Lower Oldpark Regeneration and Community Needs Survey 2025 Report

Prepared By

Lower Oldpark Community Association

August 2025

Acknowledgements

Lower Oldpark Community Association (LOCA) would like to thank Leeann Kelly of Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action (NICVA) for the suggestions she provided in relation to questionnaire content and format.

Most importantly, thanks to all those Lower Oldpark residents who completed and returned the survey questionnaire. Without them, there would have been no survey.

Contents

Appendices

1.0 Background

1.1 Lower Oldpark

The Lower Oldpark neighbourhood straddles the lower stretch of the Oldpark Road in North Belfast. It is an interface community, bound on two sides by peace walls. These walls were installed to provide peace barriers between the mainly Protestant Lower Oldpark community and the adjoining, mainly Roman Catholic, Oldpark and Cliftonville communities following sustained civil disturbance from the mid 1980's onwards. From this time, Lower Oldpark suffered significant decline with population loss and resulting demolition of vacant and decaying NIHE properties. Cleared housing sites were grassed over and fenced off or left open to become locations for extensive fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour. Interface residents suffered decades of inter-community attacks and anti-social behaviour

The Lower Oldpark neighbourhood is made up of three main housing areas. The largest is bounded by Cliftonpark Avenue, Oldpark Road, the Oldpark Road Peace Wall and the Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall. It consists mainly of Housing Executive properties built during the 1980's, some properties developed at a later date by Radius Housing, 26 former NIHE properties refurbished and let by Clanmil Housing in 2014 and a development of 12 social properties completed and let by the same housing association in late 2024.

The other two housing areas are on the opposite side of the Oldpark Road. The Hillview/ Rosewood/ Fairfax area is adjacent to Hillview Enterprise Park and was developed by the NIHE during the same period as the main housing area.

The Albertville/ Century/ Yarrow/ Rosewood housing area was developed by a housing association (now Radius Housing) during the early part of the 2000's. A row of eight properties fronting onto the lower stretch of the Oldpark Road was completed by Choice Housing, in early 2017. A social housing development consisting of 14 units was completed by NB Housing during 2024.

Two small private developments were completed in 2021 and 2023 providing a total of 11 houses on Cliftonpark Avenue at its junctions with Oldpark Road and Crumlin Road.

Across the three areas, there are also occasional properties that are owner-occupied and some that are privately rented. These are primarily a product of the Social Housing House Sales Policy.

The vast majority of the properties in Lower Oldpark were built during the 1980's and the 2000's and are terraced houses, bungalows and flats.

A supported housing complex was developed by the British Legion Housing Association (now the responsibility of Clanmil Housing) at the junction of Oldpark Road and Manor Street. This complex has tended to remain separate from the main Lower Oldpark Community.

1.2 Lower Ooldpark Community Association

Lower Oldpark Community Association (LOCA) was established in 1975. It is registered as a charity with the Northern Ireland Charity Commission. LOCA has the legal status of a company limited by guarantee. The Association has a management board consisting of eight members, four of whom live within the Lower Oldpark neighbourhood.

LOCA employs a team of four full-time staff who deliver a range of services within the community, including family support, youth services, adult education, employment support, after-schools provision, housing advice, local environment improvement and physical regeneration promotion.

1.3 Regeneration and Community Needs Survey

In 2010, efforts to kickstart a long-awaited process of physical regeneration of the Lower Oldpark neighbourhood began with the appointment by LOCA of a full-time Housing Project Worker funded the NIHE. The NIHE funded this post until March 2024. During this time, vacant NIHE properties were transferred to Clanmil Housing which refurbished and let them as social homes. New social housing was built on the Oldpark Road by Choice Housing and at Alloa Street by Clanmil Housing. The latter was provided under the umbrella of the Department for Communities' Building Successful Communities initiative. Also covered by this initiative was the development of 11 private houses on two small sites and the development a petrol station/ retail unit. There was also a major public realm improvement scheme in seven Lower Oldpark housing courts and some limited improvements to property boundaries and the LOCA Centre in Avoca Street.

In 2024, there remained three significant sites to be developed in Lower Oldpark. Disagreement between LOCA and the NIHE on how these sites would be developed created a stalemate. LOCA had regularly liaised with the local community in relation to new housing development and improvements.

With the loss of funding from the NIHE for the Housing Project Worker post in mid-2024, LOCA sought and secured funding from Belfast Charitable Trust for a replacement post to carry out largely the same role but also to implement a physical regeneration survey of all Lower Oldpark households. This planned survey was also seen as an opportunity for LOCA to obtain an update on what local people felt were the main problems of the area and what activities and services should be provided in Lower Oldpark. It was also viewed as a chance to identify latent social housing need along with local interest in house purchase. Gary Hughes took up the role of Housing and Regeneration Worker at the start of November 2024. He was responsible for carrying out survey.

1.4 Survey Purpose

The Regeneration and Community Needs Survey had specific objectives. These are set out below.

- To identify the level of resident support for housing, or alternative, development on the Lower Oldpark vacant sites.
- To identify the level of resident support for different types of housing development on the Lower Oldpark vacant sites.
- To identify which vacant site residents wished to see developed first.
- To identify interest in new-build house purchase.
- To identify latent local social housing need.
- To identify residents' views on what the main problems facing the Lower Oldpark community are.
- To identify activities or services residents think should be provided in Lower Oldpark.

2.0 Research Methodology

2.1 Research Method

Survey data was obtained by way of a questionnaire completed by a member of each Lower Oldpark household that participated in the survey. Questionnaires were made available to all households living in accommodation except for a small number that were excluded because of lack of access to individual flats due to locked communal entrance doors. This latter group of properties, along with those that were identified as void (empty at the time of the survey) were classified as 'invalid'.

2.2 Questionnaire.

The Questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was designed for self-completion by householders. It contained twelve questions, 10 of which allowed for the selection of one answer, by ticking a box, from a series of options. The 10 box ticking questions also provided respondents with the opportunity to make open ended comments in addition to their selected answer.

The last two of the 12 questions were open-ended, allowing respondents to write whatever, and as much or as little as they wanted, in response to the questions.

