

LEEDS PARKS SURVEY: FULL REPORT

Anna Barker, David Churchill & Adam Crawford

March 2018

Findings –
Informing
Change



FOREWORD

Parks and green spaces play such an important part in the lives of so many people in Leeds and this report provides a comprehensive and valuable insight into what motivates people to visit parks and why they touch the lives of so many people each year. The report is presented in a very clear and engaging way with graphic illustrations of the findings and I therefore encourage all those who share a passion for our parks and green spaces to spend some time reading and reflecting on what this report has to say.

In Leeds we have placed a strong emphasis on the principle that parks and green spaces are protected and free to access by the public, and we have done all we can to improve and sustain the quality of our parks and in particular our community parks during these difficult times of austerity. Our focus has been on improving them in line with the Parks and Green Space Strategy for Leeds which has a key aim for all 63 community parks to achieve Green Flag standard by 2020 and it is therefore reassuring to learn that quality is a key factor in what encourages people to visit parks. Leeds is a diverse city and the report pays particular attention to the background of people who visit and it is pleasing to read that visitors to our parks reflect this cultural diversity and that our parks play a crucial role in supporting social cohesion and help make Leeds an inclusive city.

I would like to pay particular thanks to the team at the University of Leeds who have been working with us for well over two years and during that time research findings have been shared locally and in a national context demonstrating the timely and relevant nature of this work to inform the broader debate on public park provision. This latest report and recommendations provide a solid foundation to inform future management and a Parks and Green Space strategy for Leeds beyond 2020.

Cllr Lucinda Yeadon, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Environment and Sustainability

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was authored by Dr Anna Barker, Dr David Churchill and Professor Adam Crawford as part of an Arts and Humanities Research Council funded research project: 'The future prospects of urban parks: the life, times and social order of Victorian public parks as places of social mixing' (2015-2017), University of Leeds [AH/N001788/1].

The collection of the survey data and production of the findings on which this report is based has been supported by a number of people at the University of Leeds and Leeds City Council to whom we are particularly grateful. In particular, the design of the survey and data collection was supported by Nathan Booth, post-doctoral research officer for the project. The survey sampling strategy was designed by Frank Perrins, Leeds City Council. Data inputting was undertaken by a team of trained post-graduate researchers. The survey weighting adjustment and modelling was undertaken by Dr Jose Pina-Sánchez. The spreadsheets from which the data tables in this report were extracted were compiled by Natacha Chevenoy, post-graduate researcher.

We would like to thank our project partners, Leeds City Council Parks & Countryside Service, for providing support with the data collection and analysis, and for contributing to the costs of the survey and its administration. We would also like to thank all of the managers from Leeds City Council who contributed to a workshop in January 2018 at which this report was first presented and discussed.

We would like to thank all of the people and park-user groups who gave their time to promote and complete the survey.

Finally, we would also like to thank the Leeds Social Sciences Institute for contributing to the costs of producing this report and the workshop with Leeds City Council.

© University of Leeds 2018

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5518/100/4>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons ([CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/))

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
1. INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE: PARK PROFILES	6
2. MAJOR AND COMMUNITY PARKS	7
3. QUALITY OF PARKS	21
4. COMMUNITY COMMITTEE AREAS	34
PART TWO: PARK-USER PROFILES	46
5. AGE GROUP	47
6. DISABILITY	57
7. ETHNIC GROUP	68
8. RECOMMENDATIONS	77
ENDNOTES	81
APPENDIX A: SURVEY METHOD	84
APPENDIX B: LEEDS PARKS SURVEY	85
APPENDIX C: CALCULATION OF ADULT VISITS TO PARKS	93
APPENDIX D: SITE-BASED ESTIMATES OF TOTAL ADULT VISITS	97
APPENDIX E: SITE-BASED USER-SATISFACTION SCORES	99

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For many people, visiting parks is an integral part of everyday life, reflecting the vital social role parks play. In 2016, a team at the University of Leeds undertook a public survey in partnership with Leeds City Council (LCC) Parks & Countryside Service as part of a broader project investigating how Leeds parks have changed through time, how they are used today, and what their future prospects might be.

Whilst Leeds has many different types of green spaces, this survey focused on the use and experiences of, and expectations for, the 70 designated public parks in the city. A core feature of the survey was to ask respondents to identify their main park (i.e. the park they visited most frequently), which was not necessarily the park closest to where they live.



69% OF PARK-USERS
USUALLY VISIT THE PARK
CLOSEST TO WHERE THEY
LIVE. 31% TRAVEL TO
ANOTHER PARK.

The survey investigated:

- the use of parks across the city and by different social groups;
- the experiences and expectations of park-users;
- the level of satisfaction with parks and priorities for the future.

Some 6,432 people responded to the public survey, which was available online and sent to 20,000 households across the city. The findings are

representative of the Leeds population in terms of gender and ethnic group.

The survey findings show that parks in Leeds are widely used and enjoyed by diverse social groups. Some 91% of people had visited a park in the preceding year and, on average, people visited more than five parks per year throughout the city.



ON AVERAGE, PARK-USERS
VISIT **MORE THAN 5 PARKS**
PER YEAR ACROSS THE CITY.

Some 77% of park visitors reported very pleasant experiences and 90% were satisfied or very satisfied overall with their main park. The majority of park-users said that they felt very safe using their park (57%). Half of park-users were high-frequency visitors in the summer months, visiting their main park at least once a week. The average visit lasted for between 30 minutes and two hours.



50% OF PARK-USERS VISITED
THEIR MAIN PARK AT LEAST
ONCE A WEEK IN THE
SUMMER MONTHS.

Extrapolating from the visit profile exhibited in the survey to the adult population of Leeds, it is estimated that there were nearly 45 million adult visits to parks in the city. Of these, some 63% were to the 63 designated 'community' parks and 37% to the seven 'major' parks.

45
MILLION

ESTIMATED **ADULT VISITS** TO
PARKS IN LEEDS EACH YEAR.
63% AT 'COMMUNITY PARKS',
37% AT 'MAJOR PARKS'.

Nevertheless, the survey found variations in the use of parks and people's experiences of them across the city. Notably there were differences by respondents in terms of the type and quality of park that they visited and in terms of different groups of park-users by age, disability and ethnic group.

The research highlights the importance of accessible, good quality parks and green spaces throughout the city; where people of all ages, cultures and abilities can enjoy the vital leisure, health and well-being benefits that parks afford.

MAJOR AND COMMUNITY PARKS

The findings show variations in use, experiences and expectations by those who selected a major park (49%) and those who selected a community park (51%) as their main park.

Community park-users were more likely than major park-users to use the closest park to where they live (79% compared with 59%); they were more likely to walk to get there (69% compared with 31%), although ease of access was rated only slightly better.



77% OF MAJOR PARK-USERS NORMALLY STAYED FOR **OVER AN HOUR** COMPARED WITH 44% OF COMMUNITY PARK-USERS.


Community park-users visited their park more frequently, albeit for shorter periods of time. Some 59% visited at least once a week compared with 39% of major park-users. Yet, 77% of major

park-users stayed, on average, for at least one hour compared with 44% of community park-users.



44% OF MAJOR PARK-USERS RATED THEIR MAIN PARK IN **EXCELLENT CONDITION** COMPARED WITH 23% OF COMMUNITY PARK-USERS.

Major park-users were more likely than community park-users to rate their park in good or excellent condition (94% compared with 80%). They were also more likely than community park-users to expect its condition to improve (26% compared with 23%) and to report being very satisfied (54% compared with 31%).



MORE PARK-USERS EXPECT THEIR PARK TO **IMPROVE** THAN **DECLINE**, BUT THE MAJORITY EXPECT IT TO **REMAIN THE SAME** OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS.

Moreover, a higher proportion of major park-users compared with community park-users rated the last visit to their park as very pleasant (85% compared with 69%) and were slightly more likely to report feeling very safe (59% compared with 55%).



85% OF MAJOR PARK-USERS HAD **VERY PLEASANT EXPERIENCES** COMPARED WITH 69% OF COMMUNITY PARK-USERS.

Nevertheless, major and community park-users were as likely to agree that spending time in their park was important to their own quality of life.

People visited parks primarily to get some fresh air, to go for walks, to enjoy nature and wildlife, and to relax and think in peace and quiet. Parks are also popular places for family outings and children's play. These top reasons for visiting were the same for visitors to major and community parks in the city.

Park-users' top five priorities for the future were:



#1 - KEEP PARKS CLEAN



#2 - KEEP EXISTING FACILITIES OPEN OR IMPROVE THEM



#3 - KEEP PARKS FREE TO ENTER



#4 - EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN PARKS FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES



#5 - TACKLE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND CRIME

Interestingly, maintaining or increasing sporting facilities in parks were ranked 14th out of a list of 15 options, just below the protection of historic features of parks, which was ranked 13th. These priorities were similar by type of park. However, community park-users were more likely to prioritise anti-social behaviour and crime while major park-users were more likely to prioritise accessibility for disabled people.

QUALITY OF PARKS

All major parks across Leeds hold the nationally-recognised Green Flag status. In 2016, 41 of 63 community parks (65% of the total) were assessed as meeting an equivalent Leeds Quality Parks (LQP) standard. Only 6% of respondents selected a park below these quality standards as their main park of use, suggesting that use of parks across the city is associated with park quality.



94% OF PARK-USERS CHOSE A LEEDS QUALITY PARK AS THEIR MAIN PARK TO USE. ONLY 6% USUALLY VISIT A PARK BELOW THESE STANDARDS.

Moreover, those who usually visited a park below LQP standards were more likely to have visited other parks in the city that are below these standards (29%) than those usually visited a park that meets LQP standards (7%).

Existing research shows that good quality, accessible green space is associated with better mental and physical health. Our findings indicate that public parks that meet designated

quality standards are associated with enriched visitor experiences, satisfaction and well-being.

Those who selected a park that meets LQP standards as their main park, compared with those who selected a park that was below the standard, were more likely to be very satisfied overall (45% compared with 15%), less likely to be very dissatisfied (1% compared with 10%), more likely to feel very safe (58% compared with 41%), have very pleasant experiences (79% compared with 59%) and to say that spending time in parks is at least very important to their quality of life.



Despite these differential experiences, those who usually visited a park below LQP standards were more likely to be high-frequency visitors (61%), visiting at least once a week in the summer months, compared with visitors to parks that meet quality standards (49%).

The former were also much more likely to use the closest park to where they live (84% compared with 68%) and much more likely to walk to this park (71% compared with 48%), suggesting that they may have lower levels of mobility or ability to travel to higher quality green spaces, than visitors to parks that meet quality standards.

There are some differences in park-users' top five priorities depending on the quality of park. Both sets of respondents agreed it should be a priority to keep parks clean and free to enter. However, visitors to parks below LQP standards were more likely to prioritise anti-social behaviour and crime, personal safety and the condition of paths, benches and other park infrastructure. Whereas, visitors to parks that meet LQP standards were more likely to prioritise the maintenance of existing facilities, the provision of events and activities for local communities and the accessibility of parks for disabled people.

In the context of cuts to local authority park budgets, there is potential for the differential experiences between these groups of park-users to widen. Without significant efforts to counteract such a possible trend, the measurable quality of a park may come to inform park-users' experiences in ways that result in a bifurcated differentiation of parks.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

There are ten community committees in Leeds which operate to give local people a say over their community, including their local parks and green spaces. The quantity and profile of parks and green spaces in each committee area varies. As such, the profile of use, experiences and expectations of park-users in each committee area differs, as do the priorities for the future. Overall, however, the survey findings suggest

that park-users have a differential experience of parks across the city.



PEOPLE HAVE A **DIFFERENTIAL EXPERIENCE** OF PARKS ACROSS THE CITY.

For example, very pleasant experiences of parks in each committee area ranged from 52% in East Inner to 90% in North East Outer, compared with 77% for all respondents. In addition, feeling very safe using their park varied from 20% in East Inner to 68% in North West Outer, compared with 57% for all respondents.

Park-users rated the condition of parks differently across committee areas, from 8% excellent in East Inner to 49% in North East Outer, compared with 33% for all Leeds parks. Park-users in East Inner were also most likely to expect the condition to decline (18%), compared with the 12% for all Leeds parks.

Given these figures, it is not unsurprising that only 9% of park-users in East Inner were very satisfied overall, compared with a 42% for all respondents. Despite the differential experiences of park-users in East Inner, they were just as likely to rate spending time in their park as important to their quality of life.

AGE GROUP

It is notable that 77% of people aged over 75 had visited a park in the preceding year, a much lower figure than the average of 91% for all respondents. Park-users aged over 75 also visited fewer parks across the city

than people in other age groups and were most likely to select the closest park as their main park (75% compared with 69% for all respondents). Over 75s were more likely to be low-frequency visitors (20%), visiting their main park less than once per month in the summer months.



PEOPLE AGED OVER 75 AND DISABLED PEOPLE WERE **SIGNIFICANTLY LESS LIKELY** TO HAVE VISITED A PARK IN THE PRECEDING YEAR.

It is notable that this age group were less likely to say that spending time in their park is essential or very important to their quality of life, but most likely to report having very pleasant experiences visiting their park. Indeed, the survey findings indicate that pleasant experiences of parks increase with age.

By contrast, nearly all people aged 25–44 had visited a park and these park-users were more likely to be high-frequency visitors. Park-users in this age group visited a wider range of parks across the city, and those aged 25–34 were the least likely to select the closest park as their main park (60% compared with 69% for all respondents). Park-users aged 25–44 were most likely to say that spending time in their park was essential or very important to their quality of life and the majority reported very pleasant experiences of visits.

Park-users aged 19–24 visited fewer parks across the city; nearly half of this group identified one park – namely Woodhouse Moor – as their main park. They were least likely to report pleasant

experiences of visiting their park, more likely to avoid their park at certain times (47% compared with 26% for all respondents) and to perceive it to be less safe, and less likely to think their park is important to their quality of life. However, they were just as likely to be high-frequency visitors as those aged under 64 and more likely to use their park after dark.

In general, people of different ages visited parks for broadly similar reasons, but there are some differences in the parks they chose to visit most often. While park-users aged 19–24 were most likely to walk to get to their park (70%), park-users aged over 75 were most likely to travel by car (49%). Indeed, walking to parks decreased with age while travelling by car increased with age, despite the fact that older park-users were more likely to have visited their local park.



WALKING TO PARKS
DECREASES WITH AGE
WHILE TRAVELLING BY CAR
INCREASES WITH AGE.

Dissatisfaction with parks was low across all age groups. People in all age groups agreed that the key priorities should be to keep parks clean, to retain existing facilities or improve them and for parks to remain free to enter.

However, young adult park-users aged 19–24 prioritised personal safety more highly than other age groups. Park-users aged 55 and over were more likely to prioritise accessibility of parks for

disabled people, highlighting linkages between older age and disability. By contrast, those aged 35–44 were more likely to prioritise activities for children and young people.

DISABILITY

Some 8% of respondents considered themselves to have a disability that affects their access to or use of parks. As with older people, disabled people were significantly less likely to have visited a park in the preceding year. It is notable that 77% of disabled people had visited a park in the preceding year compared with 91% for all respondents.

Poor health and disability (29%), as well as a concern that parks are difficult to get to (22%), comprised two of the main reasons for non-use of parks. Other factors, such as not enough time (23%), also inhibited use.

Disabled and non-disabled park-users visited the same broad range of parks across the city, for broadly similar reasons, and were just as likely to select the park closest to where they live as their main park.

Disabled park-users were just as likely to think that spending time in their park is important to their quality of life. Yet they were less likely to be high-frequency visitors (41%) compared with non-disabled park-users (51%) and a fifth were low-frequency visitors compared with 14% of non-disabled park-users. They also visited, on average, fewer parks across the city than non-disabled park-users.

Disabled park-users were more likely to travel to their park by car than to walk (52% and 27% respectively), which was the opposite for non-disabled park-users (40% and 52% respectively). Disabled park-users were more likely to say that their park is difficult to get to. One concern regarding access that was expressed related to the amount of disabled parking bays.



DISABLED PARK-USERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO TRAVEL BY CAR (52%) THAN WALK (27%).

While the majority of disabled park-users reported pleasant experiences using parks, feeling safe, and being satisfied, they were marginally more likely than non-disabled park-users to say that the last visit to their park was unpleasant, slightly less likely to say they feel very safe visiting, and slightly less satisfied overall.

While there were some similarities in priorities, disabled park-users were much more likely to prioritise the accessibility of parks for disabled people compared with non-disabled people.

The findings of the survey indicate a need to better understand the personal and social barriers, experienced by older people and disabled people, to the full enjoyment and use of parks and for the need to make improvements in this regard.

ETHNIC GROUP

Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) respondents were just as likely

to visit parks and were just as likely to be higher-frequency visitors as respondents from a White ethnic group. Park-users from different ethnic groups visited the same broad range of parks across the city, for broadly similar reasons, and were just as likely to select the park closest to where they live as their main park. Park-users from different ethnic groups were as likely to walk to get to their park and generally rated their park as easy to get to.



PEOPLE FROM DIFFERENT ETHNIC GROUPS ARE JUST AS LIKELY TO HAVE VISITED A PARK.

BAME and White park-users were just as likely to say that spending time in their park is important to their quality of life. However, BAME park-users were less likely than White park-users to rate their park in excellent condition (22% compared with 34%) and were less likely to be very satisfied overall with their park (25% compared with 43%).

While the majority of BAME park-users reported pleasant experiences using parks and feeling safe, they were less likely than White park-users to report very pleasant experiences (64% compared with 78%), less likely to feel very safe visiting (41% compared with 58%) and more likely to avoid their park at certain times (34% compared with 26%).



26% OF PARK-USERS AVOIDED THEIR MAIN PARK AT CERTAIN TIMES OF THE DAY OR WEEK.

Park-users from different ethnic groups shared many priorities, including retaining or improving existing facilities, keeping parks clean and for parks to remain free to enter. However, visitors from BAME groups had greater worries about their personal safety in parks, an issue they ranked as the third most important priority for their park, compared to an 11th placed ranking among White respondents.

GENDER

Men and women were just as likely to have visited a park in the preceding year; they stayed for similar amounts of time and they visited the same broad range of parks across the city, for similar reasons.



MALES AND FEMALES
ARE **JUST AS LIKELY**
TO HAVE VISITED A PARK.

There were broadly similar patterns in the experience of parks by gender, although women were slightly more likely than men to say that their park was important to their quality of life and to report very pleasant experiences. However, women were also slightly more likely than men to report avoiding their park at certain times and slightly less likely to report feeling very safe when visiting. The top priorities for parks were the same for men and women.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our study and survey findings, we make 16 recommendations for developing parks policy and practice in Leeds and similar cities in line with the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goal 11.7 which requires that all nation states will 'by 2030 provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities'.



VISITORS HOPE THAT THE
QUALITY OF PARKS **IMPROVE**,
AND THAT GOOD QUALITY
PARKS **REMAIN** AT THESE
STANDARDS.

Our recommendations advise that priority is given to raising the standard of parks throughout the city to ensure access to good quality green space for all residents and visitors, playing due regard to the specific needs of particular groups of people that enable them to enjoy the full benefits that derive from well-managed parks.

The full 16 recommendations are outlined in the main report (see Chapter 8).

1. INTRODUCTION

For many people, visiting parks is an integral part of everyday life, reflecting the vital role parks play within the social fabric of cities. Parks are places where history is made, both in terms of major public events — political rallies, mass meetings, demonstrations and civic celebrations — and in terms of people's intimate lives; their romances, friendships, family outings and personal commemorations. In 2016, a team of researchers at the University of Leeds undertook a public survey in partnership with Leeds City Council (LCC) Parks & Countryside Service as part of a broader Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) funded project investigating how Leeds parks have changed through time, how they are used today, and what their future prospects might be.

The purpose of this report is to present the main findings and data tables produced from this survey. The research highlights the importance of accessible, good quality parks and green spaces throughout the city; where people of all ages, cultures and abilities can enjoy the vital leisure, health and well-being benefits that parks afford. Based on our study and survey findings, we make 16 recommendations for developing parks policy and practice in Leeds and similar cities in line with the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goal 11.7 which requires that all nation states will 'By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities'.¹

1.1 Overview of the research

The Leeds Parks Survey was part of a broader, two-year research project exploring the social purpose, experiences and future expectations of urban public parks, both at the time of their foundation in the Victorian era and today. The wider study, conducted in 2015-2017, provides an overview of park life in Leeds and in-depth research into three case study parks, each of which was acquired and opened for public use during the Victorian era: Woodhouse Moor,² Roundhay Park and Cross Flatts Park.

The study used historical analysis, including digitised newspaper collections and archival records, to explore the acquisition and early life of the three case study parks, up until 1914. This approach revealed the processes by which parks were acquired, aspirations for their future during the time of their inception and people's everyday experiences of parks as spaces of social mixing.

The contemporary study comprised a city-wide public survey, which is the focus of this report, and 165 interviews with a range of stakeholders, including park-users, 'friends' groups, managers from the Leeds Parks & Countryside Service and representatives from various city services. This approach revealed how parks are used, valued and

experienced today as well as people's horizons of expectations for the future of parks at the present moment.

The research is situated within a broader context in which public parks in the UK are presently at a possible 'tipping point', prompting important concerns about their future sustainability. Nationally, these concerns have been acknowledged by the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Select Committee in its inquiry into the future of public parks which reported in early 2017.³

Some of the wider findings, illustrating resonances in park life and expectations between past and present, can be found in our wider research report: 'The Future Prospects of Urban Public Parks' which is available to download from the project website: www.futureofparks.leeds.ac.uk

As part of the project, we also curated a digital archive of images of parks over time, using photographs submitted by members of the public and Leeds Parks & Countryside Service. The collection is hosted by the Leeds Library and Information Service and is accessible via the Leodis website: www.leodis.net (search for 'future prospects' to access the collection).

