



# **SURVEY**

## **MAY/JUNE 2004**

**Friends of Lister Park (FLiP)**  
c/o Lister Park Lodge  
North Park Road  
BRADFORD BD9 4NA

**Telephone 01274 484879**

analysis and report by

## **BRC**

**BRADFORD RESOURCE CENTRE &  
COMMUNITY STATISTICS PROJECT**



**REPORT CONTENTS**

- Introduction and Summary 3
- Lister Park in Context 4
- Friends of Lister Park (FLiP) 5
- Methodology 7
- Results 9
- Conclusions and suggestions for future research 18
- Appendices
  - Manningham and Girdlington PACT Area map 19
  - FLiP survey form 2004
  - FLiP Youth survey form 2002

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Friends of Lister Park would like to thank the following organisations for support with this research project: Neighbourhood Renewal and Bradford Vision for the Neighbourhood Action Planning grant, The Community Statistics Project at Bradford Resource Centre for analysis and report writing and City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council for general support plus office and meeting premises.

In addition, we are grateful to all those involved in administering the surveys, including staff at the Millan Centre and ESOL class tutors from Bradford College based at Trinity Methodist Church.

Finally, we would like to thank everyone who completed a survey form for giving us their time and their views.

## **INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

This report arises out of Bradford Vision's Neighbourhood Action Planning (NAP) process begun by Friends of Lister Park (FLiP) in 2002. Funding was made available in November 2003.

A survey was undertaken by FLiP in May/June 2004 to get the views of park users in order to press for improvements. Taking in the results of both this new research and FLiP's prior youth survey from July 2002, this document draws together the views of over 200 park users.

The responses clearly demonstrate very positive perceptions of the park as a local resource and offer a number of constructive suggestions as to how facilities could be taken forward and developed to better meet the needs of users.

A minority of respondents indicate that they do not feel fully safe in the park during the evening and some issues of anti-social behaviour are also raised. Present policies around access to the park by vehicles are also called into question.



The gardens in front of Cartwright Hall

## LISTER PARK IN CONTEXT

Lister Park (known to some people as Manningham Park) is located in the Manningham area of Bradford, approximately 2km northwest of the city centre.

It began life as a public park in 1870 following Bradford Corporation's purchase of a 22 hectare deer park from local textile magnate Samuel Lister.

Whilst the wider area was one of Bradford's most affluent during the Victorian era, industrial decline and demographic shifts through the 20<sup>th</sup> century left Manningham as one of the city's most deprived areas, changes which found a reflection in the park's own decline.

In 1997, an ambitious £4.2m project was launched to revive the park's fortunes. It aimed at both restoration of original elements of the park, such as the boating lake, and the introduction of new features to better reflect present-day Manningham, notably the Mughal gardens.

In addition to extensive open areas and gardens, Lister Park is also home to the Cartwright Hall art gallery, three multi-sports pitches, two bowling greens, a children's play area and two cafes, one attached to the boating lake.

Thus, the park is clearly a substantial leisure resource for the population in its vicinity – and beyond – particularly given a relative lack of green space in the surrounding areas.

To date, no specific catchment area has been defined for the park that might provide the basis for a statistical profile and comparison to the survey sample. FLiP was therefore advised by Neighbourhood Renewal to reference data<sup>1</sup> for the Manningham and Girlington PACT boundaries (see Appendix 1) - one of ten areas across the District to attract European Objective 2 funding on the basis of deprivation indicators.

2001 Census data for the local PACT area indicates a sizeable youth population - 31% aged under 16 compared to 23% as the District average. Approaching 50% of the population showed as under 25, as against 36% District wide. By contrast, the population over 65 at just below 10%, compares to 16% across the local authority area as a whole.

Figures for ethnicity show that 58.7% of the population indicated as Pakistani, 26.8% as White, 4.3% as Indian, 4% as Bangladeshi and 1.6% as Black<sup>2</sup>, with the remaining 5.5% in mixed or other groups.

---

<sup>1</sup> All data cited is sourced from Census 2001 via the Maps & Stats report for Manningham and Girlington PACT area – see [www.communitystats.org.uk](http://www.communitystats.org.uk) for details of Maps & Stats and [www.statistics.gov.uk/neighbourhood](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/neighbourhood) for Census 2001

<sup>2</sup> In terms of the three Census 2001 categories Black African, Black Caribbean and Black other.

