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1. **Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study**

1.1. The Council has undertaken a study of open space, sport and recreation in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17. The purpose of the study was in part to inform the preparation of its Local Development Framework.

1.2. This report sets out at Appendices 1 and 2 the reports on open space, sport and recreation in Spelthorne by consultants PMP. Whilst the second of the consultants report is dated 6 September 2005, this was the publication date and a final version was available to the Council when it prepared its summary report.

1.3. Appendix 3 sets out a report prepared by the Council summarising the consultant’s work and setting out its conclusions and recommendations for the LDF and related work. This report was considered and agreed by the Council’s Executive on 19 July 2005.

1.4. The summary report at Appendix 3 is self-contained so far as its conclusions and recommendations for the LDF are concerned.
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1.1 In October 2004, Spelthorne Borough Council (the Council) appointed PMP to undertake an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study across the whole of Spelthorne (the Borough). The study, an assessment of local needs and audit of open space and indoor sport and recreational facilities, will provide the Council with a clear vision, priorities for the future (based on local need) and a direction for the allocation of resources.

1.2 The overall aim for this piece of work is to:

‘to provide an assessment of Spelthorne’s open space, sport and recreation facilities in the Borough to establish appropriate local standards, identify areas where there are deficiencies in provision and identify solutions/sites to meet those deficiencies’.

1.3 The above aim is underpinned by the six study outcomes, which are:

• to undertake an audit of existing provision to cover all aspects of open space (with the exception of civic spaces), sport and recreation. The audit should include an understanding of provision in areas immediately adjoining the Borough boundary and which have an existing role in meeting Spelthorne’s needs
• to establish robust local standards
• to ensure that any shortfall or surplus in provision are identified against these standards
• to produce site-specific recommendations to meet any identified shortfalls in provision having regard to suitability and sustainability in terms of site size, access, adjoining land uses, any potential adverse impacts on adjoining uses, any particular feature or habitat on the site which might constrain the proposed use
• to identify and determine the scope to use any potentially redundant allotments to meet any shortfall
• to evaluate and make recommendations on the following unimplemented open space/recreation proposals in the current Local Plan and whether or not they should be retained in the light of the findings of the study: proposals 25, 33, 34 and 35.

1.4 It is important that this study provides evidence, via a robust assessment, to support the policies for protection of urban open space sites as identified in your Local Plan. The study will also inform future planning policy, including the preparation of the Council’s Local Development Framework (LDF), which is targeted for adoption in March 2007.

1.5 The study is undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the latest Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17)(Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation, July 2002) and its Companion Guide published in September 2002. Further details of this process are provided overleaf.
1.6 This study is also running parallel to separate work being carried out by Bridge IMC consultants on allotments in the Borough and by the Council’s Liveability Parks Project. Information from both these studies have been used to inform this report.

1.7 This report is an update on progress and provides an initial introduction to the study, methodology (in line with PPG17 requirements), findings to date and outlines the way forward to completion of the final report. To date, Step 1 and 2 of the 5-Step PPG17 process have been completed and are detailed within this report. Steps 3, 4 and 5 will be completed in January. The methodology and our approach for these steps are outlined within Section 6.

1.8 The study also analyses indoor sport and recreation facilities. The analysis consisted of a comprehensive audit of indoor sports facilities. Supply and demand modelling will be undertaken for the final report in order to identify any surplus or shortfall in the provision of indoor recreation in the Borough.

1.9 As detailed above, the aim is that the study and resulting strategy will enable the Council to ensure the most effective and efficient use of open spaces and indoor sport and recreation facilities within the Borough and plan and respond appropriately to any pressures of immediate and future developments.

Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17)

1.10 PPG17 states “the government expects all local authorities to carry out assessments of needs and audits of open space and sports and recreational facilities”.

1.11 The major change in the policy guidance is the requirement for local authority decisions, regarding open space, to be informed by local needs assessments and an audit of existing provision. Such audits should incorporate qualitative, quantitative and accessibility considerations as well as the overall non-monetary value of the land including the level of use. National standards are no longer considered to meet local needs, although they may be used as benchmarks.

1.12 Other subsequent changes in this planning policy document are:

- the definition of open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals and lakes which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation
- a greater emphasis is placed on qualitative considerations – this is particularly important as it will allow local authorities to identify potential for increased use through better design, management and/or maintenance of open space
- it advocates the setting of local standards appropriate to the local area rather than assessment by national standards although these can be used as benchmarks – the Government believes that national standards are inappropriate, as they do not take into account the demographics of an area, the specific needs of residents and the extent of built development
- it provides further guidance on the constituent elements of open space typologies
- it clearly acknowledges the multiple functions that open spaces can perform.
1.13 The policy guidance sets out priorities for local authorities in terms of:

- assessing needs and opportunities – undertaking audits of open space, sport and recreational facilities
- setting local standards
- maintaining an adequate supply of open space
- planning for new open space.

1.14 The companion guide sets out the process for undertaking local assessments of needs and audits of provision. It also:

- indicates how councils can establish the needs of local communities and apply provision standards
- promotes a consistent approach across varying types of open space.

1.15 PMP and the Council have followed the recommendations of PPG17 throughout the study. Following this methodology maximises the potential the strategy has to make a real difference to the quantity, quality and accessibility of open spaces in Spelthorne.

**Need for local assessments**

1.16 A local assessment of open space and open space needs will enable the Council to:

- plan positively, creatively and effectively in identifying priority areas for improvement and to target appropriate types of open space required
- ensure an adequate provision of high quality, accessible open space to meet the needs of the community
- ensure any funding is invested in the right places where there is the most need
- conduct Section 106 negotiations with developers from a position of knowledge with evidence to support.

1.17 Where no assessment exists, developers can undertake their own independent assessment to demonstrate that open space is surplus to requirements. It is therefore desirable for the Council to have robust data to protect open space within the Borough.
Outcomes of local assessments

1.18 A local assessment of open space will enable the Council to plan effectively and achieve some desirable key outcomes required by PPG17. These are:

- provision of networks of accessible, high quality open space for sport and recreation that meet the needs of residents and visitors
- provision of open spaces that are ‘fit for purpose’ – the right type in the right place and of the right size
- provision of open spaces that are economically and environmentally sustainable
- provision of an appropriate balance between new open space and enhancement of existing provision
- setting locally derived provision standards
- provision of clarity and reasonable certainty for developers and land owners.

Demographics

1.19 Spelthorne Borough Council is located in Surrey, 15 miles west of Central London. It is bordered by the M25 to the west, the River Thames to the south and west, the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames to the east, and Heathrow Airport and the London Borough of Hounslow to the north.

1.20 Spelthorne is a compact urban area covering 21 square miles (12,671 acres). The area comprises 65% green belt and 30% of the total area is either floodplain or reservoir. The major centres of population are Ashford, Shepperton, Stanwell, Sunbury and Staines. The borough is seen as an affluent area with the exception of Stanwell – Stanwell North ward is ranked in the top 40% most deprived wards in the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2001.

1.21 The total population of the borough of Spelthorne in 2001 was 90,390 of which 51% are female. 22.8% of the population are below 19 years of age (compared to the average in England and Wales of 25.1%) and 22.0% of the population are 60 or over (compared to the average in England and Wales of 20.9%).

1.22 Further details regarding the demographic profile of the borough and the relevance of this profile in relation to open space, sport and recreation facilities will be expanded upon within the final report.

Summary

1.23 This report provides an update on Steps 1 and 2 of the PPG17 process, which incorporates the following:

- an evaluation and summary of the local needs assessment, which has been carried out throughout the Borough
- a summary of the audit of open space and indoor sport and recreational facilities in the Borough.
1.24 The above data will be used to complete Steps 3, 4 and 5 of the PPG17 process. The final study will therefore:

- provide an analysis of existing provision and appropriate policies and actions for each type of open space. This will enable the Council to plan effectively the provision of open space to meet the current and future needs and enhance existing open spaces where required

- enable the Council to ensure the most effective and efficient use of open spaces within the Borough and plan and respond appropriately to any pressures of immediate and future developments

- provide the necessary information to be used in developing a strategy for the future management and development of open space.
Undertaking the study

Introduction

2.1. This study has been undertaken in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) and its Companion Guide, published in September 2002. This Companion Guide suggests ways and means of undertaking such a study. It emphasises the importance of undertaking a local needs assessment, as opposed to following national trends and guidelines. The four guiding principles in undertaking a local assessment are:

(i) local needs will vary even within local authority areas according to socio-demographic and cultural characteristics

(ii) the provision of good quality and effective open space relies on effective planning but also on creative design, landscape management and maintenance

(iii) delivering high quality and sustainable open spaces may depend much more on improving and enhancing existing open space rather than new provision

(iv) the value of open space depends primarily on meeting identified local needs and the wider benefits they generate for people, wildlife and the environment.

2.2. PPG17 recognises that individual approaches appropriate to each local authority will need to be adopted as each area has different structures and characteristics. The resulting conclusions and recommendations that will be drawn on completion of this study will therefore be representative of the local needs for Spelthorne.

Types of open space

2.3. The overall definition of open space within the government planning guidance is:

“all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity”.

2.4. PPG17 identifies nine typologies of open space. These categories include eight types of open space and one category of urban open space.

2.5. The Spelthorne open space audit and analysis considers all but Civic Spaces (Staines High Street and Market Square, Staines), which was excluded from the brief. The study takes into account open spaces provided and managed by other organisations providing a more accurate picture of current provision within Spelthorne. Full details of these typologies, their definitions and primary purpose are outlined in Table 2.1 overleaf.
### Table 2.1 Open Space Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Primary Purpose/Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Gardens</strong></td>
<td>Includes urban parks, formal gardens and country parks</td>
<td>• informal recreation&lt;br&gt;• community events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces</strong></td>
<td>Includes publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (e.g. downlands, commons, meadows), wetlands, open and running water and wastelands.</td>
<td>• wildlife conservation,&lt;br&gt;• biodiversity&lt;br&gt;• environmental education and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity Greenspace</strong></td>
<td>Most commonly but not exclusively found in housing areas. Includes informal recreation green spaces and village greens.</td>
<td>• informal activities close to home or work&lt;br&gt;• enhancement of the appearance of residential or other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision for Children and Young People</strong></td>
<td>Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people.</td>
<td>• equipped play areas&lt;br&gt;• ball courts&lt;br&gt;• outdoor basketball hoop areas&lt;br&gt;• skateboard areas&lt;br&gt;• teenage shelters and ‘hangouts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Sports Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Natural or artificial surfaces either publicly or privately owned used for sport and recreation. Includes school playing fields.</td>
<td>• outdoor sports pitches&lt;br&gt;• tennis and bowls&lt;br&gt;• golf courses&lt;br&gt;• athletics&lt;br&gt;• playing fields (including school playing fields)&lt;br&gt;• water sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. May also include urban farms.</td>
<td>• growing vegetables and other root crops&lt;br&gt;N.B. does not include private gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemeteries &amp; Churchyards</strong></td>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards including disused churchyards and other burial grounds.</td>
<td>• quiet contemplation&lt;br&gt;• burial of the dead&lt;br&gt;• wildlife conservation&lt;br&gt;• promotion of biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Corridors</strong></td>
<td>Includes towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and disused railway lines.</td>
<td>• walking, cycling or horse riding&lt;br&gt;• leisure purposes or travel&lt;br&gt;• opportunities for wildlife migration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6. In conjunction with PPG17, there are a number of types of land use that have not been included in our assessment as open space and recreation, namely:

- grass verges on the side of roads
- small insignificant areas of grassland or trees – for example on the corner of the junction of two roads
- SLOAP (space left over after planning ie in and around a block of flats)
- farmland and farm tracks
- private roads and private gardens.

**PPG17 – 5-Step process**

2.7. The PPG17 Companion Guide sets out a five step logical process for undertaking a local assessment of open space. This process was followed to meet the requirements of the Council to plan, monitor and set targets for the existing and future provision of open space within the Borough. Although presented as a linear process, in reality, many stages can be undertaken in parallel.

2.8. The 5-Step process is as follows:

- Step 1 – Identifying Local Needs
- Step 2 – Auditing Local Provision
- Step 3 – Setting Provision Standards
- Step 4 – Applying Provision Standards
- Step 5 – Drafting Implementation and Action Plan.

**Our process**

2.9. To date PMP has completed Steps 1 and 2 of the 5-Step process, the results of which are detailed within this report. Utilising the audit and needs assessment data gathered in Steps 1 and 2, we will work with the Council in setting and applying provision standards (Steps 3 and 4) for existing and future provision of open space within the Borough. From this we will produce recommendations and draft an implementation and action plan.

2.10. Our methodology for Steps 1 and 2, in accordance with the broader PPG17 process, is detailed below. Our proposed methodology for Steps 3, 4 and 5 is detailed in Section 6.
Step 1 - Identifying local needs

Research

- desk-based research was undertaken considering national, regional and local policies and strategies that will impact upon local needs for open space and sport and recreation provision in Spelthorne. Summaries of key documents can be found in Section 3. Documents reviewed include:
  - The Local Plan
  - The Community Strategy
  - Leisure and Cultural Strategy 2002/05
  - Parks Strategy 2003/08.

Consultations

- consultations have been carried out with many organisations and individuals through various methods such as one-to-one meetings, telephone calls, questionnaires, drop-in sessions and by email, including:
  - one-to-one consultations with Council Officers (across a range of Council departments including planning, leisure, parks and education). The aim of these sessions was to establish how open space, sport and recreation provision affects each department and key issues for each
  - 5,000 household questionnaires disseminated across the Borough. The questionnaire was intended to explore user and non-user attitudes to the range of open spaces; sport and recreation facilities available near to their homes and people’s views on quantity, quality and accessibility
  - a sports club survey was distributed to all identified sports clubs in the Borough to ascertain their views on outdoor and indoor sport and recreation facilities in the area
  - all primary and secondary schools in the Borough were contacted and offered the chance for pupils to complete an on-line survey on open space, sport and recreation. The intention of this internet survey is to engage young people in the study and ascertain their views
  - three ‘drop in’ neighbourhood sessions across the Borough. Local and district wide agencies were invited to these sessions. In addition the sessions were advertised across the Borough via press releases to raise awareness amongst local residents. These sessions were held during November 2004. The purpose of these sessions was to determine the views, attitudes and expectations of local groups and residents on open spaces throughout the analysis areas and across the Borough
  - consultation was also carried out with external agencies, such as English Heritage, the Environmental Agency, Countryside Agency and British Waterways
- a press release, approved by the Council, was circulated by the Council’s press department to many of the local newspapers. The press release advertised an email address (openspaceinspelthorne@pmpconsult.com), text messaging service and freepost service to allow the general public to forward their comments on open space provision in the Borough.

2.11. Further details on the process and findings for Step 1, can be found in Section 4. A copy of all relevant questionnaires, can be found in Appendix A.

**Step 2 - Auditing local provision**

2.12. A detailed desk exercise was completed using existing data (for example, from the existing green space audit undertaken by the Council in 2003), current Council strategies, the Local Plan, Ordnance Survey and street maps and other sources, to establish exact locations and types of all open spaces within the Borough.

2.13. A total of 164 sites were visited to check the location and size of the site, confirm the primary purpose of the site and to also assess the site on quality, accessibility and value using a standard matrix and definitions. A copy of the site assessment matrix is shown in Appendix B.

2.14. All maps are in the process of being cross-checked with Council Officers to ensure that the data is as up to date and as accurate as possible. Once the Council has signed off the audit data, each open space site will be digitised using GIS software and its associated ratings and characteristics are recorded on a linked Microsoft Access 2000 database. This will enable further updates of open spaces and varying forms of analysis to be undertaken. This allows a dynamic reporting and assessment mechanism and enables individual sites or specific geographical locations to be examined in detail where necessary.

**Indoor sport and recreation audit and analysis**

2.15. Indoor sport and recreation facilities were audited by PMP using a variety of sources including PMP’s in-house database, supplemented by external sources such as www.upmystreet.com and www.yell.com. These identified sites were then audited and cross-checked via a series of telephone calls.

2.16. The facilities that were audited included:

- sports halls
- swimming pools
- health and fitness
- athletics
- squash
- indoor tennis
- synthetic turf pitches (STPs).
2.17. The provision of sport and recreation facilities will be assessed using demand models, which compare the current supply against both current and estimated future demand. The location of indoor sport and recreation facilities will also be digitally plotted using the postcode of the site to illustrate where current provision lies. Full details of the process can be found in Section 6.
Strategic context

3.1. This strategic review sets in context the study and analysis of a local needs assessment by reviewing:

- the range of local strategic documents and organisations that may have a direct or possibly indirect influence and/or impact upon the provision of open space within Spelthorne.

3.2. The current situation regarding the provision of open space nationally and national strategic documents will be reviewed in the final report.

**Spelthorne Borough Council Community Strategy July 2002**

3.3. This Strategy aims to deliver the following vision for Spelthorne:

“A place where people are fully engaged and are both respected and respectful, promoting an environment that is healthy, safe, inclusive, prosperous and sustainable”.

3.4. The strategy is divided into ten action areas with targets that have been agreed by all local partners. Six of these action areas and related targets are relevant to this study, and are highlighted below.

- A sustainable economy
  - promote the Borough as a tourist destination based on the characteristics of each area of Spelthorne (over next five years).

- Improving the environment
  - monitor the progress of major development and infrastructure projects affecting Spelthorne such as Terminal 5 (over the next five years).

- A place to live, work and play
  - carry out a fundamental review of parks and open spaces (over the next year)
  - undertake an audit of play provision (over the next year).

- Effective transport
  - improve the cycle facilities between Staines and Shepperton (over the next year).

- Younger people
  - engage with young people in order to identify their needs for improved facilities within Spelthorne and allow them to contribute to the design and provision of services and facilities such as parks and youth services (over the next five years).
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• Civic pride and a place where people are valued
  - broaden public engagement in the community planning process.

3.5. Open space, sport and recreation facilities can play a role in achieving each of the targets within six of the ten council action areas, as it cuts across many wide-ranging issues and can impact on health, deprivation, local economy etc.

Spelthorne Borough Local Plan (Adopted April 2001)

3.6. Local plans set out a local planning authority's detailed policies and proposals for the future development and use of land in their area. The Community Plan is currently being updated by the Council and a revised Plan is due to be adopted in the Spring of 2005

3.7. The Local Plan will protect urban and rural open spaces. Urban open spaces provide important outlets for recreation and break up the built environment making Spelthorne a greener and pleasanter place to live, work and plan. The Local Plan has policies and guidance under the following relevant categories:

Recreation, social and community facilities

3.8. Written before the revision of PPG17, the plan seeks to:

“ensure that adequate and appropriate provision of recreational land and buildings for recreational purposes is made to meet the leisure needs of the Borough’s population, with due regard to the proximity of recreational resources beyond the borough boundary”.

3.9. The plan highlights current deficiencies in recreation provision and indicates that the local authority will seek to encourage private initiatives and local interest groups in the provision of additional facilities in those areas of recreational need. The Council will also consider opportunities for undertaking appropriate schemes of joint recreation provision in conjunction with private and commercial concerns.

3.10. Further details are provided on the following types of facility:

• sports pitches – important to avoid any loss of public or private pitches. Council will keep demand under review. Borough does have good provision of open land for informal open space but there is only limited scope to use these for sports pitches

• equipped children’s play – overall shortage. Council has had a refurb of existing sites and new provision but some parts of the borough still do not have the standard provision. Shortage in Ashford. Opportunities to provide further sites will be taken as they arise

• open land for recreation – good surplus, though over half is common land of which a significant part is within the Staines Moor SSSI where there is low public use. Ashford has a marked shortage of open space with no sites identified to meet shortfall
• allotments – good provision, some used for grazing where otherwise unused. No local shortages despite no even distribution. No proposals for further provision
• indoor pools – provision compares well with national standards
• golf courses – there is scope for further provision.

3.11. In general, the following conclusions are stated:
• overall total area of open space is sufficient
• shortages in certain aspects – particularly open space and facilities adjoining or near the River Thames
• priority to protect facilities and make provision available where there are deficiencies.

Summary of Recreation Proposals

3.12. A number of recreation policies have been put in place to implement the above conclusions/recommendations. These are centred on the provision of children’s play facilities at eight named sites across the borough (related policies P28-P35), the development of water based and River Thames development (related policies R2-R7), the development and safeguarding of footpaths, bridleways and recreational cycling (related policy R9).

Updated Leisure and Culture Strategy for Spelthorne 2002-2005

3.13. The Strategy addresses all four of the Council’s key priorities: Engaging Younger People, Making Spelthorne a Better Place, Improving Customer Satisfaction and Making Spelthorne Safer. In addition, the Strategy is vital to delivering key objectives under the Community Strategy.

3.14. The overall aim of the Strategy is to:

“provide a framework of planned policies, objectives and actions… that will guide the provision and opportunities for leisure and culture over the next few years. The strategy seeks to provide direction to all local leisure and cultural providers in Spelthorne and provide a framework so we can best work together to achieve the aims and objectives.”

3.15. The Strategy details related objectives to the above aims as listed in the Action Plan. Objectives relevant to this study are listed below:

• Engaging Young People
  - development of play sites across the borough – audit complete in 1998, playground in Laleham updated this year
  - seek developers’ contributions through the planning process for future play sites – new site Ashford hospital
• Making Spelthorne a better place
  - develop a parks strategy
  - seek to overcome barriers of the letting of allotments and give consideration to how surplus allotment land can be best utilised
  - promote and actively encourage the use of open spaces, countryside areas and the riverside
  - support the Local Plan policies for the protection and enhancement of the built environment, green spaces, countryside
  - continue to provide and enhance the quality of our green spaces in Spelthorne.


3.16. The purpose of the strategy is to identify how parks and open spaces support the Community Vision and the Leisure and Culture Strategy for the Borough.

3.17. The main aim of strategy is to:
  • produce a scheme of management for the parks and open spaces of Spelthorne which will provide for their better protection and future resourcing, in order to improve their environmental value and uses for the people of Spelthorne
  • all policies and strategies should have a guiding vision. This strategy pursues the broad community vision, which describes the future of the parks and opens spaces as:

    “Places, which support the community vision of Spelthorne as a place where people are fully engaged and are both respectful and promoting an environment that is healthy, safe, inclusive, prosperous and sustainable.”

3.18. The Strategy contains key information which will inform projections of future demand for green space and recreational provision and sets out the amount and type of land that the authority owns and manages.

3.19. A significant amount of consultation was undertaken in developing the Parks Strategy. Key issues identified as important by the community, and relevant to this study, included:
  • security in parks
  • dog fouling
  • toilet provision
  • anti-social behaviour
  • lack of certain facilities for certain ages
  • no disabled provision.
3.20. The strategy also sets out key targets for investment and refers to the need for Section 106 generated income to include revenue sums for children’s play provision. Priority for capital investment is:

- primary parks take a precedent especially where capital investment generates incomes
- the improvement of parks and open spaces where there is a defined social need
- existing infrastructure where a need is identified in any plan.

**Parks and the sustainable development**

3.21. This strategy proposed:

- when proposing certain environmental initiatives, inform local people, schools and other interested parties and call public meetings to get views
- environmental improvement schemes should take into account existing ecological features and increase opportunities for wildlife
- provides all schools and colleges with opportunities to create a nature area or to adapt a wildlife and geological site nearby as an aid to teaching
- regular reviews of infrastructures, future plans to be drawn up to reflect national and European initiatives and legislation
- grounds maintenance contractor to be responsible for using sustainable materials and developing a recycling strategy.

**Revitalising Spelthorne’s parks**

3.22. This strategy identifies:

- the need for security in parks through different formats eg CCTV and by greater use of the parks in general through increased activities
- information relating to dog control, toilets, opportunities for children and young people and the disabled
- importance of community engagement including schools, consultation and promotion
- measurement of performance against set objectives and local performance indicators.
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Green Space Audit of Spelthorne - 2003

3.23. The Community First Partnership carried out this audit. Sites were categorised into:

- primary sites i.e. district parks
- secondary sites I.e. local parks
- tertiary sites i.e. small local parks/ open spaces.

3.24. The audit identifies the following facts:

- 71% of population has open space available to them within 300-400m walking distance
- there is a deficiency of quality sites, either primary or secondary sites in areas of the Borough e.g. Shepperton Green has 100% accessibility to primary/secondary sites compared to Ashford West, which only has 15%.

3.25. The mapping exercise that was undertaken highlighted a number of issues, which need to be addressed as part of the Action Plan over the next five years:

- improved provision in one of the parks in the north of the borough to provide another primary park e.g. Clockhouse Lane
- Ashford North West, which due to the severance effect, has 100% population with no access to primary or secondary provision. It is suggested that a local level site be upgraded to secondary status – Hengrove Park is proposed
- new sites where there are deficiencies – identify existing green spaces, which do not have public access at present and to consider whether this could form part of green space accessibility for the local community
- Section 106 agreements should all be considered on a case by case basis, taking into account local issues of quantity, quality and accessibility.

Urban Open Space - Protection from Development document – June 1993

3.26. The recommendations and proposals from this report were incorporated into the Local Plan adopted by the Council in April 2001.

Primary purpose

- to identify which open spaces in the borough are of sufficient value to justify protection from development
- open space sites that this review included were public parks and playing fields and large private grounds, excluded from the study were green belt land, very small sites (less than 0.1ha) and sites committed by development
- the value of each sites took into account three criteria 1) amenity value, 2) nature conservation value and 3) recreational value
- current provision was reviewed
• sites identified for retention fell under five headings
  - Council owned parks and recreation grounds
  - private sports grounds
  - school grounds
  - open land within residential estates
  - other land.

_Policy on Sports Provision in Spelthorne’s Parks June 2004_

3.27. **Purpose:**

• to establish a policy for the development of team sports in Spelthorne’s parks, which:
  - supports corporate priorities of ‘engaging younger people’, ‘making Spelthorne a better place’ and ‘improving customer satisfaction’
  - provides an opportunity to gain external funds
  - develops potential partnership/self-management of pitches.

3.28. **Recommendations include to:**

• develop self-management tools with football clubs and sites as identified in the report subject to the appropriate agreement
• the priority for casual use for football is given for youth teams
• that all football clubs with operate to FA Good Practice Guide
• that adult fees for football 2005/6 should be increased to help cover the cost of maintenance
• that the policy for bowls and tennis be continued and that putting is provided free of charge
• that the cricket square at Laleham is not maintained for the future and consultation with the proposed club at Long Lane commences with a view to developing a partnership.

3.29. **All of the above recommendations have reportedly been resolved.**

_Best Value Review of Young people May 2004_

**Objective of review**

• identify clear priorities to be agreed by the Council and its partners in accordance with the corporate vision
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- determine the extent to which the range of services, provided for young people by the Council and its partners, contribute to engaging younger people
- formulate a rigorous improvement plan to meet any identified shortfall in service provision over a three year timescale.

3.30. A number of action points were drawn up in an improvement plan. Relevant points to this project include:

- consulting with young people of varied ages and backgrounds
- improve safety and access in parks
- include cycle paths in parks
- provide active facilities in parks
- implement a policy of keeping parks open.

Liveability Park Life Project

- received £2.135m funding from the ODPM
- Park Life scheme seeks to introduce a series of youth zones into six parks, run jointly and locally by young people and representatives/stakeholders
- details of the schemes within the individual parks be developed, decided and managed by a Greenspace Forum.
- first phase of project covers Lammas Recreation Ground, Clockhouse Lane Recreation Ground and Kenyington Manor Recreation Ground.

Summary of strategic documents

3.31. The main issues in Spelthorne:

- parks and open spaces can play a role in achieving six priority themes of the community plan
- parks and open spaces cut across many wide-ranging issues and can impact on health, deprivation and poverty levels and the local economy
- the perception is that the level of provision for children and young people is low across the Borough. In particular provision for teenagers, which has resulted in their use of children’s playgrounds. This has led to vandalism in some instances
- the perception that many of the open space areas were littered and required maintenance e.g. grass cutting, litter bins and clearing of paths.

3.32. In summary, this review of strategic documents highlights the importance of maintaining and improving open space sites within the borough. This study will contribute to achieving the wider aims of a number of local and national agencies.
Step 1 Identifying local needs

Introduction

4.1. Consultation was undertaken as part of the local needs assessments to establish the views on open space provision amongst both users and non-users in the Borough.

4.2. The information gained from these consultations has been used to help understand:
   • the key issues/problems facing different Council departments and agencies
   • the needs and requirements of local residents
   • the attitudes and expectations of open space within the borough
   • what is right about the existing provision.

4.3. Consultations, via the various methods, have extracted a series of similar key issues across the borough; these are detailed in Figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.1 Summary of consultation

The main issues emerging are the lack of provision for children and young people, with the need to cater for young people in order to prevent the continued vandalism of the children’s play areas and the need to address the maintenance of open space sites.

The quality of the sites is important to all that use them. The recurring theme of dog fouling, litter, graffiti and anti-social behaviour by youths are considered to be a particular problem within the borough.

In terms of sport and recreation, casual swimming along with health and fitness are the most popular activities. There is a perceived demand for increased swimming and youth facilities provision. The lack of junior sports pitches has also been highlighted.

Overall, there is a need for an over-arching strategy for open spaces and the production of management and action plans may help to move the Council forward towards a more pro-active approach. The challenge is to do this against a backdrop of declining resources and increasing public demands and expectations.

4.4. More detailed analysis and key findings from the various consultation that has been undertaken is discussed in this section.

Household survey

4.5. 5000 questionnaires were disseminated across the borough. Each household was selected at random and the person in the household with the next birthday (but over the age of 10) was asked to complete the questionnaire. 485 questionnaires were returned yielding a response rate of 9.7%. This response rate, gives a statistically significant 95% confidence level. A copy of the household questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.
4.6. The returned household questionnaires have been analysed following entry on to an Access database. The following information summarises the views of the borough’s residents with regards to quantity, quality, accessibility and usage of open space and sport and recreation leisure provision:

**Respondent profile**

- 60% of respondents were male and 40% female
- respondents reflected the following age profile:
  - under 16: 0%
  - 16-24: 5%
  - 25-39: 24%
  - 40-59: 39%
  - 60-75: 24%
  - 75+: 8%.
- 93% of respondents describe themselves as white British
- 66% of respondents reported children under 16 living in their household.

**Quantity**

- a significant number of residents (greater than 80%) felt all the open space typologies were important to them
- 46% of residents felt that allotments were important (with 20% of respondents having no opinion on this typology) and 70% of residents that cemeteries and churchyards were important
- provision for children and young people was considered the least well provided for, with 60% of respondents feeling the current provision was ‘too little’
- only 1% of residents felt there was ‘too much’ provision across any of the typologies
- with regards to provision of those typologies which were considered ‘about right’ the following findings were recorded: parks - 70%, natural open spaces – 47%, green corridors – 58%, amenity greenspaces – 46%, play spaces – 32%, outdoor sports facilities – 48%, allotments – 40% and cemeteries & churchyards – 59%.

**Quality**

- dog fouling (30% of respondents) was stated as the most common significant problem across open spaces
- vandalism and graffiti (28%), litter (27%) and anti-social behaviour (23%) were also considered significant problems across the Borough
when rating the quality factors that residents were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with, these factors included planted and grass areas (81% of respondents), boundaries eg railing, hedges (80% of respondents), pathways (79%) and maintenance and management (70% of respondents)

with regards to quality factors nearly 50% of people were dissatisfied with the provision of toilets. Other areas of concern included a lack of provision of seat/benches (39% of respondents), provision of bins for litter (30% of respondents) and information and signage (22% of respondents).

*Accessibility*

- 90% of respondents were ‘satisfied’ and ‘very satisfied’ that their chosen site was accessible by foot
- 85% of respondents were ‘satisfied’ and ‘very satisfied’ with visibility of the site entrance
- 75% of people were ‘satisfied’ and ‘very satisfied’ with the opening times of their chosen open space area
- the level of dissatisfaction with accessibility was relatively low with 21% of respondents ‘unsatisfied’ or ‘very unsatisfied’ with accessibility by pushchairs or wheelchairs, 20% with accessibility by cycleways to their chosen open space area and 18% ‘unsatisfied’ or ‘very unsatisfied’ with the accessibility by public transport
- the greatest proportion of people (91%) walked to amenity green spaces.

*Usage*

- an average of 28% of respondents stated they used parks and gardens on a daily basis in the last 12 months
- weekly usage of open space was greatest for parks (24% of residents use a park/public garden each week), with 20% of residents using natural green spaces on a weekly basis
- monthly usage of open space was greatest for natural green spaces (26%), followed by 21% using green corridors and 20% using parks and public gardens
- visits to outdoors sports facilities represented the highest amount of occasional use and cemeteries the lowest
- parks and public gardens were visited most frequently by 43% of respondents, followed by natural green spaces (13%) and green corridors (17%). Linked to this, those areas of open space most used by Borough residents included:
  - Parks: Laleham, Lammas, Bedfont Lakes and Clockhouse Lane
  - Natural open space: Ashford Common, Shortwood Common
  - Green corridors: River Thames towpaths such as that from Laleham to Staines.
• respondents were asked how they normally travelled to the site they visited most frequently. The greatest proportion walked (55%), 39% were driven and 4% cycled. The remainder took public transport

• 34% of respondents stated that they had not visited any type of open space in the last 12 months

• only 2.5% use allotments on a daily, weekly, monthly or occasional basis,

• the most popular reasons for using open space was ‘to walk’ (13% of respondents), ‘for fresh air’ (12%) and ‘to take exercise’ (12%)

• the main reasons stated for non usage of open space included ‘lack of interest’ (13%), ‘lack of time’ (12%) and dog fouling (10%). 9% of respondents feel unsafe using open spaces.

**Sport and recreation leisure provision**

• the leisure facilities that respondents use most frequently are Sunbury Leisure Centre, Spelthorne Leisure Centre, Holmes Place in Staines and the Riverbourne Club in Chertsey (outside of the Borough)

• 33% of respondents stated that casual swimming was the most popular activity undertaken at their chosen leisure facility. This was followed by health and fitness (17%) and use of the café/bar (14%)

• diving, solarium and athletics were the least chosen activities by respondents

• for the facilities used most often by respondents, 62% rated them as ‘good’ or ‘very good’ compared to 9% rating them ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’. The highest satisfaction levels were attributed to location (83%), car parking (73%) and range of facilities (70%). ‘Poor’ or ‘very poor’ ratings were attributed to accessibility by public transport (23%) and the quality of changing facilities (22%)

• there is the greatest demand for youth facilities with 20% saying they would like to see more of them, 13% feel there is demand for more swimming pool provision and 13% would like to see more multi-use games areas.
School’s Internet survey

Profile of respondents

4.7. Five schools took part in the Internet survey, yielding 135 responses from children aged between six to 15 years. The majority of respondents were aged nine to 10 years. 41% of respondents were female and 59% male. The schools which respondents attend are listed below:
• Spelthorne County Junior School
• Halliford School
• Saxon Primary School
• Chennestone Primary School
• Springfield County Primary School.

4.8. A copy of the survey is provided in Appendix A. A summary of responses is given below:

Usage

• all except 11 respondents (8%) have visited open space in the last year
• the most popular reasons given for not using open space are lack of time, use of other parks/open spaces outside Spelthorne, too far from home and do not feel safe
• all types of open space have been visited. The most visited type of space is parks (91%) and the least is allotments (23%)
• most users (36%) visit open space weekly, and a further 26% visit open spaces daily. However, 23% visit occasionally showing a spread of responses
• parks and outdoor sports facilities are visited by most users on a weekly basis
• play areas, local grass areas in housing estates (amenity greenspace) and towpaths/footpaths are frequented mostly on a daily basis
• the most popular reasons for using open space are for exercise (53%), for a kickabout/informal play (52%) and to play on the sports pitches/courts (51%)
• looking at flowers and scenery is the least popular reason for visiting open space (10%)
• 57% of children and young people visit open space with their family, 36% with friends, and 5% on their own. Only 2% go with a club or group.

Quantity

• it is generally considered by children and young people that the amount of open space is satisfactory. 39% considered the quantity to be very good, 30% consider it to be good and 14% fair. Only 4% consider the quantity to be poor or very poor ie there is not enough.
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**Accessibility**

- 2% of the respondents use public transport to visit open space. Overall, 47% are driven, 34% walk, 15% cycle and 3% skate. The methods of transportation to each type of open space is detailed below:
  - parks: 39% of park users walk there, 38% drive, 18% cycle, 4% skate and 2% take the train
  - woodland: 50% walk and 41% go by car, only 9% cycle
  - grassy areas in estates: 100% walk
  - play areas: 50% are driven, 38% walk and 13% skate. None cycle or take public transport
  - footpaths/towpaths: the majority (67%) walk or are driven (18%) and the rest (11%) cycle
  - outdoor sports facilities: 79% are driven, 11% cycle, 7% walk and the remainder (4%) skate
  - allotments: all are driven
  - cemeteries: 100% walk.

- the majority of children and young people do not travel far to reach open space. 41% travel for under five minutes and 30% between five and ten minutes. 15% travel between 10-15 minutes, 3% between 15-20 minutes, 6% between 20-30 minutes and 5% over 30 minutes.

- of those that travel for under five minutes, 52% walk and 31% are driven. The remainder (17%) cycle.

- travel between five and 10 minutes is mainly by car (46%) and on foot (29%) with 20% cycling and 6% skating.

- when travelling between 10-15 minutes, 83% are driven, 11% walk and 6% cycle.

- between 15-20 minutes, half are driven, 25% walk and 25% cycle.

- between 20-30 minutes, 43% are driven, 29% walk and 28% cycle or skate.

- over 30 minutes, 67% are driven and 33% use the train.

- the time taken by children and young people to travel to each type of space is detailed in the table below:
Table 4.1 Time taken to travel to each open space type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>&lt;5 minutes</th>
<th>5-10 minutes</th>
<th>10-15 minutes</th>
<th>15-20 minutes</th>
<th>20-30 minutes</th>
<th>&gt;30 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland, meadows</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy areas in housing</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play areas</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths/towpaths</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- children and young people travel further to woodlands, meadows and grassland (natural/semi-natural greenspace). However, the majority of open space that they choose to visit is relatively local, within fifteen minutes travel time.

