

# Appendices

## Appendix 1

### *Public consultation*


Consultation took place during 2011/2012 via online and hard copies of survey questionnaires, designed to assess the views of the residents, their attitude and aspirations concerning green spaces throughout the borough. The survey was advertised in the local press, the local “contacts” magazine distributed to every household in the borough, on the council website and internally, within the council. It was also advertised through the Leisure Services email bulletin which holds a database of over 6,000 leisure cardholders. Paper questionnaires were made available at Gedling Borough Councils One-Stop reception, at each of the five leisure centres and distributed to local libraries. A total of 424 surveys were returned, providing a substantial statistical evidence base. Residents were asked their views and opinions on green spaces and sports facilities in the borough in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility.

### **Demographics from respondents**

When analysing the data from the public consultation, it was important to take into account the demographics of the respondents and compare this to the population profile of residents in the borough. Due to the nature of the survey, there was a noticeable difference between the demographics of the respondents and the population profile of Gedling and hence, this was taken into account when analysing the results, providing evidence for why consultation with children and young people was conducted as a separate survey.


The majority of respondents were female (61%), between the ages of 30 and 44 years of age (35%). Only 0.2% of responses were from those under the age of 16 and 1.2% of respondents were between the ages of 16 to 24. In fact, 66% of respondents were aged between 30 and 59. 87% described their ethnic origin as White British and 3% as White Irish/other, an ethnicity profile that falls broadly in line with the borough’s population statistics, however there were a higher proportion of female respondents than the borough’s profile.

Frequency of visits by typology



Four typologies stand out as the most frequently used (on a daily/weekly basis), these are parks and gardens and natural and semi-natural green space. Of the respondents, the least used facilities were allotments and community gardens and cemeteries and churchyards.

*Most common mode of transport used to reach green spaces in Gedling*



The most common mode of travel to green space facilities in the borough is by walking and driving. It is interesting to note that significantly more people walk to parks and gardens, natural green space, amenity green space, provision for children, school playing fields and green corridors than drive. Driving is more popular than walking when travelling to cemeteries, outdoor sports facilities and indoor facilities such as swimming pools, sports halls and gyms. Alternative modes of transport including public transport and cycling account for between 0% and 5% within each typology.

## Travel times

Residents were asked to identify the travel times they considered as acceptable to the various typologies of green space.

*Acceptable travel times and travel modes to green space typologies as identified by the borough's residents*

Green Space Typologies	Mode of Travel	Average Travel Time (minutes)	Equivalent Distance Walking (metres)
Parks and Gardens	Walk	15	1210
Amenity Green Space	Walk	8	640
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	10 minutes for a local children's play area	800
		15 minutes for an informal play area	1210
Natural and semi-natural green space	Walk	To a 2ha site: 15	1210
		20ha site: 34	2740
Outdoor Sports Facilities	Walk	10	800
	Drive	15	9660
Allotments and community gardens	Walk	20	1610
	Drive	10	6,440
Cemeteries and churchyards	Drive/Walk	20	Walk: 1610 Drive: 12870
Green corridors	N/A	N/A	N/A


*Equivalent distances have been calculated the nearest ten*

The table above provides details of reasonable travel times and their preferred mode of transport to green spaces as identified by respondents. The expected travel time was calculated to the top 75 percentile in line with PPG17 guidance. Respondents were asked if the time it takes to travel to each typology was acceptable. Overall, 97% of respondents felt that the travelling time was acceptable. In addition to this, respondents were asked if there were sufficient publicly accessible green spaces in the borough, of which 79% thought there were and 16% thought there were not.

## Quality

Local residents were asked to rate the quality of facilities using the descriptions – very good, good, average, poor and very poor. The graph below summaries the responses of those who use the facilities.

*Perceptions of quality of green spaces*



The general opinion of residents in the borough is that the quality of green spaces on the whole is good across all typologies other than parks and gardens which were rated as very good. The worst performing green spaces were school playing fields and outdoor sport facilities. Although these were rated as good, they had a lower average rating than other outdoor typologies. In addition to the public consultation, consultation took place on Parks and other green spaces as part of the Place Survey. In 2019, 73% of residents were satisfied with parks and green spaces in Gedling. Local residents were also asked to rate some factors on the sites they visited the most. The table below shows respondents responses to these factors:

*Quality ratings of specific aspects of green spaces in the borough*

	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	No opinion
Standard of cleanliness	18.9%	47.9%	24.8%	3.8%	0.9%	0.7%
Design and appearance	12.7%	48.1%	30.2%	3.1%	0.7%	0.9%
Visitor facilities	8.5%	32.5%	40.1%	7.1%	0.9%	5.9%
Children and young people's facilities	11.8%	36.8%	25.7%	4.5%	0.9%	13.7%
Outdoor sports facilities	11.6%	39.9%	25.7%	3.3%	0.7%	12.5%
Range of wildlife	14.9%	34.2%	29.0%	5.2%	0.9%	8.7%
Access around the sites	17.9%	48.6%	22.6%	0.9%	0.2%	4.5%
Choice and range of facility across the borough	7.8%	20.8%	12%	1.7%	0.2%	1.9%

The majority of respondents rate the facilities within the borough’s green spaces as good. Cleanliness was the highest rated aspect, with 66.8% of respondents rating it as either good or better. Access around the sites was also considered positively with 66.5% considering it as either good or better. Visitor facilities had the worse ratings with 7.1% considering the visitor facilities as poor.

### Why people visit green spaces in the borough

Local residents were asked the reasons why they visited public green space in the borough. The top four reasons given were to go for a walk, to relax, to improve health and to take the family. Additionally, residents were asked about barriers to visiting public green space. The most common reasons given as a barrier for use were dog fouling (14%), quality of facilities (8%) and lack of facilities (7.5%). It is interesting to note that those barriers high up the agenda are related to quality and those quoted less regularly are related to access e.g., too many roads to cross (1.2%) limiting long term illness (0.9%), no one to go with (1.7%)

Local residents were also asked to rate some specific factors on the sites they visited the most. The table below shows respondents responses to these factors. The table shows that “dog fouling and litter” are seen as the biggest issues.

*Rating of specific issues on open spaces in the borough*

	A very big problem	Significant problem	A fairly big problem	Significant problem	Occasional problem	Not a very big problem	No Problem	No opinion
Vandalism & Graffiti	3.1%	6.8%	12.3%	6.8%	42.7%	21.9%	7.3%	3.1%
Litter Problems	5.2%	13.9%	12%	13.9%	36.3%	20.3%	7.8%	0.9%
Anti-social behaviour	4%	4.7%	11.6%	4.7%	38.2%	20.5%	14.9%	3.1%
Dog fouling	8.5%	15.8%	12%	15.8%	34.4%	17.9%	5.9%	1.9%

## **Door to Door Survey**

In January 2011, 470 respondents were interviewed from a sample of 500 during a door-to-door survey of residents. Residents were asked questions concerning parks and green spaces across the borough and leisure centres and community centres. The results complement the more recent public survey described above. This door-to-door survey provides additional information on:

- The profile of residents that use parks and open spaces in the borough
- Why people use the parks
- Reasons why parks are not used more often
- Parks people avoid using and reasons
- The feeling of safety in the parks
- What would improve safety in parks

*Please note: The survey did not classify parks and greens spaces into the LPD20 typologies. Parks and green spaces play provision and outdoor sports facilities were included in what was defined as a park for the survey.*

## **Demographics from respondents**

When analysing the data from the door-to-door survey, it was important to account for the demographics of the respondents in comparison to the profile of the borough. Due to the nature of the survey, it was possible to collect data from residents that reflected the profile of the borough. The door-to-door survey showed that the majority of families with dependent children use their local parks and playing fields at least weekly and lone adults are least likely to use them. 46% of people between 25-44 use parks and playing fields on a weekly basis. After 45 years of age, the older the person is, the frequency of visits to these facilities reduces.

