SECTION 8

PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE
Provision for children and young people

Children and Young People’s Play Spaces in Surrey Heath Settlement Areas

Bagshot
- Albert Road
- Whitmoor Road
- Freemantle Road Play Space
- Connaught Play Area
- College Ride Play Area
- School Lane Play Area

Bisley
- Clews Lane Play Area
- Multi Use Games Area, Recreation Ground
- Teen Shelter

Camberley
- Orchard Way
- Clarence Drive Play Space
- Old Dean Road/Upland Road
- Bentley Copse
- Maguire Drive
- Wellington Park, Portsmouth Road
- Camberley Park, Townside Place
- London Road Recreation Ground
- Old Dean Recreation Ground (including BMX track)
- Watchetts Recreation Ground
- Lorraine Road
- Martel Close Play Area
- Crabtree Park Play Area, Skate Park & Teen Shelter
- Dawnay Road Play Area
- Old Dean Teen Shelter
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- Deanside Play Area

**Chobham**
- Chobham Recreation Ground
- Teen Shelter

**Deepcut**
- Woodend Road Recreation Ground
- Suffolk Court Play Area & Cyprus Road Play Area (Alma-Dettingen)

**Frimley**
- Frimley High Street Recreation Ground
- Chobham Road Recreation Ground
- Burrell Road Play Area

**Frimley Green**
- Frimley Green Recreation Ground
- AGS off Cross Lane Allotments

**Lightwater**
- Lightwater Country Park
- Briars Centre
- Lightwater Recreation Ground Play Area

**Heatherside & Parkside**
- Heatherside Recreation Ground
- Amber Hill Play Area
- Evergreen Road
- Cheylesmore Park
- Heathside Park Play Area

**Mytchett**
- Frimley Lodge Park
- Loman Road
- Mytchett play area and skate facility, Hamesmoor Road
- Basingstoke Canal Centre Play Area
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St Michaels
- London Road Recreation Ground Play Area

St Pauls
- Wellington Park playgrounds (x2)

West End
- Streets Heath Play Area
- Rosewood Way Playground & Basketball Area
- Benner Lane Playground
- Bolding House Lane Play Area
- Field to the North of the War Memorial
- Teen Shelter

Windlesham
- Windmill Field
- Kings Lane
- Field of Remembrance Play Area

Definition
8.1 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.

Strategic context
8.2 The Local Plan states that the enhancement of play space and outdoor sport facilities will be encouraged and outlines the Council’s intention to secure new opportunities for the provision of play space, where possible, to address identified need.

8.3 A current standard of one tenth of the total site area is set out for provision of open space and recreation within new housing development sites of five hectares and over. Provision of equipped play space is expected on new housing development
sites of 1 hectare and above or where there is a net increase of 20 or more dwellings. The required area for casual/equipped children's play space is assessed on the basis of 21m$^2$ per 2-bed dwelling, 28 m$^2$ per 3-bed dwelling and 35 m$^2$ per 4-bed dwelling.

8.4 The Leisure and Cultural Strategy 2003-2008 has been developed after consultation with the general public. Provision for children and young people has emerged as one of the areas in need of development, particularly improved play provision for the over 8 years age group. Interest group meetings and young consultees considered facilities for young people such as sports walls, teen shelters and skate parks to be the highest priorities for the strategy action plan.

8.5 Key aims set out in the strategy action plan were to:

- ensure an effective network of play and leisure services for children and young people
- update the strategy for children and young people’s formal play facilities in the Borough
- identify improved facilities for young people including skate parks, teen shelters, sports walls, goals and basketball hoops

8.6 SHBC Leisure Officers are currently working on a new Play Strategy to roll objectives forward for the next ten years. As part of an improvement plan for play space, it seeks to:

- develop facilities for teenagers within parks
- reduce the problem of dog fouling
- refurbish principal playgrounds to provide greater challenge and play opportunities
- improve access to playspace
- investigate the value of small play areas

Current position and consultation

8.7 The Council currently maintains 27 equipped children’s play areas. One more is expected to be adopted in 2008.

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

- 83% of household survey respondents consider provision for children and young people to be important to them
- 21% of those using this type of open space most frequently do so on a weekly basis, with the most popular children's play areas visited being Lightwater Country Park and Frimley Lodge Park
- the most commonly stated reasons for use were to take children out, use play equipment and to take fresh air
- there is a need to provide more challenging play experiences for children aged 8 years and over
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- there is a perceived lack of provision of open space for young people and children, particularly teenagers and young adults and identified deficiencies in St. Michael’s Ward and Chobham and Bisley parishes.
- there are some qualitative and maintenance issues to be addressed
- amenity green space is recognised as making a significant contribution to the casual play facilities available for children.
- West End Parish Council and Bisley Parish Council have recently added to their facilities by developing teen shelters. Chobham Parish Council has also converted a bus shelter at the junction of Bowling Green Road and Windsor Road to provide a teen shelter. A Multi-Use Games Area has also been provided on Bisley Recreation Ground.

Setting provision standards

8.9 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, sites assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices K, L and M.

Quantity

8.10 The audit has been based on site area rather than number of play areas and therefore a local standard has been set in terms of hectares per 1,000 population.

8.11 From the audit, the current provision for children and young people is 4.32 ha in total across the Borough. The current provision for children and young people per 1,000 head population therefore equates to 0.05 ha. The provision of play space by ward is included in Appendix G.

8.12 The main national standard for the provision of children and young people comes from the NPFA six 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 but this also includes amenity green space.

8.13 There is a division of public opinion although views generally suggest that provision of children’s play areas is currently inadequate with 46% overall considering provision to be ‘not enough’ and a higher proportion of household survey respondents giving this view in each of the three analysis areas.

8.14 In the urban area (Analysis Areas 1 and 2), 47% of respondents suggested that current levels of provision were ‘not enough’ compared to 38% who considered provision levels to be ‘about right’. In the rural area (Analysis Area 3), 45% suggested that current provision was ‘not enough’ compared to 40% who considered it ‘about right’.

8.15 Current provision ranges from 0.04 to 0.07 across the three analysis areas. This equates to 11 play areas in Analysis Area 1, 17 in Analysis Area 2 and 24 in Analysis Area 3. The current level is lower than the NPFA standard for children’s playing space, 0.2 ha per 1,000 population, although other national standards focus more on accessibility levels.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL STANDARD

0.08 ha per 1,000 population
8.16 Local standards set in other local authority PPG17 studies suggest a standard of 0.2 to 0.75 ha with most being around the 0.2 to 0.3 ha mark. Community feedback received and benchmark standards indicate that the local standard for Surrey Heath should be higher than 0.05 ha. However there may be some differences between local authorities in the way casual play space is classified. For instance its primary use may be as amenity green space therefore the total provision of play space should be viewed in combination with the provision of other types of open space particularly amenity open land but also natural semi natural space. The latter two types of open space may also provide an important means of recreation for children and young people. In this study the boundaries have been drawn tightly around actual play equipment and any surrounding green space designated as amenity green space except where it is recognised the wider area is intended exclusively for children. Further an area standard does little in indicating the quality and type of equipment provided at individual sites. The quality of spaces is considered in Para. 8.19.

8.17 There does though appear to be an under-provision of play space in certain parts of the urban area compared to rural parts of the Borough. Play space in Area 1 is mainly concentrated upon a small number of “magnet” sites in Old Dean. Area 2 has a far greater number of sites but many of these are very small providing only basic provision. It would be appropriate to set a local standard of 0.08 ha with the highest contribution needing to come from urban areas. This takes account of other local authority benchmarks, that there is a need to improve provision, and that the scale of future housing development limits the number of new play spaces which can be expected to come forward.

8.18 It should be noted that a current concern of the Council is the increasing and unsustainable cost of replacing children's play spaces and equipment. The context of an increase in provision of play areas would depend on local needs ie teenage provision versus provision for younger age groups as well as accessibility levels. The content of play areas would depend on need as well as the latest thinking as the Play Strategy develops, given the problems and expense the Council faces with provision and maintenance of equipped play areas. Notwithstanding these considerations, there is scope to achieve an increase in play equipment, primarily within the urban area.

Quality

8.19 LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs indicate quality aspirations in terms of providing seating for adults, a varied range of equipment and teenager meeting places.

8.20 Overall the quality of play areas across the Borough is rated as good. Of those sites rated in the audit and assessment of sites, 77% are considered to be good (54%) or very good (23%). The highest ranked sites to be viewed as examples of good practice are:

- Orchard Way Playspace (Site ID 15)
- Windmill Field Play Area (Site ID 255)
- Camberley Park Play Area (Site ID 177)
- Clews Lane Play Area (Site ID 138)
- Frimley Recreation Ground Play Area (Site ID 209)
- Frimley Lodge Park Play Area (Site ID 77).
8.21 Although no sites were rated as poor in the local assessments, the following are believed to be average quality:

- Connaught Play Area (Site ID 250)
- Freemantle Road Play Area (Site ID 248)
- Loman Road Play Area (Site ID 242)
- Briar Avenue Play Area (Site ID 228)

8.22 Consultation indicated that ‘Streets Heath’ play area at Benner Lane, West End, is in need of modernisation. West End Parish Council has set aside an amount in its annual budget to carry out the necessary refurbishment and replacement work.

8.23 Children’s play equipment at Bisley Recreation Ground is inspected regularly and has been recently upgraded. Resurfacing of the multi-use games area at this site is currently underway.

8.24 Kings Lane Play Area owned by Windlesham Parish Council is overshadowed by trees and is therefore sometimes difficult to manage. Due to physical constraints with the play area situated close to a busy road, this site is not as well used as other sites.

8.25 Minor incidences of broken glass, vandalism and anti-social behaviour at children’s play areas were highlighted during consultation but these problems are generally quickly addressed.

8.26 Of those using this type of open space most frequently, approximately one in five people considered vandalism and graffiti (19%), dog fouling (17%) and litter (16%) to be a problem. A further third identified each of these issues as minor problems.

8.27 Through the consultation and household questionnaires the highest rated aspirations for the provision of children and young people were clean and litter free, facilities for young people, varied equipment, toilets and seating.

8.28 A suggested quality vision standard for provision of children and young people should therefore include elements of these aspirations to meet the needs of the public.

### QUALITY VISION

“A site providing a mix of well-maintained formal equipment and enriched play environment in a safe and secure convenient location close to housing that includes clean, litter and dog free areas for more informal play and seating for adults.”

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

- LAPs - 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 – aged a minimum of 5 years; minimum areas of 400m² or within 5 minutes walking time of pedestrian routes
• NEAPs – aged a minimum of 8 years; minimum area of 1000m$^2$ and should be located within 15 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes.

8.30 Accessibility to facilities for children and young people within the Borough is high. Of those sites rated, 66% are considered to have very good accessibility and a further 27% are rated as good. No sites are perceived to have poor access but the following site was given an average accessibility rating:

• Woodland Road Play Area (Site ID 79).

8.31 A new item of play equipment has recently been ordered for Streets Heath Play Area in West End. The ‘Talking Bob’ is an interactive piece of equipment for use by those with a disability.

8.32 Of those household survey respondents who selected amenity green space as the type of open space they use most frequently, 90% were found to be satisfied or very satisfied with accessibility on foot. 75% were found to be satisfied or very satisfied with accessibility for pushchairs or wheelchairs and accessibility by public transport. A high proportion also expressed good levels of satisfaction with visibility of site entrances (82%) and signage (73%).

8.33 From the household survey the general perception is that a travel time of up to 10 minutes is reasonable. The majority of people indicated that they would expect to walk to provision for children and young people. Of those using this type of open space most frequently, 63% travel on foot and 48% walk up to 10 minutes.

8.34 We recommend a local accessibility standard of a 10 minute walk time is set, in line with public perceptions, current behaviour patterns and local authority benchmarks.

Applying provision standards – Identifying geographical areas

8.35 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we can apply both the quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards identify areas where provision does not meet the minimum standard and the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

8.36 There are many deficiencies of provision for children and young people with all areas falling below the minimum recommended quantitative standard. Analysis Area 2 is the best provided for with 18 sites and Map 8.1 below also illustrating that there is a good geographical spread of play areas in this part of the Borough.

8.37 When applying quantity and accessibility standards therefore it is possible to see that the deficiencies are concentrated in specific geographical areas as shown overleaf.
8.38 The mapping of accessibility catchments identifies a corridor settlement in Analysis Area 1 that is outside of the recommended 10 minute walk time of provision for children and young people. This corridor stretches from the east of St Michaels through Watchetts, and up to St Pauls (as shown by ‘zone a’ on Map 8.1). As described in Section 7 (Amenity Green Space), Analysis Area 1 is above the recommended minimum quantity standard for amenity green space and almost all of the area of deficiency for provision for children and young people falls within the suggested accessibility standard for this type of open space. It is therefore recommended that opportunities for development of children’s play facilities on existing amenity green space sites are explored.

8.39 Other key areas falling outside of the recommended walk time of provision for children and young people:

b. Snows Ride area (Windlesham): the residential area bounded by London Road, School Road and Snows Ride.

c. Area between Mytchett Road and Grayswood Drive (Mytchett and Deepcut).

d. The northern part of Chobham.

**Snows Ride**

8.40 Although residents in the Snows Ride area do not live either within the recommended catchment for provision for children and young people or a 15 minute walk of natural and semi-natural open space, this part of the Borough is within the recommended accessibility catchment of two small amenity green spaces - Open Space on Bosman’s Drive (Site ID 127) and Open Space on Highwayman’s Ridge (Site ID 128).
There is significant overlap in the catchments of these two sites. The Open Space on Highwayman’s Ridge is the larger site at 0.46 ha and it is recommended that the potential for development of children’s play facilities is explored.

