Tools for evaluating the impact of WIAT (Woods in and Around Towns) Intervention sites

Protocol to be followed when using the WIAT Questionnaire and Environmental Audit Tools

June 2010

Prepared for Forestry Commission Scotland
by
Catharine Ward Thompson and Jenny Roe
OPENspace: the research centre for inclusive access to
outdoor environments
Edinburgh College of Art
Lauriston Place
Edinburgh EH3 9DF
Tel: 0131 221 6177
OPENspace@eca.ac.uk

Contents   **Page**

1.0   Introduction

In 2006, in order to gauge the effectiveness of WIAT interventions over time, the Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) commissioned OPENspace to conduct a longitudinal survey comparing perceptions and use of local woodlands, both pre-WIAT intervention (2006) and 3-years post-intervention (2009). In developing the methodology for longitudinal analysis, OPENspace developed two tools: firstly, a household questionnaire (administered by Progressive Partnership Ltd., a market research company) and, secondly, an environmental audit tool designed to support findings on quality of woodlands from the questionnaire with a more objective assessment of the physical environment and evaluate the type of experience offered by the woodland, pre and post WIAT intervention.

This document sets out the development of these two tools over time, together with guidance notes for their continued use on WIAT intervention sites. The tools were developed to be used in conjunction with eachother and we strongly recommend both are administered pre and post any environmental intervention.

In order to gauge their continued effectiveness, we ask that you register your intention to use the tools with OPENspace at the address below.

OPENspace, Edinburgh College of Art, Lauriston Place, Edinburgh EH3 9DF.

Email: j.roe@eca.ac.uk or c.ward-thompson@eca.ac.uk

2.0 Protocol for WIAT Questionnaire

2.1 Background

The following protocol has been developed based on the experience derived from the first longitudinal study (2006-2009) carried out by OPENspace research centre, supported by Progressive's administering of the community questionnaire. The protocol focuses on a community-level evaluation of WIAT interventions aimed at improving woodlands so as, ultimately, to improve people's quality of life. This should be complemented by additional evaluation of specific activities and additional outcomes determined on a site-by-site basis.

2.2 Essential Requirements

- A control site should be surveyed, as similar as possible to the intervention site and from the same urban area or district. The importance of a control against which to measure change cannot be over-emphasised; it is an essential part of any attempt to demonstrate the effectiveness of WIAT interventions in a rigorous and scientifically credible way.
- Ensure control and intervention sites are selected on the same demographic criteria (e.g. communities in the top 15% of multiple deprivation indices) and physical criteria (for WIAT sites, communities within 500m of woods earmarked for WIAT activity; for non-WIAT site, communities with similar built form characteristics but without a wood within 500m).
- To ensure an unbiased sample, the community survey should be administered using a random quota sampling approach. This means the interviewers are given quotas to fill from specified sub-groups of the population, chosen at random (and so is usually based on random sampling of addresses for in-home interviews). As a minimum set of criteria, the quotas should be determined according to local census data profiles for the communities being sampled according to age, sex, ethnicity and socio-economic group (SEG).
- Sample size should be enough to allow meaningful statistical analysis of the data, with pre and post surveys of the same numbers. We recommend a minimum sample of 100 in each community or 4-5% of the total population.
- Measure longitudinally (i.e. pre and post intervention): carry out the pre and post surveys in exactly the same way, at exactly the same time of year, and over a 3-year time span, with the baseline before any intervention has taken place in year 1, the intervention in year 2 and the post-intervention survey in year 3.
- Be clear in each case study area at the outset what the nature of the intervention is (e.g. environmental change *v*. community engagement *v*.

- A record of participants willing to be re-surveyed post intervention to be kept, to assist in longitudinal tracking of the effects of interventions (complying with data protection requirements for informed consent, confidentiality, etc).

2.3 Desirable Requirements

- To measure over a longer period of time (e.g. 3-5 years post-intervention) to explore whether any significant changes are sustained over time.
- To continue to use well-being and green space questions that can be compared with other national data sets (e.g. Scottish Social Attitudes, Scottish Household Survey).   In this way, it is possible to compare survey participants' health, physical activity or perceptions of local green space at baseline to the general pattern for their city/town, or for the wider population.
- To keep a record of other environmental/community initiatives undertaken during the course of the study (as they may affect the outcomes being evaluated).
- To minimise variation in the data; e.g. by repeating the post-intervention survey at the same time of year and ideally (if participants permit storage of their name and address to allow this) of the same people. The latter is difficult to achieve in practice but is the ideal to be aimed for – consider use of a small incentive.
- To review all measures, particularly health measures, on a regular basis to reflect changes in understanding from concurrent research and practice and ensure good practice approaches are adopted.