## **Reason for visiting the Parks**

The door-to-door survey revealed some differences in the reasons why people use the parks in comparison to the public consultation. For example, the door-to-door survey highlighted people use the parks mainly for children's play and walking. Although public consultation highlighted children's play as relatively popular, it was not the most prevalent reason as to why people visited the parks on a weekly basis. However, it must be taken into account that a higher proportion of respondents from the public consultation were over 45 and hence less likely to have dependent children. From public consultation, other reasons why residents visit on a regular basis are for going for walks.



Reason why parks are not used more frequently	Percentage of respondents
Time	30%
Health/age/disability	18%
No children living at home	13%
Prefer country walks	10%
Lack of interest	8%
Transport/Distance	5%
Anti-social behaviour	4%
No dogs	4%
Weather	3%
Travel to other local authority areas instead	2%
No one to go with	2%
Dog fouling	1%

Those surveyed were asked if there were any reasons why they do not use the parks more often. The most common reason why people do not use the parks more frequently was due to personal time constraints and the second most common was due to health, age and disability. 13% of people felt that because children were not living at home there was not a strong enough reason to visit the parks. The public consultation showed that dog fouling and litter were more of an issue than antisocial behaviour however, when residents were asked during the door-to-door survey what the single biggest problem was, it was revealed that gatherings of youths and dog fouling were the two biggest issues.

People were also asked why they do not visit the parks more often with antisocial behaviour (5%) more of an issue than dog fouling (1%). In addition, when surveyed, respondents were asked why they avoid parks. The main reasons were:

- Young people (35%)
- Fear of crime (13%)
- Dog fouling (9%)
- Antisocial behaviour (5%)
- Vandalism (5%)
- Isolation (5%)

Overall, 91% of people felt safe when using parks within the borough. To improve safety in parks, the most popular suggestions were to use park wardens, better policing, better lighting, fencing, CCTV and provide more activities for youths.

### **Parks user survey**

Nine parks across the borough were surveyed individually to ascertain user's opinions. There was a total of 225 responses from 2018-2019, with a general satisfaction of 95%. These results inform the parks and gardens section of the LPD20 audit. Users were asked questions on the frequency of visits, length of stay, methods of travel, activities undertaken and the quality of the parks. These results are reported in the parks and gardens section of this document.

### **Sports Club Survey**

In March 2016, the Gedling Borough Playing Pitch Strategy was developed via a combination of information gathered during consultation, site visits and analysis. The following responses from public consultation were received. The breakdowns of clubs were as follows:

- football – 16 responses
- cricket – 4 responses
- bowls – 6 responses
- golf – 3 responses
- rugby – 1 response
- tennis – 1 response

Clubs were asked to rate the quality of open space facilities they use, on a scale from 1 (poor) to 10 (very good). Clubs were most dissatisfied with car parking facilities, 6 clubs rated them with the lowest possible score. Clubs were most satisfied with the changing areas with 14 changing areas considered 8 or above. However, 6 changing areas were given the lowest score of 1. Taking these results into account, it is important to consider the sports facilities at open spaces on an individual basis.

How sports clubs feel about the quality of the open space they use, where 1=poor and 10=excellent

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Playing Area	1	2	5	2	10	0	6	4	3	4
Car Parking	6	5	2	3	4	3	4	5	3	3
Changing Area	6	0	2	5	2	3	3	4	3	7

Clubs were asked if they have sufficient facilities and 33% felt there were not sufficient facilities at their club venue. Comments included:

- Additional full-size pitches and mini pitches
- Better location that houses all teams
- 3G pitch facilities
- Would like their own ground

The most popular comments from clubs in relation to improvements to the existing facilities these included:

- Bigger changing rooms
- Improved storage
- Improved maintenance e.g., bowling greens
- Inadequate car parking spaces
- Better marking out of pitches
- Improved practice facilities

To date, additional pitches including mini pitches have been provided by internal marking within existing pitches. Two new 3G pitches have been constructed at Redhill Academy in the north of the borough and Carlton le Willows Academy in the south. Changing facilities are being replaced at Lambley Lane Recreation Ground, an F.A identified football hub site with additional storage at other sites using metal containers. Staff have undertaken Fine Sports Turf training to improve overall standards of pitch and green maintenance. New line marking machines have been purchased that use the latest technology with laser levels and spray paint application. These replace the old pitch line marker paint barrows.

## **Allotment Association Consultation**

In October 2019, a survey was sent to all five allotment associations in the borough. The associations were asked about the range of facilities provided, quality, current usage, the main issues, future priorities, plans associated with the site and fees and charges.

**Quality** - All five associations rated the overall quality of the allotments as good or excellent. Chandos was considered as being excellent, this was despite it having fewer facilities and services on-site than some of the other sites. The main quality issues affecting the associations include:

- no toilets
- vandalism
- slow service with regard to repairs
- availability of land
- expectations of new allotment holders – turnover among new plot holders remains high due to plot condition on starting and an underestimation of the time and hard work involved in allotment gardening
- voluntary nature of committee
- dissemination of good practice could be improved

**Quantity** - No allotment sites in the borough have any vacant slots, and although, in recent years, waiting list numbers have declined, since the COVID-19 pandemic, they have vastly increased. The recent allotment review revealed the following waiting list totals.

Allotment Site	Waiting List Totals
Stoke Lane	29
Robin Hood	9
Gedling Grove	7
Leapool	9
Chandos Street	8
Killisick	18
Howbeck	27
Rookery Gardens	18
Parishes	30
<b>Total</b>	155

**Access** - All allotment associations felt that the travelling time to allotments was acceptable. The majority of people either used a car or walked. Travelling time for driving was between 5-10 minutes and walking between 10-20 minutes. The main priority for the future from all three associations were more allotment sites. The second most popular priority was improved on-site facilities. GBC allotments have seen a steady improvement since the 2012 strategy, with improved facilities for people with disabilities and the installation of new toilets and meeting rooms.

### Friends of Group Survey

At the time of consultation, Friends' of Groups were consulted through completion of a questionnaire, where they were asked questions concerning the quality and plans for their associated park. The overall view of the quality of parks they represented ranged from average to excellent. Gedling Country Park and Arnot Hill Park were excellent, Burton Road Jubilee Park rated as good and Gedling House Woods good but with issues. Issues were individual to each park; however, vandalism was an issue at Gedling House Woods and Arnot Hill Park. All Friends of Groups felt that there needed to be more parks and green spaces in the borough that are of better quality.