**Mytchett and Deepcut**

8.41 The southern area of Mytchett and Deepcut ward lies within the recommended walk time of amenity green space and natural and semi-natural open space but outside of the suggested catchment for allotments. This residential area is in close proximity to Mytchett Community Centre. Whilst, there is some resistance from the Mytchett Centre for improvements in this area, it is recommended that opportunities to develop children’s play provision at this site are further investigated.

**Chobham**

8.42 The northern part of the village of Chobham lies outside the suggested catchment area of the play equipment at Chobham Recreation Ground. It is recommended that opportunities to develop children’s play provision in this area, such as on existing amenity green spaces or on playing fields away from any intensive sporting use, are further investigated.

**Value assessment – identifying specific sites**

8.43 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 from the audit assessments or in a more complex way by assessing quality, accessibility and usage levels.

8.44 There are four sites providing facilities for children and young people within the Borough which score very highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage:

- Lightwater Country Park (Site ID 283)
- Camberley Park Play Area (Site ID 177)
- Orchard Way Play Space (Site ID 15)
- Frimley Recreation Ground Play Area (Site ID 209)
- Frimley Lodge Park Play Area (Site ID 77).

8.45 A further five sites are considered good in terms of quality and accessibility and have significant usage:

- Rosewood Way Play Area (Site ID 235)
- Old Dean Road Play Area (Site ID 180)
- Clews Lane Play Area (Site ID 138)
- Mytchett Recreation Ground Play Area (Site ID 236)
- Frimley Lodge Park Play Area 2 (Site ID 239).
8.46 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community. Those ranked highly on all counts should be recognised as examples of best practice and set the benchmark for the Borough’s play provision.

8.47 Loman Road Play Area (Site ID 242) is considered to have very good access and to be highly used despite being average quality. Similarly, Evergreen Road Play Space (Site ID 53) is rated highly in terms of quality and usage but average for accessibility factors.

8.48 High usage demonstrates that the sites in section 8.47 are important local facilities and need to be protected. Quality and accessibility, as appropriate, should be enhanced as a matter of priority to ensure that these sites deliver maximum value to the community and that good levels of usage are maintained.

8.49 Four sites with an average quality rating have good access and are used often. One further site is good quality and used often but ranked as average in terms of accessibility.

8.50 Accessibility and quality factors at these four sites should be addressed to promote optimum usage.

**Capital costs and annual maintenance**

**Provision for young adults**

8.51 A demand for enhanced provision for young people, particularly older age groups, has been identified through a strategic review as well as detailed consultation specific to this study. Informal recreation provision can take the form of basketball goals, half pipes for BMX and skateboarding, teen shelters and kickabout areas.

8.52 The existing provision for recreation provision for young adults in Surrey Heath is set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skateboard</th>
<th>BMX Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mytchett Recreation Ground</td>
<td>- Old Dean Recreation Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Crabtree Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Trim Trials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- there are tarmaced basketball areas at Old Dean Recreation Ground Lightwater Leisure Centre West End Recreation Ground</td>
<td>- Frimley Lodge Park - Lightwater Country Park - Crabtree Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a basketball goal is also provided at Rosewood Way Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-line Skating</th>
<th>Multi Use Game Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mytchett Recreation Ground</td>
<td>- Lightwater Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Crabtree Park</td>
<td>- Tomlinscote Dual-Use Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bisley Recreation Ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.53 Surrey Heath Borough Council completed two new skate parks at Mytchett Recreation Ground and Crabtree Park in Camberley in 2004. These skateboard parks were built in response to many requests from local skaters. Each skate park has a “half pipe” ramp and other features.

8.54 As a result of the new skate park developments, provision for young adults in the western part of the Borough has markedly improved. The Crabtree Park facility is set in a location suitable for limiting the impact from noise or nuisance arising through “spilling out” of activity into neighbouring streets. Notwithstanding this advantage, the site is relatively inaccessible for daily practice and may incur expense for users in reaching it. There is currently no evidence as to whether these facilities in Camberley and Mytchett do not meet the needs of young adults in the eastern part of the Borough.

8.55 We have also set out below best practice industry guidance relating to site selection and facility management and maintenance for youth provision. RoSPA has produced wide-ranging guidelines relating to the provision of skateboard parks. These supplement the recently issued Publicly Available Specification 35 (PAS 35) by the British Standards Institute. Whilst the location of any new skateboard park is likely to be strongly influenced by land availability, there are a number of key criteria for consideration including:

- ensuring the facility is overlooked
- making sure that there is good access for emergency vehicles
- achieving clear separation from traditional play equipment
- ensuring it is not near trees.

8.56 It is important to adhere to best practice guidance and PAS 35 due to the hazardous nature of skateboarding. RoSPA normally assess all skateboard parks as being high risk and the following of industry regulations ensures that any claims of negligence are likely to be largely reduced. It is not just the initial construction of the skateboard park that will ensure negligence claims are largely negated. The park will need to be inspected at least once a week to ensure it is in good working order whilst minimum public liability cover of at least £2,000,000 is recommended.

8.57 However, minimising the risk of accidents is not simply a case of adherence to key regulations. It is essential to ensure that users wear the correct safety gear, especially as the majority of users are likely to be 13 or 14 year old boys. Of course, the installation of a skateboard park will offer a safer facility with more control to the local authority, thereby reducing the risk of accidents.
8.58 Sport England published capital costings for the development of community sports facilities are based on the cost of providing good quality sports facility for 1st Quarter 2005. These costs are based on schemes recently funded through the Lottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Facility details</th>
<th>Costs/£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>40m x 18m</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use games area (MUGA)</td>
<td>40m x 18m</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.59 Recommended annual maintenance costs published by RoSPA for skate parks are as follows:

- 10-12% of original capital cost of steel facilities for annual maintenance
- 12-14% of original capital cost of timber facilities for annual maintenance
- 10% of original capital cost of concrete facilities for annual maintenance.

**Provision for Children’s play areas**

8.60 The Council seeks to ensure that there are adequate resources to keep children’s play spaces adequately maintained, safe and attractive. However, a current concern of the Council is the increasing and unsustainable cost of replacing children’s play spaces and equipment. It is anticipated that the costs of replacement and renewal will continue to rise as new residential development generates demand for more provision of open space for children across the borough.

8.61 It is the Council’s intention that new housing development should make adequate provision for open space that includes children’s play areas. In areas of deficiency, it is important that demand from new housing development does not exacerbate existing under provision. Requirements for the provision of children’s play space in association with new housing developments are set out in Local Plan policies H20, H21 and H22.

8.62 According to Policy H20, housing developments of 20 dwellings or more can provide their own children’s playing space within the site. However, where an existing children’s playing space is accessible from a proposed large housing site, the Council may require the improvement or enhancement of this playing space rather than the provision of a new facility at the new development.

8.63 For small housing developments in areas of children’s playing space deficiency, Policy H22 proposes that the Council will require commuted payments to contribute to play space improvements in the vicinity. The basis for seeking financial contributions is that the cumulative effect of even small residential development creates a very large demand for children’s playing space.

8.64 The Council intends to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in due course to support the implementation of these policies, or the policies likely to replace them as part of the new LDF. The document could specify the areas to which the scheme will apply, the payments to be made based on the children’s playing space requirement, and estimated standard costs, and the programme of playing space improvements to be funded by the payments.
8.65 A Programme of Potential Works will form an essential part of the Supplementary Planning Document. These commuted payments will part-fund programmed improvements to existing equipped play areas or provide new equipped play areas, and also part-fund the amenity green space often provided with equipped play areas.

8.66 Prior to the completion of any SPD and Programme of Potential Works, consideration needs to be given to the scale of off-site financial contributions that may be required within a small residential development. We have set out below a worked example showing a proposed methodology for the way in which financial contributions for off-site provision of children’s play space may be calculated.

8.67 Financial contributions for LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs can be calculated on an individual basis, as the lay out costs for each equipped play space type will differ. Standard mid-point price range capital costings for lay out of equipped play space types are used in the example below, sourced from current Surrey Heath Borough Council costings. The costs include supply, delivery, installation and impact absorbing surface where necessary. If some new spaces are bought, instead of being secured on new housing sites granted planning permission, then the cost of acquiring land will also have to be included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPFA Type</th>
<th>Cost/£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAP (activity zone a minimum of 100 m² in area)</td>
<td>21,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP (activity zone a minimum of 400 m² in area)</td>
<td>49,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAP (activity zone a minimum of 1000 m² in area)</td>
<td>65,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Surrey Heath Borough Council (2007)

8.68 Playing equipment is considered to have an eight-year average lifespan. In terms of maintenance and replacements costs for playing surfaces:

- 10-15% per annum needs to be set aside for replacement of ‘loose bark’ surfaces (approximately £32 per square metre)
- £60-£70 per annum for repairs and maintenance to rubber surfaces.

8.69 Specimen maintenance costs for each NPFA type are set out below, sourced from the Surrey Heath Borough Council. This is meant solely as a guide and must be interpreted in light of individual circumstances. It does however present a ballpark annual cost (excluding VAT) for consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPFA Type</th>
<th>Cost per annum/£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAP (activity zone a minimum of 100 m² in area)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP (activity zone a minimum of 400 m² in area)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAP (activity zone a minimum of 1000 m² in area)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space (per hectare)</td>
<td>1,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Surrey Heath Borough Council
Worked Example 1.

Calculation of Commuted Payments for off-site provision of Children’s Playing Space Contributions

Step One: Calculate Number of Residents /Occupancy

Proposal: The example considers a development proposal for 11 residential units comprising of 2, 3 and 4-bedroom units.

Assumption – The expected occupancy of the development is first estimated. For the purposes of this calculation, there is an assumed occupancy of 2.48 residents per dwelling equivalent to the average household occupancy for the Borough.

Two bed dwelling = 11 dwellings x 2.48 residents

Total No.of Residents = 27

Step Two: Calculate Current Costings Per Resident for Equipped Play Space and Amenity Green Space

Assumption 1 – The Local Standard for children’s play areas in Surrey Heath has been set at 0.08 ha per 1000 population (0.8 m² per person). The Local Standard for amenity green space in the urban area is 0.9 ha per 1,000 population (9 m² per person).

Assumption 2 – Calculation of costs per resident will include the total estimated layout and maintenance costs of the equipped play space and the maintenance of the amenity green space from Surrey Heath Borough Council guidance.

Assumption 3 – Commuted sums will be assessed on cost estimates for a LEAP and amenity green space as the area is deficient in these forms of play space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPFA Type</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost £</th>
<th>Cost £ per m² (layout + maintenance)</th>
<th>Cost £ per Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAP (400m²)</td>
<td>49,536 (layout) + 8,000/yr x 20 yrs (maintenance)</td>
<td>123.84 (layout) + 400 (20 yrs maintenance) = 523.84</td>
<td>523.84 x 0.8 = 419.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>1,831/ha/yr (maintenance)</td>
<td>3.66 (20 yrs maintenance)</td>
<td>3.66 x 9 = 32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>452.01</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step Three: Calculate Commuted Sums Per Dwelling

Cost per dwelling = Cost per resident x 2.48 (i.e. 2.48 residents per unit)

LEAP + amenity green space = £452.01 x 2.48 = £1,121

Total Commuted sum for 11 dwellings for LEAP = £12,331
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Housing Projections and Financial Contributions for 2006 - 2026

8.71 One possible strategy for the provision of children’s play is that, in areas of need, larger developments could include the facility within the site, which could be owned and maintained privately, or adopted by the Council subject to adequate maintenance payments. Alternatively commuted payments could be made to assist the maintenance and replacement and renewal of existing play areas where they are in the catchment area of the development. Smaller developments could make commuted payments to fund new facilities in areas of need, or to contribute to the replacement and renewal of existing facilities.

8.72 Given current concern over the costs of replacement and renewal, it is instructive to examine what scope there is for new housing development to fund children’s play facilities over the next 20 years. The following worked example uses Surrey Heath housing projections for the period 2006 - 2026 in order to calculate an estimated total of potential financial contributions for the replacement and renewal of, and limited provision of new, children’s play equipment.

Surrey Heath estimated total gross housing requirement for 2006-2026

Total potential gross dwellings (2006-2026) = 4,296 dwellings. This is based on an assumed net requirement in this period of 3,740 dwellings. The number of gross completions in 2006/7 is 295 which leaves the estimated gross dwellings in 2007-2026 to be 4,001.

Asset replacement & maintenance schedule

The Council’s total asset replacement schedule for children’s play space is estimated to be a total of £1,471,300 for the period 2007-2026.

The Council’s current asset maintenance is £172,000 per year, and will be a total of £3,268,000 for the period 2006 - 2026. Total asset replacement and maintenance = £4,739,300.

It should be noted that these costs only apply to the Council and do not take account of the costs of facilities maintained by other organisations such as the Parish Councils.

Scenario 1

This scenario describes the lower end of what funding could be forthcoming from housing developments. Of the total number of dwellings, an estimated 43% can be expected to come forward in the form of sites of 20 units plus. This scenario assumes that these developments would directly provide new play equipment and, in some cases, amenity green space. Therefore, under Scenario 1, 57% of new developments could require commuted payments in respect of small housing schemes (1-19 units) to contribute to children’s play space improvements in the vicinity.

