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Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGLV</td>
<td>Area of Great Landscape Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGST</td>
<td>Accessible Natural Green Space Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONB</td>
<td>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>Ancient Tree Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Artificial Turf Pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNR</td>
<td>Local Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWS</td>
<td>Local Wildlife Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>Multi Use Games Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE</td>
<td>National Institute for Health and Care Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPF</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAWS</td>
<td>Planted Ancient Woodland Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Playing Pitch Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROW</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Ramblers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMM</td>
<td>Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANG</td>
<td>Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Sevenoaks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCI</td>
<td>Site of Nature Conservation Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Synthetic Turf Pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>Tandridge District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>Tree Protection Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASSt</td>
<td>Woodland Access Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC</td>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFD</td>
<td>Water Framework Directive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities. The National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to set out policies to help enable communities to access high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation. These policies must be based on a thorough understanding of the local needs for such facilities and opportunities available for new provision.

Ethos Environmental Planning Ltd (in conjunction with Leisure and the Environment, and RQA Ltd) were commissioned by Tandridge District Council to undertake an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment and Playing Pitch Strategy. The Study responds to national policy requirements and will inform the preparation of the Council’s emerging Local Plan.

1.2 The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment

The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment examines existing and projected needs for open space, sport and recreation provision, using a variety of data sources, together with independent investigation, stakeholder and community consultation and surveys. Analysis of the data gathered and the reporting of findings has followed appropriate national guidance.

In brief, the scope of the Study covers:

- Open space, including amenity and natural space, parks and recreation ground, play space, allotments.
- Outdoor sports space.
- Built sports facilities (primarily sports halls and swimming pools).

1.3 How does this Report relate to the Open Space Sport and Recreation Assessment?

This report is one of six being provided as part of the overall Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment, which underpins and informs the emerging Local Plan. It provides consultation findings from the ‘Community and Stakeholder Needs Assessment’, as explained in section 1.5 below. It should be noted that the overall district wide Assessment is not yet complete, and the content of this report may therefore be subject to change.

The six reports are the:

- Tandridge Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report (this report);
- Tandridge Open Space Study;
- Tandridge Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan;
- Tandridge Indoor, Built, and Outdoor (non-pitch) Sports Needs Assessment;
- Tandridge Proposed Open Space, Sport and Recreation Typologies and Standards;
- Likely Requirements for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision for a Garden Village.

The final output from the project will integrate some of these reports into a consolidated document.
1.4 The Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan to deliver housing, employment and other types of development to meet local need up to 2033. The Council has already conducted two Local Plan consultations under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; the Local Plan Issues and Approaches Consultation (2015) and the Local Plan Sites Consultation (2016).

To guide the preparation of the Local Plan going forward the Council has agreed a Preferred Strategy for the Local Plan. The Preferred Strategy, which sets out a hybrid approach seeking to deliver development in the short term, subject to meeting the exceptional circumstances test, on the edge of the district’s sustainable settlements in addition to a strategic development that accords with the principles of a Garden Village to meet long-term development needs.

A further Regulation 18 consultation is being carried out between August and October 2017 to explore potential broad locations for a Garden Village before the Council prepares the Draft Local Plan, which is likely to be subject to public consultation in 2018.

1.5 Purpose of this Report (The Community and Stakeholder Needs Assessment)

This report makes a cross-cutting contribution to the overall Study in providing evidence that will be used in all three of the main study reports (Tandridge Open Space Study; Tandridge Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan; and Tandridge Indoor, Built, and Outdoor (non-pitch) Sports Needs Assessment). It primarily relates to the Open Space Study but relevant findings and information will also be carried forward in the Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Facilities Study.

In the three main reports the consultation findings will be combined with other evidence, findings and assessments such as that completed in the audit, mapping and analysis process.

Undertaking comprehensive consultation and engagement with all relevant stakeholders and the wider community is an essential part of the overall process. It is an expectation of the National Planning Policy Framework and is needed to ensure that the study is robust in relation to recommended national guidance such as that recommended by Sport England.

