

## APPENDIX 6: Comments received following Notice publication

### 1. Comments received online via Consultation Hub:

Are you responding on behalf of a community group or organisation?							Response %	Response Total	
1	Yes						18.52%	5	
2	No						81.48%	22	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.81	Std. Deviation:	0.39	Satisfaction Rate:	81.48	answered	27	
	Variance:	0.15	Std. Error:	0.07			skipped	6	
Name of organisation / community group: (5)									
1	25/01/17 7:46PM ID: 51583598	Learning Everywhere							
2	28/01/17 6:21PM ID: 51696564	1) Friends of Brandon Hill 2) Park Street and Brandon Hill Conservation Area							
3	29/01/17 8:23AM ID: 51705286	106th Brownie pack							
4	31/01/17 9:14AM ID: 51788529	BCR NP parks group							
5	11/02/17 6:37PM ID: 52346053	Friends of Troopers Hill							

Are your comments related to a particular park or green space in the city?							Response %	Response Total	
1	Yes						44.44%	12	
2	No						55.56%	15	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.56	Std. Deviation:	0.5	Satisfaction Rate:	55.56	answered	27	
	Variance:	0.25	Std. Error:	0.1			skipped	6	
If so, which one(s)? (14)									
1	27/01/17 3:51PM ID: 51666660	St Andrews Park							
2	28/01/17 6:21PM ID: 51696564	Brandon Hill, College Green, Berkeley Square, Park Place							
3	29/01/17 8:23AM ID: 51705286	Horfield common							
4	31/01/17 9:14AM ID: 51788529	Ashley Down Green/Muller House Open Space							
5	02/02/17 10:25AM ID: 51913959	Ashley Down Green							
6	02/02/17 11:49AM ID: 51919530	Muller House Open Space							
7	03/02/17 4:30PM ID: 51989991	Canford park							
8	03/02/17 5:08PM ID: 51992431	Redland Green							
9	03/02/17 11:14PM ID: 52002226	Green Space on corner of Penfield Road/Mina Road							
10	04/02/17 6:02PM ID: 52019449	St Georges Park							
11	06/02/17 7:50PM ID: 52104834	St. George's park							
12	11/02/17 6:37PM ID: 52346053	Troopers Hill Local Nature Reserve							
13	15/02/17 8:06PM ID: 52520130	Muller House Open Space							
14	22/02/17 6:14PM ID: 52874424	St George Park							

Please comment on the proposals here:

		Response %	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	25
		COMMENT MADE	BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL RESPONSE
1	24/01/17 2:33PM ID: 51519046	what are the rulings going to be on the flying of drones, as this is a growing hobby and interest , will there be designated flying areas so that people can fly legally or will all areas be banned causing people to take chances and possibly break the rules	The byelaw applies to any aircraft which weighs not more than 7 kilograms without its fuel and so may include drones.  This was set out in the document provided: "Appendix 8 – Communications plan and FAQs"
2	25/01/17 3:07PM ID: 51570903	Hopeless. Depressingly typical waste of time by Bristol City Council. Your failure to address the urgent issue of dogs and dog attacks in Bristol parks and estates means that the average 24% of households that own a dog have once again been handed 100% control of all these parks and green spaces. The "dog lobby" in this city must be very powerful indeed. When will BCC understand that people who don't visit their local parks usually stay away because of their fear of dogs. The failure of BCC to address the dog issue in these bylaws is cheap, cowardly and discriminatory. Let me put it more bluntly so that you fully understand: If you take a walk through the Bristol estate closest to me, you will find that the overwhelming majority of people there are dog walkers and they are overwhelmingly a single culture/race. I think you know what that is. The failure to address the dog problem in Bristol's parks discriminates against many people of varied ethnicity and culture. It is almost unbelievable that Bristol City Council has chosen, once again, to ignore this issue and continue to allow dog owners to intimidate non-dog owning people and thereby keep all of the parks and estates of this city only safely accessible to an arrogant, irresponsible dog owning minority. BCC should be thoroughly ashamed of itself. Personally, I have had enough. I refuse to subsidise this selfish minority through my council tax. There are other, better cities and towns in this area of the country and that is where I am going to go! I have now had enough of this city.	Orders made by the Council under other legislation cover dog fouling and dogs being kept on leads and these are currently enforced.  This was set out in the document provided: "Appendix 8 – Communications plan and FAQs"
3	25/01/17 7:46PM	As part of Learning Everywhere we are encouraging learning	The relevant byelaw states that: Byelaw 9(1) (which prohibits