2.4 Administering the questionnaire

2.4.1 The questionnaire (see Appendix 1) is designed to be administered by a professional interviewer.

2.4.2 The questionnaire should be used with show cards (A-Q), displaying the range of permitted responses and provided by Progressive, who have previously administered this questionnaire, see Appendix 2.

2.4.3 The pre and post surveys must be carried out at the same time of year, with a recommended time span of 3 years.

2.4.4 Keep a record of participants willing to be re-contacted for the repeat survey (in accordance with Data Protection Act 1988)

2.4.5 If the circumstances make it impossible to administer the questionnaire by interview and participants are invited to self-complete, the choice of participants should still be random within the community. However, there are several potential problems with self-completion, depending on how the surveys are distributed and results gathered. There is usually no guarantee that an appropriate, unbiased sample would be obtained, so this option should only be considered as a last resort or where an already biased sample is sought (e.g. of site users, to compare with a wider, community survey). The minimum recommended font size for printing the questionnaire is 13 point. The layout would need to be carefully considered if this option were used, to ensure clarity and ease of completion.

2.5 Collating data and analysing the questionnaire

2.5.1 The recommended coding of responses must be adhered to, as shown in Appendix A. In order to ensure comparability of data collected across different sites and at different times, it is essential that the same coding be used for responses to the core set of questions, If additional questions or options are added due to the particular nature of the site, *new codes must be allocated*. The danger otherwise is that useful and consistent data collected across different sites becomes difficult or impossible to compare in any programme-level or cross-project analysis.

2.5.2 Simple descriptive statistical analysis (using charts) and statistical tests such as Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis can usefully be used to explore the results. More complex techniques such as factor analysis and regression analyses are also recommended as likely to yield useful and robust results; advice from experts in statistics may be needed if some of these techniques are to be used effectively.

3.0 Protocol for WIAT Environmental Audit Tool

3.1 Purpose of the tool

The Audit Tool is designed to enable, within limited time and resources, evaluation of the quality and experience of any WIAT site pre and post intervention in a systematic way. It enables the user-friendliness of an urban woodland to be evaluated, its character and opportunities for different kinds of use, set within a neighbourhood context. It is designed to be used in research projects alongside other methods such as questionnaire surveys or focus groups. While principally designed to be applied by qualified environmental designers, it is also capable of being applied by members of local communities, with guidance and assistance from professionals.

The key attributes of a successful audit tool are that it must be rational, robust and reliable. Tools of this sort, addressing aspects of a woodland setting that may be rather subjective (e.g. the experience of its quality), need to rely primarily on systematic descriptive methods which can then be compared. Rationality is ensured by the careful and informed development of the relevant aspects included in the tool (as set out below). Robustness is ensured by testing the tool in a range of circumstances with a range of auditors, to ensure it comes up with consistent and credible results. The use of scoring as a quasi-objective measure helps to comparability to the evaluation of each aspect of the environment, while the use of pairs of trained assessors to do each audit ensures consistency and reliability.

It is important to note what this tool is **not** designed for: it is *not* designed for a summative scoring and comparative evaluation of overall quality between woodlands for ranking, say for competitions or awards. Nor is it designed as part of a community planning approach aimed at uncovering aspects to be improved or the development of a future vision, and in this it differs from other green space audit tools currently available, such as CABE's Spaceshaper tool. The main purpose in developing the WIAT Audit Tool has been to enable a before and after comparison of the same site in a systematic manner.

The tool is designed to be used in conjunction with the WIAT questionnaire, both to supplement this data with a record of the physical qualities of the site and to help understand and interpret the results from the questionnaire in relation to findings on qualities of local woodlands. Its appropriateness for community use, which has proved very successful in previous WIAT research, is assisted by the simplicity and descriptive character of the tool, with an emphasis on systematic recording of relevant issues rather than relying principally on the scoring. This means that the tool is more than simply a measure of physical attributes; it is an attempt to capture the experience of a place, which may include both good and bad aspects.

