

Communities and Local Government Select Committee inquiry: Future of Public Parks

Landscape Institute response

Executive Summary

1. We need a vision for parks as dynamic, rich and multifunctional spaces which deliver multiple benefits at the same time as being places of joy and beauty. To realise this, parks need to be recognised as key components of the nation's green infrastructure (GI) network, a concept which itself requires greater support in terms of strategic planning, resources and leadership.
2. A strategic approach will help guide future investment and allocation of scarce resources to secure the best possible outcomes.
3. The relationship between parks and public health is increasingly being recognised by the public health sector, although there are a number of barriers to more widespread use of parks as a mechanism for improving health outcomes.
4. It is unsurprising that parks, as a non-statutory service, are more vulnerable even though they are often more heavily used than many statutory services. Cuts to budgets are affecting both capital and revenue spending.
5. There has been a significant loss of landscape expertise in the public sector which hinders the ability of local authorities to mobilise the private sector to deliver the kind of environment society needs, as it is often dependent on internal issue-raising, policy formation, programme setting, commissioning and enforcement.
6. It is in the interest of government and society that a statutory duty is placed on local government to create or manage parks, or to secure such assets via their regulatory function.
7. There is a distinct lack of clarity in leadership on GI, parks and green spaces. We believe the natural home for this at the central government level is the Department for Communities and Local Government, given its responsibility for planning policy and the need for parks to be viewed as essential components of wider GI networks.
8. Consideration needs to be given to previous actions designed to reverse the decline of parks and why, despite a renaissance over the past 10 years, these have not ensured their long-term viability.

1. The Landscape Institute

- 1.1 The Landscape Institute is the royal chartered body for the landscape profession. We represent over 5,000 landscape professionals. From the new Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park¹, to the restoration of Stevenage Town Centre Gardens², to smaller spaces such as the Eastern Curve³ in Dalston, landscape professionals have played a leading role in some of our most magnificent parks. They have led in their creation, their management, planning and restoration.
- 1.2 Our members are trained to understand the action and interaction of natural and human systems and to manage change in the landscape to deliver a range of social, environmental and economic benefits. Landscape planners formulate green infrastructure and green space strategies and policies that are incorporated into local and neighbourhood plans. Landscape designers and landscape scientists are employed to restore existing parks, and to design and deliver new spaces. Landscape managers oversee the management and maintenance of parks. These skills are essential in ensuring parks remain fit for purpose, cost-effective, attractive and able to address 21st century challenges.
- 1.3 The future of our parks is a topic close to the heart of our members for whom the public park is an important symbol of landscape practice at its best. We therefore wholeheartedly support the Committee's decision to examine how to secure a sustainable future for our parks.

2. Overarching observations – Learning from the past

- 2.1 It was only relatively recently that concerns similar to those of today led to actions intended to reverse the decline of parks witnessed between the 1970s and 1990s. The Committee could consider whether or not there are lessons to be learned from these past interventions.
- 2.2 The Landscape Institute was instrumental in campaigning for parks in the mid/late 1990s. In 1999 the Environment, Transport and Regional Affairs Committee held an inquiry⁴ into town and country parks. Its focus was similar to this current inquiry, with a remit including the state of parks, their contribution to society, funding, administration and the role of government.
- 2.3 A key outcome of the inquiry was the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce, a group including several of our own members, which reported to the Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions. Its final report⁵ ultimately led to the formation of CABI Space⁶, an agency hugely successful in championing parks. It provided a wealth of guidance and support through its advocacy, enabling and research programmes. Much of this work is still relevant, including guidance on models of funding, management and maintenance. CABI Space was a crucial part of the renaissance in parks up until its closure in 2011 during the 'bonfire of the quangos'.

¹ <http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/knowledge/olympics.php>

² <http://www.hta.co.uk/projects/stevenage-town-centre-gardens>

³ <http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/casestudies/casestudy.php?id=197>

⁴ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199899/cmselect/cmenvtra/477/47702.htm>

⁵ Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2002) *Green Spaces, Better Places: Final report of the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce*.

