



**BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

# **Bath & North East Somerset Green Space Strategy**

## **Appendix B Quality Audit**

Making Bath & North East Somerset  
a better place to live, work & visit

# **Bath & North East Somerset**

## **Green Space Quality Audit**

### **Final Report**

October 2006

Community First Partnership  
Unit 35  
The Old Woodyard  
Hagley Hall  
Hagley  
Worcs.  
DY9 9LQ

T: 01562 887884  
F: 01562 887087  
W: [www.communityfirstpartnership.co.uk](http://www.communityfirstpartnership.co.uk)



**Bath & North East Somerset  
Green Space Quality Audit Report**

**Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Formal Spaces</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Methodology	
2.1.1 Criteria used	2
2.1.2 Scoring of criteria	4
2.2 Findings	
2.2.1 Findings – sites	4
2.2.2 Findings – criteria	7
2.2.3 Findings – factors	8
2.3 Analysis	
2.3.1 Findings by site manager	10
2.3.2 Findings by hierarchy	10
<b>3. Natural Spaces</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Methodology	
3.1.1 Criteria used	11
3.1.2 Scoring of criteria	13
3.2 Findings	
3.2.1 Findings – sites	13
3.2.2 Findings – criteria	14
3.2.3 Findings – factors	15

3.3 Analysis	
3.3.1 Findings by site manager	17
3.3.2 Findings by hierarchy	17
<b>4. Allotments</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Methodology	
4.1.1 Criteria used	18
4.1.2 Scoring of criteria	19
4.2 Findings	
4.2.1 Findings – sites	20
4.2.2 Findings – criteria	21
4.2.3 Findings – factors	21
4.3 Analysis	
4.3.1 Findings by site manager	23
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	<b>24</b>

## **Appendices**

**A** – Formal Spaces Audit Form

**B** – Natural Spaces Audit Form

**C** – Allotment Audit Form

## 1. Introduction

This report sets out the results of the qualitative audit of three types of green space provision in Bath & North East Somerset. The report represents all sites audited by council officers and is intended to inform the wider green space strategy, currently under development. The assessments took place in late 2004 / early 2005 and therefore any improvements that have since been undertaken could alter the score in its present day condition.

Three separate audit forms were used for three separate types of green space provision based on a hybrid of the green flag methodology combined with advice from CABI Space.

- formal spaces
- natural spaces
- allotments

The number of sites by typology can be seen in the table below;

Type of Space	Number of Sites Audited	Total Number of Sites	Percentage Audited
Formal	130	220	59.1%
Natural	24	39	61.5%
Allotments	39	39	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	193	298	67.8%

Table 1.1 Number of sites audited by type

## **Formal Spaces**

The formal spaces assessments were undertaken by 2 officers within the parks section.

### 2.1 Methodology

#### 2.1.1 Criteria Used

In total 130 sites were identified to be assessed against 11 criteria designed by the authority. Each criterion has a number of factors and an average of the criteria scores was used to provide a final score for all sites.

The criteria were:

- Access & Circulation
- Landscape Quality
- Facilities
- Maintenance
- Management
- Security & Safety
- Natural Heritage
- Cultural Heritage
- Education
- Health
- Responses to People

Under these headings sit a further 48 factors, these are set out below

#### **Access & Circulation**

- Entrance location & accessibility
- Entrances visible & welcoming
- Access for those with mobility difficulties
- Signage
- Parking

#### **Landscape Quality**

- Rich & Stimulating
- Variety of scales
- Boundaries
- Structure
- Visual Impact

## **Facilities**

- Furniture
- Appropriate facilities
- Buildings
- Special features
- Amount Furniture

## **Maintenance**

- Litter, dog fouling, graffiti
- Fabric, furniture, buildings
- Trees
- Permanent plantings
- Flower beds
- Grass areas
- Wildlife habitats

## **Management**

- Appropriate level
- Info to contact man services
- Info on events / activities
- Community involvement
- Signage

## **Security & Safety**

- Personal safety
- Vandalism
- ASB
- Self-surveillance

## **Natural Heritage**

- Natural habitats
- Nature conservation objectives
- Sustainable management

## **Cultural Heritage**

- Historic landscape
- Historic buildings
- Cultural activities

## **Education**

- Interpretation
- Educational activities
- Evidence / Knowledge of activities

## **Health**

- Opportunities for active leisure

## Responses to People

- Elderly
- Young People
- Children
- People with disabilities
- Diverse cultures
- Families

### 2.1.2 Scoring of criteria

Each individual criterion was scored out of 5 and a site score derived from the total of all the criteria scores divided by the actual number of criteria scored. This was then worked out as a “percentage” score. Criteria that did not apply to a particular site – e.g. historic buildings on a site that had no buildings on it – were scored as not applicable and were therefore not included in the total score or average calculations. The maximum score available was therefore 100 for each site.

The scoring line gives a description of what each numerical score means as follows:

Score	5	4	3	2	1
Quality	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor

Table 2.1.2.1 Scoring Line

## 2.2 Findings

This section of the report is divided into the findings for each of the sites and also for the various criteria so that site specific issues can be identified as well as issues that may be operating across a number of sites.