## FRIENDS OF LISTER PARK (FLiP)



The Friends of Lister Park Steering Group was formed in March 2001 as a result of a public meeting called by a group of local residents concerned about the future of the park following the completion of the restoration work. The purpose was to ascertain the interests and concerns of local people and to find out if there was support for a User Group to represent the views of Park users to the authorities.

Over 50 people attended, a number of whom put their names forward to help with the business of setting up a constituted organisation. An initial programme of action was drawn up, a set of aims agreed and a constitution drafted. FLiP was formally launched 12 months later on Sunday March 24<sup>th</sup> 2002.

The aims were that the FLiP should:

- Represent the users of Lister Park.
- Promote Lister Park as a facility that is safe and freely accessible to all groups in the community.
- Act as a forum for views regarding park management, both day-to-day and strategic.
- Take an active part in the management and development of park issues and facilities.
- Work to ensure that the membership of the Group is representative of the users of Lister Park.
- Promote the developments being undertaken at Lister Park by ensuring good communication among park users and potential users.

The first public meeting of FLiP prioritised links with young people, work with people living in nearby residential establishments and pedestrian safety across the roads bordering the Park.

A youth consultation survey event was organised in July 2002 and is detailed later in this report.

The 'Taking Time Memory Workshop' invited older people to contribute photographs and documents relating to the history Park, which were turned into computerised community archive.

Negotiations started in 2002 for safer access for pedestrians crossing on North Park Road and Emm Lane. A report 'One Million Visitors a Year' was prepared and circulated to members and officers of Bradford Council. A petition was circulated in May 2002 and taken to a full council meeting the following September where it received resounding support. It was taken to Bradford West Area Panel 3 months later following which officer time was allocated to do work on preparing a scheme to make North Park Road safer for pedestrians to cross. After the promising start – with £30,000 ear marked for the works, the proposals floundered as a result of political

and administrative changes to Bradford in May 2004. Four months later, FLiP members – from 14 to 90 years - took to the streets to protest at delays and changes of plan.

Other activities FLiP has been involved in:

- producing 3 issues of a newsletter,
- raising funds to equip an office and set up a website:
- FLiP member Veronica Youngson has led walks that have looked at both the botany and local history of the Park;
- supporting 2 successful Council bids for Green Flag status for Lister Park; co-sponsoring a evening of Poetry in the Park, at the Lister Park Coffee Shop (contributions from poets writing in English and Urdu);
- taking part in a day of festivities to mark the completion of the restoration work in Lister Park (in May 2002.)
- participating in the first carol concert in December 2003.

The Neighbourhood Action planning process that has lead to this survey began in 2002 – with a grant being agreed and released in November 2003.

## **METHODOLOGY**

A survey form (see Appendix 2) was designed by members of FLiP comprising two sides of questions, mixing multiple choice and open responses to explore various themes around usage of the park. A final group of questions sought to obtain additional data to profile age, gender, ethnicity and postcode of respondents.

In May/June 2004, survey forms were included as inserts to approximately 1500 FLiP newsletters. These were circulated to the group's 70 members and door-to-door by volunteers in the streets immediately adjacent to Lister Park (approximately 800 houses). In addition, the Manningham and Girdlington PACT project included around 25 copies of the newsletter in a mailshot. The remainder were distributed as bundles to key locations within the park (i.e Cartwright Hall and the Lister Park coffee shop) and in the vicinity (Oak Lane shops, community centres and mosques, plus St Paul's Church, the Manningham One Stop Shop and Surestart projects and tenants at Carlisle Business Centre). A freepost address was provided and 59 returns were received by post<sup>3</sup>.

In addition, two local groups were asked to complete the survey in their regular sessions – an older people's group at the Milan Centre and a women's ESOL class at Trinity Methodist Church. A further 13 completed surveys resulted from this.

Thus, a total of 72 forms were received.

The Community Statistics Project (CSP) was invited to become involved in analysing the results in June 2004 and designed a database into which FLiP volunteers keyed details from the forms. Results are presented in the next section.