1.2 Parks and green spaces in Leeds

Leeds Parks & Countryside Service manages 4,000 hectares of green space, including 70 public parks. Of these, seven are designated as formal, 'major' parks and 63 are 'community' parks. In 2011, LCC conducted an 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment'. In this report, they define 'major (city) parks' as those 'Providing a wide range of opportunities for the city's residents and visitors. The range of attractions, natural and formal landscapes and facilities provided will attract users from a wide catchment area willing to undertake longer visits'. They define 'community parks' as 'Providing for the local community as a whole. They usually provide multiple facilities for active and passive recreation with areas of formal landscaping' (p.225). All of the city's major parks hold Green Flag status and, in 2016, 41 of 63 community parks (65% of the total) were assessed as meeting an equivalent Leeds Quality Parks (LQP) standard.

1.3 Objectives of the survey

The Leeds Parks Survey, conducted between June and November 2016, was designed to capture information about frequency of park use and people's experiences of visiting parks in the preceding year. Whilst Leeds has different types of green spaces, including woodlands, cemeteries and recreation grounds, the Leeds Parks Survey focused solely on the use and experiences of, and expectations for, the 70 designated public parks in the city.

A core feature of the survey design was to ask respondents to identify their main park of use⁴ (i.e. the park they visited most frequently) – which was not necessarily the park

that is closest to where they live – and answer questions about their frequency of use, experiences, expectations, and priorities for that park. We use this feature of the survey to structure the analysis that is detailed in this report.

In summary, the main objectives for the survey were to investigate:

- the use of parks across the city and by different social groups;
- the experiences and expectations of park-users;
- the overall satisfaction with parks and priorities for the future.

In response to an online public survey combined with a city-wide postal survey of 20,000 randomly selected households, the survey captured the views and experiences of 6,432 people. Following the application of a weighting adjustment, the findings are representative of the Leeds population in terms of gender and ethnic group.

The survey method is described in Appendix A and a copy of the survey is provided in Appendix B.

1.4 Use of parks in Leeds

While the growth of other public and quasi-public spaces of meeting and recreation mean that parks now sit within a broader set of options for urban inhabitants to choose from, the Leeds Parks Survey found that parks are widely used and enjoyed by diverse groups in society. Some 91% of people had visited a park in the preceding year and, on average, people visited more than five parks per year across the city. Nearly a third of park-users (31%) travelled beyond their immediate locality to visit their main park. More park-users walked (50%) than drove (40%) to get to their park and most visitors agreed that their park is easy to get to.



91% OF RESPONDENTS VISITED A PARK IN THE PRECEDING YEAR.



ON AVERAGE, PARK-USERS VISIT **MORE THAN 5 PARKS** PER YEAR ACROSS THE CITY.



69% OF PARK-USERS USUALLY VISIT THE PARK **CLOSEST** TO WHERE THE LIVE. 31% TRAVEL TO ANOTHER PARK.



MORE PARK-USERS **WALK** TO THEIR MAIN PARK (50%) THAN **DRIVE** (40%).

Most respondents (94%) selected a park that reached designated quality standards as their main park. People visited parks primarily to get some fresh air, to go for walks, to

enjoy nature and wildlife, and to relax and think in peace and quiet. Parks are also popular places for family outings and children's play. Some 77% of park-users reported very pleasant experiences of visiting their park and nearly all (90%) reported being satisfied or very satisfied overall with that park. The majority of park-users (57%) felt very safe visiting their park during the daytime. Half of park-users were high-frequency visitors, visiting their main park at least once a week in the summer months. The average visit was for between 30 minutes and two hours, but just over a quarter of people (26%) avoided their park at certain times of the day or week.



90% OF PARK-USERS WERE 'SATISFIED' OR 'VERY SATISFIED' WITH THEIR MAIN PARK.



57% OF PARK-USERS FEEL 'VERY SAFE' VISITING THEIR MAIN PARK.



50% OF PARK-USERS VISITED THEIR MAIN PARK AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK IN THE SUMMER MONTHS.



PARK-USERS NORMALLY STAYED FOR BETWEEN 30 MINUTES AND 2 HOURS.



26% OF PARK-USERS AVOIDED THEIR MAIN PARK AT CERTAIN TIMES OF THE DAY OR WEEK.



94% OF PARK-USERS CHOSE A LEEDS QUALITY PARK AS THEIR MAIN PARK TO USE. ONLY 6% USUALLY VISIT A PARK BELOW THESE STANDARDS.

Extrapolating from the visit profile exhibited in the survey to the adult population of Leeds as a whole, it is estimated that there were nearly 45 million adult visits to parks in the city per year. Nevertheless, the survey found that there were variations in the use of parks and people's experiences of them across the city. Notably there were differences by respondents in terms of the type and quality of park that they visited most often and in terms of different groups of park-users by age, disability and ethnic group.

45
MILLION

ESTIMATED ADULT VISITS TO PARKS IN LEEDS EACH YEAR. 63% AT 'COMMUNITY PARKS', 37% AT 'MAJOR PARKS'.



PEOPLE HAVE A DIFFERENTIAL EXPERIENCE OF PARKS ACROSS THE CITY.

1.4 Structure of this report

This report is organised in two main parts. The first part differentiates between and contrasts the views and experiences of respondents depending on the type or profile of their main park. That is, park-users who selected, as their main park: (i) a major park or a community park (Chapter Two); (ii) a park that meets LQP standards or a park that falls below these standards (Chapter Three); and (iii) a park located in one of the ten community committee areas (Chapter Four). Throughout, it provides comparisons with the average survey responses for all respondents. This part also provides estimates of total adult visits to parks, by type of park and community committee area. In 2009, LCC developed a calculation for estimating total visits made to parks throughout the city. This report draws on this methodology and applies it to the findings of the 2016 survey. Appendix C provides a detailed breakdown of how total visits to parks were estimated.

The second part differentiates between and contrasts the views and experiences of respondents by their demographic characteristics. It provides an overview of the survey findings by respondents' age group (Chapter Five), disability (Chapter Six), and ethnic group (Chapter Seven). The report does not include a breakdown of the survey findings by gender as both males and females were just as likely to use parks, stayed for similar amounts of time and visited the same broad range of parks across the city, for similar reasons. There were similar patterns in the experience of parks by gender, although female park-users were slightly more likely to say that their main park was very important to their quality of life and to report very pleasant experiences. By contrast, they were slightly more likely to report avoiding their park at certain times and slightly less likely to report feeling very safe when visiting. The top priorities for parks were the same for male and female park-users.



PEOPLE AGED OVER 75 AND
DISABLED PEOPLE WERE
SIGNIFICANTLY LESS LIKELY
TO HAVE VISITED A PARK IN
THE PRECEDING YEAR.



PEOPLE FROM DIFFERENT
ETHNIC GROUPS ARE
JUST AS LIKELY TO HAVE
VISITED A PARK.



MALES AND FEMALES
ARE **JUST AS LIKELY**
TO HAVE VISITED A PARK.

PART ONE: PARK PROFILES

2. MAJOR AND COMMUNITY PARKS

Leeds Parks & Countryside Service manages 4,000 hectares of green space, including 70 public parks. Of these, seven are designated as ‘major’ parks and 63 as ‘community’ parks. All of the city’s major parks hold Green Flag status and, in 2016, 41 of 63 community parks (65% of the total) were assessed as meeting the equivalent LQP standard. Respondents to the survey were fairly evenly divided between those who selected a major park (49%) and those who selected a community park (51%) as their main park. The analysis presented in this chapter shows variations in use, experiences and expectations by these two sets of respondents. Throughout, it provides comparisons with the averages for all respondents. The chapter is organised into six sections:

- 2.1 Profile of major and community park-users
- 2.2 Use of major and community parks
- 2.3 Experiences and expectations of major and community park-users
- 2.4 Overall satisfaction with major and community parks
- 2.5 Park-users’ priorities for major and community parks
- 2.6 Summary

2.1 Profile of major and community park-users

There was some variation in the profile of visitors to major and community parks. This section gives a breakdown by age, disability, ethnicity, gender and student-status.

Major and community parks were visited by people of all ages. Table 2.1 reveals some difference in the proportion of people, by age group, visiting community and major parks.

Table 2.1 Which of the following best describes your age?

Park type	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	>75	Total
All Leeds parks	3%	13%	18%	18%	20%	19%	8%	100%
Community parks	5%	14%	19%	18%	18%	17%	8%	100%
Major parks	1%	11%	17%	17%	22%	21%	9%	100%

As shown in Table 2.2, there was no difference in the proportion of disabled park-users by type of park.

Table 2.2 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Park type	Disabled park-users % (n=536)
All Leeds parks	8%
Community parks	8%
Major parks	8%

As indicated in Table 2.3, a slightly higher proportion of BAME park-users selected a community park as their main park.

Table 2.3 Which of the following categories best describe your ethnic group?

Park type	Community parks	Major parks	Total
White (n=5899)	50%	50%	100%
BAME (n=324)	54%	46%	100%

As shown in Table 2.4, there was little difference in the proportion of male and female park-users by type of park.

Table 2.4 Which of the following categories best describe your gender?

Park type	Community	Major	Total
Male (n=2460)	50%	50%	100%
Female (n=3764)	51%	49%	100%

As highlighted in Table 2.5, a slightly higher proportion of student park-users selected a community park as their main park.

Table 2.5 Are you a student in further or higher education?

Park type	Student park-users (n=363)
All Leeds parks	6%
Community parks	8%
Major parks	4%


Table 2.6 reveals that nearly a third of park-users (31%) did not usually visit their local park; instead, they travelled beyond their immediate locality to access the attributes and facilities of another park. Hence, many park-users view parks as social rather than purely local assets. For those who selected a community park as their main park, this park was more likely to be the closest park to where they live.

Table 2.6 Is your main park the closest park to where you live?

Park type	Closest park to where I live
All Leeds parks	69%
Community parks	79%
Major parks	59%

Park visitors who usually visited a park outside of their immediate locality selected reasons for this (Figure 1). Some 36% indicated that they 'prefer other parks' suggesting that the attributes of another park were their primary motivation for visiting a non-local park. Others cited factors driving them away from their local park, including a lack of facilities, not enough things to do and insufficient size.⁵ Other factors, including safety and maintenance, were cited less frequently.

Figure 1: Which of the following options best describes why you do not visit the park closest where you live most often? Tick all that apply.



Note: Options selected by 5% or more of respondents

The following illustrative explanations are typical of those people who did not select the closest park to where they live as their main park. They include a range of 'push' and 'pull' factors involved in shaping park visitor preferences and relate to:

Proximity to other significant places

- *'I use the park nearest to my work.'*
- *'It's nearer to my grandchildren.'*

Facilities and amenities available

- *'No public toilets or café, not enough seats.'*
- *'Golden Acre [Park] is bigger and caters for my needs.'*
- *'It doesn't have a children's play area.'*

Activities and events

- *'I like Cross Flatts parkrun better.'*
- *'There are no ducks and squirrels to feed at my local park.'*
- *'My sports team train at the park I use most often.'*

Size, design and character

- *'The one I visit more often is much bigger.'*
- *'I like [Chevin] because it is relatively quiet, the dog can be safely off lead and it is hilly (this is great for my run training).'*

- *‘Kirkstall has the river running at the side of it.’*

Charges and fees payable

- *‘I used to go to Lotherton Hall [an historic country park] a lot. This stopped when the park started to charge.’*

Physical accessibility

- *‘Big road bisects it from where I live’.*

Condition of park

- *‘Smashed glass everywhere.’*

Personal attachment

- *‘It is the park I used when growing up and like to visit it.’*

People are attracted to specific parks – as their main park of use – by diverse facilities that meet their needs. The survey findings show that well-resourced major parks, like Leeds’s flagship Roundhay Park, that are in good condition and have a range of facilities, act as ‘magnets’ attracting visitors from across the city and further afield.

Parks can be elective ‘destinations’. Major parks, in particular, can act as ‘destination parks’ that are sometimes preferred to local parks, where use is usually premised on the idea of routine or habitual activity. Indeed, some 61% of survey respondents had visited Roundhay Park, at least once, in the past year. Moreover, a quarter of respondents selected Roundhay Park as their main park. As such, it is estimated that over nine million visits were made by adults to Roundhay Park in the preceding year (see Appendix D). This makes it Leeds’s most visited park by some margin.

2.2 Use of major and community parks

This section presents findings relating to the use of major and community parks and is organised into the following sub-sections:

- 2.2.1 estimated total adult visits
- 2.2.2 frequency of use
- 2.2.3 length of stay
- 2.2.4 avoidance
- 2.2.5 mode and ease of travel

2.2.1 Total adult visits to major and community parks

In 2009, Leeds Parks & Countryside Service developed a methodology to estimate total visits made to parks throughout the city. Drawing on this methodology and applying it to the findings of the 2016 survey (see Appendix C), Table 2.7 reveals that the total annual adult (18+ years) visits to Leeds parks is estimated to be 44,591,401.⁶ While the city's community parks make up 63% of total adult visits, the major parks make up 37%.



These are reasonably conservative estimates since they are based on the frequency of visits park-users made to their main park in the preceding year, rather than to all parks that they visited across the city. Indeed, the survey found that park-users visited, on average, five parks in Leeds in the preceding year.

Table 2.7 Estimated Annual Adult Visits

Park type	Total Annual Adult Visits	Total Summer Adult Visits	Total Winter Adult Visits
Community parks	28,027,074	16,043,811	11,983,263
Major parks	16,564,327	9,440,980	7,123,347
All Leeds parks	44,591,401	25,484,791	19,106,610

Unsurprisingly, there were more visits to parks in the summer months (n=25,484,791) than in the winter months (n=19,106,610). It is expected that there is very significant day-to-day variation in visitation, meaning that a simple average figure is of limited use. However, on average, 136,573 adult visits were made to parks in the city on any one day in the summer months and 109,445 were made on any one day in the winter months.

Six of the top ten most visited parks were community parks. Woodhouse Moor, a community park in North West Leeds, was the second most visited park in the city, with over three million adult visits estimated in the preceding year (see Appendix D). A further seven community parks received over one million adult visits. Of the top 25 parks that had the highest estimated total adult visits (above 500,000 visits) all, except one (Rothwell Country Park), meet LQP standards.

2.2.2 Frequency of use of major and community parks

As Table 2.8 shows, half of Leeds park-users were high-frequency visitors, visiting their main park at least once a week in the summer months. Just over a third of Leeds park-users were high-frequency visitors in the winter months (Table 2.9).



50% OF PARK-USERS VISITED THEIR MAIN PARK AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK IN THE SUMMER MONTHS.

Community park-users reported visiting their park highly-frequently in the summer (59%) and winter (42%) months compared with major park-users (39% and 27%).

Table 2.8 How often do you visit your main park in the summer?

Park type	Summer					
	High		Medium		Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	2849	50%	2022	35%	795	14%
Community parks (n=2761)	1652	59%	804	29%	259	9%
Major parks (n=2834)	1096	39%	1179	41%	514	18%

Table 2.9 How often do you visit your main park in the winter?

Park type	Winter					
	High		Medium		Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	1973	35%	1964	35%	1724	30%
Community parks (n=2761)	1158	42%	861	31%	693	25%
Major parks (n=2834)	751	27%	1062	37%	979	35%

High-frequency visitors = use their main park almost every day / once or twice per week

Medium-frequency visitors = use their main park once every two weeks / once a month

Low-frequency visitors = use their main park less than once a month / seldom

2.2.3 Length of stay at major and community parks

The survey asked how long respondents normally stayed at their main park in the summer months. As Table 2.10 shows, Leeds park-users normally stayed for between 30 minutes and 2 hours.



PARK-USERS NORMALLY STAYED FOR BETWEEN **30 MINUTES** AND **2 HOURS**.

A higher proportion of major park-users stayed for over an hour (77%) compared with community park-users (44%).

Table 2.10 How long do you normally stay in the summer?


Park type	<30 Mins	30mins-1 hour	1-2 hours	2-4 hours	4> hours
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	8%	31%	41%	16%	2%
Community parks (n=2761)	15%	41%	32%	10%	2%
Major parks (n=2834)	2%	21%	51%	23%	3%



77% OF MAJOR PARK-USERS NORMALLY STAYED FOR **OVER AN HOUR** COMPARED WITH **44%** OF COMMUNITY PARK-USERS.

2.2.4 Avoidance of major and community parks

The survey asked if visitors avoided their main park at certain times of the day or week. Just over a quarter of all respondents avoided their park at certain times. As highlighted in Table 2.11, there was little difference by type of park.



26% OF PARK-USERS **AVOIDED** THEIR MAIN PARK AT CERTAIN TIMES OF THE DAY OR WEEK.

Table 2.11 Are there any times of the day or week in which you avoid visiting your main park?

Park type	Avoid %
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	26%
Community parks (n=2761)	27%
Major parks (n=2834)	25%

Park-users identified diverse reasons for avoiding parks. These often related to competing uses of parks by different visitor groups. For instance one respondent noted that they avoided their park *‘during football season due to the swearing of the footballers and fans.’* Some park-users avoided visiting because of concerns about the lack of control of dogs by their owners. For instance, one park-user explained: *‘Generally [avoid] between 8am-10am and 4pm-6pm on weekdays... because there are too many dogs off leads and not under control by their owners.’*

A common reason for avoidance was concerns about safety, which was connected to use after dark and the behaviour of other park-users. For instance, another respondent noted, *‘On an evening it has people openly drinking alcohol and I regularly see people drug dealing.’*

Other respondents said that they avoid parks due to factors associated with specific events or periods of heavy use. These include issues with parking, noise and litter. The following quotations were typical:

- *‘Sunny weekends - unpleasantly busy. In effect, it is a victim of its own success.’*
- *‘When there is a fair, because of noise.’*
- *‘When there are events as parking is at a premium.’*

2.2.5 Mode and ease of travel to major and community parks

More Leeds park-users walk (50%) than drive (40%) to get to their main park (Table 2.12). Community park-users were more likely to walk (69%) whereas major park-users were more likely to drive (58%).



MORE PARK-USERS **WALK**
TO THEIR MAIN PARK (**50%**)
THAN **DRIVE** (**40%**).

Table 2.12 How would you normally travel to your main park?

Park type	Walk %	Car %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	50%	40%
Community parks (n=2761)	69%	23%
Major parks (n=2834)	31%	58%

Most Leeds park-users (96%) found it easy or quite easy to get to their main park. As Table 2.13 indicates, there was little difference by type of park. However, accessibility was a concern for those who did not use a park in the preceding year (see Figure 2).

Table 2.13 How easy is it for you to travel to your main park?

Park type	Ease of travel			
	Easy %	Quite easy %	Quite difficult %	Difficult %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	76%	20%	3%	1%
Community parks (n=2761)	80%	16%	2%	0%
Major parks (n=2834)	71%	25%	3%	1%

2.3 Experiences and expectations of major and community park-users

This section presents findings relating to how major and community park-users rated:

- 2.3.1 their experience of visiting
- 2.3.2 their feelings of safety
- 2.3.3 the current and expected condition of their main park
- 2.3.4 the importance of spending time in their main park to their quality of life

2.3.1 Experience of visiting major and community parks

The survey asked respondents to rate the last visit to their park in terms of the pleasantness of their experience. In Leeds, some 77% of park-users rated their last visit as 'very pleasant' on a four-point scale. As revealed in Table 2.14, a higher proportion of major park-users reported very pleasant experiences (85%) compared with community park-users (69%).



85% OF MAJOR PARK-USERS HAD VERY PLEASANT EXPERIENCES COMPARED WITH 69% OF COMMUNITY PARK-USERS.

Table 2.14 How pleasant was your last experience visiting your main park?

Park type	Last visit			
	Very pleasant %	Somewhat pleasant %	Somewhat unpleasant %	Very unpleasant %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	77%	19%	3%	1%
Community parks (n=2761)	69%	26%	4%	1%
Major parks (n=2834)	85%	12%	2%	0%

2.3.2 Feelings of safety visiting major and community parks

The survey asked respondents to rate their feelings of safety when visiting their main park in the daytime. In Leeds, 57% of park-users felt 'very safe' on a five-point scale.



57% OF PARK-USERS FEEL 'VERY SAFE' VISITING THEIR MAIN PARK.

A slightly higher proportion of major park-users felt very safe (59%) compared with community park-users (55%). Only 1% of Leeds park-users felt unsafe using their park.

Table 2.15 How safe do you feel visiting your main park during the day?

Park type	Safety – day				
	Very safe %	Fairly safe %	Never thought about it %	Fairly unsafe %	Very unsafe %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	57%	34%	6%	1%	0%
Community parks (n=2761)	55%	36%	7%	1%	0%
Major parks (n=2834)	59%	33%	6%	1%	0%

2.3.4 Condition of major and community parks

The survey asked park-users to rate the current condition of their main park. In Leeds, 33% of park-users rated their main park in 'excellent' condition, 53% in 'good' condition, 11% in 'fair' condition and 2% in 'poor' condition (see Table 2.16). When interpreting these findings it should be noted that 94% of respondents selected a park that meets LQP standards as their main park to use.

A higher proportion of major park-users rated their park in excellent condition (44%) compared with community park-users (23%). This is likely to reflect the fact that all

major parks hold Green Flag status while 65% of community parks were of LQP standards at the time of the survey.




44% OF MAJOR PARK-USERS RATED THEIR MAIN PARK IN EXCELLENT CONDITION COMPARED WITH 23% OF COMMUNITY PARK-USERS.

Table 2.16 How do you rate the current condition of your main park?

Park type	Condition			
	Excellent %	Good %	Fair %	Poor %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	33%	53%	11%	2%
Community parks (n=2761)	23%	57%	16%	3%
Major parks (n=2834)	44%	50%	6%	1%

In Leeds, park-users generally expected the condition of their main park to 'remain the same' over the next three years (52%), although more expected it to improve (25%) than decline (12%). As revealed in Table 2.17, major park-users were slightly more optimistic that the condition of their park would improve (26%) compared with community park-users (23%). Likewise, community park-users were also slightly more pessimistic that the condition of their park would decline (14%) compared with major park-users (10%).



