Parks' sports (bowls, cricket and football) facilities consultation report

Contents

Background and introduction 1
Further information on options 2

Consultation findings 4
Key quantitative findings 4
A table to show quantitative survey responses at each site 6

Qualitative analysis of comments 10
Comments received (not including those comments exclusively about bowls) 10
A table to summarise comments received (not including those comments exclusively about bowls) 11
Table highlighting the most frequently occurring category of comments (not including comments exclusively about bowls) 16
Bowls comments analysis 18
A table to summarise the most frequently occurring types of bowls comments received 19
Table highlighting the most frequently occurring category of bowls comment 23

Sport governing body comments and sport specific summaries 24
Bowls 24
Cricket 26
Football 27
Sport specific analysis: other sports 28

Appendix one: Responses to the online survey 29
Note on flow of questions and survey structure 29

Appendix two: Sites in scope 54

Background and introduction

In May 2018, following public consultation on options to make savings from its Parks budgets, the council adopted a proposal to operate "chargeable sports facilities and other facilities in public parks only when they generate no cost to the council". Of 2,625 respondents who expressed a view on this proposal during the consultation in late 2017/early 2018, 52% agreed with the proposal and 22% did not agree.

The council wanted to consult on more detailed options to achieve this. These options were:

Option A: The council would invite expressions of interest from third parties, including sports clubs and sports bodies, to operate and maintain one or more of its facilities going forward.

Option B: The council would continue to manage sports facilities in parks and increase its fees and charges for hiring these facilities to a level that covers all relevant maintenance and repair costs.

Option C: Your alternative ideas to achieve operation of sports facilities in parks at zero cost to the council.

The relevant sites:

- ARDAGH BOWLING GREEN
- ARNALL DRIVE PLAYING FIELDS (FOOTBALL PITCHES ONLY)*
- ASHTON VALE PLAYING FIELDS (FOOTBALL PITCHES ONLY)
- AVONVALE / NETHAM BOWLS FACILITY
- BEGBROOK GREEN PARK BOWLS FACILITY
- BEGBROOK GREEN PARK FOOTBALL
- CANFORD PARK BOWLS FACILITY
- CANFORD PARK FOOTBALL
- DORIAN ROAD (FOOTBALL PITCHES ONLY)
- DUNDRIDGE FARM PLAYING FIELDS (FOOTBALL)**
- EASTVILLE PARK BOWLS FACILITY
- EASTVILLE PARK FOOTBALL
- GREVILLE SMYTH PARK FOOTBALL
- KINGS HEAD LANE PARK FOOTBALL
- NETHAM PARK***
- OLDBURY COURT ESTATE
- REDCATCH PARK FOOTBALL
- ST GEORGE PARK BOWLS FACILITY
- WELLINGTON HILL (FOOTBALL PITCH ONLY)

For information on council sports sites not in scope, please see appendix 2 (Sites in scope).

Further information on options

Option A - The council would invite expressions of interest from third parties, including sports clubs and sports bodies, in leasing and operating one, some or all of its facilities going forward. This would be achieved through an Asset Transfer of buildings and full maintenance licence arrangements on pitches.

The council would allocate some one-off capital funds to improve facilities on the basis that further funds are raised from other sources by the new operator. The estimated total contribution by the council at this stage is £500k. The council would divide this sum of money between interested parties depending on their proposals and all the other competing proposals (across all the sites). The council also proposes to provide some administrative support, where appropriate and/or requested, to support potential interested parties in the bidding process and would also help with accessing external grant funds.

The outcome expected is upgraded facilities and pitches in parks that are operated sustainably by those who use them or who are better placed to manage facilities in a way that meets the modern sporting aspirations of users, clubs and leagues.

This option has been developed after discussions with sports governing bodies and after considering similar initiatives that have been carried forward successfully in other parts of the country.

Option B – The council would continue to manage sports facilities in parks. The council would also increase its fees and charges for hiring these facilities to a level that covers all relevant maintenance and repair costs.

A capital contribution of £500k would be used as match funding where there are opportunities to improve facilities. This could be spent on one, some or all sites depending on the grant opportunities available. Our preference would be to invest in facilities where other non-council funding is also available.

Costs to the user for football facilities (in 2017) were averaged at £54.81 per match, which is roughly £2 per person. The cost of providing and maintaining a football pitch and changing room varies at each site. Dividing total expenditure by the number of sites means the council is providing an estimated 75% subsidy for each football match played. To cover the costs there would need to be an increase in charges to four times the current amount.

Costs to a bowls club for bowls facilities (in 2017) were averaged at £5,000 for a season. The council estimates the cost of providing and maintaining a bowls green and pavilion is £18,000 a season. To cover the costs there would need to be an increase in charges to around three and a half times the current amount.

Costs to cricket clubs were averaged at £1,500 (in 2017) for a season. The council estimates the cost of providing and maintaining a cricket wicket, outfield and changing facilities is £11,500 a season. To cover the costs there would need to be an increase in charges to around eight times the current amount.

Option C – You have your own proposal to offer sports in parks at no cost to the council. We ask you to put these forward here.

Consultation findings

Key quantitative findings

- The survey was completed 608 times.

- The following options were chosen:

  Option A = 352
  Option B = 137
  Option C = 84

  35 gave no preferred option / skipped the question

- Question 4 asked: “Which of the sites are you interested in? e.g. that you live near and/or use. Please tick any site(s) that you are interested in.”

  This meant that respondents could select multiple sites for this question.

- At question 4, 220 respondents selected <u>only</u> Greville Smyth Park (i.e. they did not select any other site). When looking at these respondents:

  Option A = 204
  Option B = 12
  Option C = 1

  3 gave no preferred option / skipped the question

- When looking at all 608 respondents but removing those who selected <u>only</u> Greville Smyth Park as a site they were interested in at question 4 (220), we are left with 388 of 608 full responses:

  Option A = 148
  Option B = 125
  Option C = 83

  33 gave no preferred option / skipped the question

- When looking at respondents who selected only football sites at question 4 (i.e. did not select a bowls site) but also <u>not</u> including those who selected <u>only</u> Greville Smyth Park (where Ashton FC play), there are 171 responses:

  Option A = 68
  Option B = 71
  Option C = 30

  2 gave no preferred option / skipped the question

- When looking at those respondents who included a bowls site in their selected sites at question 4 there are 161 full responses:

  Option A = 53
  Option B = 52
  Option C = 48

  8 gave no preferred option / skipped the question

- When looking at those respondents who selected <u>only</u> “General interest in whole proposal (not site specific interest)” at question 4, there are 89 full responses:

  Option A = 41
  Option B = 31
  Option C = 17

  0 gave no preferred option / skipped the question

- Only 6 comments were received specifically about cricket.

