

2016 consultation response to new parks byelaws proposals

1. Public or stakeholder comments received outside of online consultation portal
2. Comments received from Bristol's Neighbourhood Partnerships



COMMENTS RECEIVED OUTSIDE OF ONLINE CONSULTATION PORTAL

Dear Bristol City Council

PROPOSED NEW BYELAWS FOR PLEASURE GROUNDS, PUBLIC WALKS AND OPEN SPACES – January 2016

I refer to the consultation about the above new Byelaws.

Thank you for asking for comments.

We have considered the byelaws in two meetings; and asked for comments via our March Newsletter. We had a few responses.

We would like to make the following detailed comments:

- We ask why the improved Public Open Space at Kingswear Road is not included in the areas to be covered.
- We ask that the Council confirm to people whether foraging for personal use is allowed on sites – or not. Byelaw 4 refers. Foraging, whether for blackberries, fruits and fungi is an important use of the Slopes which we do not wish to see blocked.

Finally, we have strong reservations about whether the byelaws will actually have any benefits for us. This is due to the chance that enforcement on the Slopes will be a low priority for resources. This makes us feel that while beneficial to many other parks/open spaces, the benefits to us of the Byelaws will be limited.

The Northern Slopes Initiative

I am secretary of the South Bristol Model Aircraft Club. Our club was started in 1947 and was originally based in the Bedminster area. Over the years we flew models in various parks in Bristol – eventually ending up in the position of having only Hengrove Park available. We are a very “traditional” club in that we fly freeflight and control-line models (no R/C models). Many years ago when flying at Hengrove we started encountering problems with youngsters on scrambler motorcycles deciding it would be “fun” to cut across where we flew – in the circumstances we felt obliged, in the interest of safety , to abandon the use of Hengrove Park. Our flying has now to be spread amongst various sites outside of Bristol which is rather unfortunate. I feel it would be good if we were once again able to fly locally.

Looking back many years model flying regularly took place in public spaces and this was the way most people , including myself, got into model making and flying – by seeing ,enquiring and then getting involved. We still see model flying as a worthwhile hobby. All our members build their own models (some also designing their own models) and this teaches construction skills, flying and trimming skills and gets people into the outdoor environment. Thus – if we were able to fly locally on public land – then the interest could possibly be encouraged once more.

The space requirements for control-line flying and freeflight models are totally different to radio control models. If you are not familiar with control-line and freeflight (as many people aren't) then I would be very happy to discuss it further – either in person or by 'phone.

Yours sincerely,

p.s. By the way – when reading the byelaws I was struck by the mention of model aircraft being defined as under 7kgs. I hope that no-one takes this to mean that larger models are not covered by the byelaws and can be flown on any public space?

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to write to express my grave concern about a new bylaw. If this is not the right forum please direct me to the correct place.

Your proposed bylaws state

4. (1) No person shall without reasonable excuse remove from or displace within the ground:

(a) any barrier, post, seat or implement, or any part of a structure or ornament provided for use in the laying out or maintenance of the ground; or

(b) any stone, soil or turf or the whole or any part of any plant, shrub or tree.

The wording of this clearly makes foraging illegal. No more parents would be able to take their children out blackberry picking as part of family bonding. Whilst I appreciate the need to look after our parks, the wording must be changed. You said yourselves "The idea of the bylaws is not to stop enjoyment of parks and green spaces but to control unacceptable behaviour that detrimentally affects others." Unfortunately outlawing foraging would undoubtedly stop any enjoyment I have of parks and green spaces.

Making daisy chains would be illegal. Children would become lawbreakers from a simple pastime which children have been enjoying for generations. You said yourselves regarding a different bylaw, "We have taken out bylaws associated with children's play, ball games, climbing and skateboarding". The wording of this bylaw must be changed to stop children becoming criminals.

How can you possibly pass a bylaw which states "No person shall displace any stone"? The wording must be changed.

Connecting people with the land is so important and banning foraging is a major blow to the development of Bristol as a "foodie" city. Bristol has a reputation as a trendy, friendly great place to eat and socialise. Some of the city's trendiest chefs would certainly fall foul of this new bylaw. Although I appreciate your desire to protect the parks and green spaces, the wording of this bylaw must be changed. People should be allowed to enjoy the fruits of nature if they are not causing any damage or harm to the environment.

