

Appendix 5

Recreation Study

Recreation Study

Public Participation Report

1. Introduction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

1. Introduction

1. Introduction

3967 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Comment	Whilst English Nature has no objection to the Recreation Study as such, it is surprised to see that there is no mention of access to nature conservation areas or improving the biodiversity of recreational areas which seems to be a missed opportunity. English Nature would wish to see biodiversity maximised in sports pitches and related facilities with measures such as appropriate planting of native species and the introduction of bat/bird boxes etc. In addition the concept of green infrastructure, which is dealt with comprehensively in the Area Action Plans, should also be mentioned in this Study, showing how green spaces can be linked with green corridors to create a network of habitats within an urban area.	Biodiversity is dealt with through the Biodiversity Action Plan. Policies proposed in the LDF will also seek improvements to biodiversity as part of new developments, which will include openspaces.
4810 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Comment	Para 1.1 Clearly the study has been based upon locally generated demand. Objection is raised to this. The study should have considered the possibility of a requirement for a sub-regional facility in Cambridge such as could be provided at Barton Road South.	The recreation study did focus on locally generated demand, and was not a study of the whole Cambridge Sub-Region. Any large scale facility will need to be located in an appropriately accessible location, and considered against policies in the LDF.
2428	Support	Pleased to see that this document exists, and that provision for Sport, Recreation and Play, having been ignored for so long, is now being planned for.	Support noted.

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD****2. Methodology***2. Methodology*

4963 - Sport England

Object The methodology of the Recreation Study is objected to as it is not considered to be adequate for use when determining developments that would result in the loss of, or prejudice to, playing fields. I would expect the next review of outdoor sports provision to be undertaken in accordance with Sport England's methodology. Sport England recommends that playing pitch assessments and audits be reviewed at least every three years. In view of the strong interrelationship between users and facilities in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and in view of the proposed level of growth within and around Cambridge, a joint assessment of playing pitch provision for both districts should be prepared.

It is agreed that frequent reviews of the recreation study are required, to ensure both the audit and assessment of need reflects current circumstances.

Officers have worked in discussion with Cambridge City Council on production of the recreation study. Standards vary between the two areas due to their nature and character.

Sport England will be consulted in future reviews of the study, to make adjustments to the methodology where they are appropriate, and can result in improvements.

Characteristics of South Cambridgeshire

2774
1274 - British Horse Society
(Cambridgeshire)

Object South Cambridgeshire has a fragmented bridleway 'network' which makes walking and riding very difficult.

Footpaths and bridleways were not directly addressed by the recreation study. They are primarily addressed by the County Council, although there are other policies in the LDF which relate to countyside access, particularly through the Area Action Plans.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD****The Outdoor Playspace Audit*

3707 - House Builders Federation	Comment	<p>The HBF queries the appropriateness of excluding primary school facilities and pitches from the calculations. Particularly given that the text states in paragraph 2.19 that the NPFA Six Acre Standard advocates inclusion of school pitches and those in educational ownership where community usage is secured by written agreement.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that school facilities are primarily to serve the needs of their pupils, it is a fact that they are often utilised by their wider communities, particularly during evenings and weekends. Although the schools can always choose to end such arrangements, it is unlikely that they will usually do so due to the likely negative impacts on local community spirits and school income.</p>	<p>The community use of primary school pitches has not been secured through written agreement, and are therefore not included in calculations. Whilst the community input from some primary schools is acknowledged, the limitations on usage detailed in the report means that it would be inappropriate to consider them as contributing fully to provision, and this included in land supply calculations.</p>
----------------------------------	---------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

