Amenity green space

Introduction and definition

6.1 This type of open space is most commonly found in residential areas. It includes informal recreation spaces and green spaces in and around housing, and fulfils a primary purpose of providing opportunities for informal activities close to home or work. Amenity green space is also often used for landscaping purposes.

6.2 Amenity green spaces can have an overlapping function with parks, recreation grounds and natural areas and provide informal opportunities for children’s play where there are no other facilities. It is important therefore to consider the provision of amenity green spaces in the context of other types of open space.

6.3 There is much research relating to the links between the provision of high quality open space and a reduction in crime. Given that amenity space is perhaps the most local type of open space provided, high quality space will be essential in order to discourage misuse and encourage a culture of respect.

6.4 This section relates to amenity green spaces and sets out the strategic context, key findings of the consultations and recommended local standards. The standards are then applied to evaluate the adequacy of the existing amenity green space and the associated demand for these spaces. Standards are also applied in the context of other open spaces with overlapping functions.

6.5 The key issues for amenity spaces arising from a review of strategic documents are set out in Table 6.1 overleaf.
Table 6.1 – Strategic context – Regional and Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reviewed</th>
<th>Summary of key strategic drivers</th>
<th>Links to the provision of amenity space in Hull</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hull Local Plan (2000)  | Chapter four of the local plan considers how to manage the local environment in a sustainable way to improve the quality of life for people and contribute positively to the environment.  
                        | Policy ME1 states that development that is sustainable and respects environmental constraints will be supported.  
                        | Chapter six of the Local Plan covers the natural environment and identifies the protection and enhancement of the natural environment as a key feature of the City Plan.  
                        | Policy NE1 protects Urban Greenspace identified on the proposals map (0.25 hectares and above) from development. Development will not be permitted if it results in the following:  
                        |  • loss of sport and recreation facilities  
                        |  • an adverse effect on nature conservation  
                        |  • loss of links between other areas of Urban Greenspace  
                        |  • an adverse effect on the amenity and character of the area.  
                        | Policy NE13 protects the Green Network identified on the proposals map from development.  
                        | Policy NE21 supports the management and enhancement of Urban Greenspace for the benefit of the community and wildlife.  
<pre><code>                    | The local plan advocates the protection of existing urban greenspace and promotes the provision of new sites within new developments. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reviewed</th>
<th>Summary of key strategic drivers</th>
<th>Links to the provision of amenity space in Hull</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy BE1 states developments should be acceptable in terms of their relationship to existing natural features and retaining existing Urban Greenspace. Policy BE6 requires developers to provide a good standard of landscape that protects existing natural features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation – Assessing Local Needs

6.6 Consultation undertaken as part of the study highlighted that:

- there is perceived to be a need for a balance between quality and quantity. Although the need for amenity green space in areas of deprivation was perceived to be particularly important, some incidences of misuse were raised and it was felt that sites of higher quality were of greater value to the local community.

- it was felt that while amenity green spaces are important visually, they are valued sites for local communities as spaces for recreational use. The social interaction benefits of communal amenity green space are widely recognised and there is a need to ensure that amenity spaces within housing areas were functional.

- the findings of the IT Children and Young People survey illustrate the value of these spaces – which are often the most localised form of recreational open space available to residents.

Existing provision - Quantity

6.7 The quantity of amenity green space in Hull is summarised in Table 6.2 below.

**Table 6.2 – Provision of amenity green space across Hull**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current provision (ha)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (ha)</th>
<th>Largest site (ha)</th>
<th>Scenario a provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
<th>Scenario b provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
<th>Scenario c provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td><strong>168.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.8 The key issues emerging from Table 6.2 and consultations relating to the quantity of provision of amenity green space across the city are as follows:

- based on the findings of the household survey, there is a split in opinion regarding the quantity of amenity green space in the city. In total, 45% of the population feel that provision is sufficient (more than enough/about right) while 45% have the opposite view – indicating that there is nearly enough/not enough