I appreciate that you've said "We will obviously take a common sense approach and these bylaws are absolutely not designed to stop people enjoying our parks and green spaces. The bylaw in question is only intended to protect plants (and other things) from damage, not to stop berry picking. We have no intention of preventing responsible people from making good use of our natural resources, as long as they are not causing any damage to the plant or its surroundings or wildlife that feed on it. Our consultation asks people to identify the impact they see it having, which will help us avoid unintended consequences." Please listen to the voice of the people and change the wording of this bylaw.

Yours with concern,

I am a daily visitor to Brandon Hill with my dog. I was listening to the Radio and heard that old park bylaws that were no longer relevant were about to be removed from our modern bylaws.

Whilst I can agree with some of these historical laws going, I feel that the ruling by Elizabeth 1st that the local women of Hotwells could use the park for their laundry is a bylaw that should be kept.

Of course, no one intends to put washing out on the hill, but it is still a story that makes Hotwells proud.

I would also add that the main Park Keeper at Brandon Hill is a Superstar who keeps our park immaculate and should you ever have an employee of the year he should certainly be on it. Many visitors remark on the beauty of our park and it is a testament to the hard work done by this man.

I am seeing stories about the Council proposing a make a byelaw prohibiting the picking of brambles.

If true, this is a bad law, serves no purpose and shows the council acting ultra vires. Please let me know the situation, thanks.

Find out if the story is true and squash the stupid byelaw.

I've seen references on social media to your proposed by-laws and the effects these could have on, for example, blackberry picking.

I'm not a Bristol resident, but would urge you to think very carefully about the wording of your new by-laws and what the effects could be, lest this sort of thing should spread.

It does sound as if people have over-reacted a bit in calling these 'laws to ban blackberry picking'. I'm sure your intentions are to prevent wanton damage to trees and plants, and most would applaud your efforts. But if this were to result in people being unable to enjoy the free food that grows in our fields and parks, that would be tragic and counter-productive. Harvesting is not damaging!

best wishes

I felt I had to write to say that I support fully a ban on foraging of hedgerows by people.

Over the years I have noticed a substantial increase in numbers of people stripping hedgerows bare, with almost industrial scale foraging.

They fail to see that their selfish actions deny many mammals from dormice and hedgehogs, to many species of birds a valuable food source.

I would hope that this were to be a national law, and the public educated about the reasons behind it.

Thank you for taking this sensible approach, I do hope you have success.

I take it this is scaremongering by somebody. You wouldn't seriously think about banning the foraging of blackberries would you – nobody's that out of touch with reality! J
Good joke.

Prevent Blackberrying under new bye-laws? Just No!

I would like to place my views on section

4. (1) No person shall without reasonable excuse remove from or displace within the ground:

(b) any stone, soil or turf or the whole or any part of any plant, shrub or tree.

As someone who spends a good deal of time in the countryside, and parks regularly, I am careful not to take from nature plants that are rare, protected, or serving as a nest or such like for wildlife. I do not take indiscriminately or inconsiderately, or in any great quantity. I trust that the majority of people using public spaces do likewise.

It would be a shame to see time honoured traditions such as blackberrying made illegal in Bristol. Even in scant years I see the same bushes picked and picked again and yet there are always berries left and withering long after the birds have had what they need. I don't think that this sort of activity is in any way problematic.

I understand this law is most likely mainly to protect ornamental plants such as bedding and trees. I would like to see a distinction made so that traditional leisure activities can continue, as for many people like myself, picking blackberries and apples in the hedgerows is half the fun and point of parks.

I watch with interest.

I've just noticed Site No 354 Penfield Rd, Children's Play Ground, Ashley, is excluded from these bye-laws. Two points about this 1. It hasn't been a playground for years 2. The Miners Arms pub next to it uses it as a garden, and there's been a steady stream of complaints about noise and litter, but it's obviously not been logged as this space. Is there any scope for changing this at this stage, please?

