighter and much improved; however line of paving can be narrowed to reduce quantity of hard surfacing.</p>	<p>Entrance in to the car park looks narrow, but is 5.5m and adequate for 2 vehicles. Pedestrian links should be stronger (planning &amp; public comments), kerb lines provide historic detailing of original design New path towards rose garden from prom not required, additional surfacing and no existing desire line. The proximity of the two junctions means there is potential for awkward vehicle movements and</p>	<p>Retain kerb lines but carry pavement surfacing through to provide increased pedestrian priority. Remove pathway extension towards rose garden Narrow pavements on corners.</p> <p>Use of paving along northern edge is a budget decision, reduce to tarmac as required.</p> <p>Need a highways assessment of turning circles and access in/out of two junctions as well as if the central road closure is</p>



			conflict when turning between Whitecliff Road and the car park	imposed what impact this has with vehicles having to u-turn.
<b>T8</b>	<b>East Gate &amp; Lodge Area</b>	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 72% of respondents answered 6 or above</p> <p>Occasionally vehicles exit on to Parkstone Road. With highways signage and furniture removed the layout needs to reinforce entry only.</p> <p>Continue the pavement across the junction into the service yard. A junction is not considered necessary here</p>	<p>Additional path around back of fine turf not required. With the knee rail removed and drainage gap filled in, access is easier and people will be able to access benches without a path.</p>	<p>Include a wider pavement on the western side of the Parkstone road entrance, narrowing the gap along the footpath for pedestrians and also providing a visual and physical barrier for vehicles.</p> <p>Allow space for benches but delete path.</p> <p>Note amendment to carry footpath across service yard entrance.</p>
<b>T9</b>	<b>Copse Close Car Park</b>	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 71% of respondents answered 6 or above</p> <p>Design layout and appearance well received</p> <p>Retain Public right of way from Sandbanks road</p>	<p>Loss of Green space/picnic area Potential access issues along the road Planning concerns over visual impact and actual evidenced need to extend the car park and remove green space.</p>	<p>Material choice and robustness of cellular grid system is queried. Needs validating through quality references and examples of use elsewhere under similar conditions.</p> <p>Significant cost (£80-100k) and if removed could help other schemes to balance the budget, without having a detrimental effect as there are no linked designs.</p> <p>Consider effect on car parking numbers and overall parking and traffic strategy. Retain in the project for now, subject to budget.</p>

<b>T10</b>	<b>Whitecliff Gate</b>		The white lining adds visual clutter to the scheme. It is recommended that the median strip is extended to the end of the project area.	Median strip to be discussed, white lining to be removed where possible. Include road narrowing measures along with revised parking arrangement of less disabled and increased road side parking.
<b>Other areas of detail</b>				
T11	Carriageway drive	Install a road build out near the Ark car park entrance. Slows speeds. Enhanced pedestrian crossing point linking to existing path.		Use a soft verge build out that limits ability for parking on it. Expand existing on-road car park spaces either side of the Ark entrance to maximise parking on road side.
T12	War memorial space			Narrow carriageway with wider verges as stone build out Limit use of Purbeck stone to N-S links only.
T13	Information Kiosk speed hump	Remove existing ramp and replace with road build out, including paving to the front of the kiosk to tie all materials together.	New ramps may not slow speeds enough as they are kerb height only.	Include new build out to slow vehicles as well as extent of paving to kiosk and also appraise context of Photomosaic site.
<b>T14</b>	<b>Road Closure</b>	Closure point needs to tie in with exit from fountain space. Will require subtle signage (timber bollards with markers or similar) to direct traffic. Closure next to revised roundabout layout is appropriate Closure system needs trialling – July to tie in with public consultation we	Telescopic bollards are expensive, need to understand they can work below water table and costs of replacement. More traditional lift out version less costly and easier to replace.	Obtain Highways sense check on impacts of two closure points , e.g. turning space provision, safety, sight lines etc.  Undertake trial road closure for 4-6pm Mon-Fri slot.

		will try 6-9am and 4-6pm closures at the central section, mon-Fri only. Planning: The suggested, permanent road closure from the Fountain to the Middle Gate is fully supported. This will prevent the current rat-running, provide a safe, vehicle free space in the central part of the Park, and still support the breakfast trade.		
--	--	--	--	--

#### 4. Poole Park Life Design Review – Heritage & Landscape Theme 14/6/16

BoP:

Martin Whitchurch, Project Manager

Toni Powell, Engagement Officer

Barbara Uphoff, Landscape Designer

Table 3. Heritage and Landscape review

Ref	Drawing Title/Area	Feedback/comments received		Decisions and actions
		Positive	Negative	
	See the full consultation summary for detailed results. To what extent do you support the heritage and landscape related plans (scale 0-10 where 0 is not supportive at all)? 1-5 19% 6-10 78% (3% Don't know) To what extent do you think the proposals will improve the heritage of the park? 53% said 'a lot' 28% said 'a little' 10% said 'not at all'			