### 2.2.1 Findings – sites

Site ID	Site Name	“Percentage”
46	Bath, Royal Victoria Park	83
54	Bath, St Stephens Millenium Green	77
43	Bath, Queen Square	76
41	Bath, Alice Park	71
45	Bath, Henrietta Park	71
1000	Keynsham Memorial Park	68
37	Bath, Parade Gardens	66
40	Bath, Alexandra Park	66
51	Bath, The Circus OS	66
3006	Hinton Charterhouse Millenium Green	65
39	Bath, Sydney Gardens	64
3020	Camerton Recreation Centre	63
32	Bath, Weston Rec	60
36	Bath, St Johns Closed Burial Ground	60
1	Bath, Beazer Maze	59
27	Bath, Pennyquick Open Space	59
3022	Timsbury Recreation Ground	59
3025	Farington Gurney Recreation Ground	59



42	Bath, Shaftesbury Road Memorial Garden	58
44	Bath, Hedgemoad Park	58
55	Bath, Northfields Open Space	58
3013	PSJ, Eckweek Lane Play Area	58
3015	PSJ, Beacon Field	58
2002	MSN, The Hollies Garden	57
3016	Tunley Recreation Centre	57
3023	Pamlton Recreation Ground	57
3034	East Harptree Playing Field	56
30	Bath, Springfield Farm Open Space	55
1009	Keynsham Manor Road Playing Field	55
3003	Paulton Memorial Park	55
3009	Monkton Combe Village Hall	55
3031	Saltford Recreation Ground	55
3039	Chew Magna, King George V Memorial Field	55
21	Bath, Rosewarne Close Open Space	54
26	Bath, Moorland Rec	54
29	Bath, Firs Field	54
34	Bath, Brassmill Lane Open Space	54
35	Bath, Roundhill Open Space	54
3012	PSJ, Ecewicke Green	54
3014	PSJ Recreation Ground	54
16	Bath, Broadmoor Lane Open Space	53
59	Bath, Julian Road Open Space	53
1007	Keynsham, Chalfield Chase Play Area	53
3040	Publow Recreation Ground	53
15	Bath, Moorfields Sand Pits	52
31	Bath, Newbridge Open Space	52
48	Bath, Newton Road OS	52
1005	Keynsham Holmoak Road Playing Field	52
3005	Bathford Playing Field	52
3026	High Littleton Recreation Ground	52
3038	Chew Stoke, Rectory Field	52
<b>Formal Spaces Average</b>		<b>52</b>
19	Bath, Innox Park	51
23	Bath, Dorset Close Open Space	51
25	Bath, Bloomfield Road Open Space	51
38	Bath, Green Park	51
56	Bath, Lambridge Street Open Space	51
3008	Bathampton Recreation Ground	51
3011	Shoscombe Recreation Ground	51
3041	Corston Recreation Ground	51
28	Bath, Woodhouse Park Open Space	50
49	Bath, Norfolk Crescent OS	50
57	Bath, Batstone Close Open Space	50
61	Bath, Entry Hill Open Space	50
64	Bath, Hillcrest Drive OS	50
1001	Keynsham, The Hawthorns OS	50
2008	MSN, Spencer Drive O/S	50
3002	Saltford, Manor Road Garden	50
3007	Freshford Memorial Hall	50
3018	Newton St Loe Recreation Ground	50
3019	Farmborough Recreation Ground	50
3021	Camerton, The Daglands	50

3027	Temple Cloud Recreation Ground	50
3028	Clutton Village Hall	50
14	Bath, Dunster House Play Area	49
33	Bath, Kelsons Field	49
1003	Keynsham, Vandyk Avenue Open Space	49
2001	MSN, SWSC	49
2003	Writhlington Village Hall	49
2005	Radstock, Southfields Rec	49
2006	Westfield, Westhill Gardens Recreation Ground	49
3004	Batheaston Garden	49
3017	Marksbury Village Hall	49
3030	Whitchurch Playing Field	49
3035	West Harptree Playing Field	49
3	Bath, Wildcombe Play Area	48
24	Bath, Corston View Open Space	48
62	Bath, Hawthorn Grove Open Space	48
1002	Keynsham, Teviot Road Open Space	48
1004	Keynsham, Queens Road Open Space	48
2009	Clandown Recreation Ground	48
2010	MSN, West Clews Rec (Welton Rovers)	48
3001	Batheaston Recreation Association Field	48
22	Bath, Brickfields Open Space	47
1006	Keynsham, Park Road Open Space	47
1008	Keynsham, Downfields Open Space	47
2007	Haydon, Grovewood Road Play Area	47
2012	Westfield, Norton Hill Rec	47
2014	MSN, Greenacres Play Area	47
3010	Wellow Playing Field	47
58	Bath, Kensington Meadows	46
60	Bath, Backstones Open Space	46
2000	MSN, Staddlestones O/S	46
2004	Radstock, Woodborough Road Open Space	46
3032	Saltford Education Land	46
3033	Saltford, Claverton Road Open Space	46
9	Bath, Berkley House Open Space	45
10	Bath, Inman House Open Spaces	45
17	Bath, Stirtingale Road Play Area	45
20	Bath, Dartmouth Avenue Open Space	45
52	Bath, Marshfield Way / Summerfield Road	45
63	Bath, Odd Down Open Space	45
2013	Westfield, Shakespear Avenue Play Area	45
2015	MSN, Hillside Crescent Play Area	45
3000	Batheaston Play Area	45
3029	Bishop Sutton Village Hall Field	45
3036	Ubley Glebe Field	45
2	Bath, Beacon Hill Open Space	44
4	Bath, Larkhall Rec	44
3024	Pamlton, Wallenge Open Space	44
3037	Chew Stoke, Bilbie Road Play Area	44
8	Bath, Roundhill Park Open Space	43
53	Bath, Walcot Open Space	43
2016	MSN, Clapton Road Rec	42
5	Bath, Homemead Park Open Space	41
12	Bath, St Saviours Open Space	41

