

## Area: Central North

	<u>Within village</u>	<u>Outlying properties</u>
Households participated	6	0
Households declined participation	0	2
Households at which letters were left	0	9
(Total households approached)	(6)	(11)
Adults in participating households	12	20
Children living in participating households	2	?
Visiting children to same households	5	?
Willing trustees	0	0
Willing managers	1*	0
Willing organisers	2	0

\*Playground only

(1) Children taken as those of an age likely to use a play facility. Visiting children it should be noted vary from once or twice weekly to once or twice per year in terms of frequency

(2) Trustee/manager numbers take into account some degrees of uncertainty

### **Number of village and number of “outlying” properties interviewed**

Residents in 6 properties within the village were interviewed.

Residents in 5 of these properties completed a questionnaire. The residents of the 6<sup>th</sup> property declined to fill in the questionnaire but did complete the additional comments section stating that “they felt both the village hall and the playground were non-starters as similar institutions had been allowed to die over the previous 40 years so why should there be any difference now”.

#### Outlying areas

##### Area adjacent to The Bairns

One resident, who was renting a property, was interviewed but showed no interest in activities in Hedley. He said that Chopwell was more convenient.

Eight other properties were approached but were empty at the time of the visit. Letters explaining the purpose of the visit were left at all eight properties.

##### Area adjacent to Hedley Park Farm

One resident was interviewed but had no interest in a village hall or playground. A letter was left at Hedley Park Farm. Also spoke to the daughter from the farm who said she would speak to her parents.

There has been no response from any of the properties at which letters were left.

### **Nature of receptiveness to study by residents interviewed**

Out of seven residents/households interviewed, five felt Hedley would benefit from increased community activities. All five felt a playground, especially a natural play-space of the type proposed by Mike Brennan, could benefit the community. Three residents/households also favoured construction of a village hall.

### **Discussions on hall—for and against**

Five residents/households said that they would use the hall if it was there. If the hall was built, facilities should include a kitchen, adequate bathroom facilities and, possibly, a license to sell alcohol. One resident suggested that it might be better if groups, such as wedding parties were allowed to provide their own alcohol, rather than the hall having a licence to sell alcohol.

The main concerns against construction of a hall were:

- a) Increased traffic through the village
- b) Increased on-road parking
- c) Noise
- d) Litter
- e) Construction costs and costs of upkeep
- f) Sustainable management structure
- g) Continuity of trustees
- h) Location
- i) Possible conflict within the community over location

### **Discussions on play facility— for and against**

Five residents/households were in favour of a natural play-space. Suggested events included garden development, wildflower planting and Easter egg hunts.

The main concerns were:

- a) Youths, especially from outside the village, using the area in the evenings to smoke and drink
- b) Vandalising of equipment
- c) Health and Safety
- d) Adequate liability insurance

### **Other potential development suggestions**

One for mini-library facility

One for tennis court

There was little enthusiasm for any other leisure facility.

### **Overview**

With regard to construction of a village hall, two households were in favour, two against and two neither for nor against. There were a large number of concerns over traffic, location, noise, costs and

management/ trustees. Villagers did feel that more information regarding location, construction costs and upkeep would have helped them in their deliberations.

Four households were in favour of constructing a natural play-space while two were against. However, there were concerns over inappropriate use of the area and of health and safety, especially with respect to liability in the case of an accident.

There was no response regarding either project from nine other properties approached in outlying areas.

**Conclusions of writer** (This is one of five overviews, and should be read only in conjunction with the other four overviews.)

Overall, among the households interviewed, the response within the village for a hall was lukewarm at best.

A large number of concerns were raised regarding construction and maintenance of the hall. None of the participants interviewed volunteered to act as trustees/managers of the hall (although 1 person replied not sure and said they would give it further thought) and as such, maintaining the required number of trustees may present a real difficulty. Taking all the concerns into consideration, it is felt that enthusiasm for construction of a hall would be small and might possibly prove divisive within the village, especially over the issue of location.

There was more enthusiasm for the idea of a natural play-space, with one person offering to help in management of the playground. This project might be feasible, but with the caveat that concerns listed above are addressed. Looking at these concerns, it might be concluded that there are unacceptable risks associated with such a project.