- in total, there is 168.97 hectares of amenity space across the city. This is fairly evenly distributed with the greatest level of provision found in the East area (49.08 hectares) and the smallest in the Wyke area (4.62 hectares). When taking into account the number of residents in the area, based on growth scenario a, it can be seen that the highest level of provision is located in the East area (1.33 hectares per 1000 population)

- the opinions in all areas are similar to the overall pattern. Residents in the East area display the highest level of satisfaction with 50% of residents suggesting that provision is more than enough/about right – this correlates with actual provision

- the highest level of dissatisfaction is located in the Northern area, where 38% feel that there are not enough amenity spaces and a further 14% suggest that there is only nearly enough. This high level of dissatisfaction is reflected in actual quantity findings, which show that the current provision of amenity green space in this area is the third lowest in the city. It is likely that these perceptions are further exacerbated by the lack of parks in the Northern area

- amenity green spaces are popular with younger children (up to 11 years old) with 28% of respondents identifying them as their most visited / used type of open space. When asked about the quantity of grass areas near their home, the majority of children state that there are a lot (40%). However, 27% indicate that there are some but could be more

- 31% of respondents to the IT young people’s survey feel the provision of informal grass areas is sufficient. 28% of respondents stated provision is insufficient.

**Setting provision standards – quantity**

6.9 The recommended local quantity standard for amenity green space has been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and is summarised overleaf. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix F. The standard has been set marginally above the existing level of provision to promote a balance between new provision in areas where it is most needed and qualitative enhancements where new provision is not required.
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Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.66 hectares per 1000 population</td>
<td>0.67 hectares per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Local consultation findings highlight a split in opinion regarding the current provision of amenity green space, with 45% of residents indicating that provision is insufficient while 45% stating provision is sufficient. Similar results were portrayed within the individual analysis areas.

Consultation highlights the importance of these sites for recreational and landscape purposes in providing green space in what is predominantly an urban environment. Respondents to the IT Children’s Survey identified amenity green space as important to them, with 28% of children identifying amenity green space as their most visited/used type of open space.

In light of the value of amenity green space to local residents from a landscape perspective and the split in opinion with regards to the provision of amenity green space it is recommended the standard is set slightly above the existing level of provision. While setting the standard at this level will enable the Council to identify priorities for new provision, it will ensure that the focus is placed on enhancing the quality of existing sites within the city. The increase in provision required to meet this standard will be sufficient to meet the identified accessibility deficiencies.

As highlighted in the consultations, amenity spaces are particularly important in the provision of local informal play opportunities for children and young people. Those residents living within close proximity to a park may have no need for local amenity green space as well although this type of open space will still be important in the context of visual amenity. When applying local standards for amenity space, visual amenity should be considered as well as the recreational benefits provided by the site.

**Current provision – quality**

6.10 The quality of existing amenity green space in the city was assessed through site visits and is set out in Table 6.3 overleaf. It is important to note that site assessments are conducted as a snapshot in time and are therefore reflective of the quality of the site on one specific day.

6.11 The quality scores are weighted according to the findings of the local consultation. Those elements that were highlighted through consultation as being a particularly important determinant of the quality of amenity green spaces have been weighted higher to ensure that they have a greater influence on the overall quality score that each site achieves. In particular, the cleanliness and maintenance and ancillary accommodation was perceived to be important for amenity green spaces. The full rationale behind this approach is set out in Appendix G.
### Table 6.3 – Quality of amenity green space across Hull

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Range of quality scores (%)</th>
<th>Average quality scores (%)</th>
<th>Lowest quality sites</th>
<th>Highest quality sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>48–80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Land north of Astral Way</td>
<td>Ark Royal Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>36–94</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33rd Avenue</td>
<td>Hull University Amenity Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>33–84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kinloss Garth</td>
<td>Whernside Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>34–83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>East Lingdale Road Amenity Area</td>
<td>Land off College Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>20–97</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vane Street Amenity Space</td>
<td>The Oval Garden Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>28–90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>East Gower Road</td>
<td>Lakeside Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>44–80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>South of Ella Street</td>
<td>Urban Sensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>20–97</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.12 The key issues emerging from Table 6.3 and the consultation relating to the quality of amenity green space are as follows:

- respondents to the household survey regard the quality of amenity green space to be average (53%). Only 18% feel that the quality of sites is good
- this is reinforced during the site assessments, where the average score was 64%. This indicates that the quality of amenity space is lower than many other types of open space. It is also clear that there are significant variations in the quality of amenity green space across the city, with scores achieved ranging from 20% to 97%
- the variation in the quality of amenity green spaces was particularly apparent in the Riverside area of the city, where scores ranged from 20% to 97% meaning that the area contains both the poorest and highest quality site in the city. Sites are also of particularly varying quality in the West area
- the quality ratings given by residents were similar across all analysis areas, and the modal response was that the quality of provision was average. With the exception of the Park area, the average scores achieved are relatively consistent across the city. The average is considerably lower in the Park area (56%) and there are no sites of particularly high quality
- consultation demonstrated that the most satisfied residents were those in the Riverside area, where 28% indicate that the quality of the sites is good. As highlighted above, site assessments indicate that the quality of amenity space varies significantly in this area.
the main issue identified by residents at drop in sessions is the need for a balance between quality and quantity

35% of respondents to the children’s IT survey suggest that amenity green space is clean, safe and nice to use. Respondents to the young people’s IT survey show a greater dissatisfaction, with 45% stating that while the informal grass areas are average, they could do with some improvements

attendees at the HDF workshop reveal concerns over the quality of amenity green space, it was felt that more could be done to make these spaces welcoming for residents and conducive to recreational use. These spaces are rated average by over 30% of respondents to the community network survey, echoing the views of attendees at the workshop.

Setting provision standards – quality

6.13 The recommended local quality standard for amenity green space is summarised below. Full justification and consultation relating to the quality of provision is provided within Appendix G. Improvements to the quality of amenity green space were perceived to be particularly important to local residents and it will be important to ensure that new provision is balanced with quantitative improvements to existing sites.

Quality Standard (see Appendix G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
<td>Dog walking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean/Litter Free</td>
<td>Level surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog free area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to amenity green spaces, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:

<table>
<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>16%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary accommodation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis suggests the improvement in quality of amenity green space is considered to be more important than increasing its provision.
Setting provision standards – accessibility

6.14 The accessibility of sites is paramount in maximising usage as well as providing an opportunity for all people to use the site. The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived directly from the findings of the local consultations.

6.15 74% of residents would expect to walk to amenity green spaces. This emphasises the expectation that these sites should be local resources. This expectation was reflected in all areas of the city.

6.16 Site specific accessibility issues were also analysed as part of the site visits. Information and signage, transport and general accessibility issues were assessed. Most sites were perceived to be accessible on foot and on the whole, signage was considered to be inappropriate at amenity spaces. One of the key barriers to access / usage at amenity spaces identified during site visits was the presence of no ball game signs. This reduces the value of the site to young people and restricts access.

6.17 The recommended local accessibility standard for amenity green space is summarised below. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix H. In light of the local nature of amenity space, the standard set is a walk time threshold.

**Accessibility Standard (see Appendix H)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
<th>10 MINUTE WALK TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A walk time standard has been set based upon the high level of expectation to travel by foot to access an amenity greenspace emphasised throughout consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70% of respondents to the household survey stated they would expect to walk between 5 and 10 minutes to access an amenity green space. The second and third quartile levels established from responses to the household survey is a 10 minute walk time, with a modal response of 10 minutes. Within the individual analysis areas, similar results are portrayed in four of the seven analysis areas. However, residents in the remaining three areas would be prepared to travel slightly longer to access an amenity green space.

In consideration of this evidence, it is recommended the local accessibility standard is set at a 10 minute walk time. Although this standard will be challenging for the Council, it is reflective of expected travel patterns and emphasises the views of residents that amenity green space should be provided in close proximity to the home. Combined with the local quantity standard, the accessibility standard will enable the Council to identify areas deficient in the provision of amenity green space. Setting the standard at a 10 minute level will ensure that larger, functional open spaces can be provided at strategic locations across the city and will ensure that sites can be effectively linked with parks and gardens.

