

The development of a recreation, policy for South Cambridgeshire District Council

October 2005

Contents

Section 1.0

Introduction

Section 2.0

Development of a mechanism for calculating capital contributions for outdoor sports facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

Section 2.1

Development of a mechanism for calculating maintenance contributions for outdoor sports facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

Section 3.0.

Development of a mechanism for calculating capital contributions for children's play facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

Section 3.1.

Development of a mechanism for calculating maintenance contributions for children's play facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

Section 4.0.

Development of a mechanism for calculating capital and revenue contributions for informal open space in accordance with the proposed standard.

Section 5.0.

Consolidates the product of Sections 2.0 to 4.1 above into single overall contributions per person/house.

Leisure and the Environment

Brandreth House

Priory Road

Newbury

RG14 7QS

t. 01635 43024

info@lande.co.uk

www.lande.co.uk

1.0 Introduction

General

This report is in response to a commission by South Cambridgeshire District Council to Leisure and the Environment to assist in the preparation of a Recreation, Public and Local Community Facilities Policy.

Key requirements of the brief

To summarise, the key requirements of the project brief were for us to help in:

Establishment of a formula of cost per head/dwelling of the population for a contribution towards existing facilities or provision of new outdoor playing space. This may be provided within the development and/or “off site” or outwith the development site. This is based on the Council’s approved requirement of 2.8 hectares per 1000 population. (1.6 ha for outdoor sport; 0.8 ha for children’s playspace; 0.4 ha for informal open space).

Scope of this report

This report provides guidance on the development of a mechanism for calculating developer capital and maintenance contributions with regard to the above. Assumptions made are explained as appropriate.

Update

In February 2007 this report was updated by SCDC to reflect the proposals of the Draft Open Space in New Developments SPD with regard to the distribution of Formal Children's Play Spaces, in particular the requirement for fewer but better equipped LEAP's.

2.0 Development of a mechanism for calculating capital contributions for outdoor sports facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

General

Along with the requirement to develop guidance on community facilities this is the most challenging element of the project brief. Although the proposed outdoor sports standard suggests an overall requirement of 1.6 ha per 1000 people, it does not currently provide guidance upon how this space should be apportioned to different sports facilities/activities. Given that sports activities/facilities differ in cost of provision it is essential that the overall standard is supplemented by guidance upon and justification for the apportionment of the overall 1.6 ha/1000 between various activities/facilities prior to a formula for capital and revenue contributions being developed.

Consideration of local demand for outdoor sports

We have drawn on the Audit of Assessment of Need for Outdoor Playspace and Informal Open Space in South Cambridgeshire produced by the District Council in June 2005. We have found this to be a very helpful document in the task of identifying the nature and extent of local provision and demand for outdoor sports facilities of different kinds, which is essential to apportioning the overall 1.6 ha/1000 standard between the various activities and facilities.

Although the audit of facilities within the District's settlements is fairly comprehensive, the audit of teams and club members is understandably less complete, as it is notoriously difficult to obtain full and detailed records of local participation rates. On this basis the following figure (showing participation rates in certain sports within each settlement hosting facilities) makes some assumptions about club membership and team numbers where information has not been forthcoming. These assumptions are highlighted in yellow, and we feel that they certainly don't overstate current participation, being based on information from some of the smaller clubs (in term of membership) that have provided information. As will be seen, most of the assumptions are in relation to club membership for tennis and bowls.

It will be noted that although sports and recreation facilities and activity exists at Cambourne it is not listed in the following table, as it is likely currently to be unrepresentative of overall patterns of supply and demand throughout the District.

Figure 1.1: Outdoor sport activity levels in South Cambridgeshire settlements

Settlement	Population (2001)	Bowls club	Bowls players	Adult foot	Junior Foot	Adult crick	Junior crick	Tennis club	Tennis players
Gt & Little Abington	1383	1	16	1	0	2	3	0	0
Babraham	269	0	0	1	0	3	4	0	0
Balsham	1641	1	36	3	7	3	0	0	0
Bar Hill	4233	0	0	2	12	2	2	1	58
Barrington	904	1	18	2	0	2	0	0	0
Barton	799	1	18	1	0	0	0	1	10
Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth	4005	0	0	2	4	1	2	0	0
Bourn	1764	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	250
Highfield Caldecote	793	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Castle Camps	600	1	18	2	1	0	0	0	0
Great Chishill	608	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	10
Comberton	2189	0	0	4	9	2	0	1	106
Coton	773	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Cottenham	5652	1	18	6	25	3	3	1	38
Dry Drayton	582	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Duxford and Whittlesford Bridge	1836	1	18	2	0	0	0	0	0
Elsworth	657	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Eltisley	421	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Gt and Little Eversden	786	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Fen Ditton	747	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Fen Drayton	825	1	18	1	0	0	0	1	54
Fowlmere	1190	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Foxton	1161	1	39	2	0	0	2	1	216
Cherry Hinton	4704	1	38	5	17	2	1	1	149
Gamlingay	3535	1	18	2	2	1	0	1	75
Girton	3752	0	0	7	5	2	0	1	184
Hardwick	2630	0	0	8	3	3	3	0	0
Harlton	303	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Harston	1962	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Haslingfield	1550	0	0	1	0	2	3	1	142
Hateley	205	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Hauxton	687	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Histon and Impington	8387	1	101	1	10	3	3	1	115
Horseheath	465	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Ickleton	655	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Linton	4310	1	18	12	15	3	1	1	10
Littlington	813	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Longstanton	1700	1	18	1	0	4	4	1	26
Longstowe	193	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0
Madingley	206	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Settlement	Population (2001)	Bowls club	Bowls players	Adult foot	Junior Foot	Adult crick	Junior crick	Tennis club	Tennis players
Melbourn	4414	1	18	2	5	2	2	1	20
Meldreth	1641	1	18	1	4	0	0	1	10
Milton	4275	1	55	4	11	3	3	1	60
Guilden Morden	929	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Steeple Morden	963	1	18	2	0	1	1	1	10
Newton	401	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Oakington and Westwick	1297	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	74
Orwell	1080	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	60
Over	2743	0	0	3	5	3	3	0	0
Papworth Everard	2012	1	32	2	8	1	3	1	32
Sawston	7150	1	18	11	9	10	5	0	0
Gt Shelford and Stapleford	5687	1	18	3	0	3	0	1	404
Little Shelford	797	1	18	0	0	1	0	0	0
Shepreth	819	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Stow com Quy	426	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Swavesey	2480	0	0	2	8	2	2	0	0
Teversham	2665	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Thriplow and Heathfield	847	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0
Waterbeach	4431	1	18	4	2	2	2	0	0
West Wrattling	436	1	18	2	4	0	0	1	50
Weston Colville and Weston Green	424	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Whittlesford	1573	0	0	2	0	3	5	1	10
Great Wilbraham	639	0	0	2	0	4	3	0	0
Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom	394	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Willingham		1	35	2	9	2	0	0	0
TOTAL		25	658	134	177	104	67	25	2173

