

Appendix B: Parks and Green Spaces Engagement and Consultation responses

2659 people responded to the survey, and each question had at least a 96% response rate. Over 10,000 free text comments were received which have been analysed and grouped into themes.

This appendix contains the responses to the questions and themed groupings for the free text responses. This data has been used to inform the recommendations in this report.

Both the quantitative and qualitative data is a rich source that will be used as the proposals recommended in this report are developed further. The data can be analysed geographically when specific proposals are further developed. Some proposals will need further consultation once they are fully developed.

Q1. Do you agree or disagree with the approach to generate more income from parks so cuts to parks services are limited)?

Views on overall approach: generate more income from parks to limit cuts to parks services	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	390	15%	15%	No. of respondents to question	25 74
Agree	1457	55%	57%	Response rate to question	96. 8%
Neither agree or disagree	510	19%	20%		
Disagree	132	5%	5%		
Strongly disagree	85	3%	3%		
Not answered	85	3%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q2. Proposal 1: Increase income from cafes and concessions (e.g ice cream vans) and provide more of these in our parks

Views on Proposal 1	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	792	30%	30%	No. of respondents to question	26 24
Agree	1405	53%	54%	Response rate to question	98. 7%
Neither agree or disagree	176	7%	7%		
Disagree	161	6%	6%		
Strongly disagree	90	3%	3%		
Not answered	35	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q3. Proposal 2: Introduce appropriate advertising in parks and green spaces.

Views on Proposal 2	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	263	10%	10%	No. of respondents to question	263
Agree	661	25%	25%	Response rate to question	99.0%
Neither agree or disagree	268	10%	10%		
Disagree	493	19%	19%		
Strongly disagree	948	36%	36%		
Not answered	26	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q4. Proposal 3: Introduce new, competitive fees and charges for any business operating from a park or green space.

Views on Proposal 3	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	468	18%	18%	No. of respondents to question	263
Agree	976	37%	37%	Response rate to question	99.0%
Neither agree or disagree	315	12%	12%		
Disagree	516	19%	20%		
Strongly disagree	358	13%	14%		
Not answered	26	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q5. Proposal 4: Introduce new fee-paying activities into parks and allow private businesses to operate pay-to-use facilities from parks.

Views on Proposal 4	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	351	13%	13%	No. of	26

				respondents to question	29
Agree	1091	41%	41%	Response rate to question	98.9%
Neither agree or disagree	340	13%	13%		
Disagree	476	18%	18%		
Strongly disagree	371	14%	14%		
Not answered	30	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q6. Proposal 5: Increase money from events in the parks of the city.

Views on Proposal 5	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question	No. of respondents to question	2625
Strongly agree	636	24%	24%	Response rate to question	98.7%
Agree	1457	55%	56%		
Neither agree or disagree	266	10%	10%		
Disagree	168	6%	6%		
Strongly disagree	98	4%	4%		
Not answered	34	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q7 - Please tell us if you have specific concerns about any of the proposals to raise income (Q2-6). If you do, how might your concerns be alleviated?

Respondents were asked whether they had specific concerns about the proposals for saving money by generating more income.

1590 (60%) of respondents provided free text comments explaining what their concerns were with the proposals and whether they would do things differently or apply conditions.

The following proposals were made:

1. Increase income from cafes and concessions (e.g ice cream vans) and provide more of these in our parks.

181 (11%) made general comments, 12 respondents did not support the proposal.

46 (3%) made specific comments in support of existing local traders in St Andrews Park, Victoria Park and Horfield Common Parks and wished them to continue to trade.

43 (3%) said that they did not want to see corporate chains operating in parks and preferred local suppliers only.

43 (3%) felt that only or more healthy products should be sold.

42 (3%) felt that better management of concession was needed, for example controlling waste, location of trader, recycling, quality of product.

34 (2%) offered unconditional support for the proposal.

17 (1%) were concerned about fumes and pollution from traders, particularly ice cream vehicles.

15 (1%) were concerned that the drive to raise income would put traders off and increase prices for park users.