3.2 History of the Tool

3.2.1 Use in WIAT evaluation to date

OPENspace first developed the tool in 2006 in order to audit WIAT woodlands pre and post environmental interventions. The aim was to provide a benchmark by which improvements to urban woodlands could be evaluated in subsequent years. The tool was intended originally for use by professional landscape architects but a major aim, when developing the tool, was that ultimately it could be piloted and used with members of local communities. Key criteria for developing the tool, to ensure it was as rational and robust as possible were:

1. To focus on key variables known from the research literature to influence people's perceptions and experience of woodlands, notably quality and safety.
2. To incorporate information on local context and neighbourhood criteria (a notable omission from other UK audit tools).
3. To provide concise measures that could be understood and used quickly and simply by non-professionals without making excessive demands on their time.

The tool drew on a number of existing green space audit tools, primarily, CABE's 2004 *Green Space Strategies, A Good Practice Guide*, Annex 2: Green Space Audit Methodology. We also considered other green space audit tools, including Simon Bell's '*Woodland Survey'* audit tool and other international tools such as the University of Western Australia's *Quality of Public Open Space Tool* (POST) (Broomhall, Giles-Corti & Lange, 2004). Key criteria from each, which overlapped or complemented each other to a large degree, were combined into one audit tool to include the following aspects of the environment: neighbourhood, access/signage, woodland quality, facilities, use, maintenance/management and security/safety. The descriptive element, which highlights the unique character and special circumstances of each space but which is sometimes difficult to make comparisons of, is supported by a scoring system whereby the criteria are rated using a simple 5 point scale (where 5 = best and 1= worst).   The aim of the scoring system is to establish some point of reference by which different aspects of **similar** woodland environments can be compared (so urban woodland can be compared with urban woodland, rather than with a rural woodland) or, as in the purpose of WIAT, to allow evaluation of change over time in the same woodland. The tool is therefore primarily a qualitative instrument, allowing comments to be recorded for each criterion in turn.

The tool was first used in a longitudinal research evaluation of WIAT interventions in three communities from the top 15% of deprived areas, according to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD). These were in

Glasgow, Aberdeen and Edinburgh, in woodlands earmarked for WIAT intervention or in control sites where no local green spaces changes were proposed. It was applied by a team of professional landscape architects in the winter of 2006, who re-audited the sites in winter 2009.   In total, 7 sites were audited, and two sites were re-audited in the summer of 2007 to record seasonal variations in quality and experience.   A high degree of consistency in scoring was found between the auditors on each occasion, ensuring the reliability of the tool. The full findings of the professional audit are reported in Ward Thompson et al 2007.

Community use: the tool was first used with local residents in Drumchapel, Glasgow, in the winter of 2007 and in summer 2008. 15 local residents took part on each occasion. A high level of consistency was found in the auditing between the professionals and local residents on all items, with the exception of safety and maintenance, where local opinion was found to be more favourable than that of the experts. Participants were offered a simple lunch afterwards but received no other incentive. No problems with language or understanding of the terminology were reported. The full findings of the community audit are reported in Ward Thompson et al 2008.

3.2.2 Modification of the tool for urban green space auditing, 2009

The tool was further developed for use in a study for the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) Space in 2009, primarily to support and inform findings on quality of urban green space from a household questionnaire. The main changes were in relation to terminology, in order to make the tool applicable to a range of urban green space typologies (e.g. parks, woodlands, etc). The tool was used in the six case study areas for the project in London, the West Midlands and Greater Manchester. Four professional architects/landscape architects from OPENspace carried out the audits, two per site, including one member of staff with special expertise in working with black and minority ethnic groups.   All auditors received an intensive half day training in use of the tool. Two urban green spaces were audited within each case study area (one park, and one other green space type), with the professional audit completed first, followed by a community audit involving white British and black and minority ethnic groups, ranging from between 5 and 9 participants in number. High consistency between auditors (between professionals and community participants) was found, and the findings helped support findings on quality from the questionnaire. Full findings are reported in Ward Thompson et al 2009.