6	Bath, Cranmore Place Open Space	40
50	Bath, Snowhill Open Space	40
7	Bath, Odins Road Play Area	39
11	Bath, Midsummer Buildings Open Space	39
2011	Westfield, Waterford Park Play Area	38

Table 2.2.1.1 Formal Site Quality Scores

The table above shows the quality scores for all formal sites assessed and also the average for the area. It shows that more sites score below the average of 52 for the area. There is an overall score range of 45.

### 2.2.2 Findings – criteria

Criteria	Average Score
Landscape Quality	3.3
Maintenance	3.2
Access & Circulation	3.1
Responses to People	3.1
Security & Safety	3.1
Health	2.9
Facilities	2.8
<b>Average Criteria Score</b>	<b>2.7</b>
Management	2.5
Cultural Heritage	2.4
Natural Heritage	1.9
Education	1.4

Table 2.2.2.1 Criteria Scores

Table 2.2.2.1 above sets out the average scores for all the assessed criteria and also the average criteria score for the authority for formal spaces. The figure for the authority shows that the average score is 'average' by the scoring line used (table 2.1.2.1). The average score is held low by the overall poor performance of the criteria 'education' and 'natural heritage'.

### 2.2.3 Findings – factors

<b>Criteria / Factor</b>	<b>Average</b>
Entrance location & accessibility	3.7
Parking	3.3
<i>Access &amp; Circulation</i>	<i>3.1</i>
Entrances visible & welcoming	3.0
Access for mobility difficulties	2.6
Signage	2.1
Structure	3.6
Boundaries	3.4
Variety of scales	3.4
Visual Impact	3.3
<i>Landscape Quality</i>	<i>3.3</i>
Rich & Stimulating	3.1
Buildings	3.7
Appropriate facilities	3.3
Furniture	2.9
Special features	2.9
<i>Facilities</i>	<i>2.8</i>
Amount Furniture	2.5
Flower beds	4.3
Grass areas	3.6
<i>Maintenance</i>	<i>3.2</i>
Wildlife habitats	3.1
Trees	3.1
Litter, dog fouling, graffiti	3.1
Fabric, furniture, buildings	3.0
Permanent plantings	2.8
Appropriate level	3.0
Community involvement	2.6
<i>Management</i>	<i>2.5</i>
Signage	2.3
Info on events / activities	2.2
Info to contact man services	2.0
Personal safety	3.6
Vandalism	3.2
<i>Security &amp; Safety</i>	<i>3.1</i>
ASB	3.0
Self-surveillance	2.7
Natural habitats	1.9
Sustainable management	1.9
<i>Natural Heritage</i>	<i>1.9</i>
Nature conservation objectives	1.5
Historic landscape	3.2
Historic buildings	3.1
<i>Cultural Heritage</i>	<i>2.4</i>
Cultural activities	2.3

<b>Criteria / Factor</b>	<b>Average</b>
Evidence / Knowledge of activities	2.2
Educational activities	1.8
<i>Education</i>	<i>1.4</i>
Interpretation	1.3
Opportunities for active leisure	2.9
<i>Health</i>	<i>2.9</i>
Children	3.5
Families	3.5
<i>Responses to People</i>	<i>3.1</i>
Diverse cultures	3.0
Young People	3.0
Elderly	2.9
People with disabilities	2.5

Table 2.2.3.1 Factor Scores

The above table shows that within each criterion there are a range of scores.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Access & Circulation	2.1 – 3.7	1.6
Maintenance	2.8 – 4.3	1.5
Facilities	2.5 – 3.7	1.2
Responses to People	2.5 – 3.5	1.0
Management	2.0 – 3.0	1.0
Cultural Heritage	2.3 – 3.2	0.9
Education	1.3 – 2.2	0.9
Security & Safety	2.7 – 3.6	0.9
Landscape Quality	3.1 – 3.6	0.5
Natural Heritage	1.5 – 1.9	0.4
Health	2.9	-

Table 2.2.3.2 Ranges

The above table shows that 'access & circulation' has the largest range of scores with 'natural heritage' and 'landscape quality' having the lowest.

## 2.3 Analysis

### 2.3.1 Findings by site manager

Site Manager	Number of Sites	Range	Average
Bath & North East Somerset	77	38 – 83	52
Other*	41	44 – 77	52
Somer Housing	12	39 – 54	44

Table 2.3.1.1 Site Manager

\*other refers to Parish Councils, Village Hall Committees and other community organisations.

