

APPENDIX A

Note the following are objections by residents all living within close distance of the Recreation Ground, Stamford:

Objection 1

May I thank you for your letter of 5th January 2010 regarding the transfer of Stamford Recreation Ground to Stamford Town Council.

I would wish to record my objection to this transfer taking place on the grounds summarized below.

1. There is no business plan to show the preparedness of the Town Council for appropriate and ongoing management of this space;
2. No benefits to the local community have been detailed – a key requirement of the Government in returning assets to parish councils;
3. The Town Council do not have the resources, either financial or of personnel expertise, to manage this complex recreational space;
4. No safeguards appear to have been put in place to ensure that this space is solely for recreational purposes. This would protect the Recreation Ground from the proposed underground car park and the proposed skate park;
5. The transfer is purely political as recorded in Minute 351 of the Town Council Meeting held on the 16th December 2008. No short or long term aims are in place and no effective consultation with the local residents, community organizations or with the Friends of the Recreation Ground has taken place.

Stamford Recreation Ground is finally becoming a green space in the heart of the town enjoyed by a large number of organizations, families and individuals of all ages as well as hosting community occasions throughout the year. This has been possible because of the willing and diverse support provided by so many SKDC personnel and organizations.

SKDC has a duty of care not to jeopardize the exciting progress that has been made in improving this space over the past few years. Please advise what action you propose to take on each of the points above before enabling a transfer.

Objection 2

I am one of those people most deeply affected by the proposals for the future of Stamford Recreation Ground, since my house is barely 100 metres from the skate board park and my windows overlook the area which it is proposed to desecrate for the sake of a car park. Faced with the complete lack of regard for the life and amenities of those most closely affected, since in spite of protestation the same aims are being followed with no deviation, all one is left with is a feeling of total helplessness. The peace and security that returned to the place on the closure of the last effort at a skate board park is about to be shattered again. Those who are determined to go through with these plans, come what may and in face of every objection do not live here and consequently are quite happy to destroy the lives of other people. The offer of consultation is just a sham to conform with regulations.

Objection 3

With regards to an item in the local Stamford Mercury asking if there were any objections to the Skate Park being placed on the recreation ground.

Over the past few years I have thought about why my attachment to this `place` is real.

The past 30 years processes of social care to this space of the recreation ground and the surrounding roads has been debatable, ie planning regulations flouted, ie Chapel Court, vandalism and lack of council funding to support services i.e. gardeners etc.

If this place is a meeting point, how do we make better meeting points and this raises another big issue, we have to think in terms of relations, between people and between 'place', we need to think both how we negotiate the mixing and internal differentiation of this space and take responsibility to how this place relates to the bigger picture i.e. quality of life to the surrounding population i.e. local residents.

We all have rules that we abide by, understood ways of behaviour, how we behave together? Negotiate pavements spaces etc. Social rules which govern life within the neighbourhood one reason why rules work is because of the continuity they do not change over time, what I mean is the idea what a good neighbour should behave like-he should be unobtrusive, respectable of privacy of others while at the same time being helpful, and being there for other residents this stable across time, there is some nominal understanding about what boundaries between privacy and community, between private households and neighbourhoods should be so harmony in the neighbourhood depends on continuity, so everyone can have some reasonable expectation about how others will behave and what is expected of them, at the same time these rules are being constantly questioned and evaluated often as a result of social change. Neighbourhoods develop different ways of dealing with issues. When issues of noise arise within a neighbourhood we call local council and mediators to resolve the disputes, methods differ from era to era and location to location.

We do need to hang on to the notion of 'place' as unique as having something special, greater senses of insecurity awareness of social changes place identity is very important for us all and to pay attention to the timelessness of this market town has to be carefully looked at and not taken advantage of for short term quick fixes ie Stamford Vision Red Lion Square, where are the instigators of this 'shared space' now?

Over the past ten years Stamford has been taken advantage of, even though public discourse has been against you, the Councils opinion.

The meeting of various issues in time and space, the local is related to the wider relations and the processes within this town. In the surrounding local there is pressure through urbanisation.

Population wants stability in their lives but we are all having to deal with various issues, this is a contested space what is quality to one social group may collide with another.

Colliding discourse is of this time, space, tranquility a zone of possible problem freeness? So understanding we are a child centric nation, people in authority are authorizing the concreting over of a green space that was used by all, for the sake of the few which will become many, and produce more human and car traffic.

Skate Park, housing policy i.e. Derby and Joan, Stamford Court, Kings Rd, these are politics, local and national this relationship of urban space is becoming more relevant.