⁶ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabi.org.uk/about/cabi-space>

2.4 There is a real risk that the achievements and investment (in particular Heritage Lottery Fund support) over the past decade will be wasted. Despite considerable efforts in the past, a solution has not yet been found which puts parks on a sustainable footing – one that can weather external pressures such as austerity and declining political interest. We urge the Committee to consider what can be learnt from the past and why, 17 years on from a similar inquiry, we are still asking questions that suggest there are fundamental issues relating to parks which have not yet been resolved. It is fortunate that parks have not declined, so far, to the state witnessed in the 1970s-1990s, however indications are that we are heading in this direction⁷.

3. Overarching observations – Re-imagining parks, as part of green infrastructure, to meet future challenges

3.1 Parks and green spaces make a major contribution to sustainable development. They improve health and wellbeing, provide space to reconnect with nature, enhance biodiversity, reduce flood risk, cool our cities, clean our air and provide space for communities to interact. The social value of parks is increasingly important to all sectors of society, but in particular children, young people, families and BAME communities⁸. Yet despite the wealth of benefits they deliver it seems a continual struggle to ensure that parks survive and thrive in the long term. Poor quality parks can accentuate social and environmental inequalities and can reduce economic benefits.

3.2 We need a vision for parks as dynamic, rich and multifunctional spaces which deliver multiple benefits at the same time as being places of joy and beauty. To realise this parks need to be treated as key components of our green infrastructure⁹ (GI), a concept which itself requires greater support. GI is the network of natural features, green spaces, rivers and lakes that intersperse and connect villages, towns and cities. It is a natural, service-providing infrastructure that is often more cost-effective, resilient and capable of meeting social, environmental and economic objectives than ‘grey’ infrastructure. It is the key vehicle for enhancing our stock of natural capital, from which ecosystem services can be derived. Viewing parks through the lens of GI enables targeted investment, focusing scarce resources and maximising cost-efficient impacts via a strategic approach to planning, designing and managing nature.

3.3 There is growing recognition of the value of GI. Examples include the Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) and reports from the Natural Capital Committee. There is however a long way to go to properly embed GI into the planning, design and management of our towns and cities. This was a key finding of a House of Lords Select Committee inquiry, which recommended that:

“The Government must do more to protect and promote green infrastructure in national policy and guidance...It should also encourage local authorities to set minimum standards for green infrastructure provision and management in local plans and in planning decision-making. Within and beyond Government, there must be wider recognition of the fact that green infrastructure is an asset, and offers wider economic, health and social benefits”¹⁰.

⁷ Heritage Lottery Fund (2016), *State of UK Public Parks*.

⁸ Heritage Lottery Fund (2016), *State of UK Public Parks*.

⁹ Landscape Institute (2013), *Green infrastructure: An integrated approach to land use*, Landscape Institute, London.

¹⁰ House of Lords Select Committee on National Policy for the Built Environment, *Building Better Places*, 19 February 2016, 2015-16

3.4 At the time of writing the Committee's report had not received a Government response, despite its conclusions being published in February 2016. Furthermore, a series of actions since 2010 have undermined the strategic approach required to unlock GI's potential. These include:

- The loss of strategic planning at a scale larger than the local, with mechanisms designed to fill this void (such as the Duty to Cooperate) failing to deliver.
- Weak coverage of GI within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Proactive, holistic and integrated planning is key to maximising the potential of parks as part of wider GI networks and the NPPF must be more explicit on this matter.
- Loss of skills within local authority teams which no longer carry out Open Space Audits and infrequently include policies for parks and recreation.
- The declining staff levels within local authorities with a loss of landscape skills vital to the strategic planning and delivery of parks and green spaces as part of wider GI networks.
- Persistent inability to 'join-up' government. There are two departments particularly relevant to GI – Defra and DCLG – and there is a lack of clarity on responsibility for GI.

This final point was highlighted in the Fabian Society's report, *Places to Be*¹¹:

"Without clear lines of responsibility, there is no focal point for campaigners, nobody whom advocates can go to, no one to coordinate the various agencies and government departments, no one who can be held publicly accountable."

3.5 Until GI, with parks as an essential component, is afforded the priority it deserves in terms of planning policy, resources and leadership, its potentially vast contributions to public life will continue to be compromised.

Responses to the key lines of inquiry

Question 1: Who uses parks and open spaces, how often and for what?