2. Introduce appropriate advertising in parks and green spaces.

528 (33%) did not support advertising in parks. From these:

- 180 (11%) expressed strongly that parks were not appropriate places for advertisements;
- 116 (7%) felt that advertising would have a detrimental impact on people's mental health and ability to de-stress or relax;
- 109 (7%) felt that it would simply make parks too commercial;
- 87 (5.5%) felt that parks were an important escape or refuge from advertising, commercialism or urban life;
- 86 (5.5%) felt that adverts would have a detrimental impact on the amenity, quality or character of a park;
- 57 (3.5%) were concerned about the impact of advertising on children;
- 9 (0.5%) felt that sponsorship was acceptable;
- 7 (0.5%) felt that advertising would attract graffiti.

82 (5%) felt they could support advertising in parks providing it was restricted in some way. From these:

- 29 (1.8%) did not want advertising of unhealthy foods;
- 16 (1%) did not want advertising of products for children;
- 17 (1%) suggested restricting the location of adverts;
- 8 (0.5%) did not want large corporate advertising.

91 (6%) specifically felt that advertising should not detract from views into a park or within it with and be done 'sensitively' e.g with consideration of size and location.

25 (1.5%) felt that advertising should be restricted to face out of parks only on the perimeter.

3. Introduce new, competitive fees and charges for any business operating from a park or green space.

147 (9%) felt that we should not charge professional dog walkers. From these:

- 36 (2%) felt that this would unfairly penalise small traders on a low income;
- 19 (1%) felt that it would be too hard to enforce and collect;
- 12 (1%) felt that parks should be free to all users.

143 (9%) felt that we should not charge fitness trainers who operate in parks. From these:

- 46 (3%) felt that there would be a negative impact on the use of parks for fitness and health;
- 22 (1.5%) felt that this would unfairly penalise small traders on a low income;
- 18 (1%) were concerned that Park Run would be included in fees and charges.
- 14 (1%) felt that fees would increase to participants as a result;

134 (8%) supported fees and charges with conditions or caveats including: that charges should relate to income made; charges should not be levied on not-for-profit organisations.

118 (7%) felt that it would be too costly or difficult to collect fees. From these:

- 52 (3%) felt that it would be too difficult to enforce against non-payment and practically collect fees;
- 30 (2%) felt the cost of fee collection would outweigh the benefit of income;
- 14 (1%) felt it would not be possible to distinguish between people who should pay and those who do not need to.

96 (6%) generally objected to fees being introduced. From these:

- 24 (1.5%) of these felt that this would overburden small businesses and that they would likely fail;
- 22 (1.5%) felt that it would impact the use of parks for exercise;
- 10 (0.5%) felt that parks should be free to all users.

45 (3%) comments were made about charging hot air balloon operators: 23 (1.5%) were in support, 5 did not support fees.

4. Introduce new fee-paying activities into parks and allow private businesses to operate pay-to-use facilities from parks.

182 (11.5%) objected to introducing fee-paying activities with reasons including:

- 35 (2%) felt that parks should be free of commercialism;

- 33 (2%) felt that parks should not be places where visitors feel under pressure to spend money;
- 31 (2%) felt that activities would spoil parks;
- 21 (1.5%) were concerned about the amount of space that would be taken up by commercial activity.

169 (10.5%) would support fee paying activities with conditions or caveats including:

- 58 (3.5%) felt that the amount of space taken up should be restricted;
- 33 (2%) felt that activities should be limited to some parks only;
- 20 (1.5%) would support only if activities were temporary;
- 17 (1%) felt that the type of activity should be restricted;
- 12 (1%) would support providing the park was not damaged.

62 (4%) made specific comments about activities listed on the consultation proposal, including 24 (1.5%) objecting to camping and caravanning.

38 (2%) made specific comments about allotments: 15 (1%) did not generally agree to allotments in parks; 6 were in support.