The number of existing teams (for a given sport) divided into the population is known as a Team Generation Rate (TGRs). Basic TGRs for Cricket and Football (derived from dividing the number of teams into the overall population of the District (130,108)):

- Football: Adult 1 team per 971 persons, Junior 1 team per 735 persons.
- Cricket: 1 team per 760 persons.

It can be seen from the above table that organized outdoor sports activity takes place in a wide range of settlements of various sizes, with even

comparatively small settlements often hosting a good level of organized activity. In fact, the above mentioned audit identified that in many villages, there appears to be a requirement for additional and/or improved facilities to cater for unsatisfied demand. TGRs can therefore underestimate actual levels of demand unless they are modified to reflect the effect of latent demand and other factors (considered shortly). TGRs in a modified form can be used as a basis for justifying the amount of outdoor sports space required by way of developer contributions, as well as how this space should be apportioned between the different sports/facilities. This in turn will provide the starting point for estimating costs in relation to developer contributions.

The requirements of each of the key sports will now be examined in turn.

Football

Football is the most significant sport locally in terms of numbers playing and the space required.

Based on the above figure it takes on average an estimated 971 local people to form an adult football team, and 735¹ local youngsters to form a junior team. In terms of adult play, if it is assumed that it takes at least 2 teams to justify the provision of one full size pitch², this means that 1942 people would justify the provision of an adult football pitch. If it is considered important to take into account the potential release of latent demand, and the success of sports development campaigns then it might be reasonable to add a 'margin for error'. Therefore, if participation levels increased by 15%³, this would mean that it would then take only 1689 people to create 2 teams, and therefore 1 adult football pitch. An adult football pitch with run-off area is 0.9 ha (based on NPFA sources) (9000 m²). This provides an adult pitch space ratio of 5.328 m² per person, or 5328 m² (0.5328 ha) per 1000 people.

In terms of junior play, this category covers a wide age range from the under 10 years mini soccer age group to youth footballers. This age group will therefore have varying requirements in terms of pitch size, from mini soccer pitches (0.2 ha), to pitches just below adult size dimensions (0.5796 ha). The aim should therefore be to provide 'flexible space' to allow pitch dimensions to be changed as the requirements of this age range evolve. A space of 0.5796⁴

¹ For football the District Council's Audit of Assessment of Need draws a distinction between adults as teams of 16 years and above playing on full size pitches, whilst junior teams are between 6 and 15 years, that play on undersized pitches including minisoccer pitches. Junior cricket covers teams up to and including 17 years of age.

² It would be difficult to justify the provision of an additional pitch for just one team. On the other hand a higher threshold of (say) three or four teams is also considered inappropriate, as teams may wish to play at the same time of the week.

³ This 15% is based on targets for sports development work seeking to increase participation. It is also a margin considered to be appropriate in several playing pitch assessments to reflect additional participation resulting from sports development campaigns as factors such as possible latent demand, the need to renovate pitches and occasionally take them out of use etc.

⁴ Based on a dimension of 80 x 45m with extra goal margins of 6m each and side margins of 9m each

ha (including run off areas) would therefore provide sufficient flexibility, as it would be large enough to meet the needs of all within this age range.

If it is assumed that it takes at least 2 teams to justify the provision of one junior pitch⁵, this means that 1470 people would justify the provision of junior pitch space. Assuming a 15% margin (as above) would mean it then takes only 1281 people to create junior 2 teams, and therefore 1 junior pitch space. Assuming the (above) junior pitch space of 0.5796 ha. This provides a junior pitch space ratio of 4.524 m² per person, or 4524 m² (0.4524 ha) per 1000 people.

Running total: Therefore, combining the total pitch space requirements for football (alone) suggests a need for 0.5328 ha + 0.4524 ha = 0.9852 ha per 1000 people.

Cricket

In terms of participation and space required cricket is the second most significant sport locally.

Local evidence (see the above table) suggests some examples of venues hosting a single cricket team. However, the general pattern is for at least two teams sharing facilities and often many more, especially when juniors are included. In terms of competitive play, if it is assumed that at least 4 teams (for example a combination of 2 adult teams with the remainder being junior teams) are required to justify one full size cricket pitch⁶, this means 4 x 760 = 1 pitch per 3040 people would be the requirement. However, similar to football it is important to add in a margin of error (again 15%)⁷. This would mean that 1 cricket pitch could be justified by 2655 people. Assuming a pitch space of 1.6 ha⁸ this provides a pitch space ratio of 6.026 m² per person, 6026 m² (0.6026 ha) per 1000 people.