In Schedule one of the parks byelaws consultation, The Ridings Open Space, Peart Drive is listed under areas where antisocial behaviour has not been reported. It most definitely has been reported there. I have made numerous reports myself concerning motorcycle nuisances, a problem for many years. Please amend as appropriate.

Dear Parks,

As the by-laws plans are unchanged since the previous consultation last year, my response is also unchanged from that given in a statement to the Council's Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee last year:

Can I start by thanking Council officers for the work that has been put in to taking this work forward since the last revision. The current proposal is a substantial improvement over the previous iteration, which was unacceptable to me for numerous well-known reasons.

I particularly welcome the removal of bye-laws that would have banned: tree climbing, adults without children in play areas, "annoying" skateboarding, "annoying" ball games, "annoying" noise. Indeed, I'm delighted by the complete excising of the word "annoying" from the whole bye-laws report!

You will no doubt be pleased to hear that the number of my objections has been reduced therefore to just two:

* The ban on erecting any unauthorised "structure" will include "sun tents" (sometimes used by families on hot days to shade children and babies) and wind breaks.

* The ban on BBQs everywhere except designated areas is a de-facto total ban on BBQs as there aren't currently any designated areas. Bearing in mind that most people in the city centre don't have gardens, this would be a ban on them ever BBQ-ing.

I note the commitment to consult on designated areas for BBQs in spring 2016, but

there is no commitment in the paper that there will definitely be any such areas. Banning BBQs first, and then trying to find spots where they should be re-legalised, effectively puts the decision into the hands of parks friends groups who generally are, and probably always will be, mostly opposed to BBQs in principle. Now, I love our local parks friends groups and the superb work they do for the city - heck, I set one of them (Friends of Brandon Hill) up! However, they aren't always representative of the wider public, and their dislike of BBQs is in my opinion not reflected among the wider public. (The original consultation, done while students were on holiday, only showed 50/50 support for the BBQ ban).

Therefore I would like to see a commitment from the Council to ensuring that there will indeed be at least a small number of parks where designated BBQ areas are created, such that - for example - no one is more than a mile from a park with one, particularly in central Bristol. I see the goal is to have the bye-laws in place for summer 2016, which doesn't leave much time for building any designated BBQ stands ready for the summer BBQ season.

Finally, I would like to raise a concern on paragraph 28: "No person shall without the consent of the Council hold or take part in any public show or performance." Clarification is need here on whether this would cover such things as a "Speakers corner" speeches, stilt-walkers, clowns, jugglers, mime-artists, buskers, etc - all people who don't charge money, but obviously are performing.

P.S. The report says: "We are not unusual - most other Councils..." - We are unusual. We are Bristol.

Therefore please submit the above as my response to the consultation.

To Whom It May Concern,

Just wanted to express my discontent at the proposed banning of model aircraft, could you please provide justification for this seemingly unprompted attack on hobbyists?

I am aware that there has been graffiti on bins in the park and around the entrance.

There has also been graffiti on the routes into the park

Dog fouling has been a problem before. Some people won't go to the park for this reason.

There has been side waste left around bins including barbecues.

Does this count?

Also I believe that the residents of the Muller Orphanage flats have reported ASB before (I think)

My concerns are essentially around what must be a policy decision to "fence in" the

children whilst allowing dogs to have free rein over the rest of the open space. Even in areas (like my own) with large gardens , people prefer to take their dogs to local parks and , whilst I'm sure they would tell me it's a minority, there are significant numbers who do not collect their faeces or control them .

I just don't see why the vociferous voices of dog owners should take priority over the needs and wishes of all other users.

Specifically I use Mowbray Green, the park between Broad Walk and Redcatch Rd at Knowle and, the cycle path between Hazelbury and Sturminster.

The only clear solution would be to only allow dogs and their owners within the confined areas leaving the rest of the space for the faeces and fear free use of the majority. That must reflect a policy approach and, now understand that to be outside of the by law framework. Our green spaces are increasing valuable , will become more heavy used by everyone and , it's pretty clear to me that the way a number of dog owners use them compromises that community value.

