



Park Services
Byelaw public consultation report
November 2018

Introduction

In 2018 Leicester has an estimated population of 542,547 residents, Leicester is the largest city in the East Midlands and the Tenth largest in the country. Leicester City Council Parks & Open Spaces Services is responsible for the management and maintenance of over 3,088 acres (1,638 hectares) of parkland and open space across the city approximately 22 per cent of the city area.

Including:

- 153 local parks
- 2 Green Flags
- 3,078 allotment plots
- 178 play areas
- 23 ball courts
- 4 Skate Parks
- 5 BMX
- 2 Parkour
- Over 150,000 trees & 107 hectares of woodland
- 4 Cemeteries and 1 Crematorium
- 31 Outdoor gyms
- Sports facilities
- Over 8 million users per year
- Leicester Environmental Service which achieves 9000 volunteer engagements and 60,000 volunteer hours annually

In addition Park Services carries out work for a number of areas of the council, from housing estates, playing fields, highway verges to small factory units. This includes grounds maintenance, tree management, landscape construction and bereavement services. We currently have a team of 7.5 Park Warden posts that manage all site health & safety monitoring and enforcement across all publically accessible parks and green spaces in the city.

Enforcement background.

When using our parks and open spaces, it is important that certain rules are followed to ensure they remain safe and clean for everyone to enjoy. We try to make sure everyone can enjoy our publically accessible green spaces safely. To do this we have a number of byelaws, policies and guides in place. We encourage people to enjoy our parks as fully as possible, however there are circumstances where without the correct permissions, you may have to abandon your activity or be prevented from continuing if the activity is already underway.

Leicester City Council uses a variety of legislative powers including byelaws to address crime and anti-social behaviour. The authority has a number of warranted officers within various environmental teams including Parks Services who have the

legal powers to issue fixed penalty notices or take alternatives actions under a variety of these powers, please see link for more information

<https://www.leicester.gov.uk/media/177541/fixed-penalty-notices-guidance.pdf>.

What are byelaws, why do we need them?

Byelaws are local laws made by a local council under an enabling power contained in a public general act or a local act requiring something to be done – or not done – in a specified area. They are accompanied by some sanction or penalty for their non-observance.

If validly made, byelaws have the force of law within the areas to which they apply. Generally byelaws are overseen by the relevant government department or confirming authority who has policy responsibility for the subject matter.

The MHCLG have responsibility for byelaws covering pleasure grounds and open spaces. These relate in the main to the peaceful enjoyment of parks and open spaces and the suppression of nuisances.

Byelaws are enforced by the local authority through the magistrates' court and contravening a byelaw can result in a fine upon successful conviction.

Byelaws are considered measures of last resort after a local council has tried to address the local issue the byelaw applies to through other means. A byelaw cannot be made where alternative legislative measures already exist that could be used to address the problem. Byelaws should always be proportionate and reasonable. Where a byelaw is no longer necessary, it should be revoked.

Leicester City Council and our usage of byelaws relating to pleasure grounds, public walks and open spaces

Leicester City Council already has adopted byelaws for Parks and Open Spaces which were last updated in 2009. Since that time the number of visitors to our parks and open spaces has risen dramatically to over 8 million per year and the way in which people utilise parks and open spaces has changed with emerging trends which has identified new items for consideration. These include,

- Site improvements, developments and name changes made in the last 9 years.
- New sites created and sites removed where byelaws no longer required.
- Changes in the way or scale of visitors accessing sites and subsequent ASB.
- Identified need for inclusion of current byelaws that previously weren't available, i.e. Drones.

Byelaw review, adoption and implementation process

There is a clearly defined process for all Local Authorities to follow if they wish to review, make changes, remove or include further byelaws. The below also demonstrates the timeframe that LCC has applied to the completion of each stage.

- 1.1. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) – **Started pre consultation August 2018**
- 1.2. Consultation – September – October 2018 **Completed 05/11/2018**
- 1.3. Review feedback and produce consultation report – November 2018
- 1.4. Complete EIA – Post consultation November 2018
- 1.5. Produce & publish regulatory assessment – November 2018
- 1.6. Submit application to MHCLA (allow 12 weeks) – December 2018
Notice of intent published on website – March 2019
- 1.7. Consultation period 28 days – April 2019
- 1.8. Seal byelaws – May 2019
- 1.9. Publish introduction of byelaws – May 2019

Consultation Process

The consultation was live for a period of 4 weeks (08/10/2018 – 05/11/2018) via <https://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/communications/parks-byelaws/>. The consultation was also advertised on all 12 main parks across the city via onsite notice boards. It was emailed to a number of stakeholders who were also asked to share where relevant.