The 12 questions were laid out over four sides of A4 paper. Completion of the questionnaire was expected to take householders between five and ten minutes.

The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix 2) that:

- Summarised the purpose of the survey.
- Explained the survey process.
- Provided relevant data privacy related information
- Provided contact details for further information/ queries.

2.3 Data Privacy

No names or addresses were recorded on the questionnaires. The personal data obtained from residents was held and retained by LOCA and was processed solely for the purpose of the regeneration and community needs research. LOCA didn't, and will not, share respondents' personal data with any other organisations or individuals. Also, it is not possible to identify any individual's responses from published information. LOCA has retained the information provided in a way that is in accordance with the Retention Policy set out in LOCA's Housing Services Privacy Notice.

2.4 Distribution

There were two main stages to the questionnaire distribution process. The first was implemented between January and April 2024.

The Lower Oldpark neighbourhood was divided into 15 distribution zones, each comprising a specific patch of homes. Questionnaires were distributed to zones on a phased basis to allow for effective management of workload. During the first stage of the distribution process, visits to properties were made during weekday office hours.

The distribution process had a second, or mop-up, stage. This was implemented in May 2025 and involved the delivery of the same questionnaire, again on a zonal phased basis, to those properties from which no completed questionnaire was received during the first stage of the distribution.

During the distribution process, 16 properties were identified as being void at the time of the survey (see Table 1 below). These properties were excluded from the list of valid survey addresses for the purpose of calculating the response rate. Also excluded were 19 flats to which access couldn't be gained because of locked front communal doors. The total number of valid addresses in the survey was 426 (see Table 1).

2.5 Completion and Return

Respondents completed the questionnaires themselves but were also given the option of seeking help from the Housing and Regeneration Worker. A very small number of householders made use of this option.

The cover letter (see Appendix 2) attached to each questionnaire during the first distribution stage informed householders that the Housing and Regeneration Worker would call within three working days to collect the completed questionnaire. In the vast majority of cases, this timeframe was adhered to. Residents were also given the option of leaving their completed survey form at his office in Lower Oldpark Community Centre. A number of householders made use of this option.

Householders were provided with a sealable envelope in which they could put their completed survey form before return. They were advised to write Housing and Regeneration Worker on this envelope.

During the first stage of the questionnaire collection process, the Housing and Regeneration Worker called at each surveyed property up to a maximum of three times. If, during the first two calls, they didn't collect a completed questionnaire, the Housing and Regeneration Worker left a typed note saying that they would call the next day. On a number of occasions, specific callback times were arranged with householders. If, after three callbacks to a property, no completed questionnaire had been obtained, the address was recorded as No Access.

In May 2025 the second stage distribution and collection process took place with all previous No Access properties receiving another questionnaire with a cover letter saying there would be a callback the next day. One callback visit was made to these properties. If no completed survey was obtained, the property was allocated a final No Access classification.

A total of 219 distributed questionnaires (51 percent) were completed and returned (see Table 1 below), while 27 householders refused to participate (6 percent) (see Table 1 below) and no access was achieved with householders in 180 properties (42 percent) (see Table 1 below). These three figures, when combined, provide the total number of valid survey addresses, namely 426 properties (100 percent).

Table 1

Outcome	Totals	% of Valid Total
Completed Survey	219	51%
No Access	180	42%
Refused	27	6%
Void	16	Non-Valid
Excluded	19	Non-Valid
Total	461	Valid and Non-Valid
Valid Total	426	100%

2.6 Presentation of Findings

The results of the survey are presented in number and percentage format in a series of tables in this report. When a result is less than 5, the actual result is not recorded. Instead, it is recorded as <5 i.e. less than 5. This is done to reduce the potential for individual respondents being linked with specific responses.

Percentages have been rounded up to the next whole number when the specific result contains 0.5 or above. When it contains 0.5 or below, the percentage has been rounded down to the next whole number. Due to rounding up and down, percentage totals may be slightly higher or lower than 100 percent. However, in the results tables, the percentage total is always recorded as 100 percent.

3.0 Research Findings

3.1 Responses to Questions

Sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.10 below contain tables providing full statistical results for each of the ten closed (with fixed response options) survey questions

These sections also provide a summary of the key statistical results for each of the ten closed questions, along with a summary of the comments made by respondents in connection with each of these questions.

3.1.11 to 3.1.12 below provide a summary of the comments made by respondents in relation to the two open questions (respondents free to write whatever they wanted in response to the question).

For the purposes of clarity, respondent comments for each question were put into categories and sub-categories and the number of comments falling into each category and sub-category counted and recorded. A total of 816 comments were extracted from the written information provided by respondents across all questions.

3.1.1 Housing on bonfire site

(Q1) Would you like to see housing built on the Bonfire Site (the grassed site bounded by Mountview St/ Oldpark Road Peace Wall/ rear of 103 to 125 Manor Street)?

Q1 Results

Four fifths of survey respondents (80%) wanted to see housing built on the Bonfire site adjacent to the Oldpark Road Peace Wall. Just over a tenth (11%) didn't want to see housing development on the site.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	176	80%
No	23	11%
Don't Know	17	8%
No response	3	1%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q1 Comments

A total of 32 comments were made by respondents against this question. Most comments related to the desire to see a range of facilities/ activities/ services in the neighbourhood and concerns about interface problems and housing access and supply.

Support for provision of open space, concerns about ASB, and a desire for retention of the 'Bonfire Site' were expressed.