MORE PARK-USERS EXPECT THEIR PARK TO IMPROVE THAN DECLINE, BUT THE MAJORITY EXPECT IT TO REMAIN THE SAME OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS.

Table 2.17 In the next three years, how do you expect the condition of your main park to change?

Park type	Expectations			
	Improve %	Remain the same %	Decline %	Not sure %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	25%	52%	12%	11%
Community parks (n=2761)	23%	49%	14%	13%
Major parks (n=2834)	26%	54%	10%	10%

2.3.5 Importance of major and community parks to quality of life

In Leeds, 57% of park-users reported that spending time in their main park was either 'very important' or 'essential' to their own quality of life, and a further 31% said it was 'fairly important'. As Table 2.18 indicates, there was little difference by type of park.

Table 2.18 In terms of your own quality of life, how important is spending time in your main park?

Park type	Importance to Own Quality of Life			
	Essential %	Very important %	Fairly important %	Not (very) important %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	20%	37%	31%	9%
Community parks (n=2761)	21%	36%	32%	9%
Major parks (n=2834)	19%	39%	30%	10%

2.4 Overall satisfaction with major and community parks

The survey asked respondents how satisfied they are overall with their main park. In Leeds, some 90% of park-users were either 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' on a five-point scale. As shown in Table 2.19, a higher proportion of major park-users reported being very satisfied (54%) compared with community park-users (31%).

Table 2.19 What is your overall impression of your main park?

Park type	User-Satisfaction				
	Very satisfied %	Satisfied %	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied %	Very dissatisfied %
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	42%	48%	7%	2%	1%
Community parks (n=2761)	31%	54%	11%	3%	1%
Major parks (n=2834)	54%	41%	3%	1%	0%

2.5 Priorities for the future of major and community parks

Based on a list of fifteen options, park-users were asked to identify their top priorities. Park-users' top five priorities for the future were:



#1 - KEEP PARKS CLEAN



#2 - KEEP EXISTING FACILITIES OPEN OR IMPROVE THEM



#3 - KEEP PARKS FREE TO ENTER



#4 - EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN PARKS FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES



#5 - TACKLE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND CRIME

These top priorities were similar by type of park. However, community park-users were more likely to prioritise anti-social behaviour and crime while major park-users were more likely to prioritise accessibility for disabled people. Interestingly, maintaining or increasing sporting facilities in parks was ranked 14th out of a 15 options, just below the protection of historic features of parks, which was ranked 13th.

Table 2.20 What do you consider to be the three key priorities for your main park?

Priorities	All Leeds parks	Community parks	Major parks
Keep the park clean	1	1	2
Keep open/improve facilities (toilets, cafes)	2	2	1
Remains free to enter	3	3	3
Events/activities for the local community	4	5	4
Tackle anti-social behaviour and crime	5	4	8
User friendly for disabled people	6	10	5
Activities for children and young people	7	6	10
Improve the condition of the paths etc.	8	9	7
Greater personal safety	9	7	12
Dog waste	10	8	11
Increase the presence of park staff	11	12	6
Plant more flowers	12	11	13
Protect or restore historic features	13	15	9
Sports facilities	14	13	15
Encourage more use	15	14	14

2.6 Summary

Not all people chose to visit their local park most often. Indeed, nearly a third selected a park outside of their immediate locality as their main park to use. Greater mobility due to transportation links and vehicle ownership renders accessing parks and other locations at greater distances easier. Overall, the findings suggest that people are attracted to specific parks – as their main park of use – by diverse facilities that meet their needs. Hence, the research shows that well-resourced parks, like Leeds’s flagship Roundhay Park, that are in good condition and have a range of facilities, act as ‘magnets’ attracting visitors from across the city and further afield. Major parks account for over a third of adult visits to parks in Leeds and Roundhay Park emerges as the most visited park by some margin.

Community parks are well-used and frequently visited assets that contribute to the well-being and quality of life of residents. Indeed, the majority of visits to parks each year are made to community parks. Woodhouse Moor, a community park in North East Leeds, stands out as the second most visited park in Leeds. However, community parks were not as highly rated in terms of their condition and quality (both in terms of formal assessments of parks and user-views), and it is evident from the survey findings that visitor experiences and overall satisfaction is lower compared with major parks. We recommend that LCC prioritise resources and seek investment to raise the level of all community parks to LQP standards to ensure that a quality experience of parks is available to all.

3. QUALITY OF PARKS

Of the 70 parks that are managed by Leeds Parks & Countryside Service, all major parks hold Green Flag status, which is ‘the benchmark standard for the management of recreational outdoor spaces across the United Kingdom and around the world’.⁷ In 2016, the Parks & Countryside Service assessed all 63 community parks against an equivalent LQP standard.⁸ Some 41 community parks (65% of the total) met this standard.⁹ Leeds Parks & Countryside Service continues to work towards achieving LQP standards for the remaining 22 community parks. Indeed, a key aim of the Parks and Green Space Strategy for Leeds is for all community parks to reach LQP standards by 2020.¹⁰



**94% OF PARK-USERS CHOSE
A LEEDS QUALITY PARK AS
THEIR MAIN PARK TO USE.
ONLY 6% USUALLY VISIT A PARK
BELOW THESE STANDARDS.**

The analysis presented in this chapter differentiates between and contrasts the experiences of park-users who selected, as their main, a park that meets LQP standards against park-users who selected a park that falls below these quality standards. The chapter is organised into six sections:

- 3.1 Survey responses by park quality
- 3.2 Park use by park quality
- 3.3 Experiences and expectations of park-users by park quality
- 3.4 Overall park-user satisfaction by park quality
- 3.5 Priorities for future by park quality
- 3.6 Summary

3.1 Survey responses by park quality

As shown in Table 3.1, the great majority of survey respondents selected a park that meets recognised standards of quality as their main park to use (94%), suggesting that use of parks across the city is associated with park quality.

Table 3.1 Survey respondents by park quality

Quality of main park	No. Survey responses	% Survey responses
Meets LQP standards	5281	94%
Working towards LQP standard	315	6%
Total	5596	100%

3.2 Park use by park quality

This section presents findings relating to use of parks that meet or fall below LQP quality standards and is organised into the following sub-sections:

- 3.2.1 most visited parks below LQP standards
- 3.2.2 range of parks visited
- 3.2.3 frequency of use
- 3.2.4 reasons for use
- 3.2.5 avoidance
- 3.2.6 use of local park
- 3.2.7 mode and ease of travel

3.2.1 Most visited parks below LQP standards

Table 3.2 highlights that over half of visitors to parks below LQP standards (58%) selected one of four parks as their main park: Rothwell Country Park, Armley Park, Western Flatts Cliff Park, Stanningley Park.¹¹

Table 3.2 What park do you use most often?

Main parks below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard
Rothwell Country Park	79	25%
Armley Park	44	14%
Western Flatts Cliff Park	32	10%
Stanningley Park	27	9%
New Wortley Recreation Ground	23	7%
Drighlington Moor Park	22	7%
Gotts Park	22	7%
The Rein	11	3%
Whinmoor Park, Coal Road	10	3%
Hunslet Moor	9	3%
Grove Hill Park, Otley	8	3%
Allerton Bywater Sports Ground	6	2%
Grove Road Recreation Ground	6	2%
Queen's Park, Pudsey	4	1%
Tyersal Park	4	1%
Kirk Lane Park	3	1%
Hunslet Lake	3	1%
Blenheim Square	2	1%
Total	315	100%

3.2.2 Range of parks visited

The survey asked respondents to identify all of the parks in Leeds that they had visited, at least once, in the preceding year. Table 3.3 reveals that those who normally visited a park below LQP standards were more likely to have visited other parks in the city below quality standards (29%) than those who usually visited a park that meets quality standards (7%).

Table 3.3 What parks in Leeds have you visited in the past year?

Park	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Roundhay Park	147	8.52%	3627	12.99%
Temple Newsam	123	7.13%	2330	8.35%
Kirkstall Abbey	115	6.66%	2088	7.48%
Golden Acre Park	101	5.85%	2619	9.38%
Armley Park	89	5.16%	304	1.09%
Rothwell Country Park	86	4.98%	367	1.31%
Pudsey Park	83	4.81%	709	2.54%
Gotts Park	61	3.53%	242	0.87%
Lotherton Hall	52	3.01%	878	3.15%
Bramley Park	50	2.90%	420	1.50%
New Wortley Recreation Ground	48	2.78%	59	0.21%
Western Flatts Cliff Park	47	2.72%	57	0.20%
Middleton Park	44	2.55%	569	2.04%
Woodhouse Moor	43	2.49%	1298	4.65%
Chevin Forest Park	36	2.09%	1251	4.48%
Farnley Hall Park	36	2.09%	264	0.95%
Stanningley Park	33	1.91%	119	0.43%
Bramley Falls Wood Park	32	1.85%	433	1.55%
Springhead Park	32	1.85%	238	0.85%
Horsforth Hall Park	30	1.74%	866	3.10%
Meanwood Park	30	1.74%	1254	4.49%
New Farnley Park	29	1.68%	134	0.48%
Cross Flatts Park	28	1.62%	307	1.10%
Drighlington Moor Park	26	1.51%	67	0.24%
Grove Hill Park, Otley	16	0.93%	187	0.67%
Tarnfield Park, Yeadon	16	0.93%	611	2.19%
Wharfemeadows Park, Otley	16	0.93%	498	1.78%
Burley Park	15	0.87%	323	1.16%
East End Park	15	0.87%	246	0.88%
Hunslet Moor	15	0.87%	64	0.23%

Potternewton Park	14	0.81%	465	1.67%
Calverley Park (Victoria Park)	13	0.75%	242	0.87%
Scatcherd Park	13	0.75%	185	0.66%
Becketts Park	12	0.70%	577	2.07%
Rodley Park Recreation Ground	12	0.70%	172	0.62%
Manston Park	11	0.64%	271	0.97%
Allerton Bywater Sports Ground	10	0.58%	31	0.11%
Grove Road Recreation Ground	10	0.58%	45	0.16%
Holbeck Moor	10	0.58%	121	0.43%
Holt Park	10	0.58%	182	0.65%
The Rein	10	0.58%	27	0.10%
Whinmoor Park, Coal Road	10	0.58%	64	0.23%
Churwell Park	8	0.46%	93	0.33%
Dartmouth Park	8	0.46%	178	0.64%
The Hollies	8	0.46%	710	2.54%
Blenheim Square	7	0.41%	103	0.37%
Chapel Allerton Park	7	0.41%	497	1.78%
Hunslet Lake	7	0.41%	57	0.20%
Hainsworth Park	5	0.29%	48	0.17%
Harehills Park	5	0.29%	200	0.72%
Micklefield Park, Rawdon	5	0.29%	162	0.58%
Nunroyd Park, Guiseley	5	0.29%	212	0.76%
Glebelands Rec, Ninelands Lane	4	0.23%	109	0.39%
Kirk Lane Park	4	0.23%	64	0.23%
Ley Lane	4	0.23%	8	0.03%
Tyersal Park	4	0.23%	6	0.02%
Lovell Park	3	0.17%	115	0.41%
Westroyd Park	3	0.17%	78	0.28%
Barley Hill Park	2	0.12%	41	0.15%
Cranmore Recreation Ground	2	0.12%	16	0.06%
Guiseley Nethermoor Park	2	0.12%	127	0.45%
Lewisham Park	2	0.12%	48	0.17%
Scarth Gardens	2	0.12%	23	0.08%
Tennant Hall POS	2	0.12%	15	0.05%
Banstead Park	1	0.06%	54	0.19%
Hartley Avenue Park	1	0.06%	12	0.04%
Halton Dene - Primrose Valley	0	0.00%	92	0.33%
Nowell Mount	0	0.00%	15	0.05%
Penny Pocket Park	0	0.00%	27	0.10%
Total	1730	100%	27921	100%
Parks below LQP standard	494	29%	1952	7%

3.2.3 Frequency of use of by park quality

The survey asked how often respondents visited their main park in the summer. As Table 3.4 demonstrates, those who normally visited a park below LQP standards were

more likely to be high-frequency visitors than those who normally visited a park that meets these standards (61% and 49% respectively). On the one hand, this suggests that the quality of park does not adversely affect the level of park use in the summer when demand is high. On the other hand, it also supports and reinforces Leeds Parks & Countryside Service's target to ensure that all community parks are of LQP standards given that they can receive high use by some park-users, particularly during summer months.

Table 3.4 How often do you visit your main park in the summer?

Frequency of use	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Low-frequency visitors	35	11%	738	14%
Medium-frequency visitors	84	28%	1898	37%
High-frequency visitors	187	61%	2561	49%
Total	306	100%	5197	100%

High-frequency visitors = use their main park almost every day / once or twice per week

Medium-frequency visitors = use their main park once every two weeks / once a month

Low-frequency visitors = use their main park less than once a month / seldom

3.2.4 Reasons for visiting by park quality

The survey asked respondents to identify the top five reasons they visited their main park. As Table 3.9 shows, these reasons were similar across park-users irrespective of whether their park is below or meets LQP standards.

Table 3.9 What are your main reasons for visiting your main park?

Reasons for use	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	Rank	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	Rank
Get some fresh air	216	1	3662	1
For a walk	179	2	3206	2
Enjoy nature	127	3	2749	3
Relax or think in peace and quiet	120	4	2113	4
Walk the dog	89	5	Not in top five	
Family outing	Not in top five		1283	5

3.2.5 Avoidance by park quality

Table 3.5 shows similar levels of avoidance by park-users, irrespective of whether their main park is below or meets LQP standards.

Table 3.5 Are there times of the day or week at which you avoid visiting your main park?

Avoidance	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Never thought about it	85	28%	1526	29%
No	141	46%	2309	44%
Yes	82	27%	1385	27%
Total	308	101%¹²	5220	100%

3.2.6 Use of local parks by park quality

The survey asked respondents to indicate if their main park was the closest park to where they live. Table 3.6 reveals that park-users who normally visited a park below LQP standards were more likely to select the park closest to where they live (84%) than park-users who normally visited a park that meets LQP standards (68%).

Table 3.6 Is the park you most often use, the closest park to where you live?

Closest park	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
No	48	16%	1691	32%
Yes	261	84%	3530	68%
Total	309	100%	5221	100%

3.2.7 Mode and ease of travel to parks

As Table 3.7 highlights, visitors to parks below LQP standards were much more likely to walk to get to their main park (71%) than visitors to parks that meet quality standards (48%). This may be because it was also more likely to be the closest park to where they live. Nevertheless, visitors to parks that meet LQP standard found it just as easy to travel to their park (see Table 3.8).

Table 3.7 How would you normally travel to your main park?

Mode of travel	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Walk	223	71%	2540	48%
Car	58	18%	2238	42%
Bus	7	2%	176	3%
Bicycle	6	2%	116	2%
Motorcycle	0	0%	5	0%
Left blank/Other	3	1%	23	0%
Total	18	6%	183	3%

Table 3.8 How easy is it for you to travel to your main park?

Ease of travel	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standard	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standard
Easy	246	79%	3986	76%
Quite Easy	54	17%	1095	21%
Quite Difficult	13	4%	136	3%
Difficult	0	0%	31	1%
Total	313	100%	5248	100%

3.3 Experiences and expectations of parks by park quality

This section presents findings relating to visitors to parks that either meet or fall below LQP standards rated:

- 3.3.1 their experience of use
- 3.3.2 their feelings of safety
- 3.3.3 the current and expected condition of their main park
- 3.3.4 the importance of spending time in their main park to their quality of life

3.3.1 Experiences by park quality

As Table 3.9 highlights, a lower proportion of visitors to parks below LQP standards rated the last visit to their park as 'very pleasant' (59%) compared with visitors to parks that meet LQP standards (79%). The former were also slightly more likely to rate the last visit to their park as somewhat unpleasant.

Table 3.9 How pleasant was your last experience visiting your main park?

Pleasantness of experience	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Very pleasant	186	59%	4141	79%
Somewhat pleasant	106	34%	959	18%
Somewhat unpleasant	19	6%	136	3%
Very unpleasant	2	1%	29	1%
Total	313	100%	5265	100%

3.3.2 Feelings of safety when visiting by park quality

Table 3.10 shows that a lower proportion of visitors to parks below LQP standards felt 'very safe' (41%) compared with visitors to parks that meet these standards (58%).

Table 3.10 How safe do you feel visiting your main park during the day?

Feelings of safety - day	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Very safe	128	41%	3057	58%
Fairly safe	141	45%	1792	34%
Never thought about it	36	11%	327	6%
Fairly unsafe	5	2%	51	1%
Very unsafe	4	1%	9	0%
Total	314	100%	5236	100%

Table 3.11 reveals that the majority of park-users did not visit their park after dark, irrespective of whether they normally visited a park that is below or meets quality standards. In general, those people who did visit their main park after dark were more likely to say they felt fairly or very unsafe than fairly or very safe.

Table 3.11 How safe do you feel visiting your main park after dark?

Feelings of safety – after dark	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Do not visit after dark	187	60%	3316	63%
My park is not open	2	1%	71	1%
Very safe	8	3%	141	3%
Fairly safe	34	11%	544	10%
Never thought about it	33	11%	459	9%
Fairly unsafe	26	8%	445	8%
Very unsafe	23	7%	267	5%
Total	313	100%	5243	100%

3.3.3 Condition of parks

Unsurprisingly, Table 3.12 shows that a higher proportion of visitors to parks below LQP standards rated their park in ‘poor’ or ‘fair’ condition (37%) compared with visitors to parks that meet quality standards (11%). However, some 63% of visitors to parks below LQP standards rated their main park in ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ condition compared with 89% of visitors to parks that meet quality standards. This may be because park-users take into consideration certain aspects of the park condition when determining their responses to this question; they may not necessarily have considered all of the criteria identified in the LQP standard.

Table 3.12 How do you rate the current condition of your main park?

Current condition	No. Park-users who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% Park-users who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. Park-users who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% Park-users who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Excellent	45	14%	1842	35%
Good	155	49%	2832	54%
Fair	84	27%	529	10%
Poor	30	10%	73	1%
Total	314	100%	5276	100%

As Table 3.13 indicates, visitors to parks below LQP standards were less likely to expect the condition of their park to improve (18%) and were more likely to expect the

condition of their main park to decline (21%) than visitors to parks that meet quality standards (25% and 11% respectively). However, the most common expectation for both groups of respondents is that their park will remain in the same condition. This, of course, may mean something slightly different to each group.

Table 3.13 In the next three years, how do you expect the condition of your main park to change?

Expected change to condition	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Improve	57	18%	1324	25%
Remain the same	143	46%	2760	52%
Decline	67	21%	600	11%
I'm not sure	47	15%	590	11%
Total	314	100%	5274	100%

3.3.4 Importance of parks to quality of life

The differential experiences of these two groups of respondents may partly inform and explain the quality of life ratings observed. While both groups expressed that spending time in their park is important to their own quality of life, Table 3.14 indicates that visitors to parks below LQP standards most commonly said that it was 'fairly important', while visitors to parks that meet quality standards most commonly said that it was 'very important'.



VISITORS TO LEEDS QUALITY PARKS WERE **MORE LIKELY** TO RATE SPENDING TIME IN THEIR PARK AS IMPORTANT TO **THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE** THAN VISITORS TO PARKS **BELOW** THIS STANDARD.

Table 3.14 In terms of your own quality of life, how important is spending time in your main park?

Importance to quality of life	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Essential	58	19%	1060	21%
Very important	87	29%	1993	39%
Fairly important	121	40%	1622	31%
Not very important	33	11%	421	8%
Not important at all	4	1%	59	1%
Total	303	100%	5155	100%

3.4 Overall satisfaction by park quality

Table 3.15 shows that a much lower proportion of visitors to parks below LQP standards were 'very satisfied' with their park overall (15%) compared with visitors to parks that meet quality standards (45%). They were also more likely to be 'very dissatisfied' (10%).

Table 3.15 How satisfied overall are you with your main park?

Overall satisfaction	No. who most often visit a park below LQP standard	% who most often visit a park below LQP standard	No. who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards	% who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Very dissatisfied	30	10%	62	1%
Dissatisfied	4	1%	22	0%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	51	16%	351	7%
Satisfied	182	58%	2477	47%
Very satisfied	46	15%	2339	45%
Total	313	100%	5251	100%

3.5 Priorities for the future by park quality

Table 3.16 shows park-user priorities in rank order. Visitors to parks below LQP standards and visitors to parks that meet quality standards shared some top priorities. These were to keep parks clean and to ensure they remain free to enter. Aside from these similarities, the former were more likely to prioritise crime and anti-social behaviour, personal safety and the condition of paths, gates and park infrastructure. Whereas, the latter were more likely to prioritise the maintenance of existing facilities, events and activities for local communities and accessibility for disabled people.

Table 3.16 What do you consider to be the three key priorities for your main park?

Priorities	Those who most often visit a park below LQP standards	Those who most often visit a park that meets GF/LQP standards
Keep the park clean	1	1
Park remains free to enter	2	3
Anti-social behaviour and crime	3	6
Greater personal safety	4	10
Condition of the paths etc.	5	8
Dog waste	6	11
Activities for children and young people	7	7
Facilities kept open or improved (toilets, cafes)	8	2
Events and activities	9	4
User friendly for disabled people	10	5
Flower planting	11	12
Presence of park staff	12	9
Sports facilities	13	13
Encourage park use	14	14
Historic features	15	517

3.6 Summary

The research highlights the importance of accessible, good quality parks and green spaces throughout the city. Our survey findings indicate that those public parks which meet quality standards are linked with enriched visitor experiences and well-being; people are more satisfied, feel safer and are more likely to say that spending time in parks is very important to their quality of life than people who usually visit a park that that was below these standards.

In the current context of cuts to local authority park budgets, there is evident potential for these differential experiences to widen between those whose main park is, on the one hand, below LQP standard and, on the other hand, those for whom their main park meets or exceeds quality standards. Without significant efforts to counteract such a development, the formal quality of a park may come to inform and constitute park-users' experiences in ways that result in a bifurcated differentiation of parks.

