

**Setting Quality Standards / Vision – Bromsgrove District Council**

<b>Field</b>	<b>Comment</b>
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations eg Green Flag criteria for parks produced by Civic Trust.
Existing Local Quality Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards.
Benchmarking against other authorities for satisfaction of quality	These are figures detailing satisfaction levels of other authorities to the quality of their open space.
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations)	Results from the household survey with regards to users of each typology in relation to their aspirations and needs and existing quality experiences.
Consultation (other)	Results from all the consultations undertaken with regards the quality issues for each typology.
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local quality standard for discussion and approval by the client .

**Setting the Local Quality Standards – Explanation and Justification of the recommended approach**

For each typology, the recommended quality standards have been derived directly from local consultations, where residents were asked to consider their opinions on the quality of sites in their local area and also to highlight the key features of a good quality site for each typology.

For each typology, these key features have been divided into those that are essential, and those that are desirable. National standards for provision and good practice examples for the rest of the country have also been taken into account as part of these recommendations.

These lists therefore set out the quality vision (as required by PPG17) which should be applied to all new sites and should inform the enhancement of existing sites.

For each typology, two lists are therefore provided. An example is set out below:

<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
Clean and litter free	Toilets
Provision of seats	A range of equipment
Provision of bins	An information board
Even footpaths	

In order to relate the recommended quality vision to the site assessments carried out by PMP, those priorities derived from consultation have been used to inform the percentage scores achieved during site assessments. For each type of open space, those elements that have emerged as being of particular priority to local residents during consultation are given a greater weighting in the site assessments. This weighting ensures that those areas considered to be of higher relative importance have a greater influence on the overall score achieved.

The key aspirations of local residents with regards the quality of open spaces have therefore been categorised into the four overarching categories considered within the site assessments, specifically:

- cleanliness and maintenance
- vegetation
- ancillary accommodation
- security and safety.

These classifications are set out below:

<b>Cleanliness and maintenance</b>	<b>Vegetation</b>	<b>Ancillary accommodation</b>	<b>Security and safety</b>
Well kept grass	Flowers/Trees	Changing facilities	Welcoming staff
Clean and litter free	Level surface	Parking facilities	Good access
Play equipment	Nature features	Footpaths	On site security
Well laid out		Toilets	
Range of facilities		Seating	

## APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

Equipment maintenance		Dog bins	
		Litter bins	
		Information boards	

For each typology, the number of responses received indicating that each of the above features is considered in addition to other comments made during consultations and national standards have been used to determine the relative importance of each of the four key areas.

Given that for each typology, respondents were able to select as many key features as they felt appropriate, the proportion of respondents prioritising each area is determined by calculating the total number of responses that could have been received and measuring this against the number of responses that were received.

The following example sets out the calculations using the above methodology, on the assumption that there were 100 respondents to the survey (who could all have ticked every box if they felt this was appropriate).

Site assessment classification	Number of features contributing to this area	Total Number of Possible Responses
Cleanliness and maintenance	6	600
Vegetation	3	300
Ancillary accommodation	8	800
Security and safety	3	300

The response rate for each of the four key areas is therefore derived by calculating the questions ticked as a percentage of the total number of responses that could have been received. A fictitious example, building on the previous example, is set out below:

Site assessment classification	Number of features contributing to this area	Total Number of Possible Responses	Responses Received	Percentage
Cleanliness and maintenance	6	600	400	66%
Vegetation	3	300	25	8%
Ancillary accommodation	8	800	400	50%
Security and safety	3	300	280	93%

The percentage response rates above (informed by other consultations) can then be used to determine the relative importance of each component of quality. Using the example above, it can be seen that for this typology, security and safety are most important, cleanliness and maintenance is second and ancillary accommodation and vegetation are less important.

This relative importance will be reflected in the overall score of the site assessment through a weighting system whereby:

The score for the most valued element will be multiplied by 4

The score for the second most valued aspect will be multiplied by three

The score for the third most valued aspect will be multiplied by two

## **APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS**

The score for the fourth element will be multiplied by one.