Therefore, combining the total pitch space requirements for football with cricket suggests a need for 0.9852 ha + 0.6026 ha = 1.5878 ha

Dedicated cricket fields and wickets are relatively expensive to provide and maintain. Although there are examples in the District of some cricket fields used exclusively for the sport in reality the practice is likely to be shared space

⁵ For the older junior teams the same assumption explained in footnote 3 would also apply.

⁶ Because of the nature of the game a well designed and managed cricket field can support more games on a regular basis than a football pitch. There is much less wear and tear in the outfield and the use of the cricket table can be managed through rotating wickets. Taking this into account it is felt that a minimum of four teams could justify the provision of an additional cricket field. This assumes that use will be spread over the weekends and weekdays during the summer months. There are some examples of villages sustaining cricket grounds used by one team or less, but it is felt that it would be unwise to assume this ratio of provision as a basis for planning, as it is unlikely to be sustainable in most cases.

⁷ See footnote 4

⁸ There is no standard size for a cricket field in the same way as there is for adult football. However, the NPFA suggest that 1.6 ha would be sufficient for a cricket field plus boundary margins.

of the outfield between football (winter) and cricket (summer). The standard approach to achieving this is through providing a cricket table between two winter sport pitches, so that the latter can serve as part of the outfield. A 'central' strip of land of 102m long (the length of an adult football pitch and run offs used in this report), and 27.44 metres wide (the width of a cricket table⁹) - 0.2799 ha – would then only be required. Only the cricket table/wicket would not be subject to shared use. Therefore a reduced allowance of 0.2799 ha (embracing part of outfield and wicket)

Running total: This would lead to: 0.9852 ha + 0.2799 ha = 1.2651 ha per 1000 people

As the number of people required to provide one cricket pitch is roughly equal to the number of people required to provide two football pitches this calculation is valid.

Other pitch sports (rugby and hockey)

Hockey

Outside schools, competitive hockey is now played almost entirely on Synthetic Turf Pitches (STPs). Players within South Cambridge have traditionally tended to join clubs in Cambridge City as well as Royston, Saffron Walden, and St Ives. There are currently no full sized ATPs for hockey in the District. (There are now 2 full sized rubber crumb pitches at Linton and Comberton village colleges suitable for football but not hockey).

Thriving Junior hockey development work happens at the Bar Hill MUGA and the Over MUGA which mostly feed into the St Ives Club. Sawston Hockey Club has men and ladies teams but no juniors and they play in Cambridge City. Sport England guidance suggests that a full size artificial pitch (to meet the needs of Hockey as well as other activities) might be provided at a ratio of 1 floodlit pitch per 60,000 people.

A full size STP for Hockey (including provision for run offs and fence surround) is 101.44m x 62.86m (0.6376 ha). If one such facility is required for every 60,000, one sixtieth of such a pitch (i.e. $0.6376 \text{ ha}/60 = 0.0106 \text{ ha}$) would be required for each 1000 people.

Running total: This would lead to: 1.2651 ha + 0.0106 ha = 1.2757 ha per 1000 people

⁹ Taken from 'Cost Guide: Sport', which suggests a cricket table is 27.44m x 27.44m

Rugby

Shelford Rugby Club – large club with junior teams at all ages (450- 500 junior members). 5 full size pitches and 1 mini rugby pitch. 4 senior mens teams and 1 senior ladies team. The Club also runs 7 junior and colts teams (playing on full size pitches)

Sawston Rugby Club has 1 mens team only and they play at various (mainly school) grounds.

Residents also play for Cambridge Rugby Club (about 50% members are South Cambs members) located on the border between Cambridge City and South Cambs. There are 5 adult teams and 6 pitches. There are also 7 junior and colts teams requiring full size pitches.

Therefore (and making an allowance for Cambridge Rugby Club) it is estimated that South Cambridgeshire District currently generates the 19 teams requiring full size pitches. There are also mini and midi teams covering the under 12s that tend to play on parts of full size pitches.

Based on the above figure it takes on average an estimated 6848 local people to form a rugby teams requiring a full size pitch. If it is assumed that it takes at least 2 teams to justify the provision of one full size pitch¹⁰, this means that 13696 people would justify the provision of an adult rugby pitch. If it is considered important to take into account the potential release of latent demand, and the success of sports development campaigns then it might be reasonable to add a 'margin for error'. Therefore, if participation levels increased by 15%¹¹, this would mean that it would then take only 11909 people to create 2 teams, and therefore 1 adult rugby pitch. An adult rugby pitch with run-off area is 1.1618 ha – 11618 m²- (based on Rugby Football Union sources and the Sport England document 'Towards a Level Playing Field'¹²) (6426 m²). This provides an adult pitch space ratio of 0.97 m² per person, or 975 m² (0.0975 ha) per 1000 people.

Running total: This would lead to: 1.2757 ha + 0.0975 ha = 1.3732 ha per 1000 people

¹⁰ It would be difficult to justify the provision of an additional pitch for just one team. On the other hand a higher threshold of (say) three or four teams is also considered inappropriate, as teams may wish to play at the same time of the week.

¹¹ This 15% is based on targets for sports development work seeking to increase participation. It is also a margin considered to be appropriate in several playing pitch assessments to reflect additional participation resulting from sports development campaigns as factors such as possible latent demand, the need to renovate pitches and occasionally take them out of use etc.

¹² The assumed size of the rugby pitch is 144 m x 69 m (to the dead ball lines), which gives 0.9936 ha. To this should be added safety margins of 114 m x 3 m at each side, and 69 m x 6 m at each end. The total run off area is 0.1682 ha. The total overall requirement is therefore 0.9936 ha + 0.1682 ha = 1.1618 ha.