The level of payments will be related to the needs arising directly from the proposed housing scheme. The Council intends for priority to be given to providing larger NEAPs and LEAPs in Surrey Heath. For the purposes of this example, the commuted sums for the layout and maintenance of a LEAP for a 2-bed room dwelling (as calculated in example 1) will be used as an estimate.
Total number of dwellings to offer commuted sums (2006-2026) = 57% of 4,001 dwellings = 2,281 dwellings.

Cost per dwelling (LEAP + amenity green space) = £1,121

**Total commuted sums for children’s play space in the whole Borough (2006-2026) = 2,281 x £1,121 = £2,557,001.**

Given that typically 84% of dwellings can be expected to be constructed in the west of the Borough where most of the Council’s play facilities are located, then approximately £2,557,001 x 84% = £2,147,881 could contribute to the Council’s replacement costs.

### Scenario 2

This second scenario describes the higher end of what funding could be forthcoming from housing developments. It assumes that all dwellings of 2-bed plus could make commuted payments. In practice this is not likely to be achieved as some larger developments will opt to make direct provision on site. Past trends show that 93% of all dwellings could be 2-beds+ and therefore will provide a commuted payment.

Therefore, 93% (3,721 dwellings) of the total 4,001 dwellings will provide commuted sums for children’s play space.

Cost per dwelling (LEAP) = £1,121 assuming that there will be a range of dwellings.

**Total commuted sums for children’s play space (2006-2026) = 3,721 x £1,121 = £4,171,241.**

Approximately (£4,171,241 x 84%) = £3,501,842 could be available from developments in the west of the Borough to contribute to the Council’s replacement costs.

### Conclusions

In both scenarios, as outlined above, the total estimated financial contributions for children’s play space (2007 – 2026) will not be sufficient to fund the Council’s current asset replacement and maintenance schedule. However, a substantial contribution could be made.

### Priorities for Children’s Play Space Provision

8.73 As part of the Council’s Programme for Potential Works, priority will be given to providing larger NEAPs and LEAPs within the minimum walking distances as specified in the local standards.

8.74 There is currently demand for new LEAPs in St Michael's ward and in the vicinity of Southcote Park. All of the existing equipment, with a few exceptions such as Alma-Dettingen Barracks, Old Dean Road and Camberley Park, need replacement.

8.75 In view of the future available financial contributions to fund off-site provision of children’s play areas, rationalisation of LAPs may be required.
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Sports facilities

Definition

9.1 The assessment of sports facilities covers both outdoor sports facilities as per the PPG17 typology and indoor sports facilities.

9.2 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.

9.3 In terms of Indoor Sports Facilities, the PPG17 Companion Guide indicates that the minimum range of ‘core’ facilities for which planning authorities should undertake local assessments is:

- those facilities which require large, bulky buildings and are intended to generate high levels of use, to include swimming pools, indoor sports halls and leisure centres, indoor bowls centres, indoor tennis centres and ice rinks
- community centres (in urban areas) and village halls (in rural areas)

9.4 This recommendation is based on the clear rationale that those facilities requiring a sizeable site are likely to attract a large number of users or will generate significant environmental impacts. Smaller facilities, such as village halls and community centres, will also be important in residential neighbourhoods and rural areas. As such, assessing the need for them is seen to be essential in order to help promote sustainable communities. Other relatively small facilities are deemed to be less important as their land requirements are limited and they tend to be associated with larger facilities.

9.5 The assessment of indoor facilities differs to other PPG17 typologies in that specific demand modelling can be undertaken in line with nationally accepted Sport England parameters.
Outdoor Sports Facilities

Local context

9.6 A Playing Pitch Strategy Survey was carried out in 2003 with local schools and football clubs. There was a limited response from nine out of 27 schools and 15 out of 30 football clubs contacted. A growth in girl’s football and associated demand for suitable changing accommodation was identified. Other specific responses from individual clubs/schools can be summarised as follows:

- Camberley Town Football Club and Mytchett Athletic identified the need for additional full size football pitches
- Two football clubs, Mytchett Athletic and Frimley Green Girls and Boys highlighted a requirement for additional small sized 7-a-side pitches
- Chobham Rugby Club expressed a need for access to two further rugby pitches
- The potential for community use of school playing fields was identified at three sites: Grove Primary School, Ravenscote Junior and Bristow Infant
- Surrey Heath Cub Scouts stated that the Council’s hire costs were prohibitive.

9.7 Key recommendations arising from this survey were to:

- increase 7-a-side pitch provision
- create two new pitches at Frimley Lodge Park
- explore opportunities to use school pitches
- improve female changing facilities, specifically seeking to change the pavilion layout at Frimley Green Recreation Ground (these have now been implemented).

9.8 We have revisited the playing pitch calculations using more up to date data from this study. For the purposes of the calculation and the way that SHBC Leisure manage their pitches, it can be assumed that juniors play on adult pitches. The results are shown in the table overleaf.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE ONE</th>
<th>Adult &amp; junior teams 122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE TWO</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior teams 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE THREE (S1 x S2)</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior teams 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE FOUR</td>
<td>Establish temporal demand for pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior teams 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior teams 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE FIVE (S3 x S4)</td>
<td>Defining pitches used each day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior teams 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior teams 41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE SIX</td>
<td>Establishing pitches currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; junior pitches 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE SEVEN (S6-S5)</td>
<td>Identifying shortfall and surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior pitches 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Adult &amp; junior pitches 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.9 Council officers advised that cricket was adequately provided for, so was not included in the model.

9.10 Critical points from this calculation are:

- Sunday is the peak day football, and there is a theoretical shortfall of 2.5 pitches. However, this observation is subject to the comments in paragraph 9.18 below arising out of consultation with Leisure Service Officers. On Saturdays there is currently a surplus in provision.

- Saturday is the peak day for adult rugby, and there is a surplus of 2 pitches.

- Sunday is the peak day for junior rugby but there are no junior pitches available. All junior rugby matches are probably being played on adult rugby pitches.

9.11 There is some evidence from teams phoning the Leisure section that the schools increasingly do not have the capacity for allowing any more non-school teams to play on their pitches, even for minis. One of the reasons for this, apart from demand from school teams, is the lack of female changing facilities.

9.12 The Leisure Section at SHBC think that mini football pitches are the main source of unmet demand. This is to meet league standards for matches involving the under 11s. Leisure believes that this amounts to a shortfall of pitches to provide for 4 more games on Saturday and 6 more games on Sunday. On the assumption that mini pitches can accommodate 4 games per week (eg 2 on Saturday and 2 on Sunday), this amounts to a need for at least 3 more pitches. This is considered an underestimate as there is some overplaying already on mini pitches.

9.13 Chobham Rugby Football Club has a very active programme across all ages including 21 mini teams. On some Sundays when more than two senior games coincide, the club looks to hire an additional pitch either in Lightwater or at Winston Churchill School in Woking. Training for the minis teams is also sometimes carried
out at these sites, in addition to Gordons School. The Club are currently looking for extra playing space within the Chobham area which will provide at least one additional pitch. A working group has been appointed which will examine potential sites.

9.14 For most club and school hockey, teams prefer to use “Astroturf.” Currently there is just one facility at Kings International College in Camberley, however its use is highly variable over the year. The Astroturf is also used for football. While the School uses the facility in twilight hours (after 4pm), it is available for use by clubs at weekends and during the Summer. The Leisure Section believe the existing single synthetic pitch broadly meets the Borough’s needs and there is not a need to provide additional facilities for hockey, particularly in the short-term.

Current position and consultation

9.15 The Council currently maintains 22 football pitches, three rugby pitches (plus an additional “reserve” pitch at Frimley Lodge which can be used in periods of high demand) and six cricket squares. There is one full size floodlit all weather pitch, the “Astroturf” at Kings International School and a range of five-a-side floodlit all weather pitches throughout the Borough.

9.16 Consultation highlighted that the overall quality of grass pitch provision across the Borough is considered to be good. However, there is a perception that a large proportion of open space is dominated by outdoor sports.

9.17 Consultation with Council officers further reinforced the growth in demand for mini and junior football pitch provision. Demand has not yet been fully satisfied and existing sites are unable to accommodate the total number of junior and senior pitches required. This demand is highest in April when some pitches have to be prepared for the cricket season.

9.18 A calculation of the demand from teams and the supply of football pitches for adults and juniors shows deficit of 2.5 pitches. However, this may be a slight overestimate as these pitches can often accommodate more than 2 junior games a week. In terms of demand for the booking of pitches, there is a strong indication from Leisure Service officers that at least 1 additional adult/junior/training pitch and 3 mini pitches are needed. Furthermore, this level of unmet need has persisted for the last few years. The Borough’s pitches also do very predominantly provide playing facilities for teams based in the Borough. The small number of teams originating from outside the Borough who sometimes play on pitches in Surrey Heath are balanced by the flow of Borough teams to pitches in other districts.

9.19 Lack of training pitches is a problem. Training takes place on the pitches used for games and this is resulting in wear and tear. The Leisure Service is of the view there is additional demand for training provision however this requirement largely results from “unofficial” use of pitches outside booked periods. It is currently unclear how users can be prevented from carrying out activities that may harm the condition of unsupervised pitches required for match days.

9.20 Any calculation of the need for football pitches can be easily distorted by small changes in the number of teams playing and on assumptions made on how many junior and mini games can be played each week. It is therefore considered that the best guide to assessing the need for pitches is for any calculation based on the demand from teams to be supplemented by the experience of the Council officers in
providing pitches over a number of years. It is therefore considered that there is an unmet need for at least one adult/junior pitch, 3 additional mini pitches and a training facility. The 2 mini pitches to be provided at the Alma Dettingen Barracks housing development in Deepcut will meet some of this demand, which leaves an outstanding need for one additional adult/junior pitch which will also provide training facilities, and for one additional mini pitch.

9.21 Lack of female changing facilities for both juniors and minis is a major constraint in being able to meet demand for female football.

9.22 In terms of rugby provision, there is believed to be high usage of the training ground at Camberley Rugby Football Club as well as the three pitches at Watchetts Recreation Ground and one pitch at Frimley Lodge Recreation Ground. Chobham Rugby Football Club has two full-sized pitches at Windsor Road. Overall the provision of rugby pitches is believed to be sufficient.

9.23 Outdoor bowls provision is a key area of concern for the Council with investment required to refurbish ‘clubhouse’ facilities currently in a poor state of repair. Declining membership levels are increasing financial pressures on resident bowls clubs and restricting clubs’ ability to fund necessary repairs and maintenance.

9.24 Of the household survey respondents using outdoor sports facilities most frequently, the majority do so on an occasional basis. The most common reason for using this type of open space is to play sports but other reasons given were to get fresh air, to take exercise and to walk.

9.25 There were no areas considered to be significant problems although those using outdoor sports facilities most frequently considered litter (47.5%), dog fouling (45%) and vandalism and graffiti (40%) to be minor problems. One third expressed dissatisfaction with seating provision at this type of open space.

9.26 Analysis of household survey responses also highlighted that 37% of respondents do not tend to use this type of open space.

**Bisley**

9.27 There is believed to be good provision for outdoor sports in Bisley Parish, both in terms of quantity and quality. These facilities are also considered to be reasonably accessible to pushchairs and wheelchairs. There is a well-maintained path around the perimeter of the main site, Bisley Recreation Ground.

**Chobham**

9.28 Consultation indicated that current outdoor sports facilities within the parish are at capacity, with limited scope for expansion to meet increasing demand. In addition, the local football team based at Chobham Recreation Ground is well positioned for promotion to a higher league. This would require pitch improvements such as the introduction of fencing and increased run-off areas, which it may be difficult to accommodate at this site.

9.29 In terms of quality, there is some conflict of use with dog walkers using outdoor sports facilities as amenity areas.
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West End

9.30 It is generally considered that West End has adequate provision for outdoor sports. The football pitch at West End Recreation Ground has recently been resurfaced at a cost of £15,000, which has increased its carrying capacity. In terms of accessibility, there are good, clear pathways around the perimeter of the recreation ground.

Windlesham

9.31 There is also considered to be good provision of outdoor sports facilities in Windlesham Parish, with pitches well maintained and of high quality.

Setting provision standards

9.32 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, sites assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices K, L and M.

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

Quantity

9.34 The current provision of outdoor sports facilities indicates 457 hectares in total across the Borough. However, excluding golf courses this figure is reduced to 236 hectares, of which 36% (84 ha) comprises school playing fields which do not offer dual use with non-school teams.

9.35 Current provision of outdoor sports facilities per 1,000 population is 5.69 ha but taking golf courses out of the equation it drops to a local provision of 2.97 ha per 1,000 population. The provision of outdoor sports facilities by ward is contained in Appendix G.

9.36 Overall opinion suggests that provision of outdoor sports facilities is sufficient. 50% of respondents across all analysis areas considered current levels of this typology to be 'about right' against 34% suggesting it is not enough.

9.37 Although the proportion of respondents stating that current provision is 'about right' was found to be highest in Analysis Area 1 (54%) where there is the lowest area per 1,000 head population and lowest in Analysis Area 2 (47%) with the highest area per 1,000 head population, it should be noted that amenity green space provision is significantly higher in Analysis Area 1.

9.38 On the basis of supporting consultation, we believe it is likely that feedback indicating that provision is insufficient may relate to the identified need for increased provision to cater for the rising popularity of junior and mini football in particular. NPFA standards for formal pitch provision recommend a minimum standard of 1.7 ha per 1,000 population.
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9.39 Benchmark data on local standards from other local authority PPG17 studies indicates that local standards for outdoor sports facility provision range from 1.5 to 3 ha per 1,000 population and commonly exclude golf courses when standards per 1,000 head of population range from 1.5 to 2.5 ha.

