

# *The value of* **City of Edinburgh Council's parks**



# The value of City of Edinburgh Council's parks

## Summary

The City of Edinburgh Council has measured and valued the outcomes that are achieved as a direct result of the parks that are provided and maintained by the Parks and Greenspace service. Financial evidence of the benefits that the services provide will influence policy and sustain existing and future investments in Edinburgh's parks and greenspaces.

## The approach – Social Return on Investment

Social Return on Investment (SROI) provides a principled approach that can be used to measure and account for a broad concept of value. It enables the social, environmental and economic benefits that a service or activity delivers to be calculated and monetised.

## The value

Using an SROI approach to identify and value the impact of City of Edinburgh Council's parks and greenspaces it was found that for every £1 invested around £12 of social, economic and environmental benefits are delivered.

By applying a sensitivity analysis, or varying the main assumptions made in the calculation, *the value of the benefits derived ranges from £10 to £14.*

This analysis has allowed us to predict that as result of City of Edinburgh Council's parks:

- Individuals will gain health and wellbeing benefits worth around £40.5 million
- The impact on social inclusion and community capacity is calculated to be worth over £6 million
- Local businesses and the economy will gain additional revenue from visitors to the parks in the region of £51 million



- Schools, nurseries and colleges are able to provide outdoor educational experiences that equate to just under £1 million
- The awareness and understanding gained by visitors of their local environment is valued at just under £5 million

**For an investment of £9,684,000 in parks and greenspace by City of Edinburgh Council benefits worth £114,191,000 are generated.**

The analysis demonstrates that City of Edinburgh Council's parks deliver multiple benefits and make a significant contribution to making people in Edinburgh feel healthier, wealthier, smarter, safer and greener. <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Changes to the National Performance Framework



## Purpose

City of Edinburgh Council wishes to identify, measure and value the outcomes that are achieved as a direct result of the services provided by the Parks and Greenspace service in providing and maintaining public parks. It is anticipated that being able to express in financial terms, or monetise, the multiple benefits parks deliver for people will influence policy and sustain existing and future investments in Edinburgh's parks and green spaces. It was decided that the best way to achieve this aim was to calculate the value of the parks through the application of a Social Return on Investment approach.

## Social Return on Investment

Social Return on Investment (SROI) provides a principled approach that can be used to measure and account for a broad concept of value.

SROI measures social, environmental and economic change from the perspective of those who experience or contribute to it. It can be used to apply a monetary value to each change that is identified and measured. The resultant financial value that is calculated is then adjusted to take account of both the contributions from others and changes that would have occurred regardless of any activity or intervention that is provided. In this way the overall impact of an activity can be calculated and the value

generated compared to the investment in the activities. This enables a ratio of cost to benefits to be calculated. For example, a ratio of 1:3 indicates that an investment of £1 in the activities has delivered the equivalent value of £3 of benefits.

Whilst an SROI analysis will provide a headline costs to benefits ratio, it will also deliver a detailed narrative that explains how change is created and evaluates the impact of the change through the evidence that is gathered. An SROI analysis is based on clear principles and progresses through set stages. SROI is much more than just a number. It is a story about change, on which to base decisions, and that story is told through case studies and qualitative, quantitative and financial information.

There are two types of SROI analyses: a forecast SROI predicts the impact of a project or activity and an evaluative SROI measures the changes that have been delivered.

## Methodology

As it was not proportionate to carry out individual SROI analyses for each of City of Edinburgh Council's 144 parks to identify and value the benefits that each delivered, it was decided to carry out individual analyses of a representative sample of parks and to use the findings to 'scale up' the results.



The City of Edinburgh Council has classified its parks into the following main categories<sup>2</sup>:

Category	Description
Premier	Large diverse parks serving international and national visitors as well as local and citywide needs
City	Dominated by sports or formal recreation serving citywide and local needs
Natural Heritage	Semi-natural green spaces usually large and featuring hills or woodland which maintain biodiversity
Community	Serving local needs

Individual forecast<sup>3</sup> SROI analyses were undertaken for a typical park in each of the above categories. The following were selected:

Category	Name of park analysed
Premier	Princes Street Gardens
City	Gyle
Natural Heritage	Hermitage of Braid
Community	Figgate

Each of the individual analyses identified and valued the outcomes that were likely to be delivered by the park type from the point of view of those who would experience change.

City of Edinburgh Council had undertaken an SROI analysis of Pentland Hills Regional Park and the findings from this were also taken into account. The parks classification includes a further category which is described as ‘Gardens’ - these are generally small areas with flower beds, shrubs and seating. As their contribution is likely to have more limited impact, and although included in the data, ‘Gardens’ are not considered in any detail in this analysis.

The SROI analyses that were undertaken provided evidence of the benefits delivered by a typical park in each category but it has to be recognised that there are wide variations in relation to the size, facilities and nature of individual parks within the four defined categories. This was taken into account in the selection of the most appropriate park to be the subject of the analysis and, to a limited extent, in the scaling up process.

Projections from the results of each of the SROI analyses were applied to predict the overall social, economic and environmental value of all of City of Edinburgh Council’s one hundred and forty four parks. This was done by assessing which of the outcomes identified were likely to be delivered by each park. This will be considered in more detail later.