For each typology, all sites can therefore be measured against each other in order to determine which sites best meet public need. For example, if cleanliness and maintenance is rated as the most important factor for an amenity green space (and therefore weighted the highest), a site which scores poorly on this factor will not gain a high quality score.

This approach means that in line with PPG17, both the quality vision and the site assessment scores are directly correlated with the findings of the local consultation. The justification behind all of these standards is that they are directly reflective of local needs and the degree to which sites achieve the required standard can be measured using the findings of the site assessments.

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PARKS AND GARDENS</b>			
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Sanders Park Management and Development Plan</b></p> <p>The vision of the strategy is, “to provide a park of the highest quality for the enjoyment of the community of Bromsgrove town and District to visitors in the area.”</p> <p>The aims of the strategy are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure that Sanders Park is welcoming and accessible to all possible users</li> <li>• ensure the safety of all staff and users of the park</li> <li>• maintain the highest standards of maintenance</li> <li>• maintain the quality of management</li> <li>• provide a responsive, flexible and high quality management service.</li> </ul>		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 36% good	Wyre Forest – 57% good (Town), 55% good (Local)	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 86% good
	Ryedale – 58% good	Wychavon - 67% good	York – 62% good (parks)
<b>Consultation household survey – aspirations  (Of those that rated parks and gardens as their most frequently used open space – 41%)</b>	<p>The household survey reveals that the highest rated aspirations with regards to parks and gardens are: Well kept grass (84%), flowers and trees (81%) and parking facilities (79%).</p> <p>Significant problems experienced by users of parks and gardens were miss use of site (22%), litter problems (21%) and dog fouling (20%).</p>		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>The majority of respondents to the household survey feel the quality of parks and gardens is good (38%) and 13% very good. 35% of residents feel the quality of parks and gardens in average. This indicates the quality of parks is generally regarded to be good.</p> <p>Within the individual analysis areas differing results are portrayed, with residents in three of the five analysis areas indicating the quality of parks and gardens is average. The lowest level of satisfaction with the current provision of parks and gardens is located in Bromsgrove West, where 57% of residents state the quality of parks and gardens is average.</p> <p>General comments from respondents to the household survey highlighted the need for improved ancillary facilities and vegetation at parks and gardens. The need for more flowers and trees and seating was regularly emphasised by residents. Wythall Park was identified as a high quality site in Bromsgrove.</p>		

**APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS**

<p><b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b></p>	<p>Drop in session attendees indicated a requirement for improved maintenance at parks and gardens. Residents stated that parks are sometimes not well kept and could be improved. Sanders Park was identified as a well used high quality park in Bromsgrove that was of strategic importance to the district.</p> <p>The quality of parks and gardens was generally perceived to be good by respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire. Specifically, Lickey Hills Country Park was highlighted as being excellent quality and Millenium Park in Barnt Green was identified as currently undergoing refurbishment, which will result in a high quality site.</p> <p>46% of respondents to the young people’s IT survey stated that the quality of parks is average and could do with some improvements. 34% of young people indicated that parks are clean, tidy and well maintained.</p> <p>27% of respondents to the young people’s IT survey who stated that parks and gardens are their favourite open space identified litter and untidiness and boring facilities two things they did not like about parks and gardens.</p> <p>29% of respondents to the children’s IT survey who identified parks and gardens as their favourite open space identified boring play facilities at parks as one of the reasons they did not like this type of open space.</p>																							
<p><b>PMP Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 762 2042 895"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Essential</b></th> <th><b>Desirable</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Well kept grass</td> <td>Clean and litter free</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flowers and trees</td> <td>Good access</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parking facilities</td> <td>Litter bins</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to parks and gardens, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 1018 2042 1209"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Component of quality</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b></th> <th><b>Weighting</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td><b>35%</b></td> <td><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td><b>58%</b></td> <td><b>4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td><b>53%</b></td> <td><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td><b>54%</b></td> <td><b>3</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>	Well kept grass	Clean and litter free	Flowers and trees	Good access	Parking facilities	Litter bins	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	Security and Safety	<b>35%</b>	<b>1</b>	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>58%</b>	<b>4</b>	Vegetation	<b>53%</b>	<b>2</b>	Ancillary accommodation	<b>54%</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>																							
Well kept grass	Clean and litter free																							
Flowers and trees	Good access																							
Parking facilities	Litter bins																							
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>																						
Security and Safety	<b>35%</b>	<b>1</b>																						
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>58%</b>	<b>4</b>																						
Vegetation	<b>53%</b>	<b>2</b>																						
Ancillary accommodation	<b>54%</b>	<b>3</b>																						

