Risk and benefits in lifestyle sports: parkour, law and social value

Paul Gilchrist (University of Brighton) and Guy Osborn (University of Westminster)

Abstract

This paper examines the interrelationship between law and lifestyle sports, viewed through the lens of parkour. We argue that the literature relating to legal approaches to lifestyle sport is currently underdeveloped. Law is viewed as a largely negative presence, seen particularly in terms of the ways in which counter-cultural activities are policed and regulated, where such activities are perceived to be transgressive and undesirable. We argue that this is a somewhat unsophisticated take on how the law can operate, with law constructed as an outcome of constraints to behaviour (where the law authorises or prohibits), distinct from the legal contexts, environments and spaces in which these relationships occur. We examine specifically the interrelationship between risk and benefit and how the law recognises issues of social utility or value, particularly within the context of lifestyle sport. A case study is provided of the employment of claims to social value present in the advancing institutionalisation of parkour in the United Kingdom. Through the case study, the paper seeks to foreground a more nuanced position that moves away from user-centred constructions of law as an imposition toward an appreciation of how the law can be used to support and extend claims to space.

Keywords:

risk; sports law; lifestyle sport; liability; social benefit; parkour

Introduction

The struggle to inhabit space for lifestyle sport activities involves negotiating a system of legal rights and responsibilities. The law structures who can belong in, or who is excluded from, space. It stipulates the types of behaviour that are permitted, and restricted, in places and spaces. It is active in producing prohibition of the use of particular environments as well as establishing 'spaces of responsibility' that authenticates the presence of legitimate users, dependent upon the performance of stipulated behaviours. As Brown (2014a: 22) argues, "A legitimate citizen of the outdoors must demonstrate requisite conduct and aesthetic ability demanded by dominant moral orderings." What we seek to show in this paper is that the law has a bearing upon how the sporting body moves through space. In this sense there are 'lawscapes' that accompany sportscapes; spatial planes where the abstract values of law acquire a material presence as behaviours are managed and legal subjects determined (Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, 2007, 2013). Whilst there is a substantive literature on the role of law and regulation in determining access to the outdoors and desirable citizenships (see Brown, 2014a; Collins, 2011; Parker, 2007; Ravenscroft, 1998; Church and Ravenscroft, 2007), our argument is that lifestyle sport studies has a hitherto under-developed appreciation of the law in determining practice and use. Where the 'lawscapes' of lifestyle sport have been observed it tends to be embedded within an analysis of the dialectical conflicts inherent in the spatial politics of lifestyle and informal sports, as an assertion of a right to play is counteracted by an assertion of a right to order space (Borden, 2001; Donnelly, 2004; Kiewa, 2002; Rinehart, 2007; Stranger, 2011; Wheaton, 2013). Viewed in this light, law is positioned as a threat to the counter-cultural, non-conformist and anti-institutional ethos of lifestyle sports. Far from being supportive or facilitative, it is seen as an obstruction or hindrance. Skateboarding is taken as the paradigmatic case and parallels are drawn where appropriate between the treatment of skateboarding and parkour. We are conscious that the literature is

more developed in the case of skateboarding so attempt to illustrate how parkour can learn from skateboarding, whilst drawing out key differences within the specific subcultures. Within skateboarding compliance with an external field of legal regulation has driven processes of sportisation, leading to the development of 'mainstream' forms of skateboarding that discharge a concern for the risks to participants as well as facilities that work with urban management regimes to satisfy occupier liability and property rights (Atencio and Beal, 2015; Borden, 2001; Howell, 2008; Németh, 2006; Turner, 2013; Vivoni, 2009). Seen through the lens of juridification these developments can be seen as forms of the colonising, taming/domesticating and subsuming tendencies of the law (Foster, 2006; Blichner and Molander, 2008; Cooper, 1995; Forster, 2012; Gibson, 2013; Greenfield et al 2011).

Here we concentrate upon the ways in which the law has intersected with parkour, noting its historical tendency to be seen in terms of policing transgression and limiting access, but we seek to develop a counter-narrative and more nuanced appreciation of law's role, something hitherto somewhat occluded in the lifestyle sports literature. This increasing role of law as bolster not hindrance, of support not obstacle, can be seen in tandem with the increasing institutionalisation of parkour. We start by outlining the traditional view of the law and its relationship to the practice, focusing on cases brought to light in the UK where lawscapes relating to parkour have emerged in early phases of its growth around parts of the British Isles. Next, we outline competing approaches to lifestyle sport and social utility, reviewing how the law has intersected with lifestyle sports and has set provisions for risk-taking activities. We consider the relationship between risk and benefit, looking specifically at issues of social value and utility and the role the law might have to protect such activities, running counter to the prevailing negative view of the law. These two aspects will then be explored using parkour, our key case study, as a vehicle to analyse some of these tensions. In conclusion, we posit that far from a dystopian narrative of co-optation, institutionalisation

and “strategic marginalisation” that has worried enthusiasts keen to retain the playfulness and spatial challenge of parkour (Mould, 2016), the law has potential to accommodate and support such practices and citizen entitlements to the enjoyment of urban space. The following findings draw upon qualitative data, mainly secondary analysis of documents and semi-structured interviews. The paper draws upon data that was originally collected as part of a longitudinal study into the institutionalisation of parkour (see Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011) and this has been supplemented by further contemporary documents obtained from a range of organisations, providers and groups involved in establishing parkour training sites and through interviews with key stakeholders, including the Chief Executive of Parkour UK. A number of cases are provided from the UK context and further afield, supplemented by available media materials as supporting evidence. The examples provided are not exhaustive of the range of entanglements between lifestyle sport and lawscapes, such a review is beyond the bounds of this paper, but are taken instead as illustrative and symptomatic examples of broader trends toward juridification, criminalisation and the institutionalisation of parkour, alongside potential recasting of space and use through discourses of social utility.

Problematising Parkour and the emerging lawscape

Akin to the histories of other lifestyle sports, the shadow of the law has followed the emergence of parkour. Several cases have occurred in the UK where parkour participants (traceurs) and communities have been forced to adjust to external legal pressures and moral injunctions, especially when the sport is practiced in unsanctioned and unauthorised spaces. Here the law begins to move in to areas where it once did not, and the forms of legal intervention alter over time (on this process with respect to football, see Osborn 2001). Traceurs have consistently reported being asked to ‘move on’ by police officers and security guards (Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011**).** Local by-laws banning ‘tombstoning’ (jumping into