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
	ID: 51583598	groups to use parks in different ways and to work with friends groups and the council to use spaces in different ways. It is hoped in the future this may include the development of new spaces where groups could have fires run by suitably trained staff. It is hoped that a partnership with local schools and the local friends group would develop to oversee and manage this and following an agreement on suitable spaces and H&S guidance that the council would not need to be involved in each decision as to whether a fire is permitted or not. The key would be not creating an event or licence agreement for each time a fire was to be used but an agreement in principle based on joint guidance and local agreement.	fires] shall not apply to: (a) the lighting of a fire at any event for which the Council has given permission that fires may be lit.  The Council is committed to minimising the regulatory burden of the byelaws and would envisage, where prudent, to give permission for a group/and or site if repeat fires are requested.  However the Council does not encourage fires in public spaces because of the potential for damage to caused, the nuisance to other park users and because the evidence of fires tends to lead to an escalation of fires in the same locality.	
4	26/01/17 12:19PM ID: 51606797	I fully support these proposals which will deter ant-social behaviour in our parks & green spaces and lead to less conflict between users.	Noted.	
5	27/01/17 10:42AM ID: 51647007	Will the reduction in PCSO numbers have any bearing on the introduction of the byelaws? How will this reduction affect the effective application of the byelaws?	PCSOs can play a role in the enforcement process as can police constables and Council officers. The efficacy of any enforcement process is determined by available resources and byelaws are no different in this respect. The Council's enforcement policy encourages education in addition to enforcement.	
6	27/01/17 10:58AM ID: 51648191	13.2 should include "or reasonable fear of injury" (the same as applied to cyclists in 14). Horses can be quite intimidating and are much less in control of the rider than cycles.	The Council communicated at length with the Department for Communities and Local Government on its draft parks byelaws proposals prior to formal submission to the Secretary of State. Guidance was clear that the precise wording of the DCLG model parks byelaws needed to be used.  In practical terms, for reporting to an enforcement officer, the term 'cause danger' can be interpreted by the person experiencing the danger in the same way that experiencing 'reasonable fear of injury' can be interpreted.	
7	27/01/17 3:51PM ID: 51666660	Amplified music and bongo drums should be banned in parks except with prior permission of the Council for specific events, and any music after 10pm	This is not the intention. Both are legitimate uses of parks and green spaces providing they are not causing a nuisance to other park users as set out in byelaw 27 Excessive Noise	

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
				Where the public is invited to attend a music activity it is considered an event which must be licensed as per the Councils existing processes.
8	28/01/17 12:15AM ID: 51681273	I feel that something needs to be done about rubbish in our green spaces. There is a lot and I'm scared that my dog or younger sibling will get injured. I'd love to see more bins and groups of volunteers cleaning green spaces more often (I'd love to volunteer). Also, a campaign to encourage the use of bins, such a posters to remind people.		Noted. There is other legislation that deals with litter and waste in public spaces.
9	28/01/17 6:21PM ID: 51696564	<p>We are extremely concerned at the suggestion that BCC may now permit people to barbecue in the public gardens.</p> <p>Fires were never allowed in the public gardens before, for very good reasons. When the council stopped employing park keepers, they turned a blind eye to the lighting of fires and barbecues. This was negligent as the police could have been used to enforce the ban. Meanwhile the University continues to preserve the beauty and freshness of its gardens by refusing to allow students or the public to barbecue in them. So in the absence of responsible stewardship on the part of BCC, the students barbecue instead in the public parks and gardens. There is therefore a huge problem on Brandon Hill. The answer is for the University to chip in and pay for a steward to patrol the hill in fine weather. Students pay no council tax, yet are a heavy charge on the public purse. This is the least recompense that could be made.</p> <p>Barbecues burn the grass, including wildlife, smoke out the trees, including wildlife, and foul the air with toxic clouds of petroleum-fuelled smoke. Branches are torn down from trees to feed the fire as the evening draws on. In addition, large amounts of greasy rubbish and half cooked food are left behind, and hot cinders, for animals and children to be harmed by.</p> <p>Bristol has a very bad air quality problem in the city centre</p>		<p>The Council considers private use of a barbecue for recreational purposes as a legitimate use of a public open space. This is particularly needed in parts of the city where private space is limited.</p> <p>At Brandon Hill, the Council is aware through its 2013 and 2016 public consultation processes on the byelaws that there is not a consensus at Brandon Hill as to whether barbecues should be permitted or not. The Council's approach therefore is to designate part of the site for barbecues and to issue conditions for barbecue use. The conditions were set out in the document provided: "Appendix 8 – Communications plan and FAQs".</p> <p>The Council will review the efficacy of designated areas after 12 months and accommodate a discussion about this locally.</p> <p>In the absence of a suggested area from local stakeholders, the area for the designated barbecue area at Brandon Hill was chosen with a view to a) keeping the smoke nuisance reasonably central to the site; b) using a location that was not so steeply sloping; and c) using an area where the user could be confident whether they were inside or outside the designated area – which is a pre-requisite of successful enforcement.</p>