Internal consultees:

Executive Lead 28/09/2018
Community Safety 28/09/2018
Estates & Buildings 28/09/2018
Festival & Events 28/09/2018
Health Services 28/09/2018
Highways team 28/09/2018
Legal Services 28/09/2018
P&OS management team 28/09/2018
Planning, City Archaeologist 28/09/2018
Planning, Nature Conservation Officer 28/09/2018
Standards & Development, inc City Wardens 28/09/2018
Sports Services 28/09/2018
Ward Councillors 28/09/2018
Trees & Woodlands 28/09/2018

External consultees:

Leicester Environmental Volunteers 18/10/2018
Environment Agency 23/10/2018
British Model Flying Association 28/09/2018
Environment Agency 28/09/2018
Leicester Dioceses 28/09/2018
Leicester Disabled Action Group 28/09/2018
LFRS 28/09/2018
National Council for Metal Detecting 28/09/2018
Abbey Park Friends of Group and User Group 28/09/2018
Aylestone Meadows Appreciation Society 12/10/2018
The Friends of Knighton Park 01/10/2018
The Friends of Victoria Park 01/10/2018
Leicestershire Wildlife Trust 01/10/2018
The Friends of Aylestone Hall Gardens 12/10/2018
Braunstone Park Art Club 12/10/2018
Braunstone Park History Club 12/10/2018
Winstanley Hotel/ Braunstone Park 12/10/2018
Police 28/09/2018
The Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Buildings, Monuments and Sites Division 28/09/2018
Braunstone Park Model Aircraft Club – 28/09/18
Forum for Older People

Responses Received

There were **36** responses received. The ethnicity responses and percentages are included below and within the full summary within the appendix II.

White British - 25 Responses = 69.44%
Prefer not to say – 4 Responses = 11.11%
White European – 2 Responses = 5.56%
Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi – 1 Response = 2.78%
Asian or Asian British Indian – 1 Response = 2.78%
Dual or Multiple Heritage – 1 Response = 2.78%
White Irish – 1 Response = 2.78%
Other ethnic group – 1 Response = 2.78%

Total 36 Responses or 100%

Based on Leicester's current population estimation this is a response of 0.007% of the population responding. A response of 1% would have been around 5425.

Consultation Responses

In summary there were 32 people out of the 36 respondents who left feedback or comments; the byelaws these comments relate to are summarized in the table below and a full copy of the comments have been included as Appendix II. The byelaw that attracted the most feedback was Part 3.14 Cycling - No person shall without reasonable excuse ride a cycle in the ground except in any part of the ground where there is a right of way for cycles or on a designated route for cycling.

This byelaw received 17 comments from the 36 people who responded which equates to 47% of respondents commenting on this proposed byelaw. The full breakdown of consultees engaged is included as appendix a.

The general opinion on whether parks and open spaces pathway networks should be fully accessible by cyclist was very much split, with many references made to safety being the priority and considerate cycling. Several referenced cycling as being a key focus of our sustainable transport plans for the city and fears over road safety for cyclists.

Park Services works closely with our in house Sustainable Transport team and their walking and cycling development officers to encourage people to use our designated walking and cycling routes and trails. Leicester City Council and our City Mayor are working hard to implement safer cycling routes and connect the city up via our Sustrans walking and cycling routes for example the network of new cycle ways within the city centre and the new London Road safer cycling scheme which includes new cycle routes across Victoria Park which are currently being installed.