Comments' Categories	Sub Categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Sports Facilities			
	Support for use for sports facilities	<5	Suggestions included: • Football pitch (<5) • Basketball court (<5) • Skate ramp (<5)
Interface Issues			
	Concern about potential for attacks/ trouble	<5	
	Support for creating physical access across peace wall	<5	
Housing			
	Concern about local resident access to housing in Lower Oldpark.	<5	
	Concern about housing supply crisis.	<5	
	Desire for a specific type of accommodation.	<5	Suggestions included: • Bungalows.(<5)
	View there is sufficient housing in the area.	<5	
Open Space			
	Support for open space provision.	<5	
Play Facilities			
	Support for use for children's play facilities	<5	
Children/ Young People			
	Desire for provision of facilities for these groups.	<5	
	Desire for provision of activities for these groups.	<5	
Retail/ Cafes/ Restaurants/ Post Office			
	Desire for provision of shop.	<5	
	Desire for provision of café.	<5	
Arts			
	Desire for provision of arts centre.	<5	Suggestions included: • Music centre (<5)
ASB			
	Concern about motorized scooters and bikes.	<5	
	Concern about potential for young people gathering.	<5	
Community Facilities			
	Desire for community centre.	<5	
Culture			
	Support for continued use for annual bonfire.	<5	
Health			
	Desire for health facility.	<5	
Knowledge of Area			
	Lack of knowledge of area.	<5	

Older People			
	Desire for facilities for older people.	<5	
Total		**32**	

<

3.1.2 Housing on Cliftonpark Avenue site

(Q2) Would you like to see housing built on the long, grassed site running from 64 Cliftonpark Avenue to Alloa Street and backing onto Avoca Steet?

Q2 Results

Slightly over fourth fifths of respondents (81 percent) wanted to see housing built on the long, grassed site running from 64 Cliftonpark Avenue to Alloa Steet and backing onto Avoca Steet? Just over a tenth (11%) didn't want to see housing development on the site.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	178	81%
No	24	11%
Don't Know	13	6%
No Response	4	2%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q2 Comments

A total of 28 comments were made by respondents against this question. The comments relating to housing were focused on support for housing development on the site, the desire for specific types of housing, and concern over access to housing.

A number of comments indicated support for the retention of open space. Respondents also indicated a desire for the provision of specific services and facilities. There was also concern about the potential for interface trouble.

Comments' Categories	Sub Categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Support for/acceptance of housing on the site.	<5	
	Desire for specific type of accommodation.	<5	Suggestions included: • Bungalows (<5) • For disabled (<5)
	Concern about local resident access to housing in Lower Oldpark.	<5	
Open Space			
	Desire for retention as open space/ park.	<5	
	Desire for retention of trees.	<5	

Retail/ Cafes/ Restaurants/ Post Office			
	Desire for provision of shops.	<5	
	Desire for provision of café.	<5	
Interface Issues			
	Concern about potential for trouble.	<5	
Play Facilities			
	Desire for provision of play facilities.	<5	
	Desire for retention as football play area.	<5	
	Develop as a community garden.	<5	
Public Services			
	Desire for public services.	<5	Suggestions included: • Library (<5)
Total		**28**	

3.1.3 Housing on peace line site

(Q3) Would you like to see housing built on the long, grassed site beside Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall (from the new houses at Annalee Street to Rosapenna Peace Wall). The Linear Park.

Q3 Results

Seventy percent of respondents wanted to see housing built on the long, grassed site beside Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall (from the new houses at Annalee Street to Rosapenna Peace Wall) – 'The Linear Park'. Just under a fifth of respondents (18 percent) didn't want to see housing development on the site.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	154	70%
No	40	18%
Don't Know	23	11%
No Response	2	1%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q3 Comments

A total of 33 comments were made by respondents against this question. The largest number (9) related to concern about the potential for interface trouble and to this can be added a number of concerns about the potential for interface attacks.

Seven respondents expressed support for open space/ park provision. The comments focused on housing related to concern about access to housing for Lower Oldpark residents, support for/acceptance of housing on the site, support for inclusion of open space as part of new housing developments, and a desire for the provision of specific types of housing.

Respondents also indicated a desire for the provision of specific services and facilities.

Comments' Categories	Sub Categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Interface Issues			
	Concern about potential for trouble.	9	
	Concern about potential for attacks.	<5	
Open Space			
	Desire for retention as open space/ park.	7	
Housing			
	Concern about local resident access to housing in Lower Oldpark.	<5	
	Support for/acceptance of housing on the site.	<5	
	Support for inclusion of open space in new housing development	<5	
	Desire for specific types of accommodation.	<5	Suggestions included: • Bungalows (<5) • For disabled (<5)
Retail/ Cafes/ Restaurants/ Post Office			
	Desire for provision of shops.	<5	
Play Facilities			
	Desire for play facilities for children with special needs.	<5	
Traffic			
	Desire for use of area to create parking spaces for residents.	<5	
Sports Facilities			
	Support for use for sports facilities	<5	Suggestions included: • Skate park (<5)
Local Environment Problems			
	Highlighted problem of dog fouling.	<5	
Public Services			
	Desire for a medical centre.	<5	
Training Facilities			
	Desire for training centre for young apprentices	<5	
Total		**33**	

3.1.4 Desire for social housing

Q(4). If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see Social Housing developed?

Results

Eighty six percent of respondents wanted to see social housing development if housing was going to be built on the sites. Five percent of respondents didn't want to see social housing development.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	189	86%
No	12	5%
Don't Know	11	5%
No Response	7	3%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q4 Comments

A total of 23 comments were made by respondents against this question. The majority of comments related to housing. Seven comments indicated support for social housing provision. Some comments indicated support for private and mixed private/social housing development while others highlighted concern over local resident access to housing in Lower Oldpark. Comments indicated support for specific types of accommodation and opposition to others and the view that house buyers would look after homes.

Comments also refer to the challenge of selling houses close to interfaces.

Comments' Categories	Sub Categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Support for new social housing development.	7	
	Support for mixed social/ private housing.	<5	
	Support for private development.	<5	
	Concern about local resident access to housing in Lower Oldpark.	<5	
	Desire for specific type of accommodation.	<5	Suggestions included: • Family Homes (<5) • Bungalows (<5)
	Opposition to specific type of accommodation.	<5	Opinions included: • Flats (<5)
	Desire for well insulated housing	<5	
	Suggestion for provision of prefabricated housing.	<5	
	View that house buyers would look after their home.	<5	
	View that private development would have a negative impact.	<5	
Interface Issues			
	Challenge of selling houses close to interfaces.	<5	
Total		**23**	

3.1.5 Desire for owner-occupier housing

(Q5) If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see owner-occupier housing for purchase developed?