The report examines local need for a wide range of different kinds of open space, sport, and recreation facilities. It has drawn upon a range of survey and analytical techniques including a review of consultation findings from relevant play, sports, leisure and open space studies. It outlines the community consultation and research process that has been undertaken as part of the study as well as the main findings.

The report is made up of 4 main sections:

- General community consultation;
- Neighbouring local authorities; and parish councils;
- Parks, green spaces, countryside, and rights of way;
- Play and youth facilities

Each section provides additional detail on the consultation process relevant to that section and at the end of each section there is a short summary of the key findings.

---

1 Additional consultation has also been undertaken in relation to pitch sports and indoor facilities as advised in Sport England guidance. These additional findings will be included in the main reports as appropriate.
The consultation and research programme was undertaken from February to June 2017. The extent of the research reflects the breadth and diversity of the study and a consequent need to engage with as wide a cross section of the community and stakeholders as possible.

In summary, questionnaire surveys were undertaken as below:

- A general household survey (online)
- A survey of parish councils
- Local groups and organisations’ surveys

In addition to the above a number of one to one stakeholder interviews/surveys were undertaken.

The result of this consultation and other analyses will help, amongst other things, to inform the content of the recommended local standards as appropriate. This will be explained further in the three main reports.

The consultation report also helps the study to understand stakeholder and local people’s appreciation of open space, sport and recreation facilities, and the wider green infrastructure and the values attached by the community to the various forms of open spaces and facilities. This appreciation will have clear implications for the way in which open space, sport and recreation facilities are considered as part of plan-making, as well as in dealing with planning applications.

---

2 It should be noted that this report provides consultation evidence in the form of the observations and views/opinions sourced from many different organisations, individuals and studies. On occasion the views and observations expressed by individuals and groups may not be consistent with each other, nor are such individual contributions necessarily accurate or up to date.
2.0 General Community Consultation

This section provides consultation findings that cover all aspects of open space, sport and recreation facility provision. In this sense it provides a useful overview across all these aspects rather than simply from groups and organisations with specific interests in just one aspect of open space, sport and outdoor recreation. This contrasts, for example, with the other sections of the report which supply findings from individuals, groups and organisations with specific interests in individual elements of open space, sport and recreation.

The section also includes engagement with public health stakeholders who have an interest spanning across all aspects of recreation facility provision, whatever activity that may be (in relation to encouraging an increase in physical activity - with associated health benefits).

2.1 Residents’ Household Survey

2.1.1 Introduction

The open space, indoor and outdoor sports and recreational facilities study needs to secure a general understanding of how residents of Tandridge District currently make use of the various kinds of open space, sport and recreation facilities; in particular whether they think there are enough of such facilities; what they think of the quality of those facilities; how accessible they are; and what kind of facilities they think are priorities for future development and improvement. A good way of securing this general overview is to secure responses from a broad cross section of Tandridge District households.

An online questionnaire survey was therefore designed by Ethos and promoted by the District Council Communications Team. Respondents were asked to respond to provide a view on behalf of their household, rather than simply as individuals; 384 surveys were completed. The total number of people represented through the household survey was 781 and the average household size of the households was 2.8 - higher than the average for England (2.4) and that of Tandridge District as a whole (2.43).

Just over 49% of households who responded had children (representing household views on behalf of 196 children and young people) with ages well spread across the age range:

![Age Profile - Children and Young People](image)

The full questionnaire is included in Appendix 2 and the following provides some of the key findings:\[3\]

\[3\] The findings are further considered - in detail - in three main reports; along with consideration of regional and national participation frequencies from sources such as Sport England's Active people survey.
2.1.2 Frequency of use – All households

Respondents were asked to state how often they visited or used each of the following types of open space, sport and recreation facilities within the study area, and the results are shown on the charts below:\(^4\):

Open Space and Outdoor Facilities

---

\(^4\) Please note that percentages have been rounded up or down to the nearest full percentage. This means that on some occasions the total percentages will vary very slightly from 100%.
It is the district’s footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths that are most commonly used by most households at least monthly (91%); followed by local parks and recreation grounds (89%); and woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves (86%). Rights of way and parks are also by far the most frequently used facility on both a weekly and daily basis: 80% use footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc. at least weekly (of which 52% make use almost every day) and 75% visit parks and recreation grounds at least weekly (45% of which visit almost every day).