Whilst we encourage cycling on designated pathways we have to be able to enforce inconsiderate or dangerous cycling on none designated pathways where it may put other sites users both animals and humans at risk or pose a risk to the cyclist themselves. Leicester City Councils Sustainable Transport team work closely with Sustrans to identify suitable pathway networks and adopt accordingly where the assessment deems them suitable. Full copies of approved city walking and cycling routes are available via <http://www.choosehowyoumove.co.uk/>

The second largest number of comments received was 5 out of 36 or 14% for the exclusion of dog control or litter management. Litter and Dog Control management and enforcements is not included within the proposed byelaws as both are addressed via alternative legislation and legal powers. Only issues not already actionable via alternative policing or enforcement powers are included within byelaws, as explained *What are byelaws, why do we need them*, at the beginning of this document.

However we acknowledge and support the 2 feedback comments received highlighting the word “Invalid” as being outdated terminology in relation to reference of mobility scooter users. We have raised this directly with The MHCLG(MHCLG) to request they consider changing this wording in future model byelaw guidance on 12/10/2018.

While the model byelaws are tried and tested and designed to cover all eventualities MHCLG recognises that in some cases there may be unique local circumstances meriting a variation to the model byelaw. Where a local council does retain a model byelaw, any changes to the wording should be kept to a minimum.

The local council is responsible for providing evidence for the need for each variation which then informs their deregulatory statement that they then publish on their website and submit to the Secretary of State. Unfortunately as this is not a unique local circumstance and we are unable to provide evidence of need for wording variation based on number of responses raising this issue.

Analysis of consultation comments received

Byelaw	Positive (In Support of proposal)	Negative (Against)	Other Wording revision or alternative suggestion	Totals
Term Invalid Carriage			Part 1 & 3 Concern raised its outdated term, LCC has raised this with MHCLA.	Various references to terminology.
3.14 Cycling	8	6	3 x Should be permitted if done safely	17
Dog Control/Litter			5 x comments re both areas of enforcement not mentioned in byelaws, that is because these are	5

			enforced via other legislation.	
Part 7 Metal Detector	1	0		1
Part 5.26 Bathing	0	1		1
Part 6.31 Model Aircraft General prohibition	2	2		4
Questions not comments			3 received	3
Part 5.30 Fishing	1	0		1
Part 2.8 Protection of wildlife	2	0	Comments raise concern the wording doesn't go far enough.	2
Part 3.15 Motor Vehicles	1	0		1
Part 4.16 Children's Play Areas	0	1		1
Part 7.35 Metal detectors	0	0	Wording suggestion	1
Part 4.18 Skateboarding	3	0		3

Consultation impact on proposed byelaws.

There are no changes to be made to the byelaws proposed and consulted on as a result of minimal input received and no overwhelming objections or identification of needs. None of the comments received identified any ways the proposed byelaws would impact on consultees because of their protected characteristic(s) and there were no service access barriers identified that could or would affect consultees from accessing services/other opportunities that meet their needs.

The full breakdown of consultee's comments are included within the consultation comments received appendix b.

Appendix b

Consultation comments received

1	<p>Byelaw 14 - No person shall without reasonable excuse ride a cycle in the ground except in any part of the ground where there is a right of way for cycles or on a designated route for cycling.</p> <p>I find this byelaw to be outdated and unreasonably restrictive. Parks should be open spaces where children and adults alike should be allowed to ride bikes. The health and wellbeing benefits to the population are undisputed so there is no justification for this bylaw.</p> <p>Please say goodbye to byelaw 14 altogether.</p>
2	<p>Part 3 Horses Cycles and Vehicles - Reference is made twice to "invalid carriage" I think the wording needs to be brought up to date by use of the term "Mobility scooter" or "Powered Wheelchair" People with mobility issues would doubtless object to being referred to as invalids. I know I would!</p>
3	<p>14 + references to dogs (not existent at the moment)</p> <p>There appears to be nowhere in this survey to add my comments - so will do so here.</p> <p>1) Where cycling is permitted is ambiguous. It says basically that it is allowed where it is allowed. I would suggest that it be allowed anywhere in the park (with a few exceptions such as children's play areas, sensory garden etc) , which is what seems to apply now, with no problem.</p> <p>2) There is no reference anywhere to dogs, which cause a major problem, particularly when allowed to roam free. I suggest that dogs should be kept on a lead at all times while being walked along the paths in the park. Ideally, a specific area should be set aside where dogs can be let off their leads, as there is a real health hazard when dogs are allowed to urinate on areas where people, especially children, play. At the moment there is a major problem of dogs jumping up on to people sitting on the benches. For some people this can be very frightening - for others a real annoyance, quite apart from the mess caused by dogs' muddy paws on one's clothes. A byelaw regarding dogs defecating in the park should also be included.</p> <p>3) I don't recollect seeing any reference to litter - it should be an offence to leave litter anywhere except in the designated bins.</p>
4	<p>3.14, cycling. Cyclist should obey MPH restrictions. e.g. on Knighton park it prominently displays 5 miles per hour on all paths many cyclists exceed this.</p> <p>7.37, why are metal detectors permitted in any parks?</p>
5	<p>I beleive cycling should be permitted/encouraged in all park areas unless specifically prohibited by appropriate signage.</p> <p>Cycling should be encouraged in Leicester as a sustainable form of transport. In line with infrastructure developments being made in the city.</p>
6	<p>The rule regarding cycling seems unreasonable. I understand about people</p>