**Please comment on the proposals here:**

	Response %	Response Total
<p>Nationally, 40,000 people are now estimated to die each year from air pollution. Bristol city centre has increasing numbers of people living in it and 5,000 new students are expected. Tens of thousands of people now live in the city centre and tens of thousands more come in each day to work, including ten thousand plus children to go to school, and teenagers to go to college.</p> <p>All these people are being poisoned by the air and BCC is doing nothing about it. The Mayor is doing nothing about it. The Transport Secretary has said he expects councils to take action on air quality by banning diesel vehicles from city and town centres, but this is not being done in Bristol. Instead we are having a new diesel transport system.</p> <p>In this context, it is grossly irresponsible of BCC, for the first time ever, to allow people to foul the air in the public gardens where people go to find respite from the pollution.</p> <p>Brandon Hill is too small and the wind too strong to have a dedicated barbecue area. The toxic petroleum-fuelled smoke blows all over the hill and in at the windows of the surrounding houses and offices.</p> <p>The particular place you have chosen on Brandon Hill is not a wise one. It is too near the playground and the smoke will blow in at the windows of houses in Brandon Steep, Queens Parade, Great George Street, Charlotte Street South, Jacobs Wells Road, and up, and off, Constitution Hill. This we know from experience. Furthermore, people will not be constrained to barbecue in the place you have chosen. All you will be doing is encouraging people to do it in greater numbers than we already suffer.</p> <p>You have arrangements for people to complain about the nuisance from bonfires, yet bonfires are sometimes a necessary part of a gardener's life, and not toxic. They happen only occasionally.</p>		

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
		<p>This cannot be said of barbecues. They spoil people's enjoyment of the public parks and gardens and for no justifiable reason other than selfish inconsiderateness on the part of a minority. They are unenvironmental and a hazard. Benches and litter bins have been burnt. The turf gets badly burnt and takes a couple of years to recover. Brandon Hill itself has been set on fire and the fire brigade called out. Stewards of land used to know all this. How have BCC so lost touch with nature that they no longer grasp this?</p>		
10	29/01/17 8:23AM ID: 51705286	<p>We often set up a small campfire (using a raised firepit which does no damage to the grass and far enough away from houses so smoke and noise is not a problem). There is not a designated area for barbecues so would this still be possible. I have also seen scouts and beavers doing similar there.</p>	<p>The byelaws allow for the Council to give permission for fires to be lit at events where prudent to do so.</p> <p>However the Council does not encourage fires in public spaces because of the potential for damage to be caused, the nuisance to other park users and because the evidence of fires tends to lead to an escalation of fires in the same locality.</p>	
11	31/01/17 9:14AM ID: 51788529	<p>The map does not show the location of the fenced off children's play area installed in 2016 which should be excluded from the Barbecue layer.</p> <p>Also, can the name be changed to Ashley Down Green which is what the local community have named it.</p>	<p>Noted. The designated area will be amended in the report to Full Council.</p> <p>The Council will use both its original name and the locally adopted name so that there can be no doubt as to the area covered by the byelaws. This is to give the best chance of success to any prosecution of the byelaw.</p>	
12	02/02/17 10:25AM ID: 51913959	<p>We have issues relating to ASB especially since the creation of the play area so by laws need to effectively tackle this.</p>	<p>There are 24 nuisance behaviours covered by the byelaws. Other behaviours can be controlled using other legislation including the ASB, Crime and Policing Act 2014.</p>	
13	02/02/17 11:49AM ID: 51919530	<p>This park is actually called Ashley Down Green and should include the Stoney Lane access route (if it doesn't already).</p>	<p>Please refer to comment above regarding name of site. The access to Stoney Lane is not able to be included as this space is statutory allotment and the enabling powers under which byelaws are made do not act here.</p>	

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
14	02/02/17 3:03PM ID: 51926442	<p>p1 Incorrect vertical spacing between the lines for 12/13</p> <p>p2 Incorrect vertical spacing between the lines for 17/18, 21/22 and 24/25</p> <p>p4 "No person shall walk on...any flower bed, shrub or plant". Grass is a plant, so no walking on the grass???? [nb I did point this out previously but you have clearly taken no notice and have not fixed your descriptions. You should not have to rely on Q&amp;A docs or 'interpretations' to better describe what you do and do not want to allow us all to do, eg walking on wildflower meadows, making daisy chains, walking on the grass, or whatever. If the byelaws were properly written in the first place, then there should be no need to have to resort to reading multiple documents to find the truth. You are creating too many uncertainties for future argument/debate. I apologise in advance for any ants, spiders or the like that I inadvertently kill, injure, take or disturb while walking on the grass.</p> <p>p9 Public shows and performances: As "morris dancing or dancing of a similar nature or music which accompanies such dancing" does not require a license, does it nevertheless require permission from the Council if to take place in a park or green space?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The Council communicated at length with the Department for Communities and Local Government on its draft parks byelaws proposals prior to formal submission to the Secretary of State. Guidance was clear that the precise wording of the DCLG model parks byelaws needed to be used.</p> <p>Byelaw 28 regulates Public Shows and Performances which require consent. However the Council's adopts a proportionate, incremental approach to enforcement in line with its policy. Whether it chose to enforce against the activity if consent were not requested would depend on whether it was reported and subsequently evaluated as nuisance behaviour.</p>	
15	03/02/17 4:30PM ID: 51989991	<p>Please ensure dogs are allowed to roam free. At many times dog walkers are by far the greatest number of users of the park. There are several elderly locals for who walking round the park with their dogs is a very valuable social occasion</p>	<p>The proposed byelaws don't tackle dog control issues. They are dealt with under different legislation.</p>	