### (a) Stakeholder involvement

All those likely to experience change as result of parks services (the stakeholders) were identified, the nature of any changes that might be experienced considered and how such changes might be measured explored. At the end of the discussions a list of those organisations or individuals whom it was believed would be significantly affected was drawn up (the ‘included’ stakeholders). A list of those whom it was thought would not experience significant change, and hence it was not considered appropriate to contact for further discussion, was also identified (the ‘excluded’ stakeholders).

A consultation plan was established for each of the identified stakeholders using methodologies that best suited their individual needs. Consultation was carried out by Carrick Associates, staff from the City of Edinburgh Council’s Natural Heritage Service and by responses to the Edinburgh People’s Survey. (EPS) is an annual survey of 5000 randomly selected Edinburgh residents.

Stakeholders were consulted initially to confirm possible outcomes that had been identified as a result of discussion with staff from City of Edinburgh Council, partner agencies and local community based groups.

Stakeholders were consulted, in a variety of ways, at all stages of the process. The methodologies used were appropriate to the relevant group and included: one to one structured interviews; focus groups; individual questionnaires; the use of survey monkey and interactive sessions with children and young people.

<sup>2</sup> More detail on the basis for this approach can be found in the Public Parks and Gardens Strategy 2006 and Open Space Strategy 2010.

<sup>3</sup> A forecast predicts how much social value will be created if the activities meet their intended outcomes.

## (b) The Theory of Change

An SROI analysis will consider what changes, for whom and the extent of the change.

*“Theory of Change provides a framework for evaluating social impact, by making explicit the relationships between activities and desired outcomes, and by describing the ‘chain of events’ that relates one outcome to another.”<sup>4</sup>*

In all of the forecast SROI analyses the reported changes that result from being able to access and use each park were considered. The benefits that parks deliver for health and wellbeing are well researched and documented. Research suggests that regular physical activity in a natural environment can reduce the risk of experiencing poor mental health by as much as 50%.<sup>5</sup> As a result of these proven benefits the Government wishes to increase the proportion of adults making one or more visits to the outdoors per week.<sup>6</sup> As well as improving and sustaining physical and emotional health and wellbeing, parks deliver many other tangible benefits.<sup>7</sup> Those identified are described in the following section and are illustrated by comments provided by those who were consulted in the course of preparing the analyses. The message is very clear that parks are a unique and special part of city life.

*“It’s an integral part of my life- I grew up in this area and used to play here after school. You can see how the seasons change. I love the wildlife and watched the cormorants nesting, saw the chicks hatch and watched them fly away. It’s part of my culture - its living history”*

*“The greenery in the sun attracts people like a beach in Australia, great to see it busy with so many enjoying it”*

### (i) Community

Parks offer people a place to meet new people and increase their social contacts. They contribute to social capital, and if visited on a regular basis enable people to feel a strong sense of belonging to a community.

*“I have been in Edinburgh for 30 years. I brought my kids to this park and I still see some of the people I played with when I grew up here”*

*“I meet the other dog walkers and we chat about what is going on. When I was in hospital some of them found out why I was missing and came to see me. I live alone so it was good to know that they cared!”*

*“Beautiful place and essential as a resource for the community’s health and wellbeing”*



*“Great for kids, a free activity, massive benefit, people feel a real sense of ownership with one family cutting the grass to allow the kids to play football”*

By visiting parks individuals of all ages and abilities are able to access the health and wellbeing benefits of outdoor physical activity. Parks offer people the opportunity to walk the dog, play football, cycle, have fun with the kids or to relax after a gentle stroll. Users of the facilities in city parks are able to gain the additional health benefits of sustained physical activity.

*“It’s a great place to exercise, to walk, cycle or run”*

*“Massive help being here with dog, I live 2 minutes away”*

*“Great to be able to come to some green space and get kid’s exercise and entertainment- they sleep better”*

*“I keep fit anyway but important that people exercise and walking in park is good - this is a safe space away from road – I bring my son here on days off to play”*

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.socialimpactscotland.org.uk/understanding-social-impact/methods-and-tools/theory-of-change/>

<sup>5</sup> Regular physical activity in natural environments halves risk of poor mental health | Centre for research on environment, society and health <http://cresh.org.uk/2012/06/20/regular-physical-activity-in-natural-environments-halves-risk-of-poor-mental-health/>

<sup>6</sup> Increase the proportion of adults making one or more visits to the outdoors per week

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.csd.org.uk/uploadedfiles/files/value\\_of\\_green\\_space\\_report.pdf](http://www.csd.org.uk/uploadedfiles/files/value_of_green_space_report.pdf)

*“We come on bikes; the kids use the play park, run about get fresh air and exercise”*

Visitors are able to gain information about the natural and cultural heritage of the park and have confidence in enjoying it responsibly with respect and understanding for the environment. Princes Street Gardens offers a unique opportunity to use a greenspace to learn more about the geology of the area in an historic setting.

*“I feel strongly that it is good to relax in a natural habitat - in a green place in the centre- this is the best place in Edinburgh”*

*“Gets you out in fresh air in nature. This place is country and nature in the city. There are nice trees and plants and a huge wild area with plenty to do. These areas are priceless to the city”*

*“It does lots. It is a place to come and picnic in summer. All year I can come and relax. At night when I am walking the dog I can see foxes. I love seeing wildlife in the city”.*

*“Nice place to sit and relax, well laid out especially for visitors- it makes us proud to be from Edinburgh”*

*“Going for a walk in a unique location and soaking up the history in the skyline”*

#### **(ii) Volunteers**

Volunteers play a vital role in supporting and sustaining the park and gain many individual benefits. They gain new practical and environmental skills, which result in improved employability or volunteering opportunities, and more confident in dealing with challenging situations.