The above table shows that Bath & North East Somerset manage the greatest number of sites and have the joint highest average with 'other'.

### 2.3.2 Findings by hierarchy

As part of the development of the green space strategy Bath & North East Somerset have devised a hierarchy of green space provision for urban areas, setting out 5 levels based on the significance of the site. For non-urban areas there is a single level of provision referred to as "parish" below.

Hierarchy	Number of Sites	Range	Average
District	2	68 – 83	76
Neighbourhood	24	44 – 71	54
Local	13	47 – 76	54
Parish	42	44 – 65	52
Doorstep	49	38 – 77	48

Table 2.3.2.1 Hierarchy

The above table shows that doorstep sites score the lowest on average and district sites the highest, however doorstep sites have the largest range of scores.

## 2. Natural Spaces

The natural spaces assessments were undertaken by 4 or 5 officers within the environment section of planning services.

### 3.1 Methodology

#### 3.1.1 Criteria Used

In total 24 sites were identified to be assessed against 11 criteria designed by the authority. As with formal spaces, each criterion has a number of factors and an average of the criteria scores was used to provide a final score for all sites.

The criteria were:

- Access & Circulation
- Landscape Quality
- Facilities
- Maintenance
- Management
- Security & Safety
- Natural Heritage
- Cultural Heritage
- Education
- Health
- Responses to People

Under these headings sit a further 43 factors.

#### **Access & Circulation**

- Entrance location & accessibility
- Entrances visible & welcoming
- Access for those with mobility difficulties
- Parking

#### **Landscape Quality**

- Rich & Stimulating
- Boundaries
- Visual Impact

#### **Facilities**

- Furniture
- Amount Furniture
- Special features

## **Maintenance**

- Litter, dog fouling, graffiti
- Fabric, furniture, buildings
- Trees
- Scrub plantings
- Wildflower areas
- Grass areas

## **Management**

- Management plan
- Monitored & managed
- Appropriate level
- Signage
- Events & activities
- Community involvement

## **Security & Safety**

- Self-surveillance
- Personal safety
- Vandalism
- ASB

## **Natural Heritage**

- Woodland
- Rich grassland
- Rich arable grassland
- Hedgerows
- Wildlife pond
- Stream or river edge
- Lake

## **Cultural Heritage**

- Cultural activities

## **Education**

- Interpretation
- Evidence / Knowledge of activities

## **Health**

- Opportunities for active leisure

## **Responses to People**

- Elderly
- Young People
- Children
- People with disabilities
- Diverse cultures
- Families



### 3.1.2 Scoring of criteria

Each individual criterion was scored out of 5 and a site score derived from the total of all the criteria scores divided by the actual number of criteria scored. This was then worked out as a “percentage” score. Criteria that did not apply to a particular site were scored as not applicable and were therefore not included in the total score or average calculations. The maximum score available was therefore 100 for each site.

The scoring line gives an indication of what each score means as follows:

<b>Score</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Quality</b>	V good	Good	Average	Poor	V poor

Table 3.1.2.1 Scoring Line

### 3.2 Findings

This section of the report is divided into the findings for each of the sites and also for the various criteria so that site specific issues can be identified as well as issues that may be operating across a number of sites.

#### 3.2.1 Findings – sites

Site ID	Site Name	“Percentage”
1701	Keynsham, Manor Road Community Woodland LNR	74
717	Bath, City Farm	71
2700	Norton Radstock Greenway	71
706	Bath, Kennet & Avon Canal Towpath	70
707	Bath, Lansdown Cemetery	70
712	Bath, Riverside Path	69
719	Bath, Primose Hill Community Woodland	68
703	Bath, Bristol & Bath Railway Path	67
718	Bath, Round Hill LNR	67
701	Bath, Abbey Cemetery	63
<b>Natural Spaces Average</b>		<b>57</b>
708	Bath, Linear Park	56
709	Bath, Locksbrook Cemetery	55
1700	Keynsham, Abbots Wood	54
705	Bath, Free Fields Woodland	51
2702	MSN, Silver Street Woodland LNR	50
700	Bath, Kensington Meadows LNR	49
716	Bath, The Tumps	49
704	Bath, Carrs Woodland LNR	47
714	Bath, St James Cemetery	46
711	Bath, Lower Newbridge Slopes	44
715	Bath, Stirtingale Farm / Rush Hill OS	43
702	Bath, Beechen Cliff Woodland	42
710	Bath, Lyncombe Vale Disused Railway	41
2701	Westfield, Disused Rail Track	40

Table 3.2.1.1 Natural Site Quality Scores

The table above shows the quality scores for all natural sites assessed and also the average for the area. It shows that again more sites score below the average of 57 for the area. There is an overall score range of 34 suggesting that some sites are falling short of the standard whereas others are exceeding it.