Results

Over half of respondents (53 percent) wanted to see owner-occupier housing for purchase developed if housing was going to be built on the sites. Almost 30 percent didn't want to see owner-occupier housing for purchase developed.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	117	53%
No	63	29%
Don't Know	32	15%
No Response	7	3%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q5 Comments

A total of 24 comments were made by respondents against this question. The majority of comments related to housing connected topics. Comments indicated concerns with the potential for landlords buying any new homes, the affordability of private housing and potential difficult neighbours. A number of comments indicated support for affordable owner-occupation, mixed private/ social development, social housing and specific types of housing. Comments also reflected the view that priority should be given to local residents, house buyers would look after their homes, purchasers wouldn't buy in Lower Oldpark and that development should take place on the small site.

Comments also reflected both a positive and negative perception of Lower Oldpark and the view that people wouldn't want to buy near the interface.

Comments' Categories	Sub Categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Concern that landlords would buy the new houses.	<5	
	Concern about affordability of house purchase.	<5	
	View that priority should be given to local residents.	<5	
	Support for affordable owner-occupation.	<5	
	Support for mixed social/ private development.	<5	
	Concern about potential neighbours	<5	
	View that house buyers would look after their home.	<5	
	View that purchasers wouldn't buy in Lower Oldpark.	<5	

	View that houses to purchase should be built on a smaller site.	<5	
	Desire for specific type of accommodation.	<5	Suggestions included: • Bungalows (<5)
	Support for social housing development.	<5	
Perception of Area			
	Positive perception.	<5	
	Negative perception.	<5	
Interface Issues			
	View that people wouldn't buy near Cliftonpark Avenue.	<5	
Total		**24**	

3.1.6 Desire for private rented housing

(Q6) If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see housing rented from private landlords developed?

Results

Two thirds of respondents (66 percent) did not want to see housing rented from private landlords developed if housing was going to be built on the sites. Slightly over a quarter of respondents (26 percent) did want to see housing rented from private landlords developed.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	58	26%
No	145	66%
Don't Know	13	6%
No Response	3	1%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q6 Comments

A total of 29 comments were made by respondents against this question. Seven comments related to concerns about the potential for high rents being charged by private landlords while five comments were concerned with the potential behaviour of private rental tenants. Comments also reflected concerns about the letting policies of private landlords and about private landlords in general. Six comments expressed support for social housing development.

Some comments reflected concern about vacant sites generating ASB, private housing creating community division and the accountability of the NIHE and housing associations.

Comments' Categories	Sub-categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Concern at high rent charges by private landlords.	7	
	Support for social housing development.	6	
	Concern over behaviour of private rental tenants.	5	
	Concern over letting policies of private landlords.	<5	
	General concern about private landlords.	<5	
ASB			
	Concern about vacant sites generating ASB.	<5	
Community Cohesion			
	Concern about private housing creating community division.	<5	
Accountability			
	Concern about accountability of NIHE and housing associations.	<5	
Total		**29**	

3.1.7 Desire for flats/ apartments

(Q7) If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see flats/ apartments developed?

Results

Just under two thirds of respondents (64 percent) did not want to see flats/ apartments developed if housing was going to be built on the sites. Just over a quarter of respondents (27 percent) did want to see flats/ apartments developed.

Response Option	Number of Responses	% of Total
Yes	59	27%
No	141	64%
Don't Know	16	7%
No Response	3	1%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q7 Comments

A total of 38 comments were made by respondents against this question. The majority of comments related to housing connected topics. The largest number, nine, indicated support for the development of traditional homes. This was closely followed by support for the development of flats/ apartments (eight comments) and concern over the behaviour of private rental tenants. Some comments highlighted a desire for specific types of accommodation, namely, bungalows, disability adopted properties and larger homes.

Other comments expressed concern about access for local residents to housing in Lower Oldpark, the unsuitability of flats for the area, problems linked to flats and the affordability of house purchase.

There were also comments indicating a desire for the provision of shops and activities for children and young people.

Comments' Categories	Sub-categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Support for development of traditional houses.	9	
	Support for development of flats/ apartments.	8	
	Concern over behaviour of private rental tenants.	7	
	Desire for provision of bungalows.	<5	
	Desire for provision of disability adapted homes.	<5	
	Support for larger homes	<5	
	Concern about local resident access to housing in Lower Oldpark.	<5	
	Concern over unsuitability of flats for the area.	<5	
	General opposition to flats.	<5	
	Concern over problems linked to flats/ apartments.	<5	
	Concern about affordability of house purchase.	<5	
Retail/ Cafes/ Restaurants/ Post Office			
	Desire for provision of shops.	<5	
Children and Young People			
	Desire for provision of activities for these groups.	<5	
Total		**38**	

3.1.8 Timing of site development

(Q8) If housing was going to be built on the sites, which site would you like to see developed first?

Results

Over half of respondents (56 percent) wanted to see housing built first on the grassed site bounded by Mountview St/ Oldpark Road Peace Wall/ rear of 103 to 125 Manor St (Bonfire Site) if housing was going to be built on the sites.

Just under a fifth of respondents (18 percent) wanted to see housing built first on the grassed site from 64 Cliftonpark Avenue to Alloa St and backing onto Avoca Street if housing was going to be built on the sites.

Just under an eighth of respondents (12 percent) wanted to see housing built first on grassed site beside Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall from the new houses at Annalee Street to Rosapenna Peace Wall.

Response Option	Number	% of Total
The grassed site bounded by Mountview St/ Oldpark Road Peace Wall/ rear of 103 to 125 Manor St (Bonfire Site)	123	56%
The grassed site from 64 Cliftonpark Avenue to Alloa St and backing onto Avoca St.	40	18%
The grassed site beside Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall from the new houses at Annalee Street to Rosapenna Peace Wall.	26	12%
Don't Know	8	4%
No Response	22	10%
Total	**219**	**100%**

Q8 Comments

A total of 15 comments were made by respondents against this question. Eight comments indicated support for housing development on the sites. Other housing related comments reflect support for the inclusion of open space as part of new housing development and opposition to the development of housing at the peace wall.

Comments indicate support for the replacement of the peace wall, concern at the potential for trouble at any new peace wall development and support for the development of sports facilities.