### **2002 Youth Survey**

A similar survey aimed at under 18s (Appendix 3) was used by FLiP at a youth consultation event in July 2002, organised in conjunction with the Bradford Youth Development Partnership (BYDP), Bradford Council and the Lister Park Coffee Shop, which acted as host. The event was publicised in advance to a variety of young people's groups and was also promoted on the day by FLiP volunteers encouraging youngsters using the park to get involved. In return for their participation, respondents were offered a voucher for a free boat ride and refreshments. BYDP workers, Lister Park staff and a number of FLiP volunteers worked one-to-one with the young people to complete the forms. 133 returns were obtained in total. The survey results were reported on in the Friends of Lister Park Newsletter and a follow-up event was held for young people who said they wanted to have a say in the Friends group.

For the purpose of this report, CSP was provided with a database collating the 2002 survey returns with a view to making comparisons with the new dataset.

---

<sup>3</sup> In this instance, approximately 4% of the survey forms originally produced were received by postal return. However, unlike questionnaires circulated purely by direct mail, the means of distribution for the newsletter/ survey makes it impossible to estimate the number which were actually received by individuals in the target population. It seems fair to assume that the number would be significantly fewer than the 1500 copies printed. Experience shows that postal surveys mailed directly to addresses generally receive a response rate of 5% to 50%, depending on a variety of factors.



Free boat rides being enjoyed by those who took part in the 2002 FLiP Youth Survey.

## DATA ASSESSMENT

Taken together, the two sets of data gather the views of more than 200 users of the park and thus represent a considerable resource.

In analysing the survey returns, it is also important to acknowledge certain weaknesses and limitations in the methods applied which restrict the scope of the conclusions which may be drawn. Thus, whilst a great many younger people's voices were obtained via the 2002 survey, the 2004 research produced a noticeable shortfall in the number of 18-24s responding relative to the local population as a whole<sup>4</sup>. The effect of targeting two specific group sessions to bolster the postal returns should be noted. This step made a significant contribution to raising the overall sample size and particularly to addressing under-representation of the Pakistani community in other returns (though this remained low). In so doing, it also raised the prominence of the voices of women who were already relatively well covered by the existing returns. Whilst recognising the largely pragmatic rationale of accessibility for choosing these groups and the benefits of so doing, the survey could have been enhanced had means been found to tackle under-representation in a more rounded way.

A planned and systematic attempt to seek returns well matched to Census population profiles would have strengthened the data collected, though it is appreciated that resources were limited in this regard.

There are many strengths to FLiP's first attempts to construct and conduct local surveys, which were undertaken without outside support. There are also useful lessons to be learnt from the process, particularly should the opportunity arise for FLiP to conduct further survey work.

Reference is made to any significant limitations and considerations in analysing the results. Suggestions for strengthening any future research are outlined in the conclusion of this report.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the absence of data on levels of park usage by different groups, the only realistic comparator for establishing an appropriate survey sample size for any given age group is the proportion to be found in local population as a whole.



## RESULTS

Due to the two year interval between the youth and general surveys and the different methods by which the results were obtained and collated, these pieces of work will be kept distinct here, focussing predominantly on the new data (May/June 2004) and drawing comparisons as appropriate from the July 2002 youth data.

However, given the high proportion of younger people in the locality, the earlier survey is recognised of being of considerable overall importance.

### The Sample

The age and gender profile of completed returns show a relative over-representation of women and older people compared to the adult population as a whole. In this instance, women represented 68% of all respondents (Q12) while 26% identified as 60 plus (Q13) - as against approximately 19% of adults<sup>5</sup> in the PACT area on Census 2001. As already noted, a particularly low proportion of 18-24s were reached by this research.

The FliP survey sought to use 2001 Census classifications for ethnicity. At 36% of the sample, the views of those identifying as Pakistani (Q15) are clearly understated compared to the 59% of the local population who are identified as such on official figures. Numbers were small for all other groups except White British (33), which together with the 'Other white Background' category made up 50% of the sample. Three respondents did not provide an answer to this question<sup>6</sup>.