The Recreation Needs Assessment

4808 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Comment	Para 2.56 The report suggests there are no significant shortages of cricket pitches because many clubs use college pitches. Our own investigations reveal that clubs do not like these arrangements because they cannot make their own investment to improve facilities and could not obtain grants even if the college were to agree. Many major clubs want their own grounds for these reasons.	This paragraph refers to the Cambridge City Council Playing Pitch Assessment 1999. The need for additional cricket facilities has been identified in the study.	
1985 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	2.71, reference to a 1/3 size artificial turf pitch at Cottenham. Where is it to be sited and why this size if more space available? 2.74, no reference to Cottenham. There has been talk recently of re-introducing tennis courts why has this not been mentioned?	These paragraphs reflect priorities of relevant sport governing bodies, and queries should be addressed to them.	
2780 1276 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 1275 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Bridleways which allow riders to ride shorter as well as longer distances are sorely needed. Other equestrian facilities such as cross country courses, arenas are not mentioned at all. The questionnaire distributed to parish councils failed to include any of the facilities enjoyed by equestrians.	The focus of the recreation study was village playspace facilities. Countryside uses such as horse riding were not included.	
3700 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The assessment ignores skateboarding (and BMX) as sports. There is a need for provision of facilities for this in larger settlements. There should be a (permanent) skate park provision available within a mile of a population centre greater than 2,000 people. The assessment also ignores the need for District wide provision for other sports, including both indoor sports (badminton et al) and indoor/outdoor sports (archery etc.). The focus on football, tennis, bowls etc should not be at the cost of ignoring all others.	Skateboarding facilities were considered as childrens play facilities, and included in the audit, and the survey of need. It was mainly larger villages that indicated a need for a skateboarding facility. An assessment of indoor facilities has not been included in this study.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5008 - Sport England	Object	With reference to paragraph 2.42 to 2.46: With specific reference to synthetic turf pitch provision and the Facilities Planning model (FPM), reference is made to the county-wide assessments (1998). It should be acknowledged that a later national assessment was carried out in 2002 using a more refined set of parameters. This assessment identified Cambridge as a priority for additional "weekday" provision (ie meeting informal training requirements) rather than formal weekend pitch needs for competitive hockey. Whilst no specific reference was made to South Cambs, it should be acknowledged that any additional provision in Cambridge might meet some of the need generated within South Cambs District. Sport England therefore objects to this section of the study on the grounds of accuracy.	Agree that the study should reflect the most up to date evidence available, and reference should be made to the 2002 study.	Include reference to 2002 study on synthetic pitch provision.

3. Results and Analysis – Towards a Playspace Standard for South Cambridgeshire

A Standard for Informal Open Space

3702 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils Object

The District Council argues for an open space requirement of an arbitrary 0.4 hectares per 1,000 head of population based on the lower of 0.4 to 0.6 range discussed under Chapter 3 "A standard for informal open space" picked to match the lowest of the local authority examples picked as good practice. With a Government requirement to increase housing densities from 25 to 30 dwelling per hectare, gardens will necessarily shrink to accommodate this. Therefore it will be essential to increase the informal open space available to compensate. The higher figure of 0.6 hectares per 1,000 population is considered more appropriate to attain the badge of "Good Practice".

The Recreation Study considered best practice examples both within the District and from other Local Authorities, and determined that 0.4ha. was the most appropriate standard for the District.

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD****4. Conclusion***4. Conclusion*

1047

Comment	<p>1. More accessible countryside and less keep out signs.</p> <p>2. More linked up bridleways to support offroad cycling.</p> <p>3. Cambridgeshire needs a 'large' centre for offroad cycling. Preferably a woodland or forest.</p> <p>4. Cambridgeshire needs large open grassed heathlands. Preferably exposed to wind for wind based sports such as Power Kiting.</p>	<p>This issue relates to the Strategic Open space Study, being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council. The need for additional large open spaces in Cambridgeshire, particularly to meet the needs of the major new developments taking place, is acknowledged.</p>
---------	---	--

Decision on 4. Conclusion*Informal Open Space*

2784
1277 - British Horse Society
(Cambridgeshire)

Object	<p>Para 4.11 mentions footpaths (only for walking) but omits to mention bridleways (used by cyclists, riders and walkers) which are multipurpose and benefit a wider community group.</p>	<p>Agree that there may be opportunities to provide or improve bridleways as part of this aspect of open space, and this should be acknowledged in the study.</p>	<p>Include reference to bridleways in paragraph 4.11.</p>
--------	---	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

Open Space and Playspace and New Developments: Northstowe and The Urban Extensions

3966 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	<p>Comment English Nature notes with interest that Cambridgeshire County Council, in partnership with the District Councils, have undertaken a study of Strategic Open Spaces in the County. It is understood that the intention is to develop a standard to suggest how much space is required to serve the needs of the population, and the quality of space that should be provided. English Nature promotes the concept of accessible natural greenspace and would suggest the adoption of 'Accessible green space standards'. In addition, we trust that the SOS incorporates protection of fragile habitats, and species vulnerable to disturbance, and addresses environmental capacity of identified areas.</p>	Standards for strategic open space in Cambridgeshire will reflect local audits and assessments of need, as required by PPG17.	
5149 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	<p>Comment Para 4.21-4.24</p> <p>We welcome the consideration of "Strategic Open Space" as a desirable resource, and one whose supply should be augmented through the local planning framework. We are disappointed, however, that the Recreation Study document concentrates mainly on organised recreation using sites such as playing fields. More attention should be paid to facilities for country walking, which is Britain's most popular outdoor family activity.</p>	Most strategic openspaces provide opportunities for country walking. Area action plans will also address opportunities to improve countryside access as part of major new developments.	