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
16	03/02/17 7:31PM ID: 51996921	These bye-laws are unnecessary - criminal and anti-social behavior are well covered by existing laws. The wording of many of the new bye-laws give them the capacity to be applied in a way that is arbitrary and unfair. They give too much power that is open to mis-use and abuse.		The Council will set out on its web pages and in Appendix 8 of the Full Council report its interpretation approach to the byelaws. Enforcement will be in line with the Council's Enforcement Policy which sets out that regulatory activities should be carried out in a way which is transparent, accountable, proportionate and consistent.
17	03/02/17 11:14PM ID: 52002226	This is a tiny space which attracts crowds in excess of 500 people annually during the St Werburghs Farm Fair event. It is like having a mini Glastonbury on my front doorstep, which carries on well into the early hours. Residents do not know who is in charge of the level of noise, music, crowds of revellers, and debris/rubbish left behind. The event seems to have mushroomed over the years. I would like prior notification of these public events in this small Council-owned public space, and a named person to contact. My fragile wooden garden fence cannot withstand crowds of revellers who use the narrow path between my house and the green space. Some even use the back of my house as a urinal. The organiser's name and contact details should be made available to all nearby residents. Thank you.		Noted. Thank you.
18	04/02/17 6:02PM ID: 52019449	Fishing ban. I feel that fishing should be allowed as it will encourage children to be able to part take in an outdoor activity rather than sitting watching tv or playing on ipads etc. It has always been a past time and fishing at St Georges Park is relatively safe as the pond is quite shallow as opposed to the river which is very deep and a drowning risk.		Fishing will continue to be permitted in all spaces with water features other than St George Park. It is further permitted in sites outside of the scope of the byelaws such as the floating harbour, the Feeder and parts of the New Cut.
19	06/02/17 7:50PM ID: 52104834	I grew up fishing at St. George's park in Bristol. That is where i and my siblings learnt to fish. Have heard of the plan to not permit fishing there. Have fished there for years and has been enjoyable, have never had problems. Open to all generations and levels of fishermen, whether novices or the expert anglers, would be a shame to no longer be able to fish the waters. There has been instances where people have had their fishing tackle stolen in broad daylight at eastville park along with muggings. Where as st George's park is safer and in view of everyone		Please refer to above.

Please comment on the proposals here:

		Response %	Response Total
			there. A nice busy park full of families.
20	11/02/17 6:37PM ID: 52346053		<p>Friends of Troopers Hill are strongly in support of the introduction of Parks Byelaws. Troopers Hill Local Nature Reserve has experienced serious fires. After 1 fire in 1995, the Grayling butterfly was never recorded on the site again. There have been further fires since.</p> <p>The introduction of Parks Byelaws would provide protection for Troopers Hill by the site being listed as one of the few in Bristol where the use of BBQs will be prohibited. This will greatly help us in discussions where there is the response "but there is no law against it".</p> <p>We are also pleased that BBQs will be prohibited for use in any play area, having raised £80,000 for the installation of a new play area in Troopers Hill Field.</p> <p>The fact that all BBQs, in places where they are permitted, will have to be of a design that prevents damage to surfaces on which they are placed will greatly reduce the damage that is currently seen across parks.</p> <p>Troopers Hill is a site that provides a habitat for a wide range of wildlife and is designated at a Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological site. We are pleased with the protection that the Byelaws will provides for the fossils, rocks, plants and wildlife of Troopers Hill.</p>
21	11/02/17 8:47PM ID: 52348535		<p>It is not clear whether gazebos' are allowed. People at victoria park and blaise castle often put gazebos up for the day. I hope you will still allow this.</p> <p>Yes. This was set out in the document provided: "Appendix 8 – Communications plan and FAQs"</p> <p>You do not need specific consent to use some structures temporarily to provide shade, act as a gathering point or as part of a small private function. These are already consented by the Council. This general consent covers structures to include gazebos, tents, windbreaks, parasols and items such as tables and chairs.</p> <p>This is a legitimate use of a park and consent will only be withdrawn if the use is unreasonable or specific areas require special protection.</p> <p>Permanent structures must not be erected and sleeping</p>