5. Increase money from events in the parks of the city.

252 (16%) supported the proposal for raising income from more events with a consistent theme that events must be appropriate to the park or green space and not have a persistent impact on general park users. 199 (13%) of these expressed support with specific caveats including:

- 57 (4%) felt that the scale of events should be limited so they do not impact too much on public access;
- 36 (2%) felt that events should be better managed with improved waste management and traffic management for example;
- 32 (2%) did not want events to be held too regularly;
- 26 (1.5%) were concerned that parks should be damaged by events;
- 23 (1.5%) felt that not all parks were appropriate for events;
- 18 (1%) wanted local residents or groups to be consulted before events were held;
- 15 (1%) were keen that event organisers cleaned up any mess or damage following an event;
- 11 (1%) were in favour if we could lower noise levels.
- 3 were concerned about the impact on wildlife

127 (8%) did not agree with the proposal to increase income from events. Reasons included:

- 41 (2.5%) felt that events would bring more noise, litter, parking and asb;
- 30 (2%) had a particular concern about large events;
- 29 (2%) were concerned that 'private events would restrict free access to parks;
- 29 (2%) were concerned about the damage events can cause to parks;
- 22 (1.5%) felt there would be too much impact on local residents;
- 12 (1%) were concerned about impact on wildlife.

44 (3%) made comments about the impact of the proposal on community or charity events. From these:

- 30 (2%) felt that increasing commercial events should not impact community events and there should be no charge for community events;
- 13 (1%) also felt that not-for-profit events should not be subject to a fee;

38 (2%) comments made a specific reference to Eastville Park. From these:

- 20 (1.5%) of these were unhappy with the impact of events on local residents;
- 8 did not want events held at the park;
- 5 felt that the park should benefit directly from the income made.

18 (1%) comments were made specifically about the balloon fiesta, 12 of these felt that the balloon fiesta should not be subject to a site hire fee.

In addition to comments made about the proposals put forward in the consultation. The following themes were noted:

155 (10%) felt that the proposals would take away what is 'special' about parks and green spaces. From these:

- 60 (4%) felt that green spaces should be free of commercialism and not encouraging people to spend money;
- 52 (3%) felt that parks were too important for mental health, physical health or wellbeing;
- 38 (2%) felt that parks should be relaxing and peaceful places;
- 31 (2%) felt that parks were places to escape the pressures of urban life;
- 30 (2%) felt parks were important for connecting with nature;

- 24 (1.5%) felt that green spaces were places where children were not subject to commercialism.

Note these numbers may not be additional to those given in the response to Proposal 4

63 (4%) made a specific comment that that Parks should always be free to access.

50 (3%) felt that Parks should be maintained with public funds and objected a commercial approach;

34 (2%) made specific comments about supporting community groups or park groups and volunteers. 10 (0.5%) of these felt that communities should be consulted about change.

22 (1%) commented about the level of maintenance in parks.

9 (0.5%) stated that parks should not be sold to generate income.

Q8 - Do you have any other ideas of how we might raise income from our parks and open spaces?

Respondents were asked whether they had specific ideas to raise income that had not been proposed in the consultation itself.

1190 (45%) of respondents provided free text comments providing ideas to raise income.

248 (21%) people provided ideas for new activities that might help raise income. These included:

- 49 (4%) suggested fee-based walks and talks and council-run on-site land or nature-based activities in parks;
- 36 (3%) suggested the Council ran activities for children including Forest Schools;
- 34 (3%) suggested specific ideas for new, chargeable facilities such as bungee jumps, segways, high ropes course, land train, zip wires, horse riding, petting zoo, soft play.
- 30 (2.5%) suggested the council sell products from land management compost, firewood and ha;
- 25 (2%) suggested we operate fitness or sporting activities and sessions;
- 18 (1.5%) suggested a range of training courses which may or may not be linked directly to land management;
- 18 (1.5%) suggested Parks' staff running gardening or horticulture classes;
- 16 (1.5%) suggested selling food produce grown on parks/allotments;
- 15 (1%) suggested music in parks with the council raising funds from concessions;
- 14 (1%) suggested bringing back boating on Eastville and St George lakes;

- 9 (0.75%) suggested the Council operate a children's or general outdoor activity centre.