A table to show quantitative survey responses at each site

	This question was asked to all respondents: **Question 4. Which of the sites are you interested in? e.g. that you live near and/or use. Please tick any site(s) that you are interested in:**					**This question was asked to respondents who chose "Option A"** **Question 8. Which of the sites are you interested in operating? Please tick the site(s) that you are interested in (please note that sites can potentially be used for other sports/activities than they are currently used for):**		
	Total	Option A	Option B	Option C	No option given	Total	Number who gave contact details	Analysis / comments on question 8 responses
General interest in whole proposal (not site specific interest)	153	**65**	54	32	3	17	3	There are three parties who have shown an interest in several sites.
Ardagh Bowling Green	59	**21**	16	18	4	4	2	The bowling club have made contact. The other contact details are possibly a mistake as they are from someone supporting Ashton FC.
Arnall Drive Playing Fields (football pitches only)	9	3	3	3	0	1	1	The current user of the site has made contact with the council outside of the consultation.

Ashton Vale Playing Fields (football pitches only)	37	**19**	9	7	2	13	8	Five of the people who gave contact details identified as Ashton FC. They may have confused this site with Greville Smyth Park.
Avonvale / Netham Bowls Facility	41	**19**	6	14	3	2	2	The bowls club are in regular communication and wish to discuss possible ways forward.
Begbrook Green Park Bowls Facility	53	**25**	5	18	5	10	5	The bowls club are in regular communication and wish to discuss possible ways forward.
Begbrook Green Park Football	15	3	5	**7**	0	1	1	There is one interested party.
Canford Park Bowls Facility	85	26	24	**30**	6	3	2	The bowls club are in regular communication and wish to discuss possible ways forward.
Canford Park Football	54	14	**28**	12	0	2	2	There are two interested parties.
Dorian Road (football pitches only)	14	4	**6**	4	0	2	2	There are two interested parties.
Dundridge Farm Playing Fields (football)	21	**13**	4	4	0	8	8	The current users have shown an interest and are in regular communication on a possible way forward. No other parties appear interested in the site.

Eastville Park Bowls Facility	63	**22**	21	16	4	3	2	The bowling club have made contact. There is also interest from the wider community in the future of the whole site.
Eastville Park Football	42	9	**23**	10	0	2	1	There is interest from the wider community in the future of the whole site.
Greville Smyth Park Football	265	**219**	30	12	4	198	90+	The current users have shown an interest and are in regular communication on a possible way forward.
Kings Head Lane Park Football	13	3	5	5	0	3	2	The current users have shown an interest and are in regular communication on a possible way forward. There is another club who also have shown an interest in the site.
Netham Park	37	**16**	15	6	0	4	4	Some of the current users and other local partners have been working together on potential ways forward for this site.
Oldbury Court Estate	42	14	**20**	8	0	4	4	One current user has shown an interest in the site for cricket. Further work is required to understand what interest others have who have left contact details.

Redcatch Park Football	21	4	**11**	6	0	2	1	There is interest from parties looking at more than one site. There is also interest from another local sports club.
St George Park Bowls Facility	66	**23**	19	19	5	2	2	The bowling club have made contact.
Wellington Hill (football pitch only)	21	2	**13**	6	0	1	1	There is interest from parties looking at more than one site.

Note: in question 4 respondents were able to select multiple sites that they were interested in. But respondents were only able to select one overall option (if they supported option A, option B or option C) in question 5. Therefore the total number of sites selected in option 4 is greater than the total number of respondents if option A, B and C are added together in question 5. This also means the option columns cannot be totalled from this table as it would be “double counting”.

Qualitative analysis of comments

Comments received (not including those comments exclusively about bowls)

Comments were made by respondents after having chosen one of the options (A, B or C). There were many occasions where the comment or suggestion made was relevant to another of the options. The comments are presented in table form to highlight this.

In this section comments that are specifically and exclusively about bowls are not included. Comments that mention other sports as well as bowls are included.

A table to summarise comments received (not including those comments exclusively about bowls)

Categories of comments	Additional detail	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C	Total	% of total comments
Suggestions / stipulations for how asset transfers of the facilities should be implemented		17	1	0	18	**7.66**
Concern about the council not continuing to manage sports facilities in public parks and the possible changes that asset transfers may have on availability of the facilities to the public		9	14	9	32	**13.62**
Questions or comments about the current estimated costs to the council of running the facilities		0	11	7	18	**7.66**
Concerns about possible changes to cost of services making them inaccessible to current users		2	12	8	22	**9.36**
Concern about the wider impact on sport locally / regionally if any of the clubs affected do not continue to exist		2	0	0	2	**0.85**

Categories of comments	Additional detail	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C	Total	% of total comments
Comments highlighting the importance of sport for the all-round health of those involved (physical, mental and social wellbeing)		6	10	8	24	**10.21**
Comments generally in support of option B		0	5	0	5	**2.13**
Site specific comments (covering various elements at the site)	Greville Smyth Park	18	0	1	19	**8.09**
	Dundridge Farm	1	0	0	1	**0.43**
	Netham Park	1	0	1	2	**0.85**
	Kings Head Lane Park	1	1	0	2	**0.85**
	Ardagh Tennis (not in scope)	0	1	0	1	**0.43**
	Ashton Vale	0	1	0	1	**0.43**
	Eastville Park	0	2	2	4	**1.70**
	Dorian Road	0	1	0	1	**0.43**

Categories of comments	Additional detail	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C	Total	% of total comments
	St George's Park	0	0	2	2	**0.85**
	Canford Park	0	0	1	1	**0.43**
Ideas and suggestions for the council to consider	Try to get sponsorship to help fund sports clubs in Bristol	0	1	8	9	**3.83**
	Suggestions that involve the wider community and sports clubs working with other community partners	0	0	5	5	**2.13**
	Seek financial help from national governing bodies and/or TV companies	1	0	1	2	**0.85**
	Try and find support / solutions using political means such as the West of England Combined Authorities or central government funding	0	0	6	6	**2.55**
	Create an independent sports trust (or similar) that could support the clubs with administration and seek funding to help sustain the facilities / /clubs	2	0	3	5	**2.13**