Court sports: tennis, netball, 5-a-side etc, and the role of Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)

Figure 1.1 shows tennis (in particular) and netball are played in many of the villages. Figure 1.2 indicates the level of provision of tennis courts and MUGAs within the District. Although there are a few tennis courts that are used exclusively for this purpose (including a small number of grass courts).

Both tennis courts and MUGAs will also generally accommodate a wide range of informal activity and training in addition to organized competitive play, and it is important therefore not just to assess potential demand for them on the basis of their use for competitive play. As can be seen from Figure 1.2 tennis courts and/or MUGAs are provided in settlements of varying size, and the Council's Audit and Assessment of Outdoor Playspace has highlighted an expressed need on the part of some villages for additional provision in this regard.

Figure 1.2: Provision of courts and MUGAs in South Cambridgeshire settlements

Settlement	Population (2001)	Tennis Courts	MUGAs
Gt & Little Abington	1383	0	1
Babraham	269	0	0
Balsham	1641	0	0
Bar Hill	4233	2	1
Barrington	904	0	0
Barton	799	2	0
Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth	4005	0	2
Bourn	1764	2	0
Highfield Caldecote	793	2	0
Cambourne	N/A	0	0
Castle Camps	600	0	1
Great Chishill	608	0	0
Comberton	2189	2	1
Coton	773	0	0
Cottenham	5652	0	2
Dry Drayton	582	0	0
Duxford and Whittlesford Bridge	1836	2	0
Elsworth	657	0	0
Eltisley	421	0	0
Gt and Little Eversden	786	0	0
Fen Ditton	747	0	0
Fen Drayton	825	2	0
Fowlmere	1190	0	1
Foxton	1161	2	0
Cherry Hinton	4704	3	0
Gamlingay	3535	2	1
Girton	3752	0	2
Hardwick	2630	0	1
Harlton	303	0	0

Settlement	Population (2001)	Tennis Courts	MUGAs
Harston	1962	0	0
Haslingfield	1550	2	0
Hateley	205	0	0
Hauxton	687	0	0
Histon and Impington	8387	5	4
Horseheath	465	0	0
Ickleton	655	0	0
Landbeach	825	0	1
Linton	4310	0	2
Littlington	813	0	0
Longstanton	1700	2	0
Longstowe	193	0	0
Madingley	206	0	0
Melbourn	4414	0	1
Meldreth	1641	2	0
Milton	4275	3	1
Guilden Morden	929	0	0
Steeple Morden	963	2	0
Newton	401	0	0
Oakington and Westwick	1297	2	0
Orwell	1080	0	0
Over	2743	0	3
Papworth Everard	2012	2	0
Rampton	440	0	1
Sawston	7150	2	1
Gt Shelford and Stapleford	5687	6	0
Little Shelford	797	0	0
Shepreth	819	0	0
Stow com Quy	426	0	0
Swavesey	2480	3	1
Tadlow		0	1
Teversham	2665	0	0
Thriplow and Heathfield	847	0	0
Waterbeach	4431	3	1
West Wrattling	436	1	0
Weston Colville and Weston Green	424	0	0
Whittlesford	1573	2	0
Great Wilbraham	639	0	0
Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom	394	0	0
Willingham	3436	0	0
TOTAL		58	30

Overall there is an estimated level of provision of:

- 1 tennis court for every 2243 persons
- 1 MUGA (which may be one of several sizes) for every 4337 persons.

However, bearing in mind the multifunctional nature of most of these facilities it is appropriate to consider also the combined ratio of provision, which is 1 tennis court or MUGA for every 1478 people.

As with playing pitches it would be appropriate to add in a margin to cater for the release of latent demand and the success of sports development campaigns etc. If the same margin of 15%¹³ is factored in this would suggest a potential ratio of provision throughout the District as a whole of 1 court or MUGA for every 1256 people.

It is felt appropriate to plan for this level of provision on the basis of MUGAs, with an appropriate specification to accommodate a range of activities at a basic standard of play. In practice, the size of the MUGAs will vary, but the tennis courts will be of a regular size. A MUGA dimension of 36m x 18m metres is a generally recognized size (0.0648 ha), and could cater for a variety of activities. **This would mean a level of provision of 0.0648/1256 = 0.0000515 ha per person within the District, or 0.0515 ha for every 1000 people.**

Running total: This would lead to: 1.3732 ha + 0.0515 ha = 1.4247 ha per 1000 people.

Bowls

The following figure indicates that the level of provision of bowling greens throughout the District is 1 green for every 4818.81 people.

Figure 1.3: Provision of bowling greens in South Cambridgeshire settlements

Settlement	Population (2001)	Bowls greens
Gt & Little Abington	1383	1
Babraham	269	0
Balsham	1641	0
Bar Hill	4233	1
Barrington	904	1
Barton	799	1
Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth	4005	0
Bourn	1764	0
Highfield Caldecote	793	0
Cambourne	N/A	0
Castle Camps	600	1
Great Chishill	608	0
Comberton	2189	1
Coton	773	1
Cottenham	5652	1
Dry Drayton	582	0
Duxford and Whittlesford Bridge	1836	1