185 (16%) gave ideas for an enhanced events programme. Of these:

- 38 (3%) would like to see more music events;
- 31 (2.5%) would like to see more food festivals or markets;
- 23 (2%) would like to see more fitness or sport activity;
- 22 (2%) would like to see more theatre and performance events;
- 21 (2%) gave examples of specific events the city should host with themes including Christmas, classic cars, kite flying, literary fairs and antique fairs;
- 17 (1.5%) would like to see more festivals;
- 17 (1.5%) would like to see more outdoor film and cinema events;
- 15 (1%) would like more, larger events;
- 14 (1%) would like more art-related events.

178 (15%) respondents gave ideas that were proposed in the consultation or are already being progressed by the Council as part of earlier income generation proposals, and therefore in support of them. From these:

- 52 (4%) supported more and/or improved café and concession facilities. Comments include requests for longer opening hours and better quality facilities;
- 26 (2%) were in favour of selling plants to the public from Blaise nursery and from more locations for a longer period of time;
- 24 (2%) felt more car parking charges could be introduced;
- 14 (1%) agreed that we should generate new fees for activities taking place in parks.

163 (14%) people suggested that parks should not have to be funded entirely by generating new income but could receive income through a levy, precept or additional taxation. Others in this group felt that parks services should be paid for solely by the local authority without generating income.

122 (10%) people suggested that donations should be sought. It was suggested these could be from individuals online or via a phone app for example or by donation boxes. Fundraising events could be held and businesses could be asked to donate. Legacy donations were suggested and philanthropic gestures. Voluntary levies were also suggested – on council tax bills for example.

107 (9%) people proposed generating sponsorship for green spaces, events, features, projects, general maintenance or to support volunteer or community activity.

90 (8%) people suggested money could be made or saved by maintaining parks in a different way. Suggestions included cutting grass less frequently, leaving areas to go wild, encourage residents to maintain local green space and supporting volunteering.

84 (7%) people suggested new fees or charges for activities or facilities that are currently free. Suggestions included charging for Park Run, to use toilet facilities, to attend the Balloon Fiesta or have barbecues in parks.

39 (3%) people suggested supporting ‘friends groups’ or local communities to maintain green spaces, raise money for improvements or organise events.

33 (2.5%) people suggested we raise charges where they already apply. Suggestions included car parking, sports facilities and allotments.

33 (2.5%) people suggested raising more income from car parking charges.

32 (2.5%) people suggested that park buildings can be used to generate new income or save money by for example making them available for commercial hire, through sale or conversion, hosting civic ceremonies or exhibitions.

21 (2%) people suggested that raising money through a trust or a charity would help fund the service or, for example, projects, events or individual parks.

Q9. Proposal 6: The operation of chargeable sports facilities and other facilities in public parks only when they generate no cost to the Council.

Views on Proposal 6	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	253	10%	10%	No. of respondents to question	26 14
Agree	1120	42%	43%	Response rate to question	98. 3%
Neither agree or disagree	668	25%	26%		
Disagree	376	14%	14%		
Strongly disagree	197	7%	8%		
Not answered	45	2%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q10. Proposal 7: Reduce the number of days Hengrove Play Park is open to five days a week – Wednesday to Sunday – all year round. Currently, over the summer months, the play area is open six days a week.

Views on Proposal 7	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question

Strongly agree	109	4%	4%	No. of respondents to question	26 14
Agree	455	17%	17%	Response rate to question	98 .3 %
Neither agree or disagree	840	32%	32%		
Disagree	743	28%	28%		
Strongly disagree	467	18%	18%		
Not answered	45	2%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q11. Proposal 8: Reduce the level of grounds maintenance on parks or parts of parks across the city where it is appropriate to do so.

Views on Proposal 8	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question	No. of respondents to question	
Strongly agree	254	10%	10%	26 22	
Agree	1038	39%	40%	98. 6%	
Neither agree or disagree	387	15%	15%		
Disagree	597	22%	23%		
Strongly disagree	346	13%	13%		
Not answered	37	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q12. Proposal 9: To no longer provide hanging baskets in parts of the city and to replace formal bedding displays with more floral meadow displays.