We recommend targeting available funds at parks in the city that do not yet reach LQP standards, yet we recognise that there are resourcing implications and other challenges. One important source of funding for parks and open spaces is provided under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Under this Act, developers may be required to contribute towards improvements to local open spaces as a result of new demands deriving from the development taking place. The report following the Communities and Local Government Select Committee inquiry into the future of public parks recommended that greater flexibility be made of this funding in

order to improve the quality of parks.¹³ Specifically, it recommended that local authorities be allowed to use Section 106 funds for revenue requirements, where currently these funds are limited to capital projects. Such an approach responds to the challenges by local authorities of on-going running costs required to maintain existing park facilities.

Section 106 developer contributions are usually directed to improvements within close proximity to the development, to mitigate its effects. However, parks located in areas that lack housing development have limited scope for improvement from such planning gains. While the research did not explicitly consider how parks across the city are funded, it highlights a strong case for spreading the benefits from Section 106 contributions beyond the immediate area where development is located, especially where this benefits lower quality parks in other parts of the city, thus helping to ensure that a quality park experience is available to all. The first step may be to improve the facilities at the busiest parks which below this standard.

4. COMMUNITY COMMITTEE AREAS

Community committees are part of the Council's decision-making processes; their function is to operate as a forum to give local people a say over their community, including their local parks and green spaces. This chapter differentiates between and contrasts the experiences of park-users who selected a park located within each of the ten community committee areas.¹⁴ Throughout, it provides comparisons with the averages for all respondents. The chapter is organised into seven sections:

- 4.1 Survey responses by community committee area
- 4.2 Use of parks by community committee area
- 4.3 Experiences and expectations of park-users by community committee area
- 4.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by community committee area
- 4.5 Priorities for the future of parks by community committee area
- 4.6 Profile of park-users by community committee area
- 4.7 Summary

4.1 Survey responses by community committee area

It is important to note that the quantity and quality of parks and green space provision varies by community committee area which is likely to explain at least some differences between them. Some committee areas also received a lower response, and findings for these areas should be treated as indicative of park-users views.¹⁵ As highlighted in Table 4.1, all major parks hold Green Flag status and, in 2016, 65% of community parks were assessed as meeting LQP standards. At the time of the survey, the pass rate ranged from 57% in North East Inner and West Inner to 100% in North East Inner.¹⁶

Table 4.1 Park profile and survey responses by community committee

Community committee	No. of community parks	Meet LQP standard in 2016		Major parks (GF)	Total no. of parks	Survey respondents who selected a park in this community committee
East Inner	5	3	60%	0	5	88
East Outer	7	4	57%	1	8	565
North East Inner	4	4	100%	1	5	1819
North East Outer	0	NA	NA	1	1	410
North West Inner	8	5	63%	0	8	428
North West Outer	8	6	75%	1	9	591
South Inner	5	3	60%	1	6	294
South Outer	9	6	67%	0	9	371
West Inner	7	4	57%	1	8	486
West Outer	10	6	60%	1	11	467
All Leeds parks	63	41	65%	7	70	5759

4.2 Use of parks by community committee area

This section presents findings relating to the use of parks in each of the community committee areas and is organised into the following sub-sections:

- 3.6.1 estimated total adult visits
- 3.6.2 frequency of park use
- 3.6.3 length of stay
- 3.6.4 avoidance
- 3.6.5 mode and ease of travel

4.2.1 Total adult visits to parks by community committee area

The methodology for estimating total adult visits can be applied to individual parks, and combined to provide a total for each of the community committee areas. However, since the methodology is based on extrapolating from the frequency with which a respondent visited their main park, some estimates are not reliable given the small number of respondents who selected particular parks. Individual park-based visitor estimates may not be reliable where they are calculated using a sample of respondents below 100. Table 4.2 provides estimates of total annual adult visits for parks located in each of the community committee areas using a coloured key to indicate the reliability of the estimate. Appendix D provides site-based estimates. Given the diverse profile of parks in each of the community committee areas, it is not appropriate to compare totals.

Table 4.2 Estimated Annual Adult Visits by Community Committee

Community committee	Total Annual Adult Visits – Community parks	Total Annual Adult Visits – all parks
East Inner	1,096,403	1,096,403
East Outer	1,202,163	3,554,524
North East Inner	3,766,907	13,051,625
North East Outer	1,755,117	1,755,117
North West Inner	4,899,115	4,899,115
North West Outer	4,204,388	4,826,873
South Inner	1,382,308	2,411,649
South Outer	3,289,096	3,289,096
West Inner	3,515,609	4,657,186
West Outer	4,756,892	5,135,621
All Leeds parks	28,027,074	44,591,401

KEY

- 100> responses – estimates are reliable
- 20 - 99 responses – estimates may be reliable
- <19 responses – estimates are not reliable

4.2.2 Frequency of park use by community committee area

As Tables 4.3 and 4.4 show, East Outer, North East Inner, South Inner and North East Outer had a lower proportion of high-frequency visitors in the summer and the winter months, compared with all respondents. By contrast, East Inner and North West Inner had a higher proportion of high-frequency visitors in the summer and the winter months, compared with all respondents.

Table 4.3 How often do you visit your main park in the summer?

Community committee	Summer					
	High		Medium		Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
East Inner (n=88)	62	70%	19	22%	6	7%
East Outer (n=565)	210	37%	230	41%	115	20%
North East Inner (n=1819)	867	48%	661	36%	265	15%
North East Outer (n=410)	110	27%	207	51%	90	22%
North West Inner (n=428)	274	64%	109	25%	38	9%
North West Outer (n=591)	306	52%	208	35%	67	11%
South Inner (n=294)	142	48%	103	35%	40	14%
South Outer (n=371)	199	54%	125	34%	39	11%
West Inner (n=486)	273	56%	145	30%	57	11%
West Outer (n=467)	280	60%	142	30%	40	9%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	2849	50%	2022	35%	795	14%

Table 4.4 How often do you visit your main park in the winter?

Community committee	Winter					
	High		Medium		Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
East Inner (n=88)	49	56%	15	17%	19	22%
East Outer (n= 565)	144	26%	183	32%	223	40%
North East Inner (n=1819)	488	32%	662	36%	548	30%
North East Outer (n=410)	71	17%	173	42%	162	40%
North West Inner (n=428)	202	47%	107	25%	113	56%
North West Outer (n=591)	215	36%	226	22%	139	24%
South Inner (n=294)	107	36%	92	31%	87	30%
South Outer (n=371)	133	36%	122	33%	109	29%
West Inner (n=486)	190	39%	158	33%	130	27%
West Outer (n=467)	193	41%	155	33%	113	24%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	1973	35%	1964	35%	1724	30%

High-frequency visitors = use their main park almost every day / once or twice per week

Medium-frequency visitors = use their main park once every two weeks / once a month

Low-frequency visitors = use their main park less than once a month / seldom

4.2.3 Length of stay in parks by community committee area

The survey asked how long respondents normally stayed in the summer months. As Table 4.5 shows, park-users normally stayed in their park for between 30 minutes and 2 hours. A fifth of park-users in North West Inner reported visiting for less than 30 minutes, which was higher than for other community committee areas and the average for all respondents.

Table 4.5 How long do you normally stay in the summer?

Community committee	<30 Mins	30mins-1 hour	1-2 hours	2-4 hours	4> hours
East Inner (n=88)	13%	47%	26%	8%	2%
East Outer (n= 565)	4%	25%	43%	23%	3%
North East Inner (n=1819)	3%	22%	50%	21%	3%
North East Outer (n=410)	1%	27%	53%	17%	1%
North West Inner (n=428)	20%	37%	28%	11%	3%
North West Outer (n=591)	9%	36%	42%	12%	1%
South Inner (n=294)	10%	31%	39%	18%	2%
South Outer (n=371)	12%	42%	35%	8%	2%
West Inner (n=486)	15%	41%	32%	9%	2%
West Outer (n=467)	15%	43%	30%	10%	1%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	8%	31%	41%	16%	2%

4.2.4 Avoidance of parks by community committee area

The survey asked if visitors avoided their main park at certain times of the day or week. As highlighted in Table 4.6, park-users in East Inner, North West Inner, South Inner and West Inner were more likely to say that they had avoided their park at certain times of the day or week, compared with all respondents.

Table 4.6 Are there any times of the day or week in which you avoid visiting your main park?

Community committee	Avoid %
East Inner (n=88)	34%
East Outer (n= 565)	22%
North East Inner (n=1819)	26%
North East Outer (n=410)	26%
North West Inner (n=428)	39%
North West Outer (n=591)	18%
South Inner (n=294)	35%
South Outer (n=371)	19%
West Inner (n=486)	32%
West Outer (n=467)	24%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	26%

4.2.5 Mode and ease of travel by community committee area

In Leeds, park-users generally walk (50%) or drive (40%) to their main park. Table 4.7 shows variation in how park-users normally travel to parks in each of the community committee areas. A higher proportion of park-users walked to their park in Inner Areas (65%) compared with Outer Areas (45%). A higher proportion of park-users drove rather than walked to their park in East Outer, North East Outer and North East Inner.

Table 4.7 How would you normally travel to your main park?

Community committee	Walk %	Car %
East Inner (n=88)	78%	9%
East Outer (n= 565)	38%	52%
North East Inner (n=1819)	41%	48%
North East Outer (n=410)	13%	78%
North West Inner (n=428)	78%	14%
North West Outer (n=591)	52%	42%
South Inner (n=294)	56%	30%
South Outer (n=371)	55%	35%
West Inner (n=486)	71%	20%
West Outer (n=467)	66%	25%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	50%	40%
Inner Areas	65%	24%
Outer Areas	45%	46%

Most Leeds park-users (96%) found it easy or quite easy to get to their park. As Table 4.8 demonstrates, there was little difference between park-users in each of the community committee areas. Park-users in East Inner were most likely to say their main park is easy to get to.

Table 4.8 How easy is it for you to travel to your main park?

Community committee	Ease of travel			
	Easy %	Quite easy %	Quite difficult %	Difficult %
East Inner (n=88)	86%	10%	1%	1%
East Outer (n= 565)	72%	24%	3%	1%
North East Inner (n=1819)	72%	23%	4%	1%
North East Outer (n=410)	72%	25%	2%	0%
North West Inner (n=428)	79%	19%	1%	1%
North West Outer (n=591)	78%	19%	3%	0%
South Inner (n=294)	76%	19%	3%	0%
South Outer (n=371)	77%	19%	3%	1%
West Inner (n=486)	82%	16%	1%	0%
West Outer (n=467)	82%	14%	2%	1%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	76%	20%	3%	1%

4.3 Experiences and expectations by community committee area

This section presents findings relating to how park-users in each of the community committee areas rated:

4.3.1 their experience of use

4.3.2 their feelings of safety

4.3.3 the current and expected condition of their main park

4.3.4 the importance of spending time in their main park to their quality of life

4.3.1 Pleasantness of experience by community committee area

The survey asked respondents to rate the last to their park in terms of its pleasantness. In Leeds, 77% of park-users rated the last visit to their main park as 'very pleasant'. As revealed in Table 4.9, there was variation in experiences of park-users by community committee area. Park-users in East Inner were much less likely to rate the last visit to their park as very pleasant (52%). They were also slightly more likely to rate the last visit to their park as somewhat or very unpleasant (15%). By contrast, park-users in North East Inner and North East Outer were most likely to report very pleasant experiences (85% and 90% respectively).

Table 4.9 How pleasant was your last experience visiting your main park?

Community committee	Last visit			
	Very pleasant %	Somewhat pleasant %	Somewhat unpleasant %	Very unpleasant %
East Inner (n=88)	52%	33%	10%	5%
East Outer (n= 565)	77%	19%	3%	1%
North East Inner (n=1819)	85%	13%	2%	0%
North East Outer (n=410)	90%	9%	1%	0%
North West Inner (n=428)	70%	28%	2%	0%
North West Outer (n=591)	76%	20%	3%	1%
South Inner (n=294)	65%	26%	7%	1%
South Outer (n=371)	71%	25%	3%	1%
West Inner (n=486)	67%	28%	3%	0%
West Outer (n=467)	72%	24%	4%	0%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	77%	19%	3%	1%

4.3.2 Feelings of safety visiting parks by community committee area

The survey asked respondents to rate their feelings of safety when visiting their main park in the daytime. In Leeds, 91% of park-users felt either 'very safe' or 'fairly safe' visiting their main park. Park-users in East Inner and South Inner were much less likely to report feeling 'very safe' (20% and 32% respectively), compared with the average for

all respondents (57%). They were also slightly more likely to say they felt fairly or very unsafe (8% and 5% respectively) compared with all respondents (1%).

Table 4.10 How safe do you feel visiting your main park during the day?

Community committee	Safety – day				
	Very safe %	Fairly safe %	Never thought about it %	Fairly unsafe %	Very unsafe %
East Inner (n=88)	20%	58%	14%	7%	1%
East Outer (n= 565)	55%	33%	9%	1%	0%
North East Inner (n=1819)	59%	34%	5%	1%	0%
North East Outer (n=410)	65%	29%	6%	0	0
North West Inner (n=428)	57%	38%	4%	1%	0
North West Outer (n=591)	68%	27%	4%	0	0
South Inner (n=294)	32%	53%	9%	4%	1%
South Outer (n=371)	53%	36%	9%	1%	0%
West Inner (n=486)	50%	39%	7%	2%	0%
West Outer (n=467)	58%	31%	9%	1%	0%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	57%	34%	6%	1%	0%

4.3.3 Condition of parks by community committee area

Some 33% of Leeds park-users rated their main park in ‘excellent’ condition. As revealed by Table 4.11, parks-users in East Inner, North West Inner South Inner and West Inner were least likely to rate their park in excellent condition, compared to the average for all respondents. These park-users were also more likely to rate their park in fair or poor condition.

Table 4.11 How do you rate the current condition of your main park?

Community committee	Condition			
	Excellent %	Good %	Fair %	Poor %
East Inner (n=88)	8%	51%	30%	11%
East Outer (n= 565)	40%	49%	10%	1%
North East Inner (n=1819)	41%	52%	7%	0%
North East Outer (n=410)	49%	47%	4%	0%
North West Inner (n=428)	18%	59%	18%	4%
North West Outer (n=591)	28%	59%	11%	2%
South Inner (n=294)	24%	55%	15%	5%
South Outer (n=371)	26%	59%	13%	2%
West Inner (n=486)	22%	56%	18%	4%
West Outer (n=467)	31%	52%	14%	2%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	33%	53%	11%	2%

Leeds park-users generally expected that their park condition would ‘remain the same’ over the next three years (52%). As Table 4.12 indicates, park-users in East Inner were the least optimistic, with 18% of visitors expecting decline compared with the 12% average for all respondents. Park-users in South Inner were most optimistic about the condition of their park improving (35%), compared to the 25% average for all respondents.

Table 4.12 In the next three years, how do you expect the condition of your main park to change?

Community committee	Park-User Expectations			
	Improve %	Remain the same %	Decline %	Not sure %
East Inner (n=88)	25%	35%	18%	22%
East Outer (n= 565)	23%	57%	9%	11%
North East Inner (n=1819)	24%	53%	13%	10%
North East Outer (n=410)	30%	54%	7%	9%
North West Inner (n=428)	22%	49%	16%	12%
North West Outer (n=591)	26%	51%	11%	12%
South Inner (n=294)	35%	41%	10%	14%
South Outer (n=371)	23%	49%	14%	13%
West Inner (n=486)	20%	53%	14%	12%
West Outer (n=467)	22%	55%	11%	12%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	25%	52%	12%	11%

4.3.4 Importance of parks to quality of life by community committee area

In Leeds, 57% of park-users said that spending time in their park was either ‘very important’ or ‘essential’ to their own quality of life and a further 31% rated it as ‘fairly important’. As demonstrated in Table 4.13 there was some variation by community committee area. Despite the differential experiences of park-users in East Inner, they are just as likely to rate spending time in their park as important to their own quality of life (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13 In terms of your own quality of life, how important is spending time in your main park?

Community committee	Importance to Own Quality of Life			
	Essential %	Very important %	Fairly important %	Not (very) important %
East Inner (n=88)	24%	27%	36%	8%
East Outer (n= 565)	15%	36%	35%	11%
North East Inner (n=1819)	23%	41%	27%	8%
North East Outer (n=410)	15%	34%	36%	12%
North West Inner (n=428)	22%	33%	31%	14%
North West Outer (n=591)	22%	39%	30%	6%
South Inner (n=294)	17%	36%	32%	12%
South Outer (n=371)	18%	36%	34%	9%
West Inner (n=486)	24%	32%	34%	1%
West Outer (n=467)	16%	37%	36%	10%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	20%	37%	31%	9%

4.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by community committee area

As shown in Table 4.14, user-satisfaction varied between community committee areas, from 9% very satisfied in East Inner to 62% in North East Outer. While major parks located in some community committee areas may skew these findings, Table 4.15 shows that user-satisfaction with community parks also varied between community committee areas, from 9% very satisfied in East Inner to 49% in North East Inner.

Table 4.14 What is your overall impression of your main park?

Community committee	Satisfaction of All Parks				
	Very satisfied %	Satisfied %	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied %	Very dissatisfied %
East Inner (n=88)	9%	55%	26%	6%	2%
East Outer (n= 565)	42%	48%	7%	1%	1%
North East Inner (n=1819)	53%	41%	4%	1%	0%
North East Outer (n=410)	62%	36%	2%	1%	0%
North West Inner (n=428)	28%	57%	10%	3%	1%
North West Outer (n=591)	41%	51%	6%	1%	0%
South Inner (n=294)	32%	50%	13%	3%	1%
South Outer (n=371)	29%	57%	11%	2%	1%
West Inner (n=486)	31%	53%	12%	3%	1%
West Outer (n=467)	35%	52%	9%	3%	0%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	42%	48%	7%	2%	1%

Table 4.15 What is your overall impression of your main park?

Community committee	Satisfaction of Community Parks				
	Very satisfied %	Satisfied %	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied %	Dissatisfied %	Very dissatisfied %
East Inner (n=88)	9%	55%	26%	6%	2%
East Outer (n= 565)	11%	61%	25%	2%	1%
North East Inner (n=1819)	49%	44%	5%	1%	0%
North East Outer (n=410)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North West Inner (n=428)	28%	57%	10%	3%	1%
North West Outer (n=591)	37%	54%	7%	1%	0%
South Inner (n=294)	18%	53%	20%	6%	3%
South Outer (n=371)	29%	57%	11%	2%	1%
West Inner (n=486)	21%	58%	15%	4%	1%
West Outer (n=467)	35%	52%	9%	3%	0%
All Leeds parks (n=5595)	42%	48%	7%	2%	1%
Community parks (n=2761)	31%	54%	11%	3%	1%

4.5 Priorities for parks by community committee area

Table 4.16 What do you consider to be the three key priorities for your main park?

Priorities	East Inner	East Outer	North East Inner	North East Outer	North West Inner	North West Outer	South Inner	South Outer	West Inner	West Outer	All Leeds
Keep the park clean	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Keep open/improve facilities	8	1	1	1	5	2	1	2	3	2	2
Remains free to enter	11	2	3	3	2	3	5	3	2	3	3
Events/activities for the local community	10	4	4	14	8	4	4	4	4	6	4
Tackle anti-social behaviour and crime	2	6	10	10	6	9	3	6	5	4	5
User friendly for disabled people	5	5	6	4	13	7	8	8	13	8	6
Activities for children and young people	12	7	8	9	12	6	9	5	8	5	7
Improve the condition of the paths etc.	9	12	7	6	4	8	11	10	7	10	8
Greater personal safety	3	10	9	11	3	10	6	9	6	9	9
Dog waste	4	9	12	5	10	5	10	7	9	7	10
Increase the presence of park staff	7	8	5	7	9	11	7	12	12	11	11
Plant more flowers	6	13	13	8	7	12	12	11	10	12	12
Protect or restore historic features	15	11	11	13	15	13	15	15	11	14	13
Sports facilities	13	14	15	15	11	14	14	13	15	13	14
Encourage more use	14	15	14	12	14	15	13	14	14	15	15

As Table 4.16 above reveals, visitor priorities for parks in each community committee area varied. Presented in rank order, the top three priorities for all Leeds parks – to keep parks clean, to maintain or improve existing facilities and to ensure parks remain free to enter - are the same for most community committee areas except East Inner, North West Inner and South Inner. In these community committee areas, anti-social behaviour, crime and personal safety were thought to be higher priorities.

4.6 Park-user profile by community committee area

There was some variation in the profile of visitors to parks located in each of the community committee areas. Tables 3-6 give a breakdown of the profile park-users by age group, disability and student-status.

Table 4.17 indicates that community committee areas vary in their proportion of park-users by age group, when compared with the average for all Leeds parks. Those shaded pink are above the Leeds average. Inner Areas generally have a higher proportion of park-users below the age of 44 while Outer Areas generally have a slightly higher proportion of park-users above the age of 55.

Table 4.7 Which of the following best describes your age?

Community committee	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	>75	Total
East Inner (n=88)	5%	11%	22%	20%	15%	20%	7%	100%
East Outer (n= 565)	1%	8%	16%	18%	22%	23%	11%	100%
North East Inner (n=1819)	2%	13%	20%	18%	21%	18%	6%	100%
North East Outer (n=410)	1%	9%	12%	12%	23%	30%	13%	100%
North West Inner (n=428)	21%	24%	16%	15%	14%	7%	2%	100%
North West Outer (n=591)	1%	9%	18%	19%	22%	22%	9%	100%
South Inner (n=294)	2%	12%	16%	20%	22%	16%	10%	100%
South Outer (n=371)	1%	10%	19%	17%	18%	22%	13%	100%
West Inner (n=486)	4%	19%	21%	16%	18%	16%	5%	100%
West Outer (n=467)	1%	12%	16%	18%	18%	21%	13%	100%
All Leeds parks (n=5759)	3%	13%	18%	18%	20%	19%	8%	100%
Inner Areas (n=3115)	7%	16%	19%	18%	18%	15%	6%	100%
Outer Areas (n=2404)	1%	10%	16%	17%	21%	24%	12%	100%

Table 4.18 below indicates, East Inner, South Inner and South Outer had a slightly higher proportion of disabled park-users when compared with the average for Leeds parks.