9.40 We recommend a local provision standard of 2.75 ha per 1,000 population, in line with current provision and benchmark data for other local authorities. If education sites without a written agreement providing for dual use are subtracted from the supply then there is a local provision standard of 1.91 ha per 1,000 population.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL STANDARD

| 2.75 ha per 1,000 population (excluding golf courses) |

Quality

9.41 The 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.

9.42 The overall quality of outdoor sports facilities across the Borough is considered good. Of those sites rated, 82% are considered to be good (41%) or very good (41%) quality and the remaining 18.5% to be reasonable. None of the facilities rated are considered to be low quality.

9.43 The highest quality sites are distributed across all three analysis areas and are stated to be:

- London Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 1)
- Watchetts Recreation Ground (Site ID 12)
- Frimley Lodge Park (Site ID 206)
- Frimley Green Recreation Ground (Site 71)
- Mytchett Recreation Ground (Site ID 91)
- Heatherside Recreation Ground (Site ID 67)
- Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 30)
- Camberley Town Football Club, Krooner Park (Site ID 7)
- Camberley Cricket Ground (Site ID 14)
- Surrey Heath Common Land (Site ID 265)
- Penny Hill Park Golf Course (Site ID 252)

9.44 Bisley Recreation Ground and Chobham Recreation Ground were identified as good practice examples during the course of consultation with Parish Clerks. The Parish Councils manage rolling maintenance programmes for both sites ensuring that they are kept in good condition.

9.45 Bisley Recreation Ground forms an important hub site with a wide range of facilities. The multi-use games area is kept secure, has high levels of use and accommodates...
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users from outside of the parish. It complements the grass sports pitches and provides a high quality sports facility.

9.46 Chobham Recreation Ground offers a variety of community sports facilities with tennis courts of excellent quality. However, ancillary provision is an identified area for improvement with car parking in need of enhancement and toilet facilities poorly maintained and not generally open for use.

9.47 Through the consultation and household questionnaires the highest rated aspirations for outdoor sports facilities were clean and litter free, well-kept grass, toilets, level surface and good drainage, and dog free areas.

9.48 A suggested Quality Vision standard for outdoor sports facilities should reflect these aspirations to ensure that the needs of the public are met. The vision should also be consistent with other local and national standards.

9.49 The recommended local standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing outdoor sports facilities to achieve in terms of enhancement.

Accessibility

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

9.51 Accessibility across outdoor sports facilities within the Borough is good. Of those sites rated, 77% are considered to have good (44%) or very good (33%) accessibility. No sites were rated as poor but the following six sites were given an average accessibility rating:

- Krooner Park (Site ID 7)
- Tomlinscote School Playing Field (Site ID 194)
- Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 151)
- Windsor Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 148)
- Bisley Recreation Ground (Site ID 142)
- Bagshot Cricket Ground (Site ID 107)

9.52 There are plans for complete refurbishment of the toilet block at Frimley Green Recreation Ground and at Watchetts Recreation Ground.

9.53 Of those household survey respondents who selected outdoor sports facilities as the type of open space they use most frequently, 92% were found to be satisfied or very satisfied with accessibility on foot. 54% were found to be satisfied or very
satisfied with accessibility for pushchairs or wheelchairs. Although 41% were satisfied or very satisfied with accessibility by cycleways, one third stated that they were unsatisfied.

9.54 A high proportion of the household survey respondents using outdoor sports facilities most frequently expressed satisfaction with opening times (82%), signage (63%) and the visibility of site entrances (59%).

9.55 The perception of the most appropriate travel time for outdoor sports facilities varied between analysis areas from 10 to 15 minutes. Although both walking times and driving times were indicated fairly equally, two of the three analysis areas had a greater number of people suggesting a drive time, with the 75% level in both areas at up to 15 minutes.

9.56 Of those who use these sports facilities most frequently 56% travel by car for up to 15 minutes. We therefore recommend that a drive time of 15 minutes is set as the local standard, a catchment threshold in line with public opinion and the behaviour patterns of existing users as well as local authority benchmarks.

**Applying provision standards – Identifying geographical areas**

9.57 In order to identify geographical areas of importance to those areas with required local needs we apply both quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards while the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

9.58 The overview accessibility catchment map indicates that the entire Borough is within the desired accessibility boundary of a 15 minute drive time. However, consultation and research indicates that there is a deficiency of adult/junior football pitches within the Borough. Some demand for mini football pitches has been met through increased community use of school sites, but there appears to still be an unmet need for up to 3 mini pitches, which would only be partially met by the completion of the pitches at Alma-Dettingen Barracks in Deepcut. The priority for sports pitches could be to seek to implement further community use of school playing fields to provide the required level of junior or mini pitch provision, where possible. However, if this is not possible, then the provision of a new adult/junior/training pitch and one mini pitch may be required.
Value assessment – Identifying specific sites

9.59 Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning. This can be done simply through assessing all options and combinations when comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites.

9.60 The significant usage of a high number of the existing sports facilities within Surrey Heath clear indicates the popularity of this type of open space and suggests that they have a vital role to play in the Borough. Usage levels at three quarters of the sites rated were stated to be high with the remainder of sites being used often.

9.61 Further consideration should be given to sites currently inaccessible to the local community (ie school based provision) and to potential opportunities to further enhance the value of these sites.

9.62 There are a high number of outdoor sports facility sites within the Borough, which have been scored highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage. These include:

- Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 30)
- Heatherside Recreation Ground (Site ID 67)
- Frimley Green Recreation Ground (Site ID 71)
- Surrey Heath Common Land (Site ID 265)
- Mytchett Recreation Ground (Site ID 91)
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• Watchetts Recreation Ground (Site ID 12)
• Frimley Lodge Sports Facility (Site ID 206)
• Old Dean Recreation Ground (Site ID 24)
• Collingwood School (Site ID 25)
• Blackdown Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 78)
• Mytchett Community Centre (Site ID 90)
• Briar Avenue Recreation Ground (Site ID 109)
• Penny Hill Park Golf Course (Site ID 252)
• Camberley Cricket Ground (Site ID 14)
• London Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 1).

9.63 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community.

9.64 There are three outdoor sports facility sites, which have high usage but are rated average in terms of their quality:

• Hallgrove School (Site ID 244)
• Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 151)
• Windsor Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 148)

9.65 Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 151) and Windsor Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 148) should be prioritised for enhancement to increase their value to the local community. By improving the quality, this will ensure existing high usage levels can be sustained and potentially increase the carrying capacity of these pitches.

9.66 There are three outdoor sports facility sites, rated average in terms of their quality and/or accessibility and used often:

• Bisham Playing Fields Association (Site ID 104)
• Bagshot Cricket Ground (Site ID 107)
• Bisley Recreation Ground (Site ID 142).

9.67 Bagshot Playing Fields Association (Site ID 104) and Bisley Recreation Ground (Site ID 142) should also be prioritised for improvements. By enhancing the quality and/or accessibility at these locations this could promote increased usage and potentially release pressure on other sites or support rising participation.
Indoor sports facilities

9.68 In addition to outdoor sports facilities, PPG17 recommends the assessment of existing indoor sport and recreation provision. A broad review of sport and recreation facilities has been undertaken to guide future planning in the Borough.

9.69 Alongside the main audit of open space an audit of indoor leisure facilities has been undertaken. This has included:

- swimming pools
- health and fitness facilities
- sports halls
- synthetic turf pitches (STPs)
- athletics tracks
- indoor tennis
- indoor bowls
- village and community halls.

9.70 We have used a range of complementary methods to ensure a comprehensive audit of provision, including a review of the online national database of sports facilities, Active Places, supporting desk research, discussions with key leisure providers and internal Council officers.

Local context

9.71 There are three main leisure facilities: Arena Leisure Centre, Lightwater Leisure Centre and Tomlinscote Sports Centre (dual use). Although the Borough only has one public indoor swimming pool, other private and school swimming facilities exist however this additional capacity is already used quite extensively by swimming clubs and schools.

9.72 The Local Plan 2000 concluded that the demand for facilities should be met by increased community use of existing facilities such as school sites, rather than additional provision. The facilities at Kings International College have recently been made DDA compliant, the indoor sports hall improved and new changing rooms provided. However to date access has only been provided for club use rather than for casual use by the wider community.

9.73 It is recognised there is substantial over demand on the Arena pool facilities from swimming clubs and schools. This often reduces pool availability for casual or competitive use. Frimley CofE School has built a new indoor pool which opened in September 2006. Kings International Pool is available to hire by clubs but the pool building which dates from the 1960s is in need of modernization. Gordons School also hire their facilities to community groups during school holidays however this has to be accommodated alongside resident programmes made by young people visiting from abroad. More extensive use of schools, particularly during the day but also during the summer break is problematic. For casual use there is a need to demonstrate there will be sufficient demand to cover the weekly operational and
staffing costs during a period of open access. Many schools are also not provided with suitable changing facilities. Increasing access during term time may create security concerns.

9.74 The Leisure and Cultural Strategy 2003-2008 was developed after in-depth public consultation. Key objectives set out in the strategy Action Plan were to:

- maintain provision and effective management of indoor leisure facilities
- working with the community, private, voluntary and business sectors to develop new facilities and improve opportunities to take part
- assess the need for new sport and recreation facilities and carry out an audit of swimming provision
- support Collingwood College on sports hall development proposals and assist Kings International College with community use options
- promote the community use of school sports facilities
- consider the feasibility of a leisure card scheme
- encourage access for all through adherence to the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA).

9.79 A Sport and Recreation Plan is also being developed by Surrey Heath Leisure Officers following consultation with the general public and local sports clubs. It will look at ways of encouraging community use of school and military facilities, the role of future funding opportunities and increasing disabled access. The role played by swimming facilities is identified as important in helping schools to meet Key Stage 2 targets seeking to ensure that all children can swim confidently over 25 metres by the time they leave primary school. Currently only one secondary school (Kings International College) has swimming facilities meaning the progression of swimming skills for older age groups becomes more dependent on non school based provision.

Current position and consultation

9.75 We have consulted with the local community in the form of a household survey asking them to indicate which facilities they use and their opinions of current provision.

9.76 The responses from the household survey provide a useful insight into the usage of indoor facilities within Surrey Heath as well as public perceptions of quality and quantity of this type of provision.

9.77 The results of the household survey showed that sports halls (58%), community centres/village halls (58%), indoor health and fitness facilities (43%) were the most highly used. Fewer respondents stated that they used indoor bowls (26%) or indoor tennis (24%) facilities.

9.78 Respondents were generally found to visit indoor leisure facilities less than once a month. Health and fitness facilities had the highest proportion of daily users (7%) and swimming pools the highest proportion of weekly users (7%).
9.79 In terms of quality, 35% of respondents consider indoor leisure provision to be good or very good and 32% perceive it to be average. 11% of respondents were found to consider the quality of facilities to be poor or very poor. The highest satisfaction levels were attributed to the range of facilities and the helpfulness of staff.

9.80 It was generally considered that the indoor leisure facilities in Surrey Heath meet the needs of local residents, with 46% of respondents stating this view compared with 22% who did not feel that facilities meet their needs.

9.81 Supporting consultation indicated that some residents are believed to use leisure facilities outside of the Borough boundary. For example, residents of Frimley Green live in relatively close proximity to Farnborough Recreation Centre and Coral Reef in Bracknell provides activity pools. There is also substantial provision in Aldershot including a 50 metre pool that can be accessed at certain times within the military estate.

9.82 Suggestions for improvements to leisure provision were found to fall in the following broad categories:

- better transport to facilities (possible improvements may include taxi vouchers and mini bus services)
- improved car parking provision (through re-design of car parks)
- lower pricing, particularly target groups such as children and young people with leisure cards and cross bookings
- increased number of facilities and range of facilities offered (opportunities from various funding streams that may be available).

Supply and demand analysis

9.83 This section assesses the current supply and compares it to the demand for different types of sports facilities. Research was undertaken to assess how this relationship might change in future years.

9.84 The supply against demand in Surrey Heath has been analysed for the following facilities:

- health and fitness facilities
- sports halls
- swimming pools.

9.85 As has already been discussed we have used a variety of sources to ascertain the existing supply of all the above facilities. All known planning applications were also considered in order to assess the likely level of future provision.

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

9.87 An assessment of indoor sports provision using the geographical analysis areas was not considered appropriate for this type of facilities due to the wider target catchment and dispersed nature of these facilities.

9.88 The geographical nature of Surrey Heath and its position with respect to neighbouring areas means that the level of inward migration of sports centre usage is likely to offset outward migration. We have therefore undertaken analysis on a borough-wide basis.

9.89 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 Surrey Heath.

**Sports hall provision**

9.90 The supply of sports halls in Surrey Heath is illustrated in Map 9.2 below. Full supply and demand models and a list of the assumptions made can be found in Appendix N.

**Demand**

9.91 The level of demand for sports hall facilities can be determined by applying accepted sports participation rate standards (by age and gender) and peak usage parameters to the catchment population. The number of total visits during peak times is used to calculate the size of a sports hall (in badminton court units) needed to serve this demand at any one time.

9.92 The key assumptions are as follows:

- 60% visits during peak time
- average visit duration = 1 hour
- normal peak periods = 40.5 hours per week
- at one time capacity = 5 people per badminton court.