3.0 Administering the tool in WIAT intervention sites

3.1 The environmental audit must be carried out at the same time as the questionnaire survey.

3.2 A professional audit should be carried out by a minimum of two trained auditors.

3.3 The professional audit can be supplemented by a community audit with a recommended minimum number of 5 participants. Appropriate clothing (e.g. waterproofs) may need to be provided for participants, with full indemnity insurance for health and safety in place. If a full community audit is not possible, we suggest at least some evaluation on safety and security aspects of the woodland is gathered from the local community.

3.4 The professional and community audits should be carried out at the same time of year, prior to the WIAT intervention and at a suitable time thereafter, to coincide with the questionnaire survey timings (we recommend a one year after completion of any WIAT interventions and, ideally, three years afterwards as well).

3.5 The control site (if available) should be audited at the same time of year as the intervention sites.

3.6 Ideally, the sites should be audited in summer and winter (pre and post intervention) to gauge any seasonal differences in vegetation cover that may affect security/safety, etc.

3.7 The repeat audit should be carried out at the same time of year as the baseline audit. The post-intervention professional environmental audit should ideally be carried out by the same trained professionals as in first survey stage.

3.78 New auditors should be trained through testing the audit tool in a local woodland prior to carrying out a WIAT audit.

See Appendix 3 for further guidelines on administering the audit tool.

References

Broomhall M, Giles-Corti B, Lange A (2004). *Quality of Public Open Space Tool (POST).* Perth, Western Australia: School of Population Health, The University of Western Australia. Available at URL http://www.sph.uwa.edu.au/go/schools-and-centres/schools/school-of-population-health/research-programs/centre-for-the-built-environment-and-health-c-beh-/projects/public-open-space-tool-post-, viewed 18/05/2008

CABE Space (2004). *Green Space Strategies, A Good Practice Guide*, London: Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)

Ward Thompson, C., Roe, J., Aspinall, P, and Zuin, A., Travlou, P, and Bell, S. (2009): *Not so green and pleasant? Understanding the impact of quality of urban green space on well-being*. Research for CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment), September 2009 (to be published by CABE, July 2010).

Ward Thompson, C., Roe J. and Alves, S., (2007) Woods in and around towns (WIAT) Evaluation: Baseline Survey, Final Report, March 2007, Prepared for the Forestry Commission Scotland.

Ward Thompson, C., Roe, J. and Alves S., (2008) Woods in and around towns (WIAT) Evaluation: Baseline Survey Phase 1B, September 2008, Prepared for the Forestry Commission Scotland.

Appendices

Appendix 1: WIAT Questionnaire

Appendix 2: Showcards A-Q

Appendix 3: Audit Tool: Instructions for Auditors

Appendix 4: WIAT Audit Tool (community version)

Appendix 1: Woodlands In and Around Towns (WIAT) Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed by OPENspace, Edinburgh College of Art, for Forestry Commission Scotland and is designed to measure perceptions and use of local woodlands and gauge the effectiveness of WIAT interventions over time. Section 1 comprises the core questionnaire; Section 2 comprises some additional mental health questions you may wish to consider including in your evaluation. The questionnaire is permitted for use by the Forestry Commission for the purpose of WIAT evaluations only and is designed to be administered by a professional interviewer. The questionnaire should be used with show cards (A-Q) displaying the range of permitted responses and provided by Progressive Partnership Ltd., who have previously administered this questionnaire, see Appendix 2.

In order to keep a record of its use, please first register your intention to use the questionnaire with OPENspace, Edinburgh College of Art, Lauriston Place, Edinburgh EH3 9DF.
Email: j.roe@eca.ac.uk or c.ward-thompson@eca.ac.uk

SECTION 1

Classification

Age		Gender		Locations (if more than one)	
16-24	1	Male	1		1
25-34	2	Female	2		2
35-44	3				3
45-54	4				4
55-64	5				5
65-74	6				
75+		**Occupation of Chief Wage Earner**		**Social Class**	
				AB	1
A. White				C1	2
Scottish	1	_____		C2	3
Other British	2			D	4
Irish	3	_____		E	5
Any other White background (specify)	4				
_____					
B. Mixed					
Any mixed background (specify)	5				
_____					
C. Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British					
Indian	6				
Pakistani	7				
Bangladeshi	8				
Chinese	9				
Any other Asian background (specify)	10				
_____					
D. Black, Black Scottish, or Black British					
Caribbean	11				
African	12				
Any other black background (specify)	13				
_____					
E. Other ethnic background					
Any other background (specify)_____	14				

<u>Interviewer's Declaration</u>
I declare that I have carried out this interview in full, in accordance with best practice and instructions.