Quality

- the quality of open space is generally considered good by children and young people. 30% think it is very good, 22% good and 28% fairly good. Only 2% said it was poor and 1% very poor. 17% did not know

- however, only 24% felt that open spaces are well maintained. 21% said they are not well maintained and 54% said some are and some are not, indicating a mix of quality of spaces

- the perceived quality of the different types of space is illustrated in the table overleaf:
### Table 4.2 Perceived quality of each open space type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland, meadows</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy areas in housing</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play areas</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths/towpaths</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- as can be seen, the small grassy areas within housing settlements are considered the best maintained, followed by play areas
- the least well maintained open spaces are thought to be footpaths/towpaths
- however, it should be noted that a large percentage of respondents are not sure of the quality
- 78% of all respondents said they feel safe in open spaces in Spelthorne.

**General comments**

4.9. The children and young people were also asked to make general comments about open space in the borough. The common themes were:
- lack of things to do
- more play spaces needed
- too much dog fouling
- excessive graffiti
- the parks are well kept and are a nice place to visit
- more fencing needed
- presence of vandalism
- intimidation by teenagers.
Neighbourhood sessions

4.10. Three neighbourhood drop in sessions were held in what was considered the most widely used locations in Spelthorne – Ashford Library, Sunbury Library and the Elmsleigh Centre in Staines.

4.11. The sessions were publicised via press releases and open to all members of the public. The purpose of the sessions was to gain information from local residents on the main aspects of the open spaces study – quality, quantity, accessibility, usage and the wider value of open space in Spelthorne.

4.12. The sessions also gave the residents an opportunity to discuss any key issues relating to open space in their area (including site specific and general issues), as well as the opportunity to comment on good and bad examples of open spaces.

4.13. The findings of these consultation sessions are as follows:

**Quality**

- problems with vandalism and litter at some sites and walking areas, for example Feltham Hill (nicknamed ‘scruffy park’), Feltham Park Road, Staines Park and Greenfield Park

- one lady mentioned that she had experienced four falls in Green Street, highlighting possible health and safety issues

- overgrown paths in walking areas. People would use walking routes if they were of better quality and well maintained and signposted. One man was of the opinion that named paths are maintained but unnamed are not. As a result they are left to become overgrown and lose their use by default. Walking routes at Thames Street and Rivermead Island were considered very pleasant

- use of motorbikes was cited as a problem and ongoing issue at Desford Way Gravel Pit. This is a private site but the public are allowed to walk there. This behaviour could result in its closure to the public

- anti-social behaviour by youths was a common theme. This was cited as a particular problem at Clockhouse Lane playground, Feltham Park Road and Greeno Park. Intimidation of younger children is an issue at Woodthorpe Road

- dog fouling seems to be an inherent problem and sites that were mentioned as it being an issue were: Laleham Park, Green Street Playground, and Staines Park. Dog fouling was also mentioned as an issue on footpaths, in particular, from Thames Lodge to Penton Hook where there are no dedicated bins and people have been seen throwing bags into the river

- sites that were mentioned as being good quality in general were Laleham Park – “quite pristine” and well managed, Sunbury Cemetery and Lammas Park in the summer. Staines Park was thought to be well maintained and tidy with good amenities such as clean toilets and places to eat and Ashford Park was considered “well maintained and attractive.” People were disappointed with facilities at Millmead Park (not well maintained, improvements needed to the playground and more seats needed)
• children’s facilities were considered as good quality at Green Street Playground and Lammas Park. Conversely, Kennington Park and Staines Park were thought to be lacking in provision. Laleham Park was considered to have good facilities for older children (a climbing frame for example) but lacked in terms of equipment provision for younger children. A lack of “exciting equipment like roundabouts” was highlighted at Laleham Park.

• those people keeping allotments found them to be well used and many have waiting lists. Comments were made in respect to Shepperton and Ashford Small Holdings.

• there was considered an overall lack of benches and shelters in the parks.

**Quantity**

• not enough walking areas and more linked paths are needed, for example in Shortwood, there is a path from the allotments to Staines but no path to Shortwood Common.

• there is a bridleway (Hanworth) but it is the only one near to Sunbury (1.5 miles away). It stops upon reaching the borough boundary and there is no public access into Kempton Park.

• not enough facilities for children and many sites where there is provision are frequented by youths showing anti-social behaviour.

• provision of green space was in most case considered sufficient although many people would like more.

**Accessibility**

• accessibility of footpaths and towpaths is poor. Overgrown hedges and overhanging makes it difficult to use some areas.

• paths were inaccessible for some people with pushchairs.

• many people are prepared to (and do) drive to the riverside parks. Only very few people walked to parks (although there were people in each drop in session who did walk to parks near them). Several preferred to travel outside the borough to Bedfont Lakes but this is not necessarily a reflection on the facilities in the borough, just a question of variety.

• there is a significant amount of private land inaccessible to the public.

• problems with accessibility to Greeno Park. It is considered as tucked away and there is a need to park and walk to get to it. The Williams Housing Estate was mentioned as a site difficult to access easily as people have to walk along Chesterfield and Stanwell to get to it.

• issues of older children/youths ‘hanging’ around play areas, thus discouraging younger children from using them.

• a disabled man mentioned that the gravel paths in Staines Park were a problem for wheelchair users. Lammas was considered better although access to the park is not...
the gates are shut in Staines Park at 8.00pm and this was felt by some to be too early.

General

• there was an overwhelming feeling that there is a lack of facilities for young people
• anti-social behaviour, mainly by youths was identified in many of the parks
• difficult to find where footpaths are located. It was felt more could be done to improve the footpaths and that people need to be encouraged to walk. If people don’t know where the routes are, they will be discouraged
• it was felt that open space was losing out to housing needs and development and many people felt strongly that the open spaces should be retained
• there is a significant amount of privately owned land that affects access and is difficult to control
• although the borough is considered quite green, many felt they had to drive to get to any large, ‘decent’ parks (eg Great Windsor)
• people felt disconcerted that earmarked money has not been used for green spaces (eg Memorial Gardens)
• parks should be visible from road for people to feel safe
• the importance of green space was emphasised especially by those with children or own dogs.

Opportunities and methods for improving open spaces

• need for providing specific sites and facilities for young people, including climbing frames and adventure playgrounds
• provision of dog bins especially on footpaths
• implement police surveillance in parks.
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Internal consultations

4.14. The following internal officers have been consulted with regards to the current provision and potential need of open spaces and sport and recreation.

- John Brooks, Assistant Head of Planning
- Cathy Munroe, Liveability Coordinator
- Dave Cobb, Head of Leisure Services
- Derek James, Parks Development Manager
- Bill Wright, Parks Liaison Officer.

4.15. The following points summarise the main issues, which emerged from consultations with internal officers.

Strategy and vision

4.16. The aim of this open spaces study is two fold. Firstly, the Council would like to understand what provision Spelthorne currently has, (building upon an open space audit undertaken in 2003) identify areas where there are deficiencies in provision and identify solutions/site to meet any deficiencies. This study will provide robust evidence to support its recommendations and will help the Council assume a pro-active approach in terms of dealing with problematic issues and enhancing the quality and usage of open spaces. The production of management and action plans in an overarching strategy may help to move the Council forward towards a more pro-active approach depending on resources and investment available.

4.17. The second purpose of this study is to evaluate current proposals as set out in the existing Local Plan and provide robust evidence to support the recommendations made on whether or not they should be retained for the new Local Development Framework.

4.18. The Council is keen to identify smaller areas of provision that may not be considered of borough importance, but collectively have significant value to the local users.

4.19. In general there is a wide range of varied landscape provision within open spaces across the borough including formal, informal and water areas. However it has been commented that there maybe shortfalls in certain areas and there is a need for an overall strategic review and management plan. This study provides the basis for this to happen and achieve this vision shared by internal officers.

4.20. Many of the officers shared the vision of a borough with more facilities catering for the needs of the young people of Spelthorne especially in terms of informal provision.

4.21. The Council currently works with many organisations to manage and maintain open spaces. Partnerships, such as with the police in the provision of Parks Community Safety Officers (PCSOs) and with housing associations, are of great benefit to the Council and they wish to continue using this way of working and developing the local open spaces.
4.22. Further evidence of the emphasis the council puts on the value of parks is the £2.1 million funding received from the ODPM for its Liveability Parks Project. This will concentrate on capital improvements to Lammas Recreation Ground, Clockhouse Lane Recreation Ground, Kenyington Manor Recreation Ground, Littleton Lane, Fordbridge Park and Short Lane. These venues were chosen as they were thought to benefit the communities around them the most.

**Quantity**

4.23. There was a general feeling that the quantity of open space available is sufficient and within the prescribed set level. Parks are also within walking distance of most people. However their use could be more imaginative and there are areas that could be improved and enhanced. For parks in particular there are questions over whether areas are used to their potential.

4.24. There has been a significant rise in junior football, especially mini soccer. This is having an impact on the need for an increased and co-ordinated sports pitch provision. It was commented that no capital funds have been allocated to the parks despite the lack of pitches.

4.25. There are perceived gaps in certain areas such as Stanwell and Ashford. There are no sports facilities in Stanwell. The attainment of specialist sports college status at Bishops Wand School will help meet local needs in Sunbury.

4.26. There is considered to be a lack of playgrounds in the borough and although the Council is working to increase these, there is a limited budget for playground provision. Officers felt that Spelthorne was not “in the same league” as other Councils. It was also commented that the playgrounds cater well for young children but advanced provision is needed for older children/young people such as Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs), teenage shelters and skateboard ramps.

4.27. The borough is lucky enough to be located close to the River Thames and benefits from some excellent riverside parks such as Laleham and Lammas. These and other major opens spaces sites such as Sunbury Park and Staines Moor attract visitors on a borough wide basis as well as providing a local function. The borough is also considered well catered for in terms of towpaths and walking routes.

4.28. There is a current waiting list for allotments in some areas suggesting a need for some future increased provision. Having said this, allotments are so reasonably priced that the public hire them and often leave them unused and uncultivated.

**Quality**

4.29. There are some good examples of ‘Good Practice’ sites with the main one being Laleham Park and Lammas Recreation Ground. They provide a varied number of spaces within one central geographical area meeting the needs of various age ranges and are very well used (reports of over 2000 visitors per day in the summer at Laleham Park). Investment in the skatepark in Lammas has improved the overall quality of the park and has attracted an active skating community. The skaters have formed their own association to ensure that the skatepark is successful before embarking on plans to develop further skateparks across the borough.

4.30. Sports pitches are well used and are thought to be well complemented with good changing facilities, however it was reported that the prices for pitch hire have increased from £40 to £70 per match this season (2004/05) and as a result usage levels have dropped.
4.31. Self management of allotments generally works very well and is considered to improve the quality of the allotments. Shepperton Village Allotment Gardens is a particularly good example where self management has been a success.

4.32. There is an over-riding problem of anti-social behaviour by teenagers in play areas and other open spaces and this often discourages usage of open spaces by other people. Particular problems have been sited at Ashford Recreation Ground, Hengrove, Staines Park, Clockhouse Lane and Wicketts Park (the latter thought to be particularly bad). It is hoped that the issues in Clockhouse Lane will be resolved through actions taken as part of the liveability project.

4.33. Linked to the above point is the issue of vandalism. Kenyington Recreation Ground in particular has suffered and the pavilion has been broken into more times than any other Council building, causing thousands of pounds worth of damage. The issues prevalent at this venue are being resolved through girls youth football and the increased usage has meant better security. A group shelter has also been installed and local people are getting more involved.

4.34. The involvement of the PCSOs have been influential in helping to combat vandalism. They are employed by the police and part funded by Spelthorne Borough Council. There are currently four PSCOs covering four areas but they will troubleshoot at all parks if required. To date, damage caused by vandalism has decreased by £13,000 over the last year. The PCSOs are good as expert witnesses and their key objective is to communicate with youngsters in an attempt to eradicate anti-social behaviour.

4.35. There is a current problem with the usage of natural open spaces for motorbiking. A possible solution is for PCSOs enforcing the powers available to them, which may help to resolve the problem although it is acknowledged that there maybe risks associated with this approach.

4.36. Quality of the sports pitches throughout the borough was thought to be quite low due to drainage and maintenance issues. The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) has previously highlighted the problems but these have not yet been addressed.

4.37. Quality of the parks are considered good in terms of grass cutting and vegetation (especially Fordbridge Park) and the parks department is working towards a safer environment.

4.38. Many of the playgrounds are old and also taking into account the positioning of major roads such as the M25, M3 and A30, it is difficult to meet the NPFA standards.

4.39. Dog fouling is widespread and a common problem. Priority is being given to working on management plans pertaining to dog management in an effort to control dog fouling and to achieving Green Flag status for the parks. The deadline for the latter is February.

Accessibility

4.40. There is generally thought to be a good level of accessible open space within walking distance. For those that do drive or are driven to areas of open space, car parking is an issue. There is a lack of parking in residential areas and near parks and playgrounds with cars being parked on grass verges.
4.41. Many people are prepared to travel to the riverside parks and this will inevitably affect parking provision.

4.42. Disabled access is considered poor for pathways. Limited funds have been spent on the infrastructure despite the implementation of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) although Spelthorne consider themselves “ahead of the game” compared to other boroughs.

4.43. There is a significant amount of private land within Spelthorne, often well maintained but inaccessible to the public in most cases.

4.44. The majority of Spelthorne’s parks are locked at night, which has caused some contention in that many people work shifts (especially in Stanwell with its proximity to Heathrow Airport) and cannot access the parks when they would like to. Conversely much of the anti-social behaviour that needs to be addressed occurs after daylight hours. The parks are currently locked for security purposes and to safeguard residents but there is a question over whether they should be locked in future especially if lighting is considered.

**Management**

4.45. It was commented that despite strategies being in place (Leisure and Cultural, Community, Parks), the Community Department is split into four different sections and there appears to be no one person to drive the parks strategy forward or to develop the cohesion between that and the other strategies mentioned here.

4.46. The role of a specific officer working on the liveability parks project will enable the community to get involved in the management of open spaces bringing with it a ‘sense of ownership’ by the local public – something that is proven to enhance the quality of open spaces and encouraged by CABE Space. The park life scheme seeks to introduce a series of zones into six parks, run jointly and locally by young people and representatives/stakeholders. Details of the schemes within the individual parks will be developed, decided and managed by a Greenspace Forum.

4.47. Recreational conflicts are prevalent, for example between dog walkers and recreational users. To resolve this issue, the Council are looking to develop the parks in order to achieve a natural designation.

4.48. Management of the parks should fit in with recreational needs. Self management of facilities at Staines Park and Lammas Recreation Ground was proposed as this is thought to result in better quality pitches.

4.49. The Council has run initiatives to engage the local community, for example an allotment and design a playground competition.
Opportunities

4.50. The provision of a wide range of open spaces within the borough are not fully utilised mainly due to a lack of investment and available funding. With the liveability funds, the potential of the chosen venues will be realised in two phases. Plans for the second phase include:

- Shepperton Studios is keen to develop Littleton Lane Park with plans to install a youth zone
- Fordbridge Park – concentration on a healthy living theme for all and introduce a trim trail and walking routes
- Short Lane – establish a BMX partnership.

4.51. Other opportunities exist with the following:

- Bishop Wand School in Sunbury is opening its sports college in Easter 2005, which will go someway to meeting the sporting needs of Sunbury
- Bronzefield Prison site in Ashford - the open space land is formally being handed over to the Council in 2006 despite the Council informally having access to it since 1989
- secure open space sites through Section 106 agreements
- increased connectivity and networks linking the major open spaces together around the borough
- increasing the attractiveness and functional use of existing open spaces
- part of the north west part of the Borough is within the Colne Valley Regional Park. This is made up of a non-statutory consortium of authorities and could work as a vehicle to bring about various ideas and improvements with regard to open space in the north of Staines
SECTION 4 – STEP 1 IDENTIFYING LOCAL NEEDS

Sports club surveys

4.52. As part of the consultation process, surveys were sent to the sports clubs in Spelthorne as identified from the Council’s Sports Directory. Surveys were returned from the following clubs:

- Staines Albion Football
- Ashford Table Tennis Club
- Ashford Town (Middx) Football Club
- Egham Fencing Club
- Princes Club (watersports)
- Woodthorpe Bowls Club
- Staines Swimming Club
- Staines Bowling Club
- Spelthorne Atoms Basketball Club
- Elmsway Tennis Club
- Ashford High Badminton Club
- Ashford Hockey Club
- Ad Tennis

4.53. The following points summarise the main issues, which emerged from the surveys:

- the majority of clubs/organisations play/practice more than twice weekly, none of the respondents played/practiced less than weekly

- in the majority of clubs, most members reside in Ashford or Staines. Three clubs based in Ashford and Staines stated that their members live all over the borough. Two clubs stated that some of their members reside outside the borough in Egham, Feltham and Hounslow

- 38% of respondents rated the overall provision of leisure facilities within Spelthorne as either poor or very poor, 31% felt they were good, 8% thought they were average and the remainder (23%) failed to provide a response

- it was generally felt that existing leisure provision did not meet the needs of clubs/organisation and the reasons for this were:
  - lack of funding support
  - equipment for the sport not sufficient
  - facility hire costs
  - poor changing/toilet/kitchen facilities
  - venue not suitable for the specific sport

- 31% of respondents would like to see more STPs and the same percentage would like more grass pitches. 23% felt there should be more sports hall provision and the remainder (15%) felt there was demand for more youth facilities, bowling greens, swimming pools, MUGAs, covered tennis courts, squash courts and health and fitness
there was no pattern as to the location of new facilities (if they should be developed) but most respondents would like to see development in the area in which their club is based

the overwhelming majority stated that the provision of leisure facilities could be improved by increasing the amount and accessibility of facilities and by reducing costs

general comments were centered on facility charges. Many felt that hiring facilities was too expensive and that there was a need for some form of subsidy in order to keep the club/organisations going. Other comments included:

- lack of youth clubs
- more publicity about facilities
- sponsorship of clubs
- more financial help for clubs rather than youth programmes
- new and improved sports facilities.
Step 2 Auditing local provision

5.1. Through the methodology detailed in Section 2, we have assembled a baseline audit of open spaces. This information shows site boundaries and contains much of the information required for a PPG17 assessment. This includes the following information for each site:

- name and location of site
- size of site
- type of space (according to PPG17 typology)
- condition and quality
- accessibility
- ownership
- facilities provided.

5.2. The audit results are stored within an Access 2000 database, which will be linked to digitised open space sites.

5.3. Table 5.1 illustrates the breakdown of the total number of open space sites identified across the borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and gardens</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and semi-natural greenspace</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity greenspace</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for children and young people</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor water sports facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. As detailed above, a total of 250 open space sites have been identified, the most common type of provision is amenity greenspace.
5.5. The following paragraphs provide headline information about each of the different types of open space identified in Spelthorne:

Parks and gardens
- the seven parks and gardens range from Sunbury Court to Stanwell Green.

Natural and semi-natural greenspace
- there are a significant number of natural and semi-natural sites open space sites in the borough these include the gravel pits and reservoirs in the borough as well as Staines Moor, Shortwood Common and Thames Meadow.

Amenity greenspace
- amenity greenspace is the most common type of open space within the borough. There are a total of 96 sites, which are generally centred around the main towns in the borough and range in size from a disused recreation ground to a small but significant grass area in a housing estate.

Provision for children and young people
- facilities for children and young people are the second most common type of open space in the borough with 38 sites. Provision generally consists of play areas within the main towns and villages, often enclosed within a recreation ground
- these facilities were generally reported to be of ‘good’ or ‘very good’ quality, well used and with good access, for example Stanwell Recreation Ground play area was rated highly for quality, accessibility and usage.

Outdoor sports facilities
- outdoor sports facilities are the third most common type of open space in the borough with 34 sites. These consist of recreation grounds, school playing fields, cricket grounds and football grounds, as well as golf courses such as Sunbury Golf Course and Ashford Manor Golf Course
- the majority of these sites are reportedly of good quality and accessibility.

Allotments
- there are 13 allotment sites in the borough, these are spread across the borough in Ashford, Sunbury, Shepperton and Staines.

Cemeteries and churchyards
- there are a total of seven cemeteries/ churchyards in the borough, ranging from the churchyard at St Mary’s Church, Staines to the large burial grounds in Stanwell, Staines and Ashford.
Green corridors

- there are a significant number of green corridor sites in the borough, these are predominantly made up of rights of way and towpaths along the River Thames.
Indoor Leisure Assessment

5.6. In addition to the auditing of open spaces, PPG17 also recommends the assessment of existing indoor sport and recreation provision. We have prepared a full audit of the current and planned supply of indoor sports facilities in the borough.

5.7. The borough boundary will be used as one catchment area but it is important to indicate this has its limitations as it excludes any facilities on the edge of the borough. With this in mind, a second catchment area including a three-kilometre buffer around the borough boundary is applied to more accurately take into account the impact of facilities on the periphery of the borough and cross boundary movement.

5.8. This buffer takes into account the facilities in close proximity to Spelthorne, which may affect the demand for sites within the borough. It is however assumed that the number of people travelling out of the borough will roughly equal those travelling in. This buffer does not suggest that people will not travel from further than three kilometres, rather it is used solely as a basis for analysis.

5.9. Indoor sports and recreation provision includes the following:

- sports halls
- swimming pools
- health and fitness
- squash
- athletics
- indoor tennis
- synthetic turf pitches.

5.10. The audit will include the following information:

- type, size and number of facilities at each site
- ownership
- charging policies
- ancillary facilities
- condition/ quality
- availability
- accessibility
- utilisation assessment.

5.11. All information will be stored in an Access 2000 database.
5.12. All existing and planned facilities within the borough and also within a 3km buffer zone of the borough have been identified.

5.13. Initial findings from the audit regarding specific facility types are provided below:

**Sports halls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual use (ie school)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the majority of sports halls within the catchment area (the borough and 3km buffer zone) are publicly accessible (ie either public or dual use access)
- the sports hall facilities are located throughout the catchment area, predominantly at secondary schools and leisure centres
- most halls are above two badminton courts in size.

**Swimming pools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual use (ie school)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- there are more private swimming pools within the catchment area than public and dual facilities combined.

**Health and fitness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there are more private health and fitness facilities in the catchment area than publicly accessible facilities

the facilities range in size from six stations to 200 stations.

**Squash**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual use (ie school)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

there are more private squash facilities than public facilities

approximately half of the squash facilities are located outside of the borough but within the buffer zone

the facilities range in size from two to four courts.

**Indoor tennis**

there is only one indoor tennis facility within the catchment area, this is St George’s Hill Lawn Tennis Club and is a private facility, two courts in size.

**Outdoor facilities (STPs/ athletics)**

there are seven STPs within the catchment area – three are for public use, three are dual use and one is club use

there is only one athletics track within the catchment area, this is a synthetic track at Stompond Lane in Walton on Thames.

**Planned facilities**

20 planned facilities have been identified within the catchment area, these range in size/ impact from an extension and additional stations in a health and fitness studio to a new sports hall facility at Bishop Wand School.

5.14. Details of all open space, sport and recreation facilities will be provided in the two Access 2000 databases at the end of the study.
The way forward

6.1. This report details the findings to date from Step 1 and Step 2 of the 5-Step PPG17 process. This data collected through these two initial stages will be used to complete the process as outlined below.

Steps 3 and 4 - Setting and applying provision standards

6.2. In terms of the way forward, Step 3 involves the analysis of the significant amount of data collected. Using this data and site ratings in terms of quality, quantity, accessibility and value of the sites we will be able to:

- determine provision standards
- apply such standards
- to identify gaps in provision and therefore the areas of priority.

6.3. The analysis will therefore be undertaken by type of open space across the borough. Throughout our analysis we have, however, noted specific examples or issues raised by consultees in order to illustrate specific findings relating to distinct geographical areas or individual sites.

6.4. The data collected will also enable analysis of open space by catchment, looking at the proportion of the borough’s population, which is able to access each type of open space. Local standards will be set for quality, quantity and accessibility. Setting robust local standards based on assessments of need and audits of existing facilities will form the basis for redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process.

Step 5 – Drafting policies - recommendations and strategic priorities

6.5. Finally, policy recommendations and guidelines will be drafted, which will form the basis for redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process. All recommendations and priorities will be the result of the detailed local assessment of need for the borough.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES
### Household Survey - Spelthorne Open Spaces and Leisure Study

**SECTION ONE - OPEN SPACES, GENERAL QUESTIONS**

#### Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Please tell us HOW IMPORTANT each of the following types of open space are to you:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Public Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural greenspaces (e.g. woodland, meadows)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors (e.g. footpaths, canal towpaths, cycleways)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity greenspace (e.g. grass areas in housing estates, village greens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play areas, youth shelters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities (e.g. pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quantity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Please indicate if you feel there is ENOUGH provision for each type of open space in Spelthorne:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Public Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural greenspaces (e.g. woodland, meadows)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors (e.g. footpaths, bridleways, canal towpaths)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity greenspace (e.g. grass areas in housing estates, village greens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play areas, skate parks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities (e.g. pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Travel Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>How long do you think you should be expected to travel to each type of open space? Please write the TIME you would expect to travel (in minutes) and tick the MODE of transport you would expect to use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Time - Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Public Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural greenspaces (e.g. woodland, meadows)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors (e.g. footpaths, canal towpaths, cycleways)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity greenspace (e.g. grass areas in housing estates, village greens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play areas, skate parks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities (e.g. pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q4** HOW OFTEN have you used each of the following types of open space in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks and Public Gardens</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural greenspaces (e.g. woodland, meadows)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors (e.g. footpaths, canal towpaths, cycleways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity greenspace (e.g. grass areas in housing estates, village greens)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play areas, skate parks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities (e.g. pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5** Please indicate your main reasons for using open space (you may tick more than one box):

- To walk
- To walk the dog
- For fresh air
- To take exercise
- To picnic / eat
- To play sport on courts / pitches
- For a kickabout / informal play
- To sit and relax or read
- To look at flowers and plants
- To observe wildlife
- To see events / entertainment
- As a meeting place
- Shortcut / easiest route
- To use children’s play equipment
- Educational reasons
- To take children out

Other (please specify) 

**Q6** For those open space types you DO NOT use, please indicate why not (you may tick more than one box):

- Lack of time
- Lack of interest
- Too far from home
- Public transport not available / difficult route
- Car access / parking
- Close to busy road / railway
- Poor quality
- Unsuitable facilities
- Fails unsafe
- Use open spaces outside home
- I am not allowed
- Public transport costs
- Inconvenient public transport times
- Livestock on-site
- Dog fouling

Other (please specify)
SECTION TWO – SPECIFIC TO THE OPEN SPACE YOU USE MOST FREQUENTLY.

The space you use most often can be located anywhere within Spelthorne.

If you DO NOT use any type of open space, please go to SECTION THREE.

Q7 Please indicate which open space TYPE you use MOST FREQUENTLY (please tick one box only):

- Parks and public gardens
- Natural greenspace (e.g. woodland, meadows)
- Green corridors (e.g. footpaths, canal towpaths, cycleways)
- Amenity greenspace (e.g. grass areas in housing estates, village greens)
- Provision for children and young people (e.g. play areas, skate parks)
- Outdoor sports facilities (e.g. pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts)
- Allotments
- Cemeteries and churchyards

Q8 Please name the SITE you use MOST FREQUENTLY


Q9 How often do you visit the site?

- Daily
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Occasionally

Q10 How do you normally TRAVEL there? (please tick one box only)

- Walk
- Bus
- Cycle
- Private car
- Train
- Skate
- Other

Q11 How LONG does it take you to reach this type of open space? (please tick one box only)

- Less than 5 minutes
- Between 10-15 minutes
- Between 20-30 minutes
- Between 5-10 minutes
- Between 15-20 minutes
- Over 30 minutes

Q12 Please indicate if you experience any of the following PROBLEMS at the open space type you visit most frequently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Significant Problem</th>
<th>Minor Problem</th>
<th>No problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Fouling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 Please rate the following QUALITY factors for the type of open space you visit most frequently:

- Play equipment
- Maintenance and management
- Lighting
- Boundaries (e.g. railings, hedges etc)
- Toilets
- Parking
- Provision of bins for litter
- Seats / benches
- Pathways
- Information and signage
- Planted and grassed areas

Very satisfied | Satisfied | Unsatisfied | Very unsatisfied | Not applicable
---------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------------------

Q14 What would be the TOP FIVE FEATURES you would like to see in the open space you visit most frequently? (please tick only FIVE)

- Well kept grass
- Clean / litter free
- Flowers/trees and shrubs
- Changing facilities
- Sports pavilion
- Clear Footpaths
- Level surface/ good drainage
- Entertainment facility
- Events eg music
- Toilets
- Cafe
- Seating
- Picnic area
- Shelter
- Varied play equipment
- Nature features (e.g. wildlife)
- Pond / lake / water features
- Nature conservation area
- Dog walking facilities
- Dog tree area
- Litter bins
- Quality soils
- Play facilities for 2-5 year olds
- Play facilities for 6-12 year olds
- Play facilities for teenagers
- Access to site
- Access within site
- On site security (e.g. warden/CCTV)
- Art / Sculptures
- Information boards
- Variety of facilities
- Car parking
- Trim-trail
- Livestock on-site

Other (please specify)

Q15 Which of the following factors would make you feel SAFER using this type of open space (you may tick more than one)

- Adequate lighting
- Clear route to open space
- Adequate car parking
- CCTV
- Staff-on-site
- Reputation of area / space
- Boundaries (e.g. railings, fencing etc)
- Using the facility during daylight hours
- Landscaping (open aspect of the open space)
- Other users

Other (please specify)
Q16 How satisfied are you with the following SITE ACCESSIBILITY factors for the open space you visit most frequently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of site entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility by walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility with pushchairs or wheelchairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility by public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility by cycleways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 Is there an open space, of the same type, nearer to your home that you do not use?

Yes ........................................ No (go to question 20) ........

Q18 If yes please state name of site:


Q19 Please state the reason for not using this site:


Q20 Please use the box below to write any additional comments about open space in your area:


Q21 Which leisure facility do you use MOST OFTEN? (Please indicate a facility name and the town/village it is in. The facility can be public or private and inside or outside of the district)

Q22 Which activities do you take part in at your chosen leisure facility?

- Casual swimming
- Swimming lessons
- Diving pool
- Tennis
- 5-a-side football
- Pitch and Putt
- Bowls
- Solarium
- Health and fitness
- Sports hall activities
- Spectating
- Other: please specify

Q23 For the facility you use MOST OFTEN, please rate the following aspects:

- Location
- Range of facilities
- Quality of changing facilities
- Appearance
- Ease of booking
- Pricing
- Accessibility by public transport
- Helpfulness of staff
- Car parking
- Overall

Q24 What types of leisure facilities would you like to see more of, and/or think there is a demand for in Spelthorne?

- Swimming Pool
- Synthetic Turf/ All weather pitches
- Multi-use Games Area
- Tennis Courts
- Sports Halls
- Health and Fitness Gym
- Grass Pitches
- Squash Courts
- Bar / cafeteria
- Others: please specify...
Q25 Please write any other comments below: (eg. possible improvements to facilities, where new facilities are required etc)


SECTION FOUR - SOME DETAILS ABOUT YOU

Q26 Are you:

Male .................................. □  Female .................................. □

Q27 How old are you?

Under 16 .................................. □  25-39 .................................. □  60-75 .................................. □

16-24 .................................. □  40-59 .................................. □  75+ .................................. □

Q28 Which of the following best describes your ethnic origin?

White British .................................. □  Black Other .................................. □  Mixed White and Black Caribbean .................................. □

White Irish .................................. □  Asian British .................................. □  Mixed White and Black African .................................. □

White Other .................................. □  Asian Pakistani .................................. □  Mixed Black and White and Asian .................................. □

Black British .................................. □  Asian Indian .................................. □  Mixed Other .................................. □

Black African .................................. □  Asian Bangladesh .................................. □  Chinese .................................. □

Black Caribbean .................................. □  Asian Other .................................. □

Other (please specify)  □

Q29 Are there any children in the household under 16 years?

Yes .................................. □  No .................................. □

Q30 Please state your postcode (this will be used to map the catchment area for open space types and for no other reason):


Thank you for completing this questionnaire, please return it in the prepaid envelope provided by 6th December 2004.
Open Spaces in Spelthorne.

How to fill in this questionnaire:

a. Please read each question carefully

b. Most questions can be answered by clicking the box next to the answer that applies to you

c. For some questions you can click more than one answer

d. Please make sure you continue to the end of the questionnaire and press "submit" once you have finished all your answers

e. It should not take more than 10 minutes to complete

Q1  Which School do you attend?

Q2  How old are you now:

6 years old.................................................................
7 years old.................................................................
8 years old.................................................................
9 years old.................................................................
10 years old...............................................................
11 years old...............................................................
12 years old...............................................................
13 years old...............................................................
14 years old...............................................................
15 years old...............................................................
16 years old...............................................................
17 years old...............................................................
18 years old...............................................................  

Q3  Are you a boy or a girl?

Boy................................................................................
Girl............................................................................

Q4 Have you visited any of the following types of open space in the last year?

- Parks
- Woodland, meadows, grassland
- Grassy areas within a housing development, village green
- Play areas or youth shelters
- Footpaths, various
- Outdoor sports facilities eg. sports pitches, basketball courts, tennis courts
- Allotments
- Cemeteries and churchyards
- None

If you HAVE visited open space please go to Q6

Q5 If you have NOT used any open spaces in the last 12 months, why is this?

- Lack of time
- Lack of interest
- Too far from home
- Public transport costs
- Public transport not available
- Inconvenient times of public transport
- Car access/parking
- Close to a busy road/railway track
- Poor quality/difficult route
- Unsuitable facilities
- I'm not allowed
- Route/path is not safe
- Do not feel safe there
- Don't like the people there
- Use other parks/open spaces outside Spelthorne

Other:

Please now go to Q16
Q6 Please indicate the type of open space you visit most often:
- Parks .................................................................
- Woodland, meadows, grassland .................................................................
- Grassy areas within a housing development, village green .................................................................
- Play areas or youth shelters .................................................................
- Footpaths, park paths .................................................................................
- Outdoor sports facilities eg. sports pitches, basketball courts, tennis courts .................................................................
- Allotments .................................................................
- Cemeteries and churchyards .................................................................
- None .................................................................................

Q7 Please tell us the name of the site which you use most often, or the road it is on:


Q8 How often do you visit this site?
- Daily .................................................................................
- Weekly .................................................................................
- Monthly .................................................................................
- Occasionally .................................................................................

Q9 How do you normally get there?
- Walk .................................................................................
- Car .................................................................................
- Bus .................................................................................
- Train .................................................................................
- Cycle .................................................................................
- Skate .................................................................................
- Other .................................................................................

Q10 How long does it take you to get there?
- Less than 5 minutes .................................................................................
- Between 5-10 minutes .................................................................................
- Between 10-15 minutes .................................................................................
- Between 15-20 minutes .................................................................................
- Between 20-30 minutes .................................................................................
- Over 30 minutes .................................................................................
Q11 What are your main reasons for using this open space?
- To use the playground/play equipment
- To play on the sports pitches/courts
- For a kickabout/informal play
- To meet friends
- To go for a walk
- To take the dog for a walk
- To get some fresh air
- To get some exercise
- To picnic/eat
- To sit and relax
- To read
- To look at scenery or floral displays
- Other: 

Q12 Who do you normally visit the space with?
- I go on my own
- With friends
- With my family
- With my school
- With a club or group (eg Brownies)

Q13 What do you like MOST about the open space?

Q14 What do you like LEAST about the open space?

Q15 When you visit open spaces in Spelthorne do you feel safe?
- Yes
- No
- if no, please say why not:

For all to answer
Q16 Please rate the following about open space in Spelthorne:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of open space available</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 Do you think open spaces are well maintained— for example, litter free and safe?
- Yes.......................................................... ........................................
- No.......................................................... ........................................
- Some are but others are not .......................................................... ........................................

Q18 If you have any other comments, please write them in the box below:

Thank you for your time
Spelthorne Sport and Recreation Survey

Please spare a few moments of your time to complete this questionnaire on behalf of your club/organisation. Please tick boxes as appropriate. Thank You.

Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Please state the name of your club/organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Which of these activities does your club participate in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Football .......  Rugby ............  Swimming .....  Badminton ....  Cycling...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket ..........  Hockey ............  Netball........  Squash ........  Walking........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>How many members do you have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Male ............  Junior Male ............  Adult Female ............  Junior Female ............</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>In which town/village do most of your members reside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>How often does your club/organisation play/practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than twice a week .......  weekly ......................  once a month ......................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>twice a week ...................  fortnightly ...............</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leisure Facility Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Which leisure facilities (indoor and/or outdoor) does your club/organisation use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>For the Facility (ies) that you use, please rate the following aspects on a scale of 1-5 where 1 = poor and 5 = very good.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility name (from Q6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If average or below, please explain the main reason why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 How would you rate the overall provision of leisure facilities within Spelthorne?

Very good ................................................

Poor ........................................................

Good ....................................................... 

Very Poor ................................................

Average ..................................................

Please explain the reason for this choice:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

Q9 Do the existing leisure facilities you use meet all the needs of your club/organisation?

Yes ..........................................................

No ............................................................

Q10 If no, please explain the main reasons why not:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Q11 What types of leisure facilities would you like to see more of, and/or think there is a demand for in Spelthorne?

Swimming Pool (Lane swimming) .........................

Synthetic Turf / All Weather pitches .................. 

Leisure Pools .............................................

Multi Use Games Area................................

Sports Halls ............................................

Grass Pitches .........................................

Health and Fitness Gym ............................

Squash Courts .............................

Other  .....................................................