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL</b>			
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	<p>Countryside Agency (now part of the Natural England Partnership) - land should be managed to conserve or enhance its rich landscape, biodiversity, heritage and local customs. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Natural England highlights the need to conserve and protect the natural environment and promotes local community involvement and consultation. They also have a commitment to work with local authorities in developing Local Area Agreements (LAA) for improved community infrastructure to enhance access to high quality natural environments.</p>		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 38% good	Wyre Forest – 66% good	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 60% good
	Wychavon – 51% good	York – 44% average	
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Local Plan</b></p> <p>Policy S35A states that the council will seek to preserve and enhance the appearance of conservation areas, further identifying that they will seek to retain and enhance open spaces, important views, trees and other features of importance.</p> <p>Policy S36 indicates that development proposals in or adjacent to areas of conservation will have to show they have taken into account and are compatible with the character of the area.</p> <p>Policy S45 states that the council will seek to secure improvements to the environmental quality of conservation areas.</p> <p>Policy C10A further states that the council will seek to minimise the affects of development proposals on features of nature conservation.</p> <p><b>Worcestershire Countryside Access and Recreation Strategy</b></p> <p>An objective of the strategy is to make use of recreational opportunities whilst protecting and enhancing the environmental qualities of the countryside.</p>		
<b>Consultation (household survey - aspirations)</b>  <b>(Of those that rated natural and semi-natural sites as their most frequently used open space – 21%)</b>	<p>The highest rated aspirations of residents that use natural and semi natural open space were: Nature features (85%), clean and litter free (68%) and footpaths (62%).</p> <p>The most significant problem experienced by current users was dog fouling (18%). Maintenance at natural and semi natural open space sites was not considered to be a problem.</p>		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>38% of respondents to the household survey state the quality of natural and semi natural open space is good. However, 33% of residents indicate the quality of this type of open space is average.</p> <p>Findings in four of the five analysis areas are consistent with the overall results, however the majority of residents in</p>		

**APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS**

	<p>Bromsgrove North East, indicated the quality of natural and semi natural open space is average (49%). The greatest level of satisfaction was portrayed in Bromsgrove West, where 53% of residents highlighted the quality of natural and semi natural open space as good.</p>																							
<p><b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b></p>	<p>The quality of natural and semi natural open space was highlighted as good by respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire. In particular the quality of this type of open space in the Parish of Alvechurch was regarded as excellent. However, the quality of natural and semi natural open space within the Catshill and North Marlbrook parish was perceived to be very poor.</p> <p>38% of respondents to the children’s IT survey, who identified natural and semi natural open space as their favourite open space, stated one of the reasons they do not like this type of open space is that they are untidy and contain litter. This was the second most popular response.</p>																							
<p><b>PMP Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 576 2042 708"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Essential</b></th> <th><b>Desirable</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nature features</td> <td>Good access</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clean and litter free</td> <td>Flowers and trees</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Footpaths</td> <td>Dog bins</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to natural and semi natural areas, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 831 2042 1027"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Component of quality</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b></th> <th><b>Weighting</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td><b>20%</b></td> <td><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td><b>31%</b></td> <td><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td><b>48%</b></td> <td><b>4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td><b>37%</b></td> <td><b>3</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Analysis suggests the increasing the provision of natural and semi natural open space is considered to be more important than enhancing its quality.</i></p>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>	Nature features	Good access	Clean and litter free	Flowers and trees	Footpaths	Dog bins	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	Security and Safety	<b>20%</b>	<b>1</b>	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>31%</b>	<b>2</b>	Vegetation	<b>48%</b>	<b>4</b>	Ancillary accommodation	<b>37%</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>																							
Nature features	Good access																							
Clean and litter free	Flowers and trees																							
Footpaths	Dog bins																							
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>																						
Security and Safety	<b>20%</b>	<b>1</b>																						
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>31%</b>	<b>2</b>																						
Vegetation	<b>48%</b>	<b>4</b>																						
Ancillary accommodation	<b>37%</b>	<b>3</b>																						