How do we make better 'places' meet well social capital and how people connect to people is not the way this narrative is being played out. 'Disconnection' is a more relevant concept to how these social groups/identities are being forced together.

Personal View

In conclusion the skate park in the beginning was brought about by a petition that was signed by a majority who were mostly from Stamford College (not local and not local rate payers) and they had a personal interest in this sport.

The older skate park that was next to the cattle market was vandalised and left derelict; it also was the successor to the municipal swimming pool which had more relevance to the population not a certain group within the community.

The social policies for Stamford Leisure facilities I believe are non existent and long term planning within any of Stamford's future developments is dubious (Leisure&Property): thinking through all of the externalities that come with this leisure and housing development has not been considered and for this reason I am against this site and any space that does not match the people who will use and frequent the site.

So as a quiet voice in the middle of a town that does not know how to say no because of political correctness always saying yes to every desire just to keep in favour and be a vote winner, I am saying no

to the transfer of power to the Stamford Council and no to the Skate Park and no to the urbanisation of this green space that has not been ruined so far. This is my formal objection to you.

Objection 4

Thank you for the flyer received on 8 February regarding Stamford Recreation Ground.

I live at Chapel Court, on the edge of Stamford Recreation Ground and am writing to state my objection of the disposal of the site to Stamford Town Council.

I can confirm that I have not been informed or consulted about transference of ownership and would object to this based on the desires of Stamford Town Council to support the Chamber of Commerce in building an underground car park and re-introduce the skate park

I have seen no business plan or an explanation as to how an underground car park could bring any benefit whatsoever to Stamford

I have seen no evidence of financial or personnel resources to manage this or the necessary expertise to undertake this plan.

I've seen no information about the additional costs - I certainly do not intend to pay for any of this in any way whatsoever.

When the skate park was open before it brought nothing but trouble, noise and rubbish and as for an underground car park!!! This beggars belief - what on earth do we need this for, what is the justification for it? The lime trees are beautiful - a green space in town that is well used and loved.

North Street already experiences severe congestion during rush hours and on a Friday and is a busy road, another car park will make matters worse and make getting in and out of my property more dangerous and difficult. I can't think where they're getting the money from to deliver this ridiculous proposal.

Objection 5

Thank you for your letter of 5th. January 2010.

My husband and I strongly oppose the transfer of the Recreation Ground from SKDC to Stamford Town Council.

In recent years the "Rec" has been much improved by both the maintenance company and "Friends of the Rec" and has obviously had a professional guiding hand from SKDC.

Money has been well spent on Belton Gardens, on the bandstand, the children's play area and more recently, planting of some well chosen trees.

The remainder of the "Rec" takes quite a beating many times each year with several fairs and functions but has recovered quickly mainly due to clement weather, good preparation, speedy and sensitive repair. The removal of the skate boarding area has contributed greatly to this space as an area for all to enjoy for a variety of activities if only to sit and eat a lunchtime sandwich.

Stamford Town Council appear to be of a mind to allow a replacement skate park to be erected on the same spot as before, indeed this would seem to be their reason for seeking control over the park. They may be able to play politics but we fear that they lack the skills to manage the park without ongoing professional management. They should be aware that those of us, who have had to endure the previous skate boarding on our doorstep, will fight against its replacement all the way.

Objection 6

Thank you for your letter of 5th. January and we did not see the advert in the Mercury which you refer to.

I would confirm that I still object very strongly to the Transfer being proposed on the following grounds :-

First of all I consider that SKDC have looked after the Recreation Ground very well. They have a fair and considered view that it should be maintained for all residents in Stamford.

The Stamford Town Councillors seem to have a main objective to turning the Recreation Ground into a playground for Children. They do not take into account the views of the Residents who live around the Recreation Ground. They have the one main objective in taking over the Recreation Ground and that it to allow the construction of a major Skatepark, regardless of the fact that the houses around will be adversely effected by noise and antisocial behaviour, as indicated in reports and guidelines on Skateparks obtained by Residents. In a recent survey of Residents living around the Recreation Ground 84% expressed the view that the proposed Skatepark should not be constructed on the Recreation Ground and the favoured alternative site was Uffington Road playing fields.

We have lived in the same house overlooking the Recreation Ground for 30 years and my wife and I are over 70 years old now. We prefer to see our views taken into account, where we are looking to see our pleasant environment retained. If the Town Council obtain control then it is inevitable that we will see considerably more Noise and antisocial behaviour, as happened when the previous Skatepark was operating.

Note the following objection is made by a member of the public not within close distance of the Recreation Ground, Stamford:

Objection 7

A Freedom of Information Act to the Stamford Town Council.