By organising events and activities to maintain and encourage use of the park, volunteers get a sense of satisfaction and feel that they are giving something back to the community and contributing to a good cause.

As a result of taking part in meetings and events, volunteers have made new friends and increased their social contacts significantly.

*“It’s a beautiful facility for a short, relaxing walk. I’m a Friend of the Hermitage and enjoy working with them to maintain the park and enjoy their company. I was pushed through here in my pram and feel a great sense of personal connection with the place - my late Mother loved it too”*

Some volunteers who are physically more active on a regular basis gain additional health benefits.

*“There’s nothing like picking up litter on a cold frosty morning to wake you up and get you active”*

#### **(iii) Local Employers**

Employees who work near a park often make use of it for a walk or to relax during lunch breaks -they may do this in on an individual basis or with their colleagues. As well as the benefits to the individuals concerned, their employers also benefit as they have a workforce whose performance is improved and who are able to work better as a team.

*“We work at our desks and it’s great to get a bit of exercise at lunchtime. We walk and chat - it helps us work better”*

*“It gets you away from office to relax for a short time – there are no keyboards here”*

*“I walk laps of gardens to get my exercise and there are no roads to cross - sometimes I am joined by workmates during lunchtime”*

*“It is part of my preparation for a stressful day at work, walking to work through the park is the same as spending an hour relaxing, I love the sounds of the park”*

#### **(iv) Schools and Nurseries**

Schools are able to use parks to provide outdoor learning opportunities in a local green space. By visiting parks and taking part in planned activities the real life, hands on experience which this offers to pupils who are able to engage directly with their environment provides a unique learning experience and makes a valuable contribution to the Curriculum for Excellence.

*“Invaluable for all ages – children need to get off our city streets and understand nature”*



*“You can just see the interest and excitement levels rise when they go outside – they are full of questions”*

*“It’s education without walls – without boundaries”*

#### **(v) Pupils**

The pupils who visit the park are able to gain new practical and social skills which they can use at school and at home. For those who are older this can enhance their future career and employment prospects. Children and young people of all ages learn more about wildlife and nature in a natural environment.

*“Hermitage of Braid is probably the single biggest thing I would miss if I had to move away from Edinburgh”*

*“I did the Award and then when I went for an interview. I was able to talk about all the things I had learnt“*

*“We saw the otter lots of times – at first we weren’t sure what it was”*

#### **(vi) Local residents**

As well as enjoying the amenities and natural views that parks offer, residents living close by are able to take advantage of increased accessibility to the other benefits that the park provides. Research suggests that proximity to greenspace improves property prices.<sup>8</sup>

*“The park is just absolutely essential. It offers freedom to relax and enjoy the environment for people, pets and children. I love the greenery and would always want a house near the park”*

*“Access for everybody is a great thing”*

*“We live in a flat and this park is important as it is our outdoor space. We walk through the park to school. Wildlife is really good”*

*“I would always want to live next to a park facility like Blackford Hill or Arthur’s Seat”*

#### **(vii) Organisations**

Local groups and organisations are able to use the park as a safe well maintained outdoor space to provide services to their members or user groups. In this way providers are able to improve the quality and attractiveness of the activities they offer. Organisers of events in Princes Street Gardens are able to use the park as a natural environment adjacent to an historic landmark and to raise the profile of their event and attract increased numbers of participants

*“It’s an amazing place to take adults with learning difficulties – it’s good to get fresh air - great to have some greenery in your life”*

*“It is a local site that they can return to – it’s like being in countryside quiet space lots of biodiversity nooks and crannies for exploring green team”*

*“Having a natural resource in an urban area. So much more potential to run sessions. Not just economic impact giving who live in city a good experience of the park and city”*

#### **(viii) Local economy**

Local businesses and the local economy gain additional revenue as a result of visitors to the park.

*“I’ve just been for lunch (in the park) and it’s shopping next”*



<sup>8</sup> [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FCRPo21.pdf/\\$file/FCRPo21.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FCRPo21.pdf/$file/FCRPo21.pdf)

## **(c) Financial proxies**

Financial proxies have been identified which allow a monetary value to be placed on the changes experienced by individual stakeholders. In each case stakeholders have been consulted on the appropriateness of these measures and given the opportunity to make suggestions on potential financial proxies. These were taken into account in the final selection. In identifying the value given to a financial proxy, attempts have been made to link the financial amount to the level of importance placed on the change by individual stakeholders. The financial proxies used are included as Appendix One.

## **(d) Impact**

### **(i) Duration and drop off**

Before the calculation can be finalised a decision has to be made as to how long the changes produced will last. In an SROI analysis the length of time change endures is considered so that their future value can be assessed. The question to be answered is *'if the activity stopped tomorrow, how much of the value would still be there?'*

To predict the length of time changes will continue stakeholder opinion and independent research are both taken into account. There will be variations in the length of time that benefits last according to the nature of the change and also the characteristics of individual stakeholders. Where significant assumptions have been required about the likely duration of change these can be considered in a sensitivity analysis.