### 3.2.2 Findings – criteria

Criteria	Average Score
Landscape Quality	3.7
Natural Heritage	3.4
Health	3.3
Security & Safety	3.1
Access & Circulation	2.9
Average Criteria Score	2.9
Maintenance	2.9
Responses to People	2.7
Facilities	2.7
Management	2.7
Cultural Heritage	2.2
Education	2.0

Table 3.2.2.1 Criteria Scores

Table 3.2.2.1 above sets out the average scores for all the assessed criteria and also the average criteria score for the authority for natural spaces. The figure for the authority shows that the average score is average by the scoring line (table 3.1.2.1). However, only 5 of the 11 criteria fall above the average suggesting that a large number of the criteria fall close to the average score. The average score is held low by the overall poor performance of the criteria 'education' and 'cultural heritage'.

### 3.2.3 Findings – factors

<b>Criteria / Factor</b>	<b>Average</b>
Entrance location & accessibility	3.5
Parking	3.0
<i>Access &amp; Circulation</i>	2.9
Entrances visible & welcoming	2.8
Access for mobility difficulties	2.5
Visual Impact	3.9
<i>Landscape Quality</i>	3.7
Rich & Stimulating	3.6
Boundaries	3.5
Furniture	3.1
Special features	2.8
<i>Facilities</i>	2.7
Amount Furniture	2.6
Grass areas	3.6
Fabric, furniture, buildings	2.9
Scrub plantings	2.9
<i>Maintenance</i>	2.9
Litter, dog fouling, graffiti	2.8
Trees	2.8
Wildflower areas	2.8
Monitored & managed	3.4
Management plan	3.1
Appropriate level	2.9
<i>Management</i>	2.7
Signage	2.6
Community involvement	2.5
Info on events / activities	2.3
Personal safety	3.4
Vandalism	3.2
ASB	3.2
<i>Security &amp; Safety</i>	3.1
Self-surveillance	2.5
Rich arable grassland	4.3
Wildlife pond	3.8
Hedgerows	3.7
Woodland	3.6
<i>Natural Heritage</i>	3.4
Rich grassland	3.0
Lake	3.0
Stream or river edge	2.8
Cultural activities	2.2
<i>Cultural Heritage</i>	2.2
Evidence / Knowledge of activities	2.2
<i>Education</i>	2.0
Interpretation	1.9

<b>Criteria / Factor</b>	<b>Average</b>
Opportunities for active leisure	3.3
<i>Health</i>	3.3
Young People	3.0
Children	2.9
Elderly	2.8
Families	2.8
<i>Responses to People</i>	2.7
Diverse cultures	2.5
People with disabilities	2.5

Table 3.2.3.1 Factor Scores

The above table shows that within each criterion there are a range of scores.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Natural Heritage	2.8 – 4.3	1.5
Management	2.3 – 3.4	1.1
Access & Circulation	2.5 – 3.5	1.0
Security & Safety	2.5 – 3.4	0.9
Maintenance	2.8 – 3.6	0.8
Facilities	2.6 – 3.1	0.5
Responses to People	2.5 – 3.0	0.5
Landscape Quality	3.5 – 3.9	0.4
Education	1.9 – 2.2	0.3
Cultural Heritage	2.2	-
Health	3.3	-

Table 2.2.3.2 Ranges

The above table shows that 'natural heritage' has the largest range of scores with 'education' having the lowest.

### 3.3 Analysis

#### 3.3.1 Findings by site manager

<b>Site Manager</b>	<b>Number of Sites</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Average</b>
Other	5	54 – 71	67
Bath & North East Somerset	19	40 – 74	54

Table 3.3.1.1 Site Manager

The above table shows that Bath & North East Somerset manage the greatest number of sites however, 'other' have the highest average. Bath & North East Somerset also has the largest range of final score.

#### 3.3.2 Findings by hierarchy

<b>Hierarchy</b>	<b>Number of Sites</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Average</b>
District	3	71 – 74	72
Neighbourhood	21	40 – 70	54

Table 3.3.2.1 Hierarchy

The above table shows that district sites score the highest, yet neighbourhood sites have the largest range of scores.

## **Allotments**

The allotments assessments were undertaken by a single parks officer.

### 4.1 Methodology

#### 4.1.1 Criteria Used

In total 39 sites were identified to be assessed against 11 criteria designed by the authority. Each criterion has a number of factors and an average of the criteria scores was used to provide a final score for all sites.

The criteria were:

- Access & Circulation
- Landscape Quality
- Communal Facilities
- Maintenance
- Management
- Security & Safety
- Natural Heritage
- Cultural Heritage
- Education
- Health
- Responses to People

Under these headings sit a further 35 factors.

#### **Access & Circulation**

- Entrance location & accessibility
- Entrances visible & welcoming
- Access for those with mobility difficulties
- Deliveries / collections
- Parking

#### **Landscape Quality**

- Rich & Stimulating
- Boundaries
- Visual Impact

#### **Communal Facilities**

- Water facilities
- Compost / rubbish / recycling
- Communal Buildings

#### **Maintenance**

- Litter, dog fouling, graffiti
- Fabric, furniture, buildings
- Permanent plantings
- Grass areas

## Management

- Appropriate level
- Non-cultivation
- Signage
- Notice board
- Community involvement

## Security & Safety

- Self-surveillance
- Personal safety
- Vandalism
- ASB

## Natural Heritage

- Natural habitats

## Cultural Heritage

- Cultural activities

## Education

- Share knowledge
- Evidence / Knowledge of activities

## Health

- Opportunities for active leisure

## Responses to People

- Elderly
- Young People
- Children
- People with disabilities
- Diverse cultures
- Families

### 4.1.2 Scoring of criteria

Each individual criterion was scored out of 5 and a site score derived from the total of all the criteria scores divided by the actual number of criteria scored. This was then worked out as a “percentage” score. Criteria that did not apply to a particular site – e.g. communal buildings on a site that had no buildings on it – were scored as not applicable and were therefore not included in the total score or average calculations. The maximum score available was therefore 100 for each site.

