

Open Space Study Update



APPENDICES 1 - 6

APPENDIX 1: OPEN SPACE SCORING CRITERIA

Criteria	Assessment guidance	'Non BHCC' open space issues
Access		
1. Access Access to the site - is it easy to get to by road system and other accesses?	... is the site easy to get to by road system and other pedestrian access points? ... is the site prominent within the local area; ie if you are giving people directions would it be easy to describe and locate? ... is the site well served by public transport?	... None specific to non BHCC space.
2. Public access within the site	... if the site was to become public open space, would it be an 'easy access' site which is easy to navigate? ... is the site reasonably flat? ... would it be easy to design access within the space for the public so it could function well and meet the needs of a range of users?	... Need to assume the existing buildings remain and then make judgment about the space that remains. ... Complex sites such as schools are more difficult. ... If site cannot be accessed or overlooked, a 'very poor' score can be given.
Welcoming		
3. Welcoming Entrances attractive and welcoming and well maintained, visible.	... are the entrances to the space well signed and located to attract visitors; ie positioned prominently within the local street scene? ... are there a number of different entrances providing choice, with adequate width to attract users into the space? ... is the setting outside and inside the entrance free of litter/fouling/graffiti, and with good quality horticulture (grass, shrubs etc)	... Need to make a judgment about how the site presents itself in it's existing use and then consider how this will relate to future potential as public space. ... For any future public spaces, the welcome can of course be greatly improved with capital investment and good management.
4. Ambiance. Rating as an attractive place to be.	... is the space within an attractive part of the neighbourhood where the public would choose to spend time? ... is the space noisy and dominated by roads and traffic noise? ... does the space feel open and a place to recharge batteries, or overlooked by buildings and dominated by buildings?	... Reasonably straightforward to assess, sometimes as with other criteria you just need to use your imagination and visualize a future public space and how it might feel.
Design		
5. Design Is site design appropriate to its use	... is the way the space is currently laid out maximising the opportunities for current and future users to enjoy it? ... are the path networks, seating, plantings, and attractions (eg play space, sport, buildings etc) well designed to meet user need? ... is there anything missing which you would expect to find in a space with this typology?	... Difficult with non BHCC space as the assessor can often not access the space, and then you need to make a judgment about design for current use.
6. Design Contribution to look of the neighbourhood	... what impact does the current design of the space have on the overall amenity of the neighbourhood - positive or negative? ... how is the site boundary presented within the wider urban form, is it of high quality? ... does the space feel part of the neighbourhood or separate from it; ie accessible entrances, good views in, boundary walls and tree belts not creating visual barriers etc.	... This criteria works reasonably well for non BHCC space.
Management and maintenance		
7. Condition - general General 'cared for' appearance	... are the standards of grounds maintenance adequate, in terms of cleansing, grass and horticultural features? ... is the main infrastructure in a good condition, including boundary walls and fencing, entrances, signage, plantings, play space, buildings etc?	... Management and maintenance criteria are relatively easy to judge for non BHCC space, as long as the site can be accessed or overlooked. If access is not possible, a N/A score should be given.
8. Furniture - litter bins, seats, signs, lights Provision and maintenance	... is the provision of seats, bins and signage sufficient for the typology and intended use of the site? ... are those facilities which are provided well maintained (eg. clean) and in a good condition (eg. painted)?	... This criteria in terms of provision is more difficult to apply to existing private use. ... Many of the sites do not have these facilities so score '0'
9. Soft landscape Provision and maintenance of soft landscape features	... are the soft landscape features - lawns, borders etc - of a good standard appropriate to the typology? ... are any formal features such as shrub borders and bedding maintained to a good standard? ... are the sites natural features - meadows, trees and woodland, wetland margins etc - well maintained?	... As above, it is more difficult to judge provision for existing non BHCC space. Maintenance is more straightforward, as long as the site can be accessed or overlooked. If access is not possible, a '0' score should be given.
10. Hard landscape Provision and maintenance of hard landscape features	... are the hard landscape areas - paths, car parks, paving etc - provided appropriate to the space and typology? ... is the hard landscape infrastructure well maintained; ie free of litter and detritus, grass arisings, moss and weeds?	... As above, it is more difficult to judge provision for existing non BHCC space. Maintenance is more straightforward, as long as the site can be accessed or overlooked. If access is not possible, a '0' score should be given.
11. Buildings Provision and maintenance of built facilities	... is the provision of buildings within the space appropriate to the site's use and typology? ... are the buildings provided well maintained and in a good condition?	... The aim is to assess buildings that are a function of the open space (such as pavilions). ... Can be difficult for non BHCC space as the buildings are not part of the open space (e.g. university residential buildings, social housing). ... Generally private buildings should not be scored unless they