In the individual analyses on which this report is based, most outcomes were predicted to last a year as there is little supporting evidence that they will last longer. There are four exceptions to this:

- The skills learnt by volunteers are assumed to last for a period of three years. This is in line with several certified practical skills assessments (e.g. first aid) in which competency levels are expected to last for a defined period.
- The new friendships and increased social contacts volunteers make by taking part in meetings are assumed to last for a period of three years. This is based on the results of stakeholder volunteer surveys which indicated that the average time individuals stayed with a group exceeded three years.
- Knowledge gained by individuals, both young and old, in relation to the local environment is assumed to last for three years. This is an estimate based on a sample of stakeholder responses.
- The benefits local residents derive from proximity to the park in relation to amenity and access are assumed to last five years. This is an estimate based on a sample of stakeholder responses.

Those outcomes which will continue to have a value in future years cannot be expected to maintain the same level of value for each of these years. It is assumed that for those outcomes that relate to skills and knowledge there will be a reduction of 25% each year.

### **(ii) Deadweight, Attribution and Displacement**

As well as considering how long the changes a service or activity delivers will last, it is necessary to take account of other factors that may be influential. The recorded change might have happened regardless of the service, something else may have made a contribution to it or the service may have displaced changes taking place elsewhere. In considering the extent to which each of these factors may have played a part in the total impact a realistic approach should be adopted. The aim is to be pragmatic about the benefits actually provided by the park and to recognise that the value it creates is affected by other events. The SROI methodology does this by taking all these factors into account in calculating the actual impact a project or activity delivers.

#### **Deadweight**

A reduction for deadweight reflects the fact that a proportion of an outcome might have happened without any intervention. In the analysis, wherever possible, research has been used to calculate the appropriate levels. For example research suggests that 31% of Scottish people volunteer in some capacity and hence it could be assumed that volunteers might have gained some of the benefits they experienced by taking part in volunteering opportunities that included environmental activities.

#### **Attribution**

Attribution takes account of external factors, including the contribution of others that may have played a part in the changes that are identified. There are several ways that this can be assessed including a detailed consideration of the context or prevailing circumstances, responses from stakeholders and research from other areas. For instance, although school children visiting the parks will learn about the environment, they will also get information from other sources. As there is less certainty about the levels of attribution this is tested in the sensitivity analysis.

#### **Displacement**

Displacement applies when one outcome is achieved but at the expense of another outcome, or another stakeholder is adversely affected. In the analyses this is considered to occur for a few stakeholders to a limited extent. By way of illustration, volunteers might have taken part in other voluntary activities or have been able to allocate more time to other existing volunteering commitments.

#### **Application on a city wide scale**

The SROI analyses that were undertaken provided evidence of the benefits delivered by a typical park in each category but it has to be recognised that there are wide variations in the size, facilities and nature of individual parks within the four defined categories.



This had to be taken into account. Projections from the results of each of the SROI analyses were applied to predict the overall social, economic and environmental value of all of City of Edinburgh Council's one hundred and forty four parks. This was done by assessing which of the outcomes identified were likely to be delivered by each park. Criteria were set that each park had to satisfy before a prediction could be made that an outcome would be delivered. This was based on research and consultation carried out in the course of the preparation of the individual SROI analyses and an assessment by experienced council officers with significant local knowledge. The criteria that have been used for assessment are summarised in the table below.

Stakeholder	Potential Outcomes	Park Assessment Criteria
Community	Enhanced fitness levels	Facilities
	Increased physical activity	Size
	Wellbeing	Quality
	Social contact	Size/quality
	Knowledge	Environment
Volunteers	New skills	Support group/ environment
	Increased pride	Support group
	Improved fitness	Support group
	More social contacts	Support group
Local Employer	More productive workforce	Size/proximity
Schools and Nurseries	Access to outdoor educational space	Size/proximity/quality
Pupils	Skills/improved environmental awareness	Environment
Local residents	Improved visual amenity	Quality/proximity of .houses/size
Organisations	Access to outdoor space	Size/proximity/quality
	Advice and support	Level of support
Local economy	Additional revenue	Facilities/location

Some outcomes were identified, and have been used in the calculation of overall value, but as they were relevant to only one park or type of park are not included in the above criteria. For example it was only in relation to Pentland Hills Regional Park that other service providers and agencies were able to improve services and reduce costs as a result of enquiries/issues being dealt with directly by trained professional staff.



Outcomes which were identified and valued but had very limited impact were excluded.

The data on which the calculation is based is shown in Table 2. The individual analyses on which this overview is based are available separately.

The overall calculation showing how the scaling up exercise was done for all parks is in Table 1.

## Materiality issues

At every stage of the SROI process judgements have to be made about how to interpret and convey information. SROI demands total clarity and complete transparency about the approach that is taken so that there is no possibility of confusion or misinterpretation. Applying a concept of materiality means that explanations must be offered for information that can be interpreted in different ways and which can exert influence on the decisions others might take.

### (a) Visitor/Visit Numbers

The purpose of this analysis was to identify the benefits or changes individuals and organisations experienced from visiting parks in Edinburgh. To achieve this it was necessary to give some consideration to visit and visitor numbers although it must be emphasised that a comprehensive analysis was not conducted. It is accepted that there is no recognised methodology for accurately measuring visit and visitor numbers to parks. Whatever method is used will only provide an estimate with varying degrees of accuracy<sup>9</sup>. Many parks, particularly the larger ones, have a number of formal and informal entry points which visitors can use in most cases twenty four hours a day, seven days a week. There is little information about visit or visitor number in relation to the parks in Edinburgh.<sup>10</sup>

Quantities of users in the individual SROI reports which underpin this analysis were calculated on the basis of visit numbers. For clarification, visitor numbers describe how many individuals visit parks whilst visit numbers refers to the quantity of individual visits. In common with most analyses, visit numbers were consistently higher than visitor numbers. This is not surprising as, particularly in community parks, many dog walkers reported using their local park twice a day. To calculate total visit numbers a combination of visitor numbers and the frequency of visits within a given time period was used.