Comments' Categories	Sub-categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Support for housing development on sites.	8	
	Support for housing and inclusion of open space.	<5	
	Opposition to housing at peace wall/ part of.	<5	
	View that decision has already been made on development of sites	<5	
Interface Issues			
	Support for replacement of peace wall.	<5	
	Concern over trouble at peace wall development	<5	
Bonfire Site			
	View on future of bonfire.	<5	
Sports Facilities			
	Support for development of sports' facilities on a site.	<5	Suggestions included: • Football pitch (<5)
Total		**15**	

3.1.9 Buying a house (Q9)

(Q9) Would you, or a member of your household, be interested in buying a new-build private house to live in, if this type of housing development happened in Lower Oldpark?

Results

Just over a quarter of respondents (26 percent) indicated that they, or a member of their household, would be interested in buying a new-build private house to live in if this type of housing development happened in Lower Oldpark. A tenth of respondents (10 percent) indicated that they didn't know if they would be interested in buying a new-build private house to live in.

Response Option	Number	% of Total
Yes	56	26%
No	18	58%
Don't Know	4	10%
No Response	4	6%
Total	10	100%

Q9 Comments

A total of 17 comments were made by respondents against this question. Comments highlighted a range of obstacles to house purchase, including age, access to finance, costs, problems of the area and personal circumstances. They also reflected positive views of owner-occupation development in the area, including purchasers respecting the area, a chance to get on the property ladder, attracting families and providing choice. In contrast, comments also expressed a desire for more social housing.

Comments' Categories	Sub-categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Obstacles To Purchase			
	Too old.	<5	
	Accessing finance.	<5	
	Cost.	<5	
	Problems of the area.	<5	
	Personal circumstances.	<5	
Positive View of Home Ownership Development			
	Purchasers will respect area.	<5	
	Chance to get on property ladder.	<5	
	Would attract families.	<5	
	Provides choice.	<5	
Negative View of Home Ownership Development			
	Desire for more social housing.	<5	
Total		**17**	

3.1.10 Need for social housing

(Q10) Is there someone in your household who doesn't have their own home and wants to apply for social housing?

Results

Just under a fifth of respondents (19 percent) indicated that there was someone within their household who doesn't have their own home and wants to apply for social housing.

Response Option	Number	% of Total
Yes	41	19%
No	150	68%
Don't Know	10	5%
No Response	18	8%
Total	219	100%

Q10 Comments

A total of 16 comments were made by respondents against this question. Housing related comments covered a range of issues. Six focused on the time applicants had to spend on the waiting list while some comments highlighted the constraints of the Housing Selection Scheme, the need for more social housing and a desire for family members to be able to housed in the area in the future. Comments also expressed a desire for more disability adapted housing and concern over ASB in the area.

Comments' Categories	Sub-categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Housing			
	Concern over length of time spent on waiting list.	6	
	Desire for disability adapted housing.	<5	
	Housing Selection Scheme constraints.	<5	
	Desire for family to be able to be housed in area in the future.	<5	
	Desire for more social housing.	<5	
ASB			
	Concern over ASB.	<5	
Other			
	Lack of knowledge of issues.	<5	
Total		**16**	

3.1.11 Main problems facing Lower Oldpark

(Q11) In the space below, please tell us what you think are the main problems facing the Lower Oldpark community.

Q11 Comments

A total of 345 comments were made by respondents against this question. Given the large number of comments, a summary of the main findings is provided below. Full details are provided in the table of findings.

The issue generating the most comments among respondents was ASB (26). Also, under the umbrella of crime and community safety, comments were made in relation to alley gates, interface issues, paramilitaries, burglary and inappropriate behaviour.

The second largest number of comments related to drugs (25). There were a further five comments on drug abuse/ misuse and a number of comments on the subject of drug dealers.

The topic of dumping/ fly-tipping attracted 23 comments. In addition, comments also reflected concern with a wide range of other local environment problems including dog fouling (9), area cleanliness (8), weeds (6) and litter (6).

Children and young people generated comments across a range of topics with 19 focused on their involvement in inter-community conflict, 19 on the lack of availability of activities for these groups and 11 on the lack of facilities for these groups. Thirteen comments indicated concern in relation to general ASB by children and young people.

The largest number of housing related comments reflected concern over social housing allocations/ house sales in Lower Oldpark (15). There were 11 comments that related to a lack of housing while a further 6 were concerned with a lack of social housing.

Eleven comments indicated concern about the decline/ neglect of the Lower Oldpark neighbourhood.

Seven comments focused on the lack of shops in the area while a further six were concerned with a lack of a local post office.

The poor quality of existing play park facilities drew six comments. Concern about a lack of a play park drew the same number of comments.

Issues relating to parking provision in Lower Oldpark received five comments.

Six comments highlighted a lack of mixing of people within the community.

Concern at people not looking after their homes drew six comments.

A wide range of topics attracted fewer than five comments.

Comments' Categories	Sub-categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Crime/ Community Safety			
	ASB .	26	Issues include: • ASB related to the Old Bank (<5). • Bonfire site (<5). • Neighbours (<5). • Fireworks misuse (<5)
	Alley gates.	<5	Issues include: • Need for alley gates. (<5) • Need for alley gates to be locked. (<5)
	Interface issues.	<5	Issues include: • Rioting. (<5) • Sectarian attacks on homes. (<5)
	Paramilitaries.	<5	
	Burglary.	<5	
	Inappropriate behaviour.	<5	
Drugs			
	Drugs.	25	
	Drugs abuse/ misuse.	5	Issues include: • Drug abusers coming into the area. (<5) • Old Bank drug users (<5)
	Drug dealers.	<5	
Local Environment Problems			
	Dumping/ Fly tipping.	23	Locations include: • Rear access walkways (<5) • Oldpark Road clothes bank. (<5) • Corner of Yarrow Street (<5)
	Dog fouling.	9	
	Area general cleanliness.	8	
	Weeds in the streets and walkways.	6	
	Litter.	6	Arising from: • Left by binmen (<5) • Petrol station customers (<5) • Lack of litter bins. (<5)
	Abandoned vehicles on roads and footpaths.	<5	
	Lack of grit boxes for winter roads/ footpaths.	<5	
	Vandalism.	<5	
	Pot holes.	<5	
	Poorly maintained open space.	<5	
	Poor storage of bins by residents.	<5	
	Pests.	<5	
Children/ Young People			
	Behaviour. Inter-community conflict.	19	Issues include: • Girdwood/ Alloa Street/ Play Park (8)
	Lack of activities for children/ young people.	19	Highlighted needs: • Those with disabilities. (<5)