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
				overnight in tents is not permitted.
22	13/02/17 3:06PM ID: 52402894	<p>These proposed byelaws cover many issues but suspiciously ignore the biggest issue for potential users of parks and estates in Bristol: that issue is Dogs. Your FAQs that accompany these proposed new byelaws state (quote): "Some of the issues I experience still do not appear in the proposed byelaws. For example dog fouling and dogs off leads causes nuisance and stop people visiting and enjoying parks – why are these issues not covered in the byelaws? Orders made by the Council under other legislation cover dog fouling and dogs being kept on leads and these are currently enforced. The byelaws will complement the various powers in the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 and other relevant existing legislation. This ‘tool-kit’ of options will mean council and police officers can address nuisance behaviours and park management issues more positively and swiftly." In other words, the various rules and regulations covering the behaviour of dogs (whether covered by Byelaws or other orders) will remain unchanged. In other words you are determined to ignore the biggest issue by far facing open spaces and the biggest cause of people's reluctance to use open spaces. This is disgraceful, but only to be expected from a Council that has repeatedly pandered to, and appeased the powerful minority of citizens that own dogs (and hence have effective control over the day to day running of Bristol's open spaces). To state that there are other orders controlling dog behaviour and to state that current orders are enforced is nothing but a lie - the Council knows full well that the open spaces in Bristol are effectively completely unregulated - it is many years since I have seen a PCSO or dog warden in the local parks that I use. The current regulations are "enforced" by the dog owners themselves. This "enforcement" ensures that dog owners are left free to let their animals foul anywhere they like and it is not nicked up, if they think nobody is around to see it. They are left</p>	<p>The proposed byelaws don't tackle dog control issues. They are dealt with under different legislation.</p> <p>If implemented the Council will provide more online information as to how dog nuisance issues are dealt with and how activity is regulated by legislation.</p>	

Please comment on the proposals here:

			Response %	Response Total
		<p>free to let their animals pester and threaten other park users with absolutely no fear of being caught. With this pitiful and shameful approach to the biggest issue facing Bristol's parks and open spaces, the Council is ensuring that the decline in these facilities will continue, with these open spaces reduced to being dangerous, dog fouled areas, littered with plastic bags of excrement that are effectively no-go areas for the majority of people in this city. I notice that the Council is now reduced to appealing for volunteers to work in the parks due to budget cuts. As you are effectively appealing to a selfish, arrogant, uncaring minority of dog owners who effectively own these parks, I don't expect you will be successful in this endeavour. It looks like your policy of appeasement of dog owners works against you on this occasion. Don't ask me to pick up somebody else's dog waste - would you do that? These proposed byelaws are therefore, in my view, completely worthless and a complete waste of money, especially at a time of severe budget constraints. But then, when it comes to the dog owners in this city, the council will move heaven and earth to keep them happy, won't it?</p>		
23	13/02/17 9:09PM ID: 52422763	<p>Use of barbecues - ok if you really must but only in certain areas and where facilities in place or restricted to barbecues on legs. Not everyone enjoys the smell of burning flesh</p>	Noted. It is the intention to regulate what type of barbecues are permitted. This was set out in the document provided: "Appendix 8 – Communications plan and FAQs"	
24	15/02/17 8:06PM ID: 52520130	<p>This space is now known as Ashley Down Green, a proposal endorsed by the Neighbourhood Partnership. Additionally there is now a children's play area on the Green which should be an area NOT designated for BBQs.</p>	Noted. The designated area for barbecues will be amended in line with the boundary of the children's play area. Refer to previous note regarding the name of this site.	
25	22/02/17 6:14PM ID: 52874424	<p>I wish to place my objection to the proposed introduction of new byelaws by Bristol City Council in, March of 2017. My particular objection is the ban on fishing of the lake at the above named park. The ban on fishing at this site has been proposed by a minority of the inhabitants/users of the park who have over time, created a lot of noise and complaints directed at anglers who, have used the lake to enjoy their pastime for many, many years. While I understand some of the complaints that have been caused by anglers, the vast majority of the complaints are the</p>	<p>Please refer to previous note regarding designated sites for fishing.</p> <p>The lake at St George Park was not designated following a number of attempts to prevent harm to wildlife at St George Park which were not successful. Since the fish were removed from this site we have had no such reports. This encourages us to continue with a ban at this location.</p>	

**Please comment on the proposals here:**

	Response %	Response Total
<p>result of errors made by the less experienced anglers that, causes the angler involved, an instant financial loss and inconvenience that, the angler will regret, remember and instantly learn from and do their best to prevent it from happening again in the future. This type of incident is, accidental and unfortunate but, a consequence of angling everywhere and not just at this lake. I am talking about lost and tangled line and other tackle. While some anglers do regrettably discard line improperly, the vast majority of anglers will always clean up after them, even to the extent of collecting rubbish left by others. Having said this, there was a recurring problem that did occur at this lake from some so called anglers. This was night fishing. Night fishing had always been banned at all of the fishing sites owned or, cared for by Bristol Council. Rather than have this problem correctly solved which, would mean spending money, not a lot when you consider the consequences but, it would cost some money to properly solve this particular problem. However, Bristol Council realised that they could apply a fishing ban that could be implemented to solve this minor problem and only cost a bit of the councillors time to vote on it. This Sledge hammer approach to cracking a nut hasn't been properly thought through to it's inevitable conclusion which, I hope will never happen. Unfortunately, the past has proven on many occasions that, this type of solution to a problem, will always progress to it's final inevitable end. When this happens, I would not like to be anyone that has been involved in banning fishing at St George Park Lake.</p>		
	answered	25
	skipped	8