______________________________________________________________________________

Q12 If new leisure facilities were developed, where would you prefer to see them located within Spelthorne?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Q13 If one thing could be done to improve the provision of leisure facilities in Spelthorne would that be?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Q14 If you have any general comments that you would like to make us aware of regarding the provision of leisure facilities in Spelthorne, please use the space provided below:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Please return your completed questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided by 6th December 2004. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
APPENDIX B

SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and tidy Well maintained and inviting No litter, dog fouling or graffiti.</td>
<td>Clean and tidy Well maintained and inviting Maintained to good standard Very little litter, dog fouling or graffiti</td>
<td>Reasonably clean and tidy. Some litter, dog fouling or graffiti but doesn’t hinder usage significantly.</td>
<td>Questions of cleanliness and consequently maintenance. Evidence of litter, dog fouling and/or graffiti that detracts from the area.</td>
<td>Poor cleanliness and maintenance and clear evidence of litter, dog fouling and/or graffiti that would detract usage on a significant scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and good lighting and well-maintained Boundaries clearly defined and well-kept</td>
<td>Boundaries clearly defined Safe and good lighting</td>
<td>Boundaries are visible but not overly clear. Safe and reasonable lighting appropriate</td>
<td>Safety and lighting questionable. Boundaries not very clear or well-designed.</td>
<td>Boundaries are unclear and not visible. Safety issues in question and very poor lighting if any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous range of planting, no weeds Maintained to very high standard Grass cover throughout, cleanly cut</td>
<td>Numerous range of planting, few weeds Maintained to good standard Grass cover throughout, cleanly cut but few weeds.</td>
<td>Appropriate range of vegetation and plants but with some patchy maintenance. Full grass cover where appropriate but some thin patches or some excessive growth areas.</td>
<td>Limited range of plants and vegetation e.g. just grass in a park. General grass cover but some significant areas thin, saturated or poorly maintained.</td>
<td>Limited planting and which is reflected through it being poorly maintained. General grass cover but serious wear and tear and no efforts to correct problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous appropriate facilities and in excellent condition Suitable material for road and paths and in excellent condition Car parks where appropriate.</td>
<td>Numerous appropriate facilities and in good condition Suitable material for road and paths and in good condition Car parks where appropriate but maintenance could be better</td>
<td>Suitable material for roads and paths and safe to use. Appropriate facilities but in average condition and possibly difficult to find.</td>
<td>Possibly unsuitable material for road and paths or right material but with some faults. Insufficient number of facilities and/or in poor condition i.e. not inviting or very well looked after</td>
<td>Roads, paths in need of repair and rethink on materials. Limited facilities and generally avoided by users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site Matrix Accessibility Standard Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to find, clean and tidy and welcoming.</td>
<td>Appropriate size, clean and tidy and well-maintained</td>
<td>Obvious entrance and fairly clean but possibly some improvements could be made.</td>
<td>Apparent as an entrance although quite clear that improvements could be made in terms of access.</td>
<td>Some confusion as to where entrance is located or not easily accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information available, attractive and easy to read. Well signposted from the road and as to where to park, entrance to the site etc.</td>
<td>Information available and easy to read and appropriate signage outside and inside the relevant open space.</td>
<td>Some information available but possibly some improvements could be made to improve easy access through signage and information.</td>
<td>Limited information available and/or not very attractive or easy to read. Quite clear that improvements could be made.</td>
<td>No information or signage available which would almost certainly detract from its potential usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good disabled access throughout. Specific separate cycle access and walking access provided which are maintained in an excellent condition.</td>
<td>Disabled access in most areas. Reasonable access for cycling and walking and which is encouraged e.g. cycle locks provided.</td>
<td>Some disabled access but maybe with some inconvenience. Pathways and cycleways provided and accessible but untidy or with slight disrepair.</td>
<td>Limited disabled access provision. Limited cycle access and limited access to and from pathways and/or which are in some form of disrepair.</td>
<td>No disabled access provision and no cycleways or cycle locks – i.e. discourages cycling to site. Pathways not suitable and not easily accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good value for money – i.e. free to use for a very good facility</td>
<td>Good value for money – i.e. free to use for a good facility or some little cost for a very good facility</td>
<td>Average value for money - some cost that provides average value for money. Would be used more if facility was provided for free.</td>
<td>Poor Value for money – i.e. high cost for a reasonable facility or charging for a poor facility</td>
<td>Very poor value for money – i.e. very high cost in relation to quality of open space or charging for a very poor facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible by all forms of environmentally friendly modes of transport including public transport and the provision of cycleways and footways. Accessible by car as well but not encouraged as dominant user access mode of transport.</td>
<td>Accessible by most forms of environmentally friendly modes of transport particularly walking, cycling and public transport.</td>
<td>Accessible by at least 2 forms of environmentally friendly modes transport such as walking, cycling or various forms of public transport. Some significant access encouraged by car.</td>
<td>Limited access by at least 2 forms of environmentally friendly modes transport such as walking, cycling or various forms of public transport. Majority of access encouraged by car.</td>
<td>Very limited access by most forms of environmentally friendly modes of transport such as walking, cycling or various forms of public transport. Nearly all access encouraged by car.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Level of Use - Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High / Significant</td>
<td>the area is used either everyday or almost everyday by either people and/or wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>the area is used fairly often by either people and/or wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low / Insignificant</td>
<td>the area is used from time to time but not very often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Use</td>
<td>the area is not used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Open Space Pro-forma (BRONZE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Main town/ward</th>
<th>Site Address / Location</th>
<th>Type of Open Space</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>SITE ACCESS</th>
<th>LEVEL OF USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High / Significant</td>
<td>Low / Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Use</td>
<td>High / Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Audit Purposes only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>General Site Comments</th>
<th>Site Labellled with Number on Map (Tick)</th>
<th>Boundary of Site Drawn (Tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction and background

Introduction and scope

1.1 In October 2004, Spelthorne Borough Council (the Council) appointed PMP to undertake an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study across the whole of Spelthorne (the Borough). The study, an assessment of local needs and an audit of open space and indoor sport and recreational facilities, will provide the Council with a clear vision, priorities for the future (based on local need) and a direction for the allocation of resources.

1.2 The overall aim for this piece of work is to:

1.3 ‘provide an assessment of Spelthorne’s open space, sport and recreation facilities in the Borough to establish appropriate local standards, identify areas where there are deficiencies in provision and identify solutions/ sites to meet those deficiencies’.

1.4 This report follows on from the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study Factual Report dated December 2004. The Factual Report, which should be read in conjunction with this document, outlines the methodology of the study (in line with the PPG17 process) and details the findings from Step 1 (Identifying Local Needs) and Step 2 (Auditing Local Provision).

1.5 This report focuses on Steps 3, 4 and 5 of the PPG17 process.
Undertaking the study

2.1 As detailed within Section 2 of the Factual Report, this study was undertaken in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17) and its Companion Guide. The PPG17 Companion Guide sets out a 5-step process for undertaking a local assessment of open space. Further details on Steps 3, 4 and 5 are provided below.

Steps 3 and 4 - Setting and applying provision standards

2.2 From the analysis of the data collected and site ratings (for quality, quantity, accessibility and value) we are able to:

- determine provision standards for each type of open space
- apply those standards for each type of open space
- identify gaps in provision across the different types of open space and therefore the areas of priority.

2.3 The analysis has been undertaken by type of open space across the borough. Throughout our analysis we have, however, noted specific examples or issues raised by consultees in order to illustrate specific findings relating to distinct geographical areas or individual sites.

2.4 Setting robust local standards, based on assessments of need and audits of existing facilities, will form the basis for redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process. The data collected has been analysed by catchment, looking at the proportion of the borough’s population who are able to access each type of open space. Local standards have been set for quality, quantity and accessibility.

2.5 These standards have then been applied, enabling the identification of gaps in provision and areas of priority for each typology. Neighbourhoods or areas that are outside of an accessible catchment area have been identified as having gaps in provision. Open space sites of other typologies and parcels of land within or adjacent to these gaps of provision have been examined for the potential for change of use based on catchment area analysis, local need and physical characteristics.

Quantity

2.6 PPG17 advocates that planning policies for open space, including playing fields, should be based upon local standards derived from a robust assessment of local need.

2.7 The quantity of provision provided by the audit of open space has assisted in the setting of such local provision standards for the borough. These are included for each type of open space in the separate sections and as recommended by PPG17 is undertaken by population to calculate the quantity of provision per person.

2.8 Officers spent some time considering a vision for the future of green spaces. Having considered the key strategic objectives in the local plan, and the objectives in the community plan, officers showed their ‘vision’ for Spelthorne’s green space by placing a marker on the diagram shown below. It was resolved to generally retain the status quo by setting numerical standards in line with current provision. This position was agreed at an Officer meeting.
SECTION 2 – UNDERTAKING THE STUDY

Quantity Standards setting exercise

2.9 Local quantity standards were derived as follows:

- officers considered standards for each type of open space except for green corridors as per guidance in the PPG17 Companion Guide
- headline descriptive statistics were derived for the whole borough which showed the number of hectares per thousand population (ha/1000 population)
- it was agreed to have a single, borough wide standard for each type of open space
- benchmarking with other authorities was undertaken to see how these descriptive statistics compared
- officers then considered the feedback from the consultation to understand the views of local people in terms of not enough/about right/too much open space of different categories
- officers also considered how they would deliver the vision “to maintain the current level of open space in Spelthorne”
- standards were then applied to the whole district using a spreadsheet, to test the effects of different numerical values of standard
- officers discussed the implications of different standards and came to an agreement on numerical values for each type.

2.10 The quantity analysis has therefore taken into account key issues raised from the consultations with the public, internally within the Council and externally with national, regional and local agencies. This provides a more balanced view rather than relying solely on statistical calculations. A comparison with the community’s view on the existing level of facilities required and the current level of provision was made to establish a reasonable level of provision.

2.11 Standards were then applied to determine whether there is a surplus of provision, the provision was about right or there is a deficiency.
2.12 All standards are based on 2001 census data, and population projections have been calculated to predict the future demand in 2011.

2.13 The overall aim of the quantity assessment is to:

- establish whether the borough has a deficiency of provision within each type of open space
- types where there is a surplus which then could allow changing the type of open space to types that are deficient in that area.

2.14 The standards set for each type of open space in Spelthorne are summarised in Section 12.

Quality

2.15 The Companion Guide to PPG17 says the following about quality standards:

“Quality standards should not be absolute measures but reasonable aspirations and benchmarks upon which to measure the quality of any existing green space in order to determine the need for enhancement."

“The quality standard should derive from:

1. Analysis of quality in the audit in the light of community views
2. The agreed vision
3. A judgement as to the quality it will be possible to set as an objective and possible to deliver.”

Setting quality standards

2.16 Local quality standards were derived as follows:

- considering the information from the community plan, local plan, public consultation and vision statement we prepared a sentence or short paragraph describing the quality standard for each type of green space. Each sentence or paragraph addressed the five headings of:
  1. cleanliness and maintenance
  2. security and safety
  3. vegetation
  4. ancillary accommodation
  5. site access.

- key questions to consider were:
  1. what did the public consultation say about quality?
  2. what does the community plan and the local plan say?
  3. how can you help to deliver those aspirations?
  4. what is realistic and achievable?
the site assessment matrix was used to help with the setting of quality scores.

2.17 The overall aim of a quality assessment should be to identify deficiencies in quality and key quality factors that need to be improved within:

- the geographical areas of the borough
- specific types of open space
- specific quality factors that ensure a high quality open space.

2.18 This enables resources to be concentrated on areas that need to be improved.

**Accessibility standard**

2.19 Accessibility is a key assessment of open space sites. Without accessibility for the public the provision of good quality or good quantity of open space sites would be of very limited value. The overall aim of an accessibility assessment should be to identify:

- how accessible sites are
- how far people are willing to travel to reach open space
- areas of the borough deficient in provision
- areas of the borough suffering in accessibility and therefore of priority importance
- key accessibility factors that need to be improved.

2.20 Accessibility standards for open space are derived from an analysis of the accessibility issues within the audit and in light of community views.

2.21 In undertaking various consultations we were able to attain the aspirations of people in terms of travel time and also in terms of issues regarding access to sites. The outcome of this analysis is detailed in each section for each type of open space. We have used this analysis to determine suitable and appropriate accessibility standards.

2.22 Distance thresholds (i.e. the maximum distance that users can reasonably be expected to travel to each type of provision using different modes of transport) have been derived to quantify the accessibility standard.

2.23 PPG17 advises that any new open space sites or enhancement of existing sites should ensure accessibility by environmentally friendly forms of transport such as walking, cycling and by public transport. Distance thresholds should be realistic as well as encouraging a comprehensive provision of accessible open space across the borough.

2.24 The consultations, both through the household questionnaire and neighbourhood ‘drop-in’ sessions, provide specific information to assist in establishing distance thresholds for each type of open space.
2.25 Each section recommends distance thresholds, based on the time that 75% of people are willing to travel, where appropriate, to each type of open space. The standards set for each type of open space in Spelthorne are summarised in Section 12.

Setting accessibility standards

2.26 It is not entirely straightforward to set specific distance thresholds for each type of open space for all areas as there are many dependencies. These standards, as PPG17 recommends, provide some guidance in order to identify possible gaps in provision and meet the local needs of the residents within Spelthorne.

Level of usage and value

2.27 The value of an open space site is entirely different to quality and relates mainly to three key factors as described in PPG17 companion guide:

- Context – a site that is inaccessible is irrelevant to potential users and therefore is of little value irrespective of its quality. Also in areas where there are large amounts of high quality open space or more than is actually required, some of it may be of little value. In contrast to this, a site of low quality but in an area of low provision maybe of extremely high value to the public

- Level and Type of Use – poorly used open space sites may be of little value while highly used sites may be of high value

- Wider Benefits – there are many wider benefits of open space sites that should be taken into account when analysing the results of particular sites e.g. visual impact, benefits for biodiversity, educational, cultural, economic etc. These benefits are difficult to assess in a systematic way and would require detailed site visits.

2.28 Evaluating value therefore involves attempting to assess these factors, in particular relating the context of the open space site (quality and accessibility) against the level of use of each site.

2.29 From the assessment of the value of sites we can to start to determine policy options in terms of feeding into a specific action plan. This is fundamental to effective planning.

2.30 Figure 2.1 provides a simple means of determining the most appropriate policy approach to each existing open space site.
2.31 Quantity, quality and accessibility of types are evaluated within sections 3–10.

2.32 The provision of sport and recreation facilities has been assessed using demand models which compare the current supply against the estimated demand. Full details of the demand models and the assumptions used can be found in Appendix B.

Supply and demand analysis

Indoor Leisure Assessment

2.33 In addition to the auditing of open spaces, PPG17 also recommends the assessment of existing indoor sport and recreation provision. PMP was appointed to complete an assessment of the existing supply of, and demand for, indoor leisure facilities in the Borough. A broad review of sport and recreation facilities within Spelthorne has been undertaken to help guide future planning. The main questions that this work sought to answer are:

- what indoor sports facilities does the Borough have?
- where are they located?
- what is the demand?
- where are the gaps in provision?
- what facilities are needed at each site?
where should resources be targeted?

2.34 A comprehensive audit of indoor sport and recreation facilities. This audit data (ie supply) has been compared against demand (ie population and participation rates). Full details of the demand models and the assumptions used can be found in the Appendix.

2.35 Two levels of supply (present and future) were compared to an estimated demand for each type of facility. The foundations of all demand assessments are an analysis of the demographic profile of the resident population within the catchment area. As a result of the fast changing nature and high rate of development of indoor sport and recreation facilities and the effect that changing participation rates may have on the local requirement for facilities, future supply is measured only up to 2010.

2.36 The population statistics are calculated on a Borough level, and therefore the Borough boundary is used as one catchment area. However, it is important to indicate this has its limitations as it excludes any facilities on the edge of the Borough. With this in mind, a second catchment area including a three kilometre buffer around the Borough boundary is applied to more accurately take into account the impact of facilities on the periphery of the Borough and cross boundary movement.

2.37 This buffer therefore takes into account the facilities in close proximity to Spelthorne, which may affect the demand for sites within the Borough. It is however assumed that the number of people travelling out of the Borough will roughly equal those travelling in. This buffer does not suggest that people will not travel from further than 3km, it is used purely as a basis for analysis.

2.38 Once the resident population has been profiled, market penetration rates and frequency of participation rates of each sport or leisure activity are used to quantify demand. This ensures that results are specific to the requirements of the population of Spelthorne.

2.39 Results from the demand modelling are detailed in Section 11.

**Step 5 – Drafting policies - recommendations and strategic priorities**

2.40 Policy recommendations and guidelines have been drafted. Recommendations and priorities identified throughout the report are the result of this detailed local assessment of need for the Borough.
Parks and gardens

Definition

3.1 This type of open space includes urban parks and formal gardens that, as their primary use, provide opportunities for various informal recreation and community events. Recreation grounds where there is, for example planting, and therefore elements of formal gardens, whilst their role is acknowledged, are not included under this typology.

3.2 This typology also has many wider benefits. Parks provide a sense of place for the local community, ecological and education benefits, help to address any social inclusion issues within wider society and also provide structural and landscaping benefits to the surrounding local area.

Strategic context and consultation

3.3 A national survey commissioned by Sport England, the Countryside Agency and English Heritage was undertaken during 2003, looking at the provision of parks within England. The aims of the survey were to establish:

- how many adults in England use parks
- what activities people take part in when visiting parks
- the reasons people visit particular parks
- the levels of satisfaction with the amenities on offer
- why non-users do not use parks.

3.4 The definition of a park used in the survey was very broad and included both formal provision such as town parks, recreation grounds and also less formal provision such as village greens and common land.

3.5 The findings of such study were:

- just under two thirds of adults in England had visited a public park during the previous 12 months
- there is a distinct bias in the use of parks by social groups, with almost three quarters of adults from the higher social group visiting a park compared with only half of those from the lower social group
- people from black and ethnic minority communities also have relatively low participation as well as adults with a disability
- more than 8 in 10 adults who had used a park in the previous 12 months did so at least once a month during the spring/summer with almost two thirds visiting a park at least once a week. Women tended to visit parks more often than men
- it is estimated that the 24.3 million adults who use parks make approximately 1.2 billion visits to parks during the spring and summer months and 600 million visits during the autumn and winter months – a total of 1.8 million visits a year
• the most popular type of park visited was an urban/city park.

3.6 The household questionnaires, which were returned for this local study, flagged up a number of parks frequently used across the Borough, such as Sunbury Park. However, it is worth noting that local residents also referred to frequently visiting ‘parks’ such as Laleham Park, Church Lammas and Clockhouse Lane. However, none of these sites have been classified as parks or gardens for the purpose of this audit as these sites do not fall under the definition of parks and gardens as described in paragraph 3.1 and classification by typology should be by primary purpose. In addition, residents of the borough also indicated that they use Bedfont Lakes (London Borough of Hounslow).

3.7 The Draft Parks Strategy for Spelthorne 2003/08 recognises the importance of parks in the Borough and describes their future as:

“places which support the community vision of Spelthorne as a place where people are fully engaged and are both respectful and promoting an environment that is healthy, safe, inclusive, prosperous and sustainable”.

3.8 This strategic importance has been substantiated through the consultation and assessment in this study. For example, overall, parks and gardens were rated as the most important type of open space within the Borough and was the typology people use most frequently.

Setting Provision Standards

3.9 In setting local standards for parks and gardens there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

Quantity

3.10 The audit of parks and gardens shows there are a total of seven sites, making up 3.28 hectares across the Borough. The current provision of parks and gardens per 1,000 population therefore equates to 0.04 ha.

3.11 There are no definitive national or local standards for parks and gardens.

3.12 70% of the household survey respondents felt the provision of parks and gardens was ‘about right’ with 28% of respondents indicating they felt the current provision was ‘not enough’.

3.13 No standard is proposed but the value attached to planted areas in open spaces needs to be considered in the management of individual sites as appropriate.

Quality

3.14 The Green Flag criteria sets out benchmarks linked to a park being a welcoming facility and providing a healthy, safe and secure environment. However, there are no definitive national or local standards for the quality of parks and gardens.

3.15 The quality of the majority of parks and gardens across the borough are considered ‘good’ with the Memorial Gardens, Staines being rated ‘very good’ on the site assessment.
3.16 Memorial Gardens, Staines and Sunbury Park were sites specifically mentioned as being examples of good practice but there was a common theme that the parks and gardens within the Borough are well kept and are a nice place to visit. Aside from some isolated cases of anti-social behaviour, there are no perceived major problems with parks in the Borough from a quality perspective.

3.17 From the consultation and household questionnaires, the highest-rated aspirations for open space were clean and litter free sites, well-kept grass, flowers, trees and shrubs, seating, clear footpaths, CCTV, litter bins and nature features (eg wildlife).

3.18 This supports consultation that was undertaken in developing the Draft Parks Strategy where key issues that the community identified as important included security, dog fouling, toilet provision, anti-social behaviour and lack of facilities for certain ages. As a result, the Draft Parks Strategy identifies ‘the need for security in parks’. In addition, the Best Value Review of Young People commits to ‘improving safety and access in parks’. Security in parks falls under the remit of the Park Community Safety Officers (PSCOs).

3.19 The quality standard for parks and gardens should therefore include elements of these aspirations to meet and address the needs of the public, and also reflect national standards.

**RECOMMENDED LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD**

“Urban parks and gardens should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. They should also be clean and tidy, well maintained, inviting, safe and secure with appropriate, high quality facilities and infrastructure”.

3.20 This local quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing parks. Both the Memorial Gardens, Staines and Sunbury Walled Garden Park are examples of good practice in achieving this vision.

**Accessibility**

3.21 With regards to accessibility there are also no definitive national or local standards.

3.22 The majority of respondents were ‘satisfied’ regarding the accessibility of parks and gardens across the Borough. This was supported by the site assessments where the majority of the seven parks and gardens in the borough were scored as ‘good’ or ‘average’.

3.23 However, of those sites that were assessed for site access, not one site achieved the highest rating of ‘very good’, which suggests room for improvement. The main concerns are information and signage. Concerns were also raised during consultation regarding opening times and infrastructure.

3.24 Action points within the Improvement Plan from the Best Value Review of Young People include implementing a policy of keeping parks open and including cycle paths in parks.

**RECOMMENDED LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**

5 minute walk (0.4km) from residential areas
3.25 In terms of setting an accessibility standard, in the consultation residents were asked how far they are willing to travel to parks and gardens.

3.26 The majority of people indicated a walking rather than a drive time with the 75% level being up to five minutes, the equivalent of 0.4km (based on a walking speed of 4.8kph).

3.27 This catchment area is relatively small regarding the limited number of parks and garden sites across the Borough, as detailed below.

Applying Provision Standards – Identifying Geographical Areas

3.28 In order to identify geographical areas of importance we have applied the accessibility standard.

3.29 When the 400m catchment is applied to each site, this indicates that the majority of the Borough is outside of the accessible catchment area. However, it must be recognised that open space provision of this typology is considered by the Council to be a borough-wide resource.

3.30 The seven parks and gardens sites identified in the borough are as listed below:

- Flower Pot Green, Thames Street, Sunbury
- Selwood Gardens Park, Selwood Gardens, Stanwell
- Stanwell Recreation Ground, Oaks Road, Stanwell
- Memorial Gardens, Off Thames Street, Staines
- Jubilee Gardens, Staines
- Kings Lawn, Thames Street, Sunbury
- Sunbury Walled Gardens, Thames Street, Sunbury.

3.31 We have highlighted those areas with accessibility deficiencies, particularly within the Ashford wards and also the wards in the south of the borough, such as Shepperton Town and Laleham and Shepperton Green. As illustrated in Figure 3.1: these areas currently have no provision of this open space typology.
3.32 The majority of sites are within Staines, Stanwell North and Sunbury East. Further analysis of existing park and garden sites reveals that a railway line cuts through the catchment area of one of the sites (as shown in Figure 3.2), thus preventing access by half of that catchment population which further exacerbates the deficiency. A similar scenario is apparent in a further four of the sites, whose catchment areas are bisected by the River Thames (as shown in Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.3), again effectively reducing the accessibility to these sites, albeit from areas outside of the Borough’s administrative area.
Map 3.2 – map showing catchment areas of parks and gardens in central Spelthorne
SECTION 3 – PARKS AND GARDENS

Map 3.3 – map showing catchment areas of parks and gardens in the east of Spelthorne
Map 3.4 – map to show catchment areas of parks and gardens in the north of the Borough
3.33 Figures 3.2 to 3.5 clearly illustrate that there are identified areas, such as Ashford and Shepperton outside of the recommended accessibility catchments. It is important to consider that this typology is of strategic significance in terms of hierarchy within the borough and should therefore be looked at borough-wide. It is also important to consider existing open space provision in areas which are beyond catchment areas as shown: amenity green space sites, natural and semi-natural sites and outdoor sports facilities all provide the opportunity to serve as an informal open space as secondary purpose.

3.34 If however, there remains a perceived need for additional parks and gardens in these areas of the borough, it is recommended that opportunities for re-designation of open space sites (where there is a quantitative surplus) should be further explored. In addition, the potential for developing a greater part of these sites for more formal planted garden areas should be explored.

**Site Visit Value Assessment – Identifying Specific Sites**

3.35 Most sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked. However there are variations from this, which suggests that these sites would need some further analysis.
3.36 Parks and gardens within the borough offer a number of wider benefits, primarily structural and landscape benefits. They define the quality and character of the area and provide a buffer between the higher density urban areas. They also provide a value for recreational amenity.

3.37 Of the sites assessed, Memorial Gardens, Staines, has been rated as very good quality, very good accessibility and high usage. This site is an example of good practice and should be protected. Stanwell Recreation Ground, Stanwell has been rated as a good quality, good accessibility and high usage site. Again, this site should be protected as a highly valued open space resource of key significance and worth to the local community.

### Summary

A provision standard for parks and gardens has not been set. The provision of parks and gardens should be considered at a borough-wide level as this reflects the strategic significance of this type of open space.

From the consultation it appears that the overall quality, accessibility and usage of parks and gardens in the borough is good. Sites such as Memorial Gardens, Staines and Stanwell Recreation Ground should be protected as sites of high value to residents.

The recommended travel time for people to be able to access a park or garden is a five minute walk, equivalent to 0.4km. This is a catchment area considering the limited number of parks and garden sites within the borough and results in a significant proportion of the population falling outside of a catchment area. Lack of accessibility in areas such as Ashford is further exacerbated by the railway line bisecting the catchment area of four of the sites.

However, it is important to consider that there are sites that by primary purpose have been classified under other PPG 17 typologies in this study, but which have planting and other elements of formal parks and gardens.
Natural and semi-natural green space

Definition

4.1 This type of open space includes woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (eg downlands, commons, meadows), wetlands, open and running water, nature reserves and wastelands with a primary purpose of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.

Strategic context and consultation

Conservation importance

4.2 Among the natural and semi-natural areas there are 18 sites including Sites of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI), some of the reservoirs and Special Protected Areas (SPA) and some have a local designation as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance – these form an important part of natural open space within the Borough and have a large role to play in encouraging bio-diversity.

4.3 Specific sites of importance in the local area include:

- Staines Moor - (SSSI)
- Laleham Park
- Church Lammas
- Sunbury Park
- Shortwood Common – SSSI
- Dumsey Meadow (SSSI)
- Penton Hook (SNCI)

4.4 The Spelthorne Local Plan states the intention to protect these sites and further encourage the access to these sites. In addition, a key aim within the Leisure and Cultural Strategy is to ‘promote and actively encourage the use of open spaces, countryside areas and the riverside’.

4.5 Specific sites were identified as frequently used by those residents responding to the household survey. These sites included Laleham Park, Church Lammas, Sunbury Park and Shortwood Common.

Setting provision standards

4.6 In setting local standards for natural and semi-natural green space there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.
Quantity

4.7 The provision of natural and semi-natural green space amounts to 194.89 hectares in total across the Borough, a local provision of 2.16 ha per 1,000 population. It is worth noting that over half of this provision is at Staines Moor, a SSSI in the northwest of the borough.

4.8 Provision is spread mainly across eight wards. 65% of provision is in Staines ward and 15% in Laleham and Shepperton. Five wards have no provision - these wards are primarily urban areas, including Ashford Town and Staines South.

4.9 The only definitive national standard for natural and semi-natural areas is the English Nature Accessible Natural Green Space Standard (ANGSt). This suggests that there should be at least 2 ha of accessible natural green space per 1,000 population. It is worth noting that the Council meets the ANGSt national standard if Staines Moor is included within the audit. There is no national or local standard that covers the whole of this typology of open space although English Nature does approve other green space standards set by other organisations.

4.10 47% of the household survey respondents felt the provision of natural and semi-natural green space was ‘about right’. This is in line with reference to natural and semi-natural sites in the Local Plan, which states that ‘there is a good surplus, though over half is common land of which a significant part is within the Staines Moor SSSI where there is low public use’.

4.11 The local standard has therefore been set to reflect the level of current provision, which results in an adequate level of provision across the Borough, despite ten of the 13 wards having provision below the recommended local standard. It is recommended that due to the nature of this type of open space, generally being located outside the urban area that provision is looked at on a borough wide level rather than ward level.

Quality

4.12 There are no definitive national or local quality standards although the Countryside Agency states that land should be managed to conserve or enhance its rich landscape, bio-diversity, heritage and local customs.

4.13 From the site visits, the overall quality of natural and semi-natural open across the Borough is considered to be reasonable with all sites considered of good or average quality. The higher quality sites are considered to be Laleham Park, Church Lammas, Shortwood Common and Sunbury Park.

4.14 From consultation, sites that have been highlighted as examples of good practice are Laleham Park and Church Lammas. They both provide a varied number of spaces within one geographical area and are considered well managed and well used.

4.15 A suggested quality standard for natural and semi-natural green space needs to take into account the aspirations of the public, as well as to incorporate the Council’s strategic vision ‘to provide and enhance the quality of green spaces in Spelthorne’. However, where sites have a nature conservation designation the management needs to ensure the protection of the acknowledged scientific interests.
4.16 This local quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing natural and semi-natural open space.

**RECOMMENDED LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD**

“Natural and semi-natural green spaces should be free from vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles with appropriate facilities provided in the least obtrusive manner. Sites should be maintained to protect any nature conservation/interest”.

**Accessibility**

4.17 With regards to accessibility, the definitive national standard has been produced by ANGSt, which recommends 2 ha of accessible natural green space per 1,000 people. There are no existing local standards. The location of natural and semi-natural sites such as woodlands, commons and wetlands are often remote from local communities by their very nature.

4.18 Overall, from the site visits, the majority of natural and semi-natural sites were rated as ‘good’ or ‘average’ for accessibility. Sunbury Park, Laleham Park, Donkey Meadow and Dumsey Meadow were all rated as having good access.

4.19 Staines Moor is difficult to access but has a wider benefit in terms of visual amenity and SSSI value. In addition, there were a number of sites rated as ‘poor’, for example Shortwood Pond and Shortwood Common. These sites have limited public access and usage, which will be the same for many sites under this typology. Careful consideration needs to be given to balancing public access and conservation of such sites.

4.20 Within the household survey, respondents were asked what they consider is an acceptable travel time to reach natural and semi-natural spaces and what their preferred mode of transport to sites under this typology would be. The majority of respondents indicated a drive time, with the 75% level being 10 minutes.

**Applying Provision Standards – Identifying Geographical Areas**

4.21 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we have applied both the quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards identify quantitative surplus and deficiencies and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

4.22 When applying the quantity and accessibility standards, all of the Borough falls within the catchment of natural and semi-natural sites (as illustrated in map 4.1), although as detailed above there are quantitative deficiencies in ten of the 13 wards. Whilst in principle there is merit in improving accessibility to existing sites such as Staines Moor, Shortwood Common and Dumsey Meadow with nature conservation designated access needs to be carefully balanced with the needs of conservation of which their use for grazing is an important aspect.
4.23 Most sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked.

4.24 There are two sites of natural and semi-natural open space within the Borough, which have high quality, high accessibility and high usage. These are Laleham Park and Sunbury Park. These sites should be protected as valuable open space assets for the local community.

4.25 Shortwood Common and Shortwood Pond are sites that are used often. They are rated as good quality and yet their accessibility value is low. Having said this, the SSSI status does put limitations on what can be done and the level of use that is appropriate.
4.26 Sites such as Donkey Meadow, which is rated as having good accessibility but average usage and of average quality, should be considered in relation to enhancing quality where possible to increase its value and support optimum usage.

Summary

The audit has shown that the borough overall is well provided for in terms of natural and semi-natural spaces. It has a large overall quantity of this type of space and many sites are designated sites of, for example, SSSI. Staines Moor is a significant site within the borough. It makes up approximately 65% of this type of open space within the borough and is an SSSI. In addition, the borough is fortunate to have additional sites distributed across the borough such as Lammas, Sunbury Park and Laleham Park.

From the consultation residents have indicated that provision of this type of open space is adequate. A provision standard of 2.16 ha per 1,000 population has been agreed.

It is proposed that people should be able to access a natural or semi-natural green space within 10 minutes drivetime (equivalent to 4km) of their home throughout the borough. This results in blanket coverage of the borough with all residents within an accessible catchment of a natural and semi-natural site.

Natural and semi-natural sites are rated as the least accessible open space sites within the Borough. This is partly due to the remote location of such sites. The importance of balancing accessibility and conservation of such sites should be recognised and carefully managed.
Amenity green space

Definition

5.1 This type of open space is most commonly found in housing areas. It includes informal recreation spaces and green spaces in and around housing, with a primary purpose of providing opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancing the appearance of residential or other areas.

Picture 5.1 – Littleton Green, Shepperton

Strategic context and consultation

Doorstep Greens and Millennium Greens (Countryside Agency)

5.2 The Doorstep Greens programme is helping communities around England to create their own new amenity green space, or to transform existing open spaces to meet their needs. Many projects have been funded in urban and rural areas, particularly in disadvantaged areas, to create and manage ‘multi-purpose’ community greens and for the community to be involved in creating open space.

5.3 The aim of the Millennium Greens initiative is to provide new areas of public open space close to people’s homes that could be enjoyed permanently by the local community. They should be breathing spaces - places for relaxation, play and enjoyment of nature and pleasant surroundings. They could be small or large, and in urban or rural locations.
Consultation

5.4 Consultation undertaken as part of the study highlighted the following key issues:

- 81% of respondents rated amenity green space as important but only 26% of people stated they used amenity green space on a daily basis
- only 6% of respondents stated amenity green space as the type of open space they used most frequently
- 67% of respondents considered amenity green spaces to be the best maintained.

5.5 The returned household questionnaires list a number of amenity green spaces frequently used in various locations across the Borough. These include Cedars Recreation Ground, Upper Halliford Park and Groveley Road Recreation Ground.

Setting Provision Standards

5.6 In setting local standards for amenity green space there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

Quantity

5.7 There are 131.73 hectares of amenity green space across the Borough, with sites ranging in size from 0.01 ha (Ferry Lane, Shepperton) to 9.54 ha (Halliford Park Recreation Ground). The current provision of amenity green space per 1,000 population equates to 1.46 ha.

5.8 Provision is found in every ward, with only Ashford East having less than 1 ha of amenity green space. However, provision is unevenly spread varying between 0.15 ha in Ashford East to 18.29 ha in Staines. Nine of the 13 wards have provision of over eight hectares, which indicates that the majority of the borough is well provided for in terms of amenity green space. The size of provision therefore varies with some small sites in residential areas having mainly a visual amenity function.

5.9 The only national standard for amenity green space provided is by the Rethinking Open Space Report – an average of all local authority applicable standards, which is 2 ha per 1,000 population.

5.10 Other national standards make reference to amenity green space, including National Playing Fields Association (NPFA), which states 2 acres (0.8 ha) per 1,000 population for ‘playing spaces’. Some local authorities in the past have added an extra 1 acre (0.41 ha) per 1,000 population intended for residential areas.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD

1.46 ha per 1,000 population
5.11 46% of respondents believe provision of amenity green spaces sites to be ‘about right’. However, as described above, this provision, although spread across all wards in the Borough, has areas of higher concentration. In line with current provision, we recommend a local standard of 1.46 ha. This indicates an adequate level of provision borough wide but also draws out some deficiencies by ward. The wards in the south of the Borough ie Shepperton Town, Halliford and Sunbury West, are particularly well provided for, whereas Ashford East, Ashford Common and Sunbury Common are areas of quantitative deficiency.

5.12 As the level of provision of amenity green space is above the recommended standard within some wards, notably in the south of the borough, there is potential for some of these sites to be re-designated as other types of open space provision. Re-designation of sites would only be in those areas above the minimum standard and with multiple sites within a single accessibility catchment. Site specific options for re-designation are explored in Section 12.

5.13 In line with the PPG17 Companion Guide, it is appropriate to consider a minimum acceptable size component within the provision standards as this provides a transparent, policy based way of deciding whether to require a developer to make or contribute to off-site provision. The Council have set a minimum size of 0.1 ha, this will ensure that provision is of a reasonable size to be of benefit to local communities and individual sites are cost effective to maintain.

**Quality**

5.14 There is no national or local quality standard for amenity green space. The Council state that amenity areas are particularly important for informal play and they make a contribution to the character of an area, its recreational value, nature conservation value and provide a break in the built environment.

5.15 From the site visits, overall quality of amenity green space across the Borough is considered to be good or average with 24 sites meeting the average quality rating and 18 sites rated good. Only two sites were rated as very good, these are:

- Knowle Green
- Stanwell Village Green.

5.16 Seven sites within the borough were given poor or very poor quality ratings during the site assessments. These were:

- Jordens Close Open Space (very poor)
- Lauser Road Open Space (very poor)
- Gordon Road
- Preston Road
- Lime Crescent
- Holywell Way
- Greeno Park (Shepperton Recreation Ground).
5.17 The majority of amenity green space sites generally provide structural and landscaping benefits rather than any other wider benefit.

5.18 In general the quality of the areas are considered satisfactory and residents believe these are the best-maintained open space type in the Borough. The main concerns are with regards to dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour.

5.19 A quality standard for amenity green space should therefore include elements of these aspirations to meet the needs of the public, and also other local and national standards.

5.20 This local quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a quality benchmark for existing amenity green space to, most notably those sites listed in paragraph 5.16.

**QUALITY VISION STANDARD**

“Amenity green space should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles and sites should be clean and well maintained with clearly defined boundaries, high quality facilities appropriate to their use and appropriate planting”.

**Accessibility**

5.21 With regards to accessibility there are no definitive national or local standards.

5.22 From the site visits, the accessibility of amenity green space across the Borough is considered to be average. The highest rated site was Lower Hampton Road, followed by Staines Park, Keywood Drive and Cedars Park Recreation Ground. The lowest rated sites were Jordens Close Open Space and Lauser Road Open Space.

5.23 On the whole, borough residents who use open space were satisfied with the visibility of the site entrance and with accessibility. Levels of dissatisfaction were relatively low and related to aspects such as accessibility with pushchairs or wheelchairs.

5.24 The consultations highlighted specific accessibility issues to Shepperton Recreation Ground where there is a need to park and walk to it. Other factors include a lack of parking in residential areas, with cars being parked on grass verges.