¹³ See footnote 4

Settlement	Population (2001)	Bowls greens
Elsworth	657	0
Eltisley	421	0
Gt and Little Eversden	786	0
Fen Ditton	747	0
Fen Drayton	825	1
Fowlmere	1190	0
Foxton	1161	1
Cherry Hinton	4704	1
Gamlingay	3535	1
Girton	3752	0
Hardwick	2630	0
Harlton	303	0
Harston	1962	0
Haslingfield	1550	0
Hateley	205	0
Hauxton	687	0
Histon and Impington	8387	1
Horseheath	465	0
Ickleton	655	0
Landbeach	825	0
Linton	4310	1
Littlington	813	0
Longstanton	1700	1
Longstowe	193	0
Madingley	206	0
Melbourn	4414	1
Meldreth	1641	1
Milton	4275	1
Guilden Morden	929	0
Steeple Morden	963	1
Newton	401	0
Oakington and Westwick	1297	0
Orwell	1080	0
Over	2743	0
Papworth Everard	2012	1
Rampton	440	0
Sawston	7150	1
Gt Shelford and Stapleford	5687	1
Little Shelford	797	1
Shepreth	819	0
Stow com Quy	426	0
Swavesey	2480	0
Tadlow		0
Teversham	2665	0
Thriplow and Heathfield	847	0
Waterbeach	4431	1
West Wrattling	436	1
Weston Colville and Weston Green	424	0
Whittlesford	1573	0
Great Wilbraham	639	0

Settlement	Population (2001)	Bowls greens
Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom	394	0
Willingham	3436	1
TOTAL		27

Given that most of the existing greens appear to be well used and maintained it is suggested that reflecting the current level of provision would be appropriate for future planning purposes. Bowls does not tend to be subject to any sports development campaigns, and it is felt unnecessary to add in a 'margin' (as with the pitch sports). A six rink bowling green is 38.4 x 38.4 m or 0.147456 ha. As there are 27 greens this would be 27 x 0.147456 ha = 3.9813 ha. **When compared with the population this works out at 3.9813 ha / 130.108 = 0.0306 ha for every 1000 people.**

Running total: This would lead to: 1.4247 ha + 0.0306 ha = 1.4553 ha per 1000 people.

Summary of outdoor sports requirements

Therefore the 1.4553 ha of the notional 1.6 ha of outdoor sports space required by the Councils standard would be composed of:

- 0.9852 ha of football pitch space
- 0.2799 ha of cricket space
- 0.0106 ha of hockey pitch space (Synthetic Turf)
- 0.0975 ha of rugby pitch space
- 0.0515 ha of MUGA space
- 0.0306 ha of bowls space

To service this provision there would also be a need for:

Changing rooms pavilion (provision of around 200m – 0.02 ha) would provide sufficient space for a small multi functional pavilion with four changing rooms, match officials space, showers, toilets, circulation space and a small kitchen.

Other service requirements would be parking and access (0.025 ha would provide sufficient for a parking area of 10m x 25m.)

Running total: Combined with the sports space (1.4553 ha) the space required for changing space and parking/access space would amount to 1.5003 ha. The remaining 0.0997 ha (out of 1.6 ha) would be laid down to marginal turf. 1.4553 ha + 0.02 ha + 0.025 + 0.0997 ha = 1.6 ha

Capital costs for outdoor sports provision

Costs assumed

Having reviewed literature available we feel most comfortable with cost guidance provide by the NPFA¹⁴. Their last guidance was published in 2003 and so will need to be modified to take account of changes in the intervening period.

In most respects the cost difference between NPFA guidance and alternative sources is not very large, the exception to this being the cost of changing pavilions where we have found potentially huge differences between the various sources. Here again, are using the NPFA cost guide. We appreciate that there is variance between these costs and those used by the Council. However, we understand the latter may also cover community buildings, which are likely to have a higher unit cost than changing rooms/sports pavilions.

The following costs:

- Include a profit margin (averaged for the industry)
- Exclude VAT
- Exclude connection to mains services and other external works (for which a % of say 15% could be factored in)
- Exclude a contingency which should also be factored in.
- Exclude the cost of acquiring land.

The cost of providing the above requirement is based on the following pro rata costs.

Grading:

Stripping topsoil £1.8/m²

Earth moving £2.0/m²

Drainage:

Sandslit £1.71/m²¹⁵

Cricket strip:

(27.44 x 27.44m) seeded with base formation £24,400

Artificial Hockey Pitch

(101.44 x 62.86m) sand based with floodlights £544,000 (£85.32 per M²)

Bowls green:

(38.4 x 38.4m) seeded £53,000

MUGA:

(36 x 18m) bituminous macadam, surround fencing and goals £45,000

Parking:

¹⁴ Cost Guide Sport 2003. (NPFA)

¹⁵ Based on a grassed sports area of 7000 m²

(hoggin/stone)	£14/m2
Pavilion changing:	
(see earlier for detail 200 m2 at £843/m2)	£168,600

Capital contribution

Stripping £1.8 x 16000 m2 (1.6 ha) =	£28,800
Earth moving £2 x 16000 m2 (1.6 ha) =	£32,000
Grass pitch sport space drainage £1.71 x 13,626 m2 =	£23,300
Marginal turf £1.71 x 997 m2 =	£1705
Cricket strip (pro rata) ¹⁶ =	£9,443
Hockey pitch £85.32 x 106 m2 =	£9044
MUGA (pro rata) ¹⁷ =	£35,760
Bowling green (pro rata) ¹⁸ =	£10,997
Changing pavilion ¹⁹ =	£168,600
Parking £14 x 200m2 =	£2,800
Total	£322,449

This capital cost equates to £322.45 for every person (i.e. 322,449/1000)

The District Council's draft Supplementary Planning Document 'Open Space and New Developments' provides guidance upon likely occupancy rates for different house sizes, as well as upon house types qualifying for contributions. From this guidance it will be possible to determine for different house developments the scale of contribution required.