**What is your age group?**

	Response Percent	Response Total
--	------------------	----------------

### What is your age group?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Under 18					3.70%	1	
2	18 – 24					7.41%	2	
3	25-44					18.52%	5	
4	45-64					51.85%	14	
5	65-74					7.41%	2	
6	Over 75					0.00%	0	
7	Prefer not to say					11.11%	3	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	3.96	Std. Deviation:	1.37	Satisfaction Rate:	49.38	answered	27
	Variance:	1.89	Std. Error:	0.26			skipped	6

### What is your gender?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Female					40.74%	11	
2	Male					44.44%	12	
3	Prefer not to say					14.81%	4	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.74	Std. Deviation:	0.7	Satisfaction Rate:	37.04	answered	27
	Variance:	0.49	Std. Error:	0.13			skipped	6

### Transgender (Is your gender identity different from that which you were assigned at birth?)

						Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes					4.35%	1

### Transgender (Is your gender identity different from that which you were assigned at birth?)

						Response Percent	Response Total	
2	No						82.61%	19
3	Prefer not to say						13.04%	3
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	2.09	Std. Deviation:	0.41	Satisfaction Rate:	54.35	answered	23
	Variance:	0.17	Std. Error:	0.09			skipped	10

### What is your ethnicity?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	White British						77.78%	21
2	White other						3.70%	1
3	Black/Black British						3.70%	1
4	Asian/Asian British						3.70%	1
5	Mixed/dual heritage						0.00%	0
6	Any other ethnic background						0.00%	0
7	Prefer not to say						11.11%	3
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.89	Std. Deviation:	1.93	Satisfaction Rate:	14.81	answered	27
	Variance:	3.73	Std. Error:	0.37			skipped	6

### What is your sexual orientation?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Lesbian, gay or bisexual						3.70%	1
2	Heterosexual (straight)						70.37%	19

### What is your sexual orientation?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
3	Prefer not to say						25.93%	7
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	2.22	Std. Deviation:	0.5	Satisfaction Rate:	61.11	answered	27
	Variance:	0.25	Std. Error:	0.1			skipped	6

### Do you have a religion or belief?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes						25.93%	7
2	No						51.85%	14
3	Prefer not to say						22.22%	6
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.96	Std. Deviation:	0.69	Satisfaction Rate:	48.15	answered	27
	Variance:	0.48	Std. Error:	0.13			skipped	6

### Are you disabled?

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Yes						3.85%	1
2	No						80.77%	21
3	Prefer not to say						15.38%	4
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	2.12	Std. Deviation:	0.42	Satisfaction Rate:	55.77	answered	26
	Variance:	0.18	Std. Error:	0.08			skipped	7

## 2. Comments received by email:

<p><b>22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017: National Union of journalists</b></p> <p>Dear Richard</p> <p>Parks Byelaws &amp; media operations</p> <p>It's been drawn to my attention that Bristol City Council has issued a Notice of Intent to make new byelaws in the city's parks and green spaces starting in March this year, and I apologise for this late communication. I am sure there is no intent to restrict the way the media operates within parks and green spaces with these byelaws, but I am contacting you seeking some clarification to avoid any misinterpretation or unintended consequences.</p> <p>The National Union of Journalists (NUJ) is the representative voice for journalists and media workers across the UK and Ireland. The union was founded in 1907 and has 30,000 members. We represent staff, casuals and freelancers working at home and abroad in the broadcast media, newspapers, news agencies, magazines, books, public relations, communications, online media and photography. Bristol Branch of the NUJ represents over 300 members including professional media and journalism students in the city.</p> <p>Proposed byelaw no. 26; titled "Provision of services"</p> <p>I have read the read through the document "Answers to questions on individual byelaws" and note on page 9 that people using a park as part of their working day are not interpreted as providing a service that requires consent under this byelaw as they are not basing their business in the park. The media do not base their business in parks, but may be filming or photographing and may approach members of the public for comment or interview, so please can you confirm that this would be interpreted as using the park or green space as part of the working day and not be .</p> <p>Proposed byelaw no.5; "Unauthorised erection of structures"</p> <p>Additionally it may be inferred from the example given in the Answers document of an artist sketching in the park that the use of an easel or stand would be allowed in a park or public space. Similarly the media may need to use a tripod and portable lighting stand.</p>	<p>This activity is not regulated under the byelaws. The byelaws are intended to regulate activity that depends on the park or green space for the service provided.</p> <p>Yes this would be permitted under the byelaws. The byelaws are intended to prevent the installation of permanent or semi-permanent structures and nuisance behaviour if reported and evaluated as such.</p>
---	---

Related to these issues, we were in discussion with the Bristol Film Office in 2012 over the issue of filming and photography permits in public spaces owned or managed by the Council, and we reached an agreement that professional news crews are not required to apply for permission to film, and that stills photographers working with limited equipment (handheld cameras/tripod/portable lighting stand) are also exempt from the licensing process and need not apply for a permit. Please see:

<https://filmapp.org/Bristol/>

We request that the interpretation of byelaw no.5 "Unauthorised erection of structures", allow for the use of a camera tripod and lighting stand if required, as in the exemption from filming permits.