	Try to find an individual solution at each site / consider a combination of options A, B and C	0	4	6	10	**4.26**
Categories of comments	**Additional detail**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C**	**Total**	**% of total comments**
	Consider installing a 4G pitch in a park	0	1	0	1	**0.43**
	Generate income through hiring the facility out (either the bowls facility or the wider park)	0	1	3	4	**1.70**
	Consider funding from other council departments (e.g. Public Health / Social Care)	0	1	2	3	**1.28**
	Council should continue to subsidise these sports / facilities	0	3	5	8	**3.40**
	Increase council tax to cover the cost of these facilities	0	0	2	2	**0.85**
	Consider an online pitch booking system / service to reduce costs to the council	0	0	1	1	**0.43**
	Consider rationalisation of the council's playing pitch stock and focus on the larger sites	0	0	1	1	**0.43**

Categories of comments	Additional detail	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C	Total	% of total comments
Comments that are critical of the council (generally)		0	8	11	19	**8.09**
Comments that are critical of the consultation		0	2	2	4	**1.70**
Totals		**60**	**80**	**95**	**235**	

Table highlighting the most frequently occurring category of comments (not including comments exclusively about bowls)

Most frequently occurring category of comments	% of total comments
Concern about the council not managing facilities in public parks and the possible changes that asset transfers may have on availability of the facilities to the public	13.62
Comments highlighting the importance of sport for the all-round health of those involved (physical, mental and social wellbeing)	10.21
Concerns about possible changes to cost of services making them inaccessible to current users	9.36
Comments that are critical of the council (generally)	8.09
Comments specifically about Greville Smyth Park	8.09
Questions or comments about the current estimated costs to the council of running the facilities	7.66
Suggestions / stipulations for how asset transfers of the facilities should be implemented	7.66
Try to find an individual solution at each site / consider a combination of options A, B and C	4.26

The above summary of the most frequently occurring comments suggest respondents are concerned that changes to the management of the facilities in scope may lead to a reduction in accessibility / availability of the facilities to the general public. Associated with this concern is the possible reduction in participation levels in sport / activity by the local population, should changes to the management and/or cost of the facilities take place.

These comments have been analysed including all the comments by the respondents supporting Ashton FC and a possible project at Greville Smyth Park. This is relevant as these respondents were overwhelmingly in support of option A (asset transfer). Despite this (inclusion of Ashton FC comments), the most frequently occurring comments are still around wider access to the sites under any potential change of management.

The comments that are site specific include suggestions about possible ways forward at those sites. These can be read in Appendix three.

Option C invited respondents to make suggestions. The most frequently cited suggestion was to try to find an individual solution at each site or consider a

combination of options A, B and C. This was followed by the suggestion to seek sponsorship to help fund sports clubs / facilities in Bristol.

Bowls comments analysis

Question 4 in the consultation asked: “Which of the sites are you interested in? e.g. that you live near and/or use. Please tick any site(s) that you are interested in.”
This gave respondents the opportunity to select multiple sites for this question.
This section looks at the comments made by consultation respondents who selected a bowls site at question 4 amongst the sites they were interested in.

Comments were made by respondents after having chosen one of the options (A, B or C). There were many occasions where the comment or suggestion made was relevant to another of the options. The number of comments are presented in table form to highlight this.

A table to summarise the most frequently occurring types of bowls comments received

Categories of comments	Additional detail	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C	Number of comments from letters / emails	Total	% of total comments
Suggestions / stipulations for how asset transfers of the facilities should be implemented		3	0	0	0	3	2.2
Concern about the council not continuing to manage sports facilities in public parks and the possible changes that asset transfers may have on availability of the facilities to the public		3	7	8	0	18	13.2
Questions or comments about the current estimated costs to the council of running the facilities		0	8	9	6	23	16.9
Site specific bowls comments (covering various elements at the site)	Begbrook	2	0	0	1	3	2.2
	Eastville	1	3	3	0	7	5.2
	Avonvale	1	0	1	1	3	2.2
	Canford	0	1	6	0	7	5.2

	St George / Omnibus	0	0	2	1	3	2.2
Categories of comments	**Additional detail**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C**	**Number of comments from letters / emails**	**Total**	**% of total comments**
Ideas and suggestions for the council to consider	Try to get sponsorship to help fund bowls clubs and bowls in general in Bristol	0	2	9	0	11	8.1
	Suggestions that involve the wider community and bowls clubs working with other community partners	0	0	7	0	7	5.2
	Council set up green maintenance contract with private contractor for all the affected clubs	1	0	0	0	1	0.7
	Seek help from national governing bodies and TV broadcasters	1	0	0	0	1	0.7
	The council to help / support the clubs in any new arrangements (such as with finding contractors and developing sites)	1	0	2	1	4	2.9
	Some council funding to help us run our own clubhouse (and generate income)	1	0	0	0	1	0.7

Categories of comments	Additional detail	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B	Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C	Number of comments from letters / emails	Total	% of total comments
	A part payment by the clubs and a part payment funded by an increase in council tax.	0	1	0	0	1	0.7
	Generate income through hiring the facility out (either the bowls facility or the wider park)	0	1	4	0	5	3.7
	A mix of council subsidy and private funding	0	1	0	0	1	0.7
	Continue the current arrangement with the council subsiding bowls either through the Parks budget or other departments	0	0	4	1	5	3.7
	Try and find support / solutions using political means such as WECA or central government funding	0	0	2	0	2	1.5
	Create an independent sports trust that could support the clubs with administration and seek funding to help sustain the facilities / clubs	0	0	1	0	1	0.7

	Try to find an individual solution at each site that may be a combination of options A, B and C	0	0	3	0	3	2.2
Categories of comments	**Additional detail**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option A**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option B**	**Number of comments from respondents who chose Option C**	**Number of comments from letters / emails**	**Total**	**% of total comments**
Concern about the wider impact on bowls locally / regionally if any of the clubs in scope do not continue to exist		3	1	0	6	10	7.4
Comments highlighting the importance of bowls for the all round health of those involved (physical, mental and social wellbeing)		5	5	0	6	16	11.8
Totals		**22**	**30**	**61**	**23**	**136**	