9.93 In terms of the impact of future participation trends, Game Plan: a strategy for delivering Government’s sport and physical activity objectives (DCMS/Strategy Unit, December 2002) sets out the Government’s long term vision for increasing participation and high performance in sport. Game Plan sets the challenging of moving to 70% of the population being regularly active by 2020. When predicting future demand for sports facilities it is important that the potential impact of this strategy is taken into consideration.
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Map 9.2: Sports hall provision in Surrey Heath

Sports Halls with 3 or more courts:-

Public Facilities: Arena Leisure Centre, Lightwater Leisure Centre, Tringham Hall

Dual Use: Tomlinscote Sports Centre, Collingwood College
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Sports Halls – Key Messages

- Only publicly accessible facilities are included in the modelling, therefore facilities which are only available for club or private members use (i.e. cannot be booked for casual use by individuals), such as Kings International College, are discounted.

- Supply at dual use facilities (Collingwood College, Tomlinscote School) is reduced by 25% to reflect restricted access.

- Only halls of 3 courts and above are considered in the modelling in line with Sport England guidelines – halls of smaller size are unsuitable for a number of sports. The sports halls with 3 or more courts are listed below:
  - Arena Leisure Centre (6 courts)
  - Tomlinscote Sports Centre (5 courts)
  - Lightwater Leisure Centre (6 courts)
  - Collingwood College (3 courts)
  - Tringham Hall (3 courts).

- Existing supply is equal to 21 badminton courts (due to the provision at Collingwood College and Tomlinscote School being reduced by 25% as they are dual use facilities).

- Existing demand (based on population and participation rates) is equivalent to 23 courts.

- Calculations therefore indicate that there is a current undersupply of sports hall provision equivalent to 2 badminton courts.

- This undersupply could be reduced through better partnership agreements with schools and other education sites. It is still intended over the long-term to make the improved Kings International College Sports Hall available for casual public use. If this can be achieved an additional 3 badminton courts could be provided. Based on dual use reducing the total level of provision equivalent to 2.25 courts, this would meet the shortfall.

- If government targets for increasing participation are met, the demand for sports halls within the district will increase to 24 courts by 2010.

- Smaller village and community halls also play an important role in leisure and recreation provision and make an important contribution to providing for the activities in sports halls. More detailed information on village and community halls can be found in paragraph 9.104.
Health and fitness provision

9.94 The supply of health and fitness facilities in Surrey Heath is set out in Map 9.3 overleaf. Full supply and demand modeling analysis with underlying assumptions and parameters is set out in Appendix N.

Demand

9.95 The propensity of residents in the district to participate in health and fitness is significantly higher than the national average – 24.3% in comparison to 19.7% nationally. The total adult population within the district and buffer zone is 339,485.

9.96 The key assumptions are as follows:

- 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).
- average user participates on average 1.5 times per week or six times a month
- at one time capacity of a health and fitness facility is calculated by the ratio of one user per station.
SECTION 9 – SPORTS FACILITIES

Map 9.3: Health and fitness facilities in Surrey Heath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arena Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lightwater Leisure Centre (inc planned extension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tomlinscote Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fitness First Health Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lakeside Health &amp; Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spa at Pennyhill Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gordons School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Atrium (planned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and Fitness - Key Messages

- demand in Surrey Heath is for 369 stations (based on population and participation rates)
- the existing supply is equal to 232 stations
- calculations therefore indicate that there is a current undersupply of 137 stations
- this undersupply could be met either by the expansion of existing facilities or by the development of new provision - however, it should be noted that the proximity of five neighbouring settlements close to the Surrey Heath boundary, will mean that surrounding facilities are likely to play a role in meeting unsatisfied demand
- looking forward to 2010, there are two planned health and fitness facilities. Reconfiguration of existing space at Lightwater Leisure Centre is anticipated to provide an additional 85 stations from this Autumn. A new gym including spinning facilities is also being provided as part of the Atrium development in Camberley Town Centre. While the final specification of the new facility is still to be agreed, it is likely this will provide approximately 60 stations. Taken together these two developments will provide approximately 145 stations and will eliminate the existing shortfall.
- Improvements in disabled access are being progressed at some leisure centres. The refurbishment and extension of the Health and Fitness Suite due to commence shortly will make disabled access easier. This will improve access from the first floor lift and remove the plinth that currently supports the jogging machines and exercise bikes.
- Population growth will however mean that by 2010 there could be a need for a further 10 stations to meet demand in addition to the new provision in The Atrium and Lightwater Leisure Centre.
Swimming pools

9.97 The supply of swimming pools in Surrey Heath is set out in Map 9.4 overleaf.

Map 9.4: Swimming pools in Surrey Heath
Demand

9.98 One method of assessing the level of demand is by applying swimming participation rate standards (by age and gender) and peak usage parameters to the catchment population. The number of total visits during peak times can be used to calculate the size of a swimming pool (in square metres) needed to serve this demand at any one time. Such an assessment should be complemented by a closer appraisal of the extent to which there is club use of school pools, the extent to which there is a reasonable use of pools outside the Borough, and how well any increase in pool size is able to meet the scope and qualitative profile of the demands made upon it.

Swimming Pools – Key Messages

- according to Sport England, one pool unit = 212m$^2$ or a 4 lane 25m pool
- only indoor public facilities with casual access should be included in any initial calculation of demand.
- there is currently only one publicly accessible facility within Surrey Heath.
  - Arena Leisure Centre (public) which provides a 6 lane 25m pool.
- The Arena pool does not meet demand.
- There is some club use of school pools, but the potential to increase club usage of school pools is limited. It is unlikely that casual public use can be provided at school pools.
- The very high usage of the Arena by swimming clubs and for teaching means that in practice the total swimming space for casual use is often reduced further, particularly during the evening.
- The overall supply needs to be viewed in the context of several large facilities in neighbouring boroughs such as Bracknell Forest, Rushmoor and Woking which are used by some Surrey Heath residents.
- One of the key priorities in the Council’s Corporate Plan 2006-2015 is to develop and implement a replacement strategy for the Arena Leisure Centre
**Indoor bowls provision**

**Supply**

9.99 There is one indoor bowls facility within Surrey Heath, Camberley Indoor Bowling Club located on Wilton Road in St Georges Industrial Estate. The facility offers six rinks.

**Demand**

9.100 Using the Sport England Sport Facility Calculator based on a total district population of 80,183 (2005 projection) and a projected future population of 84,109 (in year 2010), demand for indoor bowls is equivalent to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of rinks</th>
<th>Number of centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shortfalls/surpluses**

9.101 The demand modelling findings indicate that the Camberley Indoor Bowling Club should meet current demand, but only provides one additional rink. If demand was to increase above predicted levels, the level of provision may need to be reconsidered.

9.102 Map 9.5 overleaf indicates the location of the bowls facilities, both indoor and outdoor, in Surrey Heath.
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Map 9.5: Indoor and outdoor bowls facilities in Surrey Heath

Indoor Facilities: Camberley Indoor Bowls, Tringham Hall, Bisley Village Hall, Chobham Community Centre.

Outdoor Facilities: Camberley Bowling Club, Windlesham Bowls Club, Old Dean Bowling Club, West End Bowls Club, Watchetts Recreation Ground Bowling Green, Mytchett Recreation Ground Bowling Green.
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Indoor tennis centres

9.103 There are currently no indoor tennis centres within Surrey Heath, but facilities are located in neighbouring areas such as Woking.

Community and village halls

9.104 There are a number of village and community halls within Surrey Heath, which serve to provide leisure and recreation provision for the local community. There are ten main community halls, comprising the following:

- Briars Community Centre
- Connaught Pavilion
- Frimley Community Centre
- Heatherside Community Centre
- Mytchett Community Centre
- Bagshot Playing Field Association
- Deepcut Village Centre
- Chobham Community Centre
- Bisley Village Hall
- Tringham Hall

9.105 All of Surrey Heath’s community centres are leased out to local associations that run a range of community based programmes (sport, leisure, education, childcare) for all age groups and all sectors of the community.

9.106 A further 41 village and parish halls are used for leisure and recreation. The location of these facilities is shown on Map 9.6 overleaf.

9.107 It should be noted that the Camberley wards of Old Dean, Town and St Michael’s do not have any purpose built community centres. Whilst there are some existing facilities such as church halls and school halls that fulfil some of the demand, there is a case for further investigation as to whether these areas require more modern purpose built community centres. This point is particularly relevant for the Old Dean and St Michael’s wards, as both are the most socially deprived wards in the Borough, according to the DETR Indices of Deprivation.

9.108 The new Active Places website will shortly enable ‘power users’ to model the supply and demand of village and community halls and compare this to other Local Authority benchmarks.
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Map 9.6: Community centres and village halls in Surrey Heath

Community Centres
Village Halls
### Key of community centres and village halls within Surrey Heath

1. Bagshot Playing Field Association  
2. Briars Community Centre  
3. Connaught Pavilion  
4. Deepcut Village Centre  
5. Frimley Community Centre  
6. Heatherside Community Centre  
7. Mytchett Community Centre  
8. Chobham Community Centre  
9. Bagshot Cricket Club  
10. Camberley Baptist Church Hall  
11. Camberley Rugby Club  
12. Chertsey Road Hall  
13. Chobham Cricket Club  
14. Chobham Parish Pavilion  
15. Chobham Village Hall  
16. Community Services, Surrey Adult Education  
17. Frimley Baptist Church  
18. Frimley Green Baptist Church  
19. Frimley Green Football Club  
20. Frimley Green Methodist Church Hall  
21. Frimley Green Youth Centre  
22. Frimley Parish Hall  
23. High Cross Church Hall  
24. Lightwater Playingfield Association  
25. Old Dean Youth Centre  
26. Our Lady Green of Heaven  
27. Royal British Legion  
28. St Andrews Church Hall  
29. St Annes Parish Hall  
30. St Frances Church Hall  
31. St Johns Hall  
32. St Lawrence Church Hall  
33. St Martin Church Hall  
34. St Marys Centre  
35. St Michaels Church Hall  
36. St Pauls Church Hall  
37. St Peters & St Johns Church Hall  
38. The Camberley Theatre  
39. Windle Valley Centre  
40. Windlesham Club and Theatre  
41. The Sports Pavilion, West End  
42. All Saints Community Hall  
43. Chobham Rugby Club  
44. Valley End Institute, Highams Lane  
45. Bisley Village Hall  
46. Tringham Hall
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Allotments

Definition

10.1 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.

Strategic context

10.2 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 different cultural backgrounds
- improving physical and mental health
- providing a source of recreation
- wider contribution to green and open space.

10.3 The Local Plan sets out that the Council will normally resist the loss of allotments and will encourage further provision in suitable locations, if a demand has been identified.

Consultation

10.4 The Camberley and District Horticultural Society independently manage six allotment sites within the Borough. These are:

- Barossa Road Allotments (57 plots)
- Brook Road Allotments (25 plots)
- Church Field Allotments (15 plots)
- Crabtree Road Allotments (98 plots)
- Cross Lane Allotments (14 plots)
- Wharf Road Allotments (38 plots).

10.5 However, Church Field Allotments is church land donated to the Council for burial purposes. The church reserves the right to take back the land as and when it needs to. A recent planning application approved the change of use of some of the remaining allotment gardens to burial ground. Usage at this site has historically been low because plot holders are only given 12 month tenancy agreements and there are no sheds at this site for storing tools.

10.6 Consultation with the Society highlighted the following key points:

- all seven allotment sites are at full capacity, with waiting lists for plots in existence
the profile of the allotment user has changed significantly over recent years, with interest from the 25 to 35 year age group increasing, particularly women and professional couples

all sites are fenced around the perimeter with padlocked gates

all sites have piped water which is metered and turned off during the winter months

the larger sites, Barossa Road and Crabtree Road have tarmac roads around the perimeter, whilst the smaller sites have dirt tracks

some users tend to walk to the sites whilst others choose to drive - the mode of transport depends on the distance travelled from home as well as the amount of equipment people have to carry

Barossa Road Allotments has a large trading hut facility at the site which sells gardening provisions – although this is well used by older people, it is believed that people now more frequently purchase items from the internet

there is a triangular hut at Crabtree Road Allotments with a surrounding grass area used for social gatherings

Crabtree Road Allotments, the largest site at circa 97 plots, is very well managed and the site manager has introduced communal composting to promote the recycling of green waste

all other smaller sites are overseen by a site representative

Wharf Road Allotments has suffered from a high incidence of vandalism recently, such as the burning of wooden sheds, and the police have been notified. The waiting list for this site has been closed since a very settled community of plotholders means that in practice plots rarely become available.

the Society receives interest for allotments from the Heatherside, Bagshot, West End and Bisley areas. In some of these areas there is little or no provision, although generally in the rural area there is good provision.

although users travel to Barossa Road Allotments from Heatherside, the distance means that they ‘have to make a day of it’.

10.7 There is also some additional provision within the parishes.

10.8 Comments from household survey respondents indicated that whilst 45% of residents feel allotments are important, 35% consider them to be not important, making this by far the lowest rated type of open space in terms of importance.
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Setting provision standards

10.9 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, sites assessments and consultation on local needs.

Quantity

10.10 The audit of allotments highlight that there are 11.2 hectares in total across the Borough. This equates to 0.14 ha per 1,000 population. The provision of allotments by ward is included in Appendix G.

10.11 Current provision of 0.21 ha per 1,000 population in Analysis Area 1 equates to three allotment sites, 0.06 ha per 1,000 population in Analysis Area 2 to three sites and 0.17 ha per 1,000 population in Analysis Area 3 to eight sites.

10.12 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, based on two people per household) or 1 allotment per 200 people. This equates to 0.125 ha per 1,000 population based on an average plot of 250 square metres.