the sea from a height) and threats of £500 fines were issued by the local authority in Hornsea, East Yorkshire (Anon, 2011a). A ban was placed on parkour in Moreton, just outside Liverpool, in July 2009, prohibiting the sport across the whole town on the basis that it encourages anti-social behaviour by copycats poorly versed in the sport's philosophy of respect for public space (Granada News, 2009). In addition, the police have begun to adopt a stronger challenge to the idea that the city is a playground and have responded to public concerns about the safety of traceurs and free runners on roof tops in city centres. In June 2014 a combination of Durham Police, Durham University and the Cathedral united to issue a warning to traceurs to refrain from practicing in the city centre, for fear of damage to listed buildings that make up the city's World Heritage Site status (see anon 2014a&b). Similar warnings were issued in Salisbury, for fear loose roof tiles would be dislodged, risking the safety of pedestrians below (Cork, 2015). In Surrey, the Safer Guildford Partnership told 93 parkour enthusiasts attending a training workshop to stay away from the town, labelling it a "dangerous pastime which poses a serious risk to themselves and to others" (Dobson, 2015: 175). An anti-social behaviour officer in Stevenage also cautioned participants to "consider their actions", avoid busy shopping areas and trespassing onto private property, warning "any damage caused to buildings, or any other offences that are committed will be investigated and participants could end up with a criminal record" (Dunne, 2014). These soft warnings were communicated to traceurs and free-runners via local print and broadcast media. However, tougher actions have also been evidenced. A more spectacular police response manifested in Liverpool as five police cars and a helicopter were sent to the city centre early one Sunday morning where a leading traceur was filming roof-to-roof jumps (Tacey, 2015).

Furthermore, under Section 35 of The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (ASBCPA 2014) police have been given more stringent powers for the removal of people

considered to be causing harassment, alarm or distress to the locality. Under the provisions of the act dispersal orders can be used to move people away from a designated area for 48-hours, with powers to arrest if those excluded return. The Act was used in February 2015 in Caerphilly, Wales, after youths were seen free-running across the roof of the indoor market (Anon, 2015). Further, the use of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs), created by ASBCPA 2014 and permitting councils to criminalise specific, non criminal activities from taking place in a particular area, has been suggested as a further potential mechanism to prevent the practice of lifestyle sports. Bournemouth Borough Council examined in 2015 whether these might apply to parkour along with other 'problematic' behaviour' (Garrett, 2015), although their use has been strongly critiqued (Appleton, 2016). However, in September 2016, a PSPO was used in Horsham, West Sussex, to ban parkour from the town centre following reports of damage caused to business premises by traceurs and amid concerns of unsafe practice and trespass (BBC South Today, 2016).

These examples all illustrate the vigilance of the police in managing city and town centres and some of the legal tools available to exclude what they, usually along with residents and the business community, consider to be an undesirable presence. Such interventions sharpen the moral geographies of urban space, delineating more risk-taking forms of the sport as out-of-place, whilst at the same time enforcing property rights in the concern shown for the integrity of historic buildings (Iveson, 2013).

What these cases reveal are epistemological and ontological entanglements between sport, law and space. As Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (2013: 35) states, the law is "spread on pavements", it "covers the walls of buildings", it permits people to move and to touch in certain ways (and not others). In this sense law is inescapable. It is to be found within the regulations, limits and controls placed on behaviour in public and private spaces, and on space itself. It is guided to a large degree by where the activity is undertaken, and whether the

space that is utilised is sanctioned or unsanctioned. The former will tend to come under local authority or occupier control, that latter more likely to be subject to the gaze of the law, both civil and criminal. Whilst a narrative of external imposition and colonisation can be written, we argue that this is a potentially misleading and somewhat unsophisticated take on how the law can operate, with law constructed as an outcome of constraints to behaviour (where the law authorises or prohibits), distinct from the legal contexts, environments and spaces in which these relationships occur.

Valorising lifestyle sport: law, space and social utility

The bodily encounter of the environment and the reinterpretation of space are integral features of lifestyle sports. Through the occupation, inhabitation and intervention in sites, lifestyle sport participants have challenged conventional ideas of ownership and expression, winning space for sports that possess different value structures, and which mount a challenge to an increasingly rationalised world (Atkinson, 2009; Daskalaki et al., 2008; King and Church, 2013). As Campo explains, risk-taking activities in urban locations are a claim to 'rights to the city' (Iveson, 2013) and an assertion of equality, as "people need places within the city to experience, experiment with, and push against risk or apparent danger. For some, testing their limits is their passion and identity, whereas for others, perceived environmental risk adds stimulation and excitement to ordinary activities" (Campo, 2013: 257). These claims are not untypical. Skateboarders, for instance, have mobilised a moral discourse of a right to the city which stresses their 'right' to enjoy their sport according to the values they cherish, however deviant such practices may appear to outsiders. Carr (2010: 991) has noted that where there have been attempts to exclude (in his example with skateboarders, and specifically in Seattle) their response has been to find "seams within the law" which they can use to try and usurp this exclusionary challenge. In the United States there are a number of

examples that neatly illustrate this. In Portland, Oregon, the area under Burnside Bridge was established as a space for skateboarding, gradually expanding and becoming established not only within the skateboarding community but also within the broader community – the area becoming legally classified as a tax exempt charitable organisation (see Beal 2013). Similarly the legal status of skateboarding was altered in California in 1998, with skateboarding becoming licenced as a hazardous recreational activity and thus freeing cities and corporations of liability. In Beal's view, this effectively decriminalised skateboarding in California (Beal, 2013: 33). In the UK similar efforts to protect such activity could be provided by attempting to list a space/place as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) under the *Localism Act 2011* (see generally Layard, 2012). Whilst its avowed focus was to capture amenities such as local pubs and village shops that were threatened with closure, its ambit included the possibility of various cultural, sporting and recreational spaces falling within its scope. The Act provided that a building or land would be eligible for classification as an ACV on the condition that the relevant authority was convinced of the following:

> (a) an actual current use of the building or other land that is not an ancillary use furthers the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community, and (b)it is realistic to think that there can continue to be non-ancillary use of the building or other land which will further (whether or not in the same way) the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. (s81(1)).

The effect of this legislation was the introduction of provisions that attempted to keep amenities in public use. In particular, community assets could be nominated as an ACV so, in the event of the owner wishing to dispose of the asset, a moratorium period would be imposed and community groups would have a period of time to bid for the property. An application for an ACV was one strategy adopted by the Long Live SouthBank (LLSB) campaign in response to the Southbank Centre, London, announcing in 2013 that they wished to redevelop an area known as the Undercroft, an area Borden attributes as skateboarding's

British spiritual home (Borden, 2016), and move the skateboarders and the skateboarding 'facility' to Hungerford Bridge. An extremely effective and well organised campaign ensued (Jones, 2013), resulting in Lambeth Council listing the Undercroft as an ACV, notwithstanding the Southbank Centre (SBC) appealing Lambeth Council's original decision and creating a potential defence or barrier, even if temporary, to any attempt to change the use of the space (Booth, 2014).

