



## RIVERSIDE PARK, TADCASTER – REPORT BACK FROM THE CONSULTATION

The following report sets out the outcome of the consultation that took place in Tadcaster from 9<sup>th</sup> May to 16<sup>th</sup> May 2013. It sets out the comments received in various forms from members of the public and proposes ways ahead in dealing with issues.

It should be noted that the comments received have not been weighted in any way – all concerns have been taken account of equally.

This report was prepared by David Gluck, Executive Support to the Partnership Board and presented to the Partnership Board at their meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2013.

### Outcome of the Consultation

1. Number of feedback sheets completed – 42
2. Number of separate letters/emails – 9
3. Number of recorded visitors to consultation at Ark and Swimming Pool (no signing in sheet at the Library) – 61
4. Number of visitors to Tadcaster Community website page ([tadcastercitizen.co.uk/news-2/riverside-park-tadcaster](http://tadcastercitizen.co.uk/news-2/riverside-park-tadcaster)) – 276 (no counters on other websites)

### Overview of responses to the consultation

I have received all written comments as well as discussing verbal comments made to members of the CEF staffing the various sessions. The overall impression is summarised as follows:

- i. A large majority of visitors and respondents were supportive of the proposal to further develop the riverside area for public amenity as proposed;
- ii. The majority of those supporting the overall proposal also provided comments proposing improvements or voicing concerns about certain aspects of the scheme;
- iii. A minority of visitors and respondents stated opposition to the proposal;
- iv. The majority of those voicing opposition did support some measure of improvement to the area but not to the extent proposed;
- v. A very small minority of those voicing opposition wanted to see no development to take place whatsoever.
- vi. It should be noted that, with the exception of a letter of objection from a Manchester based Planning consultancy on behalf of Samuel Smith Old Brewery, there were virtually no objections raised to the proposals south of the bridge, although some useful comments were made regarding how to make best use of this area.

## Summary of Feedback sheets/letters/emails

Issue	Comments
<b>Headline</b>	
Layout	<p>Nice layout            Extend parks down towards Ulleskelf            Picnic area please            Looks good            Much needed            Good to re-open beach            Replace trees with native hardwoods            Like that it spans both sides of bridge            Excellent – dual use and distinct zones            Near river ridiculous/problem            More benches            Needs toilets            Need for an accurate representation of how the layout will be.            Consider the aesthetic of current situation            Noise pollution, harassment of local residents            Maybe too spread out on south side.            Concerns about where equipment will be sited.</p>
Equipment /Installations	<p>A variety would be brilliant; toddlers- 8 year olds            Good for young people            Disabled friendly equipment please            Not very small child friendly            Needs to be well lit            Climbing boulders great            Look at best practice from other sites e.g. South Milford, Grange over Sands            Wow factor scale is great            Wow factor is horrendous/out of keeping with local environment/an attraction to teenagers and drinkers to use it and behave anti socially.            Riverside cafe please            Gym is innovative            Inclusive design catering for many ages/groups            Fit for purpose            Guidance on use of equipment is needed for health and safety            Fencing around play area required for safety of young children            How about a bandstand?            Will gym equipment get used?            Seating for adults supervising children            Not in keeping with conservation area/natural environment/historic landscape</p>
Access/ Accessibility	<p>Entrance path from Bridge Street should go round front of gardens not in front of Wharfebank Terrace to avoid disruption to local residents.            Disabled access/pushchair friendly please            Needs adequate car parking            Parking concerns for local residents            Metalled path to viaduct possible?            Maintain dog walking            No problems - lots of parking            Zebra crossing either side of bridge            Flooding a problem.</p>

Issue	Comments
	<p>Will the tad albion carpark be used for the public?  Open up bridge arch to connect the 2 areas is a great idea.</p>
<b>Other comments/issues</b>	
Beach	<p>Needs steps and accessible for all.  Waste of time as it is always flooded. Needs river dredging to bring it back into use.  Include canoe club as this will increase use.  Dangerous to encourage children to use this.</p>
Cafes	<p>Can we have a cafe at beach?</p>
Cleansing and maintenance	<p>Adequate bins  Can Council afford to maintain it?  Daily cleansing required  Set up a friends of group to keep it clean  Who will maintain it? Local people already clean up a lot. The increase in use will only make this worse (more rubbish).</p>
Consultation	<p>More needed.  Not good enough to date especially for very local residents.  Need to see a more realistic version of what is being proposed.  No consultation with major landowner (SSOB)</p>
Cost	<p>How much will it cost?  Can money be better spent on regenerating the town in other ways?</p>
Crime / vandalism/ Anti Social Behaviour	<p>Possible to have a PCSO patrol?  Focus for ASB and teenagers 'out of hours'  Take it back from the drinkers  Danger from needles, broken glass, dog dirt.  Can CCTV be incorporated?  Will lighting be incorporated to aid safety?</p>
Deed of covenant	<p>No buildings (Wow Factor is a building)</p>
Fenced play area	<p>Needed for under 8s</p>
Fencing	<p>Replace/hide tad albion fence – an eyesore</p>
Fishing	<p>Conflict with anglers  Impact on river biodiversity</p>
Fitness equipment	<p>Great benefit  No one will use it  Learn from best practice  Make it wooden to be more sympathetic to riverside  Cross trainer please</p>
Flooding	<p>Safety of users  Damage to equipment  Use of area limited due to floods  Consult with Environment Agency  Needs a flood risk assessment</p>
Footpaths	<p>Need to be suitable for all users  Need to be maintained  Access from Kirkgate by Needlecase to the river north of Wharfebank terrace – avoid people's front doors.  Access from Bridge Street to go around the back of gardens to avoid local resident's front doors.  Ensure space for people to congregate without blocking footpaths.</p>