Presumably you could confirm that the current segregation arrangements are as a result of a policy and, who /what councillors hold responsibility for those policies.

Thanks in advance for your help and I appreciate your clarifying the by law position. I fail to understand why this exercise seems to continue avoidance of the major issue of dog nuisance in parks and open spaces. It's by far the most intrusive and dangerous nuisance in the majority of parks I use. It incorporates fouling .uncontrolled dogs and, overuse of shared spaces by owners who seem to see parks as being entirely for their dogs benefit.

Can anyone explain the current by laws on this and why, if the face of what I know to be concerns from other park users the opportunity to deal with this is being avoided?

Castle Park – private event Love Saves The Day festival caused damage to grass which ruined many Bristol residents' enjoyment of the park.

I write to complain in the strongest terms about the wording of the current Bristol City Council Parks Bye-Law Consultation. I am writing to you as the Council's Code of Good Practice in Consultations recommends this. The consultation is flawed and badly worded at best and is down right prejudiced against angling at worst.

Anyone wishing to support the future of fishing on Bristol Parks waters has no simple way of making their feelings known. Despite the consultation being in a multiple choice, click the button format, a respondent has no way of voting to continue angling in any Bristol park, without having to write explaining themselves in the free text box. The wording of the question is confusing and what's worse people with entirely opposing ideas are being asked to click exactly the same choice.

Anyone who has no objection to fishing, who does not wish to see angling banned at either St George's Park or any other venue (in reality Eastville Park) must select either the "disagree" or the "Strongly Disagree" option. But that is exactly the same option that needs to be selected if you DO want angling to be banned in both parks. It is then left to the respondent to explain what they mean by use of free text. For this

reason alone, the question is very badly worded, how on earth can you have a situation where people with directly opposing views are asked to vote exactly the same way ?

I am concerned that there will be no way of reporting the results of the consultation publicly without showing all comments made, as there is no way of identifying if people are entirely for banning angling or entirely against banning angling without access to all comments. This means it will be virtually impossible to accurately report on the consultations findings.

Furthermore I am aware that the consultation was open for some time without there being any opportunity to take into account those who support fishing at all and that the current version of the question is a re-hash of the original even more badly worded question. Will all responses received prior to the wording changed be deemed null and void ?

The overall tone of the consultation is not objective and thereby in breach of its own Code of Good Practice. My understanding of the process based on my conversation with you, is that the whole purpose of the consultation is to decide on where within council controlled waters fishing should be allowed. Instead the consultation doesn't talk about allowing fishing anywhere, it talks only about where fishing should be banned.

I am also at a loss to actually understand the process here, the wording of the question suggests that fishing has now been banned on one Bristol Parks water (St George's Park) without waiting for the results of the consultation anyway. It says that the "decision" was made by St George's Neighbourhood Partnership, the same group who also made the unjustifiably cruel decision to kill healthy, viable fish rather than go to the expense of having them moved to other waters, when the lake needed drained for repairs. It is my understanding that this decision too was taken without consulting any of the local fishing interests. It took the intervention of the Angling Trust to save these fish by helping to find new homes for them. How does a consultation of where fishing should be allowed, work if local interest groups are being allowed to make the decisions before the consultation even takes place ?

My belief is that the current consultation questions in respect of fishing should be scrapped , being not fit for purpose, and the issue of fishing should be removed from the byelaw consultation in its entirety as a result.

Yours

National Regions Manager | Angling Trust

We have a number of concerns, primarily the restricting of model aircraft flying to just Hengrove Park, I have had a number of responses to a request for information from our members and a number fly quite safely and lawfully at the Blaise Castle Estate and it would seem sensible for a number of reasons to give serious consideration to having a second site where powered model aircraft flying can take place, especially as this site is to the north of the city.

We are also concerned that the byelaw as worded will also prevent the flying of what

amounts to light weight radio controlled toys and we would much prefer a lower weight limit stipulating such as 500gm so powered aircraft below this can be flown. Could we put forward an amendment to the interpretation of "model aircraft" to be

"model aircraft" means an aircraft which weighs more than 0.5kg but not more than 7 kilograms without its fuel;

We would still like to arrange a meeting, Thursday 7th April would be convenient, this would also give me the opportunity to conduct a flying site assessment at the Blaise Castle estate.