1.1 Natural England's *Monitoring Engagement in the Natural Environment* (MENE) surveys provide a wealth of information which indicate how important parks are to the nation's quality of life. Findings from 2013-14¹², show that 42.3m adults took a total of 2.93bn visits to the natural environment and that the majority (1.36bn) were taken to destinations in urban areas. The report highlighted that urban parks were the most frequently visited destination, accounting for 778m visits. Research¹³ from the HLF found that more than half of the UK population visit local parks at least once a month, and that frequency of use is increasing.

1.2 Although a number of organisations undertake surveys, reliable data in an accessible format relating to the location of parks, their quality and use does not appear to be collected, organised or analysed in a systematic way. This undermines efforts to ensure that increasingly scarce

¹¹ Fabian Society (2015), *Places to Be: Green spaces for active citizenship*, Fabian Society, London.

¹² Natural England (2015), *Monitor of Engagement with the Natural Environment: The national survey on people and the natural environment – annual report from the 2013-14 survey*, Natural England.

¹³ Heritage Lottery Fund (2016), *State of UK Public Parks*.

resources are targeted efficiently to meet clear policy objectives. These points have been made on successive occasions, a point well-articulated in Policy Exchange's report, *Park Land*¹⁴:

"Several earlier investigations into the UK's urban green spaces identified a lack of data and the large number of data owners as major barriers to making improvements...Without a detailed, accessible map, it remains very difficult to target interventions where they are most needed. It is impossible, or expensive, to assess whether interventions have made a difference and should be replicated (or avoided) elsewhere. As a result, it is not clear that public money is being spent effectively."

Question 2: The contribution of parks to the health and wellbeing of communities.

2.1 The positive relationship between parks and health has been assumed for centuries and conventional wisdom has proved *"...surprisingly accurate in the prediction of what more recent empirical research has demonstrated"*¹⁵. Given the increasing concern over the costs of treating ill-health¹⁶, greater efforts are needed to ensure its prevention. This must include greater support for parks and green spaces, as part of wider GI networks. There is sufficient evidence to support this, and in 2013 we published a position statement¹⁷ on this very subject (see box 1).

Box 1: Public health and landscape: Creating healthy places (2013), Landscape Institute

The planning, design and management of parks should be guided by their importance for public health as for all of their other functions. This was the conclusion we reached following an evidence review on the relationship between parks and public health, all referenced in the publication itself. It resulted in our *Five Principles of Healthy Places*.

Healthy places...

1. Improve air/water/soil quality, including measures which help us adapt to and mitigate climate change;
2. Help us overcome health inequalities and can promote healthy lifestyles;
3. Make people feel comfortable and at ease, increasing social interaction and reducing antisocial behaviour, isolation and stress;
4. Optimise opportunities for working, learning and development; and
5. Are restorative, uplifting and healing for existing physical and mental health conditions.

¹⁴ Policy Exchange (2013), *Park Land: How open data can improve our urban green spaces*, Policy Exchange, London.

¹⁵ Ward-Thompson, C., (2011), *Linking Landscape and Health: The recurring theme*, Landscape and Urban Planning, vol. 99 (3-4) pp 187-195, 2011.

¹⁶ Appleby, J., *Spending on health and social care over the next 50 years: Why think long term?* Introduction, p 1. The King's Fund, London, 2013.

¹⁷ Landscape Institute (2013), *Public Health and Landscape: Creating healthy places*, Landscape Institute, London.

2.2 Significantly, the relationship between parks and public health is increasingly being recognised by the health sector¹⁸ itself. A recent Public Health England report¹⁹ concluded that:

“There is significant and growing evidence on the physical and mental health benefits of green spaces...Increasing the use of good quality green space for all social groups is likely to improve health outcomes and reduce health inequalities...Local authorities play a vital role in protecting, maintaining and improving local green spaces and can create new areas of green space to improve access for all communities.”