## **Parish Council Survey**

Formal consultation took place with the Parish Councils in preparation for the green space strategy 2012. The consultation was in the form of a questionnaire and allowed site inventories to be updated, gain an insight on the level of usage, condition and identify any future aspirations of the Parish Councils.

## **Schools Survey**

Questionnaires were forwarded to all schools within the borough (both primary and secondary) which derived 44 responses. The following provides an overview of the opinions on the outdoor facilities located on education sites. 69% of schools responded to say they had sports facilities on their sites. 12 schools (50%) which currently do not have community use stated they would consider community use in the future. All these were primary school and are listed below:


- Arno Vale Primary school
- All Hallows Primary School
- Arnold View Primary School
- Burton Joyce Primary School
- Carlton Central Primary School
- Westdale Primary School
- Seely C of E Primary School
- Stanhope Primary School
- Linby and Papplwick Primary School
- Robert Mellors Primary School
- St Wilfrids c of E Primary School

Outdoor facilities at education sites include mini, junior and senior football pitches, hockey (grass pitches), rugby, cricket, synthetic turf pitches, multi-use game area and tennis courts. Schools were asked to rate the quality of their own facilities. Quality varied significantly from poor to excellent with the majority assessing their facilities as good or average. Five schools have plans to improve sports facilities in the future.


## Children & Young People

All schools in Gedling were invited to participate in an online survey or complete a hard copy version of the same questionnaire. 353 questionnaire responses were received from the ages of 4 to 15.

*Frequency of visits by children and young people to parks and open spaces*



### Frequency of visits by children and young people to play areas



When asked about the frequency of visits to parks and green spaces in Gedling, over 50% of respondents stated that they use parks and green spaces once a week or more, whilst only 7% never use green spaces. When questioned specifically about visits to local play areas, the number of children who never use them increased to 16% however, 50% still used play areas once a week or more. Children and young people were asked what their perfect place to play would contain, the most popular answers were places to make dens and lots of play equipment. Respondents were also asked whether facilities for children and young people could be improved in their area. The majority stated that they feel facilities could be better (56% of respondents), with the following most popular comments being made in relation to necessary improvements:

- Reduce the amount of litter and dog fouling
- There is no playground near us (Mapperley Plains School)
- More equipment on the parks with particular reference to climbing equipment
- Less vandalism
- More space
- More woods and rocks (natural play)
- Improved safety
- Less rubbish and graffiti and more places/dens for young children to go



## **Internal consultation**

It was important that during the production of the assessment, internal officers and council members were aware of the development of the assessment and strategy. Internal consultation was carried out with council officers, from Planning, Environmental services, Leisure Services. The key themes that arose have been reviewed in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility:

### **Quality**

- overall, the green spaces are well maintained
- some high-quality play areas in the urban conurbation
- dog-fouling issues
- quality of pavilions requires improvements
- parks require more monitoring to reduce antisocial behaviour
- play areas are being damaged by dogs and suffer from graffiti
- more conservation work could be done on our parks
- the role third tier government plays in maintenance and management of open space (short term and long term)

### **Quantity**

- more football pitches are required
- a lack of tennis facilities in the Arnold area
- there is an over demand of allotment plots. Plots could be halved to help meet demand
- the amount of amenity green space varies across the borough
- more burial space required (now provided at Carlton Cemetery)
- amenity green space is overall well provided, however, some areas have a shortfall
- more provision for play areas for children and young people is required on all sizeable new developments, in particular for older children with the provision of MUGA, skateparks and teen shelters

## **Accessibility**

- limited car parking at cemeteries and issues with one-way system within the cemetery
- opening up more school sites for community use should be considered
- ensure continued future accessibility for those with disability

## Appendix 2

### Parks and Gardens

#### **Appendix 2a:** *Quantity audit of parks and gardens in the borough*

Site name	Size in ha	Ward	Urban/Rural
Newstead Country Park	88.9	Newstead	Rural
Newstead Abbey Park	62.9	Newstead	Rural
Gedling Country Park	240	Gedling and Plains Wards	Rural
Alpin Crescent	0.07	Valley	Urban
Valley Road	1.51	Carlton Hill	Urban
Hereford Road Open Space	0.18	Gedling	Urban
Willow Park	1.91	Gedling	Urban
Arnot Hill Park	8.3	Kingswell	Urban
Burntstump Country Park	20.02	Newstead	Rural
Newstead Railway Station	4.20	Newstead	Rural
Woodthorpe Library Gardens	0.16	Woodthorpe	Urban
Bestwood Country Park	279	Bestwood Village	Rural
Plains Estate Park	0.34	Mapperley Plains	Urban
Downham, Overstrand, Carmel	0.06	Kingswell	Urban

Site name	Size in ha	Ward	Urban/Rural
Coronation Gardens	0.12	Gedling	Urban
Gedling post office	0.12	Gedling	Urban
<b>Total</b>	<b>708</b>		

**Appendix 2b:** APSE Classification categories. Each park, open space and play area are assessed according to how many of the following 42 facilities each site possesses.

### Facility list

Aquarium\*  
Arboretum\*  
Artificial sports pitch\*  
Aviary\*  
Bandstand\*  
Boating Lake\*  
Bowling green\*  
Car parking\*  
CCTV/Other security\*  
Changing facilities/pavilion\*  
Defined park boundary\*  
Dog bins  
Footpath  
Formal/memorial beds/floral displays\*  
Full access to all park areas for disabled persons  
Glasshouses/floral conservatory\*  
Hard surface for play/kick about area/kicking wall  
LEAP play area\*  
LAP play area  
Litter bins  
Multiplw sports pitches\*  
Multiple play/adventure play\*  
Museum\*  
Paddling pool

Site based staff (i.e park rangers/wardens, maintenance staff, games attendants, offices\*  
Petanque  
Pet's corner\*  
Pitch & putt\*  
Plant collection (NCCPG)  
Putting greens  
Refreshments facilities\*  
Seating  
Signage  
Single sports pitch  
Single play unit  
Tennis/netball courts\*  
Toilets\*  
Visitor and/or information centre\*  
Visitor Facilities\* (i.e. railways, bouncy castles, model boating pond)  
War memorials/statues/sculptures/follies  
Water features/fountains  
Woodland walk\*

**Category A park** - Category A parks are formally defined parks/open spaces/recreation areas having at least a 3-mile catchment area and at least 20 of the facilities from the facility list. (at least 10 of which must be marked \*).


**Category B parks** - Category B parks are a formally defined park/open space/recreation area having at least a 0.75-mile catchment area with a least 10 facilities from the facility list. (at least 5 of which must be marked \*).

**Category C parks** - Category C parks are a park/open space/recreation area having at least a 0.25-mile catchment area with at least 6 facilities from the facility list. (at least 3 of which must be marked \*).

**Category D Parks** - Category D parks are a park/open space/recreation area having at least a 0.5-mile catchment area with at least 1 facility from the facility list.

## Appendix 2c: Site Specific Consultation

Table to show users overall impression of individual parks and gardens in the borough



Arnot Hill Park was considered the best park out of those where user surveys took place with 88% of responders deeming it as either good or better. Burton Road has been significantly improved and is now rated as very good standard. There were a number of comments requesting more sporting events and coaching opportunities on the parks.