10.13 Public opinion generally suggests that current allotment provision is sufficient. A higher proportion of respondents overall and in each of the three analysis areas were of the view that provision was 'about right' as opposed to 'not enough'.

10.14 However, we must take into account the fact that the most popular response overall, and a high proportion of responses across all of the analysis areas, was 'no opinion'.

10.15 Consultation with The Allotment Society suggests that there is demand for increased provision, with all seven sites under its management at full capacity and with waiting lists for plots (there are now over 70 people on the list). The Society recommend that opportunities for increased provision be investigated in Frimley Green and Deepcut where the need for allotments is considered to be greatest.

10.16 Existing provision is 0.14 ha per 1,000 population falls at the midpoint of provision in other local authority areas, which generally ranges from 0.03 to 0.29.

10.17 We recommend a local standard of 0.14 ha per 1,000 population is set. This level is in line with current provision, standards set for other local authorities and the national benchmark supported by the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners.

10.18 It is also recommended that more research is undertaken on the location of this identified demand.
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Quality

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

10.20 The overall quality of allotments across the Borough is considered high. Of those sites rated, two are considered to be very good, three good and only one, Church Road Allotments (Site ID 33) as average.

10.21 The highest quality sites are stated to be:

- Barossa Road Allotments (Site ID 17)
- Wharf Road Allotments (Site ID 75).

10.22 Through the consultation and household questionnaires the highest rated aspirations for allotments were clean and litter free, good access to and within the site, level surface and good drainage, litter bins, well-kept grass, clear footpaths and nature features.

10.23 A suggested Quality Vision standard for allotments should reflect these aspirations to ensure that the needs of the public are met. The vision should also be consistent with other local and national standards.

10.24 The recommended local standard provides the vision for any new allotments and also a benchmark for existing allotments to achieve in terms of enhancement.

Accessibility

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

10.26 Accessibility across allotment sites within the Borough is considered to be good. Of those sites rated, two were rated very good, three good and only one, The Hatches Allotments (Site ID 72) as average.

10.27 Few residents answering the household survey indicated that the type of open space they use most frequently is allotments. Of those household survey respondents who did, most were satisfied with accessibility by walking and the visibility of site entrances.

10.28 The general perception to emerge from the household survey is that a travel time of between 10-15 minutes is reasonable.

10.29 The majority of people indicated a walk time, with the 75% level up to 15 minutes in two of the three analysis areas. However, the 75% was up to 10 minutes in the third analysis area, based on a similar number of responses. Discussion with the Allotment Society suggested that, although some users drive, a high number do travel on foot.
10.30 On this basis, it is recommended that the accessibility standard is a 10-15 minute walk time. Given the minimal response from allotment users, it is suggested that this standard be treated with some caution even though it is similar to local benchmarks for other authorities.

**Applying provision standards – Identifying geographical areas**

10.31 In order to identify geographical areas of importance to those areas with required local needs we apply both quantity and accessibility standards together. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards while the accessibility standards will help to determine where those deficiencies are of high importance.

10.32 When analysing the application of quantity standards, the current level of provision in Analysis Area 2 clearly falls below the minimum standard for allotments. Map 10.1 illustrates that parts of this area also fall outside the suggested accessibility catchment for this type of open space.

**Map 10.1: Overview of access to allotments in Surrey Heath**

10.33 It is evident that a significant number of Surrey Heath residents do not live within a 1km walk time of an allotment. However, allotments are a demand-led open space type and, as such, there is no justification for providing allotments in these areas if there is no identified demand.

10.34 The existence of waiting lists at all of the Allotment Society sites suggests that there is demand for increased allotment space. It is therefore recommended that further investigation be undertaken to identify demand for allotments in specific areas across the Borough. If this work substantiates localised demand for allotments, there is potential to use areas of amenity green space or natural and semi-natural open space.
space, which are supplied above the recommended minimum standards in these identified areas, for the provision of new allotments. Only sites of poor quality or low significance should be considered to accommodate allotment development.

**Value assessment – Identifying specific sites**

10.35 Assessing quality and value is fundamental to effective planning. This can be done by simply comparing quality, accessibility and usage of sites. 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.

10.36 There are three allotment sites within the Borough which score highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage:

- Barossa Road Allotments (Site ID 17)
- Wharf Road Allotments (Site ID 75)
- Crabtree Road Allotments (Site ID 8).

10.37 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community.

10.38 There is one site, The Hatches Allotments (Site ID 72), which is considered good quality, has reasonable access and is used often.

10.39 Accessibility The Hatches Allotments should be improved to encourage increased usage.

10.40 One site, Church Road Allotments (Site ID 33) has good accessibility and is used often but is rated average in terms of quality.

10.41 Church Road Allotments is frequently used despite its average quality. The quality and features of these open spaces should be enhanced to further increase functionality and usage.
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**Green corridors**

**Definition**

11.1 This open space type includes highways, 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.

**PPG17 – the role of green corridors**

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

11.3 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 ie home and school, town and sports facility etc, it should not be included within an audit.

11.4 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).

**Local context and current position**

11.5 Specific areas within Surrey Heath have been designated as green corridors. These main routes are either major traffic arteries (including railways) or routes with particularly significant landscape value. These are set out in the Local Plan and serve to break up the built environment and provide routes between both open spaces and developments.

11.6 The Council will seek to preserve these green corridors as they are important both for the visual and physical environment. The Basingstoke Canal is recognised as an important green corridor and the Council will seek to protect this resource.

11.7 Within the urban areas, these green corridors are often of particular importance. They are largely tree-lined with deep grass verges. Within rural areas, the planning restraint will generally make it more important to retain the open landscape nature of green corridors and to effect the removal of any unsightly features.

**Policy G23: Green Corridors**

The Borough Council will seek to ensure that any development in the vicinity of green corridors, as shown on the Proposals Map, preserves their landscape character. The Borough Council will encourage, where necessary, the enhancement of the character of the area through landscape design.

11.8 The Council is committed to protect and extend, where appropriate, public rights of way. The Local Plan sets out that use of the network, including footpaths and bridleways, will be encouraged and it will also seek to improve the quality of the rights of way.
11.9 A key theme to emerge from the consultation exercise supporting development of the Leisure and Cultural Strategy 2003-2008 was an emphasis on the promotion of healthy lifestyles. One of the resultant strategic aims for the Council was to work in conjunction with the health authority to promote sports and recreational pursuits and encourage greater use of walking and the extension of cyclepaths.

11.10 Use of sustainable transport is also integral to effective protection and enhancement of the Borough’s natural environment. The Leisure and Cultural Strategy outlines a further commitment to ensure that key sites and major residential/work areas are linked with cycle routes and public transport as well as to encourage walking.

Consultation

11.11 Within the household survey, 88% of respondents indicated that they consider this type of open space to be important to them. 62% of people considered provision of green corridors to be ‘about right’.

Setting provision standards

11.12 In setting local standards for Green Corridors there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, sites assessments and consultation on local needs. There is also a special need to take into account the advice and guidance of PPG17. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices K, L and M. The provision of Green Corridors by ward is included in Appendix G.

Quantity

11.13 The Annex A of PPG17 – Open Space Typology states:

“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.”

11.14 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.”
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Quality

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

i) a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation

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

iii) a path on unvegetated natural surfaces.

11.16 As discussed above the Local Plan indicates the aim to preserve and where possible enhance and provide access to green corridors and the countryside as well as promoting and encouraging exercise and healthy living for all.

11.17 Through the consultation and household questionnaires the highest rated aspirations for green corridors were clean and litter free, clear footpaths, flowers, trees and shrubs and provision of appropriate ancillary facilities including litter bins.

11.18 A suggested Quality Vision 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 recommended local standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing green corridors to achieve in terms of enhancement.

QUALITY VISION

“A clean, well-maintained, safe and secure corridor enclosed and reinforced by natural vegetation with clear, level and well-drained pathways that links major open spaces together and provides ancillary facilities such as litter bins and seating in appropriate places.”

Accessibility

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

Links with Health Agenda

11.20 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 towards keeping the public active and improving health within the local area.

11.21 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.”

11.22 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.
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Applying Provision Standards

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

11.24 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.

Value Assessment

11.25 Provision of green corridors in Surrey Heath is clearly well valued. The Council has outlined a commitment to preserve these green corridors as they area important both for the visual and physical environment. The Basingstoke Canal is recognised as an important green corridor and the Council will seek to protect this resource.

11.26 Green corridors provide opportunities close to peoples homes for informal recreation, particularly walking and cycling, as part of every day routines, for example, travel to work or shops. The development of a linked green corridor network will help to provide opportunities for informal recreation and improve the health and well-being of the local community.

11.27 Opportunities for further development of green corridors should be realised where possible. Optimising the functionality of green corridors has a key role to play in creating and enhancing open space linkages, which can enhance the visual amenity of the area and create further health benefits to the residents of Surrey Heath.

Recommendations

11.28 The Council should improve the ecological value of green corridor sites and raise the awareness of the biodiversity importance of sites ensuring their protection and sensitive management. The Council should continue to provide better links to open space in the Borough by facilitating provision for walking and cycling access along key routes.

11.29 Key opportunities for the creation of new green corridors are outlined in the table below. The table also includes those green corridors currently identified in the Local Plan which are considered to be particularly important. In some cases these existing green corridors may merit extending to ensure that a network of corridors is created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Green Corridor</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middleton Road, Upper Park Road, Park Road and link to Blackwater Valley Path</td>
<td>Links through the centre of Camberley from the A30 and south. Linking the open space to the north of and on London Road to Watchetts Recreation Ground, the playing fields in Frimley and to Blackwater Valley Path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Red Road</td>
<td>Pedestrian link to avoid Red Road. To link with West End Common, Bagshot Heath and East of Borough, although the implications for increasing activity on the SPA will have to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridor</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Ride</td>
<td>Link from Camberley to Bagshot Heath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Ride (Camberley to Bagshot)</td>
<td>Link with Kings Ride and Old Dean Common – Paschal Wood – Bagshot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater Valley footpath</td>
<td>Key north-south link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Road</td>
<td>Links Portsmouth Road through Camberley Heath Golf Course and into Heatherside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frith Hill</td>
<td>Link through Frimley Fuel Allotments and the land to the south between Deepcut and Camberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Lane to Frimley High Street</td>
<td>Links Frimley Fuel allotments - Frimley town centre and open space in between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maultway North - The Maultway - Deepcut Bridge Road with links to Wellingtonia Avenue and Heatherside Parks</td>
<td>Key North South link. Access into residential areas off of Maultway and Deepcut Bridge Road. Provides a link with Bagshot Heath, Lightwater Country Park, West End Common, Frimley Fuel Allotments and Deepcut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lane – Kennel Lane – Updown Hill – Woodlands Lane – Windlesham Road – Windsor Road – Station Road</td>
<td>Key north-south link. Links A30 with Chobham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Road to Bisley via Donkey Town</td>
<td>Key north-south link, although the implications for increasing activity on the SPA will have to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Green Corridor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A322 Bracknell Road – Lightwater By-Pass - Guildford Road</td>
<td>Key North South link across the Borough, will improve pedestrian and cycle access, linking with green spaces along this route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30 London Road</td>
<td>East West link across the Borough. Improving pedestrian and cycle access, linking with other green spaces along this route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A319 Bagshot Road</td>
<td>Links to far east of Borough. Improving pedestrian and cycle access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Catherines Road - Lake Road</td>
<td>North – south link through Frimley and Frimley Green Links up with Frith Hill, Field Lane, Deepcut and Basingstoke Canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chobham Road – Frimley High Street</td>
<td>Key north-south link. Links to Blackwater Valley Path.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Planning overview

Key planning policy framework

12.1 The companion guide to PPG17 ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities’ illustrates 5 steps which should be addressed when undertaking open space, sport and recreation assessments and audits. Step 5 provides guidance as to drafting planning policies. When considering planning policies, the Companion Guide suggests that four strategic options should be identified:

1. existing provision to be protected;
2. existing provision to be enhanced;
3. areas in which new provision is required; and
4. opportunities for new, enhanced or relocated provision.

12.2 The Companion Guide also suggests a fifth component – land or facilities that are surplus to requirements and therefore no longer needed.

12.3 Turning to drafting policy, the Companion Guide suggests that policy should:

- protect or enhance existing open spaces or sport and recreational facilities of value (or potential value) to the local community;
- re-locate poorly located but necessary open spaces or sport and recreation facilities;
- address circumstances in which the planning authority may allow the redevelopment of an existing open space or sport and recreation facility;
- require new provision to fill identified gaps in existing provision; and
- address additional on-site or off-site provision as a consequence of new developments, together with how the authority will assess any related commuted maintenance or establishment sums.

Existing and Emerging Policy

12.4 Government’s Planning and Compulsory Bill has now completed its passage through the Palace of Westminster and received Royal Assent on 13 May 2004. The Act came into force via a commencement at the end of September 2004.

12.5 The Bill sets out to reform the planning system and includes the introduction of overarching Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) which will consist of a portfolio of Local Development Documents (LDDs). There will be three types of LDDs, namely, Development Plan Documents (DPDs) to replace local plans and unitary development plans, Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to replace SPGs and Statements of Community Involvement (SCIs). Local Authorities will also need to produce Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs).

12.6 Under the new Act, therefore, Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) will replace the existing system of Local, Structure and Unitary Development Plans. Local authorities are required to have adopted LDFs in place three years after commencement of the Act.

12.7 Surrey Heath Borough Council is currently reviewing its Local Plan in respect of this changing legislation.
Review of open space guidance

12.8 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is used to show how policies will be put into practice; gives greater detail on policies and proposals than would be appropriate in the Plan and anticipates guidance, which may be included in a future review of the Plan.