Another device used by LLSB, and something else that generally might help confront exclusionary challenge, is to attempt to get the area listed as a town or village green (TVG) under the *Commons Act 2006*, where any land can be registered as a TVG if it can be shown that a significant proportion of the local community have, continually, for over twenty years used the land for lawful sports or pastimes (see generally Bogusz, 2013; Meager, 2010; George, 2014; McGillivray & Holder, 2007). LLSB also applied to Lambeth Council to have the Undercroft designated as a village green, Simon Ricketts of lawyers SJ Berwin arguing that; '…when you think about this facility and the sort of role it plays locally…this is in my view exactly what the legislation is there to protect' (quoted in Jones, 2013). Ricketts acknowledged that the Undercroft did not accord with the traditional depiction of a village green at first blush, certainly it appears at odds with the more pastoral imagery that this tends to conjure up (Greenfield and Osborn, 1994). The campaign could however take encouragement in the fact that a beach had recently been classed by the Court of Appeal as a village green. Also what the Undercroft actually provided, that is to say a place where a local community come to congregate, to share hobbies and stories, and similar communal pastimes, could be analogous to the more traditional depiction. In the event the LLSB application was refused and the Supreme Court later overruled the appeal court decision as regards the listing of the beach (see *R (on the application of Newhaven Port and Properties Limited) (Appellant) v East Sussex County Council & another (Respondents)* [2015] EWCA

Civ 276). However, in the event an agreement was reached and the future of the Undercroft assured, in large as a result of the pressure exerted by the campaign and their utilisation of these legal devices (see SBC 2014; Borden 2016). TVGs are now also subject to the effect of the *Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013* which sought to tighten the requirements in light of deemed liberal court approaches to town and village green status. In particular TVG status cannot now be applied for once land is allocated for development (Bogusz, 2013).

The use of both of these devices illustrates just two ways in which the law can be potentially harnessed and utilised in more positive ways for lifestyle sports, and something that is also supported by the reasoning underpinning the Community Infrastructure Levy which recognises the ability to use the money for sport and recreation and the creation and maintenance of open spaces. Gaining a status as a heritage asset is also a further means to protect ongoing use, establishing protections to sites deemed to be of cultural value due to their rich histories and legacy. For example, the Snake Run in Albany, the oldest community-funded skatepark in Australia, was included on Western Australia's heritage register as an example of a prototype DIY park that has served as an inspiration to skatepark designers around the world (Acott, 2016). In the UK The Rom skatepark in Hornchurch, East London, has recently gained listed protection status, becoming the first skatepark to be given this protection in Europe; a boon to skate communities seeking to protect local spaces and assets from redevelopment (Brown, 2014b). These initiatives reinforce the idea that certain activities are worthy of protection, and that the law might in fact have a role to play outside of solely policing the transgressive. Rather than constructing law as an external threat or a site in which competing meanings, values and practices are fought over, the focus here is to think more directly about how law produces lifestyle sport. By so doing we are able to examine how socio-legal relations and jurisdictions have emerged in places and spaces in ways that are potentially empowering to sports participants seeking to legitimise their

presence, and to contest discourses of undesirability. As will be seen below, the social value or utility of the activity can be an important determinant, both in terms of acting as a counterbalance to the incidence of risk, and as providing a defence or immunity to action.

The Risks and Benefits of Lifestyle Sports

Many lifestyle sports are characterised by innovation, risk-taking and an adventurous spirit (Lavoilette, 2011; Wheaton, 2013). Whilst participants become adept at calculating risk, liability remains a chief concern for the law. The likelihood, magnitude and potential severity of risk are important factors that form part of evaluating liability, or whether precautions should be taken (see generally commentary in Anderson 2010 & James 2013), and it is becoming increasingly apparent that an holistic approach should be taken to this, looking at all the 'prevailing circumstances' which include the object of the activity, the demands made on participants, the inherent dangers, the activity's rules regulations and customs and the standards and skills to be reasonably expected (Greenfield et al, 2015).

In the main, potential liability of those responsible for public space rests on the provisions of the *Health and Safety at Work Act 1974* (HSWA), and the operation of the interrelated coverage of the *Occupiers' Liability Act 1957* (OLA 1957) and the *Occupiers' Liability Act 1984* (OLA 1984), but these statutory provisions are buttressed by the common law. The HSWA essentially ensures that those responsible for public space have a duty to provide for the health and safety of public visiting the space (Ball & Ball-King, 2011; 2013). This duty is, however, not absolute, and is qualified in so far that the employers, or those responsible for the space, only need do what is 'reasonably practicable' to ensure safety of participants, and this is the touchstone for health and safety legislation. To provide for this involves a balancing act of cost and benefit, including examining factors noted above such as the likelihood of harm, the magnitude of risk and the potential severity of damage, but also the

social utility or value of the specific activity or act in question can be taken into account. The two statutes relating to occupiers' liability (OLA 1957 and OLA 1984) provide for the level of duty of care owed to lawful visitors and trespassers respectively, and focus on civil liability. Rather like the 'reasonable practicability' of HSWA, the duty owed by an occupier is not absolute but couched in terms of reasonableness, and what the reasonable occupier ought to do to ensure the safety of people, whether lawfully present on the premises or not. In evaluating this there are various specific requirements contained in the legislation, and recourse is made to the common law where necessary. What Lofstedt (2012) and others have stressed is the need to look carefully at the definition and scope of reasonableness, picking up particularly on issues of social utility, and that it is important to ensure balance and proportionality in risk assessment (Ball and Ball King: 2013)

There are instances where clearly high-risk activities are undertaken and where the courts will find that the law neither requires providers to prevent the activity being undertaken nor to train or supervise persons who are later injured participating in this activity (*Poppleton v Trustees of the Portsmouth Youth Activities Committee*, [2008] All ER (D) 150). Here, the claimant was rendered tetraplegic when he fell awkwardly whilst 'bouldering', an activity Tejada-Flores (2000) described as an one where the 'rules' eliminated both protection and companions. The claimant in *Poppleton* was unable to sustain a claim for liability in the Court of Appeal. This case has not been without its critics, and was distinguished in *Wilson v Clyne Farm Centre* [2013] EHWC 229 (see further Pugh, 2013). Other cases such as *Tomlinson v Congleton Borough Council*, [2003] 3 WLR 705, neatly illustrate how the social utility of the activity concerned is factored into an evaluation of liability, with the key issue being the need to balance the various competing interests.

It is this balancing act that becomes so crucial in evaluating liability. The balancing act involves weighing up a number of factors. In terms of evaluating the standard of care owed

this involves looking at all the 'prevailing circumstances' of the case and which, has been argued, can include broader social and cultural context (Greenfield et al, 2015). In *Tomlinson*, Lord Hoffman stresses that social value is far more important than issues such as financial cost of taking preventative action, and notes that the social value of the activities that would need to be taken into account as part of this balancing act.

A related aspect of social benefit can be seen in state approaches to activities that are deemed to have some value. In particular, spaces that would otherwise be subject to the law might be able to insulate themselves against the law via the suspension of legal liability. Centner (2000) notes that in the US there are a variety of provisions that have been introduced to lessen liability of persons who do something of social benefit, including allowing persons onto their property for recreational activities. For example Michigan adopted a recreational use statute in 1953 and a model recreational use statute was drafted in 1965 and in 2000 all states had such recreational use statutes (Centner, 2000). Crucially these modify or alter the duty owed by landowners rather than provide a specific 'immunity', and their breadth and applicability differs greatly across states. In addition, and this may be of more specific interest for parkour parks, some states have adopted specialized statutes providing for participant safety and to preclude lawsuits against persons providing risky sports activities.