Could you tell me if you have considered any other locations for model aircraft flying apart from Hengrove Park? Also up until the consultation had you received any complaints about model aircraft flying?

Kindest Regards

Club Support Officer

The Society of Model Aeronautical Engineers Limited

T/A The British Model Flying Association

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM BRISTOL'S NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIPS

Avonmouth and Kingsweston	Encouraged members to comment online. No NP comment.
Bishopston Cotham and Redland	Parks groups to comment direct. No NP comment.
Dundry View	<p>The Neighbourhood Committee / Partnership received a verbal summary of the recommendations from the Pride of Place sub group reference Park Bye laws.</p> <p>In discussion the following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pride of Place had discussed the Byelaws thoroughly but had been unable to come to a final view due to the short timescale given for consideration. • Councillors raised concern that Hengrove Park was the only area named in Bristol for the flying of drones. It was suggested that Officers find and name other spaces for drone flying, to prevent Hengrove Park being inundated in the future. • Residents felt that the language contained in the Byelaws was difficult to interpret and should be written in much clearer language so that the intention of the Byelaw could be understood. • Residents could still submit their individual comments to the consultation online. Action: All residents <p>The Neighbourhood Partnership AGREED to submit the views of the Pride of Place sub group to the Byelaws consultation to include the additional comments arising.</p>
Horfield and Lockleaze	<p>ESG commented as group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group welcome the upgrading and feel that Parks seemed to have listened well to the 2013 consultation, particularly around barbecues. • The group agreed that the byelaws should cover all sites in Bristol where it is possible to have a byelaw, for consistency. • There was agreement that all commercial activities in parks should be regulated. <p>Protection of structures and plants This needs to interpreted in a reasonable way, particularly around picking fruit eg blackberrying, community orchards, vegetable beds. Parks would need to apply the sustainability test over the quantity and frequency of the removal of material. Consideration also needs to be given about commercial foraging. Note: Fungi (eg mushrooms) are not covered by this byelaw. Suggestion is that the Council work with the public to interpret the byelaws and agree guidelines about what is acceptable behaviour which can be published.</p> <p>Dogs There was concern about the growing number of dog walking services with multiple dogs that do not seem to be regulated. This is a particular problem on Stoke Park. The group felt that the dogs should be under control and probably kept on</p>

	<p>leads to reduce the incidence of dog fouling, but they didn't want to penalise owners of more than one dog.</p> <p>Suggest designated dog free areas, particularly those with sports pitches eg Dorian Road Playing Fields and some parts of Muller Road Rec. It was thought that some communities who do not like dogs might access parks more if there were dog free areas within them.</p> <p>Barbecues</p> <p>The group agreed that barbecues should not be allowed unless they are raised up and are disposed of properly afterwards. They should be banned on Stoke Park but that an area on Lockleaze Open Space that is accessible to fire engines is designated as a barbecue area. Barbecues should also be banned in all areas that are inaccessible for fire engines and in areas near growing summer meadows.</p> <p>Horse Riding</p> <p>The group agreed that this should only be permitted on designated bridleways or areas agreed with the Council.</p> <p>Enforcement</p> <p>The biggest issue would be to enforce the byelaws. At the moment the laws are already broken on a regular basis eg motorbikes recently on Purdown and daily cutting down of trees and removal of wood from Stoke Park. The group were concerned that these byelaws would not mean much if they could not be enforced and that this may come with a cost.</p>
Henbury, Brentry and Southmead	Encouraged members to comment online. No NP comment.
Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury on Trym	No NP comment.
Cabot Clifton and Clifton East	Encouraged members to comment online. No NP comment.
Greater Brislington	<p>The following four proposed bylaws were discussed with specific reference to the 19 greens and open spaces within Brislington. During the discussion the following comments were made:</p> <p><i>No person shall in any waterway cast a net or line for the purpose of catching fish or other animals except in a designated area for fishing. It is proposed to designate all lakes and rivers in or adjacent to parks and green spaces except at St George Park, meaning that fishing could not take place there currently but could take place in other parks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was clarified that waterways within the Brislington area would be designated areas for fishing such as Nightingale Valley, Eastwood Farm and St. Anne's Riverside. • There would be some communication with schools but resources were unable to stretch to visits to all schools. • There was concern that there could be an unintended effect on small children pursuits such as collecting frog spawn. • Rod licenses and other legislation would apply to fishing as per usual.