2.3 The growing evidence base is influencing public policy, particularly in two key areas (see box 2). Yet despite this we are not seeing delivery on the ground to the extent that is necessary. This is particularly concerning given the imperative to secure better health outcomes and reduce the cost of treating ill health. As we highlighted in a recent essay²⁰ for the Government Office for Science / Foresight *Future of Cities* project, we believe there are a number of reasons for this:

- A number of local authorities do not have GI strategies in place;
- There is no statutory duty on local authorities to protect/maintain GI, including parks;
- Reduced budgets means fewer individuals in local authorities with the skills to plan for/demand GI interventions, which undermines the ability of authorities to act as an ‘intelligent client’;
- A failure to plan long-term and the apparent lack of interest in strategic planning for everyday spaces. This is particularly pertinent as the benefits delivered by parks accrue over time;
- GI is multifunctional and therefore the organisations and teams who could be taking an interest in its planning/design and delivery need to act together. A failure to coordinate and collaborate properly undermines GI’s potential to deliver public health outcomes; and
- A lack, despite potential, of public health involvement in place-making.

Box 2: Planning and health policy supporting parks as a way of improving health outcomes

- Chapter 8, National Planning Policy Framework²¹
- National Planning Practice Guidance²²
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment²³ and Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies²⁴
- Public Health Outcomes Framework²⁵ (in particular indicators including; use of green space for exercise/health reasons; social connectedness; perceptions of community safety; self-reported wellbeing; air pollution; mortality from causes considered preventable and; health-related quality of life for older people.)

¹⁸ Marmot, M., (2010) Fair Society, Healthy Lives, Marmot Review – Strategic review of health inequalities in England post 2010, Department of Health.

¹⁹ Public Health England (2014), *Local action on health inequalities: Improving access to green spaces*, Public Health England, London.
²⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-of-cities-green-infrastructure-and-health>

²¹ <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/policy/achieving-sustainable-development/delivering-sustainable-development/8-promoting-healthy-communities/>

²² <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/health-and-wellbeing/>

²³ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/223842/Statutory-Guidance-on-Joint-Strategic-Needs-Assessments-and-Joint-Health-and-Wellbeing-Strategies-March-2013.pdf (page 8)

²⁴ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/215261/dh_131733.pdf

²⁵ <http://www.phoutcomes.info/>

Question 3: The impact of reductions in local authority budgets on parks.

3.1 Several organisations have reported on funding cuts, and their consequences for parks. These include the Joseph Rowntree Foundation²⁶, Unison²⁷, HLF²⁸, Fabian Society²⁹ and Policy Exchange³⁰. There is no reason to think this will not continue given the severe pressures placed even on statutory services, as highlighted by the Centre for Local Economic Strategies³¹:

“As demand is exponentially increasing and budgets dramatically decreasing, core services such as Adult Social Care and Children’s Services are being impacted...Evidence [suggests] that the value of adult services contracts is being reduced, and more local authorities are streamlining their services.”

3.2 It is therefore unsurprising that parks, as a non-statutory service, are more vulnerable, even though they are often more heavily used than many statutory services. Cuts to budgets are affecting both capital and revenue spending.

3.3 We are also seriously concerned by the loss of capacity in local authorities to strategically plan GI and provide skilled input into its delivery on the ground. Our own research has found that there is a decline in landscape expertise in local authorities. The impact of this is hidden in the short term, but it is a critical issue as it erodes the ability of local authorities to act as an intelligent and cost-efficient client. Reduced landscape expertise hinders the potential for local authorities to mobilise the private sector to deliver the kind of environment society needs as it is often dependent on internal issue-raising, policy formation, programme setting, commissioning, regulatory control and enforcement from within the public sector. This cannot have anything other than a negative impact on the delivery and maintenance of parks and green spaces.

3.4 Addressing this deficiency is a challenge given the current focus on reducing public spending, coupled with the removal of extant regulations. While unlikely to gain government support, this might require landscape to be put on a similar statutory footing as ecology and trees, requiring job descriptions that demand professional accreditation for holistic approaches. Failing that, local authorities and the developer community need to act as ‘intelligent clients’ and demand more from interventions in the built environment through a landscape-led approach.

3.5 Research with our members working in local authorities uncovered a range of views on the potential, perhaps unintended consequences, of local authority budget reductions, including:

- Grounds maintenance contract frequencies being reduced;
- Assets, such as children’s play equipment, could be replaced less often;
- Vandalised or broken assets may be removed less frequently and not replaced;

²⁶ Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2015), *The Cost of the Cuts: The impact on local government and poorer communities*.