Table highlighting the most frequently occurring category of bowls comment

Most frequently occurring category of comment	% of total comments
Questions or comments about the current estimated costs to the council of running the facilities	16.9
Concern about the council not managing facilities in public parks and the possible changes that asset transfers may have on availability of the facilities to the public	13.2
Comments highlighting the importance of bowls for the all-round health of those involved (physical, mental and social wellbeing)	11.8
Suggestion to try to get sponsorship to help fund bowls clubs and bowls in general in Bristol	8.1
Concern about the wider impact on bowls locally / regionally if any of the clubs in scope do not continue to exist	7.4
Suggestions that involve the wider community and bowls clubs working with other community partners	5.2
Comments specifically about Canford BC	5.2
Comments specifically about Eastvillians & Whitehall BC	5.2

The most frequently cited suggestion was to try and raise sponsorship to help fund bowls in Bristol, followed by suggestions that involve the wider community and bowls clubs working with other local community partners.

The comments received and the above summary suggest that the bowls respondents were concerned about the £18,000 per year mentioned in Option B that the council estimate it costs them on an annual basis to provide bowls facilities at each site. This figure appears to influence many of the responses and suggested the need to hold further meetings with the bowls clubs to clarify the issue.

Two further meetings were held with representatives from all the affected bowls clubs (one during the official public consultation period and one after this period had ended).

Sport governing body comments and sport specific summaries

Bowls

The Administrator for the Gloucestershire Bowls Association put forward a response to the public consultation that has been included in the analysis. Specific points about the three options included in the consultation that they wish to highlight are as follows:

- *Although increased charges for local-authority-provided sport might have an adverse impact on participation in all sports, it is arguable that the greatest impact would be likely amongst the older and often financially-less-well-off members of the community. Just at the point in their life when it becomes a struggle to keep people both healthy and happy, because of their age, the Council may be in danger of removing the one sport that is accessible to older people.*

- *Just to emphasise the link, the total membership of the six bowls clubs under threat (five bowls greens/locations) is 250 (2019 figure). This approximates to £360 per head, if the total charges from Bristol City Council are £90K. The average current annual membership subscription is something in the £60-95 range, with an average of £70, though match fees per game played would be paid on top of this, amounting to possibly another £120 for a very regular player. The disparity is vast, however, and – if Bristol City Council will not reconsider the situation - signals a total catastrophe for a number of bowling clubs in the City of Bristol.*

- *Because other cities in England are undertaking a similar process of retrenchment, does not mean that Bristol actually has to do this, with an impact on older age groups. There will be inevitable enhanced pressure on the alternative sources of funding (nationwide) referred to in Option A. Bowls clubs with relatively low memberships are not well placed to put forward a convincing business plan, nor do they necessarily have Officers with the administrative skills to head up such applications, but they should not be consequently regarded as easy targets for cuts.*

- *Notwithstanding the previous comments, should Option A be considered by any of the bowls clubs involved (or other sports clubs at those locations), it is acknowledged that the Council will offer assistance to clubs wishing to seek additional funding and take over their own facilities (presumably in locating potential grant sources and also in formulating applications for funding), and will also allocate capital funding towards bringing the existing facility into a good state of repair prior to the asset transfer.*

- *Where GBA clubs just outside the city boundary (in South Gloucestershire) have recently taken over responsibility for maintenance of their green, grounds and buildings, it is appropriate to observe that figures for greens maintenance from the two clubs (in South Gloucestershire) able to supply this information have both been circa £8,000 per annum for cutting plus special treatments at agreed times. This is very significantly below the huge £18,000 per annum that Bristol Parks Department have suggested should be paid. Were Bristol able to quote a more realistic figure, along these lines, then this might be something that would enable at-risk clubs to consider Option B. It should be further noted that, where 'asset transfer' has taken place (Option A), there will be other costs for the club – utilities, insurance, building maintenance, and more – but these will be at a comparatively lower level.*

- *However, in relation to the practicality of Option A, a significant factor is that, for bowling clubs, to take over their own green maintenance, there have to be a sufficiency of contractors – with the available skills and equipment - competing for such work. That is clearly not the case, since some of the relatively few existing contractors are fully committed and unable to take on any more new work. For this reason alone, Option A may therefore not provide a possible solution, for up to five bowling greens, unless additional greens contractors can be found. This an area where Bristol City Council might consider guidance and help in finding such contractors. Could they not use some of the capital monies referred to in the consultation, to provide training and equipment - just possibly to members of Council staff rendered redundant by the Council no longer undertaking bowls green maintenance work - to enable them to set up a small business maintaining bowling greens?*

- *Organisationally, taking out even one bowling facility will have an effect on everyone in the City of Bristol who plays bowls, not just the individual facility and club directly targeted. Clubs are intimately inter-related, through the competitive structure of the sport locally. In general, within Bristol, for bowling – less clubs, less opponents, less competitive games, less attraction to play the sport, probably people giving up sport and healthy activity altogether.*

- *Suggesting the merging of bowls clubs will not work. Bowls clubs are much more 'local' and 'locality- linked' than most sports, and people will join their local club, but are far less likely to move away. If clubs cease to exist, some bowlers will just give up, with all the implied health and social disbenefits noted. This characteristic will be even more noticeable because of the age structure of the sport.*

The comments from Gloucestershire Bowls Association are similar to those highlighted above in the qualitative bowls comments summary. These comments have led to the council having follow-up conversations with affected clubs immediately after the public consultation.

Cricket

The Gloucestershire Cricket Board completed the consultation and chose option A. They stated in the consultation:

Having done this with South Gloucestershire Council, asset transfer sounds simple but realistically it is not. Clubs who have been hiring pitches do not have many of the fundamental items of machinery to be able to take on the management and preparation of a cricket ground - so, whilst looking to asset transfer at £0 cost to the council it may be appropriate in the short term to support the clubs with the purchase of machinery (setting up costs).

The GCB have added the following statement:

The Gloucestershire Cricket Board would like to be consulted prior to, and engaged throughout, with the expression of interest process for the affected sites currently used for cricket. We want to ensure that any of our clubs are in a suitable position to take on any potential assets / liability and to support the clubs in question. We also want to protect the future of our clubs should another party become the main lease holder of any of the current cricket sites.