	<p>Notices and information would be provided to fishermen.</p> <p>It was AGREED (by a vote of 12 to 5) that the proposal be accepted.</p> <p><i>No person shall cause any power driven model aircraft to: (a) take off or otherwise be released for flight or control the flight of such an aircraft; or (b) land in the ground without reasonable excuse; other than in a designated area for flying model aircraft. The current proposal designates Hengrove Park as the only designated area subject to certain conditions. We will consider other sites put forward during the consultation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was proposed that as there had been a model aircraft club at Hengrove Park for 40 years, it would be the only site designated as an area for flying model aircraft. • Designations could be removed by the appropriate Strategic Director in the Council if they were no longer suitable. <p>It was AGREED (by a vote of 11 to 3) that the proposal be accepted.</p> <p><i>No person shall ride a horse in any of the grounds specified in Schedule 2 except: (a) on a designated route for riding; or (b) in the exercise of a lawful right or privilege. Where horse-riding is permitted by virtue of byelaw 13(1) (a) or a lawful right or privilege, no person shall ride a horse in such a manner as to cause danger to any other person.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horses would not be allowed to be ridden in spaces of less than four hectares. Officers highlighted that there were spaces where riding a horse would be allowed, although access to those spaces may remain undesignated if not specified. • Horse riding was permitted in St Anne’s Wood, Victory Park, Wick Road Open Space (OS), Nightingale Valley, Eastwood Farm, Arnos Court Park, Callington Road and Stockwood OS. Horse riding was not permitted in Allison Avenue and Hill Lawn, Bonville Road OS, Broomhill Road Amenity Area, Belroyal, St Anne’s Park, Newbridge Road OS, Wyatts View OS, St Anne’s Riverside, Hungerford Road OS, Hither Bridge and Ellsmere Road. • Bridleways would continue to be accessible as per usual rules. <p>It was AGREED that the Partnership could not comment as they were not aware of routes for horseriding within the area.</p> <p><i>No person shall light a fire or place, throw or drop a lighted match or any other thing likely to cause a fire. (2) Byelaw 10(1) shall not apply to: (a) the lighting of a fire at any event for which the Council has given permission that fires may be lit; or (b) the lighting or use, in such a manner as to safeguard against damage or danger to any person, of a properly constructed camping stove, in a designated area for camping, or of a properly constructed barbecue, in a designated area for barbecues. We are consulting on designated areas. We are proposing that we will designate all parks and green spaces except for ones we specify, because we want people to be able to enjoy the green spaces where this can be done safely and without spoiling the area for everybody else. The areas we propose that we will not designate will usually be areas with nature</i></p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p><i>conservation interest and a higher risk of fire. We will consider other areas put forward during the consultation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Council owned green spaces would be designated as not permitting fires (except when a BBQ or camping stove). • It was proposed that in areas of nature conservation and sites of scientific interest (where there was a higher risk of fire spreading or ecological damage) fires would not be permitted, (including BBQ's). <p>It was AGREED (by a vote of 13 to 1) and the proposal was accepted.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed that a fire or BBQ in a children's play area was not suitable and recommended that they were not designated.</p> <p>Comments on other related bylaws;</p> <p>- With reference to motorcyclists at Eastwood Farm, no vehicles were allowed to enter public green spaces on civil unrest and danger grounds. Unfortunately motorcyclists were aware and exploited the policy whereby the police cannot give chase if a motorcyclist was not wearing a helmet. Number plates were recorded by the police and Operation Biker was a scheme set up for this particular nuisance.</p>
<p>Stockwood, Hengrove and Whitchurch</p>	<p>Park Bye-Laws (Agenda Item No. 9)</p> <p>Parks' Client Officer introduced the report and summarised it for everyone.</p> <p>In response to concerns about model aircraft and drones using the same area, Parks' Client Officer confirmed that it may necessary to look at other areas for the use of drones.</p> <p>The NP was broadly supportive of the other proposed Bye-Laws.</p>
<p>Knowle, Filwood and Windmill Hill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sub group agrees with the implementation of 24 Byelaws • The sub group believes there should be no designated routes for horses in parks below 4 hectares. • The Sub group wanted the consultation to look at whether something can be done to restrict horse riding in areas over 4 hectares particularly Redcatch Park. • The sub group agreed with permitting BBQ's in all areas but restrict where fire risk or ecological damage is increased such as grass lands and area of nature conservation interest • The Sub group agreed with tighter management of fishing, but did not what to comment as no designated sites or fishing area within partnership area • The Sub group agree with having no designated sites for model aeroplanes within the NP • The group wanted to know more about how the byelaws will be enforced if implemented.
<p>Greater</p>	<p>No NP comment – not considered.</p>