Applying provision standards

6.18 The application of the recommended quality, quantity and accessibility standards is essential in understanding the existing distribution of open space sport and recreation facilities and identifying areas where provision is insufficient to meet local need.
Table 6.4 below summarises the application of the quantity standard both at the existing time and up to 2026. This provides an understanding of where current provision is insufficient to meet local need.

Table 6.4 – Application of quantity standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current balanced against local standard (0.67 hectares per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard Scenario a (0.67 hectares per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard Scenario b (0.67 hectares per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard Scenario c (0.67 hectares per 1000 population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>22.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>-3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>-12.44</td>
<td>-12.08</td>
<td>-12.98</td>
<td>-13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>-8.84</td>
<td>-8.48</td>
<td>-9.38</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>-16.10</td>
<td>-15.86</td>
<td>-16.46</td>
<td>-17.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-5.71</td>
<td>-10.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 indicates the following:

- the provision of amenity green space in the city is insufficient to meet current and future demand with a shortfall of 5.71 hectares expected by 2026 (Scenario b)
- current and future deficiencies are evident in five of the seven areas
- only the quantity of amenity green space in the East and North Carr areas is sufficient to meet current and future demand
- based on growth scenario c the largest expected shortfall is found in the Wyke area (17.01 hectares).

The application of the local accessibility and quality standards for amenity green space is set out overleaf (Map 6.1). Provision of amenity green space is also considered in relation to the location of parks and gardens and this can be seen in Map 6.2.
Map 6.1 – Provision of amenity green space in Hull
Map 6.2 – Provision of amenity green space and parks and gardens in Hull

Amenity greenspace with Parks
Map 6.3 – Quality of amenity green space sites in Hull
6.22 Map 6.1 indicates that there is a good distribution of amenity green space in the city, with the majority of residents able to access an amenity green space within the recommended 10 minute walk time.

6.23 As can be seen from Map 6.2 nearly all residents in Hull have access to either a park or garden or amenity green space. Only small pockets of deficiency are evident.

6.24 Map 6.3 demonstrates that the quality of amenity space is mixed across the city, with high and low quality sites in all areas. It is apparent that there are clusters of poor quality sites in the Park and West areas. It is also apparent that a greater proportion of amenity spaces are of lower quality than sites of other typologies. Site visits identified that in particular, amenity spaces were poor in terms of their infrastructure and the overall cleanliness and maintenance of the sites.

Applying the quantity, quality and accessibility standards

6.25 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas where there is potential unmet demand we apply both the quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards identify whether areas are quantitatively above or below the recommended minimum standard and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

6.26 In addition to considering the role of amenity spaces and the interrelationship of these spaces with parks, it is also important to recognise the value that sports facilities can bring from an informal recreation perspective. While informal use of sports facilities brings conflict (for example dog fouling on pitches), the presence of sports facilities can reduce the importance of localised amenity space.

6.27 The sports facilities created by the BSF scheme across Hull will see useable amenity space increased. The BSF proposals will see the school resources located directly within the community that they serve and access to these sites outside of school hours will be increased. While this will primarily impact on the demand for additional sports facilities, the impact on amenity spaces should also be recognised. In some areas, deficiencies in localised amenity space could be met by opening up school sites outside school hours to the local community.

Quality

6.28 Consultation highlights the importance of obtaining a balance between the quality and quantity of amenity green space and the quality was considered to be of particular importance. The interrelationship between quality and quantity was clear. As illustrated on Map 6.2, there are clusters of high and low quality facilities, and several sites of particularly poor quality.

6.29 In light of the importance of the quality of amenity green spaces, sites have been divided into quartiles according to their quality in order to identify those sites where particular improvement is required. This analysis is set out in Table 6.5 below and a selection of sites falling into the top and bottom quartiles are listed. A full list of all scores achieved during site assessments can be found within Appendix C. It can be seen that to fall within the top quartile, a score of 73% would be required. Several sites in the bottom quartile score particularly poorly.
## Table 6.5 – Detailed analysis of the quality of existing sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above upper quartile</th>
<th>73% +</th>
<th>Below 60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green close AGS, Northern – 84%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vane St, Riverside – 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Street AGS, Riverside – 88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land North of Wivern Road, East – 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel St AGS 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land east of Gower Road, West – 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Grove AGS, West – 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land between Westbourne Street and Springburn Street, Riverside – 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull Royal Infirmary, land on Anlaby Road, Riverside – 92%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Land, Moorhouse Road, West – 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull University, Northern – 94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land east of Lingdale Road, Park – 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The oval garden village, Riverside 97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.30
The quality scores, and key areas of improvement identified for each site should inform any improvements at amenity green space sites. During site assessments, sites were also assessed in order to determine their potential for improvement.