<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION AMENITY GREEN SPACE</b>			
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 48% average	Wyre Forest – 51% average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 56% average
	Ryedale – 49% average	Wychavon – 57% average	York – 50% average
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	No local quality standards.		
<b>Consultation household survey – aspirations  (Of those that rated amenity green space sites as their most frequently used open space - 1%)</b>	<p>Highest rated aspirations: Good access, flowers and trees and clean and litter free.</p> <p>Current users of amenity green space considered vandalism and graffiti as the only major problem experienced when using this type of open space. Litter and dog fouling were not perceived to be a problem.</p>		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	Respondents to the household survey regard the quality of amenity green space to be average (51%). Findings within the individual analysis areas mirror the overall response. The greatest level of satisfaction is located in Bromsgrove West, where 65% of residents state the quality of amenity green space is average and 23% indicate the quality is good.		
<b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b>	<p>A difference in the quality of amenity green space in various parishes across the district was evident, with a split in opinion regarding the quality of amenity green space established by respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire. The quality of this type of open space in the parishes of Tutnall and Cobley and Alvechurch was identified as poor and in need of improvement. However, in the parishes of Lickey and Blackwell and Cofton Hacckett, the quality of amenity green space was identified as good.</p> <p>Drop in session attendees highlighted the value of amenity green space to the local community stating that they provide a number of social interaction and community benefits. However, residents did raise safety concerns regarding gangs of young people congregating at these sites.</p> <p>40% of respondents to the children’s IT survey identified that amenity green space is clean, safe and nice to use. Similarly, 33% of respondents to the young people’s IT survey stated that amenity green space is clean, tidy and well maintained.</p>		

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b>	
	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
	Good access	Footpaths
	Flowers and trees	Level surface
	Clean and litter free	
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to amenity green spaces, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>	
	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
	Security and Safety	<b>3</b>
	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>4</b>
	Vegetation	<b>2</b>
	Ancillary accommodation	<b>1</b>
	<i>Analysis suggests the improvement in quantity of amenity green space is considered to be more important than enhancing its quality.</i>	

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN</b>			
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	<p>Criteria set out by the NPFA in relation to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, a varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA are also relevant to play areas and include Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management</p> <p>CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti-social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment, and highlights that there is a better solution: invest in place making and improving public spaces to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space’s study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings. <i>CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces</i></p>		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 35% average	Wyre Forest - 44% average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 43% average
	Ryedale – 47% average	Wychavon – 44% average	York – 46% average
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Worcestershire Play Strategy 2007 – 2010</b></p> <p>The values underpinning the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to provide facilities and services that meet all children’s needs, encouraging social inclusion and embracing people with disabilities</li> <li>• to extend the choice and control that children have over play opportunities. To recognise a child’s need to push boundaries, to be independent and have self esteem</li> <li>• to use play positively to foster respect for and amongst children and young people</li> <li>• to strive to achieve the best <u>quality</u> possible for the greatest number of people.</li> </ul>		
<b>Consultation household survey - aspirations</b>  <b>(Of those that rated play areas for children sites as their most frequently used open space – 9%)</b>	<p>The aspirations of those residents who stated they use children’s play areas most frequently are: litter bins (62%), dog bins (62%), well kept grass (62%) and good access (59%).</p> <p>Major problems experienced by regular users of children’s play areas were miss use of site (34%) and vandalism and graffiti (31%). Maintenance and safety and age of equipment were not considered to be a problem.</p>		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>The majority of respondents to the household survey regard the quality of children’s play areas to be average (36%). 28% of residents state the quality of play areas to be good and 22% poor. This highlights a mixed perception regarding the quality of children’s play areas in Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas are consistent with the overall findings, however, the majority of residents in Bromsgrove West feel the quality of play areas is good (48%). This suggests there may be higher quality play areas</p>		

**APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS**

	<p>located in this area of the district.</p> <p>General comments from respondents to the household survey focused on the quantity of children’s play areas, however a lack of range of facilities was an issue raised by residents. It was stated that apart from Wythall Park and Sanders Park, there is a limited range of equipment available at children’s play areas.</p>																							
<p><b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b></p>	<p>Respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire highlighted the quality of children’s play areas as average and in need of some improvements. The quality of children’s play areas in the Parish of Tutnall and Cobley was perceived to be very poor. The respondent for the Parish of Barnt Green highlighted that play areas in this area of the District were currently being updated. The need to improve the variation in the type of facilities provided was recognised.</p> <p>41% of respondents to the children’s IT survey stated that play areas are clean, safe and nice to use. However, 38% of children indicated that children’s play areas are sometimes unclean with litter and could be made better with improved equipment. This highlights a variation in opinion regarding the quality of facilities for children in the district.</p>																							
<p><b>PMP Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 596 2047 724"> <thead> <tr> <th>Essential</th> <th>Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Litter bins</td> <td>Good access</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dog bins</td> <td>Play equipment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Well kept grass</td> <td>Clean and litter free</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to play areas for children, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 820 2047 1011"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component of quality</th> <th>Proportion of possible total responses received</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>21%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>41%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>21%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>35%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Analysis suggests that enhancing the quality of children’s play areas is considered to be as important as increasing the quantity.</b></p>	Essential	Desirable	Litter bins	Good access	Dog bins	Play equipment	Well kept grass	Clean and litter free	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	21%	2	Cleanliness and maintenance	41%	4	Vegetation	21%	1	Ancillary accommodation	35%	3
Essential	Desirable																							
Litter bins	Good access																							
Dog bins	Play equipment																							
Well kept grass	Clean and litter free																							
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting																						
Security and Safety	21%	2																						
Cleanliness and maintenance	41%	4																						
Vegetation	21%	1																						
Ancillary accommodation	35%	3																						

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PROVISION FOR TEENAGERS AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b>			
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	<p>NPFA guidance relating to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment. Investment: invest in place making and improving public spaces should be used to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space’s study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings. <i>CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces.</i></p>		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 39% poor	Wyre Forest – 66% poor	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 62% poor
	Ryedale – 57% poor	Wychavon – 65% poor	York – 64% poor
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Worcestershire Play Strategy 2007 – 2010</b></p> <p>The values underpinning the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to provide facilities and services that meet all children’s needs, encouraging social inclusion and embracing people with disabilities</li> <li>• to extend the choice and control that children have over play opportunities. To recognise a child’s need to push boundaries, to be independent and have self esteem</li> <li>• to use play positively to foster respect for and amongst children and young people</li> <li>• to strive to achieve the best <u>quality</u> possible for the greatest number of people.</li> </ul>		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>Respondents to the household survey regard the quality of young people’s provision to be poor (44%). Findings across the individual analysis areas support this perception, with the majority of residents (four of the five analysis areas) stating the quality of young people’s provision is poor.</p> <p>As with children’s play area, residents in Bromsgrove West have the greatest level of satisfaction with young people’s provision, with residents identifying the quality of this type of open space as average (37%). This suggests residents in this area of the district have access to higher quality provision for the younger age groups in Bromsgrove.</p>		
<b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b>	<p>The quality of young people’s provision was identified as poor by respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire. However, within the parish of Cofton Hackett, young people’s facilities were perceived to be of good quality.</p> <p>The quality of young people’s provision was perceived to be average by respondents to the young people’s IT survey</p>		

**APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS**

	<p>(38%). However, 23% of young people indicated that the quality of facilities was good. This highlights a variation in opinion regarding the quality of facilities for young people in the district.</p> <p>50% of young people that identified young people’s facilities as their favourite open space stated that the reason they do not like this type of open space is that it is unsafe. 17% of young people did not like young people’s facilities because they were untidy and contained litter.</p>									
<p><b>PMP Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p>									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 427 1348 456"><b>Essential</b></th> <th data-bbox="1348 427 2047 456"><b>Desirable</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 456 1348 488">Range of facilities</td> <td data-bbox="1348 456 2047 488">Footpaths</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 488 1348 520">Clean and litter free</td> <td data-bbox="1348 488 2047 520">Toilets</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 520 1348 552">Well laid out</td> <td data-bbox="1348 520 2047 552"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>	Range of facilities	Footpaths	Clean and litter free	Toilets	Well laid out		
	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>								
	Range of facilities	Footpaths								
Clean and litter free	Toilets									
Well laid out										
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to facilities for young people, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 683 1115 711"><b>Component of quality</b></th> <th data-bbox="1115 683 1579 711"><b>Weighting</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 711 1115 743">Security and Safety</td> <td data-bbox="1115 711 1579 743"><b>4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 743 1115 775">Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td data-bbox="1115 743 1579 775"><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 775 1115 807">Vegetation</td> <td data-bbox="1115 775 1579 807"><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 807 1115 839">Ancillary accommodation</td> <td data-bbox="1115 807 1579 839"><b>2</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	Security and Safety	<b>4</b>	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>3</b>	Vegetation	<b>1</b>	Ancillary accommodation	<b>2</b>
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Weighting</b>									
Security and Safety	<b>4</b>									
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>3</b>									
Vegetation	<b>1</b>									
Ancillary accommodation	<b>2</b>									
<p><i>Analysis highlights the need for more innovative and imaginative provision for young people.</i></p>										

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES</b>			
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 39% average	Wyre Forest - 46% average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 45% good
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	<p>Ryedale – 41% average</p> <p>Wychavon – 52% average</p> <p>York – 50% average</p> <p><b>Worcestershire Playing Pitch Strategy 2002</b></p> <p>Only 44% of pitches within Bromsgrove have changing facilities and no sites have female changing facilities. The strategy recommended the development of changing facilities at the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aston Fields Recreation Ground</li> <li>• Boleyn Road, Frankley</li> <li>• Braces Lane Recreation Ground</li> <li>• Brook Road, Rubery</li> <li>• King George V Recreation Ground</li> <li>• Market Street Recreation Ground</li> <li>• New Inns Lane, Rubery</li> <li>• Sanders Park.</li> </ul>		
<b>Consultation household survey - aspirations  (Of those that rated outdoor sports facility sites as their most frequently used open space – 8%)</b>	<p>The highest rated aspirations of those residents that use outdoor sports facilities more frequently than any other type of open space were: clean and litter free (67%), parking facilities (67%), well kept grass (63%) and toilets (63%).</p> <p>Miss use of site (25%) and dog fouling (25%) were considered to be significant problems by regular users of outdoor sports facilities. Litter was not perceived to be problematic.</p>		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>40% of respondents to the household survey regard the quality of outdoor sports facilities to be average. 30% of residents also stated the quality of this type of open space was poor. This suggests that satisfaction with outdoor sports facilities is lower than other types of open space in Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Results within three of the five analysis areas are consistent with the overall findings, stating that the quality of provision is average. However, the majority of residents in Bromsgrove East feel the quality of outdoor sports facilities is poor (36%) and residents in Bromsgrove East state the quality of outdoor sports facilities is good (30%). This suggests there is varying levels in the quality of outdoor sports facilities in different areas of the district.</p> <p>General comments from respondents to the household survey highlighted the need to enhance the quality of outdoor sports. Residents felt a number of facilities had become run down and were in need of investment.</p>		