²⁷ UNISON, (2014), *Counting the Cost: How cuts are shrinking women’s lives*, UNISON, London.

²⁸ Heritage Lottery Fund (2016) *State of UK Public Parks*.

²⁹ Fabian Society (2015), *Places to Be: Green spaces for active citizenship*, Fabian Society, London.

³⁰ Policy Exchange (2013), *Park Land: How open data can improve our urban green spaces*, Policy Exchange, London.

³¹ Centre for Local Economic Studies (2014), *A summary of austerity in the West Midlands and a case study of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council*.

- The number of Green Flag Awards applied for may reduce;
- The number of accredited country parks could reduce;
- The public image of the local authorities and the country could be diminished;
- Visitor satisfaction levels may drop; and
- Taxpayers may become dissatisfied with paying for declining services.

Question 4: What the administrative status of parks should be in light of declining local authority resources for non-statutory services.

4.1 It is in the interest of both government and wider society that a statutory obligation is placed on local government to either create or manage urban parks, or to secure such public assets through their regulatory function. This would not automatically mean a growth in the public sector, because the option is there to secure the provision entirely through the private sector. We believe that the potential long-term damage to social cohesion, health and wellbeing and other areas of public policy which would result from a decline in quality of public parks justifies the need for such a statutory instrument to come into force.

4.2 We do however recognise that the current government is highly unlikely to add additional duties to local authorities. So at the very least, local authorities could be encouraged – through corporate strategies and planning policies – to set out a commitment to park services. There are a series of measures that could be adopted to raise the status of parks at a local level, without adding further statutory ‘burdens’. For example, the HLF State of UK Parks report encourages local authorities to prepare strategies and appointed elected members as their parks champion.

Question 5: How new and existing parks can best be supported.

Leadership

5.1 There needs to be clearer leadership on GI, parks and green spaces. We believe the natural home for this at the central government level is the Department for Communities and Local Government, given its responsibility for planning policy and the need for parks to be viewed as essential components of wider GI networks.

Strategic approach to green infrastructure

5.2 It is critical that a strategic approach is taken to GI because (a) by its nature it crosses administrative boundaries and (b) it provides a focus for multiple initiatives operating at various scales. A GI strategy³² will play a crucial role in helping draw together various scales, opportunities and needs and devise a plan to suit as many interests as possible³³. Though parks issues are increasingly driven by the localism agenda, it is important to consider them as parts of a wider GI network, each performing specific roles and responding to local circumstances. This will assist in targeting investment in the right place and focusing on the right solutions.

³² Landscape Institute (2013) *Green infrastructure: An integrated approach to land use*, Landscape Institute

³³ <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/green-infrastructure/> (paragraph 029)

- 5.3 Local or neighbourhood-level projects, such as the neighbourhood plan for Exeter St James³⁴, can contribute incrementally to the bigger landscape-scale picture, so that the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts. However there is a risk relying on this approach will lead to piecemeal planning, and neighbourhood plans are at risk of being developed in a vacuum. At the city-region level, useful examples can be found in Leeds³⁵ and London³⁶.
- 5.4 We suggest that when the time comes for a review of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), steps are taken to strengthen the Duty to Cooperate across boundaries particularly in relation to GI, and also to enhance the role of GI. Such a review should also take into account the emerging recognition of ecosystem services and natural capital, thereby integrating these agendas – being promoted by other areas of government – into the planning system.
- 5.5 There is a precedent in recent government actions to amend the NPPF to address the housing shortfall. Clearly, if the government comes to feel that parks and green spaces are important enough, the opportunity is there to amend planning policy accordingly. We would argue that there is nothing more important than ensuring the planning system makes best use of our finite land resource, and delivers GI for the benefit of society, the environment and the economy.