The scoring line gives an indication of what each score means as follows:

Score	5	4	3	2	1
Quality	V good	Good	Average	Poor	V poor

Table 4.1.2.1 Scoring Line

## 4.2 Findings

This section of the report is divided into the findings for each of the sites and also for the various criteria so that site specific issues can be identified as well as issues that may be operating across a number of sites.

### 4.2.1 Findings – sites

Site ID	Site Name	"Percentage"
518	Bath, Bloomfield Road Allotments	58
510	Bath, Lower Common West Allotments	56
502	Bath, Combe Down Allotments	55
509	Bath, Ring Common Paddock Allotments	53
3505	Bathford Allotments	52
500	Bath, St Stephens Allotments	52
504	Bath, Mendip Gardens Allotments	52
505	Bath, High Common Allotments	52
519	Bath, King Georges Road Allotments	51
3506	Bathampton Allotments	50
508	Bath, Monksdale Road Allotments	50
515	Bath, Lyncombe Vale Allotments	50
1500	Keynsham Allotments	49
3509	Farmborough Allotments	49
503	Bath, Abbey View Allotments	49
517	Bath, Moorfields Road Allotments	49
2501	MSN Allotments	48
3500	Timsbury Allotments	48
511	Bath, Larkhall Allotments	48
501	Bath, Fairfield Park Allotments	47
512	Bath, Claremont Road Allotments	47
516	Bath, Lyncombe Hill Farm Allotments	47
<b>Allotment Average</b>		<b>47</b>
2502	Haydon Allotments	46
3510	Saltford Allotments	46
507	Bath, Lower Common East Allotments	46
513	Bath, Brookfield Park Allotments	46
3502	Farrington Gurney Sunnyside Allotments	45
3513	Clutton Allotments	45
506	Bath, Canal Gardens Allotments	45
514	Bath, Eastfield Park Allotments	45
520	Bath, Avon Park Allotments	45
3501	Paulton Allotments	44
3504	Hallatrow Allotments	44
3508	Peasedown St John Allotments	44
3512	Compton Martin Allotments	44
3503	Farrington Gurney Ham Lane Allotments	42
3507	Southstoke Allotments	39
3514	Pensford Allotments	35
3511	Batheaston, Elmhurst Allotments	33

Table 4.2.1.1 Allotments Quality Scores



The table above shows the quality scores for all allotment sites assessed and also the average for the area. It shows that more sites score above the average of 47 for the area. There is an overall score range of 25 suggesting that some sites are falling short of the standard whereas others are exceeding it.

#### 4.2.2 Findings – criteria

Criteria	Average Score
Security & Safety	3.3
Maintenance	3.1
Landscape Quality	3.0
Cultural Heritage	3.0
Health	2.9
Education	2.9
Access & Circulation	2.7
Average Criteria Score	2.7
Responses to People	2.6
Communal Facilities	2.4
Management	2.3
Natural Heritage	1.8

Table 4.2.2.1 Criteria Scores

Table 4.2.2.1 above sets out the average scores for all the assessed criteria and also the average criteria score for the authority for allotments. The figure for the authority shows that the average score is average by the scoring line (table 4.1.2.1). However, only 4 of the 11 criteria fall below the average suggesting that a large number of the criteria fall close to the average score. The average score is held low by the overall poor performance of the criteria 'natural heritage' and 'management'.

#### 4.2.3 Findings – factors

Criteria / Factor	Average
Entrance location & accessibility	3.5
Entrances visible & welcoming	3.0
Deliveries / collections	2.7
<i>Access &amp; Circulation</i>	2.7
Parking	2.6
Access for mobility difficulties	1.9
Boundaries	3.1
Rich & Stimulating	3.1
<i>Landscape Quality</i>	3.0
Visual Impact	2.9
Communal Buildings	3.3
Compost / rubbish / recycling	2.4
Water facilities	2.4
<i>Communal Facilities</i>	2.4
Litter, dog fouling, graffiti	3.2
Fabric, furniture, buildings	3.1

<b>Criteria / Factor</b>	<b>Average</b>
Grass areas	3.1
<i>Maintenance</i>	3.1
Permanent plantings	2.7
Non-cultivation	2.8
Community involvement	2.6
Appropriate level	2.5
Notice board	2.3
<i>Management</i>	2.3
Signage	1.6
Vandalism	3.8
ASB	3.8
<i>Security &amp; Safety</i>	3.3
Personal safety	3.1
Self-surveillance	2.6
Natural habitats	1.8
<i>Natural Heritage</i>	1.8
Cultural activities	3.0
<i>Cultural Heritage</i>	3.0
Evidence / Knowledge of activities	3.0
Share knowledge	2.9
<i>Education</i>	2.9
Opportunities for active leisure	2.9
<i>Health</i>	2.9
Diverse cultures	2.9
Families	2.9
Elderly	2.8
<i>Responses to People</i>	2.6
People with disabilities	1.8
Children	n/a
Young People	n/a