Visitor monitoring can be conducted in two main ways: by either surveying and counting visitors to a defined area or by using general population surveys which seek responses from individuals or households using home addresses. This analysis uses data from both sources- the individual surveys from each of the types of parks and data from the Edinburgh People's Survey. It also took into account discussions with Parks and Greenspace staff and the classification and size of each park as defined within the Open Space Audit 2009. This information was cross referenced to national and historic data.

The Edinburgh People's Survey (EPS) 2013 found, *“The average Edinburgh resident visits a park in the city on 49 days in the year, just under one day a week. Reasons for visiting include sport, exercise, dog walking and taking children to the park. The average number of visits per resident, when applied to the whole adult population, results in a total of 19.8 million days on which a resident makes one or more visits to an Edinburgh park each year.”*

It should be noted that EPS data captures visits to parks, green spaces and woodlands- some of which are not in the ownership of the Council, and that it does not include data on people under 16 and visitors who are not resident in Edinburgh.

The Scottish Household Survey suggests that during 2013, 46% of adults are estimated to have visited the outdoors one or more times per week.<sup>11</sup> Greenspace Scotland omnibus survey conducted in 2007 indicated 51% of people in Edinburgh and Lothian used their local greenspace once per week or more.<sup>12</sup>

### (b) Quantities

Quantities in relation to outcomes attributed to volunteers were based upon information supplied by council officers and an extrapolation of survey results. A similar approach was taken in relation to outcomes identified for employers, school and nurseries, pupils and children and organisations.

The number of users of sports pitches was based on data provided from the pitch booking system.

### (c) Visitor spend

Visitor spend was based on extrapolating the results of the surveys that were conducted. In both city and natural heritage parks. The amount spent by visitors recorded in the survey was applied across the board. There were the following exceptions to this approach: In smaller community parks the per capita amount was reduced by 50% to reflect more limited opportunities to spend money. In relation to premier parks the unique location of Princes Street Gardens and the contribution made by the adjacent tourist attractions and shops was considered. It was also recognised that of all the parks this one attracted the greatest number of tourists. Accordingly the amount spent at other premier parks was considered to be 50% of that reported in the survey of visitors to Princes Street Gardens.

---

<sup>9</sup> Jensen, F. Søndergaard, Karoles, K., Sievänen, T., Skov-Petersen, H., Vistad, O. I. and Wallsten, P. 2007. Visitor monitoring in nature areas. <http://www.naturvarvsverket.se/Documents/publikationer/620-1258-4.pdf?pid=2661>

<sup>10</sup> In 2002, the council carried out a limited user survey within Princes St Gardens.

<sup>11</sup> Land - Outdoor Visits

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/SharedFiles/Download.aspx?pageid=133&mid=129&fileid=90>

#### (d) Ratios

The investment ratios identified in the individual analyses are described in the table below.

Sample Park	Category	Investment Ratio
Princes Street Gardens	Premier	1:17
Gyle	City	1:9
Hermitage of Braid	Natural Heritage	1:7
Figgate	Community	1:9

The ratio of investment to benefits for parks on a city wide basis has been calculated to be 1:12. Given that there are only a few premier parks and many community parks it may have been expected that the overall ratio would be closer to that of the community parks. This is not the case because whilst the investment in Princes Street Gardens is significantly higher than that of any other park it is offset by the fact that the other premier parks have less investment and generate a bigger impact.

### Confidence Levels and Sensitivity Analysis

The findings contain data about which there is uncertainty and those elements have been tested in a sensitivity analysis. This is portrayed in the table below.

As described previously attribution refers to external factors, including the contribution of others that may have played a part in the changes that are identified. For several outcomes, although a reasoned judgement has been made on the amount to be applied, it must still be considered an estimate. Accordingly it has been tested in the sensitivity analysis and varied by a factor of 10%. This has resulted in a variation of +/- £2 -which is within reasonable limits.

There is some uncertainty over the total number of visitors to the park and it is likely that the total number of visitors has been underestimated, this is tested by increasing visitor numbers by 25%. This results in a variation of +£1 -which is within reasonable limits.

Visitor spend is based on the results of the four individual park surveys projected forward. There are a wide range of variables which will impact on this and whilst these have been considered and adjustments made assumptions have still been made. Given the degree of uncertainty visitor spend has been tested by a reduction of 25%. This results in a variation of +£1 -which is within reasonable limits.

Variable	New ratio
Increase attribution for all outcomes by 10%	9.53
Decrease attribution for all outcomes by 10%	13.57
Reduce visitor spend by 25%	10.48
Increase numbers of visitors by 25%	13.29
Reduce number of visitors by 25%	10.29

Confidence levels have been considered to be 95%. Confidence intervals, or margin of error, depend to an extent on both sample size and the percentage of the sample reporting an outcome. It is generally accepted that whilst a minimum sample size from which statistical conclusions can be drawn is 30 -to identify distinguishing features a sample size of at least 100 is required<sup>13</sup>. Individual visitor park surveys were carried out on a random basis between March and July 2014 at variable times of the day and on different days of the week.