Views on Proposal 9	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question	No. of respondents to question	
Strongly agree	506	19%	19%	26 32	
Agree	976	37%	37%	99 .0 %	

Neither agree or disagree	407	15%	15%
Disagree	492	19%	19%
Strongly disagree	251	9%	10%
Not answered	27	1%	
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%

Q13. Proposal 10: Flexible opening times for parks facilities (e.g. toilets) in order to reduce out-of-hours staffing costs.

Views on Proposal 10	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	129	5%	5%	No. of respondents to question	262 7
Agree	606	23%	23%	Response rate to question	98. 8%
Neither agree or disagree	437	16%	17%		
Disagree	862	32%	33%		
Strongly disagree	593	22%	23%		
Not answered	32	1%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q14. Proposal 11: Remove play areas and play equipment when they are no longer safely usable and do not replace if the council's minimum provision standards demonstrate that there is suitable provision nearby.

Views on Proposal 11	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question	
Strongly agree	126	5%	5%	No. of respondents to question
Agree	532	20%	20%	Response rate to question
Neither agree or disagree	414	16%	16%	
Disagree	805	30%	31%	

Strongly disagree	747	28%	28%
Not answered	35	1%	
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%

Q15. Proposal 12: We propose to look for opportunities for community groups and organisations and businesses to manage, maintain or enhance local green spaces.

Views on Proposal 12	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	369	14%	14%	No. of respondents to question	2602
Agree	1140	43%	44%	Response rate to question	97.9%
Neither agree or disagree	565	21%	22%		
Disagree	322	12%	12%		
Strongly disagree	206	8%	8%		
Not answered	57	2%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		

Q16 - Please tell us if you have specific concerns about any of the proposals to save money by reducing the service (Q9-15). If you do, what you do differently?

Respondents were asked whether they had specific concerns about the proposals for saving money by reducing the service.

1247 (47%) of respondents provided free text comments explaining what their concerns were with the proposals and what they would do differently.

General comments

165 (13%) commented on the negative impacts of the proposals on health and wellbeing.

44 (4%) opposed all cuts to the parks service. 6 (0.5%) agreed with the proposals in general.

40 (3%) said that the proposals disadvantaged deprived areas.

38 (3%) said there was insufficient information or that the proposals were too broad in scope to agree with them.

32 (3%) said that the savings weren't high enough to justify the decreases in service provision.

23 (2%) were concerned with the potential job losses.

8 (1%) suggested that facilities and services should be improved and increased.

Funding/Generating income

106 (9%) suggested seeking business sponsorship to pay for services.

16 (1%) proposed that we should fundraise money to support delivering parks services.

8 (1%) proposed that the services could be commercially run.

8 (1%) proposed raising council tax.

8 (1%) said that there should be no charges for park usage. 3 (0.2%) suggested that there should be.

6 (0.5%) said that there should be no advertising in parks.

5 (0.4%) suggested selling plants.

4 (0.3%) proposed holding more events.

4 (0.3%) suggested selling park by-products (e.g. mulch, wood and hay).

4 (0.3%) proposed selling food/coffee.

4 (0.3%) said that the parks department should generate more income (non-specific).

3 (0.2%) stated that parks should not need to generate an income.

3 (0.2%) said that the parks service should sell hay.

2 (0.2%) proposed charging businesses more to rent spaces in parks.

1 (0.1%) suggested charging more for sports.

1 (0.1%) proposed raising money through a congestion charge.

Maintenance

141 (11%) disagreed with the proposals to cut maintenance as they would reduce the attractiveness and quality of the parks. 4 (0.3%) agreed with a general reduction in grounds maintenance.

71 (6%) said that grass cutting needs to be maintained. 20 (2%) agreed with reducing grass cutting.

54 (4%) stated that the proposals would lead to an unacceptable decline in maintenance standards.

41 (3%) said that leaf collection was a priority, many of them citing ash dieback as being a significant risk of cutting this service. 5 (0.4%) agreed with reducing leaf collection.