5.25 In the household survey, of those who use amenity green spaces most frequently, 100% walk, with 75% walking five minutes, the equivalent of 0.4km. This data was supported by the findings from the schools Internet survey.
Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

5.26 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we have applied both the quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards identify quantitative surplus and deficiencies and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

5.27 There are a number of minor deficiencies identified within the quantitative analysis. Figure 5.1 illustrates areas of the borough within an accessibility catchment area. It shows that there are numerous amenity greenspace sites located throughout the Borough and most residential areas are within an accessible catchment of a site (even when taking into account the impact of physical boundaries). The exceptions are Ashford, Riverside and parts of Sunbury; these are the main residential areas located outside a reasonable catchment of existing amenity green space.

*Figure 5.1 Overview of amenity green space accessible catchment areas in the Borough*
SECTION 5 – AMENITY GREEN SPACE

5.28 Six of the Borough wards are above the minimum standard of amenity green space provision in six of the 13 wards - Ashford North and Stanwell South, Ashford Town, Halliford and Sunbury, Shepperton Town, Staines and Stanwell North. As mentioned in Sections 3 and 4, this may provide opportunities for addressing shortfalls in other open space typologies. Ashford East has the highest quantitative deficiency, and although accessibility to existing sites should be considered as a priority, further analysis may be required to determine where this quantitative deficiency is located within this area.

*Figure 5.2 – overview of catchment areas of amenity green space in the Centre of the Borough*

5.29 Open spaces such as football pitches are classified under outdoor sports facilities as their primary purpose. In a number of instances, however, pitches do provide an amenity green space function in areas where there are limited amenity green spaces. This must be taken into account within the analysis of amenity green space.
Site visit value assessment – identifying specific sites

5.30 Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning for open space. This can be done simply through comparing value with quality or in more detail by assessing all options and combinations when comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites.

5.31 Of the 51 sites assessed, 29 of these were considered to have high use, 15 with average use, leaving seven amenity green space sites with low/no usage levels.

5.32 Most sites with a low level of use would normally have an ‘average’ or ‘poor’ quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked. This certainly seems to be the pattern and there are no sites of low use with higher quality or accessibility.

5.33 Similarly, most sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. However, there are variations from this and there are a number of sites identified where the use level is ‘often’ or high and yet the quality and access are average or poor, which suggests that these sites would need some further analysis and should be priority sites for enhancement.

5.34 Examples of these sites which require further investigation are:

• Woodthorpe Road Open Space
• Preston Road AGS (often)
• Lime Crescent AGS (often)
• Belgrave Road AGS (often)
• Alexandra Recreation Ground
• Catherine Drive AGS (often)
• Groveley Road
• Holywell Way AGS (often)
• Hadrian Way Open Space
• Strodes Crescent AGS
• Royal Estate AGS
• Shepperton Recreation Ground
• Hengrove Recreation Ground
• Keywood Drive
• Scott Freeman Gardens
• Selwood Gardens Park (often)
• Long Lane Recreation (often)
• Brookside Avenue AGS (often)
• Diamedes Avenue Open Space (often)
• Cordelia Road Open Space (often).

5.35 There are several sites with average to low quality and average accessibility, which have low/no usage. These are:

• Gordon Road AGS
• Heathcroft Avenue AGS
• Jordens Close Open Space (no usage)
• Lauser Road Open Space (no usage)
• Splash Meadow
• Shepperton Green
• Littleton Playing Field.

5.36 These sites need the quality and value enhancing and the accessibility issues addressing. Alternatively these sites could be primary sites for any re-designation to other open space types, assuming that there are alternative amenity greenspace sites within the immediate catchment area.

Summary

Currently the Borough is well provided for in terms of this type of open space. On the whole these spaces are valued by local people and are of an average to good standard in terms of quality and accessibility.

The catchment area analysis indicates that such spaces should be seen as local neighbourhood facilities, and people should be able to access an amenity green space within a five minute walk (or 400m) of their home.

When applying the proposed Borough-wide standard of 1.46 ha per 1000 population, there is currently an adequate level of provision. The minimum site size should be 0.1ha.

The Council should seek to investigate sites of low/ poor quality. In addition, the Council should continue to gain provision for this type of space as part of all new proposed housing developments in accordance with the standards either in the form of new space to meet the increased population or in quality improvement to existing sites in areas of need.
Provision for children and young people

Definition

6.1 This type of open space includes areas such as equipped play areas, ball courts, skateboard areas and teenage shelters with a primary purpose to provide opportunities for play and social interaction involving children and young people.

Picture 6.1 – Laleham Park Play Area

Strategic context and consultation

6.2 The Council has invested significantly in refurbishing existing sites and providing new play areas over recent years but some parts of the Borough still do not have standard provision. The Leisure and Culture Strategy for Spelthorne has identified more play facilities for children and more safe places for teenagers to go as key priorities.

6.3 Consultation throughout this study has highlighted a number of issues with regards to provision for children and young people:

- there is a perceived lack of provision of open space for young people and children, particularly teenagers and young adults. It appears that this is a problem in all areas of the Borough, which is resulting in disturbances to the general public, and anti-social behaviour problems.

- difficult issues include vandalism, upkeep and nuisance for residents

- there has been a move away from the 1970’s policy of many small sites close to housing towards larger areas sited further out into open space
• closer supervision and the chance of wider supervised usage would be preferable

• many of the playgrounds are old and taking into account the positioning of major roads such as the M3 and A30, it is difficult to meet the NPFA standards

• with regards to teenagers, consideration should be given to more dedicated provision such as that provided through the Liveability project at Lammas Recreation Ground with the introduction of a skatepark. These would be better used and policed if sited in close proximity to existing community facilities. This might encourage both casual and organised use of facilities.

6.4 The consultations flagged up a number of play areas frequently used across the Borough. These included Halliford Park Play Area (site # 290), Groveley Road Play Area (site # 144) and Laleham Park YPC (site # 146).

Setting provision standards

6.5 In setting local standards for provision for children and young people there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

Quantity

6.6 From the audit, the current provision for children and young people is 3.50 hectares in total across the Borough. The current provision for children and young people per 1,000 population equates to 0.038 hectares.

6.7 The main national standard for the provision of children and young people comes from the NPFA 6 Acre standard which stipulates 2.43 ha of ‘playing space’ per 1,000 population, consisting of 0.81 ha per 1,000 population for children’s playing space.

6.8 In the consultation, 60% of respondents stated that they felt the current provision for children and young people was not enough, whilst only 32% indicated they thought this particular provision was ‘about right’.

6.9 The consultation results support details within the Local Plan, which states that there is an overall shortage of equipped children’s play and acknowledges that despite a refurbishment of existing sites, many parts of the Borough do not have the standard provision, most notably Ashford. This is evident in the quantitative analysis, where Ashford wards have an undersupply. Two wards in the Borough (Staines South and Sunbury East) have no provision at all and seven are below the average level of provision per 1,000 population.
6.10 The Council recognise the need for additional facilities for children and young people and the Local Plan states that ‘opportunities to provide further sites will be taken as they arise’, which will help to alleviate the current levels of deficiency across the borough.

6.11 To address the quantitative deficiencies it is recommended that the local standard is set above the current level of provision. A minimum provision by size will be dependent on the type of play provision, which will be based on the latest NPFA guidelines for LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs.

Quality

6.12 Guidance on NPFA LAPs\(^1\), LEAPs\(^2\) and NEAPs\(^3\) indicate some quality aspirations in terms of providing seating for adults, a varied range of equipment and teenager meeting places for teenagers.

Footnotes:
\(^1\) – Local Areas for Play
\(^2\) – Local Equipped Areas for Play
\(^3\) – Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play

6.13 The household survey revealed concerns regarding quality and provision of sites for children and young people. The site visits highlighted the quality of some play areas as good, with the most highly rated site being Stanwell Recreation Ground Play Area (site # 137), and others were rated as poor, such as Studios Road (site # 56).

6.14 Further consultation supported this conclusion with good quality provision specifically at Lammas Recreation Ground (site # 283/284). Overall the main concern is that current play areas are vandalised and run down, dominated by teenagers displaying anti social behaviour as there is a lack of mixed provision.

6.15 Much is being done to improve provision for children and young people, specifically through the Liveability Park Project, through which the Council received £2.135 million funding from the ODPM.

Example of Improving Practice – Lammas Recreation Ground Skate Park

There appear to be many problems within Spelthorne in terms of vandalism by youth/teenagers of play areas with a lack of provision for this age group. However the skate park at Lammas Recreational Ground is an example for other sites in Spelthorne to follow. This is a new skate park aimed at teenagers and older children, which has community backing and user ownership of the site. Users have formed a forum to ensure that the skatepark is successful before embarking on plans to develop further skateparks across the Borough. The problems elsewhere with vandalism of sites is not as evident mainly due to the ownership by users and its high usage.

6.16 A quality standard has been developed to address the concerns of local residents and build on enhancement of provision and good practice that has been undertaken under the Liveability Parks Fund.
QUALITY STANDARD

“Facilities for children and young people should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles and sites should be well maintained, appropriately planted and equipped to provide range of activities to suit varied interests and age groups.”

Accessibility

6.17 With regards to accessibility there are national standards for LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs:

- LAPs – suitable for children aged 4-6 years; 1 minute walk or within 100 metres with a minimum area of 100m². LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity green space

- LEAPs – suitable for children aged a minimum of 5 years; minimum area of 400m² or within 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes

- NEAPs – suitable for children aged a minimum of 8 years; minimum area of 1000m² and should be located within 15 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes.

6.18 Further analysis should be undertaken with regards to play provision in the borough in line with the above national standards. It is recommended that this be progressed within a dedicated play strategy for the borough.

6.19 Information gained from the site visits show that access to the majority of sites is considered good with no one particular site scored more highly than another. None of the sites were considered poor or very poor.

6.20 In general, site access to play areas is reasonable with the main concerns being information and signage.

6.21 From the household survey the general perception is that a travel time of five minutes is reasonable for access to play areas. 75% walk to these sites, which emphasises the need for local provision.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD

5 minute walk from residential areas
Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

6.22 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs the quantity and accessibility standards are applied together. The quantity standards identify quantitative surplus and deficiencies and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

6.23 Consultation suggests there are many deficiencies for children and young people within the borough. However the deficiencies are concentrated in specific areas, as illustrated in Figure 6.1 below.
6.24 The specific residential areas with both a quantitative deficiency and outside the catchment of existing play areas are a high priority for new provision. These are predominantly within Staines, Sunbury, Ashford and Stanwell.

6.25 As is the case for many open space sites in the borough, the major roads and railways that bisect the Borough, as well as the vast expanses of water, negatively impact on the effective catchment area.

6.26 Consideration should be given to what other open space provision is within these areas of deficiency and whether there is a need for new provision. There is scope to provide facilities for children and young people at a number of amenity green space sites. In addition, consideration should be given to whether there is a need to enhance the accessibility and quality of existing sites. This is further explored within Section 12.
Site visit value assessment – identifying specific sites

6.27 Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning of future provision for children and young people. This can be done simply through comparing value with quality or by assessing all options and combinations when comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites.

6.28 There are 38 sites providing for children and young people. Of the 21 assessed, all were considered as having good/high usage levels. The majority also benefit from a good quality and accessibility rating, which is to be expected as these factors are related or interlinked. There is one site of particularly good quality and access, which is Stanwell Recreation Ground Play Area (site # 137). This is considered a highly valuable site.

6.29 There are a few sites that deviate from this ideal such as Alexandra Recreation Ground Play Area (site # 156), Caesars Way Play Area, Shepperton (site # 299) and Shepperton Recreation Ground Play Area (site # 145). These have average quality and accessibility ratings. In order to maintain and increase their usage further, these issues should be addressed.

6.30 Overall, there are no sites that have low usage but there are sites which are used ‘often’ and have average quality and accessibility ratings. For example, Caesars Way Play Area (site # 299) and Shepperton Recreation Ground Play Area (site # 145). Littleton Recreation Ground YPC (site # 148) is rated as being average in quality and Groveley Road Play Area (site # 144) is rated as having average accessibility. The Wickets (site # 35), Stanwell Moor Playground (site # 135), Laleham Park YPC (site # 146/147) and Donkey Meadow were all rated as having good accessibility and quality but are visited only often.

6.31 In order to address the perception that there is not enough provision for children and young people, enhancement of the sites of lower quality and addressing any accessibility issues should be a priority to attract even greater use.
Outdoor sports facilities

Definition

7.1 Outdoor sports facilities is a wide-ranging category of open space and includes natural or artificial surfaces either publicly or privately owned which are used for sport and recreation. Examples include playing pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens and golf courses with the primary purpose of participation in outdoor sports.

7.2 Outdoor water sports facilities are considered separately at the end of this section.

Strategic context and consultation

7.3 There is currently no local playing pitch strategy. However, the Local Plan recognises the importance of playing fields and sports pitches and as a consequence these types of open space are protected from development due to their recreational value.

7.4 A policy on sports provision for the development of team sports in Spelthorne’s parks was put to and resolved by Council members in June 2004 through a recognised need to develop management plans for parks. The proposal was to proceed with self-management for certain pitches “but to ensure that the open space is protected for the benefit of the local community.”

7.5 Consultation throughout the study has highlighted a number of issues with regards to outdoor sports facilities:
SECTION 7 – OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES

Outdoor sports facilities

Definition

7.1 Outdoor sports facilities is a wide-ranging category of open space and includes natural or artificial surfaces either publicly or privately owned which are used for sport and recreation. Examples include playing pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens and golf courses with the primary purpose of participation in outdoor sports.

7.2 Outdoor water sports facilities are considered separately at the end of this section.

Strategic context and consultation

7.3 There is currently no local playing pitch strategy. However, the Local Plan recognises the importance of playing fields and sports pitches and as a consequence these types of open space are protected from development due to their recreational value.

7.4 A policy on sports provision for the development of team sports in Spelthorne’s parks was put to and resolved by Council members in June 2004 through a recognised need to develop management plans for parks. The proposal was to proceed with self-management for certain pitches “but to ensure that the open space is protected for the benefit of the local community.”

7.5 Consultation throughout the study has highlighted a number of issues with regards to outdoor sports facilities:
• the demand for pitches (mainly football) is never satisfied. The pressure, at times, to delete pitches in the heart of residential areas should be reconsidered because their use for sport does not preclude a general open space use for the rest of the time

• further increase in pitches might be achieved by closer liaison with the schools and use of existing sites with physical capacity for more pitches.

7.6 A number of outdoor sports facilities across the Borough were cited as facilities frequently used by those respondents of the household survey. The most popular sites named included Ashford Recreation Ground (Clockhouse Lane) (site # 33).

Setting Provision Standards

7.7 In setting local standards for Outdoor Sports Facilities there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

7.8 However a quantity standard for this typology (which includes golf courses) is set for broad planning need only, as applying a quantity standard for surplus and deficiencies of outdoor sports facilities would be meaningless when considering the wide range and size of outdoor sports facilities from golf courses to bowling greens.

7.9 In line with PPG17 Companion Guidance notes, private sites such as Kempton Park Racecourse and Staines FC Ground have been excluded from the audit.

Quantity

7.10 The current provision of outdoor sports facilities is 214.03 hectares in total across the Borough. This includes the three golf courses in the Borough: Ashford Golf Course, Hazelwood Golf Course and Sunbury Golf Course. These sites have limited public access but have been included within the local standard calculations.

7.11 The current provision of outdoor sports facilities per 1,000 population is 2.37 ha per 1,000 population. The NPFA provides minimum standards for the provision of outdoor playing space. The standard recommends a minimum of 1.6 - 1.8 ha per 1,000 population of outdoor sports provision, covering playing pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts and athletics tracks. These are national standards and do not account for the local context or the demographics of the local area.

7.12 The Local Plan has referred to sports pitches by stating that it is important ‘to avoid any loss of public or private pitches’, and that despite a good provision of open land for informal open space, there is only limited scope to use these for sports pitches.

7.13 Like other types of open space, opinion is split between whether current provision if adequate - 48% of respondents felt the provision of outdoor sports facilities was ‘about right’. However, more qualitative consultation indicated, for example, a lack of football pitches (particularly junior pitches), youth facilities and Multi Use Games Areas. This may suggest some locational and specific sport deficiencies. For example, it is noted that provision in Halliford and Sunbury West is disproportionately high because 30% of overall outdoor sports facility provision is within that ward.
7.14 Figures suggest that the current standards should be retained, therefore a local standard should be set, including golf courses, of 2.37 ha per 1000 population. Since this typology encompasses a broad variety of outdoor sports facilities it should be recognised that application for surplus and deficiency calculations would be meaningless and that standards should be set for broad planning need only.

7.15 Any increased provision could be met by enhancing accessibility to existing sports facilities given the audit includes all school pitches, some of which are not currently available for local community use.

Quality

7.16 The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) suggests benchmarks for the quality of this type of open space. These include criteria such as gradients, orientation, ancillary accommodation, planting and community safety.

7.17 There is no local standard for the quality of outdoor sports facilities.

7.18 Overall, from the site visits the quality of outdoor sports facilities appears very positive with all sites considered very good, good or average. Sites visited included Holmes Place and London Irish RFC where it is acknowledged that whilst of very good quality they are more likely to be accessed by spectators than the general public taking part in any sporting activity. Elmsway Tennis Club was the only site visited that was rated as being of average quality: all other outdoor sports sites within the borough were considered to be of good quality. These predominantly consisted of school sites, which will benefit from a regular maintenance programme.

7.19 From the consultation with clubs, quality of the sports pitches throughout the Borough was thought to be quite low due to drainage and maintenance issues. The NPFA has previously highlighted the problems but these have not yet been addressed.

7.20 The public perception however is of good quality outdoor pitches but whose ancillary facilities need improving.

7.21 A quality standard for outdoor sports facilities should include elements of the public’s aspirations and other local and national standards. This local standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a quality benchmark for existing outdoor sports facilities.

7.22 The Council should ensure that all sports facilities are of sufficient quality and accessibility for them to be considered fit for their intended use.

QUALITY VISION STANDARD

“All outdoor sports facilities, including ancillary accommodation, should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles. Sites should be accessible and should follow design and maintenance standards set by the relevant national governing bodies of sport.”

Accessibility

7.23 With regards to accessibility there are also no definitive national or local standards.

7.24 The level of accessibility of outdoor sports facilities is relatively low in comparison to other facilities within the borough, influenced by restricted levels of access to school and privately owned sites. In many cases, the quality of these sites is high as a result
of their limited availability outside of the hours of school or sports club use. Results therefore show that site access to sports facilities could be improved. The best and worst sites are similar to those identified in the ‘quality’ section.

7.25 Results from the household survey showed a varied response to the question of how people travel to outdoor sports facilities, with both walking and driving equally popular. 75% of respondents indicated a drive time of 10 minutes as reasonable. Of those who indicated that they walk to sports facilities most frequently, 75% walk up to five minutes.

7.26 We recommend that for the purpose of setting an accessibility standard, driving is taken as the mode of transport in line with other local authorities and national standards. Therefore a local standard of a 10 minute drivetime is recommended.

**Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas**

7.27 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with local needs we apply the quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards identify quantitative surplus and deficiencies and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance. Quantity standards have been set for outdoor sports facilities for planning purposes only in this study. Further research on local demand for sports facilities by sport should be assessed through a Playing Pitch Strategy.

7.28 Figure 7.1 below presents an overview of accessibility to outdoor sports facilities. It clearly illustrates that residents throughout the borough are within the desired accessibility catchment of this type of provision, a 10 minute drivetime (equivalent to 4km). However, it should be noted that this includes school sports pitches and golf courses, many of which are not currently publicly accessible.

7.29 In particular, consultation has highlighted a demand for junior football pitches and it is recommended that further investigation through a playing pitch strategy (to address the pressures on playing fields) is undertaken along with a specific sports facility strategy. Specific studies on each facility type will enable surplus and deficiencies to be identified more accurately in accordance with the local needs.
Site Visit Value Assessment – Identifying Specific Sites

7.30 Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning of outdoor sports facilities. This can be done simply through comparing value with quality or in assessing all options and combinations when comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites.

7.31 The popularity and value of outdoor sports facilities in Spelthorne is clear with only one site, Halliford School Playing Fields, having low usage. With the majority of the remaining facilities having high usage. This suggests outdoor sports facilities have a vital role to play and, as a priority, consideration should therefore be given to improving those sites, which are of poorer quality or accessibility. In addition, it is important to improve those sites where the quality of the overall site if good but the actual pitch is poor.

7.32 There are a number of sites which have been rated high for both quality and accessibility and high level of usage. These sites, listed below, are considered high value and should be protected:

- Holmes Place and London Irish RFC, Sunbury (site # 14)
- St Paul’s Catholic College (site # 15)
• Sunbury Manor School (site # 16)
• Ashford Recreation Ground (Clockhouse Lane) (site # 33)
• Thamesmead School (site # 63)
• Sunbury Golf Course (site # 92)
• Ashford Manor Golf Course (site # 100)
• Spelthorne Sports Club (site # 114)
• Littleton Recreation Ground (site # 119).

7.33 Despite the high usage and quality of many sites, there are several which have average or poor accessibility. These sites need the accessibility issues to be addressed in order to maintain the levels of usage. These sites are:

• Elmsway Tennis Club (privately accessible) (site # 34)
• Sunbury Sports Association (privately accessible) (site # 96)
• Hazelwood Golf Course (site # 152).

7.34 As previously mentioned there is one site where the usage level is low and yet the quality and access is considered good (Halliford School Playing Fields – site # 64). Reasons for low usage should be further explored. This is a recently created site.

Outdoor Water Sports Facilities

7.35 Under the title of outdoor sports facilities we were also asked to look at Outdoor Waters Sports in order to recognise the Borough’s considerable water area.

7.36 14% of the total land area in the Borough is made up of water. Many of these extensive areas, such as reservoirs and formal gravel pits, are used for various sports, particularly fishing and sailing. The River Thames also runs along the boundary of the Borough and the 15 mile river frontage has multiple recreational uses such as rowing, canoeing, sailing and river cruises.

7.37 There is a total of 470 ha of this type of open space across the borough (excluding the River Thames), but it is not distributed evenly across the borough. Nineteen wards have no provision of outdoor water sports facilities and 80% of provision is found in Laleham and Shepperton Green (made up principally from the Queen Mary Reservoir). In addition, it is worth noting that the British Disabled Waterski Association is based just outside of the Borough in Wraysbury.

7.38 Although there are no national standards and it is not considered appropriate to set standards for this type of open space it is important to recognise the recreational opportunities that these sites provide and how they provide additional visual amenity value.

7.39 Out of the 11 sites only Desborough Sailing Club (site # 85) and Halliford Mere Lake (site # 84) reflect the pattern where a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. These sites are of significant value and should be protected.
7.40 The remaining sites all show low/no usage levels with average or poor quality and accessibility ratings. The more average sites were concentrated on the gravel pits in Laleham and Shepperton Green, Queen Mary Reservoir and Littleton Sailing Club. There is a need to enhance the quality and for accessibility in order to address the low usage.

Summary

Spelthorne is currently well provided for in terms of the space it has containing outdoor sports facilities.

A minimum provision standard of 2.37 ha per 1,000 population has been applied Borough-wide reflecting the strategic significance of outdoor sports facilities. Currently the level of provision Borough-wide is adequate, however there are deficiencies at ward level. There is a significant amount of water area in the borough, which can be used for a variety of outdoor sports and should be taken into consideration when looking at the level of outdoor sports facility provision in Spelthorne.

Generally the quality, usage and accessibility of sites of this type is good throughout the Borough. The Council should work towards maintaining these standards into the future.
Allotments

Introduction

The use and longer term management of Allotments has been the subject of a separate study by Bridge IMC for the Council and the findings of this area by PMP needs to be read in the context of that more detailed work.

Definition

8.1 This includes all forms of allotments with a primary purpose to provide opportunities for people to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. This type of open space may also include urban farms.

Picture 8.1 – Allotments, Laleham

8.2 There are a total of 12 allotment sites across the Borough: these are based in Ashford, Sunbury, Stanwell, Shepperton and Staines.

Strategic context and consultation

8.3 Like other open space types, allotments can provide a number of wider benefits to the community as well as the primary use of growing produce. These include:

- bringing together people of different cultural backgrounds
- improving physical and mental health
- providing a source of recreation
SECTION 8 - ALLOTMENTS

- contributing to green and open space.

8.4 Consultation highlighted that local residents use many of these allotment sites on a regular basis, particularly Halliford Allotments.

Setting Provision Standards

8.5 In setting local standards for allotments there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

Quantity

8.6 The audit of allotments identified 20.01 hectares in total across the Borough. This equates to 0.22 ha per 1,000 population.

8.7 The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners suggest a national standard of 20 allotments per 1,000 households (ie 20 allotments per 2,200 people (2.2 per house) or 1 allotment per 200 people. This equates to 0.125 ha per 1,000 population based on an average plot size of 250 square metres. The 1969 Thorpe Report suggests 0.2 ha per 1,000 population.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD

To be based on the findings of the allotment study by Bridge IMC

8.8 46% of the household survey respondents felt that allotments were important. However 20% of respondents stated they had no opinion on the provision of allotments. In addition, 40% of the household survey respondents felt the allotment provision is ‘about right’. These results suggest that there is a sufficient provision of allotments.

8.9 The study has demonstrated a mixed usage of sites with some sites well used and others neglected. Therefore, the Council will look to promote the allotments to determine future use.

QUALITY VISION STANDARD

“Allotments should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. Where appropriate, access pathways and signage should be clearly provided and well maintained”.

8.10 Current level of provision is 0.22 ha per 1,000 population. This is in line with standards set for other local authorities and is twice the recommended standard of the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners.

Quality

8.11 There are no definitive national or local quality standards for the provision of allotments and community gardens.

8.12 From the site visits, the overall quality of allotments is average. This was the assessment rating given to the majority of the sites, such as Shortwood Allotments (site # 130). Only Shepperton Village Allotments (site # 5) and Chattern Hill Allotments (site # 129) were rated as ‘good’; conversely Commened Road allotments (site # 46) was rated as ‘poor’ quality and described as ‘neglected’ and ‘overgrown’.

8.13 Consultation revealed that the quality of the actual plots is the responsibility of the plot holder and most residents believe these are well managed and well maintained.
Council officers consider self management of allotments to work well and can improve the overall quality of the sites. Shepperton Village Allotment Gardens is a particular example of good practice.

As supported by the site assessments, allotments also provide some ecological benefits to the local area.

This recommended local quality standard should be the benchmark for existing allotments. It also provides the quality vision for any new provision.

Accessibility

With regards to accessibility there are no definitive national or local standards for this type of open space.

The overall site accessibility of allotments and community gardens was considered average to poor with only one site rated good: Shepperton Village Gardens allotments. The most poorly indicated sites in terms of accessibility were the allotments in Halliford and Sunbury (off Croysdale Avenue – site # 124), Chattern Hill Allotments and Groveley Road Allotments (site # 98).

From the household survey, half of allotment users walked to allotments. 75% of those people suggested a walk of five minutes as the most reasonable. Very few respondents indicated access by cycle or public transport.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD

No local standard set.

Applying Provision Standards – Identifying Geographical Areas

In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we have applied both the quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards identify quantitative surplus and deficiencies and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

When analysing the application of quantity and accessibility standards it is clear that the deficiencies in both are in the same places, as shown in Figure 8.1, as per the distribution of these sites across the borough. Specific areas of deficiency are:

- Stanwell North
- Ashford North and Stanwell South
- Ashford Common.
SECTION 8 - ALLOTMENTS

8.23 However allotments are a demand-led open space type ie there is no point in providing allotments in these areas if there is no demand for them. Therefore it is recommended that the results and findings from the Bridge IMC Allotments Study are considered before any standards are set for this typology. This study will highlight any areas of surplus/deficiencies with regards to allotment provision across the borough.

8.24 Initial findings from that study suggest that there is still a demand for allotments in the Borough, and although there are some redundant pitches within allotment sites, these are randomly located and therefore of limited value in terms of re-designation to address other open space typology deficiencies, as individual plots will not be of an adequate size or easily accessible.

8.25 The Council are looking to produce an allotment development strategy to more effectively market allotment sites, linking to the healthy lifestyles agenda, the aim of which is to maximise usage of existing allotment plots in the Borough.

Site Visit Value Assessment – Identifying Specific Sites

8.26 Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning for open space. This can be done simply through comparing value with quality or in more detail by assessing all options and combinations when comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites.
8.27 Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked.

8.28 However there is only one out of the six sites assessed (Shepperton Village Gardens) that follows the pattern of high usage with good quality and accessibility. The value of this site is high and therefore should be protected.

8.29 The Chattern Hill Allotments were rated as good quality with high usage, but the accessibility was considered low due to poor signage. This and any other accessibility issues should be addressed to ensure the usage levels are maintained with the potential to increase the overall value of the site.

8.30 The Commercial Road Allotments have high usage levels and average accessibility but the quality rating was low. This quality rating should improve when focussing on accessibility and would benefit from further analysis.

Summary

Allotments are a demand-led open space type i.e. there is no real point in providing allotments in these areas if there is no demand for them. It is recommended therefore that before setting standards for this type of open space provision that the results of the Bridge IMC Allotment Study, taken in to account.
Cemeteries and churchyards

Definition

9.1. Churchyards are encompassed within the walled boundary of a church and cemeteries are burial grounds outside the confines of a church. These include private burial grounds, local authority burial grounds and disused churchyards. The primary purpose of this type of open space is for burial and quiet contemplation. They also have an ancillary benefit as areas of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.

Picture 9.1 – All Saints Church, Laleham

Strategic context and consultation

9.2. Cemeteries and churchyards can be a significant open space resource in some areas, particularly in rural areas. In other areas they can represent a relatively minor resource in terms of the land, but are able to provide areas of nature conservation importance. Some churchyards retain areas of unimproved grasslands and other various habitats.

9.3. They can make a significant contribution to the provision of urban green space sometimes providing a sanctuary for wildlife in urban areas devoid of green space. As such, although many have restricted access they still provide a useful resource for the local community. A wide variety of habitats can often be found supporting the other open space types such as areas of semi-natural and natural green space.
9.4. However, this typology was one of the least important types of open space selected by respondents to the survey although this does not perhaps reflect their value in terms of their primary purpose. There are a total of seven sites in the Borough, including large burial grounds in Stanwell, Staines and Ashford. Not surprisingly, visits to cemeteries and churchyards also represented the lowest amount of occasional use, in terms of number of visits for recreation.

9.5. Through internal consultation with Council Officers, it was apparent that the main concern for the Council regarding this open space typology, is whether there is adequate burial provision to accommodate future demand.

Setting Provision Standards

9.6. No quantity standards are to be set for cemeteries and churchyards. PPG 17 Annex states:

many historic churchyards provide important places for quiet contemplation, especially in busy urban areas, and often support biodiversity and interesting geological features. As such many can also be viewed as amenity green spaces. Unfortunately, many are also run-down and therefore it may be desirable to enhance them. As churchyards can only exist where there is a church, the only form of provision standard which will be required is a qualitative one.

9.7. For cemeteries, PPG 17 Annex states:

every individual cemetery has a finite capacity and therefore there is steady need for more of them. Indeed, many areas face a shortage of ground for burials. The need for graves, for all religious faiths, can be calculated from population estimates, coupled with details of the average proportion of deaths which result in a burial, and converted into a quantitative population-based provision standard.

9.8. This does not relate to a quantitative hectare per 1,000 population requirement.

9.9. It appears that there is currently adequate supply within the borough. If the application of a quantitative standard is required, this should be calculated using a combination of population estimates and the average number of deaths resulting in a burial in the borough, rather than using the PPG17 methodology.

Quality

9.10. There are no definitive national or local standards for the quality of cemeteries and churchyards.

9.11. There were seven cemeteries and churchyards audited within the Borough, five of which received a quality rating of good. One site was rated as average (St Mary’s in Staines) and one was rated as poor (Church Road, Shepperton). The above average ratings
suggest the quality of cemeteries and churchyards are generally well-maintained and in good condition although St Matthews Churchyard in Ashford was considered untidy and poorly maintained.

9.12. In addition, cemeteries and churchyards provide historical, ecological and structural and landscape benefits to the local area but also a local amenity benefit and ‘sense of place’.

Accessibility

9.13. With regards to accessibility there are no definitive national or local standards.

9.14. The overall rating given to the site accessibility of cemeteries and churchyards was good, thus reflecting the quality ratings. The site with the poorest access was Church Road, Shepperton.

9.15. There is no requirement to set catchments for such typologies as they cannot easily be influenced through planning policy and implementation.

9.16. If an accessibility standard were to be recommended, this would be based on the a 10 minute drivetime catchment, as per the findings from the household survey. When applying this accessibility standard, it is clear that the whole Borough and beyond is within the expected travel time of 10 minutes by car (equivalent to 4km), as illustrated in Figure 9.1.

Applying Provision Standards – Identifying Geographical Areas

9.17. Given that it is not appropriate to set any local quantity or accessibility standards it is also not appropriate to state areas of deficiency or need.

Map 9.1 – Map to show catchment area within 10 minute drivetime
9.18. Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning for open space. This can be done by comparing value with quality or by assessing all options and combinations when comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites.

9.19. Most sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked.

9.20. The majority of cemeteries and churchyards that are of high quality and good accessibility that are also rated as well used sites. These sites are highly valued and should therefore be protected. Examples of the sites which need protecting in Spelthorne are:

- Sunbury Cemetery
- Stanwell Cemetery
- Staines Cemetery
- Ashford Cemetery.

9.21. St Mary’s in Staines is one site where the usage level is rated as ‘often’ but the access and quality are rated as average. It is suggested that this site is investigated further to see whether enhancement would increase overall usage.

9.22. St Matthew’s Churchyard is the only site where usage levels are considered low and the quality and accessibility are both poor. Addressing these factors may improve usage levels.

**Summary**

While it is inappropriate to set a quantity standard for cemeteries, there will be steady demand in the Borough for this type of space. Planning for future provision should be based on close examination of burial and cremation rates. According to the Council there is sufficient capacity at the present time to meet the needs of the population for the foreseeable future.

The quality of cemeteries and churchyards remains particularly important – many people use cemeteries and churchyards as amenity green space for peace and contemplation. It appears that the quality of cemeteries and churchyards within Spelthorne is generally good. It should be a priority to maintain this standard going forward.
Green corridors

Definition

10.1. This open space type includes towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and disused railway lines with the primary purpose to provide opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding whether for leisure purposes or travel and opportunities for wildlife migration.

Picture 10.1 – Thames Path

10.2. With regards to green corridors the emphasis of PPG17 on urban areas. It uses the typology from the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce Report that is an ‘urban typology’.

10.3. Furthermore, elements of PPG17 are contradictory to the Companion Guide on this issue, where despite PPG17 suggesting that all corridors, including those in remote rural settlements should be included, the Companion Guide suggests that unless a green corridor is used as a transport link between facilities i.e. home and school, town and sports facility etc, it should not be included within an audit.

10.4. This quality and accessibility analysis considers all types of green corridors identified by the Council, including public rights of way, footpaths, towpaths and other specially designated areas. Although the role that all green corridors play in the provision of open space and recreation within the Borough is recognised, the focus is however on important urban corridors and public rights of way (PROW). The importance of the River Thames and its towpath as a recreational resource and green corridor is also recognised, including its role as part of a national trail.
Local context

10.5. The Spelthorne Local Plan recognises the potential which an accessible green space network can provide for the Borough. It states within policy R9:

“…safeguarding the existing rights of way network in the Borough, and will take the opportunities where appropriate, to extend or create footpaths, bridleways and recreational cycle routes.”

10.6. The Local Plan also refers specifically to the protection of ‘river corridors’ within policy RU5:

“The Borough Council will seek opportunities to make environmental improvements and extend public access to the riverside as appropriate and particularly in considering any development proposals.”

10.7. The Local Plan recognises the importance of green corridors not only to provide sustainable access to open space sites but as being critical to the future of nature conservation.

Consultation

10.8. Consultation undertaken for this study highlighted the perceived value of green corridors, and a number of good practice examples were quoted. The most frequently used were:

- River Thames towpath (such as that from Laleham to Staines)
- River Ash Walk
- Colne Valley.

10.9. Within the consultation survey 89% of people indicated the high importance of this type of open space but only 25% used green corridors at least once a week with 13% of people using them daily.

10.10. Of those who do use green corridors most frequently the majority of people walk to the site, as they provide a local access route away from the roads.

10.11. Other consultation indicated concerns regarding overgrown paths. People would use walking routes more of they were of better quality and well maintained and signposted. A lack of dog bins was also raised.

10.12. There are many towpaths, cycleways and walking routes across the Borough but internal consultation highlighted that there needs to be more thought about how all these are joined and linked to existing major open spaces. The Boroughs green corridors are not fully utilised mainly due to a lack of investment and available funding. There is potential for improvement with particular areas as proposed in the Local Plan:

- Thames Path – continuous pedestrian route from Staines to Shepperton
- creation of new bridlepath links, for example around Staines Moor, however as a SSSI there would be limited options.

Setting Provision Standards – Quality

“the need for Green Corridors arises from the need to promote environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling within urban areas. This means that there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard, just as there is no way of having a standard for the proportion of land in an area which it will be desirable to allocate for roads.

10.14. It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set. PPG17 goes onto to state that:

“instead planning policies should promote the use of green corridors to link housing areas to the Sustrans national cycle network, town and city centres, places of employment and community facilities such as schools, shops, community centres and sports facilities. In this sense green corridors are demand-led. However, planning authorities should also take opportunities to use established linear routes, such as disused railway lines, roads or canal and river banks, as green corridors, and supplement them by proposals to ‘plug in’ access to them from as wide an area as possible.”

Quality

10.15. There are no national standards for green corridors although the Countryside Agency does suggest that the user should expect to find:

a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation

ground not soft enough to allow a horse or cycle to sink into it

a path on unvegetated natural surfaces.

10.16. As discussed above the Local Plan indicates the aim to safeguard the existing network of accessible green space, linking green wedges and open spaces and encouraging their use as a means of access through the urban area.

10.17. Other consultation suggested that there are concerns regarding overgrown paths. People would use walking routes more of they were of better quality and well maintained and signposted. A lack of dog bins was also raised.