The sample size in premier, community and natural heritage parks is between 200 and 300. For outcomes reported by more than 80% of those surveyed the confidence interval is +/- 5% and for those reported by 40% the confidence level is +/- 6%. In the city parks the sample size was only around 100. This means that there is less confidence about the results reported for city parks. For outcomes recorded by more than 80% who were surveyed in the sample city park the confidence level is +/- 8% and for those reported by 40% the confidence level is +/- 10%.

In the use of the EPS data the confidence interval is +/-1.5%.

### Conclusion

This report identifies and values the many benefits that are delivered by City of Edinburgh Council's parks. Benefits have been identified and valued from the perspective of those who will be able to experience change as a result of the investment.

The benefits each stakeholder experiences have been outlined and a financial value placed upon them. In all the hundreds of interviews conducted people described the way being able to visit parks made a huge difference to their quality of life. When asked to place a value on their park the most common response was "it's priceless".

<sup>13</sup> English Nature 2006



## Calculation Table 1

Stakeholder	Outcome	Quantity	Value	Less Deadweight	Less Displacement	Less Attribution	Impact
Community: occasional users	health and wellbeing benefits of outdoor physical activity in a maintained and safe natural environment	19,966,170	£5.50	42%	0%	75%	£15,923,020.58
	feel better and be more relaxed after being outdoors and enjoying the scenery in a maintained and safe natural environment	22,670,460	£2.50	42%	0%	25%	£24,654,125.25
	gain information about the wildlife and plants within the park and have confidence in enjoying it responsibly with respect and understanding for the environment	6,655,278	£4.00	25%	0%	75%	£4,991,458.50
	meet new people increase their social contacts	6,726,186	£2.50	80%	0%	0%	£3,363,093.00
	feel a sense of belonging to a community	11,057,640	£2.10	77%	0%	50%	£2,670,420.06
Volunteers	a sense of satisfaction and feeling that they are giving something back to the community and contributing to a good cause.	1,500	£140.40	31%	10%	5%	£124,243.47
	new friends and increased social contacts	600	£500.00	31%	0%	15%	£175,950.00
	new skills	576	£222.50	50%	0%	50%	£32,040.00
	physically more active on a regular basis	882	£55.00	25%	0%	25%	£27,286.88
Users from close by work places occasional	feel better and more relaxed and perform better on returning to work	10,600	£52.54	50%	0%	50%	£139,231.00
	to work better as a team and improve their performance at work (Figgate only)	75	£15.00	25%	0%	25%	£632.81
Schools, Nurseries and Youth Groups	outdoor learning opportunities	46,500	£4.50	25%	0%	25%	£117,703.13
School pupils, students and children	new practical skills	12,950	£15.00	25%	0%	0%	£145,687.50
	learn about wildlife and nature	33,500	£12	25%	0%	25%	£226,125.00
Organisations	Organisations are able to use the PSG as a natural environment adjacent to a historic landmark and to raise the profile of their event and attract increased numbers of participants	1,606,000	£3.90	25%	0%	90%	£469,755.00

Stakeholder	Outcome	Quantity	Value	Less Deadweight	Less Displacement	Less Attribution	Impact
Organisations and Community Groups	Local groups and organisations are able to use the park as a natural environment to provide services to their members/ clients	1,710	£39.00	0%	0%	0%	£66,690.00
Other service providers and agencies (Neighbourhood Partnerships/Other partner local authority services/SWT/SNH/ Scottish Water)	Service delivery is improved and costs reduced as a result of enquiries /issues being dealt with directly by trained professional staff	2	£50,000.00	10%	0%	10%	£81,000.00
	Additional resources are generated	1	£82,978.00	0%	0%	25%	£62,233.50
Local residents	Improved quality of life	6,400	£5,070.00	90%	0%	90%	£324,480.00
Users of Football and Cricket pitches	Health benefits of sustained physical activity	384,560	£7.20	54%	0%	25%	£955,247.04
Local economy/ businesses	Visitors spend money locally as a result of their visit (premier parks)	2,733,000	£9.68	40%	0%	75%	£3,968,316.00
	Visitors spend money locally as a result of their visit (average for all other parks)	22,398,000	£3.50	40%	0%	0%	£47,035,800.00

## SROI Edinburgh Parks Data

### Table 2

Park Name	extrapolated visitors	Type of park	Classification	Size	Volunteers Increased pride/ social contacts	Volunteers New skills	Volunteers Improved fitness	Community Increased activity	Community Improved well being	Community Improved social Contact	Community Improved knowledge and understanding of environment	Local Employer More productive workforce	Schools and nurseries Access to outdoor educational space	Pupils Skills/ improved environmental awareness	Organisations Access to outdoor space
Abercorn Park	69,000	Community	good	0.79	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Allison Park	138,000	Community	fair	9.27	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	y	N	Y	Y	Y
Arboretum Road Playing Field	75,000	City		2.09				Y	Y						
Atholl Crescent	3,650	Gardens	good	0.23	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Balgreen Park	69,000	Community	fair	0.13	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bangholm Playing Fields	75,000	City		3.16				Y	Y						
Baronscourt Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.68	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bellevue Crescent Gardens	3,650	Gardens	fair	0.15	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bingham Park	69,000	Community	good	3.88	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Blackford Hill and Pond		Natural			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Blinkbonny Park	69,000	Community	good	4.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Bloomiehall Park	69,000	Community	good	2.26	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Braid Hills	250,000	Natural	fair	93.39	Y	Y	y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Braidburn Valley Park	138,000	Community	excelent	12.26	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Brighton Park	69,000	Community	very good	0.86	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Bruntsfield Links	1,733,000	Premier	good	14.62	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Buckstone Playing Field	75,000	City		0.91				Y	Y						
Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park	138,000	Community	good	24.36	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Burgess Park	75,000	City		0.99				Y	Y						
Buttercup Farm Park	69,000	Community	new	6				N	Y	N					
Cairntows Park	69,000	Community	poor	1.26	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Calton Hill	1,733,000	Premier	good	9.6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cammo Estate	250,000	Natural	very good	38.71	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Campbell Park	69,000	Community	good	3.87	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Civil Service Sports Council	75,000	City		8.85				Y	Y						
Clermiston Park	138,000	Community	good	6.32	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Coates Crescent	3,650	Gardens	good	0.23	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N