Table 2.2.3.1 Factor Scores

The above table shows that within each criterion there are a range of scores.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Access & Circulation	1.9 – 3.5	1.6
Management	1.6 – 2.8	1.2
Security & Safety	2.6 – 3.8	1.2
Responses to People	1.8 – 2.9	1.1
Communal Facilities	2.4 – 3.3	0.9
Maintenance	2.7 – 3.2	0.5
Landscape Quality	2.9 – 3.1	0.2
Education	2.9 – 3.0	0.1
Cultural Heritage	3.0	-
Health	2.9	-
Natural Heritage	1.8	-

Table 4.2.3.2 Ranges

The above table shows that 'access & circulation' has the largest range of scores with 'education' and 'landscape quality' having the lowest.

#### 4.3 Analysis

##### 4.3.1 Findings by site manager

<b>Site Manager</b>	<b>Number of Sites</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Average</b>
Bath & North East Somerset	21	33 – 58	49
Other	18	35 – 52	46

Table 4.3.1.1 Site Manager

The above table shows that Bath & North East Somerset manage the greatest number of sites and have the highest average. They also have the largest range.

## 5. Conclusions

Before considering any actions relating to the analysis undertaken the limitations of the approach must be set out. The assessment is a 'snap shot' e.g. sites that were covered in litter may well have been scheduled to be cleaned later in the assessment day, play areas that were poor may be subject to funding bids or a replacement programme. However, ideally the quality for the visitor to the sites should be the same 365 days of the year.

Another limitation that needs to be considered is the time of audit and the person(s) conducting the assessment. The audits were undertaken in late 2004 / early 2005. Since this time some significant improvements have been made at some of the sites and therefore this would have an effect on their score if the audit were undertaken at the present time. It also needs to be noted that a number of different staff undertook the assessments depending upon the type of green space audited. For the natural spaces 4 or 5 different officers undertook the audits and therefore there is scope for greater inconsistency.

Also overall around 7 people have carried out audits on different types of space which means comparison between types of space is very difficult.

Taking these points into consideration the main issues arising from the assessments are;

- A range of average scores were revealed for the different types of space;
  - Formal – 52
  - Natural – 57
  - Allotments – 47
- Landscape quality scored the highest of the criteria for both formal and natural spaces whereas security and safety scored highest for allotments
- Education was the lowest scoring criteria for formal and natural spaces yet for allotments it was natural heritage
- Access and circulation had the largest range of scores for formal and allotments whereas natural heritage had the largest range for natural spaces
- Bath & North East Somerset and 'other' manage formal sites to the highest average quality
- 'Other' manage natural sites to the highest average quality
- Bath & North East Somerset manage allotment sites to the highest average quality

- □ District sites have the highest average quality for formal sites with doorstep having the lowest
- □ District sites have the highest average quality for natural sites with neighbourhood having the lowest

## **Appendices**

**Appendix A**  
**Formal Audit Form**

# Formal Green Spaces Site Assessment Form

Site name/ address \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Site owner \_\_\_\_\_

	V. Good	Good	Average	Poor	V. Poor	Scores
	5	4	3	2	1	

## 1. Access and Circulation

Are entrances well located and accessible in relation to surrounding routes?

Are main entrances/ approaches visible and welcoming?

General accessibility to site for people with mobility difficulties?

Is it possible for visitors to park on site or adjacent to it?

## 2. Landscape Quality

Is the space a rich and stimulating environment?

Are the space's boundaries attractive providing a sense of enclosure and definition?

What is the visual impact of the site from surrounding areas?

## 3. Facilities

Is site furniture well designed and located (seats + bins)?

Is the amount of furniture appropriate to the space's size and location?

Are there facilities or features that give the space local distinctiveness (see below)?

Circle all present: Under 7's play; 7 - 13 play; over 13's play; toilets; café; seats; bins; dog litter bin; car parking; historical feature; sculpture; monument; cycle path/ parking; quiet area; CCTV; info boards; water feature; drinking water; lighting; sports facilities; other (specify)

## 4. Maintenance

Is the space clean and free from litter, dog fouling and graffiti?

Are the fabric and furniture of the site well maintained?

Are trees well maintained and if appropriate, new planting taking place?

Is permanent planting well maintained and if appropriate, new planting taking place?

Are flower beds well maintained?

Are grass areas well maintained?

Are areas managed for wildlife habitat value appropriately maintained?



**5. Management**

Is the level of management appropriate to the size and nature of the space?							
Does signage exist (site name, name + tel. no. of site operator)?							
Is there information on events and activities?							
Is there evidence or knowledge of community involvement?							

**6. Security and Safety**

To what extent is there self-surveillance from surrounding areas or pedestrians?							
What is the sense of personal safety in the space?							
Is there an absence of vandalism?							
Is there an absence of anti-social behaviour?							