Carr uses a neat example of the Ballard Bowl in Seattle to illustrate this, and noting the dialectical relationship between the law and skateboarders, where '…their use of the city is constantly evolving in response to a variety of legal logics – especially those of private property' (Carr: 2010, 990). Carr charts the transition of skateboarding away from private property, forced out by owners and the threat of law, to urban public space, and notes that far from powerless objects, the skateboarders found ways to work around the law, to 'find seams' as we note above, and to adapt or appropriate legal logics. In Seattle this took the form of the guerrilla reclamation of an abandoned supermarket, and the creation of an

avowed temporary skating site, called the Ballard Bowl. The Bowl was created by a group of stakeholders, builders, organisers, supporters and others (skateholders!), but was also facilitated by a shift in the propertyscape in Washington and changes in the law that supported such development. Specifically, the recreational use statute that operated in Seattle (RCW 4.24.210: Liability of Owners or Others in Possession of Land and Water Areas for Injuries to Recreation Users – Limitation) was amended in 2003 with the effect that property owners were no longer liable for personal liability where they were allowing their property to be used for the purposes of outdoor recreation;

> 'Because of his shift in liability law – and the resulting alteration of the nature of property ownership throughout the state – Seattle was able to approve the temporary construction of the Ballard skatepark free from legal liability concerns that had closed down a prior generation of private skateparks' (Carr: 2010, 998).

The stakeholders were thus able to utilise the law as the activity was seen as worthwhile or valuable. The problem with the law of trespass is that liability is strict, with no requirement to show fault or actual harm being suffered. In other areas such as negligence the competing claims of parties are able to be considered, with a balancing of interests performed and the social utility of the activity being factored in, although recent cases in the law of nuisance suggest that the importance of social utility is receding, with a more pro-claimant and pro-homeowner approach in evidence (see *Coventry v Lawrence* [2014] 2 WLR 433). That said, the importance of social utility, certainly in terms of liability in negligence, has been given statutory force via the *Compensation Act 2006* which permits the court to take into account the benefits and utility of the activity when ascribing liability, although these provisions have arguably had little effect thus far (Hunter-Jones, 2006; Greenfield et al, 2015). Importantly, such considerations are marked by their absence in trespass, an issue we return to in the conclusion. What is clear is that the calculation of risk and benefit in relation to activity and use of space is a fundamental issue for the practice of lifestyle sport, and the broader context

and social value of the activity is not to be dismissed. These arguments are writ large for parkour as we illustrate below.

Parkour, risk and social utility

Claims regarding the social benefit, or utility, of parkour have accompanied its ongoing institutionalisation and legitimisation in the UK. Parkour groups have been active in many communities around the UK, working with local authorities and the police in order to gain access to public space (Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011). This process of legitimisation and inhabitation has been accompanied by an articulation of the social, health and well-being benefits of the sport, and can arguably be seen as part of parkour's juridification, a process that is not explicitly mapped here although its impact is clearly visible. Although there are cases where traceurs have been labelled as deviant, reckless, irresponsible or 'anti-social' as we noted above, these are generally rare and it would be wrong to conclude that there has been an outright opposition to parkour by the police and local authorities. In this regard parkour diverges from more stringent cases of zero tolerance approaches enacted upon other 'urban subversions' such as graffiti (McAuliffe, 2012, 2013; Mould, 2014) and historically with regard to skateboarding in the USA, where legal prohibition was common in the early phase of its development (Borden, 2001).

The support of the police, and in particular Community Safety Partnerships, has been crucial to legitimising the presence of a parkour community. Parkour has been utilised in youth crime prevention strategies, with local constabularies providing training with parkour experts as a way of developing more responsible attitudes and safer techniques (see Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011: 116**;** Pullinger, 2010). This approach to parkour is a fairly conventional use of a sport-based intervention that deploys diversionary activities to reduce anti-social behaviour and petty crime (Kelly, 2013). Results have been positive, although the evidence is patchy. In Towcester, Northamptonshire Safer Community Partnership reported a 10% drop

in anti-social behaviour in 2010 following the enrolment of 60 at-risk teenagers in a range of extreme activities, including parkour (Anon, 2011b). In 2014, Charnwood Borough Council in north Leicestershire, recorded a 58% reduction in anti-social behaviour within a target neighbourhood area, compared with the same period the previous year. The Council funded 25 parkour training sessions to 58 participants considered to be engaged in or on the cusp of committing anti-social behaviour (Charnwood, 2014). Similar figures have been reported following Westminster Sports Unit's Positive Futures project where youth crime dropped by 50% in summer 2006 as a result of the provision of free parkour training for under-19s (Sport England, 2008: 15).

Both local authorities and the police have acknowledged that exposure to risk is part of parkour's appeal, and their tone has consequently been understanding rather than rigidly prohibitive. At the same time they are, however, seeking to implement a more precautionary approach to the management of risk in order to avoid accidents and injuries. To this end, spatially ambiguous uncertainties that attach to the sport – the curiosity and inquisitiveness of the traceur in finding distinct structures to practice upon – are discouraged in favour of more spatially determined sites where risks can be managed (see Gilchrist and Osborn, forthcoming). In this sense, Frank Furedi's notion of the institutionalisation of a precautionary principle in the risk society is alive and well (Furedi, 2007). An upshot of this approach has seen an expansion in the amenities and facilities available for parkour, and a concomitant move towards adopting and creating industry standards and specifications. Whilst the first dedicated parkour training area was installed in Crawley in 2008 there are now over 30 purpose-built outdoor sites in the UK, manufactured and installed by a range of play equipment providers. As Gilchrist and Wheaton (2011) show, authorities are seeking to contain parkour to designated areas by providing sites that are more suitable and safe environments for a range of users and abilities (see also Wheaton, 2013). Both local

authorities and local constabularies have supported youths in plans to develop purpose-built facilities; they have been present at consultations with local residents to find appropriate sites and in some cases funding has even been provided by Police Commissioners to realise these projects. This has been largely on the basis that sites can feed into crime reduction and efforts to minimise perceived anti-social behaviour. The Police commissioner for Humberside for example provided funding towards a facility in Grimsby (Team Reality, undated).