Park Name	extrapolated visitors	Type of park	Classification	Size	Volunteers Increased pride/ social contacts	Volunteers New skills	Volunteers Improved fitness	Community Increased activity	Community Improved well being	Community Improved social Contactl	Community Improved knowledge and understanding of environment	Local Employer More productive workforce	Schools and nurseries Access to outdoor educational space	Pupils Skills/ improved environmental awareness	Organisations Access to outdoor space
Colinton and Craiglockhart Dells	250,000	Natural	very good	24.14			N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Colinton Mains Park	75,000	City	poor	6.86	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Corstorphine Hill Local Nature Reserve	250,000	Natural	good	86.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Craigmillar Castle Park including Hawkhill Woods	250,000	Natural	very good	67.27				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Cramond Foreshore	75,000	City	good	17.75	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Cramond Walled Garden	3,650	Gardens	fair	0.36	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Curriemurend Park	69,000	Community	fair	4.57	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Dalmeny Street Park	69,000	Community	good	1.19	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Davidson's Mains Park	75,000	City	good	14.43	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Deaconess	0	no info													
Dovecot Park	138,000	Community	fair	6.06	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Drum Park	69,000	Community	good	2.17	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Drumbrae Park	138,000	Community	good	8.09	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Dunbars Close Garden	3,650	Gardens	very good	0.17	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Dundas Park	69,000	Community	good	4	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
East Pilton Park	69,000	Community	Fair	2.82	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Easter Craiglockhart Hill Local Nature reserve	250,000	Natural	very good	15.3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Easter Drylaw Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.84	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
Fairmilehead Park	69,000	Community	good	5.47	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Fauldburn Park	69,000	Community	good	0.98	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Ferniehill Community Park	69,000	Community	good	1.94	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Fernieside Recreation Ground	69,000	Community	good	2.62	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Ferry Glen	50,000	Natural	good	5.64	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Figgate Park	138,000	Community	very good	10.97	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gardner's Crescent	3,650	Gardens		0.11	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gayfield Square	3,650	Gardens	fair	0.3	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Geddes Gardens	3,650	Gardens	private/ council	0.07					Y						N

Park Name	extrapolated visitors	Type of park	Classification	Size	Volunteers Increased pride/ social contacts	Volunteers New skills	Volunteers Improved fitness	Community Increased activity	Community Improved well being	Community Improved social Contact	Community Improved knowledge and understanding of environment	Local Employer More productive workforce	Schools and nurseries Access to outdoor educational space	Pupils Skills/ improved environmental awareness	Organisations Access to outdoor space
Glendevon Park	69,000	Community	good	0.12	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Goodtrees Playing Field	75,000	City		0.68				Y	Y						
Gorgie/Dalry Community Park	69,000	Community	fair	0.11	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Gracemount Community Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.71	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gracemount Sports Centre	75,000	City		0.73				Y	Y						
Grannies Green	3,650							Y	Y						
Granton Crescent Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.72	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Gyle Park	75,000	City	good	16.56	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Gypsy Brae Recreation Ground	75,000	City	fair	20.23	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hailes Quarry Park	138,000	Community	very good	13.43	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Harrison Park	138,000	Community	excelent	7.81	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Haugh Park	69,000	Community	very good	0.46	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Hays Park	3,650	Gardens		0.13	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Henderson Gardens Park	69,000	Community	fair	0.21	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Hermitage of Braid Local Nature Reserve	250,000	Natural	good	57.6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hillside Crescent Gardens	3,650	Gardens	good	0.59	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Holyrood Park	non council														
Hopetoun Crescent Gardens	3,650	Gardens	very good	0.48	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Hunters Hall Park	75,000	City	fair	20.69	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Inch Park	75,000	City	fair	25.28	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Inchcolm Park	69,000	Community	good	0.73	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Inverleith Park	1,733,000	Premier	fair	20.9	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jewel Park	138,000	Community	poor	11.46	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Joppa Quarry Park	69,000	Community	good	2.42	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Keddie Park	69,000	Community	fair	0.56	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
King George V Park (Currie)	69,000	Community	good	2.19	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
King George V Park (Eyre Place)	75,000	City	good	1.97	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
King George V Park (South Queensferry)	69,000	Community	fair	0.65	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	NN	N	
Kirkliston Sports Centre	75,000	City	0.94					Y	Y						