Table 4.18 Do you have a disability that affects your access to or use of parks?

Community committee	Disabled park-users %
East Inner (n=88)	9%
East Outer (n= 565)	6%
North East Inner (n=1819)	7%
North East Outer (n=410)	8%
North West Inner (n=428)	5%
North West Outer (n=591)	5%
South Inner (n=294)	11%
South Outer (n=371)	10%
West Inner (n=486)	5%
West Outer (n=467)	7%
All Leeds parks (n=388)	7%

Table 4.19 indicates that North West Inner and West Inner had a higher proportion of student park-users, when compared with the average for Leeds parks.

Table 4.19 Are you a student in further or higher education?

Community committee	Student park-users %
East Inner (n=88)	3%
East Outer (n= 565)	3%
North East Inner (n=1819)	5%
North East Outer (n=410)	2%
North West Inner (n=428)	29%
North West Outer (n=591)	2%
South Inner (n=294)	5%
South Outer (n=371)	4%
West Inner (n=486)	9%
West Outer (n=467)	1%
All Leeds parks (n=343)	6%

4.7 Summary

The variations observed in relation to people's views of their visits to parks, feelings of safety, avoidance, ratings of park condition and expectations for the future, taken together, suggest that park-users have a differential experience of parks across the city. We recommend that LCC further investigate why there are disparities in park-users' experiences of parks across community committee areas, which may not simply be about the profile and quality of parks in each area, with a view to taking any actions that would reduce these disparities.

PART TWO: PARK-USER PROFILES

5. AGE GROUP

This chapter provides an analysis of the survey findings with regard to age group. Due to a limited response from young people aged 18 and below, the analysis presented in differentiates between and contrasts the experiences of park-users aged 19 and over.

The chapter is organised into six sections:

- 5.1 Survey respondents by age group
- 5.2 Use and non-use of parks by age group
- 5.3 Experiences and expectations of park-users by age group
- 5.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by age group
- 5.5 Priorities for the future of parks by age group
- 5.6 Summary

5.1 Survey respondents by age group

The survey asked respondents to identify their age group. Table 5.1 shows the percentage of survey respondents in each age group compared with the percentage of Leeds population based on mid-year estimates from 2016.¹⁷ The majority of survey respondents were aged 35–74.

Table 5.1 Which of the following categories best describes your age?

Age group	No. Survey responses by age group	% Survey responses by age group	% of Leeds population (mid-year estimates, 2016)
Left blank	77	N/A	N/A
0–11	0	N/A	15%
12–18	66	1%	7%
19–24	199	3%	12%
25–34	759	12%	15%
35–44	1071	17%	13%
45–54	1105	17%	13%
55–64	1261	20%	10%
65–74	1237	19%	8%
75>	657	10%	7%
Total	6432	100%	100%

5.2. Use and non-use of parks by age group

This section presents findings relating to use and non-use of parks by people of different age groups and is organised into the following sub-sections:

- 5.2.1 non-use
- 5.2.2 average number of parks visited
- 5.2.3 range of parks visited
- 5.2.4 most visited parks

- 5.2.5 frequency of park use
- 5.2.6 reasons for using parks
- 5.2.7 avoidance of parks
- 5.2.8 use of local park
- 5.2.9 mode and ease of travel to parks

5.2.1 Non-use of parks by age group

The survey reveals that people of certain groups use parks less. Table 5.2 shows that people aged over 75 were significantly less likely to have visited a park in the preceding year. It is notable that 77% of people aged over 75 had visited a park, much lower than the average of 91% for all respondents. By contrast, nearly all people aged 25–44 had visited a park in the preceding year.



PEOPLE AGED OVER 75 AND
DISABLED PEOPLE WERE
SIGNIFICANTLY LESS LIKELY
TO HAVE VISITED A PARK IN
THE PRECEDING YEAR.

Table 5.2 Have you visited a park in Leeds in the past year?

Age group	No. Survey responses by age group	No. Never visit	% Never visit
19–24	196	18	9%
25–34	755	24	3%
35–44	1070	18	2%
45–54	1089	75	7%
55–64	1253	95	8%
65–74	1226	112	9%
75>	651	151	23%

5.2.2 Average number of parks visited by age group

The survey asked respondents to identify all of the parks in the city that they had visited, at least once, in the preceding year. Table 5.3 shows that, on average, park-users aged 19–24 and those aged over 75 visited fewer parks than people in other age groups. By contrast, park-users aged 25–44 visited more parks, on average, than other age groups.

Table 5.3 Average number of parks visited in the preceding year

Age group	Parks visited
19–24	3.73
25–34	5.37
35–44	5.83
45–54	4.95
55–64	4.79
65–74	4.59
75>	3.38

5.2.3 Range of parks visited across the city by age group

Table 5.4 identifies the top ten parks visited by park-users of different age groups in rank order. There was much similarity in the most popular parks visited across age groups (shaded pink). Nevertheless, there were some parks that were more commonly selected by either older age groups or young adults. This may relate to what features/facilities are available within the park. Those that were not in the top ten for each age group are shaded blue.

Table 5.4 Which parks in Leeds have you visited in the past year?

Park	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Roundhay Park	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Woodhouse Moor	1	2	5	5	5	8	
Pudsey Park			10	10	10	9	5
Middleton Park							9
Meanwood Park	5	6	6	7	7	6	
Kirkstall Abbey	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
Horsforth Hall Park	10	8	8	8		10	6
Temple Newsam	7	5	4	3	3	3	3
Golden Acre Park	4	4	2	2	2	2	2
Burley Park	6						
Chevin Forest Park	8	7	7	6	6	5	8
Becketts Park	9	9					
The Hollies					9		
Lotherton		10	9	9	8	7	7
Tarnfield Park							10

5.2.4 Most visited parks in the city by age group

The survey asked respondents to identify their main park. Table 5.5 shows the parks selected by over 5% of respondents. Roundhay Park was selected by around a quarter of park-users in all age groups, except 19–24s (13%). Rather, Woodhouse Moor was selected by nearly half of those aged 19–24 (48%).

Table 5.5 What park do you use most often?

Park	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Roundhay Park	13%	24%	26%	26%	27%	27%	24%
Woodhouse Moor	48%	11%					
Pudsey Park						5%	6%
Meanwood Park	6%	6%	7%	5%			
Kirkstall Abbey		5%					
Horsforth Hall Park			5%				5%
Temple Newsam		5%	7%	8%	8%	10%	10%
Golden Acre Park		5%	5%	5%	8%	11%	11%

5.2.4 Frequency of park use by age group

The survey asked how often respondents visited their main park in the summer months. As Table 5.6 shows, around half of park-users aged 19–64 were high-frequency visitors, visiting their main park at least once a week. Over a third of park-users in all age groups were medium-frequency visitors, visiting their main park at least once a month but not more than once per fortnight. Over 75s were more likely than other age groups to be low-frequency visitors (22%), visiting their main park less than once a month.

Table 5.6 How often do you visit your main park in the summer?

Frequency of use	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	>75
Low-frequency visitors	12%	12%	10%	14%	15%	15%	22%
Medium-frequency visitors	38%	39%	34%	34%	34%	39%	36%
High-frequency visitors	50%	49%	56%	52%	51%	46%	42%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

High-frequency visitors = use their main park almost every day / once or twice per week

Medium-frequency visitors = use their main park once every two weeks / once a month

Low-frequency visitors = use their main park less than once a month / seldom

5.2.5 Reasons for visiting by age group

Table 5.7 shows that there were common reasons for visiting parks across age groups, including to get some fresh air, to go for a walk, to enjoy nature and to relax or think in peace and quiet. Aside from these, there were some differences in reasons for visiting parks. Exercise was more popular for park-users aged under 54. Family outings and children's play was more popular for those aged 25–44. Visiting a park café was more popular for those aged over 55. Visiting parks to meet friends and socialise was more popular for those aged 19–34. Visiting parks to walk the dog was more popular for those aged 45–64.

Table 5.7 Why do you visit your main park?

Reasons for use	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Get some fresh air	16%	15%	14%	16%	17%	17%	17%
For a walk	13%	13%	11%	13%	15%	16%	16%
Enjoy nature	8%	10%	10%	11%	14%	13%	13%
Relax/think in peace	11%	8%	7%	10%	11%	9%	10%
Family outing		6%	9%	5%			
Visit the children's play area		6%	10%	5%		5%	
Exercise	8%	6%	7%	6%			
Visit cafe/restaurant					5%	6%	8%
Walk the dog				7%	6%		
Meet friends & socialise	9%	6%					

Note: reasons selected by 5% or more park-users in each age group

5.2.6 Avoidance by age group

Table 5.8 shows that generally avoidance of parks at certain times of the day or week decreased with age. Those over 75 were least likely to say they had avoided their main park at certain times (19%). By contrast, some 47% of 19–24 year olds avoided their main park at certain times.

Table 5.8 Are there times of the day or week in which you avoid visiting your main park?

Avoidance	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Never thought about it	28%	36%	33%	29%	27%	24%	28%
No	25%	37%	42%	42%	47%	51%	53%
Yes	47%	27%	25%	29%	26%	25%	19%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.2.7 Use of local parks by age group

The survey asked respondents to identify if their main park was the closest park to where they live. Table 5.9 shows that park-users aged over 75 were most likely to select their local park as their main park (75%) while park-users aged 25–34 were least likely to do so (60%).

Table 5.9 Is the park you most often use, the closest park to where you live?

Age group	% No	% Yes	Total
19 – 24	31%	69%	100%
25 – 34	40%	60%	100%
35 – 44	34%	66%	100%
45 – 54	32%	68%	100%
55 – 64	29%	71%	100%
65 – 74	26%	74%	100%
75>	25%	75%	100%

5.2.8 Mode and ease of travel to their main park by age group

Table 5.10 reveals differences by age between how park-users normally travelled to their park. While park-users aged 19–24 were most likely to walk (70%), park-users aged over 75 were most likely to travel by car (49%). Indeed, walking to parks decreased with age while travelling by car increased with age. This is especially striking when considered alongside data on local park use in Table 5.9. In addition, 19–24 year olds were also more likely to say they travel to their park by bus.



WALKING TO PARKS
DECREASES WITH AGE
WHILE TRAVELLING BY CAR
INCREASES WITH AGE.

Table 5.10 How do you normally travel to your main park?

Mode of travel	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Car	16%	34%	41%	41%	42%	43%	49%
Walk	70%	55%	50%	50%	50%	48%	39%
Bicycle	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Bus	7%	4%	2%	2%	3%	4%	5%
Wheelchair /					1%	0.5%	2%
Left blank / other	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3.5%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

While the majority of park-users of all ages thought it was easy to travel to their main park, Table 5.11 shows that over 75s were slightly more likely to say it was quite difficult or difficult (8%).

Table 5.11 How easy is it for you to travel to your main park?

Ease of travel	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Easy	75%	74%	76%	78%	79%	78%	70%
Quite Easy	22%	22%	21%	19%	18%	20%	22%
Quite Difficult	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	6%
Difficult	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.3 Experiences and expectations of park-users by age

This section presents findings relating to how park-users of different age groups rated:

5.3.1 their experience of use

5.3.2 their feelings of safety

5.3.3 the current condition of their main park

5.3.4 the importance of spending time in their main park to their quality of life

5.3.1 Experience of visiting their main park by age group

Table 5.12 shows that the majority of park-users of all ages rated the last visit to their park as 'very pleasant'. Very pleasant experiences of parks increased with age, from 61% for 19–24s to 82% for over 75s.

Table 5.12 How pleasant was your last visit to your main park?

Experience of last visit	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Very pleasant	61%	72%	72%	76%	81%	82%	82%
Somewhat pleasant	36%	26%	25%	20%	15%	15%	12%
Somewhat unpleasant	1%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%
Very unpleasant	2%			1%	1%		1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.3.2 Feelings of safety during the daytime by age group

Table 5.13 reveals that the majority of park-users in all age groups, except 19–24s, said they felt very safe visiting their park during the daytime. Park-users aged 19–24 were most likely to say they felt fairly safe rather than very safe.

Table 5.13 How safe do you feel visiting your main park during the day?

Feelings of safety	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Very safe	42%	58%	57%	57%	61%	58%	54%
Fairly safe	48%	35%	36%	35%	33%	33%	35%
Never thought about it	7%	5%	6%	7%	5%	8%	10%
Fairly unsafe	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Very unsafe	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.3.3 Feelings of safety after dark by age group

Table 5.14 shows that, generally, park use after dark decreased with age. Park-users aged over 75 were most likely to say that they had not visited after dark (80%) while park-users aged 19–24 were least likely (36%). Yet, 38% of 19–24 year olds reported feeling unsafe or very unsafe using their park after dark.

Table 5.14 How safe do you feel visiting your main park after dark?

Feelings of safety after dark	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
I do not visit my park after dark	36%	53%	61%	57%	63%	73%	80%
My park is not open after dark		1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Very safe	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	1%
Safe	12%	13%	13%	14%	11%	6%	3%
Never thought about it	12%	12%	8%	9%	8%	8%	7%
Unsafe	19%	11%	9%	9%	8%	5%	5%
Very unsafe	19%	7%	4%	5%	5%	4%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.3.4 Condition of park by age group

While the majority of park-users of different ages thought their park was in good condition, Table 5.15 shows that park-users aged 19–24 were less likely to say their park was in excellent condition and slightly more likely than other age groups to say that their park was in fair condition.

Table 5.15 How do you rate the current condition of your main park?

Current condition	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Excellent	24%	36%	33%	31%	33%	33%	37%
Good	57%	51%	51%	54%	54%	54%	55%
Fair	16%	10%	13%	13%	11%	11%	7%
Poor	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.3.5 Importance of parks to quality of life by age group

Table 5.16 shows that park-users aged 19–24 and those aged over 75s were most likely to say that spending time in their main park was ‘fairly important’ to their own quality of life compared with park-users in other age groups who were more likely to say that it was ‘very important’. The former age groups were also more like to say that spending time in their park was ‘not very important’ to their quality of life compared with other age groups.

Table 5.16 In terms of your quality of life, how important is spending time in your main park?

Importance to quality of life	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Essential	12%	22%	27%	24%	22%	14%	8%
Very important	28%	34%	40%	38%	38%	40%	37%
Fairly important	41%	33%	26%	30%	31%	35%	40%
Not very important	18%	10%	6%	7%	7%	10%	13%
Not important at all	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.4 Overall satisfaction by age group

The survey asked respondents to rate their overall satisfaction with their park. Table 5.17 shows that dissatisfaction with parks was low across all age groups. The majority of park-users were satisfied or very satisfied with their park.

Table 5.17 How satisfied overall are you with your main park?

Overall satisfaction	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Very dissatisfied	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Dissatisfied	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11%	8%	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%
Satisfied	52%	48%	48%	47%	46%	49%	49%
Very satisfied	34%	41%	42%	42%	45%	42%	41%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5.5 Priorities for parks by age group

Table 5.18 shows that park-users of different ages agreed upon similar top priorities for parks. All park-users said that the top priorities should be to keep parks clean and to maintain or improve existing facilities. People in most age groups also agreed that parks should remain free to enter as a priority. However, the second highest priority for young adults aged 19–24 was greater personal safety. Indeed, the prioritisation of personal safety was greater for younger adults. This may relate to the times and contexts in which park-users of different ages visited their park. Over 75s were more likely to prioritise accessibility for disabled people, highlighting linkages between older age and disability. By contrast, those aged 25–44 were more likely to prioritise activities for children and young people.



A CONCERN FOR GREATER
PERSONAL SAFETY IN PARKS
DECREASES WITH AGE.

Table 5.18 What do you consider to be the three key priorities for your main park?

Priorities	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	>75
Keep the park clean	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Greater personal safety	2	5	8	6	10	12	14
Park remains free to enter	5	2	3	3	3	3	3
Facilities kept open or improved	3	3	2	2	2	1	1
Condition of the paths etc.	8	7	9	8	7	9	7
ASB and crime	6	8	7	5	6	8	8
Events and activities	4	4	5	4	4	6	5
Flower planting	7	9	11	13	12	11	10
Presence of park staff	11	13	12	11	8	5	6
User friendly for disabled people	9	15	13	9	5	4	4
Encourage greater use	14	14	15	14	14	14	13
Sports facilities	10	11	10	15	15	15	15
Activities for children and young people	12	6	4	7	13	10	11
Dog waste	13	10	6	10	9	7	9
Historic features	15	12	14	12	11	13	12

5.6 Summary

In general, people of different ages visited parks for broadly similar reasons, yet the survey findings show variations in the use and experiences of parks by age group. We recommend when developing park policy and practice that LCC take into consideration the usage, experience and views amongst different groups of park-users in ways that seek to meet specific needs and address disparities in experiences.

The findings of the survey indicate a need to better understand the personal and social barriers, experienced by older people, to the full enjoyment and use of parks and for the need to make improvements in this regard. Moreover, to ensure universal access to safe and inclusive parks and to better meet the needs of young adult park-users aged 19-24, we recommend reflecting on the survey indicators which, taken together, suggest that these park-users are slightly less likely to feel safe using their park.

6. DISABILITY

Around 11 million adults and 770,000 children in the UK (approximately 18% of the population) have a long-term health problem or disability that limits their everyday activities.¹⁸ Day-to-day experiences and barriers to social inclusion, work opportunities, services, facilities and products for people with disabilities can vary significantly.¹⁹

According to the 2011 Census,²⁰ over 125,000 people in Leeds (17% of the total population), living in a quarter of all households, have a long-term illness or disability. The likelihood of experiencing forms of limiting health problems or disability rises with age.²¹ Women and people from a white ethnic group are more likely to have a limiting health problem or disability.²² In terms of the impact that illness or disability has on day-to-day activities, 8% of the total Leeds population feel that they are limited a lot and 9% feel they are limited a little.²³

This chapter provides an analysis of the survey findings with regard to the use and experiences of parks by people with a disability. The analysis presented differentiates between and contrasts the experiences of disabled and non-disabled people. The chapter is organised into six sections:

- 6.1 Survey respondents with a disability
- 6.2 Use and non-use of parks by disabled people
- 6.3 Experiences and expectations of disabled park-users
- 6.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by disabled park-users
- 6.5 Priorities for the future of parks by disabled park-users
- 6.6 Summary

6.1 Survey respondents with a disability

There were 6,332 adult responses to the 2016 survey. Of these, 8% of respondents (n=536) considered themselves to have a disability that affects their access to or use of parks (see Table 6.1). This is broadly equivalent to the proportion of the Leeds population, cited above, that considered their everyday activities to be limited a lot. Those who answered yes to this question are referred to in this chapter as disabled park-users or non-users and those who answered no to this question are referred as non-disabled park-users or non-users.

Table 6.1 Do you have a disability that affects your access to or use of parks?

Disability	No. Survey responses	% Survey responses
No	5614	89%
Yes	530	8%
Prefer not to say	113	2%
Left blank	75	1%
Total	6332	100%

6.2. Use and non-use of parks by disabled people

This section presents findings relating to the use and non-use of parks by disabled people and is organised into the following sub-sections:

- 6.2.1 non-use of parks
- 6.2.2 average number of parks visited
- 6.2.3 range of parks visited
- 6.2.4 most visited parks
- 6.2.5 frequency of park use
- 6.2.6 reasons for use
- 6.2.7 avoidance
- 6.2.8 use of local park
- 6.2.9 mode and ease of travel

6.2.1 Non-use of parks by disabled people

The survey shows that certain groups of people use parks less. Disabled people were significantly less likely to have visited a park in the preceding year (see Table 6.2). It is notable that the use of parks by disabled people was 77%, much lower than the average of 94% for non-disabled people. Other studies have found that disabled people are less likely to use green spaces.²⁴



PEOPLE AGED OVER 75 AND
DISABLED PEOPLE WERE
SIGNIFICANTLY LESS LIKELY
TO HAVE VISITED A PARK IN
THE PRECEDING YEAR.


Table 6.2 Have you visited a park in Leeds in the past year?

Visited a park in the preceding year	No. Survey	No. Never	% Never
Non-disabled	5570	330	6%
Disabled	525	121	23%

Those who said that they had not visited a park in the preceding year were asked to select, from a list of options, the reasons for not doing so. The top reasons included poor health or disability (29%) and a concern that parks were difficult to get to (22%). Barriers to accessing and use of green space associated with ageing, poor health and disability are evident in cities across the globe.²⁵ Other factors, such as not enough time

(23%), also inhibit use.²⁶ Some residents who said they did not use parks were not interested in visiting (17%).

Figure 2 Reasons for non-use of parks in the preceding year



In an open survey question, a number of disabled people indicated that they would have liked to have visited a park but faced a range of barriers that inhibited them from doing so. For example:

- *'I am 86 years old, my legs are very bad at walking and I don't have transport. I used to love to go to Temple Newsam.'*
- *'I am a disabled, wheelchair-user without my own transport, so access is difficult.'*

However, the survey did not establish how many non-users would like to visit a park if barriers, including accessibility, could be overcome.

6.2.2 Average number of parks visited by disabled park-users

Just over three-quarters (77%) of respondents with a disability had visited a park in the preceding year. The survey asked respondents to identify all of the parks in Leeds that they had visited at least once in the preceding year. Table 6.3 shows that disabled park-users, on average, visited fewer parks than non-disabled park-users (three compared with five).

Table 6.3 How many parks have you visited in preceding year?

	Disabled	Non-disabled
Average number of parks visited	3.34	5.02

6.2.3 Range of parks visited by disabled park-users

Table 6.4 shows the top ten parks in rank order which disabled park-users visited across the city at least once in the preceding year and compares this to non-disabled park-users. Generally, disabled and non-disabled park-users visited the same broad range of parks across the city.

Table 6.4 What parks in Leeds have you visited in the past year?