The growth of purpose-built facilities has also been accompanied by attempts to foster appropriate conduct in public spaces. Cases for funding to build new parks have involved presentations to neighbourhood committees and video testimonies of youths transformed by the power of parkour. In Great Yarmouth, for example, one youth credited parkour with building self-confidence, discipline and respect, and for enabling a transition away from a life of petty crime (Anon, 2011c). It is interesting that credit is not given to programmes or networks of support provided by intervening authorities per se, but to the sport itself, reifying a message of parkour as transformative as it encourages respect for the body, environment and public space where other diversionary activities have failed (see Atkinson, 2009). Parkour mirrors trends observed in the USA where Howell (2008) noted the involvement of skateboarders in the design, management and regulation of purpose-built skateparks, fostering the creation of neo-liberal rationalities as participants come to see themselves as 'active citizens', responsible for their own well-being by exercising personal responsibility, prudential risk-taking and entrepreneurialism (see also Jones and Graves, 2000: 137; Turner, 2013). Guidance provided by a leading parkour facility provider has even stressed the importance of local parkour communities in articulating the perceived social benefits of the sport (community building, social inclusion, breaking down cultural barriers and gender stereotyping; improved health and psychological wellbeing) as part of campaigns to petition for new facilities (Freemove, 2015).

As liabilities in terms of minimising public disorder and anti-social behaviour have been discharged through partnerships with parkour communities, efforts have also been made by the sport to minimise the likelihood of injury through systems of accredited training and coaching (Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011). The ADAPT (Art du Déplacement And Parkour Teaching) qualification, developed by Parkour UK and Parkour Generations, a leading training provider, has been developed and successfully exported worldwide as the prime coaching qualification for competent and safe practice and is the industry benchmark (Wheaton, 2013). Parallel to this, a Parkour Professionals Register, endorsed by Skillsactive, was also launched in 2015 to provide public liability and personal accident insurance for performers working in advertising, media and film settings, whose liability would not be covered by Equity (the UK trade union for professional performers and creative practitioners) or the British Joint Industry Stunt Committee Stunt Register, which covers stunt performers. Of course, the very presence of risk necessitates sports governing bodies and training providers to consider strategies and precautions to deal with these risks. Writing about the unregulated area of obstacle racing, an activity without a governing body, Keiper et al (2014) noted that one of the major roles of a SGB is to provide a safety framework and environment that ensures minimum standards and promotes safety and reduces injuries as far as possible. Much of the rhetoric in this is about the intersection between risk and benefit, and the need to provide opportunities to engage in risk taking as a beneficial practice. For example PlayLink, a play and informal leisure consultancy, commissioned legal opinion on their approach to policy and practice which provides 'a robust, explicit framework for organisations to demonstrate that they have acted reasonably in offering children acceptable levels of risk in their provision for play, whether in designated play space or shared public space' (Playlink, 2006). The opinion is also clear that when evaluating risk it must be balanced against benefit however, and that risk and utility are both components of any such evaluation and that careful

risk assessments that valorise the taking of risk, within acceptable limits, are an important part of this process.

For Parkour UK, the nascent National Governing Body for parkour in the United Kingdom, the principles of Risk/Benefit Assessment as set out in *Managing Risk in Play Provision* (Play England, 2012) are currently utilised, but they are developing a Parkour UK specific Risk Benefit Assessment policy and procedure, drawing particularly upon the work of Ball & Ball-King (2011), the input of their independent inspection partners Rynat and others, and their approach is in line with best practice guidelines from the Health and Safety Executive, and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents. Ball is a key player in this, commissioned by the Health and Safety Executive to examine how the 'aims of play provision had been pushed aside amid a scramble to minimise risk of injury' (Ball and Ball King: 2011, 63). The upshot was a recommendation that the full range of benefits for children (cognitive, social, physical and emotional) ought to be balanced against the risk of injury that exists, something that Ball and Ball-King note was actually common in other sectors in any event, and that Risk Benefit Analysis was an apposite approach for play, and has been adopted by lifestyle sports such as parkour. Essentially the Guide (Play England, 2012) illustrates how play providers can replace current risk assessment practices with an approach to risk management that takes into account these benefits. This risk management calculation in many ways draws upon the judicial calculation around standards of care and reasonableness. The Guide argues that there is a strong likelihood that children will seek out risky activities anyway, so it is best to manage this in the best way possible. A crucial aspect of their approach is the adoption of a risk benefit analysis, that is to say the benefit of the activity should be used as a counterbalance when considering the risk; that the provider should weigh their duty to protect against their duty to provide stimulating opportunities. To do this required a nuanced understanding of benefit and the use of an informed risk/benefit

assessment mechanism; 'Managing risk in public spaces is essentially a value-based activity. It requires the risk of harm from an activity to be weighed up against the benefits, which might be quite different in nature' (PSF, 2012: 19). Parkour UK (ParkourUK, 2016) have also issued their own guidance which reinforces this approach, not only stressing the benefits of the practice but also broader issues around behaviour and the expectations of the parkour community, stressing a contextual and aware approach to the practice.

Case law supports the notion that this risk should be real, not fanciful or hypothetical (Harrington and Forlin, 2008; *R v Porter* [2008] EWCA Crim 1271) when considering risk assessment. In terms of play equipment, a crucial facet is that the application of any guidelines should be contextual and there is a need to take account of local conditions and circumstances - it is not a case of one size necessarily fitting all. Industry standards help set reference points but are not absolute (Play England, 2012: 30). In terms of equipment used for Parkour, Parkour UK worked with partners for some years to develop a standard, ratified by the British Standards Institution in February 2013 (BSI, 2013), which, it was noted, would have a positive effect on a number of stakeholders and affected parties, 'Following publication it will have a direct and beneficial impact enabling local authorities, schools, colleges, universities, sports centres, land owners, manufacturers and installers to build Parkour facilities and equipment that are fit-for-purpose, safe and to the recognised standard' (ParkourUK, 2013). On a micro level the impact for some parkour providers was a relaxation of entry requirements for users, as was the case with the LEAP parkour park (a managed facility in London). In a wider sense this could of course be seen as evidence of broader acceptance of the practice, and further institutionalisation. Further to this, ParkourUK has also applied to Sport England and the four home country Sports Councils for recognition as a sport, the pre-application being approved by the Recognition Panel on 26 March 2014 and following this, a full application was submitted on 24 August 2015 (Parkour UK, 2015). In

tandem with this moves have been made to establish an international body with a purported aim of Olympic recognition and following the path of other lifestyle sports that have come under the Olympic umbrella (Mackay 2014). Much in the same way that achieving BSI standard had a positive impact in terms of establishing the validity of parkour as a discipline to be used in schools and other educational settings, recognition would further benefit parkour in terms of its increased viability within an educational context, particularly in terms of its use in schools, and the status that recognition evinces which would be extremely beneficial in terms of visibility and justification, not least in terms of applications for funding (Sport England, 2010).