	<p>cycling recklessly on footpaths, but the wording discourages cycling, particularly by children. For example, the one cycle path across Victoria Park is very good, but it isn't always practical to get to it to travel across the park.</p>
7	<p>Part 3 -14 Cycling There should be a distinction between young children's cycling and 'persons cycling'. Accompanied children under 11 should be allowed to cycle in parks. This promotes good health and learning to cycle.</p> <p>Suggested change to promote safety for lone women cycling at night: "Cyclists should use the designated routes in parks for transport. If using non-designated routes, cyclists should ride at walking pace if pedestrians are present. "</p> <p>Crossing Victoria Park at night as a single female cyclist is much safer using the pedestrian route, and it is usually clear when it is dark.</p> <p>New updated items The old bye laws do need updating, but I am surprised that there is no reference to: *the use of children's electric vehicles in parks *geocaching (which should be allowed but with some restrictions) *litter (did I miss it?) including fly tipping, * photography and videoing people without permission, especially children * alcohol consumption and supply/ or drugs</p>
8	<p>26. No person shall without reasonable excuse bathe or swim in any waterway except in a designated area for bathing and swimming. This byelaw applies to all the grounds listed in Part 6 of Schedule 2.</p> <p>Following the successful crossing of the Channel by Captain Matthew Webb in August 1875 and the huge publicity his achievement received, throngs of naked boys plied the waterways of England in response, and it all became too much to bear. This same year a new Leicester bye-law for the park and St Margaret's pasture was enacted reading: "No person shall bathe in any water in the park or recreation ground except in such place or places specially set apart by the Corporation and may be identified by notice 'Subject to compliance with regulation.' " Thus bathing came under the control of the Corporation, who now prescribed its limitations. No doubt this came as a blessed relief to those who felt it essential to contain the masses of young adventurers. The imitation of Webb saw swimmers spanning great distances up and down river; however the Order would now ensure that youngsters were contained within much smaller stretches of river, out of public view. This would go a long way towards bringing to an end the annoyance and embarrassment experienced by respectable ladies. But it changed forever the thrill of distance swimming; boys and young men had to contend themselves with counting lengths rather than the real achievement of swimming for miles. From this point on, swimmers were in a sense confined by authority and so they paced backwards and forwards like caged animals. In the minds of the prudish Victorians that's exactly what they were. The first victory had been achieved;</p>