Park	Disabled	Non-disabled
Roundhay Park	1	1
Golden Acre Park	2	2
Kirkstall Abbey	3	4
Temple Newsam	4	3
Woodhouse Moor	5	5
Lotherton Hall	6	8
Meanwood Park	7	6
Chevin Forest Park	8	7
Middleton Park	9	Not in top ten
Pudsey Park	10	10
Horsforth Hall Park	Not in top ten	9

6.2.4 Most visited parks by disabled park-users

The survey asked respondents to identify their main park of use. Table 6.5 shows the top ten main parks which disabled park-users selected and compares this to non-disabled park-users. Over a quarter of both groups selected Roundhay Park as their main park. Rothwell Country Park, which does not meet LQP standards, was in the top ten for disabled people.

Table 6.5 What park do you use most often?

Park	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Roundhay Park	102	26%	1330	25%
Golden Acre Park	33	9%	370	7%
Temple Newsam	24	6%	406	8%
Middleton Park	19	5%	142	3%
Pudsey Park	17	4%	210	4%
Springhead Park	16	4%	102	2%
Meanwood Park	15	4%	234	4%
Woodhouse Moor	11	3%	268	5%
Rothwell Country Park*	9	2%	Not in top ten	
Becketts Park	9	2%	Not in top ten	
Horsforth Hall Park	9	2%	180	3%
Kirkstall Abbey	Not in top ten		158	3%

*Below Leeds Quality Park Standard

6.2.5 Frequency of park use by disabled park-users

The survey asked how often respondents visited their main park in the summer months. As show in Table 6.6, non-disabled park-users (51%), compared to disabled park-users (42%), were more likely to be high-frequency visitors, visiting their main park at least once a week. A higher proportion of disabled park-users were also low-frequency visitors, visiting their main park less than once a month (20% compared with 14%).

Table 6.6 How often do you visit your main park in the summer?

Frequency of use	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Low-frequency visitors	79	20%	709	14%
Medium-frequency visitors	149	38%	1839	35%
High-frequency visitors	161	42%	2650	51%
Total	389	100%	5198	100%

High-frequency visitors = use their main park almost every day / once or twice per week

Medium-frequency visitors = use their main park once every two weeks / once a month

Low-frequency visitors = use their main park less than once a month / seldom

6.2.5 Reasons for visiting parks by disabled park-users

The survey asked respondents to identify the top five reasons they visited their park. As Table 6.7 shows, reasons for visiting are broadly similar.

Table 6.7 What are your main reasons for visiting your main park?

Reasons for use	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Get some fresh air	288	1	3638	1
Enjoy nature	230	2	2656	3
Relax or think in peace and quiet	203	3	2049	4
For a walk	199	4	3210	2
Visit cafe/restaurant	109	5	Not in top 5	
Visit the children's play area	Not in top 5		1291	5

6.2.6 Avoidance of parks by disabled park-users

Table 6.8 shows that a higher proportion of disabled park-users avoided their park at certain times of the day or week (34%) compared with non-disabled park-users (26%).

Table 6.8 Are there any times of the day or week in which you avoid visiting your main park?

	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Never thought about it	105	26%	1528	29%
No	158	40%	2340	45%
Yes	135	34%	1348	26%
Total	398	100%	5216	100%

An open survey question asked respondents to identify their reasons for avoidance. This was completed by 135 disabled park-users. Many of the reasons were related to wider problems such as anti-social behaviour. However, some comments illustrated barriers disabled park-users face in visiting their main park at certain times. In particular, factors that affect the availability of car parking, such as events in parks, school holidays, and generally on weekends when there are more people using parks, were barriers to the use of parks by disabled park-users.

6.2.7 Use of local parks by disabled park-users

The survey asked respondents to identify if their main park was the closest park to where they live. In this regard, Table 6.9 shows that there was marginal difference between disabled and non-disabled park-users' use of local parks.

Table 6.9 Is the park you most often use, the closest park to where you live?

Closest park to where live	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
No	126	32%	1611	31%
Yes	268	68%	3602	69%
Total	394	100%	5213	100%

6.2.8 Mode and ease of travel by disabled park-users

There were differences in how disabled and non-disabled park-users normally travelled to get to their main park. Table 6.10 shows that over half of disabled park-users usually travelled by car (52%), a higher proportion compared with non-disabled park-users (40%). Just over a quarter of disabled park-users walked to their main park (27%) compared with over half of non-disabled park-users (52%). Disabled park-users were also more likely to have travelled by bus and wheelchair/mobility vehicle. As demonstrated in Table 6.11, they were also more likely to say it was quite difficult or difficult (14%) to get to their park than non-disabled park-users (2%).



DISABLED PARK-USERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO TRAVEL BY **CAR (52%)** THAN **WALK (27%)**.

Table 6.10 How would you normally travel to your main park?

Mode of travel	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Car	208	52%	2084	40%
Walk	109	27%	2739	52%
Bus	29	7%	150	3%
Wheelchair/mobility vehicle	24	6%	4	0%
Left blank or other	29	7%	287	5%
Total	399	101%	5264	100%

Table 6.11 How easy is it for you to travel to your main park?

Ease of travel	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% Non-disabled
Easy	248	63%	4081	78%
Quite Easy	92	23%	1045	20%
Quite Difficult	44	11%	106	2%
Difficult	11	3%	21	0%
Total	395	100%	5253	100%

6.3 Experiences and expectations of disabled park-users

This section presents findings relating to how disabled park-users rated:

- 6.3.1 their experience of use
- 6.3.2 their feelings of safety
- 6.3.3 the current condition of their main park
- 6.3.4 the importance of spending time in their main park to their quality of life

6.3.1 Experience of visiting parks by disabled park-users

As shown in Table 6.12, the majority of disabled and non-disabled park-users had a 'very pleasant' experience during the last visit to their main park. Disabled park-users were slightly less likely to say that the last visit to their park was very pleasant and marginally more likely to say the visit was somewhat unpleasant.

Table 6.12 How pleasant was your last experience visiting your main park?

Experience of parks	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Very pleasant	297	74%	4075	77%
Somewhat pleasant	73	18%	1019	19%
Somewhat unpleasant	22	6%	145	3%
Very unpleasant	7	2%	27	1%
Total	399	100%	5266	100%

Good examples of parks being experienced as user-friendly by disabled park-users contributed to these very pleasant experiences:

- *'My wife is disabled and the park is great for us to have a lovely steady stroll around the beautiful location.'*
- *'It's a beautiful place and has mobility scooter for hire. I am disabled, some friends with a car have taken me there and it's been great to get around.'*
- *'My park walkways are accessible for disabled and elderly. It provides interest to all ages- pushchairs/prams children, fit and un-fit can use the park. My park is popular and used by many.'*
- *'It's a busy park with lots of regulars and visitors to Leeds... The Cafe is excellent and is a draw in itself, great access, especially for disabled [people].'*
- *'I cannot think of any way to improve it, the park is always clean, plenty of litter bins, grass always neatly cut and flower beds beautiful. Disability friendly.'*
- *'It's easy [to use] for disabled [people].'*

However, parks that were experienced as less accessible or inclusive by disabled park-users contributed to less pleasant experiences:

- *'My wife and I are both disabled and cannot now walk very far, both in our eighties.'*
- *'The lower car park is uneven for a disabled person.'*
- *'I am disabled and there is hardly any seating in the park.'*
- *'Have disabled granddaughter- play ground limited.'*

6.3.2 Feelings of safety during the day by disabled park-users

As indicated in Table 6.13, the majority of disabled and non-disabled park-users described feeling 'very safe' or 'fairly safe' visiting their main park during the day. Disabled park-users were slightly less likely to say they feel very safe.

Table 6.13 How safe do you feel visiting your main park during the day?

Feelings of safety	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Very safe	203	51%	3039	58%
Fairly safe	144	36%	1826	35%
Never thought about it	35	9%	321	6%
Fairly unsafe	9	2%	49	1%
Very unsafe	5	1%	10	0%
Total	396	99%	5245	100%

6.3.3 Feelings of safety after dark by disabled park-users

As demonstrated in Table 6.14, the majority of disabled and non-disabled park-users had not visited their main park after dark.

Table 6.14 How safe do you feel visiting your main park after dark?

Feelings of safety after dark	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Do not visit after dark	260	65%	3279	62%
My park is not open	13	3%	64	1%
Very safe	8	2%	145	3%
Fairly safe	17	4%	582	11%
Never thought about it	29	7%	476	9%
Fairly unsafe	37	9%	440	8%
Very unsafe	33	8%	262	5%
Total	397	98%	5248	100%

6.3.4 Condition of parks by disabled park-users

As shown in Table 6.15, over a third of disabled and non-disabled park-users rated their main park in 'excellent' condition. This should be understood within the context that over a quarter of park-users selected Roundhay Park as their main park, which holds Green Flag status. While there were only marginal differences, disabled park-users were slightly more likely to say that their park was in excellent (35%) or, conversely, in poor (4%) condition than non-disabled park-users (33% and 2% respectively).

Table 6.15 How do you rate the current condition of your main park?

Current condition	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Excellent	142	35%	1750	33%
Good	192	48%	2836	54%
Fair	50	12%	598	11%
Poor	18	4%	94	2%
Total	402	100%	5278	100%

6.3.5 Importance of parks to quality of life for disabled park-users

As shown in Table 6.16, spending time in parks was just as important to quality of life for disabled and non-disabled park-users.

Table 6.16 In terms of your own quality of life, how important is spending time in your main park?

Importance to quality of life	No. disabled	% disabled	No. non-disabled	% non-disabled
Essential	71	19%	1069	21%
Very important	136	36%	1966	38%
Fairly important	130	34%	1637	32%
Not very important	35	9%	433	8%
Not important at all	6	2%	58	1%
Total	378	100%	5163	100%

6.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by disabled park-users

The survey asked respondents to rate their overall satisfaction with their main park. In the context that overall satisfaction with parks is high; Table 6.17 shows that disabled park-users were marginally less satisfied than non-disabled park-users.

Table 6.17 What is your overall impression of your main park?

Overall satisfaction	Disabled	Disabled %	Non-disabled	Non-disabled %
Very dissatisfied	6	2%	23	0%
Dissatisfied	8	2%	95	2%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	46	11%	367	7%
Satisfied	190	47%	2513	48%
Very satisfied	151	38%	2254	43%
Total	401	100%	5252	100%

6.5 Priorities for parks by disabled park-users

Overall, Table 6.18 shows that disabled and non-disabled park-users agreed that the top priorities should be to maintain or improve existing facilities and to keep parks clean. However, the accessibility of parks for disabled people was ranked second highest by disabled park-users but 10th by non-disabled park-users. The qualitative comments also suggest accessibility and inclusivity of parks is a high priority by (grand)parents with disabled (grand)children and those with a disabled partner.

Table 6.18 What do you consider to be the three key priorities for your main park?

Priorities	Disabled	Non-disabled
Facilities kept open or improved (e.g. toilets, cafes)	1	2
User friendly for disabled people	2	10
Keep the park clean	3	1
Free to enter	4	3
Condition of the paths etc.	5	7
Events and activities	6	4
Presence of park staff	7	11
Personal safety	8	8
Anti-social behaviour and crime	9	5
Dog waste	10	9
Flower planting	11	12
Historic features	12	13
Activities for children and young people	13	6
Encourage park use	14	15
Sports facilities	15	14

An open survey question asked about what would improve their main park. A key word search of this data was performed using the terms 'disabled' and 'disability'. The

following were cited most frequently as improvements for making parks more user-friendly for disabled park-users:

- Accessible play facilities for disabled children and young people
- Disabled parking bays and dropped kerbs on main roads leading to parks
- Accessible toilet facilities
- Improved paths and seating
- Exercise and sports for disabled park-users
- Activities and events for disabled park-users

The survey also asked an open question about park-users hopes for the future of their main park. A key word search of this data was performed using the terms 'disabled' and 'disability'. The following comments from survey respondents are typical:

- *'For the council to continue the excellent work that has been put in to the park over the last few years and keep improving the facilities for people with disabilities.'*
- *'Work has been done on paths and I hope this continues and it is much better for walking for disabled people.'*
- *'It stays free & accessible to all & disability groups.'*
- *'That it remains user-friendly and disabled-friendly.'*
- *'To be kept well maintained and welcoming for elderly and disabled people.'*
- *'Rides for disabled kids and people in park.'*
- *'More parks like Pudsey, Middleton to standard of the disabled facilities.'*
- *'Keep paths maintained so that everyone, including people with disabilities, cyclists, horse riders and walkers can use it.'*
- *'Keep it as natural as possible with more considerations for old, vulnerable, disabled people.'*
- *'Access for disabled by local transport.'*

6.6 Summary

While disabled park-users were just as likely to think that spending time in their park is important to their quality of life, they were less likely to use parks and more likely to be lower-frequency park-users compared with non-disabled people. They also visited, on average, fewer parks across the city. In line with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 11.7, we recommend when developing park policy and practice that LCC ensure access to good quality parks for all residents and visitors, playing due regard to the specific needs of disabled people, so that all can enjoy the full benefits that derive from well-managed parks. Specifically, we recommend as a priority that LCC develop a better understanding of the personal and/or social barriers to the full enjoyment of parks by disabled people and develop an approach to promoting greater accessibility and inclusivity of parks.

7. ETHNIC GROUP

This chapter provides an analysis of the survey findings with regard to ethnic group, by people who gave their ethnic origin as Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) compared with White.²⁷ The chapter is organised into six sections:

- 7.1 Survey respondents by ethnic group
- 7.2 Use and non-use of parks by ethnic group
- 7.3 Experiences and expectations of park-users by ethnic group
- 7.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by ethnic group
- 7.5 Priorities for parks by ethnic group
- 7.6 Summary

7.1 Survey respondents by ethnic group

As shown in Table 7.1, the majority of survey respondents gave their ethnic group as White. Due to the lower response by people from BAME groups, we aggregated these responses and applied a weighting adjustment based on population data in the Census 2011 for Leeds (see Table 7.2).²⁸ The findings are representative of the Leeds population by ethnic group.

Table 7.1 Which of the following categories best describe your ethnic group?

Ethnic group	No. Survey responses	% Survey responses
White	5897	91.7
Mixed	79	1.2
Asian	128	2.0
Black	68	1.1
Other	49	0.8
Left blank or prefer not to say	211	3.3
Total	6432	100%

Table 7.2 Aggregation of ethnic groups and weighting percentage

Ethnic group	No. Survey responses	% Survey responses	% of population used for weighting data ²⁹
White	5897	91.7%	85.1%
Non-White	324	5.1%	14.9%
Left blank or prefer not to say	211	3.3%	NA
Total	6432	100%	100%

7.2. Use and non-use of parks by ethnic group

This section presents findings relating to the use and non-use of parks by ethnic group and is organised into the following sub-sections:

- 7.2.1 non-use of parks

- 7.2.2 average number of parks visited
- 7.2.3 range of parks visited
- 7.2.4 most visited parks
- 7.2.5 frequency of park use
- 7.2.6 reasons for park use
- 7.2.7 avoidance
- 7.2.8 use of local park
- 7.2.9 mode and ease of travel

2.2.1 Non-use of parks by ethnic group

Some 91% of people from BAME groups had visited a park in the preceding year. Table 7.3 shows that people from different ethnic groups were just as likely to have visited a park in the preceding year.



PEOPLE FROM DIFFERENT
ETHNIC GROUPS ARE
JUST AS LIKELY TO HAVE
VISITED A PARK.

Table 7.3 Have you visited a park in Leeds in the past year?

Ethnic group	No. of responses to survey	No. Never Visit	% Never Visit
White	5828	461	8%
BAME	267	24	9%

7.2.2 Average number of parks visited by ethnic group

The survey asked respondents to identify all of the parks in Leeds that they had visited, at least once, in the preceding year. Table 7.4 highlights that the average number of parks visited by BAME park-users and White park-users was the same: 4.83.

Table 7.4 Average number of parks visited in the preceding year

	BAME	White
Average number of parks visited	4.83	4.83

7.2.3 Range of parks visited by ethnic group

Table 7.5 identifies the top ten parks visited at least once in the preceding year by BAME park-users and compares this to White park-users. Generally, BAME and White park-users visit the same broad range of parks across the city. While Potternewton Park, Harehills Park and Armley Park were in the top for BAME park-users, Lotherton Hall, Horsforth Hall Park and Pudsey Park were in the top for White park-users.

Table 7.5 What parks in Leeds have you visited in the past year?

Park	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Roundhay Park	197	17%	3594	12%
Woodhouse Moor	140	12%	1766	6%
Golden Acre Park	100	8%	2637	9%
Kirkstall Abbey	97	8%	2111	7%
Temple Newsam	72	6%	2389	8%
Meanwood Park	60	5%	1233	4%
Potternewton Park	55	5%	Not in top ten	
Harehills Park	38	3%	Not in top ten	
Armley Park*	37	3%	Not in top ten	
Chevin Forest Park	33	3%	1260	4%
Lotherton Hall	Not in top ten		934	3%
Horsforth Hall Park	Not in top ten		885	3%
Pudsey Park	Not in top ten		790	3%

*Below Leeds Quality Park Standard (LQP)

7.2.4 Most visited parks by ethnic group

The survey asked respondents to identify their main park. Table 7.6 shows the top ten main parks which BAME park-users selected and compares this to White park-users. Around a quarter of BAME (30%) and White (25%) park-users selected Roundhay Park as their main park. Aside from this, there were some differences in the main parks selected by these two groups of respondents. BAME park-users more commonly selected Woodhouse Moor, compared with White park-users. Moreover, while Potternewton Park, Cross Flatts Park, Bramley Park and Harehills Park were in the top for BAME park-users, Pudsey Park, Horsforth Hall Park, Middleton Park and Chevin Forest Park were in the top for White park-users.

Table 7.6 What park do you use most often?

Park	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Roundhay Park	84	30%	1352	25%
Woodhouse Moor	37	13%	239	4%
Potternewton Park	14	5%	Not in top ten	
Kirkstall Abbey	14	5%	151	3%
Golden Acre Park	12	4%	395	7%
Meanwood Park	11	4%	233	4%
Cross Flatts Park	9	3%	Not in top ten	
Temple Newsam	8	3%	420	8%
Bramley Park	7	2%	Not in top ten	
Harehills Park	7	2%	Not in top ten	
Pudsey Park	Not in top ten		226	4%
Horsforth Hall Park	Not in top ten		182	3%
Middleton Park	Not in top ten		156	3%
Chevin Forest Park	Not in top ten		97	2%

7.2.5 Frequency of park use by ethnic group

The survey asked how often respondents visited their main park in the summer months. As Table 7.7 demonstrates, there was little difference in frequency of use by ethnic group. About half of BAME (52%) and White (50%) park-users were high-frequency visitors and around a third of each were medium-frequency visitors; 33% and 36% respectively.

Table 7.7 How often do you visit your main park in the summer?

Frequency of use	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Low-frequency visitors	43	15%	758	14%
Medium-frequency visitors	93	33%	1898	36%
High-frequency visitors	150	52%	2650	50%
Total	286	100%	5306	100%

High-frequency visitors = use their main park almost every day / once or twice per week

Medium-frequency visitors = use their main park once every two weeks / once a month

Low-frequency visitors = use their main park less than once a month / seldom

7.2.6 Reasons for visiting parks by ethnic group

The survey asked respondents to identify the top five reasons why they visited their main park. As Table 7.8 shows, these reasons are similar by ethnic group.

Table 7.8 What are your main reasons for visiting your main park?

Reasons for use	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Get some fresh air	200	1	3724	1
For a walk	175	2	3218	2
Relax or think in peace and quiet	154	3	2090	4
Enjoy nature	123	4	2757	3
Family outing	104	5	Not in top 5	
Visit the children's play area	Not in top 5		1276	5

7.2.7 Avoidance of parks by ethnic group

As Table 7.9 shows, BAME park-users (34%) were more likely to say that they had avoided their park at certain times of the day or week than White park-users (26%).

Table 7.9 Are there any times of the day or week in which you avoid visiting your main park?

	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Never thought about it	86	30%	1558	29%
No	102	36%	2399	45%
Yes	96	34%	1380	26%
Total	284	100%	5337	100%

7.2.8 Use of local parks by ethnic group

Table 7.10 reveals that BAME and White park-users were just as likely to say that their main park was the closest park to where they live.

Table 7.10 Is the park you most often use, the closest park to where you live?

Closest park to where I live	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
No	85	30%	3677	31%
Yes	202	70%	1652	69%
Total	287	100%	5745	100%

7.2.9 Mode and ease of travel to parks by ethnic group

As Table 7.11 highlights, both BAME and White park-users were more likely to say that they walked to get to their main park rather than travelled by car.

Table 7.11 How would you normally travel to your main park?

Mode of travel	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Walk	124	46%	2703	46%
Car	93	35%	2192	37%
Bus	6	2%	172	3%
Bicycle	1	0%	118	2%
Motorcycle	1	0%	4	0%
Left blank/Other	44	16%	686	12%
Total	269	100%	5875	100%

Table 7.12 shows that BAME park-users (67%) were less likely than White park-users (77%) to say it was very easy to get to their park.

Table 7.12 How easy is it for you to travel to your main park?

Ease of travel	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Very easy	195	67%	4142	77%
Quite easy	79	27%	1056	20%
Quite difficult	11	4%	139	3%
Very difficult	4	1%	31	1%
Total	289	100%	5368	100%

7.3 Experiences and expectations of park-users by ethnic group

This section presents findings relating to how park-users by ethnic group rated:

7.3.1 their experience of use

7.3.2 their feelings of safety

7.3.3 the current condition of their main park

7.3.4 the importance of spending time in their main park to their quality of life

7.3.1 Experience of visiting parks by ethnic group

While the majority of park-users had very pleasant experiences, Table 7.13 highlights that White park-users (78%) were more likely than BAME park-users (64%) to say that the last visit to their park was very pleasant.

Table 7.13 How pleasant was your last experience visiting your main park?