Proposed byelaw nos. 24 & 25; Model Aircraft

The interpretation from the 'Answers' document is that drones would also be prohibited under byelaw nos. 24 & 25 except in a few designated areas. However some media do use drones, with operatives that are trained and licensed and the use of drones is already subject to legislation particularly in built up areas. You may already be liaising with Bristol Film Office but they have a permit system for filming with drones in estates and parks, so will use of drones subject to a relevant permit still be allowed under these new byelaws?

<https://filmapp.org/downloads/temp/FILMING%20WITH%20UAV1.pdf>

Please contact me if you require further information.

Yours sincerely

Simon Chapman

Simon Chapman  
Branch Secretary  
NUJ Bristol Branch

**22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017: Bedminster Cricket Club** (Club Secretary - address supplied and redacted)

Please see comment above.

The 'Model Aircraft' byelaw applies to any aircraft which weighs not more than 7 kilograms without its fuel and so may include drones.

Consent / permission for model aircraft cannot be given. They can only be used in designated areas. They may also be used we feel in the exercising of the Council's duty if needed. I would note that the byelaw prohibits taking off, landing and controlling of aircraft only within the scheduled site. Therefore you could operate drones, for surveying purposes for example, from land outside the scheduled site. The alternative is we designate further areas for flying model aircraft at a later date.

This will mean the current permissions advice, if byelaws were adopted, would need to be revised.

Dear Richard,

Ref: Proposed Parks Byelaws

Regarding the above proposed Byelaws that are ear marked to be applied to the land we call 'the Clanage' and you refer to as 'Bower Ashton Playing Fields' we need to formally object to the proposals.

The Clanage is home to Bedminster Cricket Club, a venue that hosts over 100 matches of cricket per year. We have over 150 members and have been on the land for over 100 years. The ground is also home to Ashton Boys Football Club for two of their age groups. The proposed Byelaws will make the hosting of both football and cricket matches impossible.

We believe the following proposed Byelaw will create problems to the running and future of the club as it is now:

#### 15.1 Parking

The club have a car parking area on the land. This is used by members and visitors for parking on all match and training days. Without the ability to park we will not be able to host any matches. On a busy match day, we can have 70-80 cars. With the neighborhood being 'resident permit parking' and the road outside being a 'clearway' we have no feasible alternative.

This would also create a problem when we have functions at the club. People reply on a car park. We are based on the edge of the city and as such over 90% of our visitors and members live over a mile away from the club.

In addition, the club reply heavily on revenue from event parking for the Ashton Gate Stadium (Bristol City FC). We are a 'designated' car parking area that Ashton Gate advertise to fans on their website and I believe is part of their license from the council in terms of the provision they offer their fans. On a dry day, we can offer over 500 spaces on our outfield.

It should also be noted that the club are two years in to a 5 years' agreement with the University of West of England (Bower Ashton Campus) to provide parking for students and contractors during term time for up to 70 cars; between the house of 8am and 4pm, whilst there major rebuilding works are undertaken.

The revenue from this has allowed us to provide a lighted car park area. Money aside, these Byelaws would mean the university would have a major

The Council has reviewed the inclusion of a number of sites that are held exclusively for sports use and leased as such to third parties with no other public access presumed other than within the requirements of the lease or licence. It will be proposed to Full Council that these sites, including Bower Ashton Playing Field, are removed from consideration from the byelaws because the site is not a public open space for general public use.

problem with a lack of parking. With no viable alternative, I am not sure of the solution that could be offered to them.

We currently have a 35-year lease from Bristol City Council and in the 'Deed of Variation' dated 24th April 2002, we have permission to use the club land for parking for one off and regular events.

This variation was put in place to ensure the club to sustain the 'rent' to the council under the terms of the lease and ensure we had an income to be able to maintain and improve our playing facilities.

If the council continue to include the Bower Ashton Playing Fields with these Byelaws then the club will have a very uncertain future. With no parking for members, visitors, Ashton Gate events, the university and functions, the club will have little or no revenue and quite quickly in the opinion of the club's executive committee would not exist beyond the next 2 – 3 years.

We propose that the 'Bower Ashton Playing Field' is removed from the Byelaw proposal that the council have put forward. It serves no benefit in its current state to the cricket club or local community.

We look forward to your response and if you need any clarification then please feel free to contact me.

Kind Regards

Chris Giles  
Club Secretary

**21<sup>st</sup> February 2017: Kings Weston Sports & Social Club**

Hi Richard.

I have read through the proposed byelaw changes, and to be honest most will not have any effect on our business. There are one or two points I would like clarification on please ;

Part 2, section 9(1) fires ; Our grounds staff do on occasion have the need to burn off fallen tree branches [ of which we get quite a few, given the grounds we maintain], i'm assuming this section is aimed at members )of the public, and not our volunteers doing essential maintenance work ?

Part 3, Horse cycles and vehicles section 16 ; This stipulates that no vehicle can be left on site between 22.00 and 06.00. We do have members who will

The Council has reviewed the inclusion of a number of sites that are held exclusively for sports use and leased as such to third parties with no other public access presumed other than within the requirements of the lease or licence. It will be proposed to Full Council that these sites, including Kingsweston Sports Ground, are removed from consideration from the byelaws because the site is not a public open space for general public use.