Bedminster	<p>(1st March 2016) ESG disappointed that Park By Laws was not passed from NP and no previous information on this was shared before the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair commented that the park By Laws will be no good if it is not policed</p> <p>Action: Stef to feed back to the NP feelings regarding no information about Park By Laws. Inadequate time for consultation.</p>
Ashley, Easton and Lawrence Hill	No NP comment.
St George NP	<p>The Environment Sub Group was supportive of the introduction of Bye Laws and proposes the Neighbourhood Partnership support the introduction of the proposed Bye laws.</p> <p>The environment sub group agreed with this proposal regarding St George Lake not to be a designated site and wanted to allow other Neighbourhood Partnerships to decide about the designation of watercourses in their Neighbourhood Partnerships.</p> <p>Re Model aircraft proposal: The environment sub group agreed with this proposal but also recommended that Dundridge Park is also a designated site when football is not being played within the park boundaries.</p> <p>Re horse riding proposal: The environment sub group agreed with this proposal and did not want to see any designated sites under 4 hectares within the NP area.</p> <p>Re barbecues proposal: The environment sub group agreed with this proposal but also felt that any area which is classed as a children's play area should not be designated due to the increased risk to children within these spaces.</p>
Greater Fishponds	<p>The following comments were made:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was there a process which allowed the public to comment on the byelaws, for example, a year after implementation? The NP Co-ordinator replied it was possible for the Council to make changes but the public would need to gather evidence of a byelaw not working well in order to bring about change; • The Partnership noted that the Environment Subgroup supported designated areas for fishing, however, the Subgroup wished the NP to decide whether fishermen at Eastville Lake should be limited to pontoons only. The NP noted that this was officer advice and they were content to support this; • The NP noted that the Environment Subgroup supported the proposal to designate Hengrove Park as the only area for flying model aircraft. The NP noted that there were no flying clubs within the GF area. If there were and they applied to use an area, they would be given permission. The NP understood that use of aircraft and drones in parks on an ad-hoc basis would be overlooked but daily use would be deemed as a nuisance. It was a matter of proportionality. Notices in parks would indicate which byelaws

	<p>applied;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Subgroup agreed with the proposal regarding horse riding but wanted 3 additional sites designated for this (Wickham Glen, Trendlewood, Meadowsweet). The NP agreed with this; • The Environment Subgroup agreed with the proposal regarding designated areas for barbecues but wished to add sports pitches, children’s play areas, floral meadows and flower beds to the non-designated areas (Chair of BPF comment). The NP agreed with this; • The NP noted that these recommendations would be submitted to the Secretary of State and then to Full Council for decision. The byelaws would be adopted citywide and designated accordingly. • The NP requested information about each park and what people could and could not do on websites and community notices. The NP also suggested making available a clear process in how the Bye Laws will be implemented and enforced. <p>It was agreed that :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Neighbourhood Partnership supported the introduction of the proposed byelaws. 2. The Neighbourhood Partnership supported the recommendations of the Environment Subgroup regarding the designation of land in relation to the four byelaws where this is possible.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------