	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Very pleasant	156	64%	4188	78%
Somewhat pleasant	72	30%	1009	19%
Somewhat unpleasant	9	4%	158	3%
Very unpleasant	5	2%	29	1%
Total	242	100%	5384	100%

7.3.2 Feelings of safety during the day by ethnic group

Table 7.14 shows that BAME park-users (41%) were less likely to say that they felt very safe visiting their park during the day compared with White park-users (58%).

Table 7.14 How safe do you feel visiting your main park during the day?

	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Very safe	119	41%	3110	58%
Fairly safe	136	47%	1835	34%
Never thought about it	25	9%	346	6%
Fairly unsafe	6	2%	53	1%
Very unsafe	3	1%	12	0%
Total	289	100%	5356	100%

7.3.3 Feelings of safety after dark by ethnic group

Table 7.15 reveals that White park-users (63%) were more likely to say that they had not visited their main park after dark compared with BAME park-users (54%).

Table 7.15 How safe do you feel visiting your main park after dark?

Feelings of safety after dark	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Do not visit after dark	157	54%	3396	63%
My park is not open	1	0%	75	1%
Very safe	10	3%	141	3%
Fairly safe	32	11%	571	11%
Never thought about it	32	11%	477	9%
Fairly unsafe	33	11%	439	8%
Very unsafe	24	8%	267	5%
Total	289	100%	5366	100%

7.3.4 Condition of parks by ethnic group

Table 7.16 shows that fewer BAME park-users (22%) rated their main park in 'excellent' condition compared to White park-users (34%). They were also slightly more likely to rate their park in 'fair' or 'poor' condition. While over a quarter of all park-users selected Roundhay Park as their main park, which holds Green Flag status, there were some differences in parks that were visited most often by different ethnic groups which may contribute to these assessments. Nevertheless, the top ten main parks used by BAME park-users are of LQP standard.

Table 7.16 How do you rate the current condition of your main park?

	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Excellent	54	22%	1834	34%
Good	148	61%	2865	53%
Fair	31	13%	605	11%
Poor	10	4%	97	2%
Total	243	100%	5401	100%

7.3.5 Importance of parks to quality of life by ethnic group

Table 7.17 indicates that spending time in their park was just as important to quality of life for BAME and White park-users.

Table 7.17 In terms of your own quality of life, how important is spending time in your main park?

	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Essential	60	21%	1067	20%
Very important	105	38%	1993	38%
Fairly important	85	30%	1691	32%
Not very important	24	9%	457	9%
Not important at all	6	2%	61	1%
Total	280	100%	5269	100%

7.4 Overall satisfaction with parks by ethnic group

Table 7.18 shows that BAME park-users (25%) were less likely to be very satisfied than White park-users (43%) and slightly more likely to be very dissatisfied.

Table 7.18 How satisfied overall are you with your main park?

	No. BAME	% BAME	No. White	% White
Very dissatisfied	7	2%	21	0%
Dissatisfied	8	3%	96	2%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	33	11%	385	7%
Satisfied	170	59%	2541	47%
Very satisfied	71	25%	2331	43%
Total	289	100%	5374	100%

7.5 Priorities for parks by ethnic group

Table 7.19 What do you consider to be the three key priorities for your main park?

Priorities	BAME	White
Facilities kept open or improved (e.g. toilets)	1	1
Keep the park clean	2	2
Greater personal safety	3	11
Free to enter	4	3
Condition of the paths etc.	5	8
Events and activities	6	4
Flower planting	7	12
User friendly for disabled people	8	6
Dog waste	9	9
Anti-social behaviour and crime	10	5
Activities for children and young people	11	7
Presence of park staff	12	10
Encourage park use	13	15
Sports facilities	14	14
Historic features	15	13

Table 7.19 above shows that both BAME and White park-users agreed that the top priorities for parks should be to maintain or improve existing facilities and to keep parks clean. However, the third highest priority for BAME park-users was personal safety, compared to 11th for White park-users.

7.6 Summary

While park-users of different ethnic groups were just as likely to use parks and say that spending time in their park is important to their quality of life, BAME park-users were less likely to be very satisfied overall with their park. Moreover, the survey indicators, taken together, suggest that BAME park-users were slightly less likely to feel safe using their park. We recommend when developing park policy and practice that LCC take into consideration the differential experiences and views amongst different ethnic groups of park-users in ways that seek to address disparities.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our study and survey findings, we make the following recommendations for developing parks policy and practice in Leeds and similar cities in line with the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goal 11.7 which requires that all nation states will 'by 2030 provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities'.

Recommendation 1:

We recommend that priority is given to raising the standard of parks across the city to ensure access to good quality green space for all residents and visitors, playing due regard to the specific needs of particular groups of people that enable them to enjoy the full benefits that derive from well-managed parks.

Recommendation 2:

Given the wide-ranging benefits to social relations and people's health and well-being that respondents say derive from park enjoyment, we recommend that park managers work closely in partnership with diverse organisations in the public, private and voluntary sectors to ensure that their contribution and role is harnessed in support of good quality accessible urban parks.

Recommendation 3:

We recommend that concerns about the differential experiences of park-users across the city - by type of park (major and community), quality of park and across community committee areas - should inform LCC park management targets and strategies in ways that seek to ensure a quality park experience is available to all.

Recommendation 4:

Community parks are well-used and frequently visited assets, but generally they receive less high ratings in terms of condition, user-experiences and public satisfaction. To ensure that there is an equivalent service of accessible, quality parks across the city, we specifically recommend that LCC prioritise resources and seek investment to raise the level of all community parks to LQP standards.

Recommendation 5:

We recommend that LCC develop discrete action plans, including resourcing considerations, for each park that does not currently meet LQP standard that can be used by parks managers, community committees, wider organisations and local groups to support the improvement of their local parks.

Recommendation 6:

Section 106 developer contributions have become an important source of funding for improving parks and green spaces across the country. These are usually directed to improvements within close proximity to the development, to mitigate its effects. However, parks located in areas that lack housing development have limited scope for improvement from such planning gains. While the research did not explicitly consider how parks across the city are funded, it highlights a strong case for spreading the benefits from Section 106 contributions beyond the immediate area where development is located, especially where this benefits lower quality parks in other parts of the city, thus helping to ensure that a quality park experience is available to all. Hence, we recommend considering the possibility and desirability of using Section 106 planning gains more widely to raise the standard of community parks that fall below LQP status. Related to this and in line with the recommendations of the House of Commons CLG Select Committee inquiry into public parks, we recommend consideration is given to using of a proportion of development funding for the maintenance and upkeep of parks to designated standards, in light of the importance of cleanliness and improvements to existing facilities identify by park-users, as one of their top priorities.

Recommendation 7:

We recommend that LCC consider prioritising available resources on and seeking investment for the following parks which receive the highest estimated total adult visits of all parks that do not currently meet LQP standards: Rothwell Country Park, Armley Park, Western Flatts Cliff Park and Stanningley Park.

Recommendation 8:

We recommend as a priority that LCC develop a better understanding of the personal and/or social barriers to the full enjoyment of parks by older and disabled people who are significantly less likely to use parks. We recommend that this further investigation is carried out with a view to revising the current Leeds Parks and Green Spaces Strategy and to developing discrete action plans that LCC Parks & Countryside and other partner departments and organisations can take that would promote greater accessibility and inclusivity to parks.

Recommendation 9:

Following from the above, we recommend that LCC investigate further the views and experiences of older people and disabled people, including those who do not currently use parks and those who use parks infrequently, the barriers to accessing and use of parks and green spaces for them, and how these barriers might be overcome.

Recommendation 10:

We recommend that LCC as a priority develop an approach to promoting greater accessibility and inclusivity of parks for disabled park-users, including developing an accessible play strategy for disabled children and young people and giving further consideration to the accessibility of parks given that driving to parks increases with age and disabled people are more likely to drive than walk to their park.

Recommendation 11:

Following from the above, we recommend taking account of differential modes of transport used to get to parks by different groups in future planning and car parking decisions such that travel to a park does not unduly restrict the access to and enjoyment of parks to certain groups.

Recommendation 12:

Currently, LCC undertake annual appraisals of community parks, based on the national Green Flag Award guidance. This includes specific reference to equal access for all, meaning that 'it should be easy for anybody, irrespective of their ability, to enter and get around the park, where practicable'. Given the survey findings regarding the less frequent visitor rate for older people and people with disabilities, as well as the high priority given by respondents to accessibility for disabled people, we recommend reflecting further on the way in which equal access is assessed. This might include working with park-users and local service-user groups to better understand what equal access for older people and people with a disability means, as well as the place and significance accorded within existing criteria to access for people with a disability. We recommend that the annual assessments are used as a mechanism to identify improvements in the accessibility of parks for these groups. Related to this, we recommend using these annual assessments to inform, update and improve public communications regarding accessibility measures already in place at parks.

Recommendation 13:

We recommend when developing park policy and practice that LCC take into consideration the usage, experience and views amongst different groups of park-users in ways that seek to meet the specific needs of these different groups and address disparities in experiences.

Recommendation 14:

To ensure universal access to safe and inclusive parks and to better meet the needs of young adult park-users aged 19-24 and BAME park-users, we recommend that further consideration is given to reflecting on the experiences of parks, perceptions of safety, avoidance and perceived condition of parks which, taken together, suggest that these park-users are slightly less likely to feel safe using their park.

Recommendation 15:

We recommend that LCC further investigate why maintaining or increasing sporting facilities were ranked as a low priority by park-users, and to use this information to revise the Leeds Parks and Green Spaces Strategy.

Recommendation 16:

We recommend that LCC further investigate why there are disparities in park-users' experiences of parks across community committee areas with a view to taking any actions that would reduce these differences.

ENDNOTES

¹ In 2015, the UK was one of 193 countries to adopt the United Nations 'Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development'. Available from: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld> [accessed 11 February 2018]

² Also known locally as 'Hyde Park'.

³ House of Commons (2017) *Inquiry into Public Parks*, Seventh Report of Session 2016-17, p.4.

⁴ Henceforth, the term 'their park' refers to respondents' main park of use.

⁵ Some respondents may have identified a recreation ground or other local green space as their main park.

⁶ This estimate it is not comparable to the estimate of total visits to parks generated by LCC in 2009. For an understanding of how the estimate from the 2016 survey was generated, see Appendix C.

⁷ The Green Flag Award (see <http://www.greenflagaward.org.uk/>) comprises a desk-based assessment of a park's management plan and a site-based assessment. It assesses parks against eight categories: (i) A Welcoming Place (ii) Healthy, Safe and Secure (iii) Well Maintained and Clean (iv) Environmental Management (v) Biodiversity, Landscape and Heritage (vi) Community Involvement (vii) Marketing and Communication (viii) Management. Each of the eight categories is given a score out of 10, with a maximum of 30 points for the management plan and 70 points for the site assessment. To achieve the standard a minimum of 15 for the management plan and 42 on the site assessment is needed, however, an award can only be given if the overall score is greater than 65.

⁸ The main difference with the Green Flag is that the criterion for a management plan is excluded and the remaining criteria are weighted accordingly. The score required to reach the LQP standard is 48. On average, each category should achieve 7 out of 10 to reach the standard, although there is no minimum score for each category. See: <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/docs/chapter%204%20PPG17%20Parks%20and%20Gardens.pdf> Pg. 47-8.

⁹ Leeds City Council (2017) *Leeds Quality Park Assessments – 2016 Results*, Leeds: Parks and Countryside Department, p.2.

¹⁰ Leeds City Council (2009) *A Parks and Green Space Strategy for Leeds*, Leeds: Parks and Countryside Department, p.31.

¹¹ Rothwell Country Park features in the top ten for disabled park-users and Armley Park features in the top ten for BAME park-users.

¹² Due to the effect of rounding, some totals do not add up to 100%

¹³ House of Commons (2017) *Inquiry into Public Parks*, Seventh Report of Session 2016-17, p.38 point 71.

¹⁴ This chapter provides data on survey respondents who selected a park located in a community committee area, rather than on park-users who live within the community committee area.

¹⁵ There should be some caution in interpreting the findings where survey responses by committee area are lower (i.e. East Inner). The survey was not designed specifically to be representative by community committee area, and the findings therefore should be understood as indicative only.

¹⁶ Leeds City Council (2017) *Leeds Quality Park Assessments – 2016 Results*, Leeds: Parks and Countryside Department, p.2.

¹⁷ The mid-year estimates were taken from:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland>

¹⁸ House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee (2017) *Building for Equality: Disability and the Built Environment*, Ninth Report of Session 2016–17, p.8.

¹⁹ Prime Minister's Strategy Unit. (2005) *Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People*, page 9.

²⁰ Leeds Observatory. *Census 2011: Factsheet 5 Limiting long-term health problems*. Available from: http://observatory.leeds.gov.uk/Leeds_Census/

²¹ From 3.4% of 0-15 year olds to 83.6% of people aged 85 and over. Leeds Observatory. *Census 2011: Factsheet 5 Limiting long-term health problems*. Available from: http://observatory.leeds.gov.uk/Leeds_Census/

²² 18% of all women and 15% of all men; 10% of all Multiple Ethnic group to 18% in the White group. Leeds Observatory. *Census 2011: Factsheet 5 Limiting long-term health problems*. Available from: http://observatory.leeds.gov.uk/Leeds_Census/

²³ Leeds Observatory. *Census 2011: Factsheet 5 Limiting long-term health problems*. Available from: http://observatory.leeds.gov.uk/Leeds_Census/

²⁴ Lee, A.C.K. and Maheswaran, R. (2010) 'The health benefits of urban green spaces: a review of the evidence', *Journal of Public Health*, 33(2): 212-222.

²⁵ World Health Organization (2007) *Global Age-friendly Cities: A Guide*, Switzerland: WHO.

²⁶ At a national level, the Natural England's Monitor of Engagement with the Natural Environment 2015-16 consistently finds that pressures of time, or being too busy, are among the most frequently cited barriers to visiting parks. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/614353/mene-headline-report-2015-16.pdf

²⁷ The BAME group includes survey respondents who gave their ethnic origin as Black, Asian, Mixed and those who selected other ethnic group. It excludes people from White minority ethnic groups.

²⁸ Weighting is a common technique that is used to adjust the results of the survey to bring them more in line with what is known about the wider population of Leeds. According to the 2011 Census, 85.1% of the population gave their ethnic origin as White and 14.9% gave their ethnic origin as non-White. We appreciate that the survey findings are not therefore able to give a meaningful breakdown of views by culturally diverse groups within these broader ethnic groups.

²⁹ According to the 2011 Census, 85.1% of the population gave their ethnic origin as White and 14.9% gave their ethnic origin as BAME. Leeds City Council. (2012) *Leeds - The Big Picture: A summary of the results of the 2011 Census*, Available from: <https://observatory.leeds.gov.uk/resource/view?resourceId=3759>

APPENDIX A: SURVEY METHOD

The Leeds Parks Survey, developed using the Bristol Online Survey tool, was available to complete between June and November 2016. The online survey link was distributed to a wide range of groups and organisations, including the Leeds Citizens' Panel, the University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University, the Leeds Youth Council, the Leeds Parks and Green Spaces Forum, among others. It was widely distributed through social media feeds and advertised through local media outlets. The online survey was also promoted via a number of events held in parks over the summer and through displaying posters in some park noticeboards.

The postal survey was sent to all members of the Leeds Citizens' Panel who opted to be contacted by post (approximately 1,000 members). It was also posted to a random sample of 20,000 households in Leeds using the Gazetteer dataset. Respondents were given a freepost envelope to return the survey free of charge. The sampling strategy for the postal survey was prepared by Frank Perrins in the LCC Intelligence and Improvement team, Environment and Housing Service. Before randomly selecting households, the dataset was cleaned. This included removing unsuitable properties, such as empty council properties and those households that had received the survey through the Leeds Citizens' Panel. A sampling strategy was built to account for representation across the city and the level of response expected in different wards assuming that it is likely that households in deprived inner city wards would have lower return rates. Hence, the sample selection was stratified in proportion to ward population and weighted according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (ranging up to double mail-out for those in the upper quartile). Those households who were sent the postal survey were given the option to complete the survey online instead of in paper form. This also allowed other members of the household to complete the survey if they so wished. Hence, we are unable to give a precise response rate. However, some 42% of responses (n=2675) were received through our online survey and 58% (n=3757) through our city-wide postal survey or completed at park events.

Following data collection, a team of trained postgraduate students inputted data from the postal surveys into a data analysis software package. A sample of surveys inputted by each student was checked for accuracy. Once the data was inputted, the survey data was weighted using Census 2011 data for Leeds Metropolitan District to account for differences in responses in relation to gender and ethnic group. Weighting is a common technique that is used to adjust the results of the survey to bring them more in line with what is known about the wider population of Leeds. This produced a sample of respondents that is representative of the Leeds population in terms of ethnicity and gender.

APPENDIX B: LEEDS PARKS SURVEY

1. Have you visited one or more public parks in Leeds in the past 12 months?

Yes		Go to Question 3
No		Go to Question 2

2. If **no**, which of the following options best describes why you have **not** visited any public parks in Leeds in the past 12 months? Please tick **all** that apply.

They are too difficult to get to or too far away		They are poorly maintained		Parks do not feel safe to use	
Parks do not interest me		Lack of suitable transport		Poor health	
There are other types of open spaces nearby that I prefer to visit		I am too busy / not enough time		I feel excluded from parks	
I consider myself to have a disability that prevents me from using parks		Other (please specify):			
Go to Question 28 – About You					

About Your Visits:

3. Which parks in Leeds have you visited in the past 12 months? Please tick **all** that apply.

Allerton Bywater Sports Ground		Kirk Lane Park	
Armley Park		Kirkstall Abbey	
Banstead Park		Lewisham Park	
Barley Hill Park		Ley Lane	
Becketts Park		Lotherton Hall	
Blenheim Square		Lovell Park	
Bramley Falls Wood Park		Manston Park	
Bramley Park		Meanwood Park	
Burley Park		Micklefield Park, Rawdon	
Calverley Park (Victoria Park)		Middleton Park	
Chapel Allerton Park		New Farnley Park	
Chevin Forest Park		New Wortley Recreation Ground	
Churwell Park		Nowell Mount	
Cranmore Recreation Ground		Nunroyd Park, Guiseley	
Cross Flatts Park		Penny Pocket Park	
Dartmouth Park		Potternewton Park	
Drighlington Moor Park		Pudsey Park	
East End Park		Rodley Park Recreation Ground	
Farnley Hall Park		Rothwell Country Park	

Glebelands Rec		Roundhay Park	
Ninelands Lane		Scarth Gardens	
Golden Acre Park		Scatcherd Park	
Gotts Park		Springhead Park	
Grove Hill Park, Otley		Stanningley Park	
Grove Road Recreation Ground		Tarnfield Park, Yeadon	
Guisseley Nethermoor Park		Temple Newsam	
Hainsworth Park		Tennant Hall POS	
Halton Dene - Primrose Valley		The Hollies	
Harehills Park		The Rein	
Hartley Avenue Park		Tyersal Park	
Holbeck Moor		Western Flatts Cliff Park	
Holt Park		Westroyd Park	
Horsforth Hall Park		Wharfemeadows Park, Otley	
Hunslet Lake		Whinmoor Park, Coal Road	
Hunslet Moor		Woodhouse Moor	
Hyde Park (formally called Woodhouse Moor)			
Other (please specify):			

4. What park in Leeds do you use most often? From now on we will refer to this as YOUR PARK.

The park I use most often is:

5. Is YOUR PARK the closest park to where you live?

Yes		Go to Question 6
No		Go to Question 5a

5a. If 'No', which of the following options best describes why you do not visit the park closest where you live most often. Please tick **all** that apply.

It is too difficult to get to		It doesn't have the facilities I / my family most often need		There is not enough to do	
There are other open spaces nearby that I prefer to visit		There are other open spaces that are more convenient for me to visit		There are too many dogs	
Too many people visit (too busy)		Not enough people visit (too quiet)		It is too small	
It is too big		It is poorly looked after		It is too dirty	
I feel unsafe using my local park		There is a crime or anti-social behaviour problem			

Other (please specify):

6. How often do you usually visit YOUR PARK?

	Seldom or never during this season	Less than once a month	Once a month	Once every two weeks	Once or twice a week	Almost every day
WINTER (including late autumn/early spring when the weather is generally cold/wet)						
SUMMER (including late spring/early autumn when the weather is generally good)						

7-8. How long do you normally stay?

Duration	Q7. Winter	Q8. Summer
Do not visit		
Less than 30 minutes		
30 minutes – 1 hour		
1 – 2 hours		
2 – 4 hours		
More than 4 hours		

9. Are there any times of the day or week in which you AVOID visiting YOUR PARK?

No		Go to Question 10.
Never thought about it		Go to Question 10
Yes		Go to Question 9a.
Q9a. Please tell us more about why you avoid the park, and at which times of the day or week:		

10. How would you normally travel to YOUR PARK? Please tick **one option only.**

On foot		Bicycle		Motorbike	
Car		Bus		Coach	
Taxi		Train		Wheelchair/mobility vehicle	
Other (please write in)					

11. Approximately how long does your normal journey take?

Less than 5 minutes		15 – 20 minutes	
5 - 10 minutes		20 - 30 minutes	
10 – 15 minutes		More than 30 minutes	

12. Please rate how easy it is for you to travel to **YOUR PARK**?

Easy		Quite Difficult	
Quite Easy		Difficult	

Experiences and Perceptions of **YOUR PARK**:

13. In terms of your own quality of life, how important is spending time in **YOUR PARK**? Is it...?

Essential	Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Not important at all	
-----------	----------------	------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--

14. What are your main reasons for visiting **YOUR PARK**? Please tick **up to 5 answers**.

Relax or think in peace and quiet		Enjoy nature (birds / wildlife / flowers / trees/ surroundings)		Feed the birds/ducks	
Get some fresh air		For a walk		Skateboarding	
Ride a bike		Walk the dog		Family outing	
Meet friends & socialise		Take a shortcut		Visit the children's play area	
Visit café/restaurant		Barbecue		Picnic	
Drink alcohol		To exercise (free activity, e.g. running)		To exercise (paid activity)	
Park Run		Play sports or games		Watch sport or games	
Bowling		Allotments		Attend community events	
Non-leisure activities (e.g. protest/activism, leafleting)		Member of a community group or social club that		Paid activities or events (e.g. funfair rides, music concerts, Tropical World)	

		meets in the park			
Meet new people		Educational visit		Enjoy the historical features	
Other:					

15. Which of the following best describes your **last** experience visiting **YOUR PARK**?

Very pleasant		Somewhat unpleasant	
Somewhat pleasant		Very unpleasant	

15a. Please describe the reason for your answer.