			• After school provision (<5) • Children aged 4 (<5) • Training for employment (<5)
	Lack of facilities for children/ young people..	11	Highlighted needs: • Place to socialize. (<5) • Place to play (<5) • Sports hall (<5) • Youth centre (<5)
	Behaviour. ASB (General).	13	Issues include: • Children smoking cannabis. (<5)
	Young people gathering.	<5	
	Inadequate parental control.	<5	
Housing			
	Concern over social housing allocations/ sales in Lower Oldpark.	15	Issues raised: • Local residents not being offered social houses.(<8) • Area treated as a dumping ground for people who cause problems. (<5) • Concern that social houses not being allocated on basis of need (<5)
	Lack of housing	11	
	Lack of social housing.	6	
	Housing regeneration slowness	5	
	Empty houses concern.	5	Issues raised: • Giro/ Bru drops. (<5)
	House type.	<5	Issues include: • Lack of family homes (<5) • Lack of larger family homes (<5) • Lack of bungalows/ ground floor properties (<5)
	Social housing poor repair services.	<5	
	House size.	<5	Issues include: • Desire for 3-4 bedroom houses.
Play Park Facilities			
	Poor quality of existing play park.	6	
	Lack of play park.	6	Issues include: • Lack of play facilities for young children (<5) • Lack of play park on Library side of Oldpark Road. (<5)
Area Decline/ Neglect			
	Area Decline/ Neglect	11	Issues include: • Loss of former great community (<5) • Area run down (<5) • Library side of Oldpark Road (<5)
Retail/ Cafes/ Restaurant/ Post Office			
	Lack of shops.	7	
	Lack of post office.	6	
	Lack of bank.	<5	
	Lack of café.	<5	

Traffic			
	Parking.	5	Issues include: • Century Street, Albert Drive and Rosewood Street. (<5) • Non-resident parking (<5)
	Traffic noise.	<5	Issues include: • Crumlin Road. (<5)
	Speeding traffic.	<5	Issues include: • Cliftonpark Avenue. (<5)
	Lack of traffic access.	<5	Issues include: • Hillview Court/ Rosewood Court. (<5)
Cross Community Relations			
	Support for positive cross-community activities.	<5	
	Concern at segregation/ division/ sectarianism.	<5	
	Support for door in peace wall.	<5	
Community Togetherness			
	Lack of mixing within community.	6	Issues include: • Isolation of disabled people in community (<5) • Need for young and old to be able to mix. (<5) • Cliques within the community. (<5)
Caring for Own Home			
	Concern at people not looking after their homes.	6	
Vacant Development Sites			
	Concern at amount of unused land.	<5	
Perception of Neighbourhood			
	Negative perception of neighbourhood.	<5	Issues include: • Desire to leave area. (<5)
Alcohol			
	Alcohol.	<5	Issues include: • Abuse. (<5)
Sports Facilities			
	Desire for provision of new sports facilities.	<5	Suggestions include: • Basket ball court. (<5) • Football pitch. (<5)
	Concern at lack of sports' facilities.	<5	
Infrastructure			
	Low domestic water pressure.	<5	
	Poor drainage system.	<5	
Older People			
	Lack of activities/ facilities/ services for older people.	<5	
Employment/ Education/ Development			
	Desire for a local library.	<5	
	Desire for special needs centre.	<5	
	Teenagers with no employment.	<5	
	Unemployment.	<5	
Public Transport			
	Reduced bus service on Oldpark Road.	<5	

Cold Callers			
	Concern at number of cold callers.	<5	
Health			
	Concern at lack of support for people with mental health and other health problems.	<5	
Total		**345**	**600 to this point**

3.1.12 Activities and services needed

Q12. In the space below, please tell us about any activities or services you think should be provided in Lower Oldpark.

Q11 Comments

A total of 216 comments were made by respondents against this question. Given the large number of comments, a summary of the main findings is provided below. Full details are provided in the table of findings.

By far the most comments related to the desire among respondents for the provision of activities/ facilities for children and young people (68). A range of suggestions for activities/ facilities were made, the most popular being the establishment of a youth club (17).

The second most common issue highlighted by comments was the desire for the provision of more local shops (13). This was followed closely by the desire for activities/ facilities for older people (12), a desire for activities for adults (12) and concern at the quality of play facilities/ desire for improved/ additional facilities (12). In relation to the play facilities, there were an additional 5 comments reflecting concern at the lack of play facilities.

Comments also focused on a range of local environment issues with a desire for the area to be kept clean generating 6 comments.

A wide range of topics attracted fewer than five comments.

Comments' Categories	Sub Categories	Number <5 = Less than 5	Additional Information
Children/ Young People			
	Desire for activities/ facilities for children/ young people.	68	Suggestions include: • Youth club (17) • Discos. (<5) • Children with special needs including autism/ ASD/ ADHD. (<5) • Summer schemes/ activities. (<5) • After-school club/ activities. (<5) • Workshops for age group 12-16 years. (<5) • To learn about other cultures. (<5) • Football. (<5)

			• Clubs e.g:
			  ○ Darts. (<5)
			  ○ Pool. (<5)
			  ○ Snooker. (<5)
			  ○ Chess. (<5)
			  ○ Drama. (<5)
			  ○ Dancing. (<5)
			  ○ Art. (<5)
			  ○ Baking. (<5)
			  ○ Beauty. (<5)
			  ○ Nail care. (<5)
			  ○ Cooking. (1)
			• Evening activities. (1)
			• Activities for 3-5 age group. (<5)
			• Something for age group 13-17. (<5)
			• Activities for smaller/ younger children. (<5)