The sites in the consultation that are currently used for cricket include Oldbury Court Estate and Netham Park. Both of these sites have other sporting uses in the winter months. The current users engaged in the consultation and have shown an interest in option A. There is also another cricket team who are looking for a venue and they have shown an interest in more than one site.

Football

A joint statement from Somerset Football Association, Gloucestershire Football Association and The Football Foundation:

The current Playing Pitch Strategy for Bristol demonstrates that there is a current need to protect the overall quantity of football pitches in the City to cope with future demand from all age groups. Based on the need to protect the existing quantity of football pitches both Somerset Football Association (SFA) and Gloucestershire Football Association (GFA) are both supportive of Option A of the consultation options - where expressions of interest (EOI) from third parties, including sports clubs and sports bodies, in leasing and operating one, some or all of its facilities going forward.

If Option A is the only viable solution in the short term then we would request that the current stock of Football pitches are retained for an extended window to enable the identification of appropriate organisations/clubs and the opportunity to develop a business plan. We would welcome regular meetings to ensure a strategic and sustainable solution can be found. Where there is no interest shown in Option A for a particular site then we would like to investigate if a mixture of option A, B and C can be found at the site, using the local knowledge of the Gloucestershire and Somerset Football Associations and the Bristol Playing Pitch Strategy steering group.
We acknowledge that Option A would result in the City Council no longer offering any 'Pay & Play' opportunities. As this presents a risk to the sustainability of football within the city we would expect any management organisation to retain a pay and play option as part of any long term lease agreement. Not only would this help to grow and sustain football in the city it would also support club/organisations business plan via additional income.

The FA is due to launch its National Grass Pitch Improvement Programme which is aimed at assisting clubs and leagues to take on further grass pitch maintenance responsibilities. In order to maximise and access this funding, both SFA and GFA would ask that they are consulted on any EOI's submitted which include football clubs. This is to ensure that the football club(s) in question are suitable to take on any potential liability, and so support can be offered to ensure the club(s) have a robust management structure, are financially sustainable and have explored any potential funding avenues (If a club has any aspiration to develop one of the sites in question).

The "Key quantitative findings" on page 5 of this report suggest an overall preference for option A.

Ashton FC have a long history of wishing to develop a more permanent home and better facilities at Greville Smyth Park. The impact of the Ashton FC / Greville Smyth responses is a skewing of the overall consultation findings. Removing these responses highlights a reasonably even split between option A and B.

The local Football Associations have suggested that any new operators of sites (under option A) should still offer some “pay and play” access to local teams to maintain equity of provision in the city.

The current users of the sites Dundridge Farm and Kings Head Lane are keen to take on their respective sites. There is no other apparent interest for Dundridge but there is another interested party who do not currently use the site at Kings Head Lane.

Sport specific analysis: other sports

There are a few comments in the public consultation that highlight that the sites can be (and in some cases are currently) used for other sports, either formally or informally. These users express concern that they may not be able to access the sites should there be a new management arrangement (option A).

Appendix one: Responses to the online survey

Note on flow of questions and survey structure

Please note: survey respondents were not directed to answer all the questions in order.

- All respondents were directed to questions 1 to 5
- All respondents were directed to questions 17 to 29

- Those who answered Option A at question 5 were then taken to questions 6 to 13. They did not answer questions 14 through to 16.

- Those who answered Option B at question 5 were then taken to questions 14 and 15. They did not answer questions 6 to 13, or question 16.

- Those who answered Option C at question 5 were then taken to question 16. They did not answer questions 6 to 13 or questions 14 & 15.

1. Page 1

1. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		35.32%	207
2	No		64.68%	379
			answered	586
			skipped	22

2. Page 2

2. If yes, what type of organisation do you belong to? (Please select all that apply)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Park user group		4.39%	9
2	Bowls club		13.66%	28
3	Football club		77.07%	158
4	Cricket club		2.93%	6
5	Sports league		0.49%	1
6	National Governing Body		0.98%	2
7	Facility provider		0.49%	1
8	Charity		0.49%	1
9	Sport coaching company		1.46%	3
10	Education		0.00%	0
11	Other (please specify):		2.93%	6
			answered	205
			skipped	403
Other (please specify): (6)				

3. Page 3

3. If you are responding as an individual, how would you best describe your interest in this consultation? (Please select all that apply)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Current user of park's sport facilities		37.47%	142
2	Regular park user (but not for formal sport)		42.48%	161
3	Member of public (general concern / interest)		47.76%	181
4	Resident living close to one of the facilities in question		36.15%	137
5	Other (please specify):		7.92%	30
			answered	379
			skipped	229

Other (please specify): (30)

4. Page 4

4. Which of the sites are you interested in? e.g. that you live near and/or use. Please tick any site(s) that you are interested in:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	General interest in whole proposal (not site specific interest)		26.29%	153
2	Ardagh Bowling Green		10.14%	59
3	Arnall Drive Playing Fields (football pitches only)		1.55%	9
4	Ashton Vale Playing Fields (football pitches only)		6.36%	37
5	Avonvale / Netham Bowls Facility		7.04%	41
6	Begbrook Green Park Bowls Facility		9.11%	53
7	Begbrook Green Park Football		2.58%	15
8	Canford Park Bowls Facility		14.60%	85
9	Canford Park Football		9.28%	54
10	Dorian Road (football pitches only)		2.41%	14
11	Dundridge Farm Playing Fields (football)		3.61%	21
12	Eastville Park Bowls Facility		10.82%	63
13	Eastville Park Football		7.22%	42
14	Greville Smyth Park Football		45.53%	265
15	Kings Head Lane Park Football		2.23%	13
16	Netham Park		6.36%	37
17	Oldbury Court Estate		7.22%	42
18	Redcatch Park Football		3.61%	21

4. Which of the sites are you interested in? e.g. that you live near and/or use. Please tick any site(s) that you are interested in:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
19	St George Park Bowls Facility		11.34%	66
20	Wellington Hill (football pitch only)		3.61%	21
			answered	582
			skipped	26

5. Page 5

5. Please state below your preference from the three options above:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Option A		61.43%	352
2	Option B		23.91%	137
3	Option C (You will be asked to provide your ideas on the following page)		14.66%	84
			answered	573
			skipped	35

NOTE:

- Those who answered Option A at question 5 were then taken to questions 6 to 13. They did <u>not</u> answer questions 14 through to 16.
- Those who answered Option B at question 5 were then taken to questions 14 and 15. They did <u>not</u> answer questions 6 to 13, or question 16.
- Those who answered Option C at question 5 were then taken to question 16. They did <u>not</u> answer questions 6 to 13 or questions 14 & 15.