Park Name	extrapolated visitors	Type of park	Classification	Size	Volunteers Increased pride/ social contacts	Volunteers New skills	Volunteers Improved fitness	Community Increased activity	Community Improved well being	Community Improved social Contact	Community Improved knowledge and understanding of environment	Local Employer More productive workforce	Schools and nurseries Access to outdoor educational space	Pupils Skills/ improved environmental awareness	Organisations Access to outdoor space
Lauriston Castle	3,650	Gardens	very good	12.99	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Leith Links	1,733,000	Premier	good	18.53	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Liberton Park	69,000	Community	good	4.41	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Liberton Playing Fields, Double Hedges (Kirkbrae)	75,000	City		5.35				Y	Y						
Lochend Park	138,000	Community	good	8.42	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
London Road Gardens	75,000	City	good	4.22	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Malleny Park	69,000	Community	good	5.51	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Marchbank Park	69,000	Community	good	6	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Meadowfield Park	138,000	Community	good	17.5	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Meadows	1,733,000	Premier	good	25.13	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Meadows Yard Local Nature Reserve	50,000	Natural	good	1.05	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Meadowspot Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.4	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Meggetland Playing Fields	75,000	City		7.52				Y	Y						
Montgomery Street Park	69,000	Community	good	1.26	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Moredun Park (Gilmerton Park)	69,000	Community	poor	2.12	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Moredun Woods	50,000	Natural		3.97			N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Morgan Playing Fields	69,000	Community	good	2.79	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Morningside Park	69,000	Community	very good	1.26	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Mortonhall Community Park	69,000	Community	good	2.25	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Muir Wood Park	69,000	Community	very good	1.82	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Muirhouse Park	69,000	Community	fair	3.74	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Murieston Park	69,000	Community	good	0.54	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Newcraighall Park	69,000	Community	very g	3.36	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Nicholson Square	3,650	Gardens	good	0.12	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Northfield & Willowbrae Community Centre	75,000	City		1.08				Y	Y						
Orchard (Brae) Park North and South	69,000	Community	fair	2.49	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Parkside, Newbridge	69,000	Community	fair	0.34	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N



Park Name	extrapolated visitors	Type of park	Classification	Size	Volunteers increased pride/ social contacts	Volunteers New skills	Volunteers Improved fitness	Community Increased activity	Community Improved well being	Community Improved social Contact	Community Improved knowledge and understanding of environment	Local Employer More productive workforce	Schools and nurseries Access to outdoor educational space	Pupils Skills/ improved environmental awareness	Organisations Access to outdoor space
Paties Road Recreation Ground	75,000	City	fair	5.18	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pentland Hills Regional Park	500,000	Natural	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
Pentland View Park	69,000	Community	good	1.49	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pikes Pool	note included allison park							N	N	N	Y				
Pilrig Park	138,000	Community	good	6.88	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Portobello Community Garden	69,000	Community	very good	0.13	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Portobello Park	75,000	City	fair	6.1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Prestonfield Park	69,000	Community	very good	0.79	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Princes Street Gardens	2,733,000	Premier	good	14.26	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ratho Park	69,000	Community	good	1.17	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	y	Y	Y
Ratho Station Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.66	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Ratho Station Recreation Ground	69,000	Community	fair	1.49	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Ravelston Park	69,000	Community	very good	1.6	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ravelston Woods Local Nature Reserve	250,000	Natural	verygood	8.86	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Redbraes Park	69,000	Community	good	1.09	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Redford Wood	50,000	Natural	poor	5.32	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Redhall Park	69,000	Community	fair	3.58	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Regent Road Park	69,000	Community	good	2.14	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
River Almond Walkway	250,000	Natural	good	7.23	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Riverside Park	69,000	Community	good	0.34	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	
Rocheid Path	50,000	Natural	fair	1.48	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Roseburn Park	75,000	City	good	5.56	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Rosefield Park	69,000	Community	good	1.34	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Saughton Park and Gardens	1,733,000	Premier	fair	13.98	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Seafield Recreation Ground	69,000	Community	good	5.54	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Seven Acre Park	69,000	Community	good	1.62	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Sighthill Park	138,000	Community	good	13.1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Sighthill Powerleague	75,000	City		0.81				Y	Y						
Straiton Place Park	69,000	Community	good	0.35	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N

Park Name	extrapolated visitors	Type of park	Classification	Size	Volunteers Increased pride/ social contacts	Volunteers New skills	Volunteers Improved fitness	Community Increased activity	Community Improved well being	Community Improved social ContactI	Community Improved knowledge and understanding of environment	Local Employer More productive workforce	Schools and nurseries Access to outdoor educational space	Pupils Skills/ improved environmental awareness	Organisations Access to outdoor space
Taylor Gardens	3,650	Gardens	fair	0.27	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
The Pitz Portobello				1.04											
Union Park	75,000	City	good	4.09	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Victoria Park	75,000	City	good	6.16	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Wardie Playing Fields	75,000	City	5.58					Y	Y						
Warriston Playing Field	75,000	City	3.85					Y	Y						
Water of Leith						Y									
West Pilton Park	69,000	Community	good	4.79			N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Whinhill Park	69,000	Community	fair	1.69			N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
White Park	69,000	Community	good	0.28			N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N



## HAPPY TO TRANSLATE

You can get this document on tape, in Braille, large print and various computer formats if you ask us. Please contact ITS on 0131 242 8181 and quote reference number 15-0588. ITS can also give information on community language translations.