Location and layout of sports pitches

The following notes and accompanying illustrations might be considered to represent sound general principles of design. The principles will include the following:

- Location
- Accessibility
- Playing surface
- Floodlighting
- Availability of changing rooms/toilets
- Social facilities
- Site suitability and security
- Parking

Location: Where the District Council seeks contributions for off site provision in lieu of direct provision 'on-site' it will be important to demonstrate that facilities on which contributions are proposed to be spent are within convenient reach of residents occupying the developers housing. The

¹⁶ Based on a pro rata cost of how much of cricket strip could be supported by 1000 people

¹⁷ Based on a pro rata cost of how much of a MUGA could be supported by 1000 people

¹⁸ Based on a pro rata cost of how much of a bowling green could be supported by 1000 people

¹⁹ For football alone a 4 changing room pavilion could be justified to service 1.6 ha per 1000 people

NPFA consider that a convenient journey by foot or bike to local playing field facilities (for outdoor sport) is reasonable and in this context suggest that it is desirable for local playing fields to be within convenient distance of the population they are intended to serve. 1.2 kilometres is a distance recommended by the NPFA in this regard, although it is accepted that this may not always be possible.

When considering the location of new pitches, the potential for conflict between recreation activities and other land uses in the area, particularly residential, must be taken into consideration. Proximity to housing makes a site more accessible, although nuisance can arise from noise, parking, traffic generation, etc.

Accessibility: for team sports it is probable that at least half of the players will be coming from out of the immediate area, and will therefore rely on some form of transport. The provision of convenient space for parking, preferably off-road and within the site, and a location near to public transport will make the site more accessible, and therefore more attractive to users.

Playing surface: pitches that are not drained and otherwise maintained cannot be used as frequently as those that are. Open pitches are vulnerable to dog fouling and other abuse. Guidance on the increase to playing capacity brought about through drainage improvements is available from various Sport England and NPFA publications.

Floodlighting: this can increase levels of usage of facilities, including for training. Floodlighting is essential for higher-level clubs, and highly desirable for artificial turf pitches, although it is considered unreasonable to require developers to contribute to floodlighting grass pitches. Sport England offers the following guidance on floodlighting levels for association football:

Class	LUX
Class 1: national and international football	500
Class 2: medium level football	200
Class 3: low level football and training	75

Additional specific guidance is provided in relevant Sport England factsheets.

Availability of changing rooms and toilets: the provision of changing facilities is desirable for all local sports teams, and essential for some. The detailed specifications for changing accommodation really depend on the nature of the sports played at a given site. A two-pitch complex would call for two home and two away team changing rooms. There will also be a requirement for separate match official's rooms (1 per game). The requirement for special facilities for junior and or female teams really depends on the specific circumstances. Guidance on these matters plus considerations such as disabled facilities, toilets, security, etc is provided in the Sport England fact sheets.

Social facilities: local sports teams value social facilities highly, particularly when hosting matches to visiting players. Such facilities make sites more attractive to players and spectators alike. Social facilities, especially where they include bar facilities and function rooms, can also be an important revenue generator for clubs.

Site suitability and security: for multi-sport community pitches, the key features of any layout are as follows:

- A site big enough to accommodate multiples of at least two football/rugby pitches, with a cricket table in between. The cricket outfield is shared with the other pitch sports on a seasonal basis
- The use of residue grass for training and/or mini-soccer, together with floodlighting to enable midweek training during the winter. Floodlighting of one or both of the main pitches is sometimes difficult to install on 'shared space' layouts.
- Changing block located close to both pitches for quick access at half-time
- Vehicular access and parking availability
- A secure equipment /maintenance shed (for goals, flags, mower, etc) is provided.
- Orientation of pitches where possible in accordance with NPFA recommendations

2.1 Development of a mechanism for calculating maintenance contributions for outdoor sports facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

General

Given that we are using largely NPFA cost guidance for capital provision we feel that it is only consistent to also adopt their guidance on maintenance contributions. To re-emphasise, their last guidance was published in 2003 and so will need to be modified to take account of changes in the intervening period.

Assumed unit costs

The following costs:

- Include labour
- Include a profit margin (averaged for the industry)
- Exclude VAT
- Exclude a contingency which should also be factored in.

General sports turf:	£0.52/m ² ²⁰
Cricket square:	£8.932/m ² ²¹
Hockey (STP)	£1.06/m ² ²²
Bowls green:	£7.48/m ² ²³
MUGAs:	£2.33/m ² ²⁴
Pavilion/changing:	£12/m ² ²⁵
Carparking:	£1/m ² ²⁶

Based on the above figures the total revenue contribution for 1.6 ha of outdoor sports space based on the apportionment between activities explained earlier would be as follows:

²⁰ This is based on the average of the range of costs for the maintenance of an adult football pitch provided by the NPFA (£4712.5 pa) divided by the size of a football pitch space (9000m²) = £0.52/m²

²¹ This is based on the average of the range of costs for the maintenance of a club square provided by the NPFA (£6725 pa) divided by the size of a square (752.9m²) = £8.932/m²

²² Based on NPFA cost guides.

²³ This is based on the average of the range of costs for the maintenance of a green (£11,035) provided by the NPFA divided by the size of a green (752.9m²) = £7.48/m²

²⁴ This is based on the average of the range of costs for the maintenance of hard porous tennis court provided by the NPFA (£1510 pa) divided by the size of a court (648m²) = £2.33/m²

²⁵ Currently District Council estimate

²⁶ As above

Regular contributions

General sports turf (includes marginal turf) 14,623 m2 =	£7,603 pa
Cricket strip (pro rata) ²⁷ =	£2,602 pa
MUGA (pro rata) ²⁸ =	£1,200 pa
Hockey Pitch (pro rata) (synthetic) (includes sweeping, litter collection, marking, and top dressing)	£112 pa
Bowling green (pro rata) ²⁹ =	£2,283 pa
Changing pavilion ³⁰ =	£2,400 pa
Parking £1 x 250m2 =	£250 pa
Total	£16,450 pa

Currently this level of maintenance would work out at £16,450/1000 = £16.45 per person. As with capital contributions the existing draft Supplementary Planning Document can be used to calculate provision per house type based on assumed occupancy rates.