6. Page 6

6. If the opportunity is presented, do you feel that you or your club/organisation would submit an expression of interest in operating any of the sports facilities?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		74.34%	252
2	No		25.66%	87
			answered	339
			skipped	269

7. Page 7

7. If you have any comments about the council potentially asset transferring any of the sites in scope, please provide them below:			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	36
		answered	36
		skipped	572

8. Page 8

8. Which of the sites are you interested in operating? Please tick the site(s) that you are interested in (please note that sites can potentially be used for other sports/activities than they are currently used for):

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	General interest in whole proposal (not site specific interest)	6.69%	17
2	Ardagh Bowling Green	1.57%	4
3	Arnall Drive Playing Fields (football pitches only)	0.39%	1
4	Ashton Vale Playing Fields (football pitches only)	5.12%	13
5	Avonvale / Netham Bowls Facility	0.79%	2
6	Begbrook Green Park Bowls Facility	3.94%	10
7	Begbrook Green Park Football	0.39%	1
8	Canford Park Bowls Facility	1.18%	3
9	Canford Park Football	0.79%	2
10	Dorian Road (football pitches only)	0.79%	2
11	Dundridge Farm Playing Fields (football)	3.15%	8
12	Eastville Park Bowls Facility	1.18%	3
13	Eastville Park Football	0.79%	2
14	Greville Smyth Park Football	77.95%	198
15	Kings Head Lane Park Football	1.18%	3
16	Netham Park	1.57%	4
17	Oldbury Court Estate	1.57%	4
18	Redcatch Park Football	0.79%	2

8. Which of the sites are you interested in operating? Please tick the site(s) that you are interested in (please note that sites can potentially be used for other sports/activities than they are currently used for):				
			Response Percent	Response Total
19	St George Park Bowls Facility		0.79%	2
20	Wellington Hill (football pitch only)		0.39%	1
			answered	254
			skipped	354

9. Would you want to make the built facility available for wider community use or will the focus be sport only? (Pitches will continue to be open to use as public open space.)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Available for wider community use		68.13%	171
2	Sport only		31.87%	80
			answered	251
			skipped	357

10. Which of the following options would you consider? (Please select yes or no for each option.)			
	Yes	No	Response Total
We would likely employ a professional to help in the asset transfer application and would welcome suggestions and contacts that the council could provide	86.4% (191)	13.6% (30)	221
We would welcome the opportunity to attend a workshop on the asset transfer process delivered by Bristol City Council	90.9% (200)	9.1% (20)	220
If there are other clubs / organisations interested in the same site(s) as we are, we would consider working with them in the initial asset transfer application	69.3% (149)	30.7% (66)	215
We do not think our organisation needs support	35.0% (71)	65.0% (132)	203
		answered	234

10. Which of the following options would you consider? (Please select yes or no for each option.)			
	Yes	No	Response Total
		skipped	374

Matrix Charts

10.1. We would likely employ a professional to help in the asset transfer application and would welcome suggestions and contacts that the council could provide			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		86.4%	191
2	No		13.6%	30
			answered	221

10.2. We would welcome the opportunity to attend a workshop on the asset transfer process delivered by Bristol City Council			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		90.9%	200
2	No		9.1%	20
			answered	220

10.3. If there are other clubs / organisations interested in the same site(s) as we are, we would consider working with them in the initial asset transfer application			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		69.3%	149
2	No		30.7%	66
			answered	215

10.4. We do not think our organisation needs support			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		35.0%	71
2	No		65.0%	132
			answered	203

11. Which of the following options would you consider?			
	Yes	No	Response Total
Purchase equipment, undertake qualifications and do it ourselves (i.e. volunteers)	84.4% (184)	15.6% (34)	218
Procure our own contractor to work exclusively for us	67.9% (142)	32.1% (67)	209
Work with other clubs / organisations to procure a contractor to work on multiple sites (and maximise potential cost savings)	80.5% (173)	19.5% (42)	215
Work with other clubs / organisations to purchase required machinery and use a local professional sports club or company to carry out the work (see Thirsk and Northallerton Golf Club (TNGC) example below for further detail*)	74.9% (152)	25.1% (51)	203
		answered	231
		skipped	377

Matrix Charts

11.1. Purchase equipment, undertake qualifications and do it ourselves (i.e. volunteers)			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		84.4%	184
2	No		15.6%	34
			answered	218

11.2. Procure our own contractor to work exclusively for us			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		67.9%	142
2	No		32.1%	67
			answered	209

11.3. Work with other clubs / organisations to procure a contractor to work on multiple sites (and maximise potential cost savings)			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		80.5%	173
2	No		19.5%	42
			answered	215

11.4. Work with other clubs / organisations to purchase required machinery and use a local professional sports club or company to carry out the work (see Thirsk and Northallerton Golf Club (TNGC) example below for further detail*)			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		74.9%	152
2	No		25.1%	51
			answered	203

12. Which of the following options would you consider?			
	Yes	No	Response Total
If successful, we would prefer to work independently to apply for funding	66.8% (135)	33.2% (67)	202
We would be interested in working with other clubs/organisations who have expressed an interest in taking on facilities where this might increase our opportunities to apply for funding	79.8% (166)	20.2% (42)	208
		answered	224
		skipped	384

Matrix Charts

12.1. If successful, we would prefer to work independently to apply for funding			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		66.8%	135
2	No		33.2%	67
			answered	202

12.2. We would be interested in working with other clubs/organisations who have expressed an interest in taking on facilities where this might increase our opportunities to apply for funding			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		79.8%	166
2	No		20.2%	42
			answered	208

13. If you have any comments about the council offering the site(s) you have selected above to a third party/sports operator, please provide them below:			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	36
		answered	36
		skipped	572

9. Page 9

NOTE:

- Those who answered Option A at question 5 were then taken to questions 6 to 13. They did not answer questions 14 through to 16.
- Those who answered Option B at question 5 were then taken to questions 14 and 15. They did not answer questions 6 to 13, or question 16.
- Those who answered Option C at question 5 were then taken to question 16. They did not answer questions 6 to 13 or questions 14 & 15.