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******APPENDICES******1. Villages Where Needs Assessment Demonstrated No Additional Need For Pitches***

2423

Comment Cambourne may have theoretically enough provision, but so far no signs are being shown that planned provision will be met. For example, playing fields are some two years behind schedule, the cricket pitch will be unavailable until 2006 (despite planting in 2003), and the recently opened games area has been built with tennis courts that are below LTA sizing guidelines.

The objection relates to the timing of provision, i.e. trigger points. Any additional facilities can be triggered more carefully, i.e. to include a lead-in time, in any future Section 106 Agreement. Facilities required to be provided through the existing S106 Agreement are being negotiated with the developers as early as possible, but there have been some delays and the Council has taken appropriate action where necessary.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2. Villages With Inadequate Pitch Provision To Meet Local Need</i>				
1996 - Cottenham Parish Council	Comment	Cottenham has two cricket pitches, not one, we do have a junior football pitch, there is enough room on the recreation ground for an additional senior football pitch. Nobody has expressed an interest in a rugby pitch. Re mini-soccer can you identify where they are? Do they cover the same area as the junior pitch.	As reflecting in the study, the surveys took place over a time when changes were taking place in provision at Cottenham. An update is required to remove inconsistencies.	Re-survey Cottenham village to ensure consistency in the report.
6019 (Land East of Recreation Ground, Over) 6020 (Land East of Recreation Ground, Over)	Comment	It is noted that Over is identified as having a low open space provision and a need for a further football pitch. Such provision could be addressed by means of developer contributions in the event of planning permission being granted for further development. In the adopted Local Plan our client's land is allocated as open space. However, it is in a central position well served by footpaths and already adjoins an existing playing field. It is considered more appropriate if this land was allocated for further centrally located residential development, and the required football pitches (or required open space) provided on the outskirts of the village.	Large residential allocations are not required at group villages, as detailed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report. The central location, close to the existing recreation ground, makes this ideal for recreation purposes to serve the village.	
2469	Support	Support need for additional sports pitches in Sawston.	Support noted.	
2998 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	Papworth Everard Parish Council strongly supports the requirement for a MUGA in the village.	Noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

4. Parish Councils Requiring New Or Updated Pavilion Facilities

2007 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	It is our opinion that these facilities need a total rebuild not refurbishment. They are in a very poor state.	Refurbishment was seen as the appropriate response at time of survey. This will be reconsidered when the resurvey of Cottenham takes place.	
---------------------------------	--------	--	---	--

5. Villages Investigating New Play / Updated Play Facilities (At Time Of Survey)

2017 - Cottenham Parish Council	Comment	A new toddler area has been set up and in addition a new skateboard park has been opened these projects have been ongoing for 18 months and the Parish Council are suprised that they were not included in this report	The early stages of these projects were reported in the Annex 1 of the recreation study. The re-survey of Cottenham will include any new facilities.	
---------------------------------	---------	--	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>10. Outdoor Playspace Audit Summary</i>				
2908 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Comment	We suspect that the figure shown for Sport ha. erroneously includes the area of our Conservation Area, rather than just that of the Recreation Ground.	Agree.	Reduce area to reflect actual sports provision, and correct Steeple Morden map.
5958 (Land at Beech Tree Farm, North of Shepreth Road, Foxton) 6627 (Land at Beech Tree Farm, South of Shepreth Road, Foxton) 5961 (Land North of Kneesworth) 5991 (Proposed recreation ground West of Middlewatch, Swavesey) 6057 (Land North of Taylors Lane, Swavesey)	Comment	Sites are proposed for residential development to facilitate provision of new recreation facilities.	Allocation of residential land outside village frameworks must be considered through the LDF Core Strategy.	