Public, user and Friends of Group's consultation have been used to examine the different parks and gardens across the borough. The key findings from each site were:

**Arno Vale** - The quality of grass was considered as the best aspect and protection of nature and wildlife considered as in most need of improvement.

**Annot Hill Park** - The highest rated facility with maintenance of trees, flowers and plants being one of its main strengths. Although still rated as good the area most in need of improvement was the range of facilities.

**Burton Road** – This was considered as park in need of the most improvements. The standard of cleanliness and the protection of nature were considered the area which required most improvement and the standard of the grass being the positive aspect of the park. Since the survey improvements have taken place to the park.

**Burntstump Park** - The standard of cleanliness and the quality of sports facilities are areas which users felt required most improvement with the standard of the grass being the best rated aspect of the park.

**Colwick Recreation Ground** – This park was rated positively; the main strengths were the maintenance of trees, flowers and scrubs and range of facilities. Colwick Recreation Ground is adjacent to Colwick Country Park managed by Nottingham City Council which enhances what it has to offer. Cleanliness and dog fouling were the main areas for concern

**Conway Road** - Most of the users rated the majority of the different aspects of Conway Road as very good. The standard of cleanliness was considered the best rated aspect.

**Jackie Bells** - The care and protection of nature and wildlife at Jackie Bells was considered as poor by the majority of responders, this is no doubt influenced by its urban location.

The range of facilities and sports facilities was considered the best aspects of the park although there were a number of requests for toilet and refreshment facilities

**Killisick Recreation Ground** – This park is influenced by its sub urban location with care and protection nature and wildlife considered the area in need of the most improvement. The maintenance of trees, flowers and scrubs was its best quality

**King George, Arnold** - The Quality of Sports facilities were considered as poor at King George V, Arnold. Cleanliness was considered as one of the better aspects of this park.

**Lambley Lane** -The standard of grass was considered to be the main strength of the site. The quality of the sports facilities was considered as the main area for improvement. Literal responses described the park as a windswept desolate underutilised area.

**Standhill Road, Carlton** - The main areas of improvement were care and protection of nature and wildlife play facilities for teenagers. Since the user consultation was completed improvements have taken place to the children's and teenage play facilities on the park.



## Appendix 2d: Green Flag Award Criteria

### Section 1: A welcoming Place

---

This section recognises the culmination of everything done well. A welcoming place is one that invites and draws people into it. This means creating a space which, through its visual appearance, range of facilities, standards of maintenance and ease of access, makes people feel that they are in a cared-for place.

1. Welcome
2. Good and Safe Access
3. Signage
4. Equal Access for All

### Section 2: Healthy, Safe and Secure

---

This section looks at how well managers understand their users' needs, encouraging them to enjoy healthy activities using appropriate, safe-to-use facilities and activities, and to feel personally safe and secure.

5. Appropriate Provision of Quality Facilities and Activities
6. Safe Equipment and Facilities
7. Personal Security
8. Control of Dogs/Dog Fouling

### Section 3: Well Maintained and Clean

---

For aesthetic as well as health and safety reasons, issues of cleanliness and maintenance must be addressed, in particular:

- + litter and other waste management issues must be adequately dealt with;
- + grounds, buildings, equipment and other features must be well maintained;
- + policies on litter, vandalism and maintenance should be in place, in practice, and regularly reviewed.

9. Litter and Waste Management
10. Horticultural Maintenance
11. Arboricultural Maintenance
12. Building and Infrastructure Maintenance
13. Equipment Maintenance

## Section 4: Environmental Management

---

This section seeks to ensure that the way the site is managed has a positive impact on the environment, locally and globally, both now and for the future. Where choices can be made for future procurement, landscaping or buildings, they should aim to minimise energy and resource consumption and waste, and design in benefits to the local and global environment. Policies should seek to eliminate the use of peat and chemicals to control pests and as fertilisers. Horticultural and arboricultural decisions should reflect an understanding of the impacts of climate change.

- 14. Managing Environmental Impact
- 15. Waste Minimisation
- 16. Chemical Use
- 17. Peat Use
- 18. Climate Change Adaption Strategies

## Section 5: Biodiversity, Landscape and Heritage

---

Attention should be paid to the appropriate management and conservation of natural features, wildlife and flora; landscape features; and buildings and structures. Their particular character and requirements should be identified and appropriate management strategies put in place to conserve and enhance them.

- 19. Management of Natural Features, Wild Fauna and Flora
- 20. Conservation of Landscape Features
- 21. Conservation of Buildings and Structures

## Section 6: Community Involvement

---

This section examines the extent to which the managing organisation:

- + understands the community it seeks to serve;
- + actively and appropriately involves members of the community in making decisions about the site's development;
- + provides opportunities for active participation in site projects; and
- + ensures that there is appropriate provision of recreational facilities and activities for all sectors of the community.

- 22. Community Involvement in Management and Development
- 23. Appropriate Provision for Community

## Section 7: Marketing and Communication

---

This section seeks to examine the ways that managers understand the key benefits of the site and how they use this information to promote it appropriately. They should understand who the main user groups are, could be or should be, and use a fitting range of interpretation and engagement techniques to communicate with them. This basis ensures that appropriate facilities, events and activities can be offered and most effectively promoted, and forms a solid foundation for development now and in the future.

**24. Marketing and Promotion**

**25. Appropriate Information Channels**

**26. Appropriate Educational and Interpretational Information**

## Section 8: Management

---

This section evaluates how well the management plan is implemented on site.

**27. Implementation of Management Plan**

**Appendix 2e: Gedling Borough site quality assessment**

Summary of Site Inspections by Scores & Gap in Quality of Provision (Summer 2010 Assessment)								
APSE Classification	Site Location	Site Score	Potential Score	Difference (Gap)	No. of Assessment Criteria	Average Site Score divided by Assessment Criteria	Average x 7 to get Green Flag Score	Pass
C	Breckhill	139	187	48	25	5.6	<b>39</b>	<b>Fail</b>
B	Arnot Hill Park	226	241	15	27	8.4	<b>59</b>	<b>Pass</b>
C	Arno Vale Road	116	141	25	19	6.1	<b>43</b>	<b>Pass</b>
B	Burntstump CP	159	191	32	24	6.6	<b>46</b>	<b>Pass</b>
B	KGV Standhill	147	173	26	23	6.4	<b>45</b>	<b>Pass</b>
C	Carlton Hill Rec	136	157	21	22	6.1	<b>43</b>	<b>Pass</b>
C	Cavendish Road	113	136	23	20	5.6	<b>39</b>	<b>Fail</b>
C	Church Lane	153	182	29	23	6.6	<b>46</b>	<b>Pass</b>
B	Colwick Rec	148	164	16	23	6.4	<b>45</b>	<b>Pass</b>
B	Conway Road	136	159	23	24	5.7	<b>40</b>	<b>Fail</b>
C	Jackie Bells	141	156	15	22	6.4	<b>45</b>	<b>Pass</b>