<p><b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b></p>	<p>Attendees at the sports clubs discussion session identified the poor quality of grass pitches as a key issue. Football pitches were generally perceived to be of poor quality and suffering from a number of issues, such as sloping and drainage. Specifically, a lack of maintenance was perceived to be the cause of this. Charford Recreation Ground was recognised as one of the best council owned pitches, but suffered from poor parking facilities.</p> <p>Respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire also highlighted the quality of outdoor sports facilities as poor. Within the parishes of Tutnall and Cobley and Lickey and Blackwell the quality of outdoor sports facilities was perceived to be very poor. The tennis courts within the parish of Barnt Green were identified as in need of resurfacing.</p> <p>A split in opinion regarding the quality of outdoor sports facilities was highlighted by respondents to the children’s IT survey, with 36% of children indicating facilities are clean, safe and nice to use and 36% of children stating facilities are sometimes unclean with litter and could be made better.</p> <p>37% of respondents to the young people’s IT survey identified the quality of outdoor sports facilities as average and in need of some improvements.</p>																							
<p><b>PMP Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 671 2042 804"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Essential</b></th> <th><b>Desirable</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Clean and litter free</td> <td>Toilets</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parking facilities</td> <td>Changing facilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Well kept grass</td> <td>Good access</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to outdoor sports facilities, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 924 2042 1118"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Component of quality</b></th> <th><b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b></th> <th><b>Weighting</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td><b>41%</b></td> <td><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td><b>48%</b></td> <td><b>4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td><b>32%</b></td> <td><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td><b>36%</b></td> <td><b>2</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Analysis suggests that enhancing the quality of outdoor sports facilities is considered to be more important than increasing the quantity.</p>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>	Clean and litter free	Toilets	Parking facilities	Changing facilities	Well kept grass	Good access	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	Security and Safety	<b>41%</b>	<b>3</b>	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>48%</b>	<b>4</b>	Vegetation	<b>32%</b>	<b>1</b>	Ancillary accommodation	<b>36%</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>																							
Clean and litter free	Toilets																							
Parking facilities	Changing facilities																							
Well kept grass	Good access																							
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>																						
Security and Safety	<b>41%</b>	<b>3</b>																						
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>48%</b>	<b>4</b>																						
Vegetation	<b>32%</b>	<b>1</b>																						
Ancillary accommodation	<b>36%</b>	<b>2</b>																						



**APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS**

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION ALLOTMENTS</b>			
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	Telford – 42% average	Wyre Forest – 53% average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 48% average
	Wychavon – 54% average	York – 55% average	
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	No existing local quality standards.		
<b>Consultation household survey – aspirations</b>  (Of those that rated allotment sites as their most frequently used open space – 1%)	Due to the low level of response it is unreasonable to identify the current aspirations of allotment user's. However, attendees at the allotment's discussion session identified a number of issues relating to the quality of allotments, these are discussed in greater detail in the section below.		
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>Respondents to the household survey feel the quality of allotments in Bromsgrove is average (40%). A further 22% feel the quality of allotments is good and 20% state the quality is poor. This suggests that although the majority of residents feel the quality of allotments is average, there may be sites of varying quality in the district.</p> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas mirror the district wide response, with the majority of residents stating the quality of allotments is average. The greatest level of satisfaction is found in Bromsgrove West, where 28% of residents feel the quality of allotments is good.</p>		
<b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b>	<p>Allotment users discussed maintenance issues at allotment sites across the district. The maintenance of allotments was highlighted as being poor and required a more pro active rather than re active approach. Specifically, poor quality paths and rubbish were identified as key issues. Users of allotments stated that a lack of investment had been the cause of current quality issues and that if regular maintenance was provided, a number of issues would be resolved. Security issues were also identified as a key issue, with all representatives highlighting the security of sites as poor.</p> <p>Parish Council respondents stated the quality of allotments in Bromsgrove was poor. Specifically, within the parish of Cofton Hackett allotments were highlighted as being overgrown.</p>		