Interviewer's Signature_____   Date: _____

Print Name:_____

Respondent's   Address:
Name:_____   _____

Phone:_____   **_____**

                                              FULL Postcode:

                                              _____

On completion of questionnaire, interviewer to make a note below of participant decision to be re-contacted, see final question, Section H

YES – participant willing to be re-contacted   1
NO – participant does not wish to be re-contacted   2

Introduction   *:*   *Good morning/afternoon I am....................... from ……………………, who are carrying-out a survey to find out what you think about your local environment and wonder if you would mind answering some questions. The interview should take no more than 15 minutes.*

Firstly, to make sure I am interviewing in the correct area, can you please tell me if you live in the area shown on this map? *ALL RESPONDENTS MUST LIVE WITHIN THE BOUNDARY (AS ESTABLISHED FOR THIS PARTICULAR PROJECT EVALUATION) WHICH MUST BE CLEARLY MARKED ON A MAP FOR THE INTERVIEWER. Showcard A*

Yes   1 – A1
No   2 - CLOSE

A1. How satisfied are you with your quality of life in this neighbourhood? *Showcard B*

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
1	2	3	4	5

A2. Would you advise a friend to live in this neighbourhood? *Showcard C*

Completely	Would consider	Neither / nor	Unlikely to consider	Not at all
1	2	3	4	5

We could use A2 or A1 – A2 usually has higher factor loadings in this case .915

A3. How satisfied are you with the quality of the physical environment in this neighbourhood? *Showcard B*

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
1	2	3	4	5

B1. In the past 4 weeks, on how many days have you done physical activities such as brisk walking, cycling, sport, or energetic exercise, sufficient to cause an increase in your breathing rate (do not include physical activity that may be part of your job)?

_____days total in last 4 weeks

B2. In general, would you say that, for a person of your age, your health is: *Showcard D*

Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Very bad
1	2	3	4	5

B3 People sometimes feel the need to escape from everyday problems and stresses to take their mind off things or clear their head. Would you say you ever feel like this? *Showcard E*

Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
1	2	3	4	

B4 All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays? *Showcard B*

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
1	2	3	4	5

B5 How strongly do you feel you belong in the neighbourhood? *Showcard F*

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither disagree or agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

B6 Generally speaking, would you say most people in your neighbourhood can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? *Showcard G*

Most people can be trusted	Some people can be trusted	Can't be too careful in dealing with people	Unsure	Refusal
1	2	3	4	5

C1. What do you think about the quality of your local woodlands? *Showcard H*

Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very poor	Don't know what my local woodlands are like
1	2	3	4	5	6

C2. How important are the woodlands around here in making a difference to your quality of life? *Showcard I*

Irrelevant	Unimportant	Neutral	Somewhat important	Very important
1	2	3	4	5

D1. The following statements relate to different aspects of your local woodlands. Please, score each statement according to your level of agreement. *Showcard J*

	Tick start, rotate, read out	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
D1	The woodlands are free from litter	1	2	3	4	5
D2	It is difficult to get into the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D3	I feel safe in the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D4	Poorly maintained paths make it difficult to visit the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D5	I feel at peace in the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D6	I can pursue healthy activities in the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D7	The woodlands provide a place to visit with family and friends	1	2	3	4	5
D8	I can see and enjoy wildlife in the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D9	I like the natural appearance of the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5
D10	There is a lack of good facilities in the woodlands	1	2	3	4	5

E1. Have you visited Scottish woodlands in the last 12 months?

	Code	Route
Yes	1	Go to E2a
No	2	Go to E9

E2a. Were those visits mainly;

Read out, Single Code	Code
To woodlands in the countryside	1
To woodlands in and around town	2
To both	3

E2b. Do you ever pass through woodlands on local journeys to or from other places?

	Code
Yes	1
No	2

E2c. What are the names of any local woods you have visited in the last 12 months?