APSE Classification	Site Location	Site Score	Potential Score	Difference (Gap)	No. of Assessment Criteria	Average Site Score divided by Assessment Criteria	Average x 7 to get Green Flag Score	Pass
B	Burton Road	128	166	38	23	5.6	<b>39</b>	<b>Fail</b>
C	Killisick Rec	139	163	24	23	6.0	<b>42</b>	<b>Pass</b>
B	KGV Arnold	125	156	31	21	5.9	<b>41</b>	<b>Fail</b>
B	Lambley Lane (N)	140	171	31	25	5.6	<b>39</b>	<b>Fail</b>
B	Lambley Lane (S)	121	154	33	23	5.2	<b>36</b>	<b>Fail</b>
C	Newstead	124	141	17	20	6.2	<b>43</b>	<b>Pass</b>
B	Oakdale Road	175	210	35	26	6.7	<b>47</b>	<b>Pass</b>
C	Thackerays Lane	138	163	25	24	5.7	<b>40</b>	<b>Fail</b>
C	Queensbower	129	138	9	20	6.4	<b>45</b>	<b>Pass</b>
60% in the field evaluation (score 42 out of 70). Score over 42 to gain a pass.								

## Appendix 3

### Natural and Semi Natural Green Space

#### Site audit of Natural and Semi-Natural green space

Site Name	Size (ha)	Definition	Ward	Location
Loop Road Wood, rear of Chandos St Allotments.	0.9	Other	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
The Hobbucks	14	LNR	Killisick ward	Urban
Woodborough Conservation Areas	1.3	Other	Woodborough Ward	Rural
Surgeys Lane	0.1	Other	St. Mary's Ward	Rural
Netherfield Lagoons	51.0	LNR	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Emmanuel Avenue (Churchfield Plantation)	0.2	Other	Porchester Ward	Rural
Beeston Close	0.7	Other	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Gedling House Woods and Meadow	7.0	LNR	Gedling Ward	Urban
Ashwell Street / Bourne Street Walkway	0.1	Other	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Ravenhead Knoll	0.4	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Longdale Plantation	28.3	SINC	Caverton Ward	Rural
Longdale Heath	1.5	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural

Site Name	Size (ha)	Definition	Ward	Location
Fox Covert	8.5	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Raceground Hill	7.5	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Mill Pond Plantation	3.9	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Cornwalls Hill Grassland	1.7	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Stockhill Grasslands, Lambley	6.7	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Pasture	5.7	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
The Woodpeckers, Burton Joyce	0.9	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Grasslands	3.6	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Scrub	3.2	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Crock Dumble	5.2	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Barrons Plantation with Gedling Wood	6.2	SINC	Gedling Ward	Urban
Harveys Plantation Meadow	1.1	SINC	Gedling Ward	Urban
New Plantation, Burton Joyce	9.4	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Lambley Dumble Grassland	7.8	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural

Site Name	Size (ha)	Definition	Ward	Location
Lambley Dumble Pasture	3.5	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Lambley Dumble	3.0	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Marshy Grasslands, Lambley	2.7	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Catfoot Lane Grassland	2.9	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Fox Covert Grasslands, Lambley	0.7	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Grassland / Hedge, Lambley	1.3	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Mapperley Plains Paddocks	1.5	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Fox Wood	3.8	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Grassland (Horse Grazed), Calverton	0.7	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lamp Wood	5.7	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Georges' Lane Scrub	0.6	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Bestwood Sand Quarry	22.8	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Trumpers Park Wood	4.0	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Linby Village Disused Railway	2.1	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Joes Wood	1.4	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Aldercar Wood	11.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Linby - Newstead Disused Railway	3.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural



Site Name	Size (ha)	Definition	Ward	Location
Calf Pasture	10.9	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Break Lane	0.5	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Seven Mile Railway	4.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Calverton Pit Mineral Railway	8.3	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lodge Farm Grassland, Calverton	1.5	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Roadside Verge, Calverton	0.6	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Little Rickets Lane Scrub	2.9	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Newstead Dismantled Railway Sidings	9.2	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Linby Paddock	0.7	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Wighay Road Grassland	3.3	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Moor Pond Wood	5.7	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Top Wighay Farm Drive	0.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Bestwood Duckponds	18.1	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
North Dumble	1.0	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Bestwood Parkside Grasslands	20.8	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Pit Tip Top Plantation	25.0	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Former Gedling Colliery Land	35.1	SINC	Gedling Ward	Rural

Site Name	Size (ha)	Definition	Ward	Location
Appleton Dale	7.5	SINC	Gedling Ward	Rural
Dark Lane, Calverton	0.7	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Cemetery	0.8	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Bestwood Country Park	62.8	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Woodborough Cemetery	0.4	SINC	Woodborough Ward	Rural
Linby Churchyard	0.4	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Newstead Football Pitch	1.1	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Newstead Cemetery	0.5	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Carlton Cemetery	5.1	SINC	Valley Ward	Urban
Linby Quarries	55.1	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Gedling Cemetery	0.7	SINC	Gedling Ward	Rural
Midland Wood (Whimsy Park)	16.2	Other	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
<b>Total</b>	<b>548.9</b>			

It must be noted that a number of sites with elements of natural and semi natural green space were not included in the audit due to them not being classified as SINC's and having another primary function. For example, this includes land categorised under the typology parks and gardens such as Burntstump Country Park.

## Appendix 4

### Amenity Green Space

#### Site audit of amenity green space

Site Name	Size (ha)	Ward	Location
Bestwood Avenue/Close	0.61	Bonington Ward	Urban
Bestwood Lodge Drive Estate	6.21	Bonington Ward	Urban
Bewcastle Road	0.03	Bonington Ward	Urban
Ernehale Court	0.10	Bonington Ward	Urban
Larkspur Avenue/ Lodge Farm	0.01	Bonington Ward	Urban
Muirfield Road	0.66	Bonington Ward	Urban
Stanhope Crescent	0.10	Bonington Ward	Urban
Woodchurch Road Bestwood	1.00	Bonington Ward	Urban
Bramble Drive (Honeywood Gardens)	0.01	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Cherrywood Gardens	0.09	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Foxhill Road	0.17	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Holly Avenue/ Cross St. Carlton	0.03	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Honeywood Garden	2.22	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Standhill Road Flats	0.10	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Carlton Business Centre	0.04	Carlton Ward	Urban
Carlton Hill Flats	0.37	Carlton Ward	Urban
Carlton Square Offices	0.01	Carlton Ward	Urban
Cromwell St Flats/ Walton Court	0.24	Carlton Ward	Urban
Moreland Court	0.22	Carlton Ward	Urban
Orchard Avenue	0.01	Carlton Ward	Urban
Southdale Drive	0.09	Carlton Ward	Urban
Bagnall Avenue Hostel	0.05	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Byron Street/ Wordsworth Street	0.03	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Coleridge Cresecnt	0.13	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Danes Close	0.05	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Nottingham Road Flats	0.12	Daybrook Ward	Urban