	<p>shameless children were hidden away so that ladies, young and old, could stroll along the riverbank in peace.</p> <p>This bylaw is outdated. Children no longer bath in the costume of Eden and so hiding them away in designated bathing areas is unnecessary.</p> <p>The council no longer provide a “designated area for bathing and swimming”.</p> <p>The Bede House, Castle Gardens, Raleigh Park, North Bridge, Abbey Park and Abbey Meadows bathing areas were all replaced by St Margret’s Baths which has also now closed.</p> <p>To outlaw bathing in the river except within a designated bathing area is a contravention of the right to navigate any river in England as stated in the Magna Carta.</p> <p>This bylaw should be removed.</p> <p>Please see examples of other local authorities and the way they have updated their regulations here:</p> <p>https://www.hungouttodry.co.uk/leicester-swimming-restrictions</p> <p>https://swimmingnews.wordpress.com/2015/07/31/outdoor-swimming-society-help-liberate-swimmers/</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4gbvasZd5C0</p> <p>Please contact me if you wish to further explore the possibility of amending and updating this bylaw.</p>
7	<p>To propose a blanket ban for all model aircraft and drone flyers across all park spaces in Leicestershire is not only an impossible thing to enforce but is also farcical in it's very nature. In my entire duration flying, the health and safety implications to members of the public is nearly always jeopardised due to the actions of that ill-advised member of the public and rarely due to the pilot.</p> <p>Further to this, engaging a ban to fly within Leicestershire parks cannot legally be enforced, as the air above the ground is not owned by the public, council or any private park owners, and under the Civil Aviation Authority Air Navigation Order (Articles 94 and 95) as long as minimum distances are adhered to UAV pilots are still able to legally operate above almost any space unless prohibited by specific legislation relating to civilian or military controlled or prohibited airspaces, neither of which Leicestershire's park spaces can be considered as.</p> <p>Further to this, laws surrounding data prevention and privacy dictate that any UAV fitted with surveillance equipment only breaches the privacy of others in the event they are identifiable from the footage acquired, which is somewhat moot when you consider that operating within any of your spaces means pilots must be a minimum of 50m from any person, vehicle or structure, either laterally or in height; and adhering to this means that any members of the public caught within the footage are non-identifiable.</p> <p>It is with some disappointment that I find I must provide you with this feedback, as Leicestershire's parkland and communal green spaces should be there for the enjoyment of all members of the public, including those who operate drones - and instead of a blanket ban, perhaps looking instead at windows of acceptable activity, zonal restrictions and changes to bye-laws that are inclusive of the drone community would be better serving to the public as a whole, rather than what appears to be an over the top knee-jerk reaction to</p>

	prior complaints, that instead unnecessarily limit the activities of those who already operate safely and legally within your constituency.
8	I think it's important, as part of creating a healthier, more environmentally friendly city, that the council encourages cycling. There should be clear cycle routes in all the city parks, ideally with either segregated lanes or wide shared paths.
9	Revised byelaw 9 re closing of gates - will this not impact of the entry for travellers taking up occupation? Revised byelaw 18 - will this include segways and similar?
10	"Bylaw 30, section 2, part 10: Fishing at aylestone meadows has had incidents of causing issues to dogs and children"
11	Under <Ball Games>, could there be a clause outlawing littering specifically by empty water bottles and the plastic bands used for players' socks? Time and again used plastic bottles & sock bands are discarded on the Aylestone Meadows football pitch nearest Bilberry Close, following a match. Could teams be fined for not taking litter away with them or not putting it in the bins? I once had a polite word with some team coaches, asking them to ask players to take bottles home with them. I don't know if I had any effect. If they had to pay a deposit, only returnable if the pitch were left litter-free, they'd think more carefully.
12	8. Protection of wildlife This, or another section, should include protection of wild plants i.e. not removing etc. Also, it's not clear whether 'animal' includes birds. This ambiguity should be removed and protection of birds explicitly included - for example, non-disturbance of nests and young during the breeding season. Generally speaking, the byelaws appear to be written largely with formal parks in mind, while they also need to cover areas which are significant for wildlife i.e. Aylestone Meadows Watermead Country Park, etc.
13	Ref 8 Protection of wildlife needs to be extended to include how country arks like Castle Hill are mown so that all wildlife including wild plants, insect life as well as birds & small mammals do not have most of their breeding and especially wintering habitat destroyed when autumn mowing commences in late September. It is understood that large areas need mowing for various reasons but wildlife require a more area rotational management scheme. Ref 15 Re motor bikers - somehow this needs tightening up in terms of dealing with offenders as Castle Hill C.P, Gorse Hill are areas beset by this motor biker plague. The police have understandable limitations both in terms of policing requirements and available manpower but more council-police co-operation and more metal gates and concreted barriers to make biker access almost impossible are needed. I photo bikers whenever I can & pass any photos and descriptions to the police when I can but very clear concrete evidence is needed and int needs more of a plain clothes monitoring presence