14. The estimated rate that would need to be charged to cover all costs and maintenance of the sports facilities is set out below: Estimated charge to hire a bowls pavilion and green = £18,000 per season Estimated charge to hire a cricket pavilion and cricket wicket/outfield = £11,500 per season Estimated charge to hire an adult football pitch with changing rooms, provision of nets and goal posts, for 12 games = £2,800 to £3,100 (depending on the site) Do you agree that people will pay this?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
Bowls	7.6% (10)	17.4% (23)	37.9% (50)	22.7% (30)	14.4% (19)	132
Cricket	7.4% (9)	23.1% (28)	36.4% (44)	22.3% (27)	10.7% (13)	121
Football	18.3% (23)	31.0% (39)	24.6% (31)	18.3% (23)	7.9% (10)	126
					answered	137
					skipped	471

Matrix Charts

14.1. Bowls			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		7.6%	10
2	Agree		17.4%	23
3	Neither agree nor disagree		37.9%	50
4	Disagree		22.7%	30
5	Strongly disagree		14.4%	19
			answered	132

14.2. Cricket			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		7.4%	9
2	Agree		23.1%	28
3	Neither agree nor disagree		36.4%	44
4	Disagree		22.3%	27
5	Strongly disagree		10.7%	13
			answered	121

14.3. Football			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		18.3%	23
2	Agree		31.0%	39
3	Neither agree nor disagree		24.6%	31
4	Disagree		18.3%	23
5	Strongly disagree		7.9%	10
			answered	126

15. If you have any comments about option B, please provide them below:			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	74
		answered	74
		skipped	534

NOTE:

- Those who answered Option A at question 5 were then taken to questions 6 to 13. They did not answer questions 14 through to 16.
- Those who answered Option B at question 5 were then taken to questions 14 and 15. They did not answer questions 6 to 13, or question 16.
- Those who answered Option C at question 5 were then taken to question 16. They did not answer questions 6 to 13 or questions 14 & 15.

10. Page 10

NOTE:

- Those who answered Option A at question 5 were then taken to questions 6 to 13. They did not answer questions 14 through to 16.
- Those who answered Option B at question 5 were then taken to questions 14 and 15. They did not answer questions 6 to 13, or question 16.
- Those who answered Option C at question 5 were then taken to question 16. They did not answer questions 6 to 13 or questions 14 & 15.

16. Please explain your proposal to offer sports in parks at no cost to the council:			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	83
		answered	83
		skipped	525

NOTE:

- Those who answered Option A at question 5 were then taken to questions 6 to 13. They did not answer questions 14 through to 16.
- Those who answered Option B at question 5 were then taken to questions 14 and 15. They did not answer questions 6 to 13, or question 16.
- Those who answered Option C at question 5 were then taken to question 16. They did not answer questions 6 to 13 or questions 14 & 15.
- All respondents were directed to questions 17 to 29

11. Page 11

17a. If you would like us to contact you about your comments or ideas, please provide your email address below. Information you provide will be treated confidentially and in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679. Your contact details will be used solely for the purpose of contacting you about your response to this consultation if you have ticked the box to request this. Our privacy policy explains what we do with your personal information, how long we keep it and your right to withdraw your consent at any time you choose.

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	I would like to be contacted about this consultation and I consent to my contact details being used for this purpose as defined in Bristol City Council's privacy policy.		100.00%	200
			answered	200
			skipped	408

17b. Email address:

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	271
		answered	271
		skipped	337

12. Page 12

18. What is your full postcode, e.g. BS9 3JZ (If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please provide the postcode of the organisation's premises)			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	425
		answered	425
		skipped	183

19. What is your age?			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	0-10	0.52%	3
2	11-15	0.70%	4
3	16-17	0.52%	3
4	18-24	2.44%	14
5	25-34	9.95%	57
6	35-44	25.65%	147
7	45-54	23.56%	135
8	55-64	15.53%	89
9	65-74	13.79%	79
10	75-84	4.71%	27
11	85 +	0.35%	2
12	Prefer not to say	2.27%	13
		answered	573
		skipped	35

20. Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		4.87%	28
2	No		89.74%	516
3	Prefer not to say		5.39%	31
			answered	575
			skipped	33

21. What is your sex?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Female		38.72%	223
2	Male		55.90%	322
3	Prefer not say		4.86%	28
4	Other (please describe):		0.52%	3
			answered	576
			skipped	32
Other (please describe): (3)				

22. Have you gone through any part of a gender reassignment process or do you intend to?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		0.00%	0
2	No		91.67%	517
3	Prefer not to say		8.33%	47
			answered	564
			skipped	44

23. What is your ethnic group? (please tick one box only)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	White British		82.98%	473
2	White Irish		0.88%	5
3	White Other		3.86%	22
4	Black /African / Caribbean / Black British		0.53%	3
5	Asian / Asian British		0.70%	4
6	Mixed / Multi ethnic group		1.75%	10
7	Gypsy / Roma / Irish Traveller		0.00%	0
8	Prefer not to say		8.77%	50
9	Any other ethnic background (please describe):		0.53%	3
			answered	570
			skipped	38

Any other ethnic background (please describe): (3)		
1	29/05/2019 16:31 PM ID: 117928818	White English
2	30/05/2019 10:22 AM ID: 117991440	Latin
3	09/07/2019 06:31 AM ID: 121592818	Polynesian

24. What is your sexual orientation?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Bisexual		3.07%	17
2	Gay Man		0.72%	4

24. What is your sexual orientation?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
3	Gay Woman / Lesbian		0.36%	2
4	Heterosexual / Straight		79.60%	441
5	Prefer not to say		15.16%	84
6	Other (please describe):		1.08%	6
			answered	554
			skipped	54
Other (please describe): (6)				