Site Name	Size (ha)	Ward	Location
Queensbower Road / Bestwood Lodge Drive	2.10	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Seagrave Court	0.01	Daybrook Ward	Urban
St Albans Road Flats/ Furlong St Flats	0.05	Daybrook Ward	Urban
St. Albans Road Flats	0.02	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Top Valley, Oxclose Lane	0.58	Daybrook Ward	Urban
West Street/ High Street Avenue	0.07	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Bramble Court	0.19	Gedling Ward	Urban
Brooklands Drive	0.13	Gedling Ward	Urban
Burton Pastures	0.60	Gedling Ward	Urban
Burton Road Burton Joyce	4.15	Gedling Ward	Urban
Conway Road	0.85	Gedling Ward	Urban
Coronation Walk Bungalows	0.14	Gedling Ward	Urban
Coronation Walk/Burton Road	0.22	Gedling Ward	Urban
Saltford Close	0.14	Gedling Ward	Urban
St. Austin's Court	0.10	Gedling Ward	Urban
Bonnington Drive Flats	0.04	Killisick Ward	Urban
Brook Avenue	0.50	Killisick Ward	Urban
Kilbourne Road	4.29	Killisick Ward	Urban
Killisick Court	0.22	Killisick Ward	Urban
Kilnbrook Avenue	0.06	Killisick Ward	Urban
Oakdale Road	0.09	Killisick Ward	Urban
Taverhillfield Court, Kilnbrook Ave	0.02	Killisick Ward	Urban
Brookfield Road	1.28	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Brookfield Road Flats	0.05	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Downham Close	0.21	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Gedling Grove Flats	0.14	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Arnold Hill Community Centre	0.01	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Edison Way Square	0.08	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Howbeck Road/ Gleneagles Drive	0.11	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Spinningdale Open Space	0.57	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban

Site Name	Size (ha)	Ward	Location
Wemberley Road/ Plains Road Open Space	1.93	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Bailey Court	0.03	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Bourne Mews	0.46	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Britannia Court	0.14	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Curzon Street Flats	0.09	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Curzon Street/Ley Street	0.02	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Hotspur Drive	0.25	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Kingsley Drive / Rochester Avenue	0.02	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Kingsley Drive Open Space	0.96	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Ley Street Community Centre	0.02	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Meadow Road Flats	0.05	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Charles Close	0.16	Phoenix Ward	Urban
Phoenix Avenue Recreation Ground	0.29	Phoenix Ward	Urban
Princess Close	0.07	Phoenix Ward	Urban
Oxclose Lane Estate	0.16	Sherwood Ward	Urban
Beck Street/Worth Street Flats	0.05	Valley Ward	Urban
Bentinck Road	0.16	Valley Ward	Urban
Cavendish Crescent	0.03	Valley Ward	Urban
Foxhill Road Flats	0.01	Valley Ward	Urban
Foxhill Road/ Cavendish Road Footpath	0.02	Valley Ward	Urban
Ian Grove	0.03	Valley Ward	Urban
Radcliffe Gardens	0.02	Valley Ward	Urban
Woodthorpe Drive	0.12	Woodthorpe Ward	Urban

Site Name	Size (ha)	Ward	Location
Church Road / Chestnut Grove Play Area	0.47	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Lendrum Court	0.51	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Stoke Bardolph	0.27	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Stoke Lane/Station Road	0.83	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Broom Road	0.28	Calverton Ward	Rural
Calverton Open Space	1.64	Calverton Ward	Rural
Collyer Road / Mews Lane	0.01	Calverton Ward	Rural
Dunelm Drive	2.36	Calverton Ward	Rural
Governors Field, Main Street	1.90	Calverton Ward	Rural
Jumelles Drive / Longue Drive	0.31	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lee Road	0.07	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lee Road Rec Ground	0.70	Calverton Ward	Rural
Manor Road Garages Calverton	0.29	Calverton Ward	Rural
Nabarro Court Calverton	0.37	Calverton Ward	Rural
Renals Way / Brickenell Road	0.23	Calverton Ward	Rural
Seely Avenue	0.46	Calverton Ward	Rural
Spindle View	0.20	Calverton Ward	Rural
Thorndale Road / Park Road	0.37	Calverton Ward	Rural
Coppice Road/ Mapperley Plains	0.05	Lambley Ward	Rural
Cromwell Crescent Lambley	0.04	Lambley Ward	Rural
Hucknall Road Recreation Ground	1.09	Newstead Ward	Rural
Linby Village	0.04	Newstead Ward	Rural
Newstead Colliery Open Space, Tilford Road	3.07	Newstead Ward	Rural
Papplewick Moor Road	1.00	Newstead Ward	Rural
Rear of Griffins Head	0.17	Newstead Ward	Rural
Plains Road Mapperley, Mapperley Miners Welfare Cl	0.97	Porchester Ward	Urban
St. Andrew's House, Digby Avenue	0.21	Porchester Ward	Urban

Site Name	Size (ha)	Ward	Location
Westdale Lane Community Centre	0.09	Porchester Ward	Urban
Westmoore Close Housing Area	0.45	Porchester Ward	Urban
Westmoore Court	0.18	Porchester Ward	Urban
Haddon Road	0.18	Ravenshead Ward	Urban
Cavendish Road Bungalows	0.04	St. James Ward	Urban
Orchard Court	0.22	St. James Ward	Urban
Wollaton Avenue Community Centre	0.05	St. James Ward	Urban
Asda Shrubbery (High Street)	0.02	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Calverton Road	0.21	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Church Lane Flats	0.07	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Church Street/Coppice Road Flats	0.06	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Rookery Gardens	0.31	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
St Mary's Church/Rest Garden	0.75	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
St Marys Close Flats	0.02	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Rushcliffe Avenue Community Centre	0.02	Valley Ward	Urban
Park Avenue Woodborough	0.01	Woodborough Ward	Urban
Smalls Croft	0.33	Woodborough Ward	Urban
Marshall Hill Drive, Carlton Hill	2.00	Carlton Ward	Urban
Arnold Vale road	1.40	Woodborough Ward	Urban
<b>Rural Total</b>		<b>16.73ha</b>	
<b>Urban Total</b>		<b>42.40ha</b>	
<b>Overall Total</b>		<b>59.13ha</b>	

## Appendix 5

### Provision for Children and Young People

#### **Appendix 5a:** *The main characteristics of LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs*

	Local Area for Play	Locally Equipped Area for Play	Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play
Age group	Up to 6 years.	4-8 years.	Older children.
Walking time from home	1 minute.	5 minutes.	10 minutes.
Location	Adjacent to a well-used pathway, overlooked by houses and on a flat site that is well drained.	Adjacent to a well-used pathway and on a flat site that is well drained.	Adjacent to a well-used pathway and on a flat site that is well drained.
Minimum activity zone	100m <sup>2</sup> .	400m <sup>2</sup> .	1,000m <sup>2</sup> divided into 2 parts; at least 465m <sup>2</sup> of hard surface area and equipped play space area.
No. and type of play equipment	Demonstrative play features to enable children to identify space as their own domain.	At least 5 types of play equipment where at least 2 are individual items rather than part of a combination. Impact absorbing surface beneath and around play equipment.	At least 8 types of play equipment to allow developmental play amongst younger children and moderate/adventurous play for older children.
Buffer zone	5m depth including planting.	10m depth including planting and other physical features.	30m depth including planting and other physical features.