### 6.31
Several amenity green space sites were identified as having particular potential to become a high quality site. Those where potential was perceived to be very good include:

- Site ID 5 - Land South of Hull Road
- Site ID 10 - Land South of Burnham Road
- Site ID 76 - St Georges Street
- Site ID 115 - Goddard Avenue
- Site ID 153 - Ada Holmes Circle
- Site ID 155 - Green Close AGS
- Site ID 192 - Land between Train and Tarran Ave
- Site ID 234 - Land between Lodwell Road and Stroud Crescent East
- Site ID 260 - strip of land east of Mount Pleasant
- Site ID 301 - Robson Way, AGS
- Site ID 301 - Robson Way, AGS
- Site ID 564 - Area South of Pendle Close
- Site ID 565 - Area South of Whernside Close
- Site ID 1051 - Marton Grove AGS
- Site ID 1055 - Philip Larkin Close
- Site ID 1059 - Northern AGS
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- Site ID 1060 - Greenfield AGS
- Site ID 1067 – Land West of Chevening Park AGS
- Site ID 1069 - Land West of Runnymede Way
- Site ID 109 – land to South of Queens Road
- Site ID 1101 - Oakfield Court

Seek to improve the quality of amenity green spaces, aiming to achieve a minimum score of 73% (the score required to fall within the top quartile). In particular, it is likely that improvements to the provision of ancillary facilities (which improve the functionality of the site) will be of particular benefit to the overall quality of amenity green space.

Priorities for improvement should be given to areas where amenity spaces provide the only informal recreational opportunity.

6.32 In order to ensure the future quality of open spaces, consideration should be given to the size of sites. Smaller sites (particularly those located in proximity to larger facilities) may be of limited value to local residents and costly in terms of maintenance to the provider. Functionality was considered to be particularly important by residents.

6.33 Amenity green space can also be used to provide linkages between larger open spaces and to create a green, sustainable environment. The emphasis on improving such linkages is a big driver behind the need to increase the quantity of amenity space.

6.34 The importance of the functionality of amenity spaces should not be underestimated. While amenity space was highlighted as being particularly important to local residents, planning policy should address the value of protecting all sites from development. In some instances, the loss of one small site (which has limited existing functionality) and the subsequent improvement of an adjacent site may offer greater overall value to local residents. This should only be considered where there are clusters of sites serving similar catchments.

Planning policy should address the issue of protection of amenity spaces. Sites serving unique catchment areas should be protected, and additionally sites which are of high value to the community. The disposal of any site which can be proven to be surplus to requirements through a supply and demand analysis should only be permitted if a nearby site serving the same residents is enhanced.

6.35 For all areas, where new development occurs, it will be essential to ensure that new amenity space is provided if the development falls outside of the recommended catchment of an existing amenity space site. This is reflective of the importance of localised, functional amenity space to residents of Hull.

6.36 Design guidelines should also be provided to ensure that all new amenity space is functional. Where possible, amenity spaces should become the focal point of the
community and should provide a network of linkages between different neighbourhoods.

Where new development occurs ensure that new amenity space is provided if the development falls outside of the recommended catchment of an existing amenity space site. This requirement should be incorporated into LDF planning policy.

6.37 The application of the quantity standards demonstrates a need for additional provision in five of the seven areas. When also considering the application of the accessibility standards, as well as the interrelationship between amenity green space and other open space types, it is clear that shorter term, the priorities focus around improvement of existing open spaces rather than the creation of new sites.