10.18. The quality standard for green corridors should therefore include elements of these aspirations to meet the needs of the public, and also other local and national standards. This local quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a quality benchmark for existing green corridors to achieve.
**Accessibility**

10.19. There is no requirement to set catchments for such an open space typology as they cannot be easily influenced through planning policy and implementation and are opportunity-led rather than demand-led.

10.20. What did come through in the consultation was a lack of signage especially on the less established walking routes. Disabled access was also considered by some respondents to be poor for pathways. Despite the implementation of the Disability Discrimination Act, limited funds have been spent on the infrastructure.

**Links with the health agenda**

10.21. Green corridors represent an important chance to link open spaces within the urban area and to promote transport by cycle and walking. These opportunities for informal recreation will help keep the public active and improve health within the local area, all ideals supported by the Council in its Local Plan.

10.22. The latest government plan published by the Department for Transport and entitled “Walking and Cycling: an action plan” states:

> “Walking and cycling are good for our health, good for getting us around, good for our public spaces and good for our society, For all these reasons we need to persuade more people to choose to walk and cycle more often”.

10.23. Therefore it is important to address any qualitative deficiencies of existing green corridors and capitalise on any opportunities to increase and enhance the existing network.

**Applying Provision Standards**

10.24. Given that it is not appropriate to set any local quantity or accessibility standards and that no site assessments have been undertaken on green corridors purely because of the nature of the typology, it is also not appropriate to state areas of deficiency.

10.25. The aim is to provide an integrated network of high quality green corridors linking open spaces together and opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport.

**Summary**

Green corridors in Spelthorne are well valued. Opportunities should be taken by the Council to protect and extend the green corridor network where appropriate and possible to do. In addition opportunities for further development of green corridors should be taken where there is demand. It is likely that a large proportion of future provision will be opportunity led.

With the River Thames bordering the Borough, and part of the Long Distance Trail, green corridors alongside waterways are important forms of open space provision and should be maintained.

No minimum provision standard has been set Borough-wide.
Indoor sport and other built forms of recreation provision – supply and demand analysis

11.1 Alongside the main audit of open space, a secondary audit of indoor sport and recreation facilities has been undertaken for the Borough. This has included facilities within three kilometres of the Borough boundary to take into account the cross boundary movement.

11.2 The audit, and subsequent supply and demand assessment, has been carried out for the following:

- swimming pools
- sports halls
- health and fitness (ie gyms)
- synthetic turf pitches (STPs)
- athletics tracks
- racket sports (squash and tennis).

11.3 We have used a variety of sources to ascertain the supply of all the above facilities. All known planning applications were also considered in order to assess the likely level of future provision.

Demand modelling

11.4 The demand modelling for the audited facilities was carried out using PMP’s Mapping the Future™ (MtF). MtF modelling techniques and demand parameters have been applied to the facility audit to indicate the level of surplus or undersupply of facilities and the need for, or impact of, any new facility developments. The full set of parameters and assumptions relating to the models are set out in detail in Appendix C.

11.5 For the benefit of this report, where the terms private, public, club and dual use facilities are used, they have been classified as follows:

- public – public leisure centres with unrestricted public access
- private – clubs where there is no pay and play access for the general public and membership is required. Not included in the model
- dual use – leisure centres that only allow public access during out of school hours and holidays. Sunbury Leisure Centre has been included within this classification, there is also public use of the facility during the school day
- club use – facilities that can only be hired out as a whole, to clubs and associations, usually on a block booking system. Such facilities do not provide staff or any other support and are therefore not included in the model.
Sports halls

11.6 The supply of sports halls in Spelthorne is illustrated in Map 11.1 below.

Map 11.1 - Sports halls in Spelthorne Borough plus a 3km buffer zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Datchet Squash &amp; Sports Club</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Springhealth Leisure Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Egham Sports Centre</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>St George's Hill Lawn Tennis Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elmbridge Leisure Centre</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>St Paul's Catholic School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feltham Airparc Leisure Centre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sunbury Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hampton Youth Project</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Pavilion Sports &amp; Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Langley Leisure Centre</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>The Thames Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leacroft Centre</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Abbey Fitness Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Princes Club</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ashford High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Royal Holloway (University Of London)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Feltham Community School Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sci-Tech Pro Gym</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hampton Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Spelthorne Leisure Centre</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hampton School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sunbury Leisure Centre</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lady Eleanor Holles School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Amida Hampton</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Strodes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Club Motivation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Thamesmead School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>David Lloyd Leisure</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Brooklands Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Holmes Place Health Club Staines</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Spelthorne College Sports Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Holmes Place Sunbury</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bishop W and School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Matthew Arnold Sports Centre</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Staines Prep School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Meadhurst Club (Corporate/Bp Membership)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Halliford School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Miss Fitness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Englefield Green Infant School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>River Bourne Health Club</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>American Community School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Runnymede Hotel Health &amp; Fitness Club</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cleves School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Slough Marriott Leisure Club</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>The American School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a total of 16 sports halls in the Borough. Of these facilities, four are public, eight are private, three are dual use and one is for club use only. There are also two planned sports halls. Outside the Borough (within the three kilometre buffer) there are a further 28 facilities.

For the purposes of demand modelling, accessibility for public use and size of facility are taken into consideration when assessing the level of current supply provided by the network of existing facilities. For example, within the model the capacity of dual-use sites is reduced by 25% to reflect the balance of school versus public access. When applying the demand model, there are eight facilities accounting for a total of 18 badminton courts, which indicates a current unmet demand in the Borough equivalent to eight badminton courts.

There are two facilities planned, one of which is an extension to the Bishop Wand School that will open in September 2005. Assuming these facilities come to fruition there would be an unmet demand in the Borough equivalent to five courts in 2010.

Looking at the Borough and the buffer zone together a level of current demand equivalent to 88 badminton courts has been calculated and a current unmet demand of 31 courts. Taking into account other planned facilities within the buffer zone this unmet demand decreases to 29 courts.

The sports club survey showed that 23% of respondents felt that there should be more sports hall provision. During consultation there were no specific comments made regarding badminton provision.

Swimming pools

The supply of swimming pools in Spelthorne is illustrated in Map 11.2 below. Full supply and demand models and a list of the assumptions can be found in Appendix C.
11.13 There is a total of 41 swimming pools in the Borough and buffer as a whole. In Spelthorne alone, there are 12 pools of which three are public. These are Spelthorne Leisure Centre, Sunbury Leisure Centre (both Council run) and (Sunbury Sports Association). Bishop Wand School is the only dual use facility and the remainder of facilities are either for club use only (Matthew Arnold School) or have private access such as Holmes Place. As such they are not included in the demand modelling. Taking this into account the current supply equates to 966m² of water space.

11.14 One way of assessing the potential demand for swimming is by applying accepted sports participation rate standards (by age and gender) to the population profile within a chosen catchment. The propensity to participate in swimming in the Borough is higher than the national average, with 26% of the population expressing an interest, compared to 23% nationally (see Sport and Leisure Potential report at Appendix D). This reflects the degree of promotion given to swimming by the Council.

11.15 The ‘at one time capacity’ (the capacity in any peak session) can then be used to establish the level of supply needed to cater for identified demand. This is based on accepted Sport England parameters including peak hours, proportion of visits during peak times, average visit duration and pool area. This approach ensures that supply is sufficient to cater for the maximum demand at any point in time.

11.16 Use of this demand modelling technique suggests there is a current level of demand equivalent to 907m² of water space. Hence there is an oversupply equivalent to 59m² if the Borough is viewed in isolation of the high participation rates and the promotion given to swimming.

11.17 There is one planned private facility at Wheatsheaf Park but as it is private it is excluded from the demand modelling. Taking into account population projections the theoretical oversupply is predicted to drop to 56m² in 2010.

11.18 If we view the Borough and buffer zone together, the level of current demand is equivalent to 3,131m² of water space and hence identifies a current oversupply of 172m². Taking into account the three planned public facilities, this oversupply decreases to an equivalent of 52m² in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>American Community School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feltham Airport Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hampton Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hurst Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lady Eleanor Holles School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Langley Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spelthorne Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sunbury Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sunbury Sports Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sunbury Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wallarton Thames Swimming Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200 flats and retail mall development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Amid a Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>David Lloyd leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Holmes Place Health Club Staines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Holmes Place Sunbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Imber Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jubilee High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Livingwell Health Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Old Crown Complex (Hotel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Onyone health club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>River Bourne Health Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Runnymede Hotel Health &amp; Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Slough Marriott Leisure Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Springhealth Leisure Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>St George’s Hill Lawn Tennis Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Pavilion Sports &amp; Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Abbey Fitness Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bishop Wand School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Exor-Site Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Feltham Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The Centre &amp; Aquis House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Matthew Arnold Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Thames Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Club Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Henworth Park House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Heathrow Park Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Outlands Park Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Wheatsheaf Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Milton Gras Site, Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ermbridge Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.19 Assuming that the targets in Game Plan are achieved (50% participation in 2010 and 70% in 2020) and if participation rates rise in line with these targets, the theoretical surplus in water space becomes a shortfall in the Borough and the three kilometre buffer zone. This would result in unmet demand of 135m² of water space in the Borough and an unmet demand of 631m² when taking into account the buffer.

11.20 In the household survey 33% of respondents stated that casual swimming is one of the most popular activities. This survey, as well as the sports club survey highlighted a perceived demand for increased swimming provision. Internal consultation has highlighted the Borough’s emphasis on water safety, reflected in leisure centre swimming pool programming. There are also many clubs, schools and societies competing for pool water space.

11.21 The Spelthorne and Sunbury Leisure Centres Needs Survey undertaken in January 2003 also highlighted demand for swimming facilities. Of the 743 people interviewed, by far the most popular activity was swimming (with aquarobics). This represented 54% of interviewees at Spelthorne Leisure Centre and 62% of interviewees at Sunbury Leisure Centre. Another pool emerged as the preferred option at both centres, despite the population already having access to two swimming pools.

11.22 Further consultation has highlighted the following points:

- membership prices at the private facilities in the Borough are considerably higher than the public facilities
- most of the private facilities do not allow children – the one exception being Holmes Place at Sunbury (but for children’s swimming lessons, a parent needs to be a member of the club)
- the private facilities tend to run their swimming pools at a higher temperature than local authority pool, and therefore the private pools are not suitable for many fitness swimmers and swimming clubs
- the demand for pool space in the public facilities is high at specific times of the day and week. After school the demand is increased for swimming lessons and public swimming. While during the day there may be capacity, it is not possible to provide general lessons for children during the school day. The same principle applies for ‘Fun Sessions’ at the weekends. These can become very busy and there are often customers queuing, because the pool is at full capacity. These sessions cannot be moved to quieter time of the week
- the demand for swimming lessons is reflected in high attendance figures and waiting lists at both Sunbury Leisure Centre (574 for Parts 1 and 2) and Spelthorne Leisure Centre (90 for Parts 1 and 2).

11.23 In light of the consultation and the known demand for swimming the evidence suggests a case for additional provision in the future or means of more effectively meeting demand.
Health and fitness facilities

11.24 The supply of health and fitness facilities in Spelthorne is illustrated in Map 11.3 below.

Map 11.3 - Health and fitness facilities in Spelthorne Borough plus a 3km buffer zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abbey Fitness Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Egham Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elmbridge Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feltham Airparc Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feltham Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Feltham Community School Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hampton Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hampton Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Langley Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Matthew Arnold Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Princes Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>River Bourne Health Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Royal Holloway (University Of London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Spelthorne Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strodes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sunbury Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Amanda Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brooklands Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Club Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Datchet Squash &amp; Sports Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>David Lloyd Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Exer-Site Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Holmes Place Health Club Staines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Holmes Place Sunbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Imber Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Livingwell Health Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Miss Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Oatlands Park Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Oxygene health club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Renaissance London Heathrow Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Riverside Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rombus Materials Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Runnymede Hotel Health &amp; Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sci-Tech Pro Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Slough Marriott Leisure Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sony UK Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Spelthorne College Sports Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Springhealth Leisure Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>St George’s Hill Lawn Tennis Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Surrey Golf and Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The Pavilion Sports &amp; Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The Thames Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Unilever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Meadhurst Club (Corporate/Bp Membership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>268 flats and retail mall development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness centre conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Heathrow Park Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.25 There are a total of 10 facilities in the Borough (accounting for a total of 692 stations\(^1\)) of which four are public and six are private. Outside the Borough, within the three kilometre buffer, there are a further 31 facilities (1971 stations).

11.26 The demand modelling exercise indicates a current oversupply equivalent to 320 stations if the Borough is viewed in isolation.

11.27 There are two facilities planned at the Meadhurst Club and London Irish Football Club / Holmes Place. Assuming these facilities come into fruition the oversupply is predicted to increase to 370 stations in 2010.

11.28 Use of this demand modelling technique for the borough and buffer zone calculates a level of current demand equivalent to 1,347 stations and hence identifies a current oversupply of 624 stations. Taking into account other planned facilities this oversupply increases further to 916 stations.

11.29 Despite the oversupply, the sports club survey highlighted demand for health and fitness facilities. There was no further reference made to the provision of health and fitness facilities in any of the other consultations.

\(^1\) A station is one piece of health and fitness equipment
11.30 The supply of STPs and athletics facilities in Spelthorne is illustrated in Map 11.4 below.

Map 11.4 - STPs and athletic facilities in Spelthorne Borough plus a 3km buffer zone

11.31 In the Borough, there are four STPs of which one is public, two are dual use and one is club use. Within the buffer zone there are a further three STPs, two public and one dual use.

11.32 Unlike sports halls and swimming pools, there are no detailed demand parameters but Sport England use a normative parameter of one STP for every 60,000 people within a 20 minute off peak drivetime.

11.33 The current population of the Borough is 90,509 therefore the number of STPs required is 1.5. As a result of the audit, the actual existing provision is 1.75 pitches (taking into account dual use) – a technical oversupply equivalent to 0.25 pitches. A further pitch is being provided at Kenyngton Manor recreation ground but this will not be full size.

11.34 There are no additional pitches planned. Taking into account population changes, a greater number of people will be served by existing pitches, subsequently reducing demand. There is scope for STPs to meet some of the demand for indoor five-a-side football and relieve the pressure on sports halls.
11.35 Using the Sport England parameters for the borough including the buffer zone (a population of 312,421), the number of STPs required is 5.2 against an existing provision of 4.5 - an unmet demand equivalent to 0.7 pitches. The number of pitches is not expected to rise in the foreseeable future as there are no additional facilities planned. However, due to the expected increase in population, the number of STPs required is expected to rise to 5.3 in 2010 – an increase in unmet demand equivalent to 0.8 pitches, these being outside the buffer.

11.36 Increased provision of STPs was highlighted in the sports club surveys with the highest number of respondents (33%) stating that they would like more facilities in the Borough. The provision of a half sized STP at Kenyngton Manor would address this as well as the perceived shortfall in outdoor junior grass sports pitches.

11.37 With regard to the provision of athletics facilities, the National Athletics Facilities Strategy (1998-2004), commissioned by the Amateur Athletic Association of England and the former British Athletics Federation with the support of Sport England, states that there should be one six lane synthetic track with floodlighting per 250,000 people living within 30 minutes drive time (45 minutes in rural areas) of the proposed location. Stompond Lane Track, located within the three kilometre buffer zone in Walton on Thames, currently meets this demand parameter. There are no additional facilities planned and despite population rises provision should sufficiently meet demand up to 2010.
Squash and Tennis

11.38 The supply of squash and tennis facilities in Spelthorne is illustrated in Map 11.5 below.

Map 11.5 - squash and tennis facilities in Spelthorne Borough plus a 3km buffer zone

11.39 There is a total of three facilities in the Borough of which two are public and one is private. There are a further seven facilities in the buffer zone, the majority of these are private facilities. Not on the map is the Princes Club and although predominantly a water sports club, it has provision for squash also.

11.40 No planned facilities have been identified. There are no known set parameters for squash or tennis by which to assess demand. However, internal consultation has highlighted a need for covered tennis courts.
Overall summary and conclusions

Introduction

12.1 The study has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the latest Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation, July 2002) and its Companion Guide “Assessing Needs and Opportunities” (September 2002).

12.2 The overall aim of the project was to:

- consider the local context of open space in Spelthorne
- undertake an audit of existing provision to cover all aspects of open space (with the exception of civic spaces), sport and recreation
- undertake consultation to ascertain the demand for open space within the Borough
- set and apply robust local provision standards based on local needs and aspirations
- ensure that any shortfall or surplus in provision is identified against these standards
- produce site-specific recommendations to meet any identified shortfalls in provision having regard to suitability and sustainability in terms of site size, access, adjoining land uses, any potential adverse impacts on adjoining uses, any particular feature or habitat on the site which might constrain the proposed use
- identify and determine the scope to use any potentially redundant allotments to meet any shortfall
- evaluate and make recommendations on the following unimplemented open space/recreation proposals in the current Local Plan and whether or not they should be retained in the light of the findings of the study: proposals 25, 33, 34 and 35.

12.3 The study has provided:

- an overview of the open space resource within the Borough according to definitions provided within PPG17
- a review of relevant plans and strategies and national developments
- detailed consultations using various methods including household questionnaires, neighbourhood drop-in sessions and consultation with internal and external agencies to establish the key issues and needs
- consideration of relevant and appropriate provision standards
- identifying geographical areas and specific sites of priority
- a summary of key issues based on the main findings from the supply and demand analysis in terms of quantity, quality, accessibility and value.
The study shows that Spelthorne is well provided for in terms of the total amount of open space as well as specialised types of provision, such as Staines Moor and the River Thames, but there are localised problems and issues in certain typologies within the Borough. The following sections summarise the key findings of the study, under the headings of quantity, quality, accessibility and value.

**Quantity**

From the quantity analysis, in association with consultations and surveys undertaken, we have determined provision standards appropriate for a number of types of open space within the Borough.

PPG17 advocates the development of local standards rather than the use of national standards, which do not take into account the local context. The standards have therefore been developed for consideration and possible adoption by the Council.

These standards are outlined in Table 12.1 below.

**Table 12.1 Quantity standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPG17 Typology</th>
<th>Quantity Provision Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Public Gardens</td>
<td>No standard set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space</td>
<td>2.16 hectares per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>2.37 hectares per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Spaces</td>
<td>1.46 ha per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children &amp; Young People</td>
<td>0.038 ha per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Local standard to be set following results of Bridge IMC Allotments report. Current provision equates to 0.22 ha per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>PPG17 suggests a quantity standard not required due to the nature of the typology. However if a quantity standard is needed this should be a population based provision standard also taking into account the demand for future burial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>PPG17 suggests a quantity quantitative standard is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Water Sports</td>
<td>Standard not set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 12 – OVERALL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Quality

12.8 A quality standard has been developed for each typology based on national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

12.9 These could be used as a benchmarking measurement to assess the current quality of open space sites and what improvements could be made in the future. They could be broken down into a detailed assessment matrix for any future quality assessments of sites.

Accessibility

12.10 Accessibility is a key assessment of open space provision. Without public access the provision of good quality or quantity of open space sites would be of little benefit to the community.

12.11 PPG17 encourages any new open space sites or enhancement of existing sites to ensure accessibility by environmentally friendly forms of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport. There is a real desire to move away from reliability on the car.

12.12 Residents are generally satisfied with accessibility to existing sites. However, the main area of concern is with regards to information and signage of sites with the public unaware that good quality accessible sites exist within some areas of the Borough.

12.13 The consultations, both through the household questionnaire and neighbourhood ‘drop-in’ sessions, provide specific information to assist in establishing distance thresholds and accessibility standards for each type of open space as defined by PPG17. Table 12.2 shows recommended distance thresholds for each type of open space.

Table 12.2 Accessibility standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Realistic Mode of transport (from analysis)</th>
<th>Recommended Travel Time</th>
<th>Estimated Equivalent Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Spaces</td>
<td>Drive by car</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Spaces for Children and Young People</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Drive by car</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>No Standard Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Open Space Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Realistic Mode of transport (from analysis)</th>
<th>Recommended Travel Time</th>
<th>Estimated Equivalent Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>No Standard Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>No Standard Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.14 These standards, as PPG17 recommends, provide guidance in order to identify gaps in provision and meet the local needs of Spelthorne’s residents.

**Applying Standards**

12.15 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs, both the quantity and accessibility standards are applied together.

12.16 In order to identify specific sites of importance and priority, the quality, site access and usage of these sites are analysed simultaneously.

12.17 The main issues for each typology are as follows:

**Parks and Gardens**

12.18 There are only seven sites of this typology across the Borough. It is recommended that in light of strategic hierarchy, provision is looked at Borough-wide. This is particularly relevant as other sites in the Borough, although not defined as parks and gardens by primary purpose, have elements of formal parks and gardens within them such as planting.

12.19 As stated in Section 3, the Council is reluctant to develop further formal parks and gardens in the Borough because of the associated maintenance costs. As a result, the emphasis should be on enhancing the quality of existing sites. There is only one site in the Borough that has been rated as a high quality, good accessibility and high usage. This site is Memorial Gardens, Staines and can be considered as an example of good practice.

**Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space**

12.20 There are quantitative deficiencies in the more urban areas of the Borough (Ashford, Shepperton and Stanwell). However, given the nature of this type of open space, it is recommended that provision be looked at on a Borough-wide level particularly as the Borough has significant natural and semi-natural green space sites, such as Staines Moor (within Staines ward) and Church Lammas (within Laleham and Shepperton ward).

12.21 Based on the recommended local minimum level of provision of 2.16 ha per 1,000 population, there is adequate provision across the Borough. However, this provision is geographically skewed because of Staines Moor, a site 87 ha in size. In addition, this typology includes SSSI and common land sites in Staines, which have limited potential use because of their specialist status.
Amenity Green space

12.22 If the recommended minimum standard of 1.46 ha per 1,000 population is applied Borough-wide, there is adequate provision of amenity green space. However, if the recommend minimum standard is applied at ward level, which is appropriate given the need for social equity and the local benefits of an amenity green space site, there is an uneven spread of provision. Levels of provision below the recommended minimum measure are apparent within Ashford Common, Ashford East, Riverside and Laleham and Sunbury East. Consideration should be given to how deficiencies in these areas are addressed. This is further explored in relation to accessible catchment areas in paragraph 12.43.

12.23 The locational deficiencies as detailed above are balanced by levels of provision above the minimum standard elsewhere in the Borough, such as Halliford and Shepperton, parts of Staines, Shepperton Town, parts of Ashford North and Ashford Town. It is important to recognise that a level of provision above the minimum measure does not imply a surplus and all sites should be considered on an individual basis before any potential development or re-designation to an alternative open space typology.

12.24 In line with the PPG17 Companion Guide, for this typology it is pertinent to consider a minimum acceptable size component within the provision standards as this provides a transparent, policy based way of deciding whether to require a developer to make on-site provision or contribute to off-site provision. The Council have set a minimum size of 0.1 ha. This will ensure that provision is of a reasonable size to be of benefit to local communities and sites are cost effective to maintain.

12.25 The overall quality of amenity green space across the Borough is varied, with a number of sites rated ‘poor’. Over half of the 96 amenity green space sites were considered to have high usage and only nine of the amenity green space sites assessed were considered to have low usage levels. This supports the conclusion of the consultation that these open spaces have value as areas for informal recreation and also have a visual amenity benefit to the local community.

12.26 In light of the quantitative and accessibility deficiencies in the Borough, the Council is considering, as a proposal to meet both a deficiency in Amenity Green Space and children’s and young people facilities on part of an open field on the south side of Wehatsheaf Lane, Staines and part of an open field to the west of Edward Way, Orchard Way and Desford Way area south of the A30 in north Ashford. The former site is used for grazing and the latter area is scrub and has some grazing use. These could meet the need for amenity green space and children’s and young people’s facilities (see12.30, second bullet below).

Provision for Children and Young People

12.27 Based on the recommended level of provision of 0.038 ha per 1,000 population, current provision meets the recommended measure when the Borough is taken as a whole. However, this provision is unevenly spread throughout the Borough. Seven of the 13 wards have a level of provision below the recommended minimum measure.

12.28 Quantitative deficiencies are most notable in Ashford (all wards except Ashford Common), Riverside and Laleham, Stanwell North, Staines South and Sunbury East. A priority for the Council is to address these locational quantitative deficiencies, particularly for residential areas that are both outside of an accessible catchment area of children’s and young people open space provision and within a ward that is below
the recommended minimum level of provision. These areas should be a high priority for new provision. This is further explored in paragraph 12.43.

12.29 Through the Liveability Parks Project the Council is already working to enhance provision for children and young people at certain key sites. There is potential to address the quantitative deficiency at ward level through use of some of the amenity green space in wards within the Borough that is above the recommended minimum level of provision, which could be re-designed to include provision for children and young people.

12.30 In light of the quantitative and accessibility deficiencies in the Borough, the following proposals are being considered by the Council:

- Land at Wheatsheaf Lane, Staines – public open space provision with children’s play equipment. Progression of this proposal will help to address the deficiency of provision within the south Staines area. An area larger than the existing proposal in the Local Plan would be required if the needs for Amenity Green Space are also to be met.
- Also identified is a part of an open field to the west of Edward Way, Orchard Way and Desford Way area south of the A30 in north Ashford. The area is scrub and has some grazing use. This could also meet the need for amenity green space.

12.31 The Council is already undertaking a Play Strategy for the Borough and this work will provide the opportunity to establish the types and locations of facilities for children and young people which will best meet the geographic gaps identified in this study.

Outdoor Sports Facilities

12.32 Spelthorne is generally well provided for in terms of outdoor sports facilities. The Borough also has a range of outdoor sports facilities, including a high proportion of outdoor water sport facilities.

12.33 Based on the recommended local standard of 2.37 ha per 1,000 population, there is adequate provision Borough-wide. This level should be considered a guiding principle rather than a fixed standard. A Borough-wide standard reflects the strategic significance of outdoor sports facilities and although adequate provision is demonstrated Borough-wide there are deficiencies at ward level. However, when applying the accessibility standard for outdoor sports facilities it is clear that the whole Borough and beyond is within the expected travel time of 10 minutes by car therefore there are no areas of the Borough with both quantitative and accessibility deficiencies.

12.34 The Borough does benefit from significant water provision, which has not been included in current provision in setting the quantitative standard, but does provide opportunities for sport and recreation participation through sailing, canoeing, rowing etc.

12.35 Generally the quality, usage and accessibility of sites of this type are good throughout the Borough. The Council should work towards maintaining these standards in the future. The study did reveal concerns about the strategy of provision for junior football and also about the quality of some sites. There is a need to consider how best to use existing sites in a way which meets all the various demands for outdoor sport. The Council is to embark on developing a playing pitch strategy and this should provide a means of balancing supply with demand. The Council will also need to address the issue of how to ensure consistent and appropriate quality of provision.
Allotments and Community Gardens

12.36 Allotments are a demand-led open space type i.e. there is no point in providing allotments in these areas if there is no demand for them.

12.37 An Allotment Study has been undertaken by Bridge IMC Consultants and the findings from this study need to be taken in to account. Initial findings from suggest that there is still a demand for allotments in the Borough, and although there are some redundant pitches within allotment sites, these are randomly located and therefore of limited value in terms of re-designation to address other open space typology deficiencies, as individual plots will not be of an adequate size or easily accessible.

12.38 The Council are looking to produce an allotment development strategy to more effectively market allotment sites, linking to the healthy lifestyles agenda, the aim of which is to maximise usage of existing allotment plots in the Borough.

Cemeteries and Churchyards

12.39 Although needed for the burial of the dead, cemeteries and churchyards provide an open space to be used on an opportunity-led basis – i.e. they provide opportunities for wildlife and use of the open space by the public for informal recreation as well as walking and relaxing. Site-specific recommendations in relation to this typology are not appropriate and therefore have not been considered at this stage. However, it is the intention that in due course some allotment sites will become burial grounds.

12.40 In line with the PPG17 Companion Guide, no quantity standard has been set for this typology. Existing provision is considered to be of very good quality with a number of cemeteries and churchyards of high quality and relatively high accessibility, which are also rated as well-used sites.

Green Corridors

12.41 Green corridors represent an important chance to link open spaces within the urban area as well as along the River Thames and to promote transport by cycle and walking. These opportunities for informal recreation will help keep the public active and potentially improve health within the local area.

12.42 Green corridors in Spelthorne are well valued; therefore opportunities for further development of green corridors should be taken where there is demand. It is likely that a large proportion of future provision will be opportunity led.
Indoor sport and recreation provision

12.43 The supply and demand analysis has revealed the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports halls</td>
<td>Unmet demand equivalent to 8 courts</td>
<td>Unmet demand equivalent to 5 courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools</td>
<td>Oversupply equivalent to 59 sq m water</td>
<td>Oversupply equivalent to 56 sq m water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and fitness</td>
<td>Oversupply equivalent to 320 stations</td>
<td>Oversupply equivalent to 370 stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Turf Pitches (STPs)</td>
<td>Oversupply equivalent to 0.25 pitches</td>
<td>Unmet demand equivalent to 0.2 pitches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-appraisal of current proposals in the Local Plan

12.44 There are two current proposals in the existing Local Plan that will impact on green corridor provision in the Borough:

- Proposal 25: Towpath, Shepperton near the junction with Dockett Lane and Eddy Lane – small public car park. No direct reference was made to issues regarding access at the site and there is no evidence from the consultation to support the need for a car park. The Shepperton area has deficiencies of outdoor sports facilities and parks and gardens therefore the deficiencies for these typologies should be addressed before building on areas of open space.

- Proposal 34: River Ash between Priory Green, Staines and Fordbridge Road, Sunbury – provision of a riverside walk. Several sections of this walk already exist in areas close to existing residential areas at Staines, Ashford and Shepperton. There is no evidence from consultation to support the extensions of this walk.

- Proposal 35: Land adjoining south and south west side of Staines Moor – part of a circular bridleway route including footpath. There was no evidence from the survey to support this proposal although horse riders were not targeted as a specific group.
SECTION 12 – OVERALL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Residential areas outside of accessible catchment areas

12.45 Now we have considered (and discounted) the current proposals, it is necessary to consider what new proposals might be required in the LDF and its associated DPDs, to remedy shortfalls in provision as identified in this study.

12.46 To facilitate this process, we have examined the catchment area maps for all typologies, and considered those residential areas which fall outside of the catchment areas of existing open spaces.

12.47 We have then considered whether there are either:

(a) surplus parcels of land from other typologies which could, via change of use, remedy this deficiency (clearly each parcel of land would have to meet criteria such as minimum size, accessibility, suitability of neighbours uses, and so on)

or

(b) whether nearby open space of another typology could meet the needs of local people without requiring a change of use, for example, a good quality amenity green space may work effectively as an informal play area.

12.48 This assessment looks at firstly the whole Borough and secondly the individual residential areas which are affected. It does not rely on ward boundaries which are, in respect of open space catchments, artificial and inappropriate.

12.49 The assessment was undertaken as a desk based exercise using large scale maps of the Borough showing open space sites, catchment areas and parcels of land which could be considered for change of use. Each ‘out of catchment’ residential area was discussed in terms of its needs, and each parcel of land was discussed in terms of what it could offer.

12.50 From the analysis undertaken earlier in the study it quickly became apparent that the key open space typologies were Amenity Green Space and Provision for Children and Young People because of the areas of the Borough failing outside of the catchment of one or other.

12.51 This information is shown on Figures 12.1 and 12.2:

- Figure 12.1 shows the interaction between AGS and CYP sites and their catchment areas

- Figure 12.2 identifies a series of residential areas, labelled R1-R20, which lie outside of catchment areas. Table 12.3 then sets out proposals to deal with these residential areas' the lack of access to open relevant open spaces.
12.52 Figure 12.2, the 20 residential areas in the Borough outside of the accessible catchment for provision for children and young people or amenity green space. Each of these areas are considered in table 12.3 overleaf and possible solutions to address the deficiency are offered for each residential area.
Figure 12.2 Overview map of the Borough showing residential areas currently outside of an accessible catchment areas for amenity green space and provision for children and young people

A large scale version of this map will be provided in the appendices.

12.53 Table 12.3 highlights urban areas within the Borough that lie outside an accessible catchment area of an amenity green space site or a play site. Solutions have been provided above as to how these deficiencies may be addressed in relation to alternative open space within the locality. In addition, open space sites within the Borough have been identified as potential sites that could be re-designated to address some of these deficiencies. These are highlighted in Figure 12.2 above and are considered in detail on the following pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Reference</th>
<th>Area description</th>
<th>Proposals to address deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Stanwell New Road, Staines</td>
<td>Both of these residential areas are adjacent to Shortwood Common, a natural and semi-natural site of SSSI status. Shortwood Common provides an opportunity for informal recreation. However, there is no scope for provision of informal recreation facilities due to its SSSI status and use for grazing. Access to Shortwood Common from Stanwell New Road is available via a signal controlled crossing (over the A30). There is pedestrian access available via Shortwood Avenue onto the Common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Shortwood Avenue, Staines</td>
<td>Deficiency in provision in this area will be substantially met by amenity green space that has been provided as part of the residential development to the east of Ashford Hospital, off Long Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3a</td>
<td>Area adjacent to southeast side of Ashford Hospital (north of A30 – Albain Crescent)</td>
<td>There is no remaining open space/land within this urban area that could be considered for re-designation to address current quantitative deficiencies. Part of the needs of this area can be met if part of the field to the west of Edward Way were developed for open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3b</td>
<td>Area around Stanwell Road (immediately south of A30 – Ashford Crescent/Gordon Rd)</td>
<td>There is no remaining open space/land within this urban area available to address current quantitative deficiencies. Part of the needs of this area can be met if part of the field to the west of Edward Way were developed for open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### R5 - Harrow Road

Part of the west side of this locality is currently in commercial use but being considered for housing by the Council. It could provide the opportunity to provide some open space.

### R6 - South Staines – Penton Road, Wheatsheaf Lane, Avondale Ave

This is an extensive urban area that is outside of an accessible catchment of amenity green space or provision for children and young people.

Immediately to the south are two areas of amenity green space at Silvery Sands and Penton Hook Island, but as these sites are adjacent to the River Thames they are unsuitable for unsupervised play for younger children. This means that there is in fact an even greater urban area of south Staines with no access to amenity green space or children’s and young people’s provision. Residential areas in south Staines are characterised by larger houses, houses with larger gardens or flats in landscaped grounds, which will in part compensate for the lack of provision of open space in this area.

In addition, the River Thames towpath provides an extensive area of linear green space, which in part mitigates the shortage of conventional open space areas locally. The Local Plan already includes a proposal for an equipped children’s play area on the north edge of an open field on the south side of Wheatsheaf Lane (Proposal P33). A greater area of space could be provided to meet the general need for open space in this area as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R7 North half of Laleham Village</td>
<td>The south of Laleham Village is within an accessible catchment of the play provision at Laleham Park. It is only the north of the village that falls outside of the accessible catchment area. The area is however, well provided for in terms of open space as, in addition to Laleham Park, in the centre of the village there is Laleham Recreation Ground, which is accessible off The Broadway (B377). Whilst Laleham Recreation Ground is primarily a site for sport (cricket and football) and classified as such in this study, it also provides an area of amenity green space. In addition, the River Thames also provides an extensive area of linear green space. The open space needs of this part of Laleham village are considered to be provided for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8 Central Ashford</td>
<td>This is an extensive urban area centred on Fordbridge Road and Church Road, Ashford and extending up to the railway line and down to the northern boundary of Ashford Golf Club. The only undeveloped areas are the playing fields at Spelthorne College in Church Road and St Michael’s RC Primary School in Feltham Hill Road. At both of these sites the open areas are not visible from nearby roads with no separate and secure public access from the schools building complex is achievable. Whilst this is in an area of deficiency, there are limited opportunities for provision of new open space sites due to availability of land, therefore it is important to ensure that existing sites within adjacent catchments are accessible and of good quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9 Anderson Drive area off Feltham Road, Ashford</td>
<td>Access to Bedfont Lakes Country Park, an open space site outside of the Borough, off Challenge Road gives most of this urban area access to open space with a range of facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Ashford Road – Cambridge Road/ Benjamin Court (South A308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>Chertsey Bridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>Chertsey Road east of Docket Eddy Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>Towpath Shepperton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Chertsey Road, Shepperton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>West Shepperton Town – Manor Farm Avenue, Shepherds Close, Shepperton Court Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>East of Walton Bridge Road, Shepperton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>Hawthorn Way, Bramble Close area, Upper Halliford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>Old Upper Halliford Road area adjacent to Halliford Halt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>Highfield Road, Tadmore Close, Upper Halliford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Broomfield area south of Sunbury Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential proposal sites to meet shortfalls

Site Ref 1: International Way, Windmill road, Sunbury

12.54 This area has been developed for a residential development of 266 houses. As part of this development there is additional open space provided which helps address the quantitative and accessibility deficiencies in the area.

12.55 This proposal addresses deficiencies in residential area R10.

Site Ref 3: Woodthorpe Road CYP, Ashford

12.56 Staines Bypass (A30) is elevated and Woodthorpe Road provides access under the A308. This means that the catchment area is not severed and a greater part of this residential area is within an accessible catchment.

12.57 This proposal addresses deficiencies in this part of Ashford.

Site Ref 4: Bedfont Lakes – Access of Challenge Road, Feltham Road, Ashford

12.58 Bedfont Lakes is a site outside of the Borough within the London Borough of Hounslow. However the site lies on the Borough boundary and therefore has a catchment area covering a part of Spelthorne. The site is a Country Park but provides amenity green space provision and opportunities for informal recreation. There are no formal facilities in the southeast corner of the Country Park.

12.59 This proposal helps address deficiencies in residential area R9.

Site Ref 5: Ashford Hospital, Long Lane, Stanwell

12.60 A residential development of 100 units has recently been completed in this area. The development includes provision of amenity green space. This additional provision will help to address the quantitative and accessibility deficiencies within this area.

12.61 This proposal addresses deficiencies in residential areas R3a and R3b.

Site Ref 6: Shortwood Common

12.62 This proposal addresses deficiencies in residential areas R1 and R2.

Site Ref 7: Laleham Recreation Ground

12.63 Whilst the primary purpose of this site is classified as an outdoor sports facility, it does also provide an area of amenity green space for local residents and therefore serves the needs of those in the centre/north of Laleham Village.

12.64 This proposal addresses deficiencies in residential area R7.
Summary

12.65 In summary, there are a number of potential proposals that will help to address accessibility and quantitative deficiencies within the Borough. These proposals should be addressed to ensure that there is social equity across the Borough. In general the Borough is adequately provided for in terms of open space provision across each of the PPG17 typologies, it is a case of ensuring that existing sites are, where applicable, enhanced in terms of both quality and accessibility to maximise usage and key gaps in provision are met.