30 (2%) said that hay cutting needs to be maintained. 1 (0.1%) agreed with reducing the number of hay cuts.

21 (2%) said that we should prioritise maintaining paths and walking/seating areas.

12 (1%) said that waste removal and bins were a priority.

11 (1%) said that tree maintenance was a priority.

7 (1%) said that we should prioritise hedge and shrub trimming.

6 (0.5%) suggested that unemployed people, people on community service or prisoners could contribute to delivering parks maintenance.

4 (0.3%) said that the parks service should clear scrub.

3 (0.2%) proposed introducing grazing animals to reduce park maintenance.

Ownership & Service delivery

82 (7%) were concerned that volunteers would be unable to effectively take over the running of parks services.

73 (6%) suggested that the Council should work more closely with community groups to effectively deliver parks services.

68 (5%) said that safeguards would need to be put in place to ensure that any organisations taking over parks services would deliver a high quality inclusive service.

49 (4%) said that organisation taking over parks services should be non-profit.

48 (4%) said we should not outsource or sell off parks to businesses.

20 (2%) suggested that we should consult the local communities before making significant changes to their parks.

18 (1%) suggested that we should make more use of volunteers for delivering parks services.

15 (1%) said that the council should retain overall responsibility for park management.

7 (1%) raised issues with handing over services to community groups.

7 (1%) said that the council should continue to maintain park spaces.

4 (0.3%) suggested that each park needed its own individual approach.

3 (0.2%) proposed that the parks service should maximise staff efficiency.

3 (0.2%) said that the parks service should enable facilities to be reinstated once the financial situation improves.

Planting

104 (8%) said that the parks should be planted and managed in a way that encourages wildlife.

83 (7%) disagreed with removing shrubs.

51 (4%) said that hanging baskets should still be provided. 29 (2%) said that hanging baskets were unnecessary.

43 (3%) suggested taking a less formal, lower maintenance approach to displays and planting.

41 (3%) suggested that there should be more wildflower spaces and meadows. 7 (1%) said that meadows would still require managing and maintenance, so would still incur a cost.

35 (3%) said that formal flower beds and displays were a priority. 3 (0.2%) agreed with reducing the amount of floral displays.

31 (2%) suggested that members of the public could provide plants for the parks and displays.

14 (1%) wanted more woodlands. 11 (1%) said that we should not create new woodland. 3 (0.2%) noted that woodlands still require significant maintenance.

6 (0.5%) suggested that the council should provide cheaper alternatives to hanging baskets and flowers.

Play areas

305 (24%) disagreed with the removal of play equipment. 6 (0.5%) of the comments agreed with it.

57 (5%) stated that Hengrove Park needed to be open for longer. 3 (0.2%) suggested that Hengrove Park should close on different times/days than in the proposals.

25 (2%) said that removing play equipment would disadvantage families who could not travel.

10 (1%) suggested that play areas should be self-managing.

Savings

13 (1%) suggested that the council should save money from other services.

6 (0.5%) proposed reviewing the procurement and management of services to make them more cost effective.

Sports

40 (3%) said that sports provision was a priority.

22 (2%) said that we should not charge for use of sports facilities.

19 (2%) agreed with charging for sports. 4 (0.3%) of these suggested not charging too much, or not charging certain groups in order to make sports more inclusive.

10 (1%) said that keeping changing rooms open was a priority.

7 (1%) said that the council needs to ensure that all people are able to use the sports facilities.

Toilets/facilities

353 (28%) said that toilets and facilities should be open later than the proposed times.

165 (13%) said that removing toilet facilities would have negative impacts. 2 (0.2%) agreed with removing toilet facilities.

11 (1%) proposed charging for toilets.

8 (1%) suggested introducing self-locking toilets.

1 (0.1%) proposed implementing a business toilet scheme.

1 (0.1%) suggested introducing compost toilets.

Q17. Do you have any other ideas of how we might save money from reducing the service?

609 (23%) of respondents provided free text comments giving their own ideas to save money from the service.

Disagree with proposals

103 (17%) said that we should oppose the cuts.