Other spaces used at least weekly by at least 65% of households (including those who are more frequent users) are woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves; and informal open spaces (for ball games, picnics, hobbies, dog walking etc).

Play areas, playing fields and areas for water recreation are also fairly frequently used but by fewer households. At least 43% use them on a regular basis - at least monthly (including those who are more regular users).

**Swimming Pools and Indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor facilities - Frequency of use - all households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swimming Pools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% Less often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports and Leisure Centres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% Less often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% At least weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gym/Health &amp; Fitness facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Less often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist Indoor Sports facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Less often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village Halls and Community Centres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% Less often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28% Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Almost every day</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At least weekly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At least monthly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less often</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sport and leisure centres are used regularly by significant numbers (54% of households report using them at least monthly - many more regularly); as are the district’s gym/health and fitness facilities (48%). 45% of respondent households make use of swimming pools at least monthly and 44% use village halls/community centres.

Sport/leisure centres and gym/health and fitness facilities are also the most frequently used on a weekly and daily basis (36% of households report using them at least weekly, including some almost every day).
2.1.3 Frequency, regularity and times of use – Regular Users

It is interesting to look at the frequency with which regular users of facilities visit them as for some facilities this is not immediately obvious from looking at the overall figures.

**Open Space and Outdoor Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
<th>At least weekly</th>
<th>At least monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds and parks</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for teenagers</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor playing fields for football etc.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis/netball courts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation facilities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal open spaces for ball games etc</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By regular users we mean those households where open spaces/facilities are used/visited at least monthly.*
Many users of outdoor sports facilities use them at least weekly (73% for artificial turf pitches, of which 13% use them nearly every day); 70% for grass pitches (21% nearly daily); and 67% for bowling greens (7% nearly daily).

76% of households using play areas visit at least weekly (of which 31% make use nearly every day).

71% of allotment holders visit their allotment at least weekly (of which 43% visit almost every day).

**Swimming Pools and Indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor Facilities - frequency of use - users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Leisure Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym/Health &amp; Fitness facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Indoor Sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Halls and Community Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of indoor facilities the most frequently visited by regular users (at least weekly) are the gym/health and fitness facilities (75% use these at least weekly of which 12% make use almost every day).

In addition, 71% of users of specialist indoor sports facilities such as indoor bowls use them at least weekly (of which 6% use them nearly daily).
2.1.4 Quantity of open space, sport and recreation facilities

Residents were asked if they needed more, the same or fewer of different types of open space and recreational facilities. Findings are illustrated in the chart below and will influence the “quantity” component of local standards as appropriate (this will be explained further in the 3 main reports).

**Open Space and Outdoor Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Need for more</th>
<th>There are enough</th>
<th>Don’t need as many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds and parks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for teenagers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor playing fields for football etc.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis/netball courts</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal open spaces for ball games etc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of open space typologies that respondents suggest there is a general need for more. Over 60% suggest a shortfall of informal open spaces - for ball games, picnics, hobbies, dog walking etc. (68%); woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves (67%); facilities for teenagers (64%); and footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc (62%).

Following this, other aspects where there was considered to be an overall shortfall by a majority were: children’s play areas (59%); local recreation grounds and parks (57%); water recreation facilities (57%); and allotments (51%).
A large majority thought that overall there are enough outdoor bowling greens (72%) and an additional 8% said that Tandridge don’t need as many. Smaller majorities think that in general there are enough tennis courts (57%) and grass playing fields (54%).