Open spaces database: a working tool

12.66 Now that a comprehensive audit has been carried out for the Borough and contained within an Access database, it is important that this is kept up to date this will include adding and removing new sites within the GIS layers and ensuring the attribute data associated with each site is correct and complete. This will enable the Council to monitor changes in the quantity and quality of open space over time.
APPENDIX A

QUALITY STANDARDS
Quality standards for Spelthorne

A vision for all open space in Spelthorne

1.1. To meet the needs of local communities.

1.2. To enhance the quality and usage of all open spaces in Spelthorne in line with the agreed quality standards.

1.3. To provide greater linkage between areas, particularly into the more deprived neighbourhoods.

1.4. To create well used open space through the provision of appropriate, high quality facilities and layout, following ‘safer by design’ principles.

A quality standard for urban parks and gardens

1.5. Urban parks and gardens should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. They should also be clean and tidy, well maintained, inviting, safe and secure with appropriate facilities and infrastructure.

A quality standard for natural and semi-natural green space

1.6. Natural and semi-natural green spaces should be free from vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles with appropriate facilities provided in the least obtrusive manner. Sites should be maintained to an appropriate conservation standard.

A quality standard for green corridors

1.7. Green corridors should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles. They should provide links between green spaces and from residential areas to green spaces.

A quality standard for amenity green space

1.8. Amenity green space should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles and sites should be clean and well maintained with clearly defined boundaries, high quality facilities appropriate to their use and appropriate planting.

A quality standard for facilities for children and young people

1.9. Facilities for children and young people should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles and sites should be well maintained, appropriately planted and equipped to provide a range of activities to suit varied interests and age groups.

A quality standard for outdoor sports facilities

1.10. All outdoor sports facilities, including ancillary accommodation, should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow ‘safer by design’ principles. Sites should be accessible and should follow design and maintenance standards set by the relevant national governing bodies of sport.
**A quality standard for allotments**

1.11. Allotments should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. Where appropriate, access pathways and signage should be clearly provided and well maintained.

**A quality standard for cemeteries and churchyards**

1.12. Cemeteries and churchyards should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. Sites should be maintained to safe standards and should have safe and secure access where appropriate. There should be a variety of planting and facilities which reflect the local landscape character and biodiversity of the site.
Breakout session – deriving quality standards for Spelthorne

Outputs:

- A sentence or short paragraph describing the quality standard for each type of open space:
  - parks and gardens
  - outdoor sports
  - natural and semi natural
  - amenity green space
  - provision for children and young people
  - cemeteries
  - allotments
  - and green corridors.

- Each sentence or paragraph must address the four headings of:
  1. Cleanliness and maintenance
  2. Security and safety
  3. Vegetation
  4. Ancillary accommodation.

- A five minute presentation to the rest of the group.

Key questions

1. What did the public consultation say about quality?
2. What does the community plan and the local plan say?
3. How can you help to deliver those aspirations?
4. What is realistic and achievable?

Example quality statement

“A clean and litter free area that is well-lit and well-used and provides a level of varied vegetation and includes natural features such as ponds, lakes and water where appropriate. Pathways and access routes should be clearly provided and appropriate facilities for children and young people.” [Kirklees MBC]

....based on the following assessment criteria:

- a clean and litter free area
- well-lit
• well-used
• provides a level of varied vegetation
• includes natural features such as ponds, lakes and water where appropriate.
• pathways and access routes clearly provided
• appropriate facilities for children and young people.

What the public said about the quality of Spelthorne’s open spaces

• The research findings indicate that the most significant problem across open space in the borough is as follows:
  - dog fouling
  - vandalism and graffiti
  - litter
  - and anti-social behaviour.

• The quality of open space is generally considered good across the borough.

• Factors that residents are satisfied with, regarding open space in the borough, include planted and grass areas, boundaries eg railing, hedges, pathways and maintenance and management

• Consultation has however, highlighted concerns relating to:
  - provision of toilets
  - lack of provision of seat/benches
  - provision of bins for litter
  - information and signage
  - vandalism
  - antisocial behaviour
  - dog fouling/ no dedicated bins.

• The research findings show that cleanliness and tidiness is the one main factor that residents consider to be important in open space. Other factors considered to be important comprised ‘provision for bins’, ‘dog walking facilities’, ‘maintenance and management’, ‘security’ and ‘toilets’.

• Parks and gardens. Sites that were mentioned as being good quality in general were Laleham Park and Lammas Park. Staines Park was thought to be well maintained and tidy with good amenities such as clean toilets and places to eat. There was considered an overall lack of benches and shelters in the parks.
• **Natural and semi-natural.** Residents indicated that the quality of natural and semi-natural green spaces in the borough is good. The high percentage of this open space type in the borough consists of water ie the reservoirs and gravel pits.

• **Green corridors.** There are concerns regarding overgrown paths in walking areas. People would reportedly use walking routes if they were of better quality and well maintained and signposted.

• **Amenity green space.** Residents indicated that they are satisfied with the quality of these areas and that they believe these are the best maintained open space type in the borough.

• **Provision for children and young people.** Children’s facilities were considered as good quality in the borough, specifically at Green Street Playground and Lammas Park. It was considered to be important to also have good facilities for older children.

• **Outdoor sports facilities.** Most of those consulted are happy with the quality of outdoor pitches, however believe the ancillary facilities could be improved.

• **Allotments.** Quality of the actual plots is the responsibility of the plot holder, however most residents believe these are well managed and well maintained.

• **Cemeteries and churchyards.** Limited comments were made on the quality of this type of open space.

**What officers said about the quality of Spelthorne’s green spaces**

• There are some good examples of ‘Good Practice’ sites with the main one being Laleham Park and Lammas Recreation Ground. They provide a varied number of spaces within one central geographical area meeting the needs of various age ranges and are very well used. Investment in the skatepark in Lammas has improved the overall quality of the park and has attracted an active skating community.

• Sports pitches are well used and are thought to be well complemented with good changing facilities, however it was reported that the prices for pitch hire have increased from £40 to £70 per match this season (2004/05) and as a result usage levels have dropped.

• Self management of allotments generally works very well and is considered to improve the quality of the allotments. Shepperton Village Allotment Gardens is a particularly good example where self management has been a success.

• There is an over-riding problem of anti-social behaviour by teenagers in play areas and other open spaces and this often discourages usage of open spaces by other people. Particular problems have been sited at Ashford Recreation Ground, Hengrove, Staines Park, Clockhouse Lane and Wicketts Park (the latter thought to be particularly bad). It is hoped that the issues in Clockhouse Lane will be resolved through actions taken as part of the liveability project.

• Linked to the above point is the issue of vandalism. Kenyington Recreation Ground in particular has suffered and the pavilion has been broken into more times than any other Council building, causing thousands of pounds worth of damage. The issues prevalent at this venue are being resolved through girls youth football and the increased usage has meant better security. A group shelter has also been installed and local people are getting more involved.
The involvement of the PCSOs have been influential in helping to combat vandalism. They are employed by the police and part funded by Spelthorne Borough Council. There are currently four PSCOs covering four areas but they will troubleshoot at all parks if required. To date, damage caused by vandalism has decreased by £13,000 over the last year. The PCSOs are good as expert witnesses and their key objective is to communicate with youngsters in an attempt to eradicate anti-social behaviour.

There is a current problem with the usage of natural open spaces for motorbiking. A possible solution is for PCSOs enforcing the powers available to them, which may help to resolve the problem although it is acknowledged that there maybe risks associated with this approach.

Quality of the sports pitches throughout the borough was thought to be quite low due to drainage and maintenance issues. The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) has previously highlighted the problems but these have not yet been addressed.

Quality of the parks are considered good in terms of grass cutting and vegetation (especially Fordbridge Park) and the parks department is working towards a safer environment.

Many of the playgrounds are old and it is difficult to meet NPFA standards due to the positioning of major roads such as the M25, M3 and A30.

Dog fouling is widespread and a common problem. Priority is being given to working on management plans pertaining to dog management in an effort to control dog fouling and to achieving Green Flag status for the parks. The deadline for the latter is February.
Methodology for setting quantity standards

1.13. Quantity standards were set by officers at a workshop facilitated by PMP.

1.14. It was agreed not to set a standard for green corridors as per guidance in the PPG17 Companion Guide.

1.15. The workshop discussed the concept of a hierarchy of open spaces and it was agreed that in broad terms the types could be classified as follows:

- strategic: parks and gardens, outdoor sports facilities
- middle order: cemeteries, allotments
- neighbourhood: amenity space, children’s play.

1.16. Standards would only be applied at ward level if they related to a neighbourhood open space type ie amenity space or children’s play. Again, green corridors were not included.

Developing the vision for open space

1.17. Officers spent some time considering a vision for the future of open spaces. Having considered the key strategic objectives in the local plan, and the objectives in the community plan, officers showed their “vision” for Spelthorne’s open space by placing a marker on the continuum diagram shown below. It was resolved to make Spelthorne greener by adopting challenging numerical standards.
Standards setting exercise

1.18. Local standards were derived as follows:

- officers considered standards for each type of open space
- headline descriptive statistics were derived for each analysis area which showed the number of hectares per thousand population (ha/1000 population)
- it was agreed to have a single, borough wide standard for each type of open space
- benchmarking with other authorities was undertaken to see how these descriptive statistics compared
- officers then considered the feedback from the consultation to understand the views of local people in terms of not enough/about right/too much open space of different categories
- officers also considered how they would deliver the vision “to maintain the current level of open space in Spelthorne”
- standards were then applied to wards and the whole borough using a spreadsheet, to test the effects of different numerical values of standard
- officers discussed the implications of different standards and came to an agreement on numerical values for each type
- a briefing note was issued following the workshop so that officers were able to reflect on what they discussed and agreed.
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1. Demographic Data

The demographic data source used is the most comprehensive source of demographic data, namely the 2001 Census.

2. Population Projections Data

Revised demographic reports are based on the 2001 census. However the “official” revised population projections will not be available until late 2004. Population projections for PMP’s demand models are based on 1996 projections with an amendment to reflect the 2001 census. The 2001 census results have highlighted significant discrepancies in the 1996 estimates and actual figures for 2001. Details of the population projections can be found on the (data) tab of the demographic report.

The projections show what population levels would result if assumptions about future migration, fertility and mortality were exactly realized. The assumptions underlying the calculation of the projections are based on recent demographic trends and do not reflect the impact of future policies (social or economic).

3. Sport and Leisure Data

This data source is derived from Continental Research’s Million Plus Panel. This panel comprises a pool of over 2 million UK residents and holds over 3,000 lifestyle, demographic and purchasing details. This panel is a representative sample of the Experian Ltd (ICD) Lifestyle database, which has in excess of 12 million records.

The Million Plus Panel allows minority groups, such as Golfers or Stamp Collectors (for example people who represent less than 1% of the population) to be analysed and profiled.

The Panel is updated biannually and therefore represents a comprehensive and up to date data source.

All records have a valid postcode attached to them. Any sample area can therefore be profiled by collating all records (postcodes) that fall within the target area and comparing this profile to the profile of the whole database (which represents GB).

4. Facility Audits (existing supply)

Below are brief details of the methodology that is followed when completing facility audits.

A wide variety of sources of audit information are used to identify target facilities (public and private), including

- Mapping the Future’s (MtF) audit of facilities, which includes data on health and fitness facilities, swimming pools, sports halls, synthetic turf pitches, golf courses, playing pitches, athletics tracks, 5-a-side soccer centres.
• Various internet search engines and other web sites
• AFD Postcode software, identifying all postal addresses within the target areas.
• Audits are validated by using designated list companies, for example JS Turner Direct Marketing. The main output from such organisations are lists of facilities, which are quality checked and updated by designated teams of MtF researchers.

Every facility identified is quality checked by telephone to ensure the facility details are accurate, to assess the level of public access (management) and to confirm the level of provision and charges, where required.

Level of provision is measured in different units depending on the target facility, but the main facility types use the following units:

• Health and fitness – number of stations (including all cardiovascular and resistance machines. Free weights are not included)
• Sports halls – number of badminton courts
• Swimming pools – pool area in metres squared

Proposed facilities may also taken into account and are identified through the National Planning Databases, for example Glenigan Direct.

5. Facility Audits (future supply)

To predict the future supply of facilities, current planning applications are researched. Companies such as Glenigan Direct specialise in such data. All planning applications that might contain any swimming pool developments are then assimilated into the models to assess future demand.

The actual size of the planned facilities is often unknown, therefore the size is estimated to be the common size of swimming pool (one pool unit, 212m²) (or sports hall (four badminton courts) or the average size of facility from the audit of present facilities (for example health and fitness)).

The exceptions to this are where the client that is developing the site is a major / national operator. This is especially important in the health and fitness market. For example, if a Fitness First, Holmes Place or other large operator are planning a site, their completed scheme is likely to have around 100 stations of health and fitness equipment and a swimming pool of 25metres is not uncommon. Therefore, such planned facilities are given the appropriate value.

However, planning applications can be at a number of different stages, from submission of outline plans to having detailed plans granted. At any stage of the planning application process a scheme can run into difficulties and lead to planning permission not being granted. Due to this the demand models consider two different scenarios, namely, ‘The most likely scenario’ and ‘The worst case scenario’.

The most likely scenario
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This scenario only includes those planning applications that have had detailed plans granted or have started work on site. Such facilities are the most likely facilities to be in place within the next 3-5 years.

The worst case scenario

Unlike the previous scenario this one assumes that all planned facilities that are going through the application process will gain permission. This is a very unlikely event, but does represent the worst possible picture of the future.

6. Generation of Catchment Area and Population

All demand models are based upon the population within a predefined catchment area. Usually this is a drivetime catchment, but there are other types also utilised, including:

- a radial (‘as the crow flies’ distance from a central point) catchment,
- user defined (a catchment area defined by existing membership / usage),
- a drive length catchment (where the catchment boundary is calculated by traveling along all possible roads from a central point for a certain distance).

Drivetime catchments

Drivetime catchments are similar to drive length ones, but instead of traveling on every possible combination of roads from a central point for a certain distance, the boundary of the catchment is defined by a travel time down each road combination.

There are several important aspects to generating such catchments, namely:

- For drivetime catchments to be possible, the road speed for every road is required. In the MtF system the average road speeds published by the AA are used. These are dependent upon the urban density through which the road lies.
- The term ‘average’ means that it is the road speed that is possible taking into account maximum road speeds, stopping delays, but assumes that congestion is minimal (off peak).
- Peak drivetimes which take congestion into account are not widely used because they are too unpredictable. Congestion is dependent on so many things, for example, time of day, day of the week, day of the year (bank holidays), school holidays, road works, etc. Therefore, no one drivetime would cover peak conditions.
- Off peak drivetimes are arguably more appropriate as much of the peak hours of sport and leisure facilities is during times of minimal congestion.
- Off-peak drivetimes are an average representation of drivetimes. Therefore, just because it might be possible to travel further or not as far on occasions, this does not make the drivetimes incorrect.
• Special considerations have been made for roads that are located in London. London roads have had their road speeds reduced to a greater extent than other urban roads.

• The details and level of accuracy of a Drivetime catchment is dependent upon the complexity of the mapping road layer that is used to generate such catchments. The different road layers are typically at the following scales:
  o Street Level – very detailed but requires much detail on road character, access, navigation and restrictions (e.g. no right turns, one way, bus lanes etc). This layer is costly to operate and keep up to date, and arguably goes into too much detail.
  o 1:200,000 scale layer – detailed road layer concentrating on major roads. Less detailed than the street level layer but less dependent upon accurate and up to date road restriction / navigation data.
  o 1:500,000 scale layer – less detailed network of roads. Quick and easy to use but produces generalized output drivetimes.

For the uses of the MtF system the 1:200,000 road layer is most commonly used. It combines a sufficient level of detail with value for money and usability.

• The size of drivetimes are often defined in conjunction with the demand parameters. For example Sport England estimate that the most significant size of catchment for sports halls and swimming pools in urban areas is 15 minutes. The corresponding size for health and fitness is less than this. This is due to the presence of far more facilities of this type. Therefore, potential users have more choice of where to travel to and therefore are not prepared to travel for large distances. Market leaders in health and fitness provision now use a combination of drivetimes commonly between 5 and 12 minutes.

Population within drivetime catchments

Once drivetimes have been created the population within them is calculated. The accuracy of this calculation is dependent upon two things. Firstly the method by which the drivetime was calculated (and therefore its size), and secondly, the method by which the demographic data underlying any map is stored and then used.

Mapping packages in general use two methods to calculate populations. Demographic data is stored at a number of levels, for example at ward, postcode sector (M22 5) or enumeration district (ED) level. When it is stored at ED level it is possible to count all the EDs that are located within a drivetime. Where an ED intersects the boundary of the drivetime it is either included or not depending on the location of the geometrical center of the ED. If this center is located outside the boundary then it is ignored, and if it is inside then it is included. This assumes that the amount that are excluded will be compensated by those that are included.

Where postcode sectors or wards are used (larger areas) there are often not enough of them in a drivetime to allow an accurate use of geometrical centers. Therefore, they use a different methodology of calculating populations. Where a postcode sector or ward is intersecting the drivetime boundary, the percentage of its area that lies within it is calculated. This percentage is then applied to the population data within the postcode.
sector / ward. This alleviates the issue of including and excluding peripheral area, but it
does assume that the distribution of population within postcode sectors / wards is even
throughout.

The MtF system uses the second methodology.

Different systems generate different drivetimes and different populations

From the above it can be seen that differences in drivetime calculations and the
subsequent calculations of populations is possible between different mapping packages.
Each package will calculate road speeds slightly different, some take into account delays
at every roundabout, traffic light and junction, some do not take into account urban
density and its impact on road speeds.

Furthermore, different packages store demographic data at different levels and calculate
populations in either of the methods explained above.

However, no system is more right or wrong than any other, but care should be taken if
comparisons are being made between results from different mapping packages. That is,
just because both are generating a 15 minute off-peak demographic report does not
mean that they will be identical.
7. Demand Modelling – Swimming Pools

Any model is a snapshot of reality that has been based upon a number of assumptions. A brief methodology of the demand model and the assumptions on which it is based follow.

**What size of facility is required to cater for estimated demand?**

The demand model is based upon the estimated demand of any catchment area. Demand is assessed using two criteria - Age and Gender. Sport England has researched parameters of swimming pool demand based on these two criteria. It is these parameters that have been used in this model (They are displayed on the Demand Model Sheet itself).

Therefore, once the age and gender breakdown of any population is known, the potential demand for swimming can be estimated.

**At one time capacity**

The supply that is needed to cater for this demand is then calculated. In order that all demand is catered for, the supply will need to be sufficient in size to cater for the maximum demand at any point in time. The at one time capacity has to therefore be able to cater for the maximum demand.

At one time capacity (the capacity in any peak session) is then used to calculate the necessary supply. This is based on a number of assumptions that have been researched by Sport England. They are as follows:

- Proportion of visits during peak times = 63%
- Average duration of visit = 64 minutes (tank), 68 minutes (leisure pool)
- Normal peak periods = 52 hours per week = 49 peak sessions
- At one time capacity = 6m² per person
- A one time capacity is defined as the supply/capacity of one m² of pool area at any one time
- Capacity per 212m² (1 pool unit) = 35 people. (number of metres squared divided by the at one time capacity of one m²)
- A pool unit is defined as an average four lane, 25 metre pool.

This calculates a total supply in metres squared that is necessary to meet the maximum demand. This figure is compared to the existing supply, which is calculated from a detailed competition analysis.

**Assessing current supply**

A detailed competition analysis is performed on the catchment area and the size of pool area available to the public is researched. Supply is then calculated for the total pool area that is available to the public for casual use. Private pools and pools that do not allow any casual swimming are taken out of the calculation of pool supply. Supply of pool areas that have limited public access are adjusted/reduced accordingly.
Comparing the existing supply (measured in pool area) to the current estimated demand (measured in pool area) quantifies the current over supply or unmet demand of swimming pools (measured in pool area).

**Other assumptions used within demand models**

The model relies on other assumptions, namely:

- It is assumed that all pools within the catchment are equally accessible, irrespective of relative location within the catchment.

- It assumes that the number of people residing just outside the catchment who will use pools within the catchment is equal to the number of people who reside within the catchment and use pools outside the catchment.

**Modelling future situations**

**Demand in the future**

The model can be rerun taking into account the projected changes in demand as a result of changes in population. The base model uses population figures from 2001.

When estimating future demand it is assumed that an increase in population of 10% will result in a 10% increase in demand for pool area. This allows the estimated demand for swimming pool area to be projected into the future.

**Supply in the future**

The supply in the future is assessed using the methodology outlined in Section 5. All planned facilities will not come to fruition. Therefore, the future supply is assessed in two future scenarios, namely:

- ‘The most likely scenario’ – only those developments that have detailed plans granted or have started to build on site are included, and

- ‘The worst case scenario’ – where all planned facilities actually come to fruition and are therefore included.

The projected supply and demand are then compared, to quantify the level of over or under supply up to five years into the future.

**Demand Modelling – An Objective Tool**

The model methodology above provides an objective assessment of the relationship between supply and demand. The local context and other more subjective factors are not considered at this stage. As a result conclusions generated from the demand models should be taken in this context and where possible used in conjunction with an analysis of the local context. Other considerations that are useful to consider include:
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- *The quality of existing provision.* If there is an over supply, but a significant amount of it is in a very poor state of repair then a new competitor in the market place could be financially viable.

- *Access to existing provision.* There might be gaps in the market even if there is an overall over supply. This might be when provision is concentrated on a few sites, or more concentrated in certain areas. Therefore, some potential markets can not successfully access the existing supply due to its spatial distribution.

- *Price / value for money.* For example, in the health and fitness market, different facilities are differentiated by price rather than whether they are public or private. It is price that can now affect and control the attractiveness of facilities.

- *The facility mix of existing provision.* For example, if a health and fitness club includes a swimming pool its chances of success are greater than one without, especially if membership subscriptions are similar. Therefore, a facility offering a better service than the existing provision can be successful in an area where there is little or no unmet demand. However, its success will often be to the detriment of the existing provision.

- *If you increase the supply the demand will increase as a result.* This is a tested methodology when used in a road building context. That is, if a new road is built all that happens is that cars fill it up until journey times are reduced to the same time as was the case before the new road was built. In the scenario of sports facilities, demand will increase when supply grows, but by how much has yet to be researched and quantified.

- *Differentiated product in the new facility.* A new facility must have a product that is significantly different and/or better than what is currently provided for. For example, if there are no leisure pools in an area of over supply of pool area and one is opened, its viability is possible because this type of facility is not currently provided for.

- *Local Economic Plans.* If there are any local developments that will bring in new residents and employees, and not just cater for natural population changes, then they will impact on the population projections in that area.

8. **Demand Model – Sports Halls / Squash Courts**

This model works on exactly the same principals as the swimming pool model, but with the relevant parameters.

These parameters include: *(Source: 1999 Sport England)*

**Assumptions/Parameters used in Model:**

- Proportion of visits during peak times = 60%
- Average duration of visit = 1 hour
- Normal peak periods = 40.5 hours per week
- At one time capacity = 5 people per badminton court

Squash courts can also be analysed using the same methodology, but currently the only demand parameters published are those researched by Sport Scotland.
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9. Demand Modelling – Health and Fitness

The commercial value of and growth in the health and fitness market has resulted in this type of facility to be vitally important to assess. Below is the methodology used in assessing unmet demand in this type of facility.

Demand for health and fitness

There are few demand parameters for health and fitness. This is because:

- Sport England has completed little research in this sector
- It is a very financially and commercially sensitive sector, which results in any research completed being confidential
- There are so many different types of health and fitness facilities, from a small back room gym with free weights only to a 10,000 sqft fully equipped and air conditioned gym as part of an even larger multi sport club.

The demand model is based upon the estimated demand of any catchment area. Demand is assessed using two criteria – Total Adult Population and Sport and Leisure Potential. The Sport and Leisure Potential is assessed using data form the Million Plus Panel (see Section 3).

Therefore, once the population and propensity of this population to participate in health and fitness is known, the potential demand for health and fitness can be estimated.

The supply that is needed to cater for this demand is then calculated. In order that all demand is catered for the supply will need to be sufficient in size to cater for the maximum demand at any point in time. The ‘at one time capacity’ has to therefore be able to cater for the maximum demand.

At one time capacity (the capacity in any peak session) is then used to calculate the necessary supply. This is based on a number of assumptions that are listed at the start of each model, and include:

- The average health and fitness session is one hour
- 65% of use is during peak times
- Peak times are 5-9pm Monday to Friday and 9am-5pm weekends (36 hours in a week).
- The average user participates on average 1.5 times per week or six times a month.

The model defines health and fitness users as all people participating in health and fitness, including private club members, users of local authority facilities, body builders and home users. A reduction of 10% in the demand for stations is assumed to represent the proportion of health and fitness users who do not use gyms, for example ‘home’ users.

It is also assumed that the at one time capacity is calculated by the ratio of one person per station (a station is a piece of equipment – cardio vascular and resistance).
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Equipment such as free weights, stretch mats and ab cradles are not included. Their exclusion is due to the life span, range of and type of such ‘equipment’.

Example One: A mat used for stretching could be in a designated warm up/down area, with other stretching aids, or could be a small mat positioned in between two resistance machines. Therefore, from facility to facility and indeed from day to day within a facility the quality and quantity of such equipment is flexible.

Example Two: The capacity of free weights equipment is also difficult to assess. Is it defined by the physical floor area that it is located in, the number of benches, the number of bar bells and/or the number of dumb bells?

Example Three: More ‘perishable’ equipment such as mats and ab cradles will frequently not be included in health and safety and operational assessments of a health and fitness area’s capacity.

Furthermore, supply/capacity/demand is measured using stations (pieces of equipment) rather than membership or floor area, because it is the most accurate and accessible type of measurement.

Membership numbers are commercially sensitive and are problematic to establish. The official number of members for a club can also be different to the actual number. For example, membership numbers can be inflated to imply the club is more successful and larger than perhaps it might be.

Floor area is also difficult to assess. It is not a commonly known piece of information and the floor area can include circulation space and corridors, changing facilities, other facilities, etc. Therefore, it is difficult to obtain this information in the first place and once located, it is often unclear as to what the floor area actually covers.

Therefore, the number of stations in a health and fitness facility is used to quantify the level of supply that is necessary to meet the maximum demand.

The demand figure is then compared to the existing supply which is calculated from a detailed competition analysis.

Assessing current supply of health and fitness

A detailed competition analysis is performed on the catchment area. The number of stations available is researched. Some assumptions are used in this research exercise, namely:

- It is assumed that all facilities within the catchment are equally accessible, irrespective of relative location within the catchment.
- It assumes that the number of people residing just outside the catchment who will use health and fitness facilities within the catchment is equal to the number of people who reside within the catchment and use health and fitness facilities outside the catchment.

The model can be rerun taking into account the projected changes in demand as a result of changes in population. The base model uses population figures from 2001.
In line with other demand models it is assumed that an increase in population of 10% will result in a 10% increase in demand for health and fitness stations.

Therefore, the estimated demand for health and fitness stations can be projected to the present day and into the future. This figure is compared to the estimated supply in the same projected year. The methodology for assessing this is identical to that detailed in the swimming pool demand model (see Section 8).

10. Demand for Other Facilities

Any type of facility that has published demand parameters can be assessed using a very similar methodology as described above. The detail of the model however is dictated by the robustness and type of demand parameters researched for each facility type. To date the most accurate demand parameters have been published by Sport England and Sport Scotland as part of their Facilities Planning Model programme. They include national audits of facilities (not published) and comprehensive national surveys to assess demand. To date Sport England has only run models on the following facilities:

- Sports Halls
- Swimming Pools

However, they are in the process of assessing synthetic turf pitches and indoor bowls (and soon indoor tennis). Until they have been completed older and less detailed parameters are the most appropriate to use.

Facilities such as synthetic turf pitches and athletics tracks have published normative demand parameters. An example of which is:

“One full size synthetic turf pitch for every 60,000 resident people within a 20 minute off-peak drivetime”

Such parameters can be used to assess the demand from the population of any catchment (by total numbers only) and then supply can be assessed in the same way as before.

Where there are no published demand parameters for facilities for example outdoor bowls (in England) and theatres, demand models are not possible. Supply can be assessed as normal but then the only indication to a gap in the market is an analysis of the spatial distribution of the facilities.
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DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT AND DEMAND MODEL
## Demographic Profile - 2001 Census

### Report for: PMP

**Defined Area:** Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer  
**Postcode:** N / A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>From GB % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>19,235</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>19,702</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>22,114</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>37,649</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>53,432</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>42,370</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>38,262</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>60,787</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Males**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>From GB % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149,781</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>9,751</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>10,112</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>11,449</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>6,807</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>18,427</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>26,038</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>21,419</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>19,114</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>26,664</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>From GB % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156,679</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>9,484</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>9,590</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>10,665</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>19,222</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>27,394</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>20,951</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>19,148</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>34,123</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Other</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Chinese</th>
<th>% Black - Caribbean</th>
<th>% Black - African</th>
<th>% Black - Other</th>
<th>% Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All White</td>
<td>280,721</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - British</td>
<td>261,898</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Irish</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Other</td>
<td>13,205</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Black</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black - Caribbean</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black - African</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black - Other</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ethnic Origin contd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Results from GB</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference (ave. =100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Asian</td>
<td>12,831</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Indian</td>
<td>8,245</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Pakistani</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Bangladeshi</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Other</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mixed</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed - White and Black African</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed - Mixed</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed - Others</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residents who have a limiting long-term illness

- Total: 41,368
- 13.5% of the population
- 17.0% of the population
- 17.5% of the population
- 77% of the population
- 23% of the population
- 79% of the population
- 21% of the population

### Economic Activity of Household Residents (aged 16 and over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>In Full-time employment</th>
<th>In Part-time employment</th>
<th>Self employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Permanently Sick/Disabled</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Other inactive</th>
<th>Looking after home/family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248,895</td>
<td>122,577</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>20,744</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>11,974</td>
<td>6,617</td>
<td>28,107</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>14,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,724</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>15,213</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>11,979</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>16,128</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,853</td>
<td>26,003</td>
<td>5,531</td>
<td>6,137</td>
<td>16,128</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>14,054</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>14,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>245,409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenure of Households

Total Occupied Household Spaces 128,990

- Owned 96,371 74.7 68.7 65.7 114 14 109 9
- Private Rented or Living Rent Free 13,404 10.4 12.0 11.2 93 -7 86 -14
- Rented from Council 9,600 7.4 13.2 17.4 43 -57 56 -44
- Other Social Rented 9,615 7.5 6.1 5.8 128 28 123 23

Car Availability by Household

- with no car 22,400 17.4 26.8 30.5 57 -43 65 -35
- with 1 car 56,381 43.7 43.7 43.5 100 0 100 0
- with 2 cars 50,052 38.8 29.5 26.0 150 50 132 32

Social Class of Head of Household

Total Head of Household (aged 16+)
242,690

- AB - Higher & Intermediate managerial/admin/ professional 65,965 27.2 22.2 20.6 132 32 122 22
- Supervisory, clerical, junior 82,831 34.1 29.7 28.1 121 21 115 15
- C2 - Skilled manual workers 31,846 13.1 15.1 14.8 89 -11 87 -13
- D - Semi-skilled & unskilled manual workers 31,228 12.9 17.0 17.3 75 -25 76 -24
- E - On state benefit, unemployed, lowest grade 30,820 12.7 16.0 19.2 66 -34 79 -21

Graph to illustrate population by age and gender.
Population Projection Report

Report for: PMP
Defined Area: Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer
Postcode: N / A

Data Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>297,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>306,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>312,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>318,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer 3.0% 1.9% 3.8%
Actual Total Change 9,142 5,961 11,772


Note: Some variations may occur in projections due to the changes in postal geography.
MtF Demand Model - Swimming Pools - PART A - DEMAND SIDE

Target Area: Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer

Any model is based on a number of assumptions. The assumptions used in this model are as follows:

Assumptions/Parameters used in Mode

- Proportion of visits during peak times = 63%
- Average duration of visit = 64 minutes (tank), 68 minutes (leisure pool)
- Normal peak periods = 52 hours per week = 49 peak sessions
- At one time capacity = 6m² per person
- A one time capacity is defined as the supply/capacity of one m² of pool area at any one time
- Capacity per 212m² (1 pool unit) = 35 people. (number of metres squared divided by the at one time capacity of one m²)
- A pool unit is defined as an average four lane, 25 metre pool.

These assumptions are then applied to the population (classified by age and gender) of the target area. Calculated Sport England demand parameters for each category of age and gender are also applied (see the following table).

Demand Assessment Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Rate of participation (%)</th>
<th>Participation numbers</th>
<th>Frequency of participation (per week)</th>
<th>Visits per week</th>
<th>Peak visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>31,312</td>
<td>29,739</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>3793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>3594</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>15,110</td>
<td>14,453</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>36,162</td>
<td>38,265</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>4965</td>
<td>7228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3525</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>5818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>40,533</td>
<td>40,099</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>3295</td>
<td>4186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3098</td>
<td>3391</td>
<td>4088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>22,777</td>
<td>25,929</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145,894</td>
<td>148,485</td>
<td>14,939</td>
<td>18,467</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>15,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantifying Demand

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of a swimming pool needed to serve this demand at any one time.

This is calculated by:

- dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (49)
- divide by the water area required by one person (6m² of pool area).
- allow for the comfort capacity at 70% of peak time usage

This leaves one number signifying the total demand from the catchment area, measured in square metres of pool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Water area required to meet potential demand/m², in 2001 :</th>
<th>3131 m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The corresponding demand in 2005 will be :</td>
<td>3192 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The corresponding demand in 2010 will be :</td>
<td>3251 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2001:</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2005:</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2010:</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Demand will change over time in relation to the increase or decrease in resident population

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the data above is accurate PMP Consultancy Ltd (MtF) accept no liability for errors or omissions within this data or any losses arising from this.
Demand Sensitivities

The model calculates the total potential demand for swimming and assumes that each pool will operate on average at 70% peak time capacity to provide comfort for users. Once this 70% capacity has been exceeded it assumes that people will choose not to use the pool and either find an alternative pool or not go swimming.

A number of sensitivities have been calculated:

**Capacity** - this is the theoretical pool area to meet the demand for swimming based on current participation rates with the pool operating at capacity during peak time. This does not allow for the comfort factor (this is the basis on which previous models (FPM and MtF) have been calculated).

**Standard** - this identifies the potential demand for swimming provision and assumes that all barriers to participation are removed. This includes an allowance for a comfort factor and equates to the Sport England Facility Calculato.

**Game Plan** - this assumes that the targets in Game Plan are achieved (50% participation in 2010 and 70% in 2020) with swimming increasing proportionately to the increase in participation. This allows for the comfort factor and assumes pools will operate on average at 70% peak time capacity.

### Total Peak Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Peak visits</th>
<th>Comfort Capacity</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>6664</td>
<td>8064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>3237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>5618</td>
<td>8312</td>
<td>10057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>4088</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>7066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>2516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,899</td>
<td>25,570</td>
<td>30,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of swimming pool provision needed to serve this demand at any one time. This highlights:

- potential demand for swimming at peak times based on participation rates
- potential demand for swimming at peak times allowing for a comfort factor
- potential demand for swimming at peak times if the targets in Game Plan are achieved

### Water area required to meet potential demand/m², in 2001:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2192</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td>3789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (49) divide by the water area required by one person (6ft² of pool area).

The total demand from the catchment area, measured in square metres of pool.

### Water area required to meet potential demand/m², in 2005:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2192</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2234</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2276</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>3934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding demand in 2005 will be:

| Pool Units Required in 2001: | 10.3 | 14.8 |
| Pool Units Required in 2005: | 10.5 | 15.1 |
| Pool Units Required in 2010: | 10.7 | 15.3 |
| Pool Units Required in 2010 (Game Plan adjusted): | 18.6 |

A pool unit is equal to: 212 m² or a 4 lane 25 metre pool

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the data above is accurate PMP Consultancy Ltd (MtF) accept no liability for errors or omissions within this data or any losses arising from this.
The total demand (calculated in the pool demand sheet) is then compared to the supply of pool area within the catchment area. There are three scenarios considered:

1. **Present situation.** In the year 2001 the existing pool area available is compared to the corresponding estimated demand. Using projected demand in the year 2010 and population projections to estimate any change in demand, the situation in 2010 is estimated. It is assessed under two conditions.

2. **Worst Case Scenario.** Assumes that all current planning applications will come to fruition.

3. **Most Likely Scenario.** Assumes that only the projects that are currently underway (have gained planning permission) will eventually be completed.

### The Three Scenarios

#### 1. Present Situation

Using the 2001 Census population projections, and only those facilities that are presently built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing pool area (m²)</td>
<td>2.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>2.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 98 sqm

#### 2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)

Using population projection to the year 2010, and assumes all planned developments come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing pool area (m²)</td>
<td>2.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>2.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 218 sqm

#### 3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something)

Using population projection to the year 2010, and only planned developments where building work has started on site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>= 3,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>= 3,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unmet Demand (Game Plan Adjusted) 901 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing pool area (m²)</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- Public LCs - Public leisure centres with unrestricted public access
- Dual Use - Leisure centres that only allow public access during out of school hours and holidays. Supply has been reduced by 25% to reflect this.
- Club Use - Facilities that can only be hired out as a whole, to clubs and associations, usually on a block booking system. Such facilities do not provide staff or any other support. These facilities are therefore not included in the model.
Any model is based on a number of assumptions. The assumptions used in this model are as follows:

Assumptions/Parameters used in Model:
- Proportion of visits during peak times = 60%
- Average duration of visit = 1 hour
- Normal peak periods = 40.5 hours per week
- At one time capacity = 5 people per badminton court

These assumptions are then applied to the population (classified by age and gender) of the target area. Calculated Sport England demand parameters for each category of age and gender are also applied (see the following table).

Demand Assessment Table
Demand in relation to the age and gender profile of the target area is calculated by applying Sport England demand parameters to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Rate of Participation (%)</th>
<th>Participation Nr's</th>
<th>Frequency of participation (per week)</th>
<th>Visits per week</th>
<th>Peak Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>31,312</td>
<td>29,739</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>15,110</td>
<td>14,453</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>22,654</td>
<td>24,468</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>24,915</td>
<td>24,954</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>2346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>25,929</td>
<td>25,929</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148,894</td>
<td>148,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,921</td>
<td>10,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantifying Demand
The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of a sports hall needed to serve this demand at any one time.