_____

_____

E3. What kinds of activities do you pursue when visiting your local woodlands? *SPONTANEOUS – MULTICODE*

	Code
Go for a walk	1
Walk the dog	2
Go out with my family	3
Exercise or sport	4
Relax	5
Look at plants or wildlife	6
Participate in an event	7
Other (specify)_____	8

E4. How frequently did you visit woodlands last winter i.e. between October and March? *Showcard K*

	Code
Every day	1
Several times a week	2
Once a week	3
Several times a month	4
About once a month	5
Less often	6
Not at all	7
Unsure	8

E5. How frequently did you visit woodlands this Summer i.e. between April and September?
Showcard L

	Code
Every day	1
Several times a week	2
Once a week	3
Several times a month	4
About once a month	5

	Code
Less often	6
Not at all	7
Unsure	8

E6. On average during the last 12 months <u>how long</u> did you normally spent at your local woodlands? *Showcard L*

	Code
Up to 15 minutes	1
Over 15minutes – 30 minutes	2
Over 30 minutes – 1 hour	3
Over 1 hour – 2 hours	4
Over 2 hours – 5 hours	5
More than 5 hours	6
Unsure	7

E7. How do you get to your local woodlands? *Multi-code*

	Code
By foot	1
By car	2
By public transportation	3
By bicycle	4
Other (Please specify)	5
_____	

E8. Do you usually go to the woodlands?

Read out, single code	Code
Alone	1
With others, including family and friends	2

ASK ALL
E9a. How easy is it to get to your local woodland from where you live? *Showcard M*

Very easy	Easy	Not sure	Difficult	Very Difficult	Unsure
1	2	3	4	5	6

E9b. Can you name any woods in or near your neighbourhood?

_____

_____

E10. Do you know how long it takes to get to your local woodlands?

	Code	Route
Yes	1	Go to E10.1
No	2	Go to E11

E10.1 How long does it take to get to your local woodlands? *SPONTANEOUS Showcard N*

	Code
Up to 5 minutes	1
5 to 10 minutes	2
11 – 15 minutes	3
16 to 20 minutes	4
Over 20 minutes	5

E11. Did you visit local woodlands as a child? *Showcard O*

	Code
Almost every day	1
More than once a week	2
Once a week	3
Several times a month	4
Once a month	5
Several times a year	6
Once a year	7
Less than once a year or never	8
Never	9

E12. Have you been consulted about your views on local woodlands in the last 12 months?

	Code
Yes	1
No	2

F. IMPORTANCE OF THE WOODLANDS

F1 If your local woodlands could be improved, what would encourage you to use them more?
Please code no more than 3 statements. (*Showcard P)*

	Tick start, rotate, read out	Only code 3 statements
F1	Off-road car parking	1
F2	Clear signposting on paths	2
F3	Leaflets and maps to help you find your way around	3
F4	Well-surfaced paths for your activity	4
F5	Availability of staff at the site (for example rangers)	5
F6	Information on-site. e.g. about history or conservation	6
F7	No signs of vandalism	7
F15	Feeling safe from undesirable other people	8
F16	Feeing safe from having an accident	9
F17	Well maintained trees and plants	10

F2 If your local woodland were improved, what would you most like to do there?
Please choose up to **three things** from the following (Showcard *Q)*

	Tick start, rotate, read out	Only code 3 statements
F8	Being able to spend time with family and friends	1
F9	Being able to enjoy scenery and views	2
F10	Being able to enjoy the wildlife	3
F11	Getting peace and quiet	4
F12	Getting physical exercise	5
F13	Getting fresh air	6
F14	Being able to relax and unwind for a while	7

G SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Code

G3. Working status of respondent?

Working full-time (30+ hrs per week)	1
Working part-time (less than 30 hrs per week)	2
Self-employed	3
Unemployed	4
Full time student	5
Retired	6
Student	7
Looking after home/ family	8
Permanently sick/disabled	9
Other (Please specify)	10

G4. Are you a registered disabled person?

Yes	1
No	2

G5. Do you have young children under 16 years old living in your household?

Yes	1
No	2

G6. Do you own a dog?

Yes	1
No	2

G7. Do you have regular access to a car or other motor vehicle?

Yes	1
No	2

G8. How long have you been living in your current neighbourhood?

Less than 1 year	1
1-3 years	2
4-10 years	3
More than 10 years	4

H. Recontact[1]

H1. Would it be possible for us to pass your contact details onto the partnership agencies involved in WIAT (*woodlands in and around towns*), so you can be recontacted in connection with any future research? Data would be held in full accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

	Code
Yes	1
No	2

.