6.38 The most appropriate short and long-term priorities for each area of the city are therefore discussed taking into account the relationship between quality, quantity and accessibility.

**East area**

6.39 Application of the quantity standard reveals that there is sufficient provision of amenity green space to meet current and future demand in the area. Accessibility mapping reinforces this good level of provision, with all residents in the area within the recommended 10 minute walk time of an amenity green space. Although access to parks is also good in the East area, amenity green spaces provide local access for residents.

6.40 In light of the even distribution and quantity of amenity green space in this area, priority should be given to the enhancement of existing amenity space in order to improve the functionality and perceived value to local residents.

6.41 The quality of sites within the East area is in line with the average across the city although it is clear that there are significant disparities in the quality of sites across the area with scores ranging from 48% to 80%.

6.42 Consideration should also be given to the value of specific sites in this area. In order to enhance the quality of some sites, it may be necessary to reduce the overall quantity of provision. The current provision in the East area is sufficient to meet both current and projected demand.

Seek to enhance the quality of amenity green space in the East area, striving to achieve the recommended quality standard of 73% at all sites.
SECTION 6 – AMENITY GREEN SPACE

Northern area

6.43 Accessibility mapping illustrates that nearly all residents in the Northern area within the recommended catchment of an amenity green space. The only area outside of the catchment is primarily industrial.

6.44 Despite nearly all residents having access to an amenity green space, quantitative calculations indicate that there is insufficient provision of amenity green space to meet current and future demand. Assuming that the population grows as projected in Scenario b there will be an expected shortfall of 2.92 hectares by 2026.

6.45 The Northern area contains fewer parks and gardens than other areas of the city. Additionally, the BSF proposals are likely to see the loss of part of Princess Elizabeth Playing Fields, an important local amenity in this area. This reinforces the importance of providing high quality local amenity space.

6.46 As nearly all residents in the area have access to an amenity green space within the recommended 10 minute walk time, it appears that despite quantitative shortfalls, the quality of amenity space is of greater importance in the short term. Short term effort should therefore focus on enhancing the quality of green space in the area. This will increase the value of amenity green spaces to local residents and provide a network of high quality informal open space.

6.47 The quality of existing sites is average, although there is a significant range in the quality of sites, with scores achieved ranging from 36–94%, suggesting that while there are some high quality sites, there are several in particular need of improvement. In light of longer term quantitative deficiencies, it should be ensured that new open space is provided as part of new housing developments.
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Seek to enhance the quality of amenity green space in the Northern area, striving to achieve the recommended quality standard at all sites. In light of longer term quantitative deficiencies ensure that amenity space is provided as part of new development.

North Carr area

6.48 Application of the quantity standard reveals that there is sufficient provision to meet current and future demand in the North Carr area. Accessibility mapping reinforces this adequate provision with all residents able to access an amenity green space within the recommended 20 minute walk time.

6.49 Like other areas, the quality of amenity spaces in North Carr is varying, with scores ranging from 38–84%.

6.50 In light of the adequate provision and high level of accessibility, effort should focus on enhancing the quality of amenity green space within the North Carr area and improving linkages between green space sites. Figure 6.1 below illustrates several amenity spaces within North Carr which already provide good linkages between different spaces.
6.51 Consideration should also be given to the value of specific sites in this area. In order to enhance the quality of some sites, it may necessary to reduce the overall quantity of provision. The current provision in the North Carr area is sufficient to meet both current and projected demand.

6.52 Accessibility mapping highlights two main areas of deficiency in the Park area. A large number of residents in the Southcoates East / Holderness wards and residents located in the east of the Marfleet ward are unable to access an amenity green space within the recommended 10 minute walk time (Figures 6.2 and 6.3). There is also limited provision in the industrial area of Marfleet.

6.53 Application of the quantity standard supports these findings with there being insufficient provision of amenity green space to meet both current and projected future demand.
6.54 Based on population projections set out in Scenario b there will be an expected shortfall of 12.98 hectares by 2026. However, when amalgamating the provision of parks and gardens and amenity green space, nearly all residents have access to either an amenity green space or park or garden. This indicates that new provision is not as high a priority as may first appear.