This is calculated by:
- dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (40.5) :
- divide this number by the average number of people that play on a badminton court (5) :
- allow for the comfort capacity at 80% of peak time usage

This leaves one number signifying the total demand from the catchment area, measured in badminton courts.

Current
No of badminton courts demand in 2001: 88.5 courts
The corresponding demand in 2005 will be: 90.2 courts
The corresponding demand in 2010 will be: 91.9 courts

Number of four court sports halls required in 2001 is: 22.1
Number of four court sports halls required in 2005 is: 22.6
Number of four court sports halls required in 2010 is: 23.0

Note: Demand will change over time in relation to the increase or decrease in resident population.
Demand Sensitivities

The model calculates the total potential demand for sports halls and assumes that each hall will operate on average at 80% peak time capacity to provide comfort for users and allow for a balanced programme providing different types of activity.

Once this 80% capacity has been exceeded it assumes that people will choose not to use the hall and either find an alternative hall or not participate in activity.

A number of sensitivities have been calculated:

**Capacity** - this is the theoretical sports hall area to meet the demand for hall based activities based on current participation rates with the hall operating at capacity during peak times. This does not allow for the comfort factor (this is the basis on which previous models (FPM and MtF) have been calculated).

**Standard** - this identifies the potential demand for sports hall provision and assumes that all barriers to participation are removed. This includes an allowance for a comfort factor and equates to the Sport England Facility Calculator.

**Game Plan** - this assumes that the targets in Game Plan are achieved (50% participation in 2010 and 70% in 2020) with sports hall activities increasing proportionately to the increase in participation. This allows for the comfort factor and assumes halls will operate on average at 75% peak time capacity.

### Total Peak Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Capacity Peak visits (80%)</th>
<th>Comfort Capacity Peak visits (90%)</th>
<th>Game Plan Peak visits 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>3238</td>
<td>3918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3553</td>
<td>4441</td>
<td>5373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-44</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>3447</td>
<td>4171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>2828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,336</td>
<td>17,820</td>
<td>21,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of sports hall provision needed to serve this demand at any one time. This highlights the:

- potential demand for sports halls at peak times based on participation rates
- potential demand for sports hall at peak times allowing for a comfort factor
- potential demand for sports halls at peak times if the targets in Game Plan are achieved

### Calculations

Dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (40.5)

divide this number by the average number of people that play on a badminton court (5):

The total demand from the catchment area, measured in badminton courts.

#### Number of four court sports halls required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity 2001</th>
<th>Standard 2001</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding demand in 2005 will be:

The corresponding demand in 2010 will be:

Number of four court sports halls required in 2001 is: 11.7

Number of four court sports halls required in 2005 is: 18.0

Number of four court sports halls required in 2010 is: 18.4
MtF Demand Model - Sports Halls - PART B - MODEL RUNS

Target Area: Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer
Target Site: N / A

The total demand (calculated in the hall demand sheet) is then compared to the supply of sports halls within
the catchment area. There are three scenarios considered:

(1). **Present situation.** In the year 2001 the existing sports halls available are compared to the
 corresponding estimated demand.

Using projected demand in the year 2010 and population projections to estimate any change in demand,
the situation in 2010 is estimated. It is assessed under two conditions.

(2). **Worst Case Scenario.** Assumes that all current planning applications will come to fruition.

(3). **Most Likely Scenario.** Assumes that only the projects that are currently underway
(have gained planning permission) will eventually be completed.

### 1. Present Situation

*Year 2001*

Using population projections to the year 2000, and only those facilities that are presently built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing badminton courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 31 courts.

### 2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)

*Year 2010*

Using population projection to the year 2010, and assumes all planned developments come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing badminton courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 29 courts.

### 3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something)

*Year 2010*

Using population projection to the year 2010, and only planned developments where building work has started on site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Game Plan Adjusted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing badminton courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 29 courts.

**Notes:**
- Public LCs - Public leisure centres with unrestricted public access
- Dual Use - Leisure centres that only allow public access during out of school hours and holidays. Supply has been reduced by 25% to reflect this.
- Club Use - Facilities that can only be hired out as a whole, to clubs and associations, usually on a block booking system. Such facilities do not provide staff or any other support. These facilities are therefore not included in the model.
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MtF Demand Model - Synthetic Turf Pitches (STPs)

Unlike sports halls and swimming pools there are no detailed demand parameters. The most comprehensive parameter is a normative parameter which is the following:

“One STP for every 60,000 people within a 20 minute off-peak drivetime”

Source: 1999 Sport England

The following table shows the adult population within a 20 minute off-peak drivetime from the target site. The last column details the number of STPs that are thus required.

Demand Assessment Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>No. of STPs Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>297,318</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>312,421</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>318,232</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of STPs that are required is then compared to the number that exist. STPs should be full sized and be floodlit to be counted in this analysis.

Supply of STPs

Catchment area is: Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer

No. of STPs (full size, floodlit) in operation : 4.5
No. of STPs (full size, floodlit), currently being built : 0
No. of STPs (full size, floodlit) planned : 0

1. Present Situation Year 2001

No.of STPs existing: 4.5
No of STPs required: 5.0
There is an unmet demand equivalent to 0.5 pitches

2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything) Year 2010

No.of STPs existing: 4.5
No. of STPs being built: 0
No of STPs required: 5.3
There is an unmet demand equivalent to 0.8 pitches

3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something) Year 2010

No.of STPs existing: 4.5
No. of STPs being built: 0
No. of planned STPs: 0
No of STPs required: 5.3
There is an unmet demand equivalent to 0.8 pitches

This figure is a national standard and relates to hockey and multi purpose activities. Consideration should be given to the number of locally based teams, demand for football and relevant playing pitch strategy.

The demand for an STP should be based on local demand and local term sustainability.
Generic Assumptions Used in the Model

- The model defines health and fitness users as all people participating in health and fitness, including private club members, users of local authority facilities, home users.
- The model is based on the premise that for the supply to be sufficient, it must be large enough to cater for the maximum demand at any one time. Maximum demand is described as the demand during a peak hour/session.
- Penetration of health and fitness users is defined using results from MtF’s Sport and Leisure Potential Report. This report is derived from a representative sample of nearly 1 million people who completed a survey, a significant number of which reside within the target area. The penetration rate is therefore dependent upon the character of people in the target catchment area. A figure of 19.7% penetration was attained for GB as a whole. This is a current figure and does not take into account market trends in health and fitness.
- A reduction of 10% in the demand for stations is assumed to represent the proportion of health and fitness users who do not use gyms, including ‘home’ users, etc. The reduction is subtracted at the end of the model calculations.

Parameters Used in the Model

- A potential penetration rate of 23.5% will be used. This figure was obtained from the Sport and Leisure Potential Report for this target area. It includes all health and fitness users (from home gym users to members of private health and fitness clubs).
- The average health and fitness session is one hour.
- 65% of use is during peak times.
- Peak times are 5-9pm Monday to Friday and 9am-5pm weekends (36 hours in a week).
- The average user participates on average 1.5 times per week or six times a month.
- The at one time capacity of a health and fitness facility is calculated by the ratio of one user per station.

The Calculations Used to Calculate Demand (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Adult Population</td>
<td>235,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Potential members/users of health and fitness clubs</td>
<td>23.5% of total adults = 55,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits per week = potential members/users * 1.5</td>
<td>= 82,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits per week in peak times = 65% of total number of visits</td>
<td>= 53,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits in one hour of peak time = total visits during peak times /36</td>
<td>= 1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce figure by 10% to account for non gym users</td>
<td>= 1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total number of stations would be required to cater for the predicted demand by potential members/users of any health and fitness facility.</td>
<td>1,347 stations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantifying Demand - demand changes over time as a result of changes in resident population.

- In 2001 there will be a demand for 1,347 stations
- In 2005 there will be a demand for 1,374 stations
- In 2010 there will be a demand for 1,399 stations

NB. Market trends have not been considered at this stage.
MtF Demand Model - Health and Fitness - PART B - MODEL RUNS

Target Area: Spelthorne District and 3 km Buffer
Target Site: N / A

The total demand (calculated in the demand sheet) is then compared to the supply of stations within the catchment area. There are three scenarios considered:

1. **Present Situation**. In the year 2001 the existing stations available are compared to the corresponding estimated demand.

Using projected demand in the year 2010 and population projections to estimate any change in demand, the situation in 2010 is estimated. It is assessed under two conditions.

2. **Worst Case Scenario**. Assumes that all current planning applications will come to fruition.

3. **Most Likely Scenario**. Assumes that only the projects that are currently under way (have gained planning permission) will eventually be completed.

### 1. Present Situation  
**Year 2001**

Using population projections to the year 2000, and only those facilities that are presently built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2001</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td>Public: 13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private: 28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Stations</td>
<td>Public: 550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private: 1496</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 2046</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an oversupply equivalent to 699 stations.

### 2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)  
**Year 2010**

Using population projection to the year 2010, and all planned developments come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td>Public: 13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private: 28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned: 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Stations</td>
<td>Public: 550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private: 1496</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned: 293</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 2339</td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an oversupply equivalent to 940 stations.

### 3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something)  
**Year 2010**

Using population projection to the year 2010, and only planned developments which are looking favourable come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td>Public: 13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private: 28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned: 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Stations</td>
<td>Public: 550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private: 1496</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned: 293</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 2339</td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an oversupply equivalent to 940 stations.

Notes:
No assumptions/consideration has been made regarding the quality of facilities. It is assumed that although private clubs require a membership fee to be paid before joining, no reduction in accessibility to the facility results. Similarly, the standard requirement in public facilities to undertake an induction before using the facility also has no impact on accessibility.
### Demographic Profile - 2001 Census

**Report for:** PMP  
**Defined Area:** Spelthorne District  
**Postcode:** N / A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>From GB %</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90,357</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>5,662</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>10,596</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>15,402</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>12,348</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>11,621</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>19,756</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>From GB %</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 44,399</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 4 2,626</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9 2,950</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 15 3,260</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 19 1,874</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 - 29 5,253</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39 7,531</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49 6,293</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59 5,879</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 + 8,733</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>From GB %</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 45,958</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 4 2,522</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9 2,712</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 15 3,029</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 19 1,661</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 - 29 5,343</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39 7,871</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49 6,055</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59 5,742</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 + 11,023</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>From GB %</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All White 85,326</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White - British 81,130</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White - Irish 1,570</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White - Other 2,626</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Black 518</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black - Caribbean 237</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black - African 215</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black - Other 66</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese 373</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin contd</td>
<td>Results from area of England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>Results from GB Index (ave. =100)</td>
<td>Index difference</td>
<td>Results from area of Wales (ave. =100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Asian</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Indian</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Pakistani</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Bangladeshi</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian - Other</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mixed</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed - Other</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed - Others</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents who have a limiting long-term illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity of Household Residents (aged 16 and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 73,312 [total of all economic sub-types]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Full-time employment 36,780 50.2 39.0 40.5 124 24 129 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Part-time employment 10,144 13.8 12.8 13.1 105 5 108 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed 5,765 7.9 5.2 5.7 139 39 150 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed 1,329 1.8 2.5 3.0 59 -41 74 -26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students 2,776 3.8 18.3 12.5 30 -70 21 -79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Sick/Disabled 1,860 2.5 4.3 5.6 45 -55 58 -42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired 9,497 13.0 9.9 11.3 114 14 131 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inactive 1,415 1.9 2.5 3.1 63 -37 76 -24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after home/family 3,746 5.1 5.3 5.2 98 -2 96 -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male In Full-time employment 23,380 31.9 25.3 26.0 123 23 126 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Part-time employment 2,087 2.8 2.7 2.7 106 6 105 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed 4,288 5.8 3.8 4.1 143 43 154 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed 817 1.1 1.5 1.9 58 -42 75 -25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students 1,369 1.9 9.2 6.1 31 -69 20 -80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Sick/Disabled 970 1.3 2.4 3.0 44 -56 56 -44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired 4,069 5.6 4.0 4.5 122 22 139 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inactive 638 0.9 1.1 1.3 66 -34 79 -21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after home/family 166 0.2 0.4 0.4 58 -42 62 -38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female In Full-time employment 13,400 18.3 13.7 14.5 126 26 134 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Part-time employment 8,057 11.0 10.1 10.5 105 5 109 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed 1,477 2.0 1.5 1.6 128 28 134 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed 512 0.7 1.0 1.1 63 -37 72 -28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students 1,407 1.9 9.4 6.5 29 -71 20 -80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Sick/Disabled 890 1.2 2.0 2.6 47 -53 61 -39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired 5,428 7.4 6.2 6.9 107 7 119 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inactive 777 1.1 1.4 1.7 61 -39 73 -27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after home/family 3,580 4.9 5.0 4.8 102 2 98 -2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lone Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total 73,258 [Total of All People aged 16+]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 3,394 4.6 5.6 6.0 77 -23 82 -18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 574 0.8 0.8 0.8 98 -2 101 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 2,820 3.8 4.9 5.2 74 -26 79 -21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tenure of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Occupied Household Spaces</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>From GB % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>30,363</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rented or Living Rent Free</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from Council</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Rented</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Car Availability by Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Availability by Household</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>From GB % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with no car</td>
<td>5,864</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 1 car</td>
<td>16,690</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 2 cars</td>
<td>15,801</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Class of Head of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class of Head of Household (aged 16+)</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>From GB % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
<th>From England &amp; Wales % Index (ave. =100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB - Higher &amp; Intermediate managerial/admin/ professional</td>
<td>18,640</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisory, clerical, junior</td>
<td>25,840</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Skilled manual workers</td>
<td>9,853</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Semi-skilled &amp; unskilled manual workers</td>
<td>8,766</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - On state benefit, unemployed, lowest grade</td>
<td>9,433</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph to illustrate population by age and gender.
Population Projection Report

Report for: PMP
Defined Area: Spelthorne District
Postcode: N / A

Data Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>88,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>90,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>90,638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne District</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Total Change</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Projections


Note: Some variations may occur in projections due to the changes in postal geography.
MtF Demand Model - Swimming Pools - PART A - DEMAND SIDE

Target Area: Spelthorne District
Target Site: N/A

Any model is based on a number of assumptions. The assumptions used in this model are as follows:

Assumptions/Parameters used in Mode

- Proportion of visits during peak times = 63%
- Average duration of visit = 64 minutes (tank), 68 minutes (leisure pool)
- Normal peak periods = 52 hours per week = 49 peak sessions
- At one time capacity = 6m² per person
- Capacity per 212m² (1 pool unit) = 35 people. (number of metres squared divided by the at one time capacity of one m²)

A pool unit is defined as an average four lane, 25 metre pool.

These assumptions are then applied to the population (classified by age and gender) of the target area. Calculated Sport England demand parameters for each category of age and gender are also applied (see the following table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Rate of participation (%)</th>
<th>Participation numbers</th>
<th>Frequency of participation (per week)</th>
<th>Visits per week</th>
<th>Peak visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>8,826</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>10,463</td>
<td>10,864</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>12,172</td>
<td>11,797</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,190</td>
<td>43,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>5,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantifying Demand

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of a swimming pool needed to serve this demand at any one time.

This is calculated by:
- dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (49)
- divide by the water area required by one person (6m² of pool area).
- allow for the comfort capacity at 70% of peak time usage

This leaves one number signifying the total demand from the catchment area, measured in square metres of pool.

Standard

| Water area required to meet potential demand/m², in 2001 : | 907 m² |
| The corresponding demand in 2005 will be : | 909 m² |
| The corresponding demand in 2010 will be : | 910 m² |
| Pool Units Required in 2001: | 4.3 |
| Pool Units Required in 2005: | 4.3 |
| Pool Units Required in 2010: | 4.3 |

A pool unit is equal to: 212 m² or a 4 lane 25 metre pool

Note: Demand will change over time in relation to the increase or decrease in resident population
Demand Sensitivities

The model calculates the total potential demand for swimming and assumes that each pool will operate on average at 70% peak time capacity to provide comfort for users. Once this 70% capacity has been exceeded it assumes that people will choose not to use the pool and either find an alternative pool or not go swimming.

A number of sensitivities have been calculated:

Capacity - this is the theoretical pool area to meet the demand for swimming based on current participation rates with the pool operating at capacity during peak time. This does not allow for the comfort factor (this is the basis on which previous models (FPM and MtF) have been calculated).

Standard - this identifies the potential demand for swimming provision and assumes that all barriers to participation are removed. This includes an allowance for a comfort factor and equates to the Sport England Facility Calculated.

Game Plan - this assumes that the targets in Game Plan are achieved (50% participation in 2010 and 70% in 2020) with swimming increasing proportionately to the increase in participation. This allows for the comfort factor and assumes pools will operate on average at 70% peak time capacity.

Total Peak Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Peak visits (63%)</th>
<th>Comfort Capacity (70%)</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>2259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>2099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>8,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of swimming pool provision needed to serve this demand at any one time. This highlights the:
- potential demand for swimming at peak times based on participation rates
- potential demand for swimming at peak times allowing for a comfort factor
- potential demand for swimming at peak times if the targets in Game Plan are achieved

Water area required to meet potential demand/m², in 2001:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (49) divide by the water area required by one person (6m² of pool area).

The total demand from the catchment area, measured in square metres of pool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pool Units Required in 2001:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2001:</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2005:</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2010:</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pool Units Required in 2010 (Game Plan adjusted):

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Units Required in 2010 (Game Plan adjusted):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A pool unit is equal to: 212 m² or a 4 lane 25 metre pool

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the data above is accurate PMP Consultancy Ltd (MtF) accept no liability for errors or omissions within this data or any losses arising from this.
The total demand (calculated in the pool demand sheet) is then compared to the supply of pool area within the catchment area. There are three scenarios considered:

1. **Present situation.** In the year 2001 the existing pool area available is compared to the corresponding estimated demand. Using projected demand in the year 2010 and population projections to estimate any change in demand, the situation in 2010 is estimated. It is assessed under two conditions.

2. **Worst Case Scenario.** Assumes that all current planning applications will come to fruition.

3. **Most Likely Scenario.** Assumes that only the projects that are currently underway (have gained planning permission) will eventually be completed.

### The Three Scenarios

#### 1. Present Situation

Using the 2001 Census population projections, and only those facilities that are presently built

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing pool area (m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public LCs</th>
<th>Dual Use</th>
<th>Club Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public LCs</th>
<th>Dual Use</th>
<th>Club Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 211 sqm

#### 2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)

Using population projection to the year 2010, and assumes all planned developments come to fruition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing pool area (m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public LCs</th>
<th>Dual Use</th>
<th>Club Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public LCs</th>
<th>Dual Use</th>
<th>Club Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 214 sqm

#### 3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something)

Using population projection to the year 2010, and only planned developments where building work has started on site

| Existing Sites | Supply in Year 2010 | Demand in Year 2010 | Demand in Year 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public LCs</th>
<th>Dual Use</th>
<th>Club Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 214 sqm

Unmet Demand (Game Plan Adjusted) 405 sqm

Notes:

- Public LCs - Public leisure centres with unrestricted public access
- Dual Use - Leisure centres that only allow public access during out of school hours and holidays. Supply has been reduced by 25% to reflect this.
- Club Use - Facilities that can only be hired out as a whole, to clubs and associations, usually on a block booking system. Such facilities do not provide staff or any other support. These facilities are therefore not included in the model.
Any model is based on a number of assumptions. The assumptions used in this model are as follows:

- Proportion of visits during peak times = 60%.
- Average duration of visit = 1 hour.
- Normal peak periods = 40.5 hours per week.
- At one time capacity = 5 people per badminton court.

These assumptions are then applied to the population (classified by age and gender) of the target area. Calculated Sport England demand parameters for each category of age and gender are also applied (see the following table).

### Demand Assessment Table

Demand in relation to the age and gender profile of the target area is calculated by applying Sport England demand parameters to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Rate of Participation (%)</th>
<th>Participation Nr's</th>
<th>Frequency of participation (per week)</th>
<th>Visits per week</th>
<th>Peak Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>8,836</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>6,899</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>7,287</td>
<td>7,221</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,190</td>
<td>43,537</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantifying Demand

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of a sports hall needed to serve this demand at any one time. This is calculated by:

- divide this number by the average number of people that play on a badminton court (5):
- allow for the comfort capacity at 80% of peak time usage

This leaves one number signifying the total demand from the catchment area, measured in badminton courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>No of badminton courts demand in 2001</th>
<th>25.8 courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The corresponding demand in 2005 will be:</td>
<td>25.8 courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The corresponding demand in 2010 will be:</td>
<td>25.9 courts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Number of four court sports halls required in 2001 is: 6.5
- Number of four court sports halls required in 2006 is: 6.5
- Number of four court sports halls required in 2010 is: 6.5

Note: Demand will change over time in relation to the increase or decrease in resident population.
Demand Sensitivities

The model calculates the total potential demand for sports halls and assumes that each hall will operate on average at 80% peak time capacity to provide comfort for users and allow for a balanced programme providing different types of activity.

Once this 80% capacity has been exceeded it assumes that people will choose not to use the hall and either find an alternative hall or not participate in activity.

A number of sensitivities have been calculated:

**Capacity** - this is the theoretical sports hall area to meet the demand for hall based activities based on current participation rates with the hall operating at capacity during peak times. This does not allow for the comfort factor (this is the basis on which previous models (FPM and MtF) have been calculated).

**Standard** - this identifies the potential demand for sports hall provision and assumes that all barriers to participation are removed. This includes an allowance for a comfort factor and equates to the Sport England Facility Calculator.

**Game Plan** - this assumes that the targets in Game Plan are achieved (50% participation in 2010 and 70% in 2020) with sports hall activities increasing proportionately to the increase in participation. This allows for the comfort factor and assumes halls will operate on average at 75% peak time capacity.

**Total Peak Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Peak visits (60%)</th>
<th>Comfort Capacity (80%)</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-44</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,323</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of sports hall provision needed to serve this demand at any one time. This highlights the:

- potential demand for sports halls at peak times based on participation rates
- potential demand for sports hall at peak times allowing for a comfort factor
- potential demand for sports halls at peak times if the targets in Game Plan are achieved

Dividing the total peak visits by the number of peak sessions (40.5):

Divide this number by the average number of people that play on a badminton court (5):

The total demand from the catchment area, measured in badminton courts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of badminton courts demand in 2001</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding demand in 2005 will be:

The corresponding demand in 2010 will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of four court sports halls required in 2001</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of four court sports halls required in 2005</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of four court sports halls required in 2010</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Game Plan 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total demand (calculated in the hall demand sheet) is then compared to the supply of sports halls within the catchment area. There are three scenarios considered:

1. **Present situation.** In the year 2001 the existing sports halls available are compared to the corresponding estimated demand.

   Using projected demand in the year 2010 and population projections to estimate any change in demand, the situation in 2010 is estimated. It is assessed under two conditions.

   2. **Worst Case Scenario.** Assumes that all current planning applications will come to fruition.

   3. **Most Likely Scenario.** Assumes that only the projects that are currently underway (have gained planning permission) will eventually be completed.

### 1. Present Situation  
**Year 2001**

Using population projections to the year 2000, and only those facilities that are presently built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing badminton courts</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 8 courts.

### 2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)  
**Year 2010**

Using population projection to the year 2010, and assumes all planned developments come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing badminton courts</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an unmet demand equivalent to 5 courts.

### 3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something)  
**Year 2010**

Using population projection to the year 2010, and only planned developments where building work has started on site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Sites</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing badminton courts</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned badminton courts</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public LCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unmet Demand (Game Plan Adjusted) = 5 courts.

**Notes:**
- **Public LCs** - Public leisure centres with unrestricted public access
- **Dual Use** - Leisure centres that only allow public access during out of school hours and holidays. Supply has been reduced by 25% to reflect this.
- **Club Use** - Facilities that can only be hired out as a whole, to clubs and associations, usually on a block booking system. Such facilities do not provide staff or any other support. These facilities are therefore not included in the model.
MtF Demand Model - Synthetic Turf Pitches (STPs)

Unlike sports halls and swimming pools there are no detailed demand parameters. The most comprehensive parameter is a normative parameter which is the following:

"One STP for every 60,000 people within a 20 minute off-peak drivetime"

Source: 1999 Sport England

The following table shows the adult population within a 20 minute off-peak drivetime from the target site. The last column details the number of STPs that are thus required.

**Demand Assessment Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>No. of STPs Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>88,218</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90,509</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>90,638</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of STPs that are required is then compared to the number that exist. STPs should be full sized and be floodlit to be counted in this analysis.

**Supply of STPs**

**Catchment area is:** Spelthorne District

- No. of STPs (full size, floodlit) in operation: 1.75
- No. of STPs (full size, floodlit), currently being built: 0
- No. of STPs (full size, floodlit) planned: 0

1. **Present Situation** Year 2001

   - No. of STPs existing: 1.75
   - No. of STPs required: 1.5
   - There is an over supply equivalent to 0.3 pitches

2. **Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)** Year 2010

   - No. of STPs existing: 1.75
   - No. of STPs being built: 0
   - No. of STPs required: 1.5
   - There is an over supply equivalent to 0.2 pitches

3. **Most Likely Scenario (Do something)** Year 2010

   - No. of STPs existing: 1.75
   - No. of STPs being built: 0
   - No. of planned STPs: 0
   - No. of STPs required: 1.5
   - There is an over supply equivalent to 0.2 pitches

This figure is a national standard and relates to hockey and multi purpose activities. Consideration should be given to the number of locally based teams, demand for football and relevant playing pitch strategy.

The demand for an STP should be based on local demand and local term sustainability.
Generic Assumptions Used in the Model

- The model defines health and fitness users as all people participating in health and fitness, including private club members, users of local authority facilities, home users.
- The model is based on the premise that for the supply to be sufficient, it must be large enough to cater for the maximum demand at any one time. Maximum demand is described as the demand during a peak hour/session.
- Penetration of health and fitness users is defined using results from MtF’s Sport and Leisure Potential Report. This report is derived from a representative sample of nearly 1 million people who completed a survey, a significant number of which reside within the target area. The penetration rate is therefore dependent upon the character of people in the target catchment area. A figure of 19.7% penetration was attained for GB as a whole. This is a current figure and does not take into account market trends in health and fitness.
- A reduction of 10% in the demand for stations is assumed to represent the proportion of health and fitness users who do not use gyms, including 'home' users, etc. The reduction is subtracted at the end of the model calculations.

Parameters Used in the Model

- A potential penetration rate of 21.6% will be used. This figure was obtained from the Sport and Leisure Potential Report for this target area. It includes all health and fitness users (from home gym users to members of private health and fitness clubs).
- The average health and fitness session is one hour.
- 65% of use is during peak times.
- Peak times are 5-9pm Monday to Friday and 9am-5pm weekends (36 hours in a week).
- The average user participates on average 1.5 times per week or six times a month.
- The at one time capacity of a health and fitness facility is calculated by the ratio of one user per station.

The Calculations Used to Calculate Demand (2001)

Total Adult Population = 70,430
Number of Potential members/users of health and fitness clubs = 21.6% of total adults = 15,213
Number of visits per week = potential members/users * 1.5 = 22,819
Number of visits in one hour of peak time = total visits during peak times /36 = 413
Reduce figure by 10% to account for non gym users = 372

A total number of 372 stations would be required to cater for the predicted demand by potential members/users of any health and fitness facility.

Quantifying Demand - demand changes over time as a result of changes in resident population.

In 2001 there will be a demand for: 372 stations
In 2005 there will be a demand for: 372 stations
In 2010 there will be a demand for: 373 stations

NB. Market trends have not been considered at this stage.
MtF Demand Model - Health and Fitness - PART B - MODEL RUNS

Target Area: Spelthorne District  
Target Site: N / A

The total demand (calculated in the demand sheet) is then compared to the supply of stations within the catchment area. There are three scenarios considered:

(1). Present situation. In the year 2001 the existing stations available are compared to the corresponding estimated demand.

Using projected demand in the year 2010 and population projections to estimate any change in demand, the situation in 2010 is estimated. It is assessed under two conditions.

(2). Worst Case Scenario. Assumes that all current planning applications will come to fruition.

(3). Most Likely Scenario. Assumes that only the projects that are currently under way (have gained planning permission) will eventually be completed.

1. Present Situation

Year 2001

Using population projections to the year 2000, and only those facilities that are presently built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2001</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2001</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2001 = 372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td>Public 3</td>
<td>Private 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Stations</td>
<td>Public 154</td>
<td>Private 613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an over supply equivalent to 395 stations

2. Worst Case Scenario (Do everything)

Year 2010

Using population projection to the year 2010, and all planned developments come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 373</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td>Public 3</td>
<td>Private 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Stations</td>
<td>Public 154</td>
<td>Private 613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an over supply equivalent to 394 stations

3. Most Likely Scenario (Do something)

Year 2010

Using population projection to the year 2010, and only planned developments which are looking favourable come to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Supply in Year 2010</th>
<th>Demand in Year 2010 = 373</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sites</td>
<td>Public 3</td>
<td>Private 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Stations</td>
<td>Public 154</td>
<td>Private 613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an over supply equivalent to 394 stations

Notes: No assumptions/consideration has been made regarding the quality of facilities.
It is assumed that although private clubs require a membership fee to be paid before joining, no reduction in accessibility to the facility results. Similarly, the standard requirement in public facilities to undertake an induction before using the facility also has no impact on accessibility.
APPENDIX D

SPORT AND LEISURE POTENTIAL PROFILE
# Sport and Leisure Potential

**Report For:** PMP Consultancy  
**Defined Area:** Spelthorne District & 3 km buffer  
**Postcode:** N / A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>Index (ave.=100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angling</td>
<td>14122</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>40248</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats And</td>
<td>14576</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Health</td>
<td>55328</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>46905</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>37121</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycling</td>
<td>10541</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Sport</td>
<td>24663</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding</td>
<td>6960</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>21940</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>14374</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving</td>
<td>6809</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>14526</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snooker/Pool</td>
<td>25672</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>2925</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>8725</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>61078</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>17400</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports</td>
<td>11953</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>73082</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1999 Million Plus Panel/ Continental
Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children Per Household (aged under 18)</th>
<th>Results from area % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>Index (ave.=100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>32229</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>33540</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>10390</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2673</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children</td>
<td>155292</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Adults Per Household (aged 18 and Yachting)</th>
<th>Results from area % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>Index (ave.=100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>31018</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yachting Two</td>
<td>162959</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>28395</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>10793</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>97089</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>78529</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>22646</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12811</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>24008</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cars in Household</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 car</td>
<td>81404</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cars</td>
<td>79437</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more cars</td>
<td>18258</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cars</td>
<td>55984</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LessThan £5k</td>
<td>15080</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5-£10k</td>
<td>28244</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10-£15k</td>
<td>25016</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15-£20k</td>
<td>27437</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20-£25k</td>
<td>29656</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25-£30k</td>
<td>26025</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30-£40k</td>
<td>36112</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40-£50k</td>
<td>21435</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>£50-£60k</td>
<td>12962</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £60k</td>
<td>13113</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1999 Million Plus Panel/Continental
## Sport and Leisure Potential

**Report For:** PMP Consultancy  
**Defined Area:** Spelthorne District  
**Postcode:** N / A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Results from area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>Index (ave.=100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angling</td>
<td>5548</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>11507</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats And</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Health</td>
<td>15206</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>15411</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>12021</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycling</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Sport</td>
<td>6627</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>4110</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>3442</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snooker/Pool</td>
<td>7757</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>17672</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>4829</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports</td>
<td>4932</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>21525</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1999 Million Plus Panel/ Continental
### Demographic Profile

#### Results from area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Results as % of area</th>
<th>Results as % of GB</th>
<th>Index (ave.=100)</th>
<th>Index difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children Per Household (aged under 18)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Adults Per Household (aged 18 and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yachting Two</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven or more</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cars in Household</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 car</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cars</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more cars</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cars</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LessThan £5k</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5-£10k</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10-£15k</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15-£20k</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20-£25k</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25-£30k</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30-£40k</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40-£50k</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50-£60k</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £60k</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1999 Million Plus Panel/ Continental
Summary of the study prepared for
the Council by consultants PMP
1.0 Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to summarise the findings of a study of Open Space, Sport and Recreation undertaken for the Council by consultants PMP.

1.2 The objective of the study was to identify what specific proposals for open space, sport and recreation might need to be included within the Council’s Local Development Framework (LDF) and secondly to assist operational decisions about the future use and management of Council owned sites and facilities.

1.3 Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 ‘Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation requires authorities to undertake robust assessment of existing and future needs in their communities and sets out the way this should be done. The consultants have been required to follow the methodology of PPG 17. This will ensure a sound evidential base for this aspect of the LDF.

1.4 The purpose of this summary report is to explain the study method in general terms and the main findings and recommendations.

2.0 Study Methodology

2.1 The Consultants have followed the five steps set out in PPG 17. These are:

   Step 1 - Identify Local Needs
   Step 2 - Audit Local Provision
   Step 3 - Set Provision Standards
   Step 4 - Apply the Provision Standards
   Step 5 - Identify Proposals and Action Plan

2.2 The following sections look at each step in turn and explain the surveys undertaken and the findings of that work.

3.0 Identifying Local Needs (Step 1)

3.1 This has concentrated on drawing out the views of local residents by way of sample surveys and invitations to make views known and from sports organisations on the adequacy of existing provision.

3.2 Several different surveys have been undertaken. These surveys have sought to establish views on a range of issues of which the main issues are:
a) policy and demographic context.
b) whether the amount of open space is sufficient.
c) views on its quality.
d) accessibility of open space and how people travel to it and by what means.

Where appropriate responses are related to specific open space types.

3.3 The survey’s background work is as follows:

a) An overview of existing Council policy documents including the Local Plan, Community Strategy, Parks Strategies 2003/08 and Leisure and Culture Strategy 2002/05. These documents are summarised in the main report and provide context to the study.

b) Assessment of future population/demographic charges. The Council’s latest projections suggest the total population may only increase by about 2,000 by 2016 from the figures of 90,300 in 2001. However, there is projected to be a slight fall in the 0-14 age range (about 7%) but a significant rise in those aged over 65 and in particular those over 85. Overall the study is able to assume a broadly stable active population, although possible changes in requirements of different age groups will need to be monitored.

c) Consultation/Surveys

i) 5,000 household questionnaires are sent out across the Borough. 485 (9.7%) were returned. The absolute number provides a good general indication of public views but care would be required if undertaking detailed analysis of sub-parts of the response or involving assumptions about particular groups within the local community. This survey asked a range of questions about the types and location of open space visited, regularity and means of travel on visits, reasons for using particular types of open space, views on the quality of open space.

ii) All primary and secondary schools in the Borough were contacted and offered the chance for pupils to complete an on-line survey. The purpose was to engage young people. Five schools took part yielding 135 responses from children aged 6-15 - the majority were aged 9 and 10. The general scope of the questions were similar to the household survey but less detailed.

iii) Three ‘drop-in’ neighbourhood sessions were held at Ashford and Sunbury libraries and the Elmsleigh Centre.
The events were advertised via press releases and subsequent newspaper articles. About 100 people were interviewed.

iv) Sports Club survey to all known sports clubs in the Borough. 13 clubs responded.

3.4 The views obtained from the consultation/surveys of public opinion are dealt with in the following paragraphs.

**Sufficiency of open space**

3.5 Appendix A sets out in table form the general response of the public to the adequacy of provision of various types of open space in the Borough. Questions about allotments were asked but excluded from the table because this subject has been dealt with by a separate and more detailed study, specifically of allotments. Views on outdoor water sports facilities were not addressed in these surveys.

3.6 The % responses referred to in Appendix A provide a general indication of the level of satisfaction but also need to be understood in the context of the geographic distribution of facilities and how far people are willing to travel to them. Appendix B shows there is a wide variation in provision of open space in some parts of the Borough and this is confirmed, particularly when looking at the catchment areas for amenity green space and space for children and young people. This may in part explain why for several types of open space there are both large percentages of people happy with provision and also large percentages who are not.

3.7 So, for example, when in the case of amenity green space 46% feel provision is about right and 41% say there is not enough it would be incorrect simply to assume that on balance the figures average out and could be interpreted as suggesting nothing needs doing. It is evident that about half the Borough’s population is in fact in areas with good provision, but some have little or no provision of this type of space. Similarly in the case of natural and semi natural green space most of the provision is in the Staines area and comprises the Staines Commons where as large areas of the Borough do not have this type of open space nearby. Nevertheless, these responses also need to be considered in the context of the findings summarised in Appendix A which also show that for certain types of space most people who responded are also prepared to travel some distance for certain types of open space.

3.8 What is clear from these figures is that only a fraction of responses suggest there is too much open space (eg 0.8% in the case of amenity green space). This is important when considering what ‘standards’ or ‘measure’ of minimum provision should be considered (this is dealt with...
later). There is no case on the basis of this evidence to assume there is surplus open space in the Borough, which could be disposed of.

Quality of Open Space

3.9 Each of the surveys provided the opportunity to draw out peoples’ views on the quality of open space within Spelthorne. Nationally there are benchmark standards for open space in the form of ‘Green Flag’ awards. This study has not sought to judge which sites would meet this fairly demanding standard, but has identified the public’s general opinions.

3.10 Public views reflected a number of issues many of which the Council is aware of and is already seeking to address. In summary views from different groups identified the following main issues:

a) Household Survey - Concerns of significance were dog fouling (30%), vandalism/graffiti (28%), litter (27%), anti-social behaviour (23%). Quality of provision - 81% were satisfied with planted/grassed areas and 70% were satisfied with maintenance and management generally.

b) School Internet Survey - 30% thought open space was generally very good, 20% was good, 28% only fairly good and only 3% said poor or very poor. 17% said ‘don’t know’. 24% felt open spaces were well maintained but 21% said they were not well maintained and 54% said some are and some are not. Young people generally perceived amenity green space (grassy areas in housing estates) and play areas as the highest quality of all open space. Other open space types had fairly high levels of ‘don’t know’.

c) Neighbourhood Sessions. These raised a lot of anecdotal comments. Vandalism and litter issues were identified at Feltham Hill Road recreation ground and Greenfield Park. Anti-social behaviour by youths was a common theme and referred to specifically at the Shepperton Recreation Ground and Ashford Recreation Ground. Dog fouling was referred to generally and specifically at Laleham Park, Staines Park, Cedars Recreation ground and on the Thames towpath from Staines to Penton Hook. Lammas Park and Staines Park were seen as being well maintained.

d) Survey of Sports Clubs. 38% rated overall provision in Spelthorne as either poor or very poor, 31% felt they were good, 8% said they were average and 23% made no comment. 31% wanted more synthetic turf pitches and an equal number wanted more grass pitches. 23% wanted more sports hall provision and 15% identified the need for more youth related provision. Clubs also referred to cost of facilities/hire, need for more sponsorship,
poor changing/toilet and kitchen facilities. Some identified venues not being suitable for specific sports.