	and perhaps the use of drones at key times of biker presence in these areas - i.e usually between 15.00 & 16.30 between May and September.
14	<p>Old - Cycling 15. No person shall without reasonable excuse ride a cycle in the ground except in any part of the ground where there is a right of way for cycles or on a designated route for cycling.</p> <p>Draft revision -Cycling 14. No person shall without reasonable excuse ride a cycle in the ground except in any part of the ground where there is a right of way for cycles or on a designated route for cycling.</p> <p>The City Council walking and cycling team are keen to encourage people of all ages to cycle more. People who are learning how to cycle are encouraged to practice their cycle skills off the public highway. It is not helpful to give the impression they are not welcome to do this in the Leicester parks. The parks are also particularly attractive off-road routes for commuters and children travelling to school by cycle. It would not make sense from a road safety view to push these people on to the public highway.</p> <p>Please could you re-word your section on cycling to something like:- " Considerate cyclists are welcome to cycle in our parks so long as they do not wilfully cause distress or injury to other park users." There may be occasions during particular events when restrictions on cycling in certain areas of parks are required. This could be signed as temporary restriction with reasons given.</p>
15	<p>Part 6 Model Aircraft Will the council publish designated areas for Model Aircraft flying?</p>
16	<p>Part 3 .14 Cycling prohibitions need enforcing.</p> <p>There isn't any reference to littering and penalties for it.</p>
17	<p>Part 4 - 16 - it does not say that people over 14 should not go onto the play equipment. so an 18 year old in charge of a younger sibling or infant, may just have a go on the swings whilst watching the child? "Not being in the area of the play equipment" is not enough to my mind, the old wording was.</p> <p>Part 6 Model Aircraft - somewhere at the start or end of that set of bylaws - should say "this also includes any Drones whether remotely controlled or not" that should future proof the section for a year or two.</p> <p>Part 7 - 35 "..... or Drone" should be included, since with development of drone delivery, many "pilots" sat in an office do not see their vehicle as a toy or model and many drone owners have no idea of the law - as personally witnessed in Bradgate Park chasing deer and dogs with a drone and I then called the wardens when a middle aged lady was buzzed with one and she fell</p>

	over!
18	<p>31 . Model aircraft This is significantly over reaching and doesn't differentiate between type, size, weight or function. It would include all models from rubber band powered toy planes weighing a few grams to professional drones.</p> <p>It would allow large unpowered (powered launch) craft, which could do just as much damage.</p> <p>Indeed, a flying football can (and often does) cause way more damage than a flying toy plane.</p> <p>The bylaw should make a differentiation by stating size and weight of the model that is allowed to fly in an open park as opposed to a designated area</p> <p>If you think photography should be banned in all parks, then also include a statement about aircraft with cameras, but also include a clause about walkers with cameras.</p>
19	<p>New Byelaw 31. I feel that as stated this is weak in that in some of the larger parks such as Abbey Park, on occasions I have witnessed the flying of small drones which caused danger to other park users. I am not sure if this is legally enforceable but I suggest these drones should not be physically taken into any park or open recreation area under Council control - how this could be enforced if such drones are in car boots is questionable, but at least it would require they remain in the vehicle.</p>
20	<p>I can't provide a reference number as I can't find any bylaw relating to dogs.</p> <p>I've looked through the draft bylaws but I can't find any reference to dogs. I was expecting to see bylaws about keeping dogs under control, owners responsibilities regarding dog fouling, etc, etc. I don't understand this omission.</p>
21	<p>I support New Byelaw 18 which bans skateboarding in certain parks, mostly within the City Centre area.</p> <p>I support the retention of Byelaw 14 which states that 'No person shall without reasonable excuse ride a cycle in the ground except in any part of the ground where there is a right of way for cycles or on a designated route for cycling.'</p> <p>I believe that Byelaw 14 and 18 should extend to the whole length of New Walk as this walkway does link a number of parks and gardens such as Museum Square, De Montfort Square and The Oval - as well as the top and bottom of the Walk.</p>
22	Happy with these changes
	Leicester has a huge problem in terms of anti social dog owners in all its parks and the Great central Way. Bradgate Park has acknowledged this problem