	Desire for career related training services for young people.	<5	
	Desire for life skills training for young people.	<5	Suggestions include: • Cooking and cleaning. (<5)
	Desire for employment related support for young people.	<5	Suggestions include: • Local Jobs Co-ordinator. (<5)
Retail/ Cafes/ Restaurant/ Post Office			
	Desire for more local shops.	13	Suggestions include: • Large shopping centre (<5)
	Desire for a fast food carry out shop.	<5	
	Desire for a post office.	<5	
Older People			
	Desire for activities/ facilities for older people.	12	Suggestions include: • Bingo. (<5) • Pensioners' club. (<5) • Training programmes. (<5) • Gardening for older people. (<5) • Groups for older people, including over 50's. (<5)
	Desire for more services for older people.	<5	
	Desire for more help for older people.	<5	
Play Facilities			
	Concern at quality of play facilities/ desire for improved/ additional facilities.	12	Suggestions include: • Safe location (<5) • Kids' play area (<5)
	Concern at lack of play park.	5	Suggestions include: • Benches. • Picnic area. • Flower beds.
Adults			
	Desire for activities for adults.	12	Suggestions include: • Adult education classes including English language classes. (<5) • Trips out. (<5)

			• Activities for parents including when children are at school. (<5) • Women's group. (<5) • Men's group. (<5) • Cooking group. (<5) • Fitness/ friendship group. (<5) • Coffee mornings. (<5) • Activities in the evening for those who work. (<5)
Local Environment			
	Desire for area to be kept clean.	6	Suggestions include: • Community clean-up/ litter picking. (<5) • Monitoring of rear walkways. (<5)
	Concern over litter problem.	<5	Suggestions include: • Provision of litter bins. (<5)
	Desire for action to address dumping/ fly-tipping.	<5	Suggestions include: • Anti-dumping/ fly-tipping service. (<5)
	Concern over dog/ cat fouling/ urinating.	<5	Suggestions include: • Foul bins. (<5)
	Desire for improved open grounds' maintenance.	<5	
	Desire for more urban tree planting.	<5	
	Desire for better bin management by households.	<5	
	Desire for problem of weeds in the streets to be addressed.	<5	
	Desire for utility providers to repair road surfaces properly after completing work.	<5	
Community Facilities			
	Desire for a new community centre.	<5	
	Desire for meeting place for parents to share and support each other.	<5	
	Desire for community spaces.	<5	
	Support for existing community centre.	<5	Suggestions include: • Space for birthday parties. (<5)
	Desire for inclusion of all in use of community centre.	<5	
	Desire for inclusion for all in use of former library building.	<5	
	Desire for a library.	<5	
	Desire for a community garden.	<5	
	Desire for community groups.	<5	
	Desire for a new community.	<5	
Home Maintenance			
	Desire for grass cutting/ garden maintenance service.	<5	Suggestions include: • Scheme to help elderly/ disabled member households (<5)
	Desire for home decorating service.	<5	
Sports' Facilities			
	Desire for sports' facilities/ activities.	<5	Suggestions include: • Snooker/ pool. (<5) • Swimming pool/ swimming lessons (<5)

			• Football pitch. (<5) • Karate/ self defence. (<5) • Skate park (<5)
Advice Services			
	Desire for housing advice service.	<5	
	Desire for benefits advice service.	<5	
Interface Issues			
	Desire for Community Officers on the ground when trouble starts.	<5	
	Fear of leaving home in case trouble starts.	<5	
	Fear among parents of letting their children go to play park.	<5	
	Challenges posed by Girdwood.	<5	
Childcare			
	Desire for a nursery.	<5	Suggestions include: • With own play park. (<5)
	Desire for a mother and tots group.	<5	
	Desire for baby club.	<5	
Vulnerable Groups			
	Activities for disabled people.	<5	
	Activities for autistic children.	<5	
	Support for the socially isolated.	<5	
	Support for the vulnerable.	<5	
Community Communication			
	Desire for more information on things happening in the area including library side of Oldpark Road.	<5	Suggestions include: • Delivery of leaflets to homes. (<5)
Open Space			
	Support for people getting outside.	<5	
	Desire for green spaces.	<5	
	Desire for family friendly spaces.	<5	
	Desire for a dog park.	<5	
Crime/ Community Safety			
	Desire for more police in the area.	<5	
	Desire for neighbourhood watch in the area.	<5	
	Desire for installation of alley gates at access points to rear walkways.	<5	
Drugs			
	Drugs	<5	
	Concern about drug dealing in the area.	<5	
Household Income			
	Desire for provision of a foodbank.	<5	
	Desire for help for people on low income.	<5	
Community Relations			
	Desire for cross-community activities	<5	Suggestions include: • Fun day. (<5)
Families			
	Desire for family days out.	<5	
Traffic			
	Desire for improved parking provision in housing courts.	<5	

Health			
	Desire for health and wellbeing centre.	<5	
Waste Management			
	New recycling bins.	<5	
Total		**216**	

Appendix 1

Questionnaire

Lower Oldpark Regeneration Survey

LOCA Questionnaire

January/ May 2025

Section 1 – Housing Development

There are three grassed-over sites in Lower Oldpark on which some type of physical development could take place. The three questions in this section are about what you would like to see developed on these sites.

Question 1.

Would you like to see housing built on the Bonfire Site (the grassed site bounded by Mountview St/ Oldpark Road Peace Wall/ rear of 103 to 125 Manor St)?

Responses	Tick One Box	
Yes		
No		See Comments below.
Don't Know		See Comments below.

Comments. If you answered 'No' or 'Don't Know' to the above question, is there something other than housing you would like to see developed on the site?

……..……

Question 2.

Would you like to see housing built on the long, grassed site running from 64 Cliftonpark Avenue to Alloa St and backing onto Avoca St?

Responses	Tick One Box	
Yes		
No		See Comments below.
Don't Know		See Comments below.

Comments. If you answered 'No' or 'Don't Know' to the above question, is there something other than housing you would like to see developed n the site?

……..……

Question 3.

Would you like to see housing built on the long, grassed site beside Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall (from the new houses at Annalee Court to Rosapenna Peace Wall). The Linear Park.

Responses	Tick One Box	
Yes		
No		See Comments below.
Don't Know		See Comments below.