3.11 Officers views on these responses are that they do not suggest a fundamental problem with the quality of provision but it does emphasise the importance of the Council’s on-going work, including the current Liveability Fund projects to continually maintain, improve and adapt provision to meet both specific and often changing recreational needs and public expectations of quality.

3.12 These findings on quality suggest the need for a more systematic assessment of public expectations in relation to the appearance, facilities and maintenance of different types of open space in the Borough and mechanisms to ensure that sites are maintained and their use adapted as necessary over time.

Accessibility of Open Space

3.13 The surveys did ask people how far they were prepared to travel to different types of open space and how they usually got to the sites. For certain types of space people generally expected to be able to walk to it within 5 minutes eg amenity open space and some children’s and young peoples provision. National guidance also supports this and it is already reflected in the current Local Plan. For other types of space such as sports grounds, equipment often has to be transported those who responded indicated a car drive of as long as 30 minutes being undertaken.

3.14 This response raises two important issues. Firstly, some types of open space need to be very local and therefore a good distribution of sites across the Borough is needed. In the case of outdoor sports and natural and semi natural green space, any location within the Borough would be within the travel times a large proportion of people found acceptable (10 minutes by car). Therefore, for these particular types of open space whilst the amount of provision is critical, the exact location within or even adjoining the Borough is much less of an issue to people than amenity green space.

3.15 The second issue, however, is the sustainability of expecting people to travel long distances for open space. In the case of Spelthorne the relatively compact nature of the Borough means that most forms of open space are more accessible than would be the case in a more dispersed settlement pattern. But for some types of open space and in some localities car use is necessary to get to open space. However, for sustainability reasons the mix of recreational opportunity, both formal and informal, available in each part of the Borough is important and there are challenges as to how a wide range of recreation activities can be best managed on sites to achieve this. This is an important dimension of the systematic assessment of the use and management of sites referred to earlier and dealt with later in the recommendations.
3.16 Based on the survey responses the following emerges as the accessibility ‘standards’ or patterns that respondents found acceptable, but in respect of the drive times should be regarded as an absolute maximum for the reasons explained above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Realistic Mode of transport (from analysis)</th>
<th>Recommended Travel Time</th>
<th>Estimated Equivalent Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>0.4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>Drive by car</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>0.4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Spaces for Children and Young People</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>0.4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Drive by car</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>4 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Audit of Local Provision (Step 2)

4.1 An important part of the study has been ensuring we have a comprehensive audit of existing open space, sport and recreation provision. Inevitable changes are always occurring to available open space due to new provision as a result of major housing schemes and the introduction of new types of facility on existing sites as is occurring with the Liveability Fund initiative. Many facilities, including open space, are not necessarily owned or managed by the Council and it will be important that the records that have now been completed in both written schedules and graphic form on our GIS systems are maintained.

4.2 As referred to in the previous section, for the purposes of the surveys and general analysis, open space has been broken down into nine separate types to reflect the categories used in PPG17 and which in turn reflect the diversity of open space type found in all Boroughs. Every open space site in the Borough has been categorised according to its primary use except for children’s and young people’s facilities. These have been specifically identified within larger sites wherever they occur. Inevitably some sites can perform several secondary functions, for example a site might have an extensive area available for outdoor sports (eg Ashford recreation ground) but when not used for this purpose also functions as an area of amenity green space. Any
classification of sites can obscure the flexible way in which many are
used and this has a bearing on the assessment of apparent
deficiencies in specific categories of open space and how these may
be met.

4.3 The nine types used, and the way they have been defined in this study,
is as follows, (the number of sites and total hectarage in Spelthorne is
also shown).

a) **Parks and Gardens** - for the purposes of this study this only
includes formally planted or managed parks eg Memorial
Gardens, and the Walled Garden at Sunbury and other
significant parts of sites. Small planted areas within larger sites
are not included where this is not the overall site's primary use.
However, the existence of such smaller areas and their
contribution to the appearance and perceived quantity of sites as
a whole is recognised. There are seven sites in this category in
Spelthorne amounting to three hectares in total.

b) **Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace** - these are more
natural areas with no or limited formal management. This
includes sites such as Staines Moor, Shortwood Common,
Dumsey Meadow, Sunbury Park and Laleham Park. There are
18 sites overall in this category covering 195 hectares.

c) **Amenity Green Space** - this includes recreation grounds and
other managed (whether well or poorly managed) areas of open
space but not sites used primarily for outdoor sports. There are
96 sites in the Borough covering some 131 hectares.

d) **Children and Young People** - these areas include equipped
play areas, skateboard areas and ball courts. There are 38 sites
in the Borough of which most are within amenity green space
sites. These areas cover some 3.5 hectares.

e) **Outdoor Sports Facilities** - this includes both public and
privately owned sites and includes secondary school playing
fields and golf courses. Water sports are included in a separate
category for this study. There are 56 sites in the Borough
covering 214 hectares.

f) **Allotments** - there are 15 sites across the Borough, although
not all are used for allotment purposes. They cover about 20
hectares. This study has not examined this use in detail as it is
the subject of a separate detailed study by consultants Bridge
IMC whose report (April 2005) has considered issues not only of
need but also the future management and promotion of
allotments and will be reported to Members in due course.
g) **Cemeteries and Churchyards** - studies include this category because of the incidental amenity value often associated with such sites. Demand is of course based entirely on burial space needs and any ‘recreational’ use is incidental to their primary purpose. There are seven cemetery sites in the Borough covering 14 hectares.

h) **Green Corridors** - the study has mapped all statutory public footpaths including the towpath to the River Thames. They provide a valued form of access to open areas as well as an opportunity for exercise and recreation in their own right.

i) **Outdoor Water Sports Facilities** - some water supply reservoirs and extensive areas of former gravel working provide the Borough with large areas of water used for fishing, sailing and other sports. There are sites used for sport covering an area of 471 hectares. Most of the sites are private with no general public access. This excludes the River Thames, which has a 15 mile frontage to Spelthorne.

4.3 In total there are 228 sites in eight categories and in addition there is an extensive network of green corridors. The total amount of land for open space, sport and recreation is 1051 hectares - but nearly half of this is water. Provision in each of these categories and distribution by ward is set out in Appendix B.

4.4 The ward based information in Appendix B shows that, even discounting the figures on water sports provision in wards varies from just 5.93 hectares in Ashford Common ward to 157 hectares in Staines ward. The following points need to be borne in mind:

a) Wards are of varying sizes.

b) Some are wholly urban whereas some have significant areas of open land.

c) Some types of open space are by their nature generally found outside of urban areas eg natural and semi natural green space (sites such as Staines Moor and Laleham Park).

d) Some types of open space are found in just a few locations eg again natural and semi natural green space.

e) The boundaries of wards in many cases do not relate to whole natural communities and boundaries reflect more a need to secure a degree of uniformity in ward population and may result in open space not always being within the wards their natural catchment areas extend to. So for example, the Greenfield Recreation Ground, which is on the edge of the Royal Estate, Staines, which it primarily serves, is not in the Staines South.
ward but in the Riverside and Laleham ward. A schematic map of ward boundaries is set out at Appendix C.

f) Some wards in Spelthorne are also served by open space outside the Borough. For example, the consultation surveys showed that the Country Park at Bedfont Lakes in Hounslow (but abutting the Borough boundary) is used by many residents in the Ashford area.

4.5 Despite these qualifications there are nonetheless clearly some urban wards in particular where provision of open space is much more limited that other locations. The extent and significance of any deficiency is addressed in Section 6, which applies the standards set out in Section 5.

5.0 Set Provision Standards (Step 3)

5.1 PPG 17 expects authorities to set local standards. Local standards are able to reflect local circumstances, demographic profiles of specific areas and the extent of build development compared to open countryside. It expects standards to include quantitative, qualitative and accessibility components. Agreed standards are required to be included in development plans.

5.2 The term ‘standard’ needs to be used with some care. At a simplistic level the concept of a ‘standard’ can be interpreted as implying that any provision above that standard is automatically surplus to requirements and not needed. The surveys undertaken in Spelthorne suggest that whilst many people are satisfied with the level of provision only a fraction of the responses indicated they felt there was too much.

5.3 It is therefore recognised that whilst the concept of ‘standards’ needs to be used, the meaning behind the terms needs to be clear. In the context of the responses received to the adequacy of space in Spelthorne any standard must be regarded as a ‘measure’ of the minimum provision required, rather than a statement of the adequacy in the amount of open space.

5.4 In Appendix D is a table setting out the ‘standard’ or ‘measure’ for each open space type having regard to responses on accessibility (acceptable travel distances) and quality. The ‘standard’ or ‘measure’ is expressed in terms of hectares per 1000 population and the figure taken is the average provision for each type except where no standard is proposed.

5.5 A judgement has been made in the light of the responses given from the opinions surveys that the ‘standard’ or ‘measure’ should broadly reflect the current provision of space per 1000 population. The locational standard, however, defines the catchment areas for existing
sites and enables shortfalls in particular localities to be identified. The following section looks at the application of the standards.

6.0 Applying Standards (Step 4)

6.1 Overall the Borough has a significant area of various types of open space. However, the following analysis of the various open space types does show that in certain parts of the urban areas of the Borough there are significant shortfalls in the provision of amenity green space and children’s and young people’s facilities which need to be in fairly close proximity (400 metres - 5 minutes walk) of residential areas.

6.2 Each of the types is considered below:

a) Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space - with a catchment area of 4 km, all parts of the Borough are well within 4 km of this type of space. The major sites are Staines Common, Laleham Park and Sunbury Park. Many residents also use the Bedfont Lakes Country Park which is an additional local area of semi natural green space, albeit just outside the Borough within Hounslow but which meets the needs of Ashford in particular which otherwise has no sites in this open space type. There is a pedestrian access via Challenge Road off Feltham Road but the access via Clockhouse Lane (with car park) does not have a safe pedestrian route from Spelthorne.

b) Amenity Green Space - this has a critical location requirement. The catchment areas of all such sites have been plotted and there are residential areas of the Borough outside the 400 metre catchment areas. There are also areas of the Borough where there is provision but the amount of amenity green space is limited and below the level of 1.46 hectares per 1000 population. At Appendix E is a plan showing the catchment areas of amenity green space and children’s and young people’s facilities. Appendix F lists the areas with no provision. This list also identifies where deficiencies can be met by the allocation of any additional sites or existing space in other types could or does substantially meet the need for general local open space (amenity green space).

c) Children’s and Young People’s Facilities - there are considerable gaps in the provision across the Borough. However, comparison with areas of amenity green space and account of the location of public sites used primarily but not exclusively for sports, suggests there is scope in land-use terms to substantially meet the gaps in provision on existing open space sites. The feasibility of meeting provision on specific sites depends however on what is required. For example, a toddler play area is relatively small and the nature of this type of facility can enable them to be satisfactorily accommodated on relatively
small areas of amenity green space. But at the other scale of provision, skateboard facilities require particular care because of their size, likely levels of attraction and potential for disturbance to any nearby residential property. The survey also showed that some people do travel more than 400 m to sites and that distance issues may be more critical in those parts of the Borough with greater levels of relative deprivation and less access to private transport. Officers are currently preparing a Play Strategy and will be undertaking further research on this provision. It is recommended that decisions on whether to locate additional children’s facilities on existing sites and the exact form of that provision should be considered in detail in the context of that study with particular regard to the need to make a provision across the Borough for various specific age groups.

The Appendix F does identify a site at Wheatsheaf Lane, Staines which could provide for a shortfall of amenity green space and children’s and young people’s facilities in the south Staines area. It also identifies a site on the south side of the A30 at Ashford on a field to the west of Edward Way, Orchard Way and Desford Way area. Neither site are in the Council’s ownership.

d) Outdoor Sports Facilities - the nature of team sports in particular mean that people have to travel to play other teams and this is an accepted aspect of such recreation. No part of the Borough is outside a 4 km catchment boundary of existing outdoor sports facilities. However, responses suggest an unmet need for junior football and possibly some general unmet demand and desire for additional synthetic turf pitches. A synthetic turf pitch is proposed for Kenyngton Manor recreation ground as part of the Liveability Fund project and there are other existing open space sites where pitches have a limited use or could be re-introduced. This gives some flexibility in meeting demand without the need to acquire new sites. Officers judge that the amount of space available/planned is therefore about right to meet needs, but the particular use of sites and management of site use in response to changes in demand over time, needs ongoing consideration. We agree there is a need for additional provision for junior football which is to be given particular priority. The comments received from the clubs who responded to the survey support the need for a more detailed playing pitch assessment as a tool to ensure available pitch numbers and type match need. Subject to this, and the capacity/flexibility available to already meet some additional demand, no further sports pitch sites (public or private) appear to be needed at present.

e) Allotments - allotment issues have been considered in a more detailed study by Bridge IMC (April 2005). It concluded no additional allotments are needed but action is required to
promote the use of the existing provision. There are also no surplus sites.

f) Cemeteries and Church Yards - the recreational use is incidental to their primary purpose and future demand needs to be assessed in the light of the need for additional burial space. Burial space is a separate issue and not directly relevant to this study but officers are aware that longer term capacity is an issue.

g) Green Corridors - no standard is proposed and neither is there any national guidance on minimum provision. The River Thames is a ‘green corridor’ of particular amenity value in Spelthorne and the towpath has obvious local recreational value as a linear open space as well as its rational role. Its contribution in meeting needs in areas otherwise deficient of other types of open space is relevant. There has been no public response via the surveys seeking additional ‘corridors’ although this does not preclude seeking additional appropriate routes by agreement in the context of new developments or enhancement of Green Belt sites including links to routes outside the Borough.

h) Outdoor Water Sports - the extensive areas of water for a non-coastal authority are generally well in excess of what most generally urban local authorities might expect to have. The figures for Spelthorne do not include the River Thames, half the width of which lies in the Borough. No standards are proposed locally or exist nationally but the contribution to outdoor activities and general amenity need to be recognised although what exists in Spelthorne serves a catchment area well beyond the Borough’s boundary. New sites are only likely to occur as a by-product of further mineral extraction or any possible longer term flood relief proposals. Any recreational use of the resultant water areas would be coincidental to the sites /facilities primary purpose. There is no identified need to create additional water sports areas.

7.0 Quality of Open Space

7.1 As part of the opinion research surveys people were asked about their views on the quality of open space, sport and recreation provision. The consultants also assessed the quality of sites. The main consultants report includes a section on quality under each type and has also considered what quality standards might be set.

7.2 Overall the study has found a mixed picture. The respondents have specifically identified sites which they feel are good (Knowle Green, Laleham Park, Lammas Recreation Ground, Shortwood Common and Sunbury Park) but also a number of sites which are poor (Jordans
Close, Lauser Road, Gorden Road, Preston Road, Lime Crescent, Holywell Way, Shepperton Recreation Ground).

7.3 The consultants own assessment work has identified additional sites which are of a poorer quality (Grovelly Road, Hadrian Way, The Royal Estate).

7.4 Some of the sites referred to above are in parts of the Borough where there are higher levels of deprivation than generally found in Spelthorne and therefore also need to be considered in the wider context of resolving social exclusions.

7.5 Results from both the public and the consultants confirm a mixed position on quality. Other survey work of public opinion by the Council has confirmed general concerns about dog fouling, litter, anti social behaviour and security, which have all emerged in comments made.

7.6 For many of the Council owned sites the activities catered for and the way they are managed and maintained has not changed greatly over many years. There is no explicit management plan for most sites or accompanying maintenance plan to support defined management objectives for those sites. Some management plans have been developed for certain major sites eg Sunbury Park. It is this sort of work which is critical in both determining and then maintaining specific levels of quality to ensure public expectations are met and also ensuring consistency across the Borough.

7.7 The public comments received from the study and the consultants survey work is helpful in understanding the variability of quality and the importance the public attach to it. It will be important that the Council works toward establishing how each of its own sites are managed to meet a range of open space requirements and the standards of maintenance of these to ensure high and consistent quality across the Borough.

7.8 It is recommended that the Council works toward preparing appropriate management plans and maintenance programmes and measures to ensure open space needs are met to appropriate consistent standards across the Borough.

8.0 Indoor Sports and Recreation Provision

8.1 Along side the main audit of open space a secondary audit of indoor sport and recreational facilities has been undertaken. The public’s views on levels of provision have also been sought.

8.2 The audit has looked at:

a) swimming pools
b) sports halls
c) health and fitness
d) synthetic turf pitches (STP’s)
e) athletics tracks
f) racket sports

8.3 The consultants have used a data base they hold of all facilities in this region and set out details on their report of facilities both in Spelthorne and within 3 kilometres of the boundary (1¾ miles). This has enabled provision in Spelthorne to also be understood in the content of facilities in the wider area.

8.4 Each of the categories of provision are dealt with in turn. All facilities whether public, private or dual use have been considered. However, particularly in the case of private facilities such as health clubs the cost of membership, usage and often restrictions against use by children mean that these are exclusive rather than inclusive and in practice preclude a large proportion of the Spelthorne residents. Care is therefore required in simply counting numbers of facilities.

a) **Swimming pools.** Overall there are 9 pools in the Borough of which 2 are public (Spelthorne Leisure Centre and Sunbury Leisure Centre – albeit Sunbury is also used by the Sunbury Manor School), 2 dual use (Bishop Wand School and Matthew Arnold School) and 5 private. While nationally 23% of people participate in swimming, 33% of respondents in the household survey stated that casual swimming is one of the most popular activities for Spelthorne residents. Operational experience at both Council leisure centres confirms high demands for swimming at popular times and challenges in meeting the needs of casual swimmers and clubs. National targets in ‘Game Plan’ are aiming at 50% participation rates by 2020. Future space requirements in part depends on future leisure times patterns and extent to which peak demand periods can be spread and needs therefore managed within existing facilities. It is concluded that, subject to careful management demands can be met and additional space is not needed. It also follows from the evidence in the study and operational experience there is certainly no case for reducing available pool space.

b) **Sports halls.** There are 18 facilities in Spelthorne of which 3 are public (Spelthorne and Sunbury Leisure Centres and Leadcroft Hall), 4 are dual use (Ash Technology College, Bishop Wand, Thamesmead School and Sunbury Manor) and 11 are private/club based. 23% of respondents to the sports club survey felt there should be more sports hall provision and the consultant’s demand showed a need within the wider area. There are new/extended facilities with planning permission/or recently completed at Bishop Wand, Halliford School or Staines Preparatory School. The Councils two leisure centres are at capacity from 3pm-9pm most week days, although there is some
spare capacity during the rest of the day and at weekends. Peak demand coincides with after school periods and when people are not at work. Operationally it is recognised that continuing work on 'peak spreading' with concessionary charges can spread demand. In additional there is scope to provide some capacity by further encouraging dual use of school facilities. Indoor football is a significant user of main halls and 5-a-side astro turf pitches – albeit outdoors, can be an alternative and future provisions of these is likely to be an important part of the equation in managing demand for sports halls. A new astro turf is currently being provided at Kempton Manor Recreation Ground.

c) Health and Fitness. There are 10 facilities in the Borough including 2 public (Spelthorne and Sunbury Leisure Centres), 1 dual use (Matthew Arnold School) and 7 private. One private facility has permission for extension. A number of private facilities have opened in recent years and the consultants work suggest some over supply in that sector but by virtue of price those are only realistically available to a small proportion of the local population. However, the existing facilities at Spelthorne College is due to close and will reduce supply to an extent. The Council’s two fitness suites in its Leisure Centres are busy and an important and integral part of the overall recreational offer at these two sites. Some growth in demand at both site is beginning to emerge despite the level of provision in the private sector. At both sites officers, nevertheless, are satisfied there is currently sufficient flexibility to meet a growth in demand.

d) Synthetic Turf Pitches. There are currently no publicly owned STP’s in Spelthorne although one is to be constructed at Kenyngton Manor Recreation Ground. The three school/club based STPs have, however, each received some Council grant funding to support the wider contributions of each facility to the needs of the community. The club/dual use facilities are at Ashford Sports Association ground in Stanwell, Matthew Arnold School, Staines and Laleham Sports Ground and St Paul’s School. Virtually all league hockey is played on STP’s and a lot of football training also taken place on them. STP’s can be used for many hours a day, 7 days a week and therefore can equate to many grass pitches which are normally only capable of use 23 times a week across the season. Some 33% of respondents to the sports club survey wanted more STP’s free/too?. The Kenyngton Manor proposal will contribute to meeting this need.

e) Athletics Tracks. There are no athletic tracks in Spelthorne and the National Athletics Facilities Strategy 1998-2004 commissioned by the Amateur Athletics Association of England recommends one six lane track per 250,000 people within 30 minutes drive time in urban areas. The nearest facility is at
Stompond Lane in Walton. There was no evidence from the survey to suggest additional facilities were required.

f) **Racket Sports.** Squash facilities are available at four locations (Spelthorne Leisure Centre, Princes Ski Club, Meadhurst Club and Sunbury Sports Association). The only Council squash courts are at the Spelthorne Leisure Centre and are reasonably well used but need refurbishing. Officers are satisfied that the needs of squash are broadly being met and no additional capacity is needed. There are a range of public and private outdoor tennis facilities but not indoor tennis facilities. There are no further planned facilities. Consultation identified a demand for a covered tennis facility but major facilities can be very expensive to provide and whether viable proposals could be developed at a price people are prepared to pay is uncertain. There could be scope operationally for small scale proposals involving covering over existing courts with basic facilities and would not necessarily require new sites. The impact of such structures would need careful assessment and might significantly limit actual potential sites where this is feasible.

8.5 The above details cover a wide range of facilities but many leisure centres and clubs have many of these in single complexes. For certain activities the main halls can be used for a variety of sports and thereby have an inherent flexibility to respond to changing needs.

8.6 The key issues arising from the above information and supporting data in the consultants work are:

a) Despite the large number of sites at which facilities exist availability to the general public is also a function of price and for indoor facilities the Council’s two leisure centres have a crucial role in provision for most people.

b) There is demand for additional provision in a number of sports categories albeit some facilities are very expensive to provide and aspirations for provisions, therefore, do not automatically mean the facilities could be funded or afforded when provided.

c) There has been a significant expansion of indirect facilities generally in recent years mainly at existing sports sites including extensions to existing facilities. Officer’s judgement is that, subject to demand and funding, there is scope for the extension of facilities at various sites and there is no need for the Local Development Framework to identify new sites for any form of indoor sports provision.

d) The finding of the study alongside our own usage data confirms the particular importance and popularity of the Councils two leisure centres in indoor sports provision for local residents.
9.0 **Proposals in the Current Local Plan**

9.1 The current local plan does contain some open space proposals and the study findings provide a basis to assess whether these should be considered for taking forward into the Local Development Framework.

9.2 Unimplemented open space proposals from the Local Plan are:

a) **Children’s equipped playgrounds**;
   
i) Fordbridge Park, Staines (Proposal P28)
   
ii) Holywell Way, Stanwell (Proposal P29)
   
iii) Eastern end of Oakington Drive, Sunbury (Proposal P30)
   
iv) Land at Greeno Crescent, Shepperton (Proposal P31)
   
v) Land adjacent River Ash, off Wellington Road, Ashford – part of Fordbridge Park, north of Staines By-Pass (Proposal P32)
   
vi) Land at Wheatsheaf Lane, Staines (Proposal P33)

b) **River Ash Walk Proposal P34**

c) **Bridleway on south side of Staines Moor Proposal P35**

9.3 **Children’s Equipped Play Grounds** All but the Wheatsheaf Lane proposal are on land owned or managed by the Council. Planning permission is not needed for play equipment on open space sides owned by the Council. There is no land use or planning reason therefore, to include playground proposals in the Local Development Framework unless the site is not already an open space use. For this reason only the Wheatsheaf Lane proposal would need to be taken forward into the Local Development Framework subject to the findings of the play strategy.

9.4 **River Ash Walk - Proposal P34** This proposal reflects a long held aspiration since the 1950’s to create a continuous riverside walk from Staines to Sunbury. Much of the route exists with lengths at Staines from Priory Green to the Fordbridge Roundabout, at Shepperton Studios and from Old Charlton Lane\Nutty Lane to and including Donkey Meadow at Gaston Bridge Road, Shepperton.

9.5 The missing links include a long section from the Fordbridge Roundabout to Shepperton Studios Estate through land adjacent to the Queen Mary Reservoir, Littleton Pumping Station and the gravel processing area associated with the reservoir. There are security issues due to current gravel and water supply facilities as well as nature conservation conflicts given the undisturbed character of this large area. These issues alone are significant and the creation of a fenced route of some 2100 metres could be very costly to construct and maintain.
9.6 This locality near to the Royal Estate is not short of open space as Fordbridge Park and the Green Field Recreation Ground are close by and there are existing footpaths across farmland to the south. The public survey have not revealed a single mention either for the additional paths in this locality or for the proposal.

9.7 The second ‘missing link’ is between Littleton and Nutty Lane of 800 metres. This is a former mineral working area. There are no known nature conservation issues relating to the adjoining land but again the route would be costly to provide and maintain. This locality is not short of accessible open space and the surveys have no revealed any public interest.

9.8 The final link is from Donkey Meadow to Fordbridge Road, Sunbury. At this point there is no Thames towpath on this side of the Thames and the route would come to a dead end. It passes mainly through horticultural and grazing land. Public interest and costs issues are the same as the other sections.

9.9 The sections of ‘walk’ that do exist are used by the residents local to these sections and in some cases link to other paths and open spaces. Their value could not be said to be compromised by them not being part of a longer route and for people wanting extensive riverside walks the Borough has the River Thames. It is recommended this proposal is not carried forward into the LDF. However opportunities will continue to be take to upgrade the corridor if development schemes occur close by where “contributions” can be secured through Section 106 Agreements.

9.10 Bridleway on south side of Staines Moor (Proposal P35). This proposal was intended to link to sections of Bridleway to the west and east of Staines Moor and thereby create a circular route. It originally emerged as a proposal as part of the initiatives associated with the Colne Valley Park.

9.11 As shod horses cannot be ridden on Staines Moor and a bridleway would require a strip of common land immediately to the north side of Staines-by-Pass to be removed from common land status, part of which is also an SSSI. This strip would need to be appropriately surfaced as a bridleway and also a footbridge for horses would need to be constructed over the River Colne.

9.12 There was no mention of the proposal in the surveys undertaken or reference by respondents generally to bridleway facilities in the Borough. The proposal would be very costly with common land and nature conservation implications.
9.13 The study has produced no evidence to justify seeking to take forward such a proposal at the present time, particularly given the known difficulties of implementation.

10.0 Conclusions

10.1 The study has provided the basis for a comprehensive assessment of open space, sport and recreation facilities. Whilst the Borough has a lot of space overall, and has the added benefit of extensive water areas, there are some areas of shortfall of local open space (amenity green space and children and young people facilities in a number of areas).

10.2 ‘Standards’ or ‘measures’ of provision have been identified in the table at Appendix D and are recommended in the next section. These should be used in assessing provision in local areas where development proposals come forward and when formulating policy in Local Development Framework.

10.3 Where there are shortfalls in provision, the availability of sites to make additional premises have been explored. It has been conducted that two sites could go forward for consultation as part of the ‘Issues and Options’ stage of the LDF. Other areas of shortage would be dealt with by a ‘policy’ approach.

a) Part of an open field at Wheatsheaf Lane, Staines (in the Green Belt) is best placed to meet the large area in the south Staines area. This could meet the need for amenity green space and children and young peoples facilities. The ‘measure’ in Appendix D equate to 1.5 hectares of space per 1000 population when both measures are combined. The population in this area outside the catchment area of other open space sites in 2034 (877 residential properties x average household size of 2.32 for the Riverside and Laleham Ward). This equates to a space requirement of 3 hectares. Due to the extensive length of River Thames towpath in this area (although not suitable for unsupervised play by young children) it could be reasonable to reduce the area required by 50% ie. to 1.5 hectares. This site as a whole is 4.17 hectares and therefore only about a third of the northern part nearest Wheatsheaf Lane would be required.

b) Part of an open field to the west of the Edward Way, Orchard Way, Desford Way area south of the A30 in north Ashford. The area is scrub and has some grazing use. This could meet the need for amenity green space and, subject to the findings of the Play Strategy Study, childrens and young peoples facilities. The population within the area without any open space provision within 400 metres of their homes is 1200 people. Some 675 of this population would come within 400 metres of the suggested site and on the basis of 1.5 hectares per 1000 population an
area of 1 hectare could be appropriate. The total site area of this field is 1.9 hectares.

c) The shortfall in children and young peoples facilities should be considered further in the context of the current study for a Play Strategy to establish where and what type of provision can be made on existing public open space. There remain parts of the urban area where there is no or inadequate amenity green space provision and no sites exist which could be identified for future provision. Some areas of shortfall are in areas of relatively high deprivation in the Spelthorne context. It is proposed this should be addressed by:

i) Requiring some additional provision for open space in any redevelopment schemes for housing in or immediately adjoining those areas in addition to the provision of the housing scheme itself might require.

ii) Assessing how the quality of existing sites or sites adjoining areas of shortfall/no provision might be further enhanced to enable a greater quality of provision. This is recommended for assessment in the context of the study of the further management and maintenance of sites generally. The lack of maintenance should not be taken as an incentive to release open space for development purposes. Such an approach cannot be justified by the findings of the study.

10.4 In view of the recommended studies in connection with the Play Strategy and the maintenance and management of sites it needs to be recognised that the need for further proposals for the LDF might arise. Public consultation on the LDF might also reveal particular open spaces issues, including provision of sites requiring further consideration. The recommendations should therefore at this stage be regarded as an interim position.

11.0 Recommendations

11.1 The following recommendations arise from the findings and conclusions of the study:

a) The open space sport and recreation standards set out in Appendix D of this report be agreed for use in the Local Development Framework, determining future planning proposals and informing decisions on the mix of open space use on individual sites.

b) To note the levels of existing open space provision and areas of shortfall in the Borough.
c) The current study into a Play Strategy for Spelthorne considers what type and location of additional provision on existing open space sites be provided.

d) A playing pitch strategy be prepared to assess how demand can best be accommodated on existing sites.

e) A strategy should be prepared to identify the appropriate mix of uses on included sites and to deliver quality standards to ensure high standards and consistency across the Borough.

f) A possible site at Wheatsheaf Lane for amenity green space and, subject to the findings of the Play Strategy, a possible children’s and young peoples facility be consulted on for inclusion in the Local Development Framework.

g) A possible site to the west of Edward Way and south of the A30 in north Ashford for amenity green space and, adjacent to the findings of the Play Strategy, a possible childrens and young peoples facility be consulted on for inclusion of the Local Development Framework,

h) The Local Development Framework to include standards for the provision of open spaces which individual appropriate sized housing schemes and additional provision be required where feasible in and adjoining areas of existing deficiency is currently green space.

i) To note the current local plan proposals that it is considered do not need to be taken forward onto the Local Development Framework or which are not required.
### PUBLIC VIEWS ON THE SUFFICIENCY OF OPEN SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>PUBLIC/STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>70% feel provision is about right (household survey). 28% felt provision was not enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi Natural Green Space</td>
<td>47% feel quantity is about right (household survey). 49% say there is too little, 0% say there is too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>46% feel provision is about right (household survey). 41% say too little, 0.8% say too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
<td>32% feel provision is about right, 60% feel provision is too low. More needed for older children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>32% feel provision is about right. Lack of junior football pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Water Sports</td>
<td>This category was not surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridor</td>
<td>58% thought provision was about right (household survey)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B

#### PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE BY WARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Parks &amp; Gardens</th>
<th>Natural &amp; Semi-Natural Green Space</th>
<th>Amenity Green Space</th>
<th>Children &amp; Young People</th>
<th>Outdoor Sports Facilities</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Cemeteries &amp; Churchyards</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th>Outdoor Water Sports</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford Common</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford East</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford North &amp; Stanwell South</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td>84.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford Town</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliford &amp; Sunbury West</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>69.85</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>97.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleham &amp; Shepperton Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>379.12</td>
<td>430.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside &amp; Laleham</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepperton Town</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>46.38</td>
<td>91.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staines</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>126.78</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staines South</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwell North</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury Common</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury East</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borough Wide Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>194.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>131.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>214.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>581.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>471</strong></td>
<td><strong>1052.67</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision per hectare per 1000 population</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity 'Standard' or 'Measure'</th>
<th>Locational Standard</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td>No standard is propose but the value attached to planted areas in open spaces needs to be considered in the management of individual sites as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5 minutes walk = 0.4 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s and Young Peoples</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>5 minutes walk = 0.4 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td>No standard is proposed. Allotments have been considered in a separate study which has identified a surplus of provision but scope for better marketing and use of allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Church Yards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td>No standard is proposed as any recreational use is incidental to the primary purpose of the sites and need for provision to reflect burial space requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td>No standard is proposed but existing corridors are protected by virtue of being statutory rights-of-way. May be scope for additional corridors in the enhancement of Green Belt sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Water Sports</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 minutes drive by car = 4 km</td>
<td>No standard is proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Areas Deficient of Amenity Green Space and Children’s/Young Peoples Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Ref</th>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>Proposals to Meet Need</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stanwell New Road, Staines</td>
<td>There is access via a signal controlled crossing across the A30 to Shortwood Common which is classified as Natural/Semis Natural Green Space but has short grass and gives scope for general recreation although no additional recreational facilities are or could be provided due to its SSSI status. Need for amenity green space is effectively met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shortwood Avenue, Staines</td>
<td>Pedestrian access available from Shortwood Avenue onto Shortwood Common – see comments above. Need for amenity green space is effectively met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ashford- around Stanwell Road immediately south of A30</td>
<td>No remaining open land within this urban area. Ash Technology College playing fields lie immediately to the east of this area and a field adjoining that. The field, which adjoins Edward Way has some grazing and part could be used for open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Edward Way, Orchard Way, Desford Way Ashford</td>
<td>No remaining open land within this urban area. Field to the west could be used for open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harrow Road</td>
<td>No remaining open land within this small urban area. Adjoining the area is a small industrial area identified in the Housing Capacity study and with potential to also include an area of open space to meet both the needs of any residential use of that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site and of Harrow Road. Open space provision should be pursued in the context of this scheme. The use of the field to the west of Edward Way could make a limited contribution to the needs of this area but is just over 400 metres away.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>South Staines- Penton Road – Wheatsheaf Lane area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a fairly extensive area. Adjoining the Thames to the south of this area are two area of amenity green space - Silvery Sands and Penton Hook - but being adjacent to the river they are unsuitable for unsupervised play for younger children. This means there is a large area of south Staines with no Amenity Green Space or Children’s and Young Peoples Space. The area is characterised by larger houses, houses with larger gardens or flats in landscaped grounds. The River Thames towpath provides an extensive are of linear open space/.green corridor and, in part, mitigates to an extent the shortage of open areas. The Local Plan had a proposal for an equipped children’s play are on the north edge of an open field on the south side of Wheatsheaf Lane (Proposal P33). The site is used for grazing. The site is designated Green Belt and is liable to flood therefore there is no prospect of development. Provision of Amenity Green Space and some provision for children at this site could meet the needs of a substantial part of this south Staines area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Central Ashford</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is an extensive area centred on Church Road Ashford and extending up to the railway line and down to the northern boundary of Ashford Golf Club. The only undeveloped areas are the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ashford Road - Cambridge Road (South of A308)</td>
<td>The only undeveloped area within this locality is land either side of the Thames Waters Reservoir Aqueduct. Because of the potential dangers of the aqueduct alternative use of any part of this site for open space could only realistically be contemplated if the reservoir aqueduct were no longer needed and could be filled in. There have been proposals in the past to replace the aqueduct by a deep bore pipe but there are currently no proposals by Thames Water to pursue this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chertsey Bridge Road</td>
<td>Dumsey Meadow is opposite this housing area - site is categorised as Natural/Semi Natural green space which can not be altered due to its SSSI status and use for grazing. But the site does provide open space including a frontage to the River Thames – the north part of the site near the car park is some distance from the river. The needs of this small area are therefore effectively met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Towpath Shepperton</td>
<td>Low density housing area with large gardens adjoining the River Thames with extensive towpath on this bank. Nature of the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chertsey Road, Shepperton</td>
<td>This is small area on the western end of old Shepperton Village. It is about 500 metres from nearby open space. There is a fishing lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>West Shepperton Town – Manor Farm Avenue, Shepherds Close, Shepperton Court Drive</td>
<td>Immediately to the north and the River Thames some 500 metres to the south. There is a restored gravel pit to the south of Chertsey Road. This urban area has no undeveloped land within it. It is between 400 and 550 metres from nearby open space. To the south is a green corridor (Blackditch) and to the north of Laleham Road adjoining the M3 is a fields in agricultural use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>East of Walton Bridge Road, Shepperton</td>
<td>This is a small residential area to the east side of Walton Bridge Road. Bishop Duppas Park is within 400 metres but is on the west side of Walton Bridge Road. Limiting issues is the busyness of the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Old Upper Halliford Road Area adjacent to Halliford Halt</td>
<td>This area has no undeveloped land within it. Halliford Park is opposite and within 400 metres of the whole area but involves crossing a busy road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Highfield Road, Tadmore Close, Upper Halliford</td>
<td>This is a small residential area virally abutting the catchment areas of open space both to the west and east.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Broomfield area south of Sunbury Station and Park Road area north of the A308.</td>
<td>This is an area in the northern part of Lower Sunbury. There are no undeveloped areas within it but St Paul’s School, London Irish grounds, Kempton Park and the Kempton Cricket Club (Lazards) sports ground adjoin the area. The first three sites to not have visibility from public roads or open land immediately adjoining them which is not used. The Kempton Cricket Club (Lazards) sports ground does have an open frontage to the Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>