<p>leave their vehicle overnight, if they have driven to the clubhouse, then used the bar facilities, and then [quite responsibly] decided to make alternative travel arrangements home if they are unfit to drive. These vehicles are left in the allocated car park adjoining the club house. Can you clarify if we would be OK to continue this, or if we would need to apply to the Council for exemption from this clause.</p> <p>I would also like to clarify who is responsible for enforcing the new ByeLaws, is it Kings Weston Sports &amp; Social Club, or Bristol City Council ? We seldom have any staff or volunteers at the site from Monday to Friday, and would therefore quite simply be unable to prevent any transgression of these byelaws.</p> <p>Lastly, i'm assuming there will be some requirement for new signage, in order for people to know what can and can't be done on our leased area. Who is responsible for the purchase, erection and maintenance of such ?</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Alan Jay Chairman Kings Weston Sports &amp; Social Club</p>	
<p><b>21<sup>st</sup> February 2017: Friends of Troopers Hill</b></p> <p>Richard,</p> <p>Thanks for this, we think the detail is slightly wrong.</p> <p>The fenced circle clearly shouldn't be designated.</p> <p>We assume that the other square you have shown is intended to be the 5-aside football? If so we agree it should not be designated.</p> <p>The other areas we would like not to be designated are on the new activity trail. There are two areas which have safety surfacing, in addition for the remainder we would like a box defined as about 3m from the equipment.</p> <p>The attached shows this on the plan produced for the design, the actual installation was slightly different to this. We think this covers the area that most people would consider to be part of the play area.</p> <p>In addition the older log climbing structure (not shown on the plan) should not</p>	<p>The site designation will be amended accordingly in the proposal to Full Council.</p>

<p>be designated - a circle around the outside of the mounds around it. This has been partially burnt in the past.</p> <p>We are happy for BBQs to be used in the area of the original stepping logs under the trees.</p> <p>Finally I must reiterate that we fully support the non-designation of the LNR for BBQs and we are sure that this will reduce the number of fires we have on the site.</p> <p>Rob Acton-Campbell Friends of Troopers Hill</p>	
<p><b>13<sup>th</sup> February 2016: Shire Colts Junior Football Club</b></p> <p>Hello Richard</p> <p>Many thanks for notifying me of the proposed changes and providing the supporting information. I have read through all the documents and my presumption is there is no issue with Shire Colts Junior Football Club's existing and continued use of Sea Mills Recreation Ground. Please advise if that is not the case.</p> <p>Ross Burnham</p> <p>Chairperson Shire Colts JFC</p>	<p>The byelaws do not bring in an regulation that will prevent the use of the site for football as currently takes place.</p>
<p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> February 2017: Friends of Ashley Down Green</b></p> <p>Hi Richard. Thanks for your quick response.</p> <p>The area was definitely referred to as Ashley Down Green in the council's consultation for the play area and on all the designs. On a couple of documents it has been labelled as Ashley Down Park, so double check as it isn't a park!</p> <p>Can the area immediately adjoining the boundary wall of the Rendezvous flats also be excluded from any 'permitted barbecue area', especially the strip immediately bordering Flat 1, which has the sloping wall almost to ground level.</p> <p>Thank you. Regards</p>	<p>The Council will use both its original name and the locally adopted name so that there can be no doubt as to the area covered by the byelaws. This is to give the best chance of success to any prosecution of the byelaw.</p> <p>The Council is adopting an approach of designating as much green space as possible for barbecues in the first instance and not designating this area would be inconsistent with our approach elsewhere. However designated areas can be reviewed and if there are particular nuisance problems found then this area could be de-designated.</p>

<p>Julia Jones</p>	
<p><b>31<sup>st</sup> January 2017: Friends of Ashley Down Green</b></p> <p>Hi</p> <p>Further to Alison's email regarding Muller House Open Space, the change of name to Ashley Down Green was agreed at a Neighbourhood Partnership meeting in 2015 - to avoid confusion with the communal gardens of Muller House, which is an open space within the privately owned and managed development adjoining ADG.</p> <p>IMPORTANT: The plan of the site does not show the newly opened access between ADG and Stoney Lane, including a track which was part of the allotments but which is now open to the public. This area should be included within the proposed new byelaws.</p> <p>Regards Julia Jones Co-chair FoADG</p>	<p>Refer to response above.</p> <p>The footpath from ADG to Stoney lane cannot be included in the byelaws because it is statutory allotment and therefore is not covered by the Acts under which byelaws are made.</p>
<p>31st January 2017:</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>I have submitted a consultation response concerning Muller House green space known locally as Ashley Down Green.</p> <p>IMPORTANT: The maps do not show the new children's play area which should be omitted from the barbecue layer.</p> <p>Is it possible to use the local name for this space or at least include the local name in the list of green spaces covered?</p> <p>Regards Alison Bromilow</p>	<p>Noted, thank you. The site designation will be amended accordingly in the proposal to Full Council.</p> <p>Please refer to response given above.</p>