	Local Area for Play	Locally Equipped Area for Play	Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play
Fencing	600mm high fencing and barrier to limit speed of child entering or leaving the facility.	1m high fencing with two pedestrian gates & barriers to limit speed of child entering/leaving the facility.	1m high fencing with two pedestrian gates & barriers to limit speed of child entering/leaving the facility.
Furniture	Seating.	Seating and a litter bin.	Seating and litter bins at each access point. Secure bicycle parking facilities.
Signs and notices	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children.	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children, and name and tel. no. of facility manager.	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children, and name and tel. no. of facility manager.

**Appendix 5b:** Play Value pro forma (Derived from Play England and ROSPA)

**Site Name:**

**Number of pieces of equipment:**

**Weather:**

**Assessment By:**

**Date:**

**Toddlers**

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Balancing		1	
Crawling (Short tunnels etc)		1	
Hiding		1	
Climbing		1	
Jumping/bouncing		1	
Rolling		1	
Rocking		1	
Rotating		1	
Sliding		1	
Swinging		1	
Sensory Items (sight, smell and sound) Traffic is negative.		3	
Textural Variety (two types of material = 1, three types plus = 2)		2	

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
3+Primary Colours (bold colours)		2	
Toddler Seating		1	
Does it lend to Imaginative play? Score relates to number of items that allow for imaginative play 0 >1=1, 2>3= 2, 3+=5		5	
Interactive ability (Items encouraging group) pieces of equipment 1 or 2=1,3 or 4=2, 5+3		3	
Parental Seating (in Toddler section)		1	
<b>Total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>

### Juniors

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Balancing		2	
Crawling (Short tunnels etc)		1	
Rocking		1	
Rotating		1	
Rotating (Multi-use i.e., roundabouts etc)		2	
Rocking and rotating (Mobilus, Waltz etc)		4	

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Sliding conventional (i.e., slide etc)		1	
Sliding (Fireman's pole etc)		1	
Swinging (Single)		1	
Swinging (Group)		2	
Gliding (Aerial runways etc)		2	
Hanging		1	
Climbing (ladders, climbing wall and net)		3	
Agility (Clatter bridges etc)		2	
Ball Play (Basketball/netball/football) when encouraging competition more marks		4	
Textural Variety (two types of material = 1, three types plus = 2) manipulate natural and fabricated materials		2	
Wheeled Play (for bikes, skateboards etc) flow, mix of obstacles and terrain		6	
3+ Primary colours		1	
Interactive ability (Items encouraging group) pieces of equipment 1 or 2 =1 3or 4=2 5+3		3	
Junior Seating		1	

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Imaginative play (Area lending to use of child's imagination, floor graphics, pretend play, local connection)		4	
Educational Play (abacus etc)		1	
Total		48	0

### Teenagers

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Interaction - Number of items which allow for group play. 4=4 marks 1=1 mark etc		4	
Sports Simulation / Dynamic Equipment / Competition. Site caters for 1 sport site caters for more than one sport, site allows for competition, equipment is multi use		4	
Fitness equipment 4= broad range of fitness equipment including cardio and muscular items 3 = less than 6 items but cardio and muscular present 2= only one type of equipment present but more than 1 in quantity 1= one piece of equipment		4	

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Rocking and rotating (Mobilus, Waltz etc) one mark for Rocking, one for rotating, an extra mark if there is more than 1 item		4	
Swinging (Group) Up to two marks for a basket swing, up 2 marks for a rope swing 1-2 marks depends on quality		4	
Gliding (1 = glide rail, 2= small to medium sized Aerial runways 3 = large aerial runway)		3	
Climbing (Climbing walls etc) 1= climbing present 2= Climbing applicable for all ages		2	
Textual variety 1-2 materials used =1 3+ is two marks. manipulate natural and fabricated materials		2	
Graphics - one mark each of these: graphics present, children involved in producing it, use of bright colour		3	
Teenage Seating areas/shelters. Seating - 1 mark for good location, 1 mark for seat rests, 1 mark for normal seating. Shelter -1 mark for a shelter present, 1 mark for good location of shelter, 1 mark for panels		6	
Ball Play number of sports (football, basketball/netball, cricket) 1 mark line markings, 2 marks surface condition,		6	

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Wheeled Play (for bikes, skateboards etc) 2 marks for ancillary facilities e.g. seating area, 2 marks for flow, 2 marks for mix of obstacles and terrain		6	
Total		48	0

#### SITE ASSESSMENT

Criteria	Max	Details	Score
Physical Safety, including secure boundary, vandalism, personal safety, maintenance e of equipment, feeling of safety	5	Overlooked CCTV, self-closing gate	
Minimum of two gates and self-closing	2		
Access suitable for pushchairs and wheelchairs	2	one mark for gates being DDA compliant and one for level access	

Criteria	Max	Details	Score
Age separation	3	clearly defined area which allows Children to easily transfer areas	
Access for disabled (in reference to activities provided by equipment)	3	1=1-2, 2=3-4, 3=5+	
Adult Seats	1		
Bike Storage	1		
Suitable Litter Bins	1		
Appropriate Signage	1		
Layout? Location is a part of the throughfare, and location in area	2		

**Total** **21**

Is the play area well used?	1= not used 5=very well used	5	
-----------------------------	------------------------------	---	--



## Appendix 6

### Outdoor Sports Facilities

#### *Gedling Borough Playing Pitch Strategy and action plan*

An update of the Playing Pitch Strategy is currently being prepared for republication in 2021. The information provided below will inform the new Playing Pitch Strategy and is the latest information the council holds about the outdoor sports facilities in the borough.

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
5	Arnold Hill Academy	Football	Trust/ Academy	Two adult football pitches on different levels of the two-tiered site. One pitch has been unused following Sport England investment towards pitch improvement work but is due to be operational for the beginning of the next school year. The other standard quality pitch is on the lower level and is used mainly for school fixtures given most curricular sport takes place on the Playfootball Nottingham 3G pitches on the	<p>Maximise use of the newly improved for use by school teams supported by continued use of the 3G pitches.</p> <p>Improve pitch quality through increased maintenance, creating additional capacity to reduce likely overplay on the bottom pitch.</p> <p>Explore potential to access newly developed provision for community use to increase capacity and reduce shortfalls.</p>		Local site	Short

<sup>1</sup> Timescales: (S) -Short (1-2 years); (M) - Medium (3-5 years); (L) - Long (6+ years).