Four individuals from the 66 who answered Question 2 (6%) identified as disabled in relation to limitations in their use of the park. By comparison, data from Census 2001 provides details of responses to a statement related to long-term illness and disability which limit work and/or daily life, including age-related conditions. Around 18% of people locally identified with this definition, with figures strongly skewed toward older age groups.

A total of 67 respondents provided postcode information (Q14). 60% indicated an address in BD9 (the area immediately West and North of the park) and 25% in BD8 (immediately South below Oak Lane and including properties to the East, on the other side of Manningham Lane). BD18 (including Frizinghall) was cited by three respondents and other postcodes given ranged as far as BD5, BD15 and, in one instance, Leeds.

### Park Usage Data

Question 1a on use of the park was answered by all respondents - 19% indicated daily visits, 36% weekly and 11% monthly. The remaining third of survey returns were from 'occasional' users.

---

<sup>5</sup> In terms of persons aged 16+

<sup>6</sup> Layout and presentation of Q15 had a flaw in section headings due to the omission of Asian/British Asian above the four categories offered. It is impossible to assess any influence this may have had in completion but the categories as presented did not attract comment from respondents.

On question 3, three quarters of respondents indicated that they walk to the park on some or all visits. A third of respondents mentioned use of cars to access the park, two mentioned cycling and two public transport.

For two thirds of those who mentioned car usage, this was their sole means of accessing the park, whereas one third also mentioned walking, either as an alternative or in combination (those possibilities are impossible to distinguish from the data).

Whilst sample numbers are small, no car user indicated themselves to be disabled on the survey. All respondents who identified as having a disability which limited their access to the park also indicated that they walked to do so.

## **Activities**

Respondents were offered a list of activities they might do and facilities they might use when visiting the park and were asked to tick all that applied. They also had the opportunity to write in anything not listed. All but one respondent gave information in this section.

63 indicated walking, 41 use of Cartwright Hall, 31 use of the coffee shop, 29 use of the play area, 16 use of boats, 7 cycling and 3 use of multisports facilities.

Most questionnaires had 2 or 3 options ticked in this section. The structure of the question does not allow an assessment to be made of the relative importance of the activities indicated to each individual or the frequency with which they form part of their visits.

In addition to the specified options, a number of reasons for visiting the park which were not suggested on the survey form were written in. 15 respondents (21%) added such a note – enjoyment of the botanical gardens figured four times; bowling, picnicking and feeding the ducks twice; tennis, jogging, reading, attending events, drawing and photography and accompanying children cycling were also mentioned. The write-in nature of these responses are likely to mean the frequencies understate the extent of these activities – research experience shows that most survey respondents will tend to stick to listed options even if not comprehensive.

In analysing the data, the responses of more frequent users (i.e. the 40 daily and weekly users) were specifically looked at with regard to usage patterns. In most respects, this did not suggest dramatically different usage patterns to less frequent users – except that boating appeared to be more favoured amongst regular visitors than less frequent ones. Not surprisingly, however, it was the more regular users who listed the vast majority of additional activities not covered by the multi-choice options, suggesting additional weight should be added to these in profiling park usage.

Question 7 explored sports use of the park for football, tennis, cricket and basketball specifically plus others as a write-in option. 25 respondents (35%) provided information in this section. Football received 13 mentions, tennis 6, cricket and basketball 3 each. These answers perhaps suggest higher usage of the multi-sports courts than the number who ticked under that terminology under question 4. Of the

write-in responses running, walking and play with children received two mentions each.

The survey provides a limited perspective on the proportion of park use by people as individuals as against being part of family or other groups. Question 6 sought to find out who respondents 'usually visit the park with' but its options were restrictive. Since no option box is offered for those who generally visit alone, it is not possible to distinguish these individuals from those who chose not to answer the question (this applies to 10 out of 72 surveys). It is notable that several forms had written comments to this question, mostly to the effect of 'visit alone', though no space was provided for them.

Almost 70% of respondents who chose an option for this question indicated that they normally visit with family. Just short of a third of answers mention a wife or partner. 39% mention visiting with friends.

## Views

A total of 65 respondents answered yes to question 5 - 'Do you like the improvements in the park?' – 100% of all those who gave a clear response. Detailed views on this topic were not directly explored by a follow-up but were a substantial part of responses to the open comments section of the survey at Q10.