---

[1] Note to interviewer: add participant consent decision to front declaration sheet

SECTION 2: additional mental health questions

Annex to Question B3 ('People sometimes feel the need to escape from everyday problems and stresses to take their mind off things or clear their head. Would you say you ever feel like this?'**)**

B3.2 Where would you be most likely to go to escape from everyday problems and 'clear the head'

1 your own home
2 a family or neighbour's home
3 out of doors (private or shared garden, local streets, park, wood, field or nearby countryside)
4 other (specify)

Short version of Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS) 7-item scale (register intention to use with H.Maheswaran@warwick.ac.uk)

Below are some more statements about your feelings and thoughts. Please tick the box that best describes your experience of each **over the past 2 weeks.**

Statements	None of the time	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time
1. I've been feeling optimistic about the future					
2. I've been feeling useful					
3. I've been feeling relaxed					
4. I've been dealing with problems					
5. I've been thinking clearly					
6. I've been feeling close to other people					
7. I've been able to make up my own mind about things.					

Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) (Cohen 1983) 10-item: permission for use of the scale is not necessary for academic research.

In the last month…	never	almost never	some-times	fairly often	very often
1 How often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?					
2 How often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in life?					
3 How often have you felt nervous and stressed?					
4 How often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?					
5 How often have you felt that things were going your way?					
6 How often have you found that you could not cope with all the things you had to do?					
7 How often have you been able to control irritations in your life?					
8 How often have you felt that you were on top of things?					

9	How often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?					
10	How often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?					

Appendix 2

SHOWCARD A – Insert MAP of study area

Showcard B

Very satisfied

Satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied

Showcard C

Completely

Would consider

Neither / Nor

Unlikely to consider

Not at all

Showcard D

Very good

Good

Fair

Bad

Very bad

Showcard E

Always

Frequently

Occasionally

Rarely

Never

Showcard F

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither disagree or agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Showcard G

Most people can be trusted

Some people can be trusted

Can't be too careful in dealing with

people

Showcard H

Very Good

Good

Neutral

Poor

Very poor

Don't know what my local woodlands are

like

<u>Showcard I</u>

Irrelevant

Unimportant

Neutral

Somewhat important

Very important

Showcard J

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly agree

Showcard K

Every day

Several times a week

Once a week

Several times a month

Less often

Not at all

Showcard L

Up to 15 minutes

Over 15 minutes – 30 minutes

Over 30 minutes – 1 hour

Over 1 hour – 2 hours

Over 2 hours – 5 hours

More than 5 hours

Showcard M

Very easy

Easy

Not sure

Difficult

Very difficult

Showcard N

Up to 5 minutes

5 to 10 minutes

11 – 15 minutes

16 to 20 minutes

Over 20 minutes

Showcard O

Almost every day

More than once a week

Once a week

Several times a month

Once a year

Less than once a year

Never

Showcard P

Off – road parking

Clear signposting on paths

Leaflets and maps to help you find your way around

Well- surfaced paths for your activity

Availability of staff at the site (for example rangers)

Information on-site e.g. about history or conservation

No signs of vandalism

Feeling safe from undesirable other people

Feeling safe from having an accident

Well maintained trees and plants

Showcard Q

Being able to spend time with family and friends

Being able to enjoy scenery and views

Being able to enjoy wildlife

Getting peace and quiet

Getting physical exercise

Getting fresh air

Being able to relax and unwind for a while

Appendix 3

WIAT Audit Tool: Instructions for Auditors

The Professional Audit

1. Conduct the professional audit **prior to** the community audit, either on a separate day or at a separate time.
2. Take a small, <u>selective</u> number of photographs as a reference (boundaries/entrances, main spaces, and local neighbourhood) and reference locations on a map.
3. Check the scoring for consistency between auditors (if more than two auditors, a statistical tool such as SPSS can be used to compare for statistical differences, otherwise simply examine the data for differences).