**Swimming Pools and indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Need for more</th>
<th>There are enough</th>
<th>Don’t need as many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Leisure Centres</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym/Health &amp; Fitness facilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Indoor Sports facilities</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Halls and Community Centres</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear majority of households reported that overall there are currently enough of all of the various kinds of indoor sport and leisure facilities; most notably in relation to village halls/community sports centres (75%); swimming pools (71%); and gym/health and fitness facilities (71%).

The two kinds of facility where a significant minority of respondent households (30%) believe that overall there is a need for more are sports/leisure centres and specialist indoor sports facilities such as indoor bowls and tennis centres.


### 2.1.5 Quality of open space, sport and recreation facilities

Respondents were asked how they rated various types of facilities in the study area in terms of quality. The responses of those expressing an opinion on specific categories of facility are illustrated below:

**Open Space and Outdoor Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds and parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for teenagers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor playing fields for football etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis/netball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal open spaces for ball games etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all kinds of outdoor facilities/open spaces a majority of households suggested that in general they were of average or better quality (though the most common rating tended to be only "average"). However, for some typologies there were notable levels of dissatisfaction with general levels of quality as noted below.

47% of households highlighted the overall quality of outdoor facilities for teenagers as being either poor or very poor. The quality of MUGAs, water recreation facilities and artificial turf pitches was rated as poor or worse by at least 34% of respondents.

In contrast some kinds of facilities/open spaces were rated relatively highly in terms of quality. These include: parks and recreation grounds (50% rate quality in general as being good or very good); woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves (48% similarly); play areas (41%); and footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths (40%).
In broad terms respondent households appear quite satisfied with the quality of indoor sports and recreation provision. All are commonly rated as being of average or better quality.

The indoor facilities most commonly regarded as being of good or very good quality are swimming pools (50%); sport and leisure centres (48%); and gym/health and fitness facilities (47%).

The quality of specialist sports centres was not rated quite as highly (34% being rated as good or very good). Similarly for village halls and community centres (42%).

The detailed findings regarding quality will be useful in relation to reviewing the “quality” aspect of local standards.

2.1.6 Access Issues (Geographical)

An important component of this study is to develop and recommend a series of local standards of provision for different types of open space, sport and recreation opportunity. The following provides a means to gauge people’s willingness to travel to use different types of facility/open space (which might be by car, foot, bike, public transport etc). Where appropriate, these results will feed into the determination of the “access” element of local standards.

In looking at the travel times in the first set of charts below it should be noted that these do not specify the mode of preferred travel (this is covered by the next set of charts).
In general, a majority of household respondents report that they would not normally travel more than 15 minutes to visit the different kinds of open spaces and outdoor facilities. There is considerable variation however between the typologies.

For example, 39% of user households are prepared to travel 16 minutes or more to visit water recreation facilities; 31% of households are prepared to travel that long to make use of use of artificial turf pitches; and 30% to access MUGAs.

In contrast, for significant numbers of residents, facilities need to be much more locally accessible before they will be used (for example, play areas, parks and recreation grounds, and informal open space areas - for ball games, picnics, hobbies, dog walking etc).
- 82% of users would expect play areas to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 45% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
- 73% of users would expect local parks/recreation grounds to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 39% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
- 73% of users would expect informal open spaces to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 44% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.

**Swimming Pools and Indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Acceptable Travel Times to Indoor Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Swimming Pools Acceptable Travel Times" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Leisure Centres</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Sports and Leisure Centres Acceptable Travel Times" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym/Health &amp; Fitness facilities</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Gym/Health &amp; Fitness Facilities Acceptable Travel Times" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Indoor Sports facilities</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Specialist Indoor Sports Facilities Acceptable Travel Times" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Halls and Community Centres</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Village Halls and Community Centres Acceptable Travel Times" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where households make use of the opportunities identified 65%, users are prepared to travel up to 15 minutes to use some facilities such as specialist indoor sports facilities; 18% of these would travel up to 20 minutes and 12% more than 20 minutes.

In the cases of swimming pools and sports leisure centres, 59% users are prepared to travel up to 15 minutes to make use of such