Comments. If you answered 'No' or 'Don't Know' to the above question, is there something other than housing you would like to see developed n the site?

……..……

Section 2 – Housing Type (Ownership)

Question 4. If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see Social Housing developed?

Responses	Tick One Box
Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Comments

……

Question 5.

If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see owner-occupier housing for purchase developed?

Responses	Tick One Box
Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Comments

……

Question 6.

If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see housing rented from private landlords developed?

Responses	Tick One Box
Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Comments

……

Section 3 – Housing Type (Flats/ Apartments)

Question 7.

If housing was going to be built on the sites, would you like to see flats/ apartments developed?

Responses	Tick One Box
Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Comments

……

Section 4 – Timing Of Development

Question 8.

If housing was going to be built on the sites, which site would you like to see developed first?

Site	Put A Tick Beside the One Site You Would Like To See Developed First
The grassed site bounded by Mountview St/ Oldpark Road Peace Wall/ rear of 103 to 125 Manor St (Bonfire Site)	
The grassed site from 64 Cliftonpark Avenue to Alloa St and backing onto Avoca St.	
The grassed site beside Cliftonpark Avenue Peace Wall from the new houses at Annalee Court to Rosapenna Peace Wall.	

Comments

……

Section 5 – Buying A House To Live In

Question 9

Would you, or a member of your household, be interested in buying a new-build private house to live in, if this type of housing development happened in Lower Oldpark?

Responses	Tick One Box
Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Comments

……

Section 6 – Need For A Social House

Question 10

Is there someone in your household who doesn't have their own home and wants to apply for social housing?

Responses	Tick One Box
Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Comments

……

Section 7 – Lower Oldpark Problems

Question 11

In the space below, please tell us what you think are the main problems facing the Lower Oldpark community.

Problems Facing the Lower Oldpark Community

……
……
……
……
……
……

Section 8 – Lower Oldpark Services and Activities

Question 12

In the space below, please tell us about any activities or services you think should be provided in Lower Oldpark.

Activities/ Services That Should Be Provided In Lower Oldpark

……
……
……
……

Thank You

Thank you very much for taking the time and the trouble to complete this Lower Oldpark Regeneration Survey questionnaire.

What To Do Now

The LOCA Housing and Regeneration Worker, Gary Hughes, will call with you to collect the completed form within three days of you receiving it.

You may prefer to leave your completed form into Lower Oldpark Community Centre at 9-23 Avoca Street. If so, put it in an envelope, write Housing Regeneration Worker on the envelope, seal it and leave the envelope into the Centre.

Use Of Questionnaire Information

A survey report will be prepared and residents will be invited to locally based workshops.

Based on the survey results and resident input during the workshops, a draft physical regeneration strategy will be prepared.

Lower Oldpark residents will be consulted on the draft strategy and a final strategy prepared. This Lower Oldpark Physical Regeneration Strategy will be used to influence Government decisions.

Appendix 2

Questionnaire Cover Letter (January – April)

lpark Regeneration Survey

Lower Oldpark Community Association

January/April 2025

Dear Householder

Lower Oldpark Community Association (LOCA) wants to find out the views of Lower Oldpark residents on the future development of vacant sites in the neighbourhood, and on the problems of the area. We are doing this by way of a residents' survey.

The information gathered will be used to help develop a physical regeneration plan for the area and to help guide LOCA on what it does in the area.

How Long Will It Take to Complete the Questionnaire?

It should only take between 5 and 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Completed Questionnaires

The LOCA Housing Regeneration Worker, Gary Hughes, will call with you to collect your completed questionnaire within three days of you receiving it.

You may prefer to leave your completed questionnaire into Lower Oldpark Community Centre at 9-23 Avoca Street. If so, put it in an envelope, write Housing Regeneration Worker on the envelope, seal it, and leave the envelope into the Community Centre at 9-21 Avoca Street.

Queries

If you have any queries about the survey, please contact the LOCA Housing Regeneration Worker, Gary Hughes, using the above address or by calling 028 96928293 or 028 90351334 or by emailing loweroldparkhousing@gmail.com or by way of Facebook message @loweroldparkhousing.

Privacy Statement

All information obtained in this questionnaire will be treated in the strictest confidence by LOCA.

LOCA will retain the information in accordance with the Retention Policy set out in the LOCA Housing Services' Privacy Notice available at https://loweroldparkhousing.co.uk/

Appreciation

Your co-operation would be very much appreciated.

Gary Hughes

Housing and Regeneration Worker

Appendix 3

Mop-up Questionnaire Cover Letter (May)

Lower Oldpark Regeneration Survey

Lower Oldpark Community Association

Dear Householder

Lower Oldpark Community Association (LOCA) wants to find out the views of Lower Oldpark residents on the future development of vacant sites in the neighbourhood, and on the problems of the area. We are doing this by way of a residents' survey.

The information gathered will be used to help develop a physical regeneration plan for the area and to help guide LOCA on what it does in the area.

How Long Will It Take to Complete the Questionnaire?

It should only take between 5 and 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Completed Questionnaires

A questionnaire was previously delivered to your home but, when the Housing and Regeneration Worker, Gary Hughes, called to collect it, no one was in.

Gary will call with you to collect your completed questionnaire on the evening of Monday 19th May 2025.

You may prefer to leave your completed questionnaire into Lower Oldpark Community Centre at 9-23 Avoca Street. If so, put it in an envelope, write Housing Regeneration Worker on the envelope, seal it, and leave the envelope into the Community Centre at 9-21 Avoca Street.

Queries

If you have any queries about the survey, please contact the LOCA Housing Regeneration Worker, Gary Hughes, using the above address or by calling 028 96928293 or 028 90351334 or by emailing loweroldparkhousing@gmail.com or by way of Facebook message @loweroldparkhousing.

Privacy Statement

All information obtained in this questionnaire will be treated in the strictest confidence by LOCA.

LOCA will retain the information in accordance with the Retention Policy set out in the LOCA Housing Services' Privacy Notice available at https://loweroldparkhousing.co.uk/

Appreciation

Your co-operation would be very much appreciated.

Gary Hughes

Housing and Regeneration Worker