	<p>which has been widely publicised. I'm surprised that there is nothing in the proposals to deal with dog ownership, specifically the owners not being in control of the dog/ the dog not being kept on a lead. I use a lot of the parks in the south of the city with my children or for running and there are many instances daily where dogs are causing problems because the owner makes the conscious decision not to control them properly. Can this be addressed please?</p>
23	<p>#14 - cycling</p> <p>I just want to support the retention of this byelaw. While it is not generally enforced it does allow (for example) signage which will deter some cyclists. I fear that some cyclists don't understand the problems of mixing with pedestrians (especially the young and old) - and they want to access all areas.</p> <p>I am finding it increasingly difficult to walk in some parks due to being unbalanced by cyclists. My walking route to City Centre includes Victoria Park, but having fallen to the ground a number of times (on all occasions due to cyclists) I rarely walk on the paths and can only use the park when dry enough to walk on the grass. The risk of a fall has increased now I'm on blood thinners. Often I have to get the bus.</p> <p>On some other parks where cycling occurs freely, the increase in numbers is also preventing me from using them - certainly for relaxing leisure. I like to take my camera and watch nature - that may involve standing still focused on a birds movements, or moving unpredictably, which doesn't match well with the quiet fast approach of a cyclist. (I can hear the joggers!).</p> <p>We need to have routes across parks for cyclists - but equally we need routes where pedestrians can relax and walk safely. I am aware that in some parks young children are being pushed in buggies because parents feel that cyclists are a risk to their toddlers unpredictable route.</p> <p>The byelaw doesn't prevent safer routes being designated for cyclists, but does allow some control where needed and it should be retained.</p>
24	<p>Cycling is to be encouraged for many reasons, however, I feel strongly that pedestrian walk ways in parks should not be opened up to cyclists. By their nature and design walk ways are intended for pedestrian use by people of all ages and disabilities. If a cyclist wants to take a particular route, they should dismount and walk. I do not see why they think they are entitled to determine and select the quickest route across a park. People walking alongside young children, people with visual, hearing and other disabilities are all put at risk.</p> <p>I understand that many people do not feel safe cycling on some of our roads, but this is no excuse to jeopardise the safety of pedestrians, particularly if there is a cycle route, which may be slightly longer. The council is working hard to provide more cycle paths and interested cycling groups should work with the council on these projects.</p>
25	<p>Part2 3 Cycling</p> <p>parks are a safe way for people to get from A to B, and the established cycle lanes to not reflect all the routes people may wish to take. if it aint broke, don't try and fix it.</p> <p>it would be difficult to police this bylaw- it is more appropriate to encourage</p>

	careful cycling, with due regard to pedestrians (who may also wander onto cycle lanes inadvertently. Reckless cyclists should be taken to task, but not everyday cyclists- including children learning to ride.
26	I'm pleased to see that the Council has recently been increasing cycle parking at a number of city parks (although 6 stands at popular cycle destinations like Abbey Park cafe doesn't seem like enough to me). But the byelaw preventing cycling other than on specifically designated routes seems too heavy handed. Experience in the city centre is, as the City Mayor frequently points out, that cyclists and pedestrians can share certain spaces safely, without increased risk. Surely we should be encouraging more people to cycle in general. If that means cycling through a park, as a safer alternative to a busy road, then that should be facilitated by opening up routes rather than this outdated approach which does not appear too have been reviewed at all.
27	Cycling should be allowed where done safely in Victoria Park and New Walk. Many more people would be encouraged to travel to work safely if this were the case. Cycling into Leicester via London road is high risk.
28	I don't see why I should be expected to know this useless piece of information. Surely this should have been picked up from the page I came here via! I don't see why cycling should not be allowed in parks. Respectful cyclists will cycle safely, disrespectful cyclists will not pay any attention to byelaws regardless!
29	I support the retention of Byelaw 14 regarding the restrictions on cycling. I support the introduction of Byelaw 18 restricting skateboarding
30	Stop motor bikes and cars using Hamilton park and green spaces as a race track
31	I fully support the retention of Byelaw 14 regarding the restrictions on cycling and I totally support the introduction of Byelaw 18 restricting skateboarding in much the same way. I believe these Bye-Laws should be extended to Museum Square, De Montfort Square, The Oval and, is appropriate, the whole length of New Walk as both cyclists and skate-boarders are quite serious hazards to pedestrians, especially the young, the infirm and those who are partially sighted or blind.
32	Older Persons Forum Supportive of byelaw 14 restricting cycling and 18 restricting skate boarding especially within the city centre.