The Community Audit

1. Recruitment of participants: in the past recruitment has been facilitated by a local community centre or health promotion group.   Ideally, those without a 'green' bias should be recruited but this may not be achievable if, say, recruiting via a local walking group. Aim for a mix of age and gender.
2. Take care not to bias or influence the community participants' opinion in any way by pointing out things you think are 'good' or 'poor' during the audit process. Participants may discuss things amongst themselves; whilst this may be unavoidable, try to keep participants focused on the task.
4. You will need to introduce the project to the community group and thank them for taking part. e.g. "*The information collected as part of this audit will be used with other data (questionnaires etc) to help inform forest recreational policy*".
5. Start by taking a ½ hour walk around and within the woodland. If it's a very long woodland walk, you will need to be selective.
6. Find a sheltered spot to complete the audit. Unless it's pouring with rain, the audit sheet should be completed in the field (you will need to take clip boards and pens). If it's raining, complete in car/shelter/local café. Be aware some people may need help completing the questionnaire (forgotten reading glasses etc).
7. Safety: stay as a group, do not allow anyone to wander off. Make this clear at the start, and that individuals need to act responsibly for their own personal health and safety on-site.

8. If conducting the audit with minority ethnic groups, be aware of a possible need for a translator or the need for more time on site to interpret particular words, etc.
9. You may need to offer an incentive to take part (e.g. a voucher for a local store). We strongly recommend you provide refreshments/lunch for participants on completion of the task.
10 Check the participant sheets at the end to make sure all sections have been completed.
11 SPSS can be used to pick up any statistical differences within the group but, if less than 5 participants or so, simply look critically at the data for consistency between recruits. Preparing charts of results will help pick up any patterns of differences.

Appendix 4

Each Item to be scored on a scale of 1 to 5
(1= Poor, 2=Low 3=Medium/Fair, 4=Good, 5 = Excellent)

Location: **Date and time of audit:**

Weather conditions: **Carried out by:**

1 The Neighbourhood	Score	Comments
1.1 Is there a good urban infrastructure (ie. mix of facilities (shops, community centre, recreation), services (police, health, education, public transport), range of housing?		
1.2 How would you rate the appearance of the neighbourhood (e.g. shop frontages/housing/gardens)?		
1.3 Is the neighbourhood free of graffiti, litter, vandalism, dog fouling?		
1.4 Are the local streets/roads well-maintained and well-lit?		
Total Score		
2 Access/signage to Wood		
2.1 Is there good and safe access (well located entrance(s), within easy walking distance of homes, safe road crossings (zebras/signals), bus access) ?		
2.2 Is there a good path network within the woodland (including surface quality, range)?		

---

[2] If being used with local community, we recommend inclusion of the following questions in the introduction:
Have you visited this site before? Y/N
How did you get to the woodland (e.g. by foot)?
How often do you visit? (visits per month: summer and winter)

2.3 Is it welcoming?		
2.4 Is there equal access for all members of the community? (clear signage, good paths, ramps alongside steps, wide entrances, no obstacles, good seating, accessible information where appropriate)		
2.4 Is there good signage to and within the woodland?		
Total Score		
3 Woodland Quality		
3.1 Is there a variety of spaces within the woodland (e.g. open and enclosed areas)?		
3.2 Is it a rich and stimulating environment?		
3.3 Are the boundaries attractive?		
3.4 Is it high on sensory appeal (presence of water/birds) etc?		
Total Score		
4 Facilities		
4.1 What facilities are present (e.g. presence of toilets, picnic, café, cycle tracks, health/fitness, play, educational, ranger provision)?		
4.2 Do you think these facilities are appropriate to a woodland of this size?		
5 Use		
5.1 Is the space well-used (on the day of audit)?		
5.2 .2 Is there evidence of other use, formal and informal, not present on the day of audit, e.g. remains from picnics, trampling from informal ball games, dens, tyres/swings, ramps, bike tracks etc		
Total Score		
6 Maintenance/Management		
6.1 Is the woodland clean and free from litter, dog fouling and vandalism/graffiti?		
6.2 Are the site furniture and signage and any buildings (if present) well maintained?		

6.3 Is the planting and grass well-maintained?		
6.4 Is there any evidence development within the woodland?		
Total Score		
7 Security/Safety		
7.1 Can you see out from the woodland (to streets/other people)?		
7.2 What's your sense of personal security in the space: • on the day with a group (if appropriate)		
• if you were on your own		
7.3 Is this a secure place for all members of the community to use or walk through (elderly people, people from diverse cultures, children, young people)?		
TOTAL		