		are part of the open space.
12. Litter Is there litter on site - could it be improved?	... is the space litter free? ... is there adequate provision of litter bins - and recycling facilities - for the space and typology? ... are the bins provided well maintained and in a good condition?	... This criteria is more important for public spaces, often if not used by public there are no issues of litter and often these spaces are scored '0' ... If there is some access, a score can be given.
13. Dog Fouling Is there dog fouling on site - could it be improved?	... is the space free from dog fouling? ... is there adequate provision of dog poo bins for the space and typology? ... are the bins provided well maintained and in a good condition?	... This criteria is more important for public spaces, often if not used by public there are no issues of litter and often these spaces are scored '0' If there is some access, a score can be given.
Healthy, safe and secure		
14. Safety - Design Does the site feel safe - could better design improve feeling of safety?	... is the layout and design of the site helping to make the most of the space in relation to user comfort and sense of security? ... are there good views into and out of the space, and inter visibility between spaces within the site? ... does the site provide choices and options for those who wish to remain in more public and perceived safer areas?	... One of the more difficult criteria for non BHCC space, as it is often not relevant. ... In terms of site potential, need to use your imagination and visualise a future public space use.
15. Safety - Vandalism Is there evidence of vandalism and other anti-social behaviour (ASB) - could it be made better?	... is there evidence of ASB on site; eg graffiti, vandalized features, broken bottles etc? ... is there a 'zero tolerance' approach taken to the management of ASB and appropriate maintenance regimes in place?	... This criteria often does not apply well to many non BHCC spaces. If site does not have any level of access and ASB is not relevant (eg closed campus school), score the site as '0'
Value		
16. Value for formal recreation Value of site for formal sporting activity	... does the site currently support sporting uses? ... is the site of sufficient size to accommodate formal sports? ... is the topography and layout of the site suitable for sporting use? ... would sporting use potentially have a damaging impact on biodiversity and the natural features of the site?	... Reasonably straightforward. Need to assume the existing buildings remain and focus on the scale and topography of the existing open space.
17. Value for informal recreation Value of site for informal recreational activity	... does the site currently support informal recreational uses? ... is the site of sufficient size to accommodate informal recreation by a significant number of users; ie more than a local dog loo? ... is the topography and layout of the site suitable for informal recreation and functioning as a 'green lung'?	... Reasonably straightforward. Need to assume the existing buildings remain and focus on existing open space, particularly the amount of public space that might be provided.
18. Value to green infrastructure Value as part of the Green Infrastructure (GI) network	... is the site isolated from other green spaces or is it well connected into natural corridors - including public spaces, gardens or other 'backland' natural spaces? ... does the site and those spaces around it have potential to become valuable GI or is the environment 100% built up?	... Connectivity is the key issue with GI, including front and back gardens if they are a significant land use in the local neighbourhood. Isolated spaces can have biodiversity value but minimal GI value.
19. Value for Biodiversity Value of site for biodiversity	... is the site exploiting it's full potential for biodiversity with a range of natural features which are appropriate to the space and typology? ... could the space be transformed by changing the typology and making the site far more biodiverse? ... is this space made more important for wildlife due to the neighbourhood lacking natural green space?	... This criteria looks more at potential and the value that local communities might apply to a local space. Important if the neighbourhood is lacking in green space generally including natural space. Scale is an important consideration, although small green spaces can be valuable.
20. Historic Value Value for heritage/historic purposes	... does the design of the space have an interesting history, perhaps relating to the buildings surrounding it? ... does the site have interesting historic features - such as entrances, boundary walls, statuary etc? ... does the space make a contribution to the wider historic landscape - both urban and suburban/urban fringe?	... A judgment can be made based on the look and feel of the space rather than the assessor needing to have information about any specific historic interest on site.
21. Community Value Value to act as a facility for use by the community	... does the site appear to lend itself to different types of community involvement, such as volunteering, feature adoption, community projects, or direct site management? ... is the site well located in relation to local community facilities - such as a school, church or community centre -and residential areas?	Can be difficult to assess for non BHCC sites as they may have no form of public access, so will often score '1'. An effort can be made to assess potential if the space was accessible.
22. Economic Value Does the site contribute to the economy of City	... does the site provide significant employment? ... does the current use make a contribution to the city economy; eg the sporting or cultural offer? ... does the site make a contribution to tourism in the city?	... This criteria is difficult to apply to most spaces, public as well as non BHCC. Larger secondary schools, arenas and stadia, and sea front facilities would be identified as significant economically.
23. Value for Education Does the site contribute to education	... is the site currently supporting educational use? ... is the site close to an existing educational establishment who might make better use of the facilities? ... does the site's multi functionality lend itself to a wider curriculum?	... Reasonably straightforward to make an assessment. Existing schools will clearly have a stronger weighting with current use assessment.
24. Value for Play. Does the site have any value for play.	... Does the site have equipped play facilities? ... Is there space and or features for informal play?	... Reasonable straightforward to make an assessment if access can b gained
Desk top assessment		