If full recognition is achieved it will be an interesting moment for the development of parkour. Parkour UK is in many ways an atypical governing body, a governing body that thus far does very little actual governing. This reflects the atypical and decentralised nature of parkour which is reflected in the approach of its governing body, as such it is rather different from more traditional governing bodies. This is a position which recognises parkour's indiscipline and informality at its heart, but also acknowledges that there are real benefits in terms of the possibilities of parkour for it to be brought within the fold, and move from outside to inside. In addition, the recognition by Sport England (if Parkour UK's bid is successful) of parkour as a sport may be beneficial in terms of recognising its social value and utility, something that will be of use in its construction as something worth protecting from the law, or by the law (as noted in sections above), but also in terms of how the issue of risk is navigated by people offering parkour facilities. So, whilst the combination of achieving the BSI standard, the QTS qualifications for teaching parkour, the quest for recognition and Olympic status all provide evidence of broader acceptability and visibility of parkour as a whole, it also creates potential tensions for 'pure' parkour, and may invite symbolic boundary disputes over values, meanings, practices and styles that have plagued

other lifestyle sports – echoing O'Loughlin's (2012) point that even how you term the practice (free running/parkour/art du déplacement) may be an indication of an ideological stance. It must also be stressed that these trends that have been identified apply primarily to the sanctioned spaces/forms of parkour and these trends of legal intervention and domestication may not be evident in terms of parkour as practiced in unsanctioned spaces and in untamed forms.

Conclusion

What this piece has shown is that the intersection of law with lifestyle sports is more nuanced than perhaps has been previously acknowledged. The law is always there, oftentimes visible in asserting sovereignty over subjects and space, sometimes it is out-of-sight and at others it becomes materially manifested as bodies engage with space and practice develops (Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, 2013). Our analysis has shown that rather than a purely negative construct, in fact we are beginning to see the increased emergence of law as an enabling force, a development that can be seen in tandem with the increasing visibility, penetration and acceptance of lifestyle sports, and something that is accelerated by processes of institutionalisation. So on one level this paper introduced lifestyle sports to the broader, and more positive, possibilities of the law. It also illustrates the ways in which risks and liabilities are being made knowable, controllable and predictable through the spatial containment and moral ordering of the sport. This is largely seen through standards applied to parkour such as the British Safety Standards and European Standards, by the increased availability of forms of accredited training and coaching, and is evidenced in the approaches at the increased numbers of parkour specific facilities. These shifts herald considerable advantages to the sport in terms building a participation base and allaying community fears, but at the same time begins to ask questions about not only the future institutional development of parkour, but also about other spaces of parkour that currently elude these

processes of incorporation and rationalisation, and poses questions about its scope, role and meaning.

Being sensitive to the spatialities of risk and responsibilisation may indeed require us to avoid the use of an aspatial formalism in the application of law to lifestyle sports. Locational dependencies and site specifics need to be taken account, particularly as the activity can fall under the purview of different laws when performed in different spaces. Similarly the potential benefits of the activity, and how risk itself can be beneficial and should be positively valorised need to be further articulated and supported. We have illustrated that the Risk/Benefit evaluation, and its underpinning philosophy, is crucial for ParkourUK and have articulated how the law might view such an approach. There are of course other possibilities that could be harnessed to support lifestyle sports, and to further counter the traditional narrative that sees law as a hindrance or obstacle. In a US context, Bezanson and Finkelman (2009-10) propose that a defence can be mounted for the presence of parkour in private spaces. They do this by defining parkour as an artistic endeavour, and arguing that forms of art that technically involve trespass ought to be protected by a modified regime that 'made way' for these forms of artistic expression. They note the artistic and expressive nature of parkour and its very specific relationship with space, particularly its transformative potential, would be key to such a defence. The articulation of social benefit is crucial here, weighing how it may outweigh the observance of private interest, as art or artistic expression is deemed to create new sensual and place meanings in the broader public interest. Thus, a privileging of 'trespassory art' performed in private space should require the property owner to present actual damages or harms accrued. This takes the statutory immunity approach detailed by Cettner and Carr even further, mapping out that courts should be able to modify their approaches to 'trespassory art', acknowledging the nature of the act but modifying how

landowners are able to respond to it, and such an approach would undoubtedly further protect and support parkour, specifically in 'unsanctioned spaces'.

Whilst it is beyond the scope of this paper to say how parkour spaces are being differentially produced through the law, we simply note here that parkour has emerged into favourable contexts, no doubt through the efforts of other risk-taking recreationists and claimants to public space. A range of legal tools are available to traceurs to claim community use/asset, to settle liability concerns, and policies that emphasise the importance of risk-taking behaviours to the physical and emotional development of young people lend support to the presence and legitimacy of the activity. As has been found by other scholars working in outdoor recreation (Brown, 2012; Church et al., 2013), the mere presence of legal tools to recalibrate rights of use and access can only take recreationists so far as the assertion of moral claims and legal rights to space are contingent upon the ability of participants to imbibe, reflect upon and articulate an array of social benefits when challenged. How parkour communities articulate social benefit therefore becomes paramount to the longevity of the activity and its visibility in different locations. Most importantly, the ability of the parkour community to harness and utilise the law, to see it as an opportunity and tool and not solely as a threat, begins to articulate an attempt to recalibrate the relationship between lifestyle sports and the law, and reclaim risk as a positive attribute to be navigated.

References

Acott, K., 2016. 'Skate park makes heritage history', *The West Australian*, 12 February 2016. Available online at https://au.news.yahoo.com/thewest/wa/a/30800058/skate-park-makes-heritage-history/ (last accessed 16 September 2016).

Ameel, L and Tani S (2012) 'Parkour: Creating loose spaces?' *Geografiska Annaeler: Series B, Human Geography* 94(1) 17-30.

Anderson, J. 2010. Modern Sports Law Oxford and Portland, Oregon: Hart.

Anon, 2011a. '"Tombstoning" by-law stops East Yorkshire's free runners' BBC News, available online via http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-humber-13839990 (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Anon, 2011b. 'Parkour leads to drop is (sic) anti-social behaviour' *Advertiser and Review* 25 March available online at **http://www.buckinghamtoday.co.uk/news/crime/pakour-leads-to-drop-is-anti-social-behaviour-1-2523879** (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Anon, 2011c. 'Children in Need: Parkour group helps Great Yarmouth teenager', BBC News, available online via http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-15698656 (last accessed 26 April 2016)

Anon, 2014a. 'Police warn Parkour could be "life-threatening"' ITV News 25 June, available online at **http://www.itv.com/news/tyne-tees/update/2014-06-25/police-warn-parkour-could-be-life-threatening/** (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Anon, 2014b. 'Free runners' putting lives and heritage at risk – police *The Northern Echo* available online via http://www.thenorthernecho.co.uk/news/11304483.__39_Free_runners__39__putting_lives_and_heritage_at_risk___police/ (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Anon, 2015. **'**Dispersal order issued for Caerphilly town after reports of anti-social behaviour' *Caerphilly Observer*, February 26 available online at http://www.caerphillyobserver.co.uk/news/949906/dispersal-order-issued-for-caerphilly-town-after-reports-of-anti-social-behaviour/ (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Appleton, J., 2016. *PSPOS: A busybodies' charter*. Report for The Manifesto Club, available online via http://www.manifestoclub.com/ (last accessed 7 March 2016).

Atencio, M. and Beal, B., 2016. The legitimate skateboarder. In K.-J. Lombard, ed. *Skateboarding: subcultures, sites and shifts*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 108-120.