The Mughal Gardens - created as part of the refurbishments begun in 1997

Sections 8 and 9 covered perceptions of safety. At Q8, 90% of the 67 people who offered a clear yes/no response said that they felt safe in the park.

In total, 71 respondents provided some information for part of Q8 and, to some extent, these depart from the structure of the question as designed.

Respondents who answered no (7) were given the opportunity to indicate the time bands where they felt unsafe in summer. 8am-12pm was mentioned by two of the seven, 12pm-4pm by one individual and 4pm to 8pm received three mentions. Of the five respondents who answered neither yes or no at 8 – or both, three ticked that the park felt unsafe 4pm-8pm.

In addition, nine of those who said they did feel safe, and thus might have been expected to skip the remainder of the question, nevertheless ticked against one or

more times at Q8a. Thus, 8am-12pm was mentioned by three individuals, 12pm-4pm by one and 4pm to 8pm by five.

A total of 11 respondents (15% of those addressing the question in full or part) indicated a perception of some safety concerns in the late evening.

Whilst the views of these individuals are clearly important, it is notable that, despite a question which gave every opportunity to respond otherwise, a very high proportion of respondents appeared to perceive the park as safe - without qualification.

In the structure of the questionnaire, Q9 'What makes you feel unsafe?' operates as a leading question - i.e. it should properly be attached to Q8a aimed at those who have indicated safety concerns not at all respondents. Instead, two options were offered – 'Not enough staff about' and 'Not enough cameras'.

In the event, 27 respondents gave information for this question. 20 of these ticked against lack of staff, while 10 ticked against cameras. Two written comments were given under a question on improving safety – one indicating a concern over fast cars being driven in the park, the other regarding the presence of parked cars in the park – issues thematically linked with comments in the next section.

Questions 8 and 9 introduced a clear focus on safety issues to the survey and did so directly before inviting general comments. In this context, it would not be surprising to find safety concerns achieving a high prominence in the overall results. In fact, this proved not to be the case.

## **General Comments**

Question 10 invited respondents to give 'any other comments about the park' and 44 people chose to do so. These comments represent a rich source of feedback about the park and thus direct quotes are drawn on extensively here.

The majority of individuals used the opportunity to make positive comment about the park.

Recurring themes were the beauty of the park, a positive view of the changes made and a feeling that the park is a real asset to the area...

*"It is remarkably beautiful since the refurbishment"*

*"Looks good / well used"*

*"I like Lister park because it's clean, beautiful and big."*

*"It is a joy to use the park. I live at Wrose but bring my granddaughter to play."*

*"The Regeneration has been well done"*

*"It's brilliant. The best effort for years in Manningham"*

*"It's a wonderful asset to the area, and is kept clean and tidy by staff."*

*"There is a good range of facilities & gardens in the Park, these seem to attract a range of ages and cultural groups to the Park".*

A number of constructive suggestions were made:

Activities and promotion

*"I would like more performances in Park such as Theatre, Live Music (Pop, Reggae, Rock) at the bandstand etc"*

*"More publicity, e.g. posters in Heaton Village about events in the Park"*

*"would welcome family events in the Park, at more convenient times."*

*"Bring back the Mela"*

Facilities

*"Can we have a small paddling pool?" (Mentioned twice)*

*"We need more swings for small children and babies"*

*"Lack of water fountains, drinking source!"*

*"more seating spread around with bins by them"*

*"Signs to educate litter droppers - extra litterbins"*

*"Along the walkway from the Bandstand to the Botanical Gardens it would be good to have more seats, and some facing the Sun on the other side. Also more seats on walkway along North Park Rd side, at present seats are too far apart, and too far for old people to do in one go, (They need to rest)."*

Toilet facilities in the park were a notable theme:

*"The public toilets at Oak Lane are very poor, but those in the coffee house are very good."*

*"More public toilets, please"*

*"Public toilets - Oak Lane not open until comparatively late."*

As was the presence of cars in the park

*"I don't like the cars driving through the park."*

*"It has been made into a road, except there are no pavements - people are encouraged to park there through indicating arrows that lead them to designated parking areas. All this needs to be abolished."*

*"disabled parking only within the park."*

NB. Two negative comments about cars in the park were also made under question 9c.