Funding

- 5.6 GI, including parks and green spaces, can be funded through developer contributions, in order to reflect the additional pressures that development places on the natural environment and existing infrastructure.
- 5.7 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 agreements and local plan policies require developers to meet a required standard for open space provision and / or recreation provision. Development can only be required to pay for new green space where the additional number of homes justifies it, and where local plan standards are not met on-site. These payments tend to be for capital costs not ongoing maintenance, so many local authorities are beginning to require open space to be provided on-site where it will then be managed by others.
- 5.8 Ultimately, parks need to be funded publically, but increasingly supplementary resources need to come from a wider variety of public, private, lottery and voluntary sources. By demonstrating GI's ability to deliver on wider policy objectives, it may also be funded by sources benefitting from its wider application, such as health bodies, water companies and energy providers.
- 5.9 Even where initial capital for GI has been secured, it is critical that a funding plan for ongoing management and maintenance is considered from the start³⁷, and GI aspirations designed accordingly. Local authorities should ensure that they include adequate capital and revenue provision for GI in their own budgets and that approved developments are adequately resourced

³⁴ <http://www.exeterstjamesforum.org/userfiles/PDFs/St%20James%20Draft%20Neighbourhood%20Plan.pdf>

³⁵ <http://www.lida-design.co.uk/projects/leeds-city-region-green-infrastructure-strategy/>

³⁶ <https://www.london.gov.uk/WHAT-WE-DO/environment/parks-green-spaces-and-biodiversity/all-london-green-grid>

³⁷ <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/green-infrastructure/> (paragraph 031)

by effective contributions, either in kind or through ring-fenced financial sums. If management and maintenance is not considered at the outset then the initial investment is at risk.

- 5.10 Sources of revenue funding can include opportunities to generate income from GI assets through franchising, licensing and entry fees, endowments, community trusts, commercial investment and traditional local authority funding. Alternatively, revenue could include direct income from renewable energy, food production, agricultural grazing, silage or events, or indirect savings from reducing flood risk.

Skills

- 5.11 We accept the need to rebalance the relationship between wealth generation and public expenditure. Action has been taken over a number of years to enable this to happen across the public sector. The emphasis on staff restructuring and reduction has focussed on economics, at the expense of securing the rights skills for the future needs of society. GI, and urban parks in particular, meet the needs of society as a whole in support of corporate government – contributing to children’s services, care for the elderly, social stability, improving biodiversity, resilience to climate change, improving air quality along with other services. Consequently, we recommend the Committee considers the need for a new post in local government – Head of Landscape and Ecology – to enable a corporate approach to be taken by local government in the commissioning of the private sector for the delivery of services – an intelligent client function.

Question 6: What additional or alternative funding is available and what scope is there for local authorities to generate revenue from park users.

- 6.1 Several of our members have agreed that a charge for entry to parks would be opposed by local communities. Parks were conceived as public assets with the philosophy of free access and ownership. There is therefore a real danger that if we take these away from public bodies we move closer to the realm of market forces determining the quality and location of parks.
- 6.2 Parks should therefore continue to be free at the point of entry, but a variety of traditional and innovative charging and income generation measures could be adopted across and within appropriate parks. This earned income should be ring-fenced for use across the entire park services to maintain an equitable and wide variety of spaces across a borough.
- 6.3 HLF funding has been invaluable in the revival of many parks, but there is a significant risk that these spaces will not be maintained in the long-term. In any case, the purely reactive HLF approach could give rise to a postcode lottery, depending on the aspirations of local communities and the resources available to them, and could lead to a fragmented pattern of parks improvements. HLF spaces and other community-run parks vary hugely in terms of the quality and quantity of services they offer, and their wide-ranging maintenance requirements cannot be sustained in the long-term by a ‘conventional’ local authority parks service. We are therefore concerned that localism in the context of HLF funding, mutualisation or privatisation could potentially lead to polarisation between adjoining areas and neighbouring parks.

6.4 We recommend the Committee considers the excellent work undertaken by others, too numerous to list in detail here, on alternative sources of funding and management approaches. This includes reports from Policy Exchange³⁸, CABI Space³⁹ and, most recently, Nesta's *Rethinking Parks*⁴⁰ which tested new ways to raise income or reduce costs for public parks.

³⁸ Policy Exchange (2014), *Green Society: Policies to improve the UK's green spaces*, Policy Exchange, London

³⁹ CABI Space (2006), *Paying for Parks: Eight models for funding urban green spaces*, CABI Space, London.

⁴⁰ Nesta (2016), *Learning to Rethink Parks*, Nesta, London.