**7. Natural Heritage**

To what extent are areas managed as natural habitats?							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**8. Cultural Heritage**

Is there evidence or knowledge of cultural activities taking place on site?							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**9. Education**

Is there interpretation of any elements in the space?							
Is there evidence or knowledge of educational activities taking place on site?							

**10. Health**

Are there appropriate opportunities for active leisure?							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**11. Responses to People**

Does the space meet the needs of/ encourage use by:							
The elderly							
Young people							
Children							
People with disabilities							
Diverse cultures							
Families							

Site Value						
Site context						
Level and type of use						
Wider benefits (see below)						
Circle the relevant benefits; structural and landscape benefits; ecological benefits; educational benefits; social inclusion and health benefits; cultural and heritage benefits; amenity benefits and a 'sense of place'; economic benefits.						
	V. Good	Good	Average	Poor	V. Poor	Scores
	5	4	3	2	1	

Comments

Improvements Required

Quick Wins

**Appendix B**  
**Natural Audit Form**

# Natural Green Space Site Assessment Form

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Site name/ address

Site owner

	V. Good	Good	Average	Poor	V. Poor	Scores
	5	4	3	2	1	

## 1. Access and Circulation

Are entrances well located and accessible in relation to surrounding routes?						
Are main entrances/ approaches visible and welcoming?						
General accessibility to site for people with mobility difficulties?						
Is it possible for visitors to park on site or adjacent to it?						

## 2. Landscape Quality

Is the space a rich and stimulating environment?						
Are the space's boundaries attractive providing a sense of enclosure and definition?						
What is the visual impact of the site from surrounding areas?						

## 3. Facilities

Is site furniture well designed and located (seats + bins)?						
Is the amount of furniture appropriate to the space's size and location?						
Are there facilities or features that give the space local distinctiveness (see below)?						
Circle all present: Under 7's play equip; 7 - 13 play equip; over 13's play equip; toilets; café; seats; bins; dog bin; parking; historical feature; sculpture; monument; cycle path/ parking; quiet area; CCTV; info boards; water feature; drinking water; lighting; sports facilities; other (specify)						

## 4. Maintenance

Is the space clean and free from litter, dog fouling and graffiti?						
Are the fabric and furniture of the site well maintained?						
Are trees appropriately maintained and if appropriate, new planting taking place?						
Is scrub planting appropriately maintained and if approp. new planting taking place?						
Are wild flower areas appropriately maintained?						
Are general grass areas appropriately maintained?						

**5. Management**

Does a wild life focussed site management plan exist?							
If a management plan exists, is it regularly monitored and management adjusted?							
Is the level of management appropriate to the size and nature of the space?							
Does signage exist (site name, name + tel. no. of site operator)?							
Is there information on events and activities?							
Is there evidence or knowledge of community involvement?							

**6. Security and Safety**

To what extent is there self-surveillance from surrounding areas or pedestrians?							
What is the sense of personal safety in the space?							
Is there an absence of vandalism?							
Is there an absence of anti-social behaviour?							

**7. Natural Heritage**

What is the quality of woodland present?							
What is the quality of species rich grassland present?							
What is the quality of species rich arable grassland present?							
What is the quality of ancient or species rich hedgerows present?							
What is the quality of any wildlife pond present?							
What is the quality of any stream or river edge present?							
What is the quality of any lake (not primarily for fishing) present?							

**8. Cultural Heritage**

Is there evidence or knowledge of cultural activities taking place on site?							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**9. Education**

Is there interpretation of any elements in the space?							
Is there evidence or knowledge of educational activities taking place on site?							

**10. Health**

Are there appropriate opportunities for active leisure?							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**11. Responses to People**

Does the space meet the needs of/ encourage use by:

The elderly						
Young people						
Children						
People with disabilities						
Diverse cultures						
Families						

**Site Value**

Site context						
Level and type of use						
Wider benefits (see below)						

Circle the relevant benefits; structural and landscape benefits; ecological benefits;

educational benefits; social inclusion and health benefits; cultural and heritage

benefits; amenity benefits and a 'sense of place'; economic benefits.

	V. Good	Good	Average	Poor	V. Poor	Scores
	5	4	3	2	1	

Please note whether the site contains any of the following BAP short list species:

Bats	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bath	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asparagus	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bee Fly	<input type="checkbox"/>
Blue Carpenter Bee	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chalk Hill Blue	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dormice	<input type="checkbox"/>
Greater Crested Newt	<input type="checkbox"/>
Red Hemp Nettle	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sky Lark	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vole	<input type="checkbox"/>
White Clawed Crayfish	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Appendix C**  
**Allotment Audit Form**







**11. Responses to People**

Does the space meet the needs of/ encourage use by:

The elderly

Young people

Children

People with mobility difficulties

Diverse cultures

Families


**Site Value**

Site context

Level and type of use

Wider benefits (see below)


Circle the relevant benefits; structural and landscape benefits; ecological benefits;

educational benefits; social inclusion and health benefits; cultural and heritage

benefits; amenity benefits and a 'sense of place'; economic benefits.

Comments

Improvements Required

Quick wins