--

16. Which of the following words best describe how you usually experience **YOUR PARK** as a place to visit? Please tick **up to 5 answers**.

Welcoming		Unfriendly		Joyous	
Unpleasant		Playful		Controlled	
Liberating		Restrictive		Inspiring	
Depressing		Peaceful		Chaotic	
Relaxing		Tense		Tolerant	
Intolerant		Exciting		Deprived	
Lively		Dull		Secure	
Intimidating		Contrasting		Inviting	

17. How safe do you feel visiting **YOUR PARK** during the day?

Very safe		Safe		Never thought about it		Unsafe		Very unsafe	
-----------	--	------	--	------------------------	--	--------	--	-------------	--

18. How safe do you feel visiting **YOUR PARK** after dark?

I do not visit my park		My park is not open		Very safe		Safe		Never thought about it		Unsafe		Very unsafe	
------------------------	--	---------------------	--	-----------	--	------	--	------------------------	--	--------	--	-------------	--

19. What factors make **YOUR PARK** feel more or less safe?

Safer:													
Less safe:													

Expectations and Priorities for the Future of YOUR PARK:

20. How do you rate the current condition of **YOUR PARK**?

Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
-----------	--	------	--	------	--	------	--

21. In the next three years, how do you expect the condition of **YOUR PARK** to change? Do you expect it to...?

Improve		Decline		Remain		I'm not	
---------	--	---------	--	--------	--	---------	--

21a. Please provide a reason for your answer.

--

22. What do you consider to be the key priorities for **YOUR PARK**? Please tick **up to 3 answers**.

Ensure sufficient events and activities for the local community	
Keep existing facilities open or improve them (e.g. toilets, cafes, drinking water)	
Improve the condition of the parks gates, paths and/or benches	
Encourage more people of different cultures and backgrounds to use the park	
Ensure the park is user friendly for people with disabilities	
Plant more flowers and create flower displays	
Greater personal safety in the park (e.g. lighting, visibility, access to first aid)	
Maintain or increase the presence of park staff	
Keep the park clean (e.g. free of litter, weeds and rubbish)	
Maintain or increase activities for children and young people (e.g. play areas, skate	
Maintain or increase sports facilities (e.g. courts and pitches)	
Protect and restore historic features (e.g. bandstands, memorials, buildings)	
Tackle anti-social behaviour and crime	
The park remains free to enter	
Tackle dog waste	
Other (please specify):	

23. What is your main **hope** for the future of **YOUR PARK**?

--

24. What is your main **fear** for the future of **YOUR PARK**?

--

25. Can you think of any new or different uses for **YOUR PARK** in today's society?

--

Overall Impressions of YOUR PARK:

26. What is your overall impression of **YOUR PARK**?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied

27. Please write down any ideas you have that would make **YOUR PARK** better:

About You:

28. Which of the following categories best describes your **age**?

12-14	15-16	17-18	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75 or over

29. Which of the following describes how you think of your **gender**?

Male		Female		In another way		Prefer not to say	

30. Which of the following categories best describes your **ethnic group**?

White:	Mixed:
White British - English Scottish Welsh	White and Black Caribbean
White Irish	White and Black African
Gypsy/Traveller	White and Asian
Other White background	Other Mixed background
(please write in)	(please write in)

Asian, Asian British, Asian English, Asian Scottish, Asian Welsh:
Indian
Pakistani
Bangladeshi
Other Asian background
(please write in)

Black, Black British, Black English, Black Scottish, Black Welsh:
Caribbean
African
Other Black background
(please write in)

Other ethnic groups:
Chinese or Chinese British
Arab
Other ethnic group

31. Are you a **student** in further or higher education?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

32. Do you have access to a **private or communal garden**?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

33. Do you consider yourself to have a **disability** that affects your access to or use of parks?

Yes		No		Prefer not to say	
-----	--	----	--	-------------------	--

34. Are you a member of a **park support group or neighbourhood organisation** engaged in volunteering in, or campaigning for, parks?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

35. What is your **postcode**? (e.g. LS6 9JB)

--

APPENDIX C: CALCULATION OF ADULT VISITS TO PARKS

This technical note provides an outline of the process for calculating total adult (aged 18+) visits to Leeds Parks based on the results of the 2016 survey. It draws on the methodology devised in 2009 by LCC. However, the 2009 and 2016 estimates of total visit to Leeds Parks are not comparable.

Background

In 2009, Leeds Parks & Countryside Service, in partnership with the Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management, developed a methodology for calculating an estimate of the total number of visits to all parks in Leeds based on a survey of residents. This approach relies on respondents identifying how often they visit a park and making generalisations about park use from this sample to the wider Leeds population. A calculation was developed by LCC in the first instance to give an overall picture of the total number of visits made to parks throughout the city and as a secondary measure to individual parks.

We applied the methodology developed by LCC, with some modifications, to the results of the Leeds Park Survey 2016 which asks about visits to parks in the previous year. For this, we provide an estimate of total adult visits to all parks in Leeds. However, it was not possible to provide a reliable calculation for all individual parks as some parks did not receive sufficient responses to the survey.

Calculation of Total Adult Visits to Leeds Parks

We received 6,432 completed responses to the survey, of which 6332 were adults. We applied a post-stratification weighting adjustment for gender (male and female) and ethnicity (BAME and white), based on population data in the Census 2011 for Leeds. This produced a sample representative of the Leeds population with respect to gender and ethnicity.

The 2016 survey asked respondents to identify which park they visited most often. It then asked about the frequency of their visits to this park, in both the summer and winter. Respondents had six answer options, which were given a numerical value (Table B.1). For example, respondents who answered 'almost every day', were given a value of 6 (out of 7 days per week).

The total figure for all respondents was then multiplied over the 6 month seasonal period (winter/summer) as outlined in Table B.1. For example, respondents who answered 'almost every day' were given a value of 6 (out of 7 days per week), which is equivalent of 156 days over a 6 month seasonal period. The survey specifies that the 'summer' includes late spring/early autumn when the weather is generally good and the 'winter' includes late autumn/early spring when the weather is generally col/wet. Hence, these are equated to two six month seasonal periods. This approach relies on

respondents identifying how often, on average, they visited their most used park and then multiplying this over a season. The 2016 survey did not ask respondents how often they visited *all* parks in Leeds. Hence, the estimated total of adult visits to Leeds Parks is likely to be reasonably conservative.

Table B.1 Answer Options and Numerical Values

Answer Options	Multiplier Over 7 Days	Multiplier Over 6 Month Seasonal Period
Almost Every Day	6/7	156
Once or Twice a Week	1.5/7	39
Once Every Two Weeks	0.5/7	13
Once a Month	0.230/7	6
Less than Once a Month	0.115/7	3
Seldom or Never	0/7	0

The total multiplied figure for all respondents was then multiplied by the total adult population for Leeds (using 2016 population data). It was then divided by the number of replies to the survey for each seasonable period (winter and summer). This is not the same as the total number of adult survey responses (6,332). This is because some people answered the survey but left the question unanswered about frequency of use. Tables B.2 & B.3 give the actual data for all parks in Leeds in 2016 as an example of this calculation.

Table B.2 Summer Figures

Answer Options	Number of Replies	Multiplier Over 6 Month Summer Seasonal Period	Total Summer Visits
Almost every day	1,099	156	171,444
Once or twice a week	999	39	38,961
Once every 2 weeks	710	13	9,230
Once a month	1,046	6	6,276
Less than once a month	1,767	3	5,301
Seldom or never	102	0	
Total	5,723		231,212

Table B.3 Winter Figures

Answer Options	Number of Replies	Multiplier Over 6 Month Winter Seasonal Period	Total Winter Visits
Almost every day	738	156	115,128
Once or twice a week	1,255	39	48,945
Once every 2 weeks	843	13	10,959
Once a month	1,136	6	6,816
Less than once a month	1,135	3	3,405
Seldom or never	616	0	
Total	5,723		185,253

Summer: $231,212 * 616,937 / 5723 = 24,924,557$ – Total number of visits per summer

Winter: $185,253 * 616,937 / 5722 = 19,973,686$ – Total number of visits per winter

Whole year: $24,924,557 + 19,973,686 = 44,898,242$ – Total number of visits per annum

Adult Visits to Leeds Parks per day, per season

One would expect very significant day-to-day variation in visits, meaning that a simple average figure is of limited use. However, the following calculation provides the average number of adults estimated to visit Leeds parks per day in each season:

Summer: $24,924,557 / (365/2)$ days of summer = 136,573 visits to Leeds parks per day in summer

Winter: $19,973,686 / (365/2)$ days per winter = 109,445 visits per day in winter.

Adult Visits to Leeds Parks per season, at any one time

One would expect very significant variation in visits at any one time, meaning that a simple average figure is of limited use. However, taking the average daylight hours in each season (summer: 14.42 and winter: 9.8) and from the visitor survey the average length of visit in summer and winter (summer: 1.42, winter: 0.89), the following calculation gives the average number of adult visits in Leeds parks at any one time. These were calculated manually summing up the UK average daylight values for all 6 months of 'summer' and of 'winter'. Source: <http://www.derekscope.co.uk/average-of-hours-of-daylights-in-the-uk/>

Summer: $136,573 / [14.42 \text{ (hours)} / 1.42 \text{ (length of stay)}] = 13,107$ visitors in Leeds parks on average at any one time in summer

Winter: $109,445 / [9.8 \text{ (hours)} / 0.89 \text{ (length of stay)}] = 9,947$ visitors in Leeds parks on average at any one time in winter

Comparability with the 2009 estimate of total visits

While the overall methodology for calculating total visits is similar, there are differences in sampling, survey questions, and approach to the calculation which make the 2016 estimate of adult visits to parks not comparable to the estimate produced in 2009. The differences are summarised as follows:

- While the 2009 estimates of visits to parks are for adults and young people (using the number of adult visits as a proxy for young people), the 2016 estimates are just for adult visits.
- The 2016 survey asked respondents to identify their main park (i.e. the park they use most often) and then identify how often they visited this park. Whereas, in the 2009 survey, respondents were asked to name a park, which did not explicitly state that the chosen park should be their local park, park they visit most frequently or just a park of interest.
- Both the 2009 and the 2016 surveys asked respondents to say how often they visited their named park, in both summer and winter. However, these surveys provided different answer options. Specifically, the 2009 survey provided an option to say respondents visited their park 'every day', whereas the 2016 survey did not include this option. Hence, a score of 7/7 is not possible using the 2016 methodology (see Tables B.4 & B.5).
- There are also differences in sampling and data collection methods which may have an effect on the responses.

Table B.4 Answer options and multiplier rate for the 2009 survey

Answer options	Multiplier Over 7 Days	Multiplier Over 6 Month Seasonal Period
Every Day	7/7	182.5
Most Days	6/7	159
Once or Twice a Week	1.5/7	39
Once Every Two Weeks	0.5/7	13
Once a Month	0.230/7	6
Seldom or Never	0/7	0

Table B.5 Answer options and multiplier rate for the 2016 survey

Answer options	Multiplier Over 7 Days	Multiplier Over 6 Month Seasonal Period
Almost Every Day	6/7	156
Once or Twice a Week	1.5/7	39
Once Every Two Weeks	0.5/7	13
Once a Month	0.230/7	6
Less than Once a Month	0.115/7	3
Seldom or Never	0/7	0

APPENDIX D: SITE-BASED ESTIMATES OF TOTAL ADULT VISITS

Community Committee	Park	Total Annual Adult Visits	Total Annual Adult Visits
East Inner	Banstead Park	8,301	Community Parks 1,096,403
	East End Park	634,33	
	Harehills Park	247,741	
	Seacroft Gardens	Not included	
	The Rein	206,023	
East Outer	Allerton Bywater Sports	73,524	Community Parks 1,202,163
	Barleyhill Park	109,962	
	Glebelands Recreation	191,789	
	Grove Road Recreation	77,620	
	Halton Dene - Primrose Valley	167,319	
	Manston Park	485,243	
	Temple Newsam	2,352,361	
	Whinmoor Park, Coal Road	96,706	
North East Inner	Chapel Allerton Park	617,302	Community Parks 3,766,907
	Meanwood Park	2,312,690	
	Norma Hutchinson	Not included	
	Potternewton Park	836,915	
	Roundhay Park	9,284,718	
North East Outer	Golden Acre Park	1,755,117	1,755,117
North West Inner	Beckett Park	1,003,688	Community Parks 4,899,115
	Blenheim Square	33,960	
	Hartley Avenue Park	Not selected	
	Lovell Park	249,467	
	Tennant Hall POS	Not selected	
	The Hollies	358,785	
	Woodhouse Moor	3,253,215	
	Woodhouse Ridge	Not included	
North West Outer	Chevin Forest Park	622,485	Community Parks 4,204,388
	Grove Hill Park, Otley	39,026	
	Holt Park	293,881	
	Horsforth Hall Park	1,194,612	
	Kirk Lane Park	42,369	
	Micklefield Park, Rawdon	315,122	
	Nunroyd Park, Guiseley	466,910	
	Tarnfield Park, Yeadon	745,280	
	Wharfemeadows Park, Otley	1,107,188	
South Inner	Cross Flatts Park	1,081,525	Community Parks 1,382,308
	Holbeck Moor	127,643	
	Hunslet Lake	68,674	
	Hunslet Moor	103,819	
	Middleton Park	1,029,341	

	Penny Pocket Park	646,91	
South Outer	Churwell Park	115,675	Community Parks
	Dartmouth Park	628,735	
	Drighlington Park	218,846	
	Lewisham Park	111,258	
	Rothwell Country Park	676,817	
	Scarth Gardens	Not selected	
	Scatcherd Park	398,562	
	Springhead Park	1,091,660	
	Woodlesford Park	47,543	
West Inner	Armley Park	264,020	Community Parks 3,515,609
	Bramley Falls Wood Park	660,648	
	Bramley Park	996,028	
	Burley Park	707,110	
	Gotts Park	254,644	
	Kirkstall Abbey Park	1,141,577	
	Rodley Park Recreation	147,914	
	Stanningley Park	485,245	
West Outer	Calverley Park (Victoria Park)	571,701	Community Parks 4,756,892
	Farnley Hall Park	881,543	
	Hainsworth Park	157,399	
	New Farnley Park	206,128	
	New Wortley Recreation	231,572	
	Pudsey Park	1,803,072	
	Queens Park	85,815	
	Tyersal Park	44,417	
	Western Flatts Cliff Park	420,018	
	Westroyd Park	355,227	
	Lotherton Hall	378,729	
All Leeds parks		44,591,401	

APPENDIX E: SITE-BASED USER-SATISFACTION SCORES

East Inner	Banstead Park (n=4)	East End Park (n=48)	Harehills Park (n=25)	The Rein (n=11)	Community Parks (n=88)	All Leeds
Very satisfied	25%	10%	8%		9%	42%
Satisfied	50%	54%	60%	45%	55%	48%
Neither		27%	24%	36%	26%	7%
Dissatisfied		4%	4%	18%	6%	2%
Very dissatisfied	25%		4%		2%	1%
Total	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%

East Outer	Allerton Bywater Sports Ground (n=6)	Barleyhill Park (n=7)	Glebelands Recreation Ground (n=23)	Grove Road Recreation Ground (n=6)	Halton Dene - Primrose Valley (n=11)	Manston Park (n=59)	Temple Newsam (n=443)	Whinmoor Park, Coal Road (n=10)	Community Parks (n=122)	All Leeds
Very satisfied		29%	4%		18%	14%	51%	10%	11%	42%
Satisfied	33%	43%	57%	33%	27%	75%	44%	70%	61%	48%
Neither	67%	29%	39%	33%	45%	12%	3%	10%	25%	7%
Dissatisfied				33%	9%				2%	2%
Very dissatisfied								10%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%

North East Inner	Chapel Allerton Park (n=46)	Meanwood Park (n=249)	Potternewton Park (n=57)	Roundhay Park (n=1459)	Community Parks (n=351)	All Leeds
Very satisfied	35%	57%	30%	54%	49%	42%
Satisfied	52%	39%	63%	41%	44%	48%
Neither	11%	4%	5%	4%	5%	7%
Dissatisfied	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Very dissatisfied					0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%

North East Outer	Golden Acre Park (n=410)	All Leeds
Very satisfied	62%	42%
Satisfied	36%	48%
Neither	2%	7%
Dissatisfied	1%	2%
Very dissatisfied		1%
Total	100%	100%

North West Inner	Beckett Park (n=85)	Blenheim Square (n=2)	Lovell Park (n=21)	The Hollies (n=33)	Woodhouse Moor (n=286)	Woodhouse Ridge (n=1)	Community Parks (n=428)	All Leeds
Very satisfied	29%		19%	61%	25%		28%	42%
Satisfied	57%	50%	52%	39%	60%	100%	57%	48%
Neither	9%		19%		11%		10%	7%
Dissatisfied	3%	50%	10%		3%		3%	2%
Very dissatisfied					1%		1%	1%
Total	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

North West Outer	Chevin Forest Park (n=103)	Grove Hill Park (n=8)	Holt Park (n=15)	Horsforth Hall Park (n=192)	Kirk Lane Park (n=3)	Micklefield Park (n=38)	Nunroyd Park (n=44)	Tarnfield Park (n=94)	Wharfemeadows Park (n=94)	Community Parks (n=485)	All Leeds
Very satisfied	61%		27%	41%	33%	29%	27%	35%	44%	37%	42%
Satisfied	36%	75%	60%	54%	33%	50%	57%	57%	50%	54%	48%
Neither	1%	25%	13%	5%		21%	16%	4%	4%	7%	7%
Dissatisfied	2%				33%			1%	1%	1%	2%
Very dissatisfied				1%				1%		0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%

South Inner	Cross Flatts Park (n=101)	Holbeck Moor (n=14)	Hunslet Lake (n=3)	Hunslet Moor (n=9)	Middleton Park (n=163)	Penny Pocket Park (n=1)	Community Parks (n=128)	All Leads
Very satisfied	20%	14%	33%		42%		18%	42%
Satisfied	55%	36%	33%	56%	48%	100%	53%	48%
Neither	17%	36%		33%	8%		20%	7%
Dissatisfied	6%		33%	11%			6%	2%
Very dissatisfied	2%	14%					3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%

South Outer	Churwell Park (n=19)	Dartmouth Park (n=72)	Drighlington Park (n=22)	Lewisham Park (n=9)	Rothwell Country Park (n=79)	Scatcherd Park (n=45)	Springhead Park (n=121)	Woodlesford Park (n=4)	Community Parks (n=371)	All Leads
Very satisfied	16%	28%	23%		28%	18%	41%	25%	29%	42%
Satisfied	79%	50%	59%	67%	58%	67%	51%	75%	57%	48%
Neither	5%	21%	14%		9%	16%	5%		11%	7%
Dissatisfied		1%	5%	22%	4%		1%		2%	2%
Very dissatisfied				11%			2%		1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

West Inner		Armley (n=43)	Bramley Falls Wood Park (n=51)	Bramley Park (n=91)	Burley Park (n=62)	Gotts Park (n=22)	Kirkstall Abbey Park (n=169)	Rodley Park Recreation Ground (n=21)	Stanningley Park (n=27)	Community Parks (n=314)	All Leeds
Very satisfied		14%	25%	23%	24%	18%	50%	29%	4%	21%	42%
Satisfied		60%	59%	57%	58%	59%	43%	57%	56%	58%	48%
Neither		14%	8%	14%	18%	14%	6%	10%	26%	15%	7%
Dissatisfied		9%	6%	3%		9%			7%	4%	2%
Very dissatisfied		2%						5%	7%	1%	1%
Total		100%	98%	98%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%

West Outer	Calverley Park (Victoria Park) (n=51)	Farnley Hall Park (n=68)	Hainsworth Park (n=12)	New Farnley Park (n=21)	New Wortley Recreation Ground (n=23)	Pudsey Park (n=231)	Queens Park (n=4)	Tyersal Park (n=4)	Western Flatts Cliff Park (n=31)	Westroyd Park (n=22)	Lotherton Hall (n=76)	Community Parks (n=465)	All Leeds
Very satisfied	59%	24%	33%	10%	17%	42%			3%	41%	54%	35%	42%
Satisfied	39%	54%	50%	62%	39%	52%	50%	75%	77%	50%	45%	52%	48%
Neither	2%	19%		19%	17%	6%	50%		10%	9%		9%	7%
Dissatisfied		1%	8%		22%			25%	10%		1%	3%	2%
Very dissatisfied		1%		5%								0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	92%	95%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TO CITE THIS REPORT

When citing data from this report, please acknowledge source using the following citation:

Barker, A., Churchill, D., Crawford, A. (2018) *Leeds Parks Survey: Full Report*, Leeds: University of Leeds. [Arts and Humanities Research Council AH/N001788/1]

CAVEAT ON USE OF DATA

If citing the estimates of total adult visits included herein, please include the following statement: Data on estimated number of total visits to parks were produced drawing upon a methodology developed by Leeds City Council.

DISCLAIMER

The findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this report are strictly those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of Leeds City Council or the Arts and Humanities Research Council who take no responsibility for the correctness of the information reported.

FOR MORE INFORMATION PLEASE VISIT

For more information about the study and to download the survey reports free of charge please visit:

www.futureofparks.leeds.ac.uk | [@leedsparksstudy](https://twitter.com/leedsparksstudy)



Arts & Humanities
Research Council