12.9 To date, the Government has not provided any statutory procedures for the preparation and adoption of SPG. This will change with the introduction of new planning legislation and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). Government has produced statutory procedures now (in 2004) for the production of SPDs through the publication of PPS12 “Local Development Framework” and associated companion guide and regulations.

12.10 A review of other Local Authority adopted SPG’s has been undertaken to provide some guidance and comparison including:

- Leicester City Council’s ‘Open Space Provision in New Residential Development’ (April 2003)
- Cambridge City Council’s ‘Open Space Standards: Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation’ (July 2002)
- Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council’s ‘Recreational Open Space Provision and Commuted Payments’ (February 2001).

12.11 A review has also been undertaken of key guidance produced by both Harrogate Borough Council ‘Provision of Open Space in Connection with New Housing Development’ (June 2003) and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council ‘Play and Open Space Guide’ (October 2002).

12.12 Through the analysis of existing open space guidance, it can be concluded that:

- All new housing developments (even single dwelling developments) should contribute towards open space provision;
- Local standards should be set for different open space typologies.
- Local standards can be used to inform the preparation of planning policies where additional open space is needed. For example, the children’s play space standard is 0.08ha per 1,000 people, and the amenity space standard in the urban area of 0.9 ha per 1,000. These could combine to give a requirement for 9.8 sqm per person for new play space in the urban area, equivalent to 29 sqm of open space required for a 3-bed house on the basis of there being 3 people in the house.
- Consideration should be given to providing formulas and worked examples within SPD to show the scale of off-site financial contributions;
- If financial contributions are insufficient to provide new recreation space beyond the ability of individual developments, special area based open space funds should be considered to contribute towards district wide projects. A list of projects and estimated costs contained within the SPD, which can be regularly updated, should be considered.
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Resourcing open space

Introduction

13.1 Budgets for both the enhancement and maintenance of open spaces has been reduced.

13.2 CABE Space make the point within their ‘manifesto’ that:

• a strategic vision is essential
• political commitment is essential
• and to start by making the case for high quality green spaces in-house (persuading other departments is key – high priority)

13.3 This will be essential to gain any financial support (both internally and externally) for any improvements to existing provision or new provision.

Sustainability of funding

13.4 There is a high risk of services becoming dependent upon external funds that cannot be guaranteed in the future. Although this increased dependence helps to increase opportunities, there are serious concerns in the event of funding applications being unsuccessful. This would mean a reduction in opportunities for local people, having raised their expectations.

13.5 There is a significant risk that, without a clear strategy based upon thorough assessments, short-term budget reductions could damage the Council’s ability to deliver long-term improvement.

Decisions

13.6 Should the general standard of maintenance be reduced across all types of open space or should there be wider differential maintenance regimes between the different categories of open space? What is the ideal balance?

13.7 Can the Council sell open space land to improve maintenance budgets whilst still meeting any recommended standards?

13.8 Almost all the parks and open spaces budget is tied up with maintaining existing provision and therefore there is little scope to respond to changing needs?

13.9 There are always improvements, enhancements and new provisions that could be made to improve the network of open space across the Borough. However many would require funding of some format.

13.10 Identified priorities can be resourced in a number of ways. Initially it may be necessary to allocate funding from within existing budgets for open spaces. This funding will be used to support other funding that is available from external sources, much of which will come from governmental organisations or quangos, which require match-funding from local authorities.

13.11 Potential sources of income are outlined below.
**Sale of Council land**

13.12 Generating and reinvesting resources obtained from land which is surplus to requirements is a principle that has been successfully adopted in the London Borough of Bromley, and by Glasgow City Council (through its Parks and Opens Spaces Strategy).

13.13 This is, however, likely to be a long process, and ultimately may prove difficult to achieve.

13.14 If considered feasible at some future stage, reinvestment would:

- secure political credibility for the sale of land
- provide sufficient funding to carry out significant rather than purely minor open space improvements. It should, however, be realised that the process may take two/three years to introduce, owing to planning, legal and other restrictions which could delay its introduction
- also, this mechanism is likely to create some public controversy and its potential success depends on how the process and sale of land is sold to the public in terms of benefits and outcomes.

**Section 106 planning agreements**

13.15 In particular, Section 106 agreements can be used to achieve environmental improvements. Once a Strategy framework has been established, the process of obtaining these improvements will be enhanced because they can be used to achieve specific purposes, eg:

- by opening linear route ways to connect green spaces
- providing walking and cycling routes
- obtaining open space in areas of deficiency
- funding open space improvements
- there are maintenance considerations to be taken into account; ie significant costs may arise, particularly if new open space is acquired.
- it may therefore be necessary to obtain an endowment fund wherever possible to cover these ongoing costs.
- it should of course be noted that such Agreements have to meet the test of Circular 1/97, and “Developers should not be expected to pay for facilities which are needed solely in order to resolve existing deficiencies”
- some councils have used part of the contributions towards revenue ‘Development Officer’ posts; e.g. in N Nottinghamshire.

**Use of redundant buildings**

13.16 Sympathetic use of redundant facilities for leisure and recreational purposes is also a possibility. This could include the establishment of small commercial sports facilities (e.g. tennis) in parks. Another example could be the use of a redundant sports pavilion as a children’s crèche or nursery.
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Business funding/sponsorships

13.17 Examples from other boroughs include sponsorship of Cardiff City Council’s events and festivals programme, and the Body Shop Playground Project in Auchinlea Park, Glasgow.

Partnership arrangements with the voluntary sector

13.18 This could include the formation of further parks “Friends” groups. An example is that of Rossmere Park, Hartlepool, where the community was encouraged to take ownership. The park was promoted and became heavily-used, attracting investment from funding bodies.

Lottery funding

13.19 This could include the Heritage Fund if works are carried out which are of outstanding interest and importance to the national heritage. Funding is provided for whole-park projects, the conservation of park features or park activities. Grants are available from £50,000 to £5 million for a period of up to five years. Projects must be designed to involve all stakeholders, must demonstrate sustainability, and must demonstrate the heritage value of the park in question.

Review of pricing

13.20 This needs to cover all charges where a significant income is obtained, including outdoor sports, allotments and burials. The review needs to consider:

- charges for similar provision in other local authorities
- the quality of provision
- whether the service can be improved to justify a price increase
- the extent to which the market will bear any future increase
- whether differential pricing can be used to encourage off-peak usage
- concessions for minority groups, or those which the Council particularly wishes to encourage
- pricing at a level which does not deny access
- lower and/or more favourable charges for Surrey Heath residents.

Living spaces

13.21 The “Living Spaces” grant scheme was launched in May 2003, and covers schemes with a value of £1,000 to £100,000. It may be suitable for small local parks, and is open to existing neighbourhood groups. The scheme supports:

- improving local parks
- creating or improving pocket parks or community gardens
- creating or improving play or seating areas
- cleaning up neglected residential land
- restoring village greens
- carrying out planting schemes on estates or verges
- creating or improving nature areas or city farms
• restoring local cemeteries
• restoring paths, gateways, ponds or boundaries.

**The “People’s Places” Scheme**

13.22 The “People’s Places” scheme runs until the year 2006, and is administered by the British Trust for Conservation Volunteers. It is provided for local community groups, and is for the transformation of derelict, underused or unsightly land or buildings. The scope of grant available is for schemes with a value of £3,000 to £10,000.

**The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme**

13.23 The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme was revised in April 2003, and allows registered landfill operators to contribute 6.5% of their annual landfill tax liability to environmental bodies approved by the organisation ENTRUST.

13.24 The scheme must be used for social, environmental and community based projects complying with specific “approved objects.” These objects are the provision and maintenance of public amenity, and restoration and repair of buildings open to the public with historical or architectural significance.

13.25 The project must be within 10 miles of a landfill/extraction operation.

**Local Heritage Initiatives**

13.26 Local Heritage Initiatives are to assist local communities in the preservation of their environment, landmarks and traditions including archaeological, natural, built and industrial heritage. A community group could investigate and celebrate a historic park, prepare a public exhibition in a park, and repair a feature. Up to 100% of project costs between values of £3,000 and £25,000 are payable.

13.27 Your Heritage Grants are available from the Heritage Lottery Fund, and are for projects of between £5,000 and £50,000 in value.

13.28 English Heritage supports the Heritage Grant Fund for historic parks and gardens where there is a significant risk of losing important landscape features.

**Lottery Small Grants Scheme**

13.29 The Lottery Small Grants Scheme offers Awards for All grants of between £500 and £5,000 for small projects which involve people in their community, and can include local environmental work and community park projects.

**Barclays Sitesavers**

13.30 Barclays Sitesavers is a grant mechanism for community projects which transform derelict land into community leisure and recreation facilities. Between £4,000 and £10,000 per project is available.

**The Tree Council**

13.31 The Tree Council supports the Community Trees Fund which funds up to 75% of all expenditure on tree planting schemes having a value of £100 to £700.
The Esmee Fairburn Foundation

13.32 The Esmee Fairburn Foundation aims to improve quality of life, particularly for people who face disadvantage. Eligible activities include the preservation and enhancement of open space, and good management of woodlands, gardens and allotments. The size of grant is not limited, with the average award for the year 2002 being £33,500.

The New Opportunities Fund for PE and Sport

13.33 A UK wide programme that aims to bring about a step-change in the provision of sporting facilities for young people and the community. Local education authorities have been tasked with delivering this programme in their areas.

Awards for All

13.34 A Lottery grants scheme aimed at local communities. The aim of the awards are to extend access and participation, increase skill and creativity and improve quality of life by supporting local projects that improve people’s opportunities.

Others

13.35 These could include other pro-active mechanisms such as:

- increased income from events and activities
- improvements negotiated as “added value” from service providers.
- New Opportunities Fund
- Awards for All

13.36 The degree of funding will define the scope and timescale over which any developments could be implemented. It is therefore essential to carefully consider all possible sources of funding.

13.37 These should include Council capital and revenue funding, but should also include consideration of the release of existing funds; commercial opportunities such as the franchising of facilities such as catering outlets; the delegated management of facilities such as outdoor sports; commercial sponsorship (e.g. floral bedding); planning gain (e.g. through Section 106 agreements); volunteer support; reviews of fees and charges; and increased income from events and activities.

13.38 Further detailed information regarding grants can be found in Claiming Your Share: A Guide to External Funding for Parks and Green Space Community Groups, obtainable from [http://www.greenspace.org.uk](http://www.greenspace.org.uk)
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Overall summary

Introduction

14.1 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).

14.2 The overall aim of the project was to:

- consider the local context of open space in Surrey Heath
- carry out a comprehensive audit of open space and recreation facilities in line with PPG17 typologies and guidelines for indoor provision
- undertake consultation to ascertain the demand for open space within the Borough
- assess the extent to which demand is currently satisfied
- set and apply provision standards based on local needs and aspirations.

14.3 The study has provided:

- an overview of the open space and recreation 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 surveys, consultation with internal and external agencies to establish key issues and needs
- consideration of relevant and appropriate provision standards
- identifying geographical areas and specific sites of priority
- a planning review
- a review of possible funding sources for improvements and future developments
- a summary of key issues based on the main findings from the supply and demand analysis in terms of quantity, quality, accessibility and value.

14.4 The following sections summarise the key findings of the study, under the headings of quantity, quality and accessibility and value.
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Quantity

14.5 From the quantity analysis, in association with consultations and survey undertaken, we are able to determine provision standards appropriate for a number of types of open space within the Borough.

14.6 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.

14.7 These standards are outlined in Table 15.1 below.

Table 15.1: Recommended local quantity standards by typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPG17 typology</th>
<th>Quantity provision standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Public Gardens</td>
<td>0.35 ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi-Natural Space</td>
<td>11.53 ha per 1000 population (urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.72 ha per 1,000 population (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>2.75 ha per 1,000 population (excluding golf courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Spaces</td>
<td>0.9 ha per 1,000 population (urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 ha per 1,000 population (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children and Young People</td>
<td>0.08 ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.14 ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>No standard set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality

14.8 A quality vision has been developed for each typology based on national or local standards, current provision, other local authority benchmark standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices K, L and M.

14.9 These could be used as benchmarking measurement to assess where open space sites are now 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

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

14.11 PPG17 encourages any new open space sites or enhancements 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.

14.12 There is good overall satisfaction level by residents regarding accessibility to existing sites. This covers accessibility by walking and for those with pushchairs and wheelchairs as well as factors such as visibility of site entrances and signage.

14.13 The household survey responses provide specific information to assist in establishing distance thresholds and accessibility standards for each type of open space as defined by PPG17. Table 15.2 shows recommended distance thresholds for each type of open space.

Table 15.2: Recommended local accessibility standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space type</th>
<th>Realistic mode of transport</th>
<th>Recommended travel time</th>
<th>Estimated equivalent distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Spaces</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>1.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Spaces</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>5-10 minutes</td>
<td>400m-800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children and Young People</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10-15 minutes</td>
<td>800m-1.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>No standard set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.14 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 per PPG17 recommendation, provide guidance in order to identify gaps in provision and meet the local needs of Surrey Heath’s residents.
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Applying standards

14.15 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs, both the quantity and accessibility standards are applied in combination. A full breakdown of spaces and facilities by ward is included in Appendix G.

14.16 In order to identify specific sites of importance and priority, the quality, site access and usage is analysed simultaneously.