Notwithstanding the comments below concerning new government guidance, it would be appropriate to index link regular annual payments, so assuming an average annual inflation of 2.5%, the overall level of contribution per person would rise over five years as follows:

Year 1: £16.45
Year 2: £17.86
Year 3: £17.28
Year 4: £18.71
Year 5: £18.15

New Circular guidance in relation to Planning Obligations and developer contributions

Between our original tender proposal, commissioning, and writing this report the ODPM has replaced the old Department of the Environment Circular 1/97 'Planning Obligations' with a revised Circular 05/2005. This new Circular has several passages relevant to this project, and these are considered below, together with our comments:

Para B9 What is sought must be also be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and reasonable in all other respects...The effect of the infrastructure investment may be to confer some

²⁷ Based on a pro rata cost of how much of cricket strip could be supported by 1000 people

²⁸ Based on a pro rata cost of how much of a MUGA could be supported by 1000 people

²⁹ Based on a pro rata cost of how much of a bowling green could be supported by 1000 people

³⁰ For football alone a 4 changing room pavilion could be justified to service 1.6 ha per 1000 people

wider benefit on community but payment should be directly related in scale to the impact which the proposed development will make...

Our Comment: similar requirement to the previous circular.

Para B18 Where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance (i.e. physical upkeep). Such provision may be required in perpetuity.

Para B19 As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developer's contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested. Where contributions to the initial support ("pump priming") of the new facilities are necessary, these should reflect the time lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in the public sector funding streams, or its ability to cover its own costs....Pump priming maintenance payments should be time-limited and not be required in perpetuity by planning obligations.

Our Comment: We think there are significant differences between this requirement and that of the earlier Circular, especially with regard to possible maintenance contributions, even where there is some use by residents not living in the associated development. We think that in practice this provision might be far more applicable to small areas of open space and play areas within the development, although the views of the Council on this matter are invited. In terms of other facilities (including those off site) it would appear that the requirement upon developers (and therefore the expectation of local authorities) to commit to maintenance contributions in the medium and longer term does/should not exist. This could obviously have consequences for the Council's desired maintenance contribution period (within the Supplementary Planning Document stated to be 10 years.)

Para B22 In some cases, individual developments will have some impact but not sufficient to justify the need for a discrete piece of infrastructure. In these instances, local planning authorities may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to seek contributions to specific future provision....In these cases, spare capacity in existing infrastructure provision should not be credited to earlier developers.

Our Comment: This statement is a little vague, especially with regard to the last sentence. However, we would argue that developers should still be required to make contributions to rectify deficiencies in the *quality* and *accessibility* of open space even when there is no apparent need for additional *quantitative/per capita* provision. This would be consistent with statements found within the Companion Guide to PPG 17, and indeed PPG17 itself which states the need for local standards to have a qualitative, quantitative/per capita and accessibility components.

3.0 Development of a mechanism for calculating capital contributions for children’s play facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

General

The overall proposed standard for children's play space and facilities is 0.8 ha per 1000 people.

The Council’s standard suggests that the overall 0.8 ha can be provided by a combination of both equipped play provision plus informal playing space within housing areas. The Council’s proposed standard suggests that of this 0.8 ha half should be devoted to equipped play space and half to informal playspace.

The proposed standard covering equipped children’s play facilities is based on a modified version of the NPFA’s hierarchy of LAPs, LEAPs, and NEAPs. The detailed costings for the provision of each of these types of equipped playspace are included in a spreadsheet appendix to this document. However, for the purpose of developing a mechanism for calculating capital contributions the figures can be summarized as follows:

Assumed costs

LAP (Local Area for Play) (assumed activity areas 0.01ha)	£9,000
Modified LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play) (activity area 0.05ha)	£65,000
Modified NEAP (Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play) (activity area 0.12ha)	
Part 1: 8 x play equipment etc	£70,000
Part 2: MUGA/Wheel Park	£65,000

The element of the standard covering informal playspace assumes laying out of grass at a cost of £7 m². This figure reflects the figure provided for amenity grass in the draft SPD.

The above costs:

- Include a profit margin (averaged for the industry)
- Exclude VAT
- Exclude a contingency which should also be factored in.
- Exclude the cost of acquiring land.

In terms of equipped playspace it is important to establish what proportion of the 0.4 ha per 1000 provided for such features should be allocated to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs respectively as this will have significant cost implications for developers and must therefore be justified. This can be achieved by

firstly looking at the catchment radii for LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs within the SPD, which are:

- LAPs: 100m radii
- LEAPs: 450m radii
- NEAPs: 1000m radii

If the above are converted into corresponding catchment area circles they would cover the following areas:

- LAP: 3.142 ha
- LEAP: 63.6 ha
- NEAP: 314.1 ha

Therefore within 1 NEAP catchment there would be sufficient catchment area space to justify:

1 NEAP
5 LEAPs
100 LAPs

Multiplying this level ratio of provision for each type of facility provides the following areas:

NEAP:	1 x 0.1200ha =	0.12ha
LEAPs:	5 x 0.0500ha =	0.25ha
LAPs:	100 x 0.01ha =	1.0ha
Combined total:		1.37 ha

The percentage of this combined area devoted to each of the three categories is therefore:

NEAP:	8.7%
LEAP:	18.3%
LAP:	73%

These percentages can now be used for working out what proportion of the overall 0.4 ha equipped playspace per 1000 people should be devoted to provision of the above three facilities.