25. What is your religion/faith?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	No Religion		46.54%	262
2	Buddhist		1.24%	7
3	Christian		37.48%	211
4	Hindu		0.18%	1
5	Jewish		0.00%	0
6	Muslim		0.36%	2
7	Pagan		0.00%	0
8	Sikh		0.00%	0
9	Prefer not to say		12.43%	70
10	Other (please describe):		1.78%	10
			answered	563
			skipped	45
Other (please describe): (10)				

26. Are you pregnant or have you given birth in the last 26 weeks?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		1.44%	8
2	No		90.84%	506
3	Prefer not to say		7.72%	43
			answered	557
			skipped	51

27. Are you a refugee or asylum seeker?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		0.00%	0
2	No		92.84%	519
3	Prefer not to say		7.16%	40
			answered	559
			skipped	49

28. How did you hear about this consultation?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Poster		0.53%	3
2	Postcard		0.00%	0
3	Email from council		18.51%	104
4	Verbally from a council officer		1.96%	11
5	Facebook		25.98%	146
6	Twitter		1.78%	10
7	NextDoor		0.36%	2
8	Instagram		0.00%	0

28. How did you hear about this consultation?									
								Response Percent	Response Total
9	Snapchat							0.00%	0
10	Ask Bristol notification							3.38%	19
11	Citizens' Panel notification							1.42%	8
12	Voice and Influence Partnership							0.18%	1
13	Friends of/campaign group							12.10%	68
14	Ward councillor							0.89%	5
15	Radio / TV							1.96%	11
16	Newspaper/online newspaper							2.85%	16
17	Library							1.07%	6
18	Citizen Service Point							0.36%	2
19	Word of mouth							21.89%	123
20	Other (please specify):							13.35%	75
Analysis	Mean:	12.1	Std. Deviation:	7.15	Satisfaction Rate:	58		answered	562
	Variance:	51.15	Std. Error:	0.3				skipped	46
Other (please specify): (75)									
If you heard about it from a friends of/campaign group, please specify: (57)									

We want to make sure our surveys are as good as possible. Please tell us if you agree or disagree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
There is enough information about the proposals for me to answer the questions	13.8% (77)	55.5% (309)	18.5% (103)	8.4% (47)	3.8% (21)	557

We want to make sure our surveys are as good as possible. Please tell us if you agree or disagree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
The questions make it easy for me to give my views	14.3% (79)	51.8% (287)	19.5% (108)	11.0% (61)	3.4% (19)	554
The survey meets my accessibility requirements	23.0% (127)	52.1% (288)	21.7% (120)	2.2% (12)	1.1% (6)	553
					answered	559
					skipped	49

Matrix Charts

29.1. There is enough information about the proposals for me to answer the questions			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		13.8%	77
2	Agree		55.5%	309
3	Neither agree nor disagree		18.5%	103
4	Disagree		8.4%	47
5	Strongly disagree		3.8%	21
			answered	557

29.2. The questions make it easy for me to give my views			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		14.3%	79
2	Agree		51.8%	287
3	Neither agree nor disagree		19.5%	108
4	Disagree		11.0%	61
5	Strongly disagree		3.4%	19
			answered	554

29.3. The survey meets my accessibility requirements			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		23.0%	127
2	Agree		52.1%	288
3	Neither agree nor disagree		21.7%	120
4	Disagree		2.2%	12
5	Strongly disagree		1.1%	6
			answered	553

Appendix two: Sites in scope

Sites in scope

This consultation is only looking at cricket, bowls and football facilities that are hired from the council on an adhoc pay & play basis or per season.

Facilities currently hired from the council on an adhoc pay & play basis or per season (IN SCOPE)

All these facilities include pitches or bowls greens AND the associated changing room or pavilion except for:

- Ardagh bowling green (the pavilion is not in scope)
- Dorian Road, Wellington Hill, Arnall Drive Playing Fields and Ashton Vale Playing Fields- where only football pitches are in scope.

ARDAGH BOWLING GREEN
ARNALL DRIVE PLAYING FIELDS (FOOTBALL PITCHES ONLY)*
ASHTON VALE PLAYING FIELDS (FOOTBALL PITCHES ONLY)
AVONVALE / NETHAM BOWLS FACILITY
BEGBROOK GREEN PARK BOWLS FACILITY
BEGBROOK GREEN PARK FOOTBALL
CANFORD PARK BOWLS FACILITY
CANFORD PARK FOOTBALL
DORIAN ROAD (FOOTBALL PITCHES ONLY)
DUNDRIDGE FARM PLAYING FIELDS (FOOTBALL)**
EASTVILLE PARK BOWLS FACILITY
EASTVILLE PARK FOOTBALL
GREVILLE SMYTH PARK FOOTBALL
KINGS HEAD LANE PARK FOOTBALL
NETHAM PARK***
OLDBURY COURT ESTATE
REDCATCH PARK FOOTBALL
ST GEORGE PARK BOWLS FACILITY
WELLINGTON HILL (FOOTBALL PITCH ONLY)

*Part of Arnall Drive Playing Fields is currently licensed to Henbury FC. This license is unaffected by this consultation.

**Part of Dundridge Farm Playing Fields is currently licensed to Nicholas Wanderers. This license is unaffected by this consultation.

***Bristol Pakistanis use Netham Park and have a licence in place. This licence is unaffected by this consultation.

Sites that have hosted formal sport in the recent past but are not currently used as pitches (NOT IN SCOPE)

BEDMINSTER DOWN
BADOCK'S WOOD RECREATION FIELD
ST ANNE'S PARK
CRAYDON ROAD OPEN SPACE

These sites have not been available for hire in recent seasons and there are no plans to change this.

Sites that have either have long term licences or leases or education use (NOT IN SCOPE)

ARDAGH BOWLS PAVILION
ARNALL DRIVE OPEN SPACE
ASHTON VALE PLAYING FIELD
BOWER ASHTON PLAYING FIELD
HILLFIELDS RECREATION GROUND
KINGSWESTON SPORTS GROUND
KNOWLE SPORTS GROUND
MULLER ROAD PLAYING FIELD
PEN PARK PLAYING FIELDS
SEAMILLS RECREATION GROUND
SHIREHAMPTON SPORTS GROUND
THE DOWNS (DURDHAM DOWNS)
VICTORY PARK

Please note: this is not an exhaustive list of all sport facilities leased or licenced from the council. If you use a facility that is not on any of the above lists then it is NOT IN SCOPE for this consultation.