14.17 The main issues for each typology are set out below:

Parks and gardens

14.18 No specific recommendations have been made with respect to parks and gardens as all the open spaces known as Parks within the Borough have been classified according to their primary purpose such as an outdoor sports facility. However, there was a general consensus that there was a need for more formal parks provision which could take the form of small, pocket parks part of existing larger open spaces.

Natural and semi-natural

14.19 There are five sites of natural and semi-natural open space within the Borough which score highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage:

- Brentmoor Heath (Site ID 132)
- Turf Hill Park (Site ID 133)
- Frimley Recreation Ground Open Space (Site ID 208)
- Camberley Park Woodland (Site ID 178)
- Frimley Lodge Park Meadows (Site ID 238)

14.20 A further seven sites are high quality, have good access and are used often. These are:

- Tomlins Pond (Site ID 41)
- Greenhill Road (Site ID 221)
- Watchmoor Reserve (Site ID 4)
- Open Space (Site ID 64)
- Watchetts Lakes (Site ID 5)

- Diamond Ridge Woods (Site ID 18)
- Chobham Place Woods (Site ID 146).

14.21 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community.

14.22 There are four sites which are high quality, have reasonable access and are used often, these are:

- Wendover Drive Wood (Site ID 59)
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- Warren Wood (Site ID 52)
- The Obelisk (Site ID 175)
- Open Space (South) (Site ID 88).

14.23 These sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community. Accessibility to these sites should be enhanced and their primary function further promoted to improve the potential for increased usage.

14.24 Lightwater Country Park is considered to have good quality, average accessibility, and a high/significant level of use.

14.25 One site, the Land Rear of Horseshoe Crescent (Site ID 19), is rated as high quality and is used often but has poor accessibility. However, due to SPA status of the adjoining land, along with Birch Close, improving accessibility may not be appropriate.

14.26 Accessibility at the Horseshoe Crescent and Birch Close sites should be addressed to improve usage, subject to the constraint of the adjoining SPA which may limit accessibility.

14.27 There are a number of natural and semi-natural open space areas, which have good accessibility and are used often but are rated average in terms of quality:

- MOD Whitehill (Site ID 224)
- Ivy Drive Pond (Site ID 225)
- Spruce Drive Open Space (Site ID 226)
- Briar Woodland (Site ID 227).

14.28 These sites are frequently used despite their average quality. The quality and features of these open spaces should be enhanced to further increase functionality and usage.

14.29 Common Land owned and managed by Surrey County Council across Analysis Area 3 (the rural part of the Borough) is generally considered to be low quality, have low accessibility and to have low levels of usage.

14.30 The potential for the quality and accessibility of these sites to be improved to enhance their value and increase levels of usage needs to be considered. However the wider purpose and benefits of these open spaces, such as for nature conservation must be evaluated before any action is taken. At the current time, it is envisaged that any additional visitor use of land that falls within the SPA should not be encouraged except where it can be demonstrated that ample capacity for increased use exists.
Amenity green space

14.31 There is an undersupply of amenity green space in certain parts of the Borough. There are ten sites of amenity green space within the Borough which score highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage:

- Camberley Park (Site ID 176)
- The Green (Site ID 74)
- Burrell Road Open Space (Site ID 28)
- Southcote Park (Site ID 50)
- Library Amenity Green Space (Site ID 179)
- Cheylesmore Open Space (Site ID 61)
- Open Space (Site ID 130)
- Open Space (Site ID 86)
- Open Space North (Site ID 87)
- The Grove (Site ID 171).

14.32 A further twenty-two sites are high quality, have good access and are used often.

14.33 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community. Those scoring highly in all three areas (in bold) should be recognised as examples of good practice.

14.34 One site is high quality, has reasonable access and is used often, Holly Hedge Play Space (Site ID 54).

14.35 This site needs to be protected as a site of high value to the local community. Accessibility to this site should be enhanced and its primary function further promoted to improve the potential for increased usage.

14.36 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 deviations to this, which suggests that certain sites require further analysis.

14.37 One site, Bain Avenue Amenity Space (Site ID 9), is considered good quality but has poor access and low usage.

14.38 Accessibility at this site should be addressed as a matter of priority to promote optimum usage.

14.39 There are a high number of amenity green space areas, which have good accessibility and are used often but are rated average in terms of quality. These include open spaces at Mitcham Road, Sullivan Road, Gilbert Road, Bagshot Green, Kirkstone Close and Rivermead Road.

14.40 These sites are popular despite their average quality. The quality and features of these open spaces should be enhanced to further increase functionality and usage.

14.41 There are a number of residential areas outside the recommended catchment areas where new amenity space could be considered eg. Westerdele Drive, Frimley; Alphington Avenue, Frimley; a small area in the east of Heatherside; Crawley Ridge, Camberley; and the northern part of Lightwater. However, the function of amenity
space such as kickabout areas for younger children, can in many of these areas be provided on the larger recreation grounds in the vicinity.

Provision for children and young people

14.42 There are four sites providing facilities for children and young people within the Borough which score very highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage:

- Lightwater Country Park (Site ID 283)
- Camberley Park Play Area (Site ID 177)
- Orchard Way Play Space (Site ID 15)
- Frimley Recreation Ground Play Area (Site ID 209)

14.43 A further five sites are considered good in terms of quality and accessibility and have significant usage:

- Rosewood Way Play Area (Site ID 235)
- Old Dean Road Play Area (Site ID 180)
- Clews Lane Play Area (Site ID 138)
- Mytchett Recreation Ground Play Area (Site ID 236)
- Frimley Lodge Park Play Area 2 (Site ID 239).

14.44 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community. Those ranked highly on all counts should be recognised as examples of best practice and set the benchmark for the Borough’s play provision.

14.45 Loman Road Play Area (Site ID 242) is considered to have very good access and to be highly used despite being average quality. Evergreen Road Play Space (Site ID 53) is rated highly in terms of quality and usage.

14.46 High usage demonstrates that these sites are important local facilities and need to be protected. Quality and accessibility, as appropriate, should be enhanced as a matter of priority to ensure that these sites deliver maximum value to the community and that good levels of usage are maintained.

14.47 Four sites with an average quality rating have good access and are used often. One further site is good quality and used often but ranked as average in terms of accessibility.

14.48 Accessibility and quality factors at these sites should be addressed to promote optimum usage.

14.49 Most sites with a low level of usage would have an average or poor quality and/or accessibility rating. This is the case with Elizabeth Avenue Amenity Space (Site ID 249), which is considered to have very good access but to be of average quality.

14.50 This site at Elizabeth Avenue requires further investigation to assess whether the primary purpose of the open space is appropriate. Quality should be enhanced as a priority if research indicates that this will serve as a catalyst to increase usage.
Alternatively, options to increase usage levels through a change of open space be explored.

14.51 There is an undersupply of childrens equipped play spaces in certain parts of the Borough. Some of the existing play spaces are not large enough. Those parts of the Borough lacking in play provision include parts of St Michaels Ward and St Pauls Ward, the southern part of Mytchett, Snows Ride, Windlesham, and the northern part of Chobham.

14.52 Given concerns over the cost of the maintenance, and replacement and renewal of play equipment, one approach may be for play equipment to be increasingly provided and maintained by private housing developers or, where appropriate, for commuted payments from housing developments to pay for the replacement and renewal of existing equipment in the Council’s ownership.

14.53 Further investigation is required to assess whether additional flexible multi-use games areas, teen shelters, kickabout and basketball areas, and skateboarding facilities should be provided.

Sports facilities

Playing pitches

14.54 There are a high number of outdoor sports facility sites within the Borough, which have been scored highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage. These include:

- Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 30)
- Heatherside Recreation Ground (Site ID 67)
- Frimley Green Recreation Ground (Site ID 71)
- Surrey Heath Common Land (Site ID 265)
- Mytchett Recreation Ground (Site ID 91)
- Watchetts Recreation Ground (Site ID 12)
- Frimley Lodge Sports Facility (Site ID 206)
- Old Dean Recreation Ground (Site ID 24)
- Collingwood School (Site ID 25)
- Blackdown Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 78)
- Mytchett Community Centre (Site ID 90)
- Briar Avenue Recreation Ground (Site ID 109)
- Penny Hill Park Golf Course (Site ID 252)
- Camberley Cricket Ground (Site ID 14)
- London Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 1).

14.55 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community.
SECTION 14 – OVERALL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

14.56 There are three outdoor sports facility sites, which have high usage but are rated average in terms of their quality:

- Hallgrove School (Site ID 244)
- Chobham Recreation Ground (Site ID 151)
- Windsor Road Recreation Ground (Site ID 148)

14.57 These sites should be prioritised for enhancement to increase their value to the local community. By improving the quality, this will ensure existing high usage levels can be sustained and potentially increase the carrying capacity of these pitches.

14.58 There are three outdoor sports facility sites, rated average in terms of their quality and/or accessibility and used often:

- Bagshot Playing Fields Association (Site ID 104)
- Bagshot Cricket Ground (Site ID 107)
- Bisley Recreation Ground (Site ID 142).

14.59 These sites should also be prioritised for improvements. By enhancing the quality and/or accessibility at these locations this could promote increased usage and potentially release pressure on other sites or support rising participation.

14.62 It is considered that there is an unmet need for at least one adult/junior pitch, 3 additional mini pitches and a training facility. The 2 mini pitches to be provided at the Alma Dettingen Barracks housing development in Deepcut will meet some of this demand, which leaves an outstanding need for one additional adult/junior pitch which will also provide training facilities, and for one additional mini pitch.

**Indoor sports facilities**

**Sports Halls**

14.63 There is a current undersupply of sports hall provision equivalent to 2 badminton courts.

14.64 This undersupply could be reduced through better partnership agreements with schools and other education sites so they are available for casual use by the community. Facilities such as Kings International College are currently able to meet only club requirements.

14.65 If Government targets for increasing participation are met, the demand for sports halls within the district will increase to 24 courts by 2010.

14.66 Smaller village and community halls also play an important role in leisure and recreation provision.
**Health and Fitness**

14.67 Modelling calculations indicate that there is a current undersupply of 137 stations.

14.68 This undersupply is however due to be eliminated by new provision coming forward as part of the Atrium development and the reconfiguration of facilities at Lightwater Leisure Centre.

14.69 The combined effect of these two new developments will be an additional 145 stations. This will eliminate the existing shortfall however population growth will mean an additional ten stations will be required to meet demand by 2010.

**Swimming Pools**

14.70 There is currently only one publicly accessible facility within Surrey Heath at the Arena Leisure Centre which provides a 6 lane 25m pool. The Arena pool does not meet demand. There is some club use of school pools, but the potential to increase club usage of school pools is limited. It is unlikely that casual public use can be provided at school pools. The very high usage of the Arena by swimming clubs and for teaching means that in practice the total swimming space for casual use is often reduced further, particularly during the evening. The overall supply needs to be viewed in the context of several large facilities in neighbouring boroughs such as Bracknell Forest, Rushmoor and Woking which are used by some Surrey Heath residents.

14.71 One of the key priorities in the Council’s Corporate Plan 2006-2015 is to develop and implement a replacement strategy for the Arena Leisure Centre. An assessment of the need for swimming pools using participation rates should be complemented by a closer appraisal of the extent to which there is club use of school pools, the extent to which there is a reasonable use of pools outside the Borough, and how well any increase in pool size is able to meet the scope and qualitative profile of the demands made upon it.

**Indoor Bowling**

14.72 The demand modelling findings indicate that the Camberley Indoor Bowling Club should meet current demand, but only provides one additional rink. If demand was to increase above predicted levels, the level of provision may need to be reconsidered.

**Community and village halls**

14.73 There are a number of village and community halls within Surrey Heath, which serve to provide leisure and recreation provision for the local community. There are ten main community halls, comprising the following:

- Briars Community Centre
- Connaught Pavilion
- Frimley Community Centre
- Heatherside Community Centre
Mytchett Community Centre
Bagshot Playing Field Association
Deepcut Village Centre
Chobham Community Centre
Bisley Village Hall
Tringham Hall

14.74 All of Surrey Heath’s community centres are leased out to local associations that run a range of community based programmes (sport, leisure, education, childcare) for all age groups and all sectors of the community.

14.75 A further 39 village and parish halls are used for leisure and recreation. Further investigation is required as to whether Old Dean, St Michaels Wards, and Town wards in Camberley require more modern, purpose-built community centres.

Allotments

14.76 There are three allotment sites within the Borough which score highly in terms of quality, accessibility and level of usage:

- Barossa Road Allotments (Site ID 17)
- Wharf Road Allotments (Site ID 75)
- Crabtree Road Allotments (Site ID 8).

14.77 All of the above sites need to be protected as sites of high value to the local community.

14.78 There is one site, The Hatches Allotments (Site ID 72), which is considered good quality, has reasonable access and is used often.

14.79 Accessibility to this site should be improved to encourage increased usage.

14.80 One site, Church Road Allotments (Site ID 33) has good accessibility and is used often but is rated average in terms of quality.

14.81 This site is frequently used despite its average quality. The quality and features of these open spaces should be enhanced to further increase functionality and usage.

14.82 More detailed work is required to establish whether new allotments are required, but there is an indication that there is probably a demand which could be met for additional plots, and that the south west of the Borough appears to have a shortfall compared with provision in the rest of the Borough.

Green corridors

14.83 The Council should improve the ecological value of green corridor sites and raise the awareness of the biodiversity importance of sites ensuring their protection and sensitive management.
14.84 The Council should continue to provide better links to open space in the Borough by facilitating provision for walking and cycling access along key routes.

14.85 Key opportunities for the creation of green corridors are outlined in Section 11.