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p>	
	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
	Good access	Parking facilities
	Footpaths	Toilets
	Clean and litter free	Seating
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to allotments, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	
Security and Safety	<b><i>4 - Based on current user consultation</i></b>	
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b><i>3 - Based on current user consultation</i></b>	
Vegetation	<b><i>1 - Based on current user consultation</i></b>	
Ancillary accommodation	<b><i>2 - Based on current user consultation</i></b>	
<p><b><i>Analysis suggests that enhancing the quality of allotments is considered to be more important than increasing the quantity.</i></b></p>		

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION GREEN CORRIDORS</b>	
<b>National standards and/or benchmarks</b>	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Natural England, the Countryside Agency and the British Heart Foundation advocate providing a network of local health walks to promote the 'Walking the Way to Health Initiative', something that can easily be enhanced through the provision of quality green corridors and natural linkages with other open spaces.</p>
<b>Existing local quality standards and strategic context</b>	No existing local quality standards.
<b>Consultation household survey – aspirations  (Of those that rated green corridors as their most frequently used open space – 5%)</b>	<p>The aspirations of those residents that use green corridors more frequently than any other type of open space are: footpaths (86%), clean and litter free (71%) and nature features (64%).</p> <p>Dog fouling was a significant problem experienced by users of green corridors. Miss use of sites was not considered to be problematic.</p>
<b>Consultation household survey - other</b>	<p>41% of respondents to the household survey felt the quality of green corridors was average. 31% of residents perceived the quality of this type of open space to be good.</p> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas provide differing results, with the majority of residents in three of the five analysis areas stating the quality of green corridors is good. However, residents in Bromsgrove North East felt the quality of green corridors average (56%). This highlights the varying quality of green corridors in the district.</p>
<b>Consultation (Other including IT young people survey)</b>	

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b>	
	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
	Footpaths	Flowers and trees
	Clean and litter free	Level surface
	Nature features	Dog bins
<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to green corridors, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>		
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Security and Safety	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>21%</b>	<b>2</b>
Vegetation	<b>52%</b>	<b>4</b>
Ancillary accommodation	<b>23%</b>	<b>3</b>

<b>BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES</b>	
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	None.
<b>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Sport England CPA Choice and Opportunity Score</b></p> <p>52.6% of the population within Bromsgrove are within 20 minutes travel time of a range of three different sports facility types of which one has achieved a quality assured standard.</p>
<b>Consultation Household Survey – aspirations  (Of those that rated indoor sports facilities as their most frequently used open space – 12%)</b>	<p>The demand led nature of indoor sports facilities is highlighted by the fact that although 33% of respondents to the household survey stated they do not use this type of facility, 12% of residents indicated that they use indoor sports facilities more frequently than any other open space in Bromsgrove.</p> <p>The highest rated aspirations for users of indoor sports facilities are: Range of facilities (61%), parking facilities (58%), toilets (58%) and welcoming staff (58%).</p> <p>The only significant problem experienced by users of indoor sports facilities was poor maintenance. Vandalism and graffiti and safety and age of equipment were not acknowledged as a problem.</p>
<b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b>	<p>The quality of indoor sports facilities is perceived to be average by the majority of respondents to the household survey (38%). However, 31% of residents state the quality of indoor sports facilities is poor.</p> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas are consistent with the overall results, with the exception of residents in Bromsgrove Central, who view the quality of indoor sports facilities as poor (44%). This suggests the quality of indoor sports facilities in this area of the District is poorer than in other areas of Bromsgrove.</p> <p>The majority of respondents to the children’s IT survey stated that indoor sports facilities are clean, safe and nice to use (60%).</p> <p>38% of young people indicated that indoor sports facilities are clean, tidy and well maintained. However, 34% of respondents to the young people’s IT survey stated that the quality of facilities is average and in need of some improvements.</p>

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b>	
	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
	Range of facilities	Welcoming staff
	Parking facilities	Equipment maintenance
	Toilets	Good access
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to indoor sports facilities, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>	
	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>
	Security and Safety	<b>40%</b>
	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>37%</b>
	Vegetation	<b>12%</b>
	Ancillary accommodation	<b>31%</b>
	<b>Weighting</b>	
		<b>4</b>
		<b>3</b>
		<b>1</b>
		<b>2</b>