Atkinson, M., 2009. Parkour, anarcho-environmentalism, and poiesis. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 33(2), 169–194.

Ball, D. and Ball-King, L., 2013. Safety management and public spaces: restoring balance. *Risk Analysis*, 33(5), 763-771.

Ball, D and Ball-King, L., 2011. *Public safety and risk assessment. Improving decision making* Abingdon: Earthscan.

BBC South Today, 2016. Report on parkour ban in Horsham. Broadcast 14 September 2016. Available online at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_AEduq89BBk (last accessed 16 September 2016).

Beal, B., 2013. *Skateboarding: The Ultimate Guide*. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood

Bezanson, R.P. and Finkelman, A., 2009-10. Trespassory art. *University of Michigan journal of law reform*, 43(2), 245-322.

Blichner, L. and Molander, A., 2008. Mapping Juridification. *European Law Journal*, 14(1), 36-54

Bogusz, B., 2013. Regulating public/private interests in towns and village greens. *International Journal of Law in the Built Environment.* 5, 1, 21-39

Booth, D., 2014. Council Upholds Southbank ACV status *Planning Resource*, 3 March Available online at http://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/1283015/council-upholds-southbank-acv-status. (last accessed 29 January 2016)

Borden, I., 2016. Southbank skateboarding, London, and urban culture: the Undercroft, Hungerford Bridge, and House of Vans. In K.-J. Lombard, ed. *Skateboarding: Subcultures, Sites and Shifts*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 91-107.

Borden, I., 2001. *Skateboarding, space and the city*. Oxford: Berg.

Brown, K.M., 2014a. Spaces of play, spaces of responsibility: creating dichotomous geographies of outdoor citizenship. *Geoforum*, 55, 22-32.

Brown, K.M., 2012. Sharing public space across difference: attunement and the contested burdens of choreographing encounter. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 13(7), 801-820.

Brown, M., 2014b. The Rom, Hornchurch, becomes first skatepark in Europe to get listed status. *The Guardian*, 29 Oct. http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2014/oct/29/the-rom-hornchurch-first-skatepark-europe-listed-status (last accessed 1 April 2016).

BSI., 2013 *BS 10075:2013 British Standard for Parkour Equipment* BSI

Campo, D., 2013. *The accidental playground*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Carr, J., 2010. Legal geographies – skating around the edges of the law: urban skateboarding and the role of law in determining young people's place in the city. *Urban geography*, 31(7), 988-1003.

Centner, T.J., 2000. Tort liability for sports and recreational activities: expanding statutory immunity for protected classes and activities. *Journal of Legislation*, 26(1), 1-44.

Charnwood., 2014. 'Charnwood community safety partnership agenda, 10 April', available online via http://www.charnwoodtogether.com/uploads/csp-10-april-2014-agenda-with-attachments.pdf (last accessed 1 April 2016)

Church, A., Gilchrist, P., Ravenscroft, N. and Heys, B., 2013. Property ownership, resource use and the 'gift of nature'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 31(3), 451-466.

Church, A. and Ravenscroft, N., 2007. Power, resource mobilisation and leisure conflict on inland rivers in England. In A. Church and T. Coles, eds. *Tourism, power and space*. London and New York: Routledge, 171-196.

Collins, M., 2011. The politics of the environment, and noisy sports: two totally different outcomes in the Lake District National Park for powerboating and off-road motoring. *Leisure studies*, 30(4), 423-452.

Cooper, D., 1995. Local Government and Legal consciousness in the Shadow of Juridification. *Journal of Law and Society*, 22(4), 506-26.

Cork, T., 2015. 'Police issue parkour warning in Salisbury - because roof tiles could fall on innocent heads' *Western Daily Press* 14 July http://www.westerndailypress.co.uk/Police-issue-parkour-warning-Salisbury-roof-tiles/story-26899079-detail/story.html (last accessed 1 April 2016)

Daskalaki, M., Stara, A. and Imas, M., 2008. The 'parkour organisation: inhabitation of corporate spaces. *Culture and organization*, 14(1), 49-64.

Dobson, J., 2015. *How to save our town centres*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Donnelly, P., 2004. Playing with gravity: mountains and mountaineering. In P. Vertinsky and J. Bale, eds. *Sites of sport: space, place, experience*. London: Routledge, 131-144.

Dunne, M, 2014. 'Stevenage police warn against the dangers of parkour' *The Comet* 16 July, available online at **http://www.thecomet.net/news/stevenage_police_warn_against_the_dangers_of_parkour_1_3687088** (last accessed 1 April 2016)

Forster, A., 2012. British judicial engagement and the juridification of the armed forces. *International Affairs*, 88:2, 283-300.

Foster, K., 2006. The juridification of sport. In S. Greenfield and G. Osborn, eds. *Readings in law and popular culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 155-182.

Freemove, 2015. *Understanding parkour/freerunning*. Egham: Freemove.

Furedi, F., 2007. *Culture of fear revisited*. London: Continuum.

Garrett, B., 2015. PSPOs: the new control orders threatening our public spaces. *The Guardian* 8 September. http://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/sep/08/pspos-new-control-orders-public-spaces-asbos-freedoms [Accessed 29 January 2016].

George, M., 2014. The time of town and village greens. *Kings Law Journal* 25, 325-331.

Gibson, H., 2013. Home-school agreements: explaining the growth of "juridification" and contractualism in schools. *Oxford review of education*, 39(6), 780-796.

Gilchrist, P. and Osborn, G., (forthcoming). Signposting risk: parkour and the materialities of regulation. In S. Carnicelli and D. Turner, eds. *Lifestyle sport and public policy*. London: Routledge.

Gilchrist, P. and Wheaton, B., 2011. Lifestyle sport, public policy and youth engagement: examining the emergence of parkour. *International journal of sport policy and politics*, 3(1), 109-131.

Granada News, 2009. 'Moreton Parkour Ban', available via https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sdWAVPYZwDQ October 13 [last accessed 1 April 2016].

Greenfield, S. and Osborn, G., 1994. The sanctity of the village green: preserving lord Denning's pastoral vision. *Denning Law Journal*, 9(1), 53-60.

Greenfield, S., Karstens, K,, Osborn, G. and Rossouw, J.P., 2015. Reconceptualising the standard of care in sport: the case of youth Rugby in England and South Arica. *Potchefstroom electronic law journal*, 18(6), 2184-2217.

Greenfield, S., Osborn, G., and Rossouw, J.P., 2011. The juridification of sport: A comparative analysis of children's rugby and cricket in England and South Africa. *Journal for Juridical Science*, 36(1), 85- 104.

Harrington, P. and Forlin, G., 2008. The Court of Appeal has refined the test of the meaning of risk. *New law Journal*, 158(7332), 1102-1104.

Howell, O., 2008. Skateparks as neoliberal playground. *Space and culture*, 11(4), 475–496.