Several users commented about misuse of facilities, vandalism and safety issues

*"I notice adults and children skateboarding on the sloping paths where people are walking and feel this is dangerous (far side parallel to Emm Lane). I notice recently teenage boys on motorised 2 wheel scooters on paths in botanical garden. Machines were noisy and I feel in wrong place."*

*"The night light should be switched off at 10 or 11pm because people are coming to the Park (some at 2am) and making a lot of noise which interferes with local residents' sleep. If the park was unlit at night, this might deter some of them from coming."*

*"Certain areas need to be protected from general use, e.g. Bowling Greens, maybe public notices could be introduced so that culprits could be made aware of no playing football etc- it would help those who need to address this issue."*

*"To stop small children falling in the lake, we need a low fence all round"*

*"In the play area, most of the things are now vandalised, or broken. I would like them repaired and ... more equipment and a bigger climbing frame."*

*"Put cameras in botanical gardens and watch over teenagers who sit and view visitors, think it is a great ambush area or possibly drug dealing area. Get rid of top seats to stop suspect persons coming to botanical gardens otherwise I feel area is dangerous to travel alone.... Lower seating OK because visible to walkers."*

*"More cameras or security guards patrolling"*

*"Cameras will make the park feel more dangerous"*

*"A visible 'Parkie' would be a great improvement - one who can talk about the parks History/Botany would be excellent, but even anyone just to keep a eye on kids chucking rubbish in the lake would do for starters!"*

Overall, the results of the survey present a positive picture of the way the park is regarded by its users and also point the way toward possible improvements.

Particularly since they were given specific focus, some safety issues do clearly emerge alongside concerns regarding 'anti-social behaviour'.

## **COMPARISONS WITH THE 2002 YOUTH SURVEY**

Returns from the younger age group show lower response rates for individual questions, have less expansive comments overall than the 2004 data and are obviously shaped by the assistance of adults and sharing of ideas with peers in their completion. Nevertheless, a number of themes of clear importance to young people emerge and there is great benefit to taking a fresh look at this data alongside the new survey.

The sample of 133 people aged 18 and under gathered the views of proportionately more males (approximately two thirds) and more Asian respondents (approximately 60%) than the new data – though it should be noted that representation of those

identifying as Pakistani of both genders still fell below that for the age group in question in the PACT area<sup>7</sup>.

The sample achieved a fairly even split of respondents for the age groups 7-10, 11-14 and 15-18, while also getting replies from a small number of under 7s.

A common theme with the 2004 survey is that a significantly higher proportion of respondents were from BD9 addresses than from BD8 - 63% against 17% of responses given. This lends further weight to the appearance that park usage may be somewhat uneven between those to the north and west edges (BD9) and those to the south and east (BD8). However, it is recognised that a variety of other factors could have contributed to this pattern in the two surveys and this inference should thus only be drawn with a degree of caution.

Overall, the youth survey captured a higher proportion of daily/weekly users (at 75%).

Notably higher for this age group were access to the park by cycle and cycling within the park as an activity – mentioned by 46% of respondents. Multi-sport usage was cited by 54% of surveys.

Satisfaction with improvements was high at 95% of those responding.



One of three multi-sports courts in Lister Park

The survey provided two questions inviting open comments – 10-1 ‘How could it be improved?’ (after ‘What makes you feel unsafe?’ - see earlier comments about question design), plus space for general comments at number 11. In practice, the pattern of responses departed significantly from this structure – comments were often given under other at 10c and those at 10-1 were often praise for the park and bore no relation to safety or improvements. As a result, all written feedback across these questions has been taken together in order to identify themes.

Where comment was provided, it was generally brief and positive:

*“facilities good”*

*“friendly - play football a lot”*

---

<sup>7</sup> In addition to 53 respondents who identified as Pakistani, 23 identified as ‘Other Asian’ which may indicate a greater unease with the appropriateness of Census 2001 categories amongst this age group.