<p>25. Proximity to other open space If the open space is lost, can other open spaces nearby meet the function?</p>	<p>This makes an assessment that if the open space was lost, could its current functions be met by other open spaces nearby. For example, if a play space is lost, could it be replaced on a nearby site? This is very much a judgement, and requires the assess to look at other spaces nearby and see what functions they could meet. This is a yes/no assessment, therefore scores were given as follows: ... not applicable or Yes = 1 ... No = 3</p>	<p>Many of the non BHCC open spaces do not have a clear function, so the assessment can be subjective. For example, a small grass verge has no real function other than limited visual value. If this was removed - would it have an impact on the visual value?</p>
<p>26. Indices of deprivation Ward Rank</p>	<p>This assesses where the open space is located in relation to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). IMD's have been used at ward level and scores given as follows: ... >top 50% nationally = 0 ... top 50% nationally = 1 ... top 25% nationally = 3 ... top 10% nationally = 5)</p>	<p>No issues</p>
<p>27. Designation/ Protection</p>	<p>This assesses where the site is located in relation to any significant local plan designations. There are many designations within the local plan, so key ones were chosen which could have a significant impact on protection. Designations were mapped and overlaid on the open space layer (see section xx). A simple scoring system was applied where if the site fell within a designated area it scored 3, if it did not it scored 1. The following designations were given a score of three: South Downs National Park (SDNP), Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Archaeological Sensitive Areas (ASA), Historic Park & Garden (P&G), National Nature Reserve (NNR), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Conservation Area (CA), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS)</p>	<p>The issue is not specific to non BHCC sites, but applies to all sites. Different designations were not ranked in order of priority or importance as time did not allow this exercise to be undertaken, it is also quite subjective ranking certain designations over others.</p>
Quantity and Access Scores		
Criteria	Assessment Guidance	'Non BHCC' space issues
<p>Quantity against standards Is there sufficient quantity of this type open space in the ward (ha/1000)?</p>	<p>This used the quantitative assessment of each typology at ward level (see section 2.2). The existing quantity was compared to the required quantity (using the 2008 standards). The principle follows that if there is an under provision of a typology in the ward then it scores higher than if there is sufficient provision. The following scores have been used: ... more than -1.0 ha below standard = 5 ... between 0.0 and -1.0 ha below standard = 4 ... between 0.0 and 1.0 above standard = 3 ... more than 1.0 ha above = 2 ... not applicable = 1</p>	<p>Some of the typologies included do not have a recommended standard so they will score 1. This puts typologies with no standard at a disadvantage to other typologies.</p>
<p>Access against standards Is there currently good access to the typology in the area?</p>	<p>This used the access standards for each typology from the 2008 study. Access standards were applied to all open spaces above 0.1 hectares in size and shown on maps (see section 3). Using the typology for each site, an assessment is made on the existing access to that typology. The principle is that if there is currently poor access to that typology, it would score higher than if there was already good access. This is a yes/no assessment, therefore scores were given as follows: ... not applicable or Yes = 1 ... No = 3</p>	<p>Some of the typologies included do not have a recommended standard so they will score 1. This puts typologies with no standard at a disadvantage to other typologies.</p>