<b>H1</b>	<b>Park-wide proposals</b>	<p>PPHG: 'Concept of railings, rather than the current ugly "pipework" around designated areas. The railings should be uniform and be in keeping with the black, wrought iron railings around the Park's perimeter, and should all be the same style in each location</p> <p>All lighting to be in Victorian style, but with modern lights.'</p> <p>Swimming pool site and beyond. This area will be assessed for wildlife benefit and to extend native planting, including wildflower meadows as appropriate.</p>	<p>PPHG: 'Removal of some of the holm oaks in various locations, with possible replacement by Scots Pine'</p>	<p>Agree with railings and lighting comments, consistent style to be adopted across Poole Park</p> <p>Holm Oaks thrive in harsh growing conditions, provide effective screening and a lot of mature tree cover that shall be retained. A broader mix of alternative planting will be used in the future.</p>
<b>H2</b>	<b>Freshwater lakes</b>	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 73% of respondents answered 6 or above</p> <p>Positive comments throughout the events and feedback.</p>	<p>Comments concerned suitability of planting to retain views</p> <p>PPHG comment re. 'too much bamboo present'. Bamboo was introduced as a Victorian plant and provides screening in different areas. This can be managed to restrict encroachment but shall be retained.</p>	<p>The open end of the freshwater pond near to the Ark will be retained with open views and low shrubs. The opposite end near to the model railway sheds etc will retain a structural element providing screening and a woodland feel of mature planting.</p> <p>Views will be opened up between the ponds and across to the cricket pitch.</p>
<b>H3</b>	<b>Rose Garden</b>	<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 62% of respondents answered 6 or above</p>		As proposed

<b>H4</b>	<b>Go-kart Track</b>	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 80% of respondents answered 6 or above		As proposed
<b>H5</b>	<b>Putting Green</b>	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 65% of respondents answered 6 or above	Concern over cars parking adjacent to new garden addressed in T6	As proposed
<b>H6</b>	<b>War memorials</b>	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal? 82% of respondents answered 6 or above  Planning: 'We generally endorse the DDA compliance as being well thought out and discreet. The natural stone kerbstones should be incorporated into the ramps on the east-west path nearest the memorial cross'		As proposed and adopt stone kerbs into ramps.

## 5. Poole Park Life Design Review - Geese and Wildlife Theme

Table 4 Geese review

Ref	Drawing Title/Area	Feedback/comments received		Decisions and actions
		Positive	Negative	
	<p>See the full consultation summary for detailed results.</p> <p>To what extent do you agree/disagree with the statements:</p> <p>There are too many Geese in Poole Park</p> <p>36% ticked 10 – strongly agree</p> <p>1-5 35%</p> <p>6-10 64%</p> <p>The numbers of Geese in Poole Park should be actively managed</p> <p>1-5 28%</p> <p>6-10 71%</p> <p>If Geese numbers are reduced then visitor satisfaction will increase</p> <p>1-5 43%</p> <p>6-10 71%</p> <p>Use a range of wildfowl solutions including humane intervention of pricking eggs to control numbers</p> <p>1-5 29%</p> <p>6-10 70%</p>			
G1		We received lots of positive comments towards a stronger management solution to controlling Geese and making the park cleaner.	Some comments against 'humane control' and some people like the Geese and don't see a particular problem	Continue to incorporate new management solutions in to the park maintenance plans. Continue to explore options within the capital works that could help to design out some issues, such as limiting access to islands and re-landscaping areas to make

them less appealing.

## 6. Poole Park Life Design Review – Conservation Management Plan

Table 5 Conservation management plan review

Ref	Drawing Title/Area	Feedback/comments received		Decisions and actions
		Positive	Negative	
	See the full consultation summary for detailed results. To what extent do you agree/disagree with the statements: All questions with reference to the Conservation Management Plan received positive scores, all of them having the ‘agree’ answer the most popular answer ranging from 46% to 52%.  Continue to finalise the CMP in line with this support.			

## 7. The next steps.

Following the reviews the design proposals will be amended to reflect the required changes and dialogue will continue with the various stakeholders listed above. This will involve specific feedback and meetings with those groups who made significant comments, with minutes from these meetings in turn recorded.

In the second phase of consultation, July 11<sup>th</sup> to August 6<sup>th</sup>, final versions of the various designs will be exhibited along with this consultation feedback. These will also be published on [www.pooleprojects.net/pooleparklife](http://www.pooleprojects.net/pooleparklife)

Work will then take place to fully cost estimate and add further detail to all of the proposals. A prioritisation exercise will be required once all the themes are drawn up to ensure the project budget can deliver all of the proposals and a prioritisation process will take place if this is not the case.