6.55 The majority of the apparent area of deficiency in Marfleet is an industrial area where the need for amenity space is limited. Additionally, Stonebridge Park is within a ten minute catchment of almost all residents falling outside of the 10 minute catchment for amenity green space. The presence of this park negates the need for further additional amenity space.
6.56 The indices of Multiple Deprivation 2004 indicate that the Southcoates Super Output Area is the second most deprived in Hull and the 45th most deprived nationally. Access to local, functional informal open space will therefore be particularly important in this area of the city. East Park is particularly important to residents of this area although for some residents, it is further than a 10 minute walk and an additional amenity space is therefore required. Alternatively, access to the school site outside of community hours should be secured for residents.

6.57 Any new provision in the Park area should be located in the Soathcoates East / West ward, the only area where residents are outside of a 10 minute catchment area for both parks and gardens and amenity open space. New sites should be designed to maximise their impact and value in the local green space network. In light of quantitative deficiencies it should be ensured that new amenity space is considered as part of any new development in this area.

6.58 In addition to access and quantity issues within the Park area, consideration should also be given to the quality and functionality of sites. Improvements to the quality of sites are as important as providing new sites in areas of deficiency. Map 6.3 demonstrates that all sites to the east of the Park area are relatively poor and calculations indicate that the overall quality of amenity spaces within this area is significantly below other areas of the city with the average site score being only 59%. These sites should therefore be prioritised for improvement in the short term.

| AGS7 | Prioritise poor quality sites for improvement in the Park area. Consider the provision of a new amenity green space site within the Park area located in the Southcoates East ward. Ensure that amenity green space is provided as part of new development. |

Riverside area

6.59 Quantitative analysis reveals that there is insufficient provision of amenity green space to meet current and future demand in the Riverside area. Based on Scenario c, the highest growth scenario, there will be an expected shortfall of 10.20 hectares by 2026.

6.60 Although quantitative analysis reveals there is an undersupply of amenity green space in the area, accessibility mapping illustrates that the majority of residents have access to this type of open space within the recommended 10 minute walk time. This suggests that amenity spaces are perhaps small in size but well distributed.

6.61 The only area of deficiency is the area found in close proximity to the River Hull corridor, in the Myton ward (Figure 6.4). In light of the predominantly industrial nature of this area, and the location of nearby parks, while residents in this area are outside of the catchment of amenity space additional provision would not be required.
6.62 The quality of amenity green space in the Riverside Area is average although like other areas there is significant variation in the quality of sites.

6.63 Further glance at the distribution of amenity spaces in the Riverside Area illustrates that there are clusters of small amenity space sites located in close proximity to each other. This may provide opportunities for the rationalisation of some sites and the investment in larger sites to enhance the overall quality. The HMR programme in Newington and St Andrews may provide a good opportunity.

6.64 Despite the even distribution of spaces, in light of the low quantity of amenity space, any opportunities for new provision in the Riverside Area should be seized. This will be particularly important in the event of population growth.

6.65 While an increase in the quantity of amenity space is required over the longer term, the short term focus should remain on improving the quality and functionality of existing provision and ensuring that the value of new sites is optimised.

AGS8

| Identify a strategy for improvement of the quality of amenity spaces across the Riverside area. |
| Long term, identify opportunities for increased provision of amenity green space within the Riverside area. New developments should contribute towards the provision of amenity space where required. |
West area

6.66 The average quality score achieved by sites in the West area is 61%, suggesting that the quality is worse than in most other areas of the city.

6.67 Accessibility mapping illustrates that nearly all residents located in the West area have access to an amenity green space within the recommended accessibility threshold. Only a small number of residents located in the west of the Boothferry ward do not have access to an amenity green space (Figure 6.5). Application of the quantity standard contrasts with the findings of accessibility mapping, with small shortfalls evident when the standard is applied against both current and future populations.

Figure 6.5 – Deficiencies of amenity green space in the Boothferry ward

6.68 When considering the interrelationship between parks and gardens and amenity space, it can be seen that Costello Playing Fields are located in close proximity to the area where residents do not have access to an amenity green space. All residents outside of the catchment area of an amenity space are within a 10 minute walk of this site. This site provides informal recreation as well as formal sports facilities.