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
				<p>shared site. This pitch is likely to be overplayed. The school is currently undergoing redevelopment which includes the provision of new pitches.</p> <p>Update: 20.06.17</p> <p>Gedling Southbank FC to have 20 teams playing on this site from season 2017/18 following the development of new pitches.</p> <p>Update: 11.01.19</p> <p>Additional grass pitches will be available soon both community and school use soon. Their remains a drainage issue regarding this new provision that the Academy is seeking to resolve with the contractor. This poses an uncertainty whether these pitches will be</p>				

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
				<p>available for the 2019/20 football season. When pitches become available it is expected they will meet the grow demand of Gedling Southbank junior teams and the facility will provide a 7x7 and 9x9.</p> <p>The Academy is currently assessing quality issues regarding the existing new provision on site referred to in Update 20.06.17.</p> <p>The Academy has continued concerns regarding the poor quality of the 3G pitch provision currently managed by Play Football.</p>				

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
		Rugby union		<p>Poor (M0/D1) quality senior pitch unavailable for use due to ongoing construction work onsite. New school build in progress to include the re-provision of lost grass pitches. Intentions to make grass pitches available for use again when building work is completed in two- or three-years time.</p> <p>Update: 11.01.19</p> <p>The Academy has plans for the new grass pitches to offer rugby goals initially for school use.</p>	<p>Improve pitch quality through increased maintenance, creating additional capacity to reduce likely overplay on the bottom pitch.</p> <p>Explore potential to access newly developed provision for community use to increase capacity and reduce shortfalls at club sites.</p>			Short
6	Arnot Hill Park	Bowls	GBC	<p>Standard quality green used by Arnold Park BC. The Club has around 30 members, therefore the green is considered to have spare capacity to accommodate</p>	<p>Improve standard of maintenance to improve green quality.</p> <p>Determine future plans for sporting use of the site given potential need to</p>		Local site	Short

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
				<p>additional members and play.</p> <p>Update 11.01.19</p> <p>We believe the membership of Arnold Park BC has reduced. Therefore spare capacity exists on this site.</p>	<p>rationalise supply amidst budget pressures.</p> <p>Consider potential for asset transfer and club management mechanism where viable.</p>			
7	Bestwood Country Park	Football	County Council	<p>Mini 7v7 pitch and two adult pitches, one of which is overmarked with a youth 9v9 pitch. Pitches are standard quality and used by six teams from Bestwood Park Rangers Youth FC. Pavilion building is too small and the Club has to use all available space including changing rooms as storage space which becomes dangerous. Actual spare capacity of one mini 7v7 match per week.</p>	<p>Remove overmarked youth 9v9 pitch and seek to make greater use of spare capacity elsewhere or on certified 3G pitches to re-accommodate this competitive demand.</p> <p>Consider installation of an external storage container so that equipment is not obstructing pavilion facilities.</p> <p>Update: 20.06.17</p> <p>Review licence on this site between GBC and</p>		Local site	Medium

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
				<p>Update: 20.06.17</p> <p>Following the Football Development Group meeting on 19.06.17, Bestwood Park Rangers Youth FC reported they have reduced to 3 teams.</p> <p>Update 16.12.19</p> <p>The pitches are currently being used and booked by NG United providing junior and youth Football on the site.</p>	<p>Bestwood Park Rangers Youth FC</p> <p>Update: 17/12/19</p> <p>Establish relationship between NG United and Bestwood Park Rangers and seek licence renewal.</p>			
		Tennis		<p>Two poor quality courts without floodlighting. Available for community use but no recorded club use. Likely used for social and recreational tennis.</p>	<p>Improve quality to increase attractiveness and performance for play.</p> <p>Seek to maximise use for participation activities such as parks leagues or cardio tennis.</p>			Short
8	Bestwood Miners	Football	CISWO/	Standard quality adult pitch used by just one	Improve pitch quality through increased		Local site	Short

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
	Welfare Sports Ground		Trust	team from Bestwood Miners Welfare FC. The Club has aspirations to play in the football pyramid at Step 7. Site demand will increase next season by one adult team, whilst the Club also has ambitions for a junior section. Actual spare capacity of 0.5 match sessions per week.	<p>maintenance, creating additional capacity to reduce shortfalls.</p> <p>Maximise use of spare capacity to reduce existing shortfalls.</p> <p>Support the Club in developing facilities to meet Step 7 requirements.</p>			
9	Bestwood Village Community Centre	Bowls	Parish Council	Good quality green used by Bestwood Workshops BC and Star BC. Membership unknown, however, the green is considered to have spare capacity for additional membership and play.	Maximise use of spare capacity through club development and increasing participation.		Local site	Short
		AGP		Two small sized sand-based pitches with floodlighting which are now disused. The pitches are partly dismantled and cannot be played on but	Support the Club as appropriate and consider potential for resurfacing to 3G as a more appropriate surface to accommodate			Medium

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
				<p>Bestwood Miners Welfare FC states that it would like to be a part of any community scheme that could bring these pitches back into use and is investigating possible funding opportunities that might enable them to be.</p> <p>Update: 01.11.18</p> <p>Currently no plans to refurbish the former pitches, which are currently an eyesore for the local community. Recent health and wellbeing programme in the village identifies this as a priority, but there is insufficient funding and capacity in the community to move this forward. The biggest priority regarding facilities for the community at present is</p>	<p>football use and to meet shortfalls.</p>			



Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
				pursuing a healthcare facility.				
10	Oakwood Academy	Football	Trust/ Academy  PFI	Two standard quality youth 11v11 pitches available for community use. No recorded community use at present but likely to be overplayed given the extent of academy use for lessons and fixtures throughout the week.	Retain for school use and explore potential for increased future community use to help reduce shortfalls.		Local site	Short
		Rugby union		Poor (M0/D1) quality pitch maintained by Carillion to a basic standard. Available for community use and previously well used before PFI but the academy believes that community use would require covering of staffing costs which is cost prohibitive for most teams. Likely to be overplayed given the level of weekly academy use.	Improve pitch quality through increased maintenance, creating additional capacity for school use.  Work to resolve barriers to community use, particularly cost of hire and access to changing provision.			Short

Site ID	Site	Sport	Management	Current status	Recommended actions	RAG	Comment	Timescales <sup>1</sup>
		Cricket		Non turf pitch situated between football pitches which has now become disused.	Maximise school use and resurface if required for school use given no demand for community use.			Short
		AGP		Small sized sand filled AGP rated as standard quality with floodlighting. Available for community use but not recorded as being used. Marked with three tennis courts and used for tennis and small sided football.	Maximise community use to accommodate demand for team training.			Short

## Appendix 7

### Allotments and Community Gardens

#### Allotment Facilities


Site name	Water	Toilets	Sheds	Fencing	Recycling	Access	Skips	Car park	Plot watch
Leapool	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Stoke Lane	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Chandos	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Gedling Grove	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Howbeck Allotment site	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Killisick Allotment	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Rookery Gardens	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
New Robin Hood	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
<b>Parish Managed</b>									
Trent Lane	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Newstead	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
Calverton	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Woodborough	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

## Appendix 8

### Cemeteries and Churchyards

#### *Ethnicity of Gedling Borough*

The ethnic origin of the population affects demand for burial space. People of Black African and Caribbean origin typically prefer burial, whereas people of Asian, Indian origin typically prefer cremation. This reflects the predominant religious beliefs in these cultures. The graph below shows a comparison of the ethnicity of residents in Gedling and the whole of England and Wales:



*Ethnicity of Gedling Borough and England and Wales from ONS 2011 (excluding white British who comprise 80.5% of England and Wales and 90.3% of Gedling's population)*

It can be seen that the population of Gedling borough is less ethnically diverse than England and Wales as a whole. Gedling borough most closely mirrors England and Wales as a whole in the Black Caribbean group, who prefer burial to cremation.