*"like play area"*

*"park is all good"*

*"like it - splash in fountains"*

*"park good for kids"*

While specific facilities were rarely picked out, perhaps surprisingly, enthusiasm for the fountains was most prevalent, referred to on three forms. Suggestions for improvements were not common but some ideas did emerge...

*"Bike lanes needed"*

*"BMX; ice rink, tracks marked"*

*"Café all year"*

*"More swings"*

*"More things for children to do"*

*"Tennis courts – more"*

*"Shelter near play area"*

*"roundabout - better one"*

*"swimming pool – indoor"*

More and improved toilets were repeatedly mentioned, as with the adult survey, and cars in the park also drew negative comment.

## **Safety issues**

At 71% (approximately equal for both genders), the number saying they felt safe in the park (Q5) was lower than for the adult age group covered by the 2004 results. However, without data for young people's perceptions of safety in other settings (which might also be presumed to be lower than for adults) it would be unwise to infer too much from this difference between the two surveys.

Of those with some concerns, themes around bullying and fears around certain adults were prominent - e.g. specific mention of 'alcoholics', 'drug takers' and 'creepy men'.

In terms of suggestions for safety improvements, better lighting figured repeatedly in comments and by far the single most common theme was more staff...

*"rangers visible – more"*

*"staff - employ more"*

*"people walking about – more"*

*"security patrols –regular"*



Eighteen forms clearly put this forward, with an additional one making reference to the police. Thus, in keeping with adult respondents, numerous children across the age range indicated that more and more visible staffing in the park would help assuage some of their concerns.

Whilst it must be noted that question 10 offered 'more staff' as a selectable option, thereby introducing the idea, the same treatment of 'more cameras' did not result in this being widely echoed in comments – only 3 forms did so, all of them as their sole comment across the two open questions. Comments regarding staffing were both more plentiful and more expansive.

The other safety suggestion offered regarding the park environment was a comment for the 'removal of hedges', which appeared to tie in with concerns of bullying and 'being jumped'.

Overall, whilst recognising the restrictions of a written survey in obtaining developed views from this age group, the under 19s surveyed in 2002 demonstrated a strong enthusiasm for the park and some clear ideas regarding safety. Their views form a vital complement to those obtained from adults in the more recent research.

## CONCLUSIONS

Despite some concerns emerging, the overall feedback on Lister Park was positive and supportive across both surveys. The park was clearly highly valued amongst those who took part in the research.

Most respondents indicated that they found the park a safe environment to be in.

Whilst the issue of extending CCTV camera coverage was specifically explored by the surveys, this did not find wide support. Instead, users noted the role of park design and lighting in ameliorating problems and creating a feeling of safety. The valuable role of park staff came through particularly strongly in this regard.

Of themes not specifically raised by survey questions, it is notable that users volunteered several concerns over the presence of cars in the park, both in terms of inappropriateness and safety. Concern at limited toilet facilities was also an obvious recurring theme across the age range.

Undoubtedly the most valuable aspect of the survey was obtaining open-ended comments from park users, representing a broad range of views above and beyond those facilitated by the multiple choice options used. This report has therefore highlighted those comments extensively via direct quotes which it is hoped will prove valuable to FLiP and others involved in planning the future of the park.

### Scope for further research

To date, the scope of survey work undertaken by FLiP has necessarily been limited by lack of funding and volunteer time. Nevertheless, valuable information and experience have been gained<sup>8</sup>.

Data remains lacking on overall levels, patterns and types of usage of Lister Park – the kind of information that might be provided by an exit survey over an appropriate time-frame.


Similarly, there would be a clear value to survey work which explored the perceptions of non park users in the locality. This might hope to identify obstacles which might be overcome or facilities which might be developed to increase access to the site.

Research into both aspects would doubtless be of value to FLiP and other local agencies should the resources become available to pursue it.

---

<sup>8</sup> To back this research experience and in addition to comments made in the body of this report, the Community Statistics Project has provided FLiP with an additional report detailing constructive suggestions for improving future research work.

**APPENDIX 1 – Manningham and Girlington PACT Area**



The target area that FLiP agreed with the Neighbourhood Renewal Team took in residents living adjacent to the roads immediately surrounding the Park. For the purposes of survey analysis, it was decided to compare data for the whole of the area deemed as Manningham and Girlington PACT.