8 (1%) opposed the reduction in parks maintenance as it would result in anti-social behaviour and would reduce potential income generation.

5 (1%) said that toilets should be open later.

4 (1%) suggested making parks more attractive.

2 (0.3%) suggested learning from other local authorities.

Funding/Generating income

58 (10%) suggested seeking business sponsorship.

21 (3%) said that the council should fundraise money to support delivering parks services.

17 (3%) suggested selling park by-products (e.g. mulch, wood and hay).

- 17 (3%) suggested charging for toilets.
- 15 (2%) suggested fining litterers and dog foulers.
- 15 (2%) said that taxes should be raised.
- 11 (2%) said that the council should generate income (non-specific).
- 7 (1%) proposed running more events in parks.
- 7 (1%) proposed introducing charging/increasing charges for parking.
- 4 (1%) suggested that the NHS/Public Health should contribute to the parks budget.
- 3 (0.5%) proposed selling off unused land.
- 3 (0.5%) suggested selling services.
- 2 (0.3%) proposed generating income through offering advertising on park sites.
- 1 (0.2%) suggested introducing a congestion charge.

Maintenance

- 42 (7%) said we should take a less intensive approach to parks maintenance.
- 17 (3%) suggested that people on community service, unemployed people or prisoners could contribute to delivering parks maintenance.
- 9 (1%) proposed that money could be saved by introducing a more efficient bin and waste collection strategy.
- 6 (1%) suggested educating people about looking after parks in order to reduce maintenance costs.
- 5 (1%) suggested saving/generating money through better use of technology.
- 4 (1%) proposed introducing grazing animals to reduce park maintenance.

Ownership & Service delivery

- 90 (15%) said that we should work with other organisations (e.g. trusts, community groups, schools and farms) to deliver parks services.
- 39 (6%) suggested that we should make more use of volunteers for delivering parks services.
- 21 (3%) suggested that the parks service should be run more efficiently.
- 7 (1%) proposed implementing a business toilets scheme for parks.
- 7 (1%) said that the parks service should focus on delivering the basics and reduce non-essential overheads.

7 (1%) suggested that the council should directly engage residents and set up friend's groups.

6 (1%) said that the council needed to improve its communication with supportive groups.

4 (1%) suggested that there should be individual business/management plans for each park.

3 (0.5%) said that the parks team should be improved in order to deliver a more effective service.

2 (0.3%) suggested protecting deprived areas and reducing the services in more wealthy areas first

2 (0.3%) said that the council should protect parks from being bought out by developers.

Planting

51 (8%) suggested introducing a lower maintenance planting regime.

5 (1%) said that hanging baskets should be removed.

Savings

33 (5%) said that the council should reduce its number of staff, particularly senior managers.

18 (3%) said that the council should save money from other services.

2 (0.3%) proposed that Hengrove Park play area should be unmanned.

2 (0.3%) suggested closing some of the parks.

2 (0.3%) suggested closing toilets.

Sports

12 (2%) suggested that the parks service should charge for sports.

2 (0.3%) suggested reducing the council's spend on sports.

Q18. Proposal 13: We propose to increase the number of pay and display parking spaces in parks, and increase the parking charges on sites that already have pay and display parking

Views on Proposal 13	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question		
Strongly agree	343	13%	13%	No. of respondents to question	26 11
Agree	936	35%	36%	Response rate to question	98 .2 %

Neither agree or disagree	393	15%	15%
Disagree	516	19%	20%
Strongly disagree	423	16%	16%
Not answered	48	2%	
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%

Q19. Proposal 14: We are considering the merits of the Parks Service being delivered by a Trust or similar organisation rather than the City Council

Views on Proposal 14	Number of responses	% of responses to survey	% of responses to the question	No. of respondents to question	
Strongly agree	233	9%	9%	26	05
Agree	755	28%	29%	Response rate to question	98.0%
Neither agree or disagree	670	25%	26%		
Disagree	468	18%	18%		
Strongly disagree	479	18%	18%		
Not answered	54	2%			
Total	2659	100.0%	100.0%		