




Steyne Park Online Consultation Report 2026

**(Revised to include a max of 5 responses from each IP
address)**

506 respondents


Background information

Q1 What is your age?




Still a very positive 506 responses, from a wide range of ages, under 10 to over 60, with the largest block being aged 35-44.

Q2 Who in your household primarily uses the park?




The reasons for not using the park were a combination of the rules about no dogs allowed and no longer having young children to take there.

Q3 Who do you/they attend the park with? (tick all that apply)



Still mainly users attend with family and friends, but organised groups have increased to almost 45%.

Q4 How do you/they travel to Steyne Park? (tick all that apply)



Walking remains most popular, but driving is now a clear second with almost 55% and cycling has dropped down below 30%.

Opinions on the current park.

Q5 What do you like most about the current Steyne Park?

Response Summary:

AI summary: Respondents shared a generally positive view of Steyne Park, with the most valued aspect being its open space, which supports recreation and family activities. Many also appreciated the park's flat terrain and accessible layout, as well as the fresh air and clean, well-maintained environment. Facility amenities such as toilets, parking, and the community centre were highlighted by several, along with the quality of play areas and sports facilities, including football pitches, basketball courts, and skate ramps. Some respondents noted the park's suitability for children, citing safe and secure play areas. A few mentioned the absence of dogs and dog mess as a benefit. Overall, feedback focused on the park's versatility, cleanliness, and its role as a welcoming community space for all ages.

(Note AI response has not changed so I would suggest analysing the attached detailed responses).

Q6 What do you like least about the current Steyne Park?

Response Summary:

AI summary: Feedback on Steyne Park's current state is mostly negative, with many respondents highlighting poor toilet facilities as a key issue, citing cleanliness, safety, and accessibility concerns. Some also mention frequent waterlogging and poor pitch conditions, leading to cancelled sports activities. A few note limited or outdated facilities, insufficient parking, and a lack of all-weather sports options. Other concerns include the skatepark's condition, anti-social behavior, and limited amenities for children and youth. While views are generally critical, the responses consistently emphasize the need for improved maintenance, upgraded amenities, and better support for varied recreational activities.

(Note AI response has not changed so I would suggest analysing the attached detailed responses).

Proposals:

(Please also see excel spreadsheet to review all comments on each proposal).

Q7 Proposal A: Refurbish the existing basketball court to include resurfacing and multi use court lining to allow sports such as basketball, futsal and pickleball. To include enclosure of the court and upgraded lighting. On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 1 being lowest level) how much do you support this proposal?



Overall rating of this proposal has leapt from 4.3 to 6.8 once responses have been limited to 5 max.

50.2% of respondents rated this proposal between 8-10, whilst 21.4% of respondents rated it between 1-3.

The comments show that negative ratings may stem from a dislike for specific elements of the proposal, e.g. enclosure of courts, lighting, inclusion of pickleball and futsal, lack of netball, rather than a strong dislike for the entire proposal.

Q8 Proposal B: 3G all-weather 9 x 9 football pitch, additionally capable of hosting rugby, hockey, American football. Pitch will be enclosed, with flood lights and available to hire all year round. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



Overall rating for this proposal has also jumped up to 7.1/10.

62.7 % of respondents rated this proposal between 8-10, whilst 24.5% of respondents rated it between 1-3. Respondents had strong feelings about this proposal, either loving it and giving a 10 rating, or hating it and giving a 1 rating, there were very little ratings in between.

Q9 Proposal C: An enlarged and upgraded play area for all age groups which provides much improved accessibility. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



A popular proposal with 57.5% of respondents rating it 8–10 whilst only 8.4% rated it 1–3. Comments ask for the small children’s play area to still be separated from the older children for safety reasons. Many also ask for adult gym to be included or maintained near to play area, however, this contravenes Health and Safety guidance.

Q10 Proposal D: A perimeter pathway around both fields of the park to ensure that the park is fully accessible to all, all year round. Also to include 'trim-trail' exercise points alongside the path. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



Overall rating has improved up to 6.6/10. 52.2% gave a high rating between 8-10, whilst 25.6% rated it between 1-3. Lots of positive comments with any concerns rising from proximity to properties and the usefulness of the trim trail.

Q11 Proposal E: Extra planting and landscaping around the park to increase visual appeal and provide areas of shade. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



A decent average but only 45% rate this between 8-10 and 23% between 1-3. Comments seem to be almost entirely positive however, with the only negatives surrounding concerns over choice and maintenance of planting, ensuring that it doesn't impact neighbouring properties negatively and worries around anti-social behaviour.

Q12 Proposal F: The demolition of existing changing rooms and the building of new updated provision with added accessibility and new public toilets. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



Not much of a change from previous report, average has moved from 7.4 to 7.6. 59.2% rate it positive 8-10 rating and only a 10.1% negative 1-3. However, the wording of the question could have been better in hindsight as it is hard to tell from the comments whether or not positive ratings are for new changing rooms, new toilets or both.

Q13 Proposal G: Use any space from the demolition of toilet block and/or changing rooms to increase parking provision. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



37.5% rated this within the negative range of 1–3, whilst only 41.3% rated it between 8-10. Whilst quite a few of the comments point out the problems caused to nearby roads due to lack of Steyne Park parking spaces and the subsequent road safety issues that this causes, many others do not want to see more cars in the park, worry about safety within the park, and are against more concrete areas.

Q14 Proposal H: Provide a new updated skate park/pump track. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much do you support this proposal?



Rated a 5.8 overall but 29.8% rated low between 1-3 and 38.1% high between 8-10. Whilst the comments show that there is an appetite for a pump track to provide a facility for older children, there are a lot of concerns about anti-social behaviour and vandalism.

Rankings:

Average –

Most Popular -

Least Popular -

(Scored 8 – 10)

(Scored 1 – 3)

1 st Play area	7.6	1 st 3G Pitch	62.7%	1 st Parking	37.4%
1 st Changing Rooms	7.6	2 nd Changing Rooms	59.2%	2 nd Pump Track	29.8%
2 nd 3G Pitch	7.1	3 rd Play area	57.5%	3 rd Path	25.6%
3 rd MUGA	6.8	4 th Path	52.2%	4 th 3G Pitch	24.5%
4 th Path	6.6	5 th MUGA	50.2%	5 th Planting	23.0%
5 th Planting	6.5	6 th Planting	45.0%	6 th MUGA	21.4%
6 th Pump Track	5.8	7 th Parking	41.3%	7 th Changing Rooms	10.1%
7 th Parking	5.6	8 th Pump Track	38.1%	8 th Play area	8.4%

Further thoughts:

Response Summary:

AI summary: Feedback on the Steyne Park Regeneration plans is mixed, with concerns about increased commercialization, noise, and loss of green space featuring prominently. Some respondents urge stronger security measures like CCTV, while others highlight the need for refreshment facilities, seating, and preserving natural areas. A few suggest expanding community events, improving play areas, and considering facility funding. There is notable disagreement over sports facility expansion, particularly football pitches. Overall, responses reflect a desire for balanced development that maintains the park's community and natural character.

(See also attached detailed responses).