6.69 Given that on the whole access to existing provision is sufficient to meet needs, the focus should be placed on enhancing the quality of amenity spaces and increasing their functionality. Additional amenity space may be required in the longer term.
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Seek to enhance the quality of existing amenity green space sites in the West area, aiming to achieve the recommended quality vision at all sites.
SECTION 6 – AMENITY GREEN SPACE

Wyke area

6.70 A large quantitative shortfall of amenity green space is located within the Wyke area and accessibility mapping reinforces this, indicating that there are a number of areas of deficiency. Specifically, a number of residents in the centre of the Bricknell ward and south of the Avenue ward do not have access to an amenity green space within the recommended 10 minute walk time (Figures 6.6 and 6.7) although most are able to access Bricknell Playing Fields within a 20 minute walk time.

Figure 6.6 – Deficiencies of amenity green space in the Bricknell ward

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)

Figure 6.7 – Deficiencies of amenity green space in the Avenue ward

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)

6.71 Based on Scenario b there will be a shortfall of 16.46 hectares of amenity green space by 2026. The provision of parks and gardens in the area is also insufficient to meet demand in quantitative terms although there are few accessibility deficiencies.

6.72 However, when amalgamating the provision of parks and gardens and amenity green space, accessibility mapping illustrates that nearly all residents have access to either one of these types of open space within the recommended accessibility standard of an amenity green space. There remain some residents however who do not have access to an amenity space or park within a ten minute catchment.
6.73 In light of the large quantitative deficiency, opportunities to provide further amenity spaces in the Wyke area should be considered, particularly longer term in the event of population growth. In particular, new provision should be considered to the north of the Bricknell ward. The lower levels of both amenity spaces and parks means that linkages between existing sites and the quality of current provision takes on greater importance. Opening up access to school sites may also offset this small area of deficiency.

6.74 Shorter term, it should therefore be ensured that existing amenity spaces are of sufficiently high quality to meet the needs of residents. Site assessments suggest that the quality of facilities in Wyke varies less than in other areas, however there remains potential for improvement.
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| Should the opportunity arise, the Council should seek to increase the provision of amenity green space in the Wyke area, particularly focusing on the areas of deficiency within the Bricknell ward. |
| Seek to improve the quality of existing amenity spaces in the Wyke area of the city. |

Summary

6.75 The community interaction benefits of amenity green space are recognised, with residents identifying this type of open space as valuable to the local community.

6.76 Application of the quantity, quality and accessibility standards illustrates the need for qualitative enhancements to a number of existing amenity green space sites. Amenity spaces can be particularly important to local residents in light of their close proximity to the home. Amenity green spaces are also of particular importance in terms of linking residents with open space and in providing links between neighbourhoods. In a sustainable neighbourhood, an amenity space may be the focal point of the local community.

6.77 The application of the quantity standards demonstrates a need for additional provision in five of the seven areas. When also considering the application of the accessibility standards, as well as the interrelationship between amenity green space and other open space types, it is clear that shorter term, the priorities focus around improvement of existing open spaces rather than the creation of new sites.

6.78 While the overall focus is on increasing the quality of amenity spaces, consideration should be given to new provision in the Riverside, Park and Wyke areas. Longer term, it will be important to ensure that new developments include the provision of amenity space in order to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to address the needs of the existing and projected future population.

6.79 It is therefore recommended that the key priorities for the future delivery of provision for amenity green space in Hull that should be addressed through the Hull Development Framework and/or other delivery mechanisms are to:

- facilitate the improvement of the network of existing amenity spaces through the inclusion of appropriate policy and design guidelines in the Hull Development Framework
• seek to improve the quality of amenity green spaces, aiming to achieve a minimum score of 73% at each site

• focus on enhancing the quality of existing amenity green space sites across all areas, focusing particularly on West, Park and Riverside areas

• longer term, identify opportunities for the provision of new amenity spaces within Park, Riverside and Wyke areas

• ensure that new developments contribute towards the provision of amenity green space where they are outside of the recommended catchment of a facility.