NEAP: 0.0348 ha
LEAP: 0.0732 ha
LAP: 0.292 ha

The cost of providing the activity space for the above proportions can be worked out from the summary costings for Activity Areas of these three levels of provision provided earlier in this section:

NEAP: 0.0348ha is 29% of the Activity Space of a NEAP (0.12ha). 29% of the total cost of the Activity Space of a NEAP (£135,000) is **£39,150**.

LEAP: 0.0732ha is 146.4% of the Activity Space of a LEAP (0.05ha). 146.4% of the total cost of the Activity Space of a LEAP (£65,000) is **£95,160**.

LAP: 0.292ha is 2920% of the Activity Space of a LAP (0.01ha). 2920% of the total cost of the Activity Space of a LAP (£9000) is **£262,800**

The above costs produce a combined total of £397,110 for 0.4 ha of equipped playspace per 1000 people, or £397.11 per person.

As mentioned informal children's playspace is also to be provided at a level of 0.4 ha per 1000 people. At the (above) cost of £7/m², this works out at £28,000 per 0.4 ha per 1000 people, or £28 per person.

3.1 Development of a mechanism for calculating maintenance contributions for children's play facilities in accordance with the proposed standard.

General

The accompanying spreadsheet providing itemized costs for (modified) LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs suggests that maintenance costs for these facilities will tend to work out at about 10% of the overall capital costs per annum.

Assumed costs

Based on the total capital contributions for LAPs, LEAPs, and NEAPs per 1000 people the annual maintenance cost would be:

10% of £397,110 = £39,711 per annum per 1000 people, or £39.71 per person.

This breaks down into the following contributions for each level of equipped provision:

NEAPs: 10% of £39,150 = £3915.00 per annum per 1000 people, or £3.91 per person.

LEAPs: 10% of £95,160 = £9516.00 per annum per 1000 people, or £9.51 per person

LAPs: 10% of £262,800 = £26,280.00 per annum per 1000 people, or £26.28 per person

Based on the total capital contributions for informal children's playspace per 1000 people the annual maintenance contribution (at 5% of the capital cost of provision) would be:

5% of £28,000 = £1400 per annum per 1000 people, or £1.4 per person.

New circular guidance

In establishing an appropriate period for maintenance contributions we draw attention once again to the requirements of the new ODPM Circular 05/2005, and in particular the following quote:

Para B18 Where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the

developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance (i.e. physical upkeep). Such provision may be required in perpetuity.

Para B19 As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developer's contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested. Where contributions to the initial support ("pump priming") of the new facilities are necessary, these should reflect the time lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in the public sector funding streams, or its ability to cover its own costs....Pump priming maintenance payments should be time-limited and not be required in perpetuity by planning obligations.

The above statement is considered to be especially relevant to the maintenance of children's play provision. Facilities intended to service very local catchments, such as LAPs and (in all probability) informal play space will in practice be predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development. It might therefore be argued that maintenance contributions should be in perpetuity.

On the other hand, facilities with a larger catchment are likely also to be used by residents other than those of the associated development, especially where offsite provision is made. In such circumstances the Circular suggests that maintenance periods covering only a limited period would be appropriate.

The practical implication of the above could be that developers might be asked to provide maintenance contributions in perpetuity for both LAPs and Informal Playspace. On the other hand, LEAPs and NEAPs might justify a maintenance contribution for developers for 3-5 years at best.

Section 4.0. Development of a mechanism for calculating capital and revenue contributions for informal open space in accordance with the proposed standard.

General and assumed costs

Capital

The proposed standard also requires the provision of 0.4 ha of informal open space per 1000 people. The District Council in its draft SPD uses a figure of £15 per m² for developing general amenity space³¹. This figure assumes that 85% of the space is laid to grass and the remainder (15%) is shrub planting. The figure excludes:

- Land acquisition costs
- VAT
- Project management and professional fees
- A contingency fee.

However, they include a profit margin and labour costs.

After review of other possible sources we feel that the above is a reasonable guide figure to use.

Based on the above figure 0.4 ha (or 4,000 m²) of amenity space would work out at $4000 \times £15 = £60,000$, or £60,000 per 1000 people (£60 per person).

Maintenance

The District Council in its draft SPD uses a figure of £0.82 per m² to reflect the cost of maintaining amenity space with the above mixture of grass and shrubs.³² Use of this figure would provide consistency with adoption of the capital cost unit figure.

Therefore the cost of maintaining 0.4 ha (or 4,000 m²) of amenity space would be $4,000 \times £0.82 = £3,280$ per year, or £3,280 per 1000 people per year (£3.28 per person per year).

Amenity space where it is provided within a new development is likely only to be used by local people (i.e. those living in houses built by the contributing developer). Accordingly, the District Council should seek guidance on the length of time for which it might be reasonable to expect maintenance contributions to be made, bearing in mind the provisions of the new government circular described earlier in this report.

³¹ Cost as at January 2004.

³² Cost at January 2004.

Inflation should be factored into annual contributions in a manner similar to that explained earlier in this report.

5.0 A combined standard

General

The capital and maintenance contributions developed in the preceding sections can largely be consolidated into two standard payments.

Capital contributions

Provision (capital)	Cost per person
Outdoor sport	£322.45
Equipped children's play space	£397.11
Informal children's play space	£28
Amenity space	£60
Total	£807.56 per person

Maintenance contributions

Provision (capital)	Cost per person per year
Outdoor sport	£16.45
Equipped children's play space	£39.71
Informal children's play space	£1.40
Amenity space	£3.28
Total	£60.84 per person per year

Dependent on the interpretation of government policy covering developer contributions some of the maintenance contributions for elements of equipped play space and community buildings will be for a limited period.