Hunter-Jones, J., 2006. Legal instruction within initial teacher training. *Journal of education for teaching*, 32(3), 259-268.

Iveson, K., 2013. Cities within the city: do-it-yourself urbanism and the right to the city. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 37(3), 941-956.

James, M., 2013. *Sports Law*. Palgrave Macmillan

Jones, S. and Graves, A., 2000. Power plays in public space: skateboard parks as battlegrounds, gifts, and expressions of self. *Landscape journal*, 19(1-2), 136-148.

Jones, S., 2013. Skateboarders form village green preservation society for Southbank. *The Guardian*, 10 May. Available online at http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/may/10/skateboarders-village-green-society-southbank [Accessed 29 January 2016].

Keiper, M., Young, S., Fried, G., and & Seidler, T., 2014. The Legal Implications of Obstacle Racing and Suggested Risk Management Strategies. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 24, 78-95.

Kelly, L., 2013. Sports-based interventions and the local governance of youth crime and antisocial behaviour. *Journal of sport and social issues*, 37(3), 261-283.

Kiewa, J., 2002. Traditional climbing: metaphor of resistance or metanarrative of oppression? *Leisure studies*, 21, 145-161.

King, K. and Church, A., 2013. 'We don't enjoy nature like that': youth identity and lifestyle in the countryside. *Journal of rural studies*, 31, 67-76.

Laviolette, P., 2011. *Extreme landscapes of leisure: not a hap-hazardous sport*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Layard, A., 2012.'The Localism Act 2011: What is 'Local' and how do we legally construct it?' 14 *Env LR* 134

Lofstedt, R., 2011. *Reclaiming health and safety for all: an independent review of health and safety legislation*. London: DWP. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/66790/lofstedt-report.pdf

MacKay, D., 2014. Parkour sets up new organisation in what could be first step towards Olympic recognition, Inside the Games. Available from: http://www.insidethegames.biz/articles/1022376/parkour-sets-up-new-organisation-in-what-could-be-first-step-towards-olympic-recognition [Accessed 1 May 2016].

McAuliffe, C., 2013. Legal walls and professional paths: the mobilities of graffiti writers in Sydney. *Urban studies*, 50(3), 518-537.

McAuliffe, C., 2012. Graffiti or street art? Negotiating the moral geographies of the creative city. *Journal of urban affairs*, 34(2), 189-206.

McGillivray, D & Holder, J., 2007. Locality, environment and law: the case of town and village greens. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 3, 1, 1-17

Meager, R., 2010. The 'village green industry': back in business. *Cambridge Law Journal*, 69, 238-240.

Mould, O., 2016. Parkour, activism and young people. In T. Skelton, ed. *Geographies of children and young people. space, place and environment*. Berlin: Springer.

Mould, O., 2014. Tactical urbanism: the new vernacular of the creative city. *Geography compass*, 8(8), 529-539.

Németh, J., 2006. Conflict, exclusion, relocation: skateboarding and public space. *Journal of urban design*, 11(3), 297-318.

O'Loughlin, A., 2012. A door for creativity – art and competition in parkour. *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* 3, 2, 192-198.

Osborn, G., 2001. 'Football's legal legacy: recreation, protest and disorder' in S. Greenfield and G. Osborn, eds. *Law and Sport in Contemporary Society.* London: Frank Cass, 51-68.

Parker, G., 2007. The negotiation of leisure citizenship: leisure constraints, moral regulation and the mediation of rural place. *Leisure studies*, 26(1), 1-22.

ParkourUK., 2016. 'Information, Advice and Guidance – Training outdoors', available online via http://www.parkouruk.org/information-advice-and-guidance-training-outdoors/ (last accessed 26 April 2016)

ParkourUK., 2013. 'British standard for Parkour Equipment, BS 10075:2013 published' available online via http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-15698656 (last accessed 26 April 2016)

Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, A., 2013. Atmospheres of law: senses, affects, lawscapes. *Emotion, space and society*, 7, 35-44.

Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, A., 2007. *Law and the city*. New York: Routledge-Cavendish.

Playlink, 2006. Negligence, play and risk. Legal Opinion available online via http://www.playlink.org/articles/?p=8 (last accessed 7 March 2016).

ParkourUK., 2015. Full application submitted for recognition with the UK Sports Councils. News item, available online at http://www.parkouruk.org/2015/08/. (24 August), last accessed 7 March 2016.

Play England, 2012. *Managing risk in play provision: implementation guide*. Nottingham: DCSF, available online http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/172644/managing-risk-in-play-provision.pdf (last accessed 26 April 2016)

Play Safety Forum, 2012. *Managing risk in play provision: implementation guide*. London: National Children's Bureau.

Pugh, H., 2013. When adventures go wrong. *New Law Journal*, 7563, 12-13.

Pullinger, S. 2010. 'Craze sets fans leaping into danger in Great Yarmouth' *Eastern Daily Press* 10 December available online at http://www.edp24.co.uk/news/environment/craze_sets_fans_leaping_into_danger_in_great_yarmouth_1_752280 (last accessed 1 April 2016)

Ravenscroft, N., 1998. Rights, citizenship and access to the countryside. *Space and polity*, 2(1), 33-48.

Rinehart, R., 2007. The performative avant-garde and action sports: vedic philosophy in a postmodern world. In M. McNamee, ed. *Philosophy, risk, and adventure sports*. Abingdon: Routledge, 118-137.

SBC (2014) Joint statement: long live Southbank and Southbank Centre secure future of Undercroft for skateboarding and urban activities. Press Release 18 September. Available

online at http://www.southbankcentre.co.uk/sites/default/files/press_releases/southbank_centre_and_llsb_joint_statement.pdf (last accessed 26 April 2016)

Sport England, 2010. Policy statement: Sports Councils' policy for the recognition of sporting activities and associated national governing bodies of sport. Available online via http://archive.sportengland.org/about_us/how_we_recognise_sports.aspx [Accessed 30 January 2016].

Sport England, 2008. *Creating safer communities: reducing anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime through sport*. London: Sport England.

Stranger, M., 2011. *Surfing life: surface, substructure and the commodification of the sublime*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Tacey, L., 2015. 'Free running is art' blasts parkour photographer after police send 5 cars and helicopter' *The Mirror*, available online **http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/free-running-art-blasts-parkour-6338779** (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Team Reality (undated) 'Grimsby Parkour Park' available online via http://www.teamreality.co.uk/news/grimsby-parkour-park/ (last accessed 1 April 2015)

Tejada-Flores, L., 2000. Games climbers play. In K. Wilson, ed., *The games climbers play*. London: Baton–Wicks, 19-27.

Turner, D., 2013. The civilized skateboarder and the sports funding hegemony: a case study of alternative sport. *Sport in society*, 16(10), 1248-1262.

Vivoni, F., 2009. Spots of spatial desire: skateparks, skateplazas, and urban politics. *Journal of sport and social issues*, 33 (2), 130–149.

Wheaton, B., 2013. *The cultural politics of lifestyle sports*. London: Routledge.