Issue	Comments
"Friends of"	Love to help Clean up help
General	Great improvement to provision – encourage people to come to Tad River a great resource, needs more use Brings more people to football ground Children and dogs/river a problem Sooner the better Good for local businesses – more footfall. The area is one of beauty and serenity at present and development will ruin it.
Health and Safety	Access for emergency vehicles? Netting under bridge Is water quality ok? There is a drainage outfall near the beach. Safety for children unsupervised Encouraging people using a dangerous river is silly Dangerous currents Fencing in of play areas Danger from broken glass Needs information signs
Lighting	Is lighting proposed on south side? Needs lighting to avoid Anti Social Behaviour
Parking	None adjacent to the site Lack of accessible parking for disabled Avoid disruption of local residents parking/access.
Play equipment	Fence it for under 8s 'Wow factor' horrible 'Wow factor' better integrated with the beach area? Equipment that can integrate with the landscape – wooden Ensure a good range of ages catered for. Split the site – children equipment to the north, fitness equipment to the south?
Planning permission	Does it need it? Change of use will require it. Conservation Area Historical site needs protecting Impact on local residents Intrusion of equipment on open space/vistas
Residents (local)	Devaluation of property Noise intrusion Loss of their amenity Threat from Anti Social Behaviour Car parking in private spaces
Seating	Seating for older people Seating for parents/carers looking after children playing Picnic tables
Signage	Needs good signing from around town and to/from carparks Signs on site needed to ensure safety, tell people how to behave. Information boards about the heritage of the area
Timescale	When will it happen? Sooner rather than later
Toilets	Needs toilets for young/old particularly Local businesses won't be happy about people using their toilets.

Issue	Comments
Use	
Daily	9
Once/week+	11
Once/month +	7
Occasionally	8
Not sure	3

### Separate comments made in writing at consultation events

Can't come soon enough
Height of equipment?
Just what Tad needs – get on it with it
Needs toilets
How about a drinking water fountain?
Needs a slide
General concept is ok. The Wow factor item is totally out of keeping with the area
I disagree: the Wow factor indicated we are moving with the times. Love it!
Maintain dog walking facilities and dog waste bins
What about flood defences
What about the restrictive covenant which applies?
Looks excellent – get on and build it
Disabled access? Pushchairs need to access the beach.
Proper signage needed to direct people there.
Play area for small children needed (enclosed)
Plenty of litter bins and dog bins (and signs) need to be provided
Picnic tables please
Safety equipment and info near river
Brilliant - cant come soon enough

### What do we need to address and what does the community need to know?

1. **Access and Accessibility Plan** – how accessible will the park and its equipment be for people with mobility issues, the disabled, wheelchair users? Will the beach area be fully accessible? What rights of way will be signed as the main entry points for the park? What other signage will be incorporated through the town to direct traffic to parking and pedestrians to the park? Can we address concerns of local residents about anti social parking affecting their properties?
2. **Anti social behaviour** – a plan needs to be developed to minimise anti social behaviour and impact of such on local residents and users of the park. This needs to be co-ordinated with North Yorkshire Police and may also benefit from the development of a Friends of Riverside Park group.

3. **Cleansing and Maintenance Plan**– a comprehensive plan for maintenance of the Park is required to ensure it is kept clean, equipment is maintained to a high standard, remediation is undertaken after flooding events or vandalism.
4. **Consultation** – when plans have been refined and concerns responded to, I would propose an ‘open day’ is held on site with positions for equipment marked out, information tents (north and south) for residents to view the detailed proposals and ask questions.
5. **Habitat & Ecology Survey** – it is recommended that a survey of the site is undertaken to identify and avoid potential disruption of habitats. This to be undertaken with participation of the Environment Agency with specific regard to the river ecology.
6. **Historic Monument report** – English Heritage to provide written comments on the impact of the proposals on the historic monument and any recommendations to avoid or minimise impact on the site to their satisfaction.
7. **Health and Safety Plan** – there are clear concerns about the dangers of encouraging children to play near the river, especially when levels are higher than normal. A full Health and Safety review/ risk assessment should be undertaken and its findings implemented on the basis of the current proposals. This to address as a minimum:
  - On site information and signage
  - Fencing off play areas
  - CCTV
  - Safety on the beach/use of the river
8. **Layout of equipment and installations** – taking account of comments received, a final set of proposals is required about what equipment should be installed and where these should be sited to ensure best use, safety and to minimise impact on the natural and built environments.
9. **Restrictions on use and development** – what is the precise and legal situation regarding the covenant and the proposed development? Do we have confirmation from SDC that planning permission is not required for the installation of the equipment proposed? Are there other restrictions regarding the site and use of the river/bank?
10. **Toilets** – while it is perfectly normal for public parks not to have toilets, consideration needs to be given to where public facilities are, how accessible they are to the park and whether additional facilities can be incorporated either on site or nearby.

**Next Steps**

It is recommended that a Task and Finish group is established by the Partnership Board to undertake/commission the work required to get the project to the final consultation phase as described above. This Task and Finish group to meet quickly, develop a timetable and plan for undertaking the works and report back to the Partnership Board before the July Partnership Board meeting.

**Task and Finish Group members (agreed at Partnership Board meeting 20<sup>th</sup> May 2013):**

David Gluck

PC Liz Hartley (co-opted)

Cllr Don Mackay

Cllr Chris Metcalfe (Chair)

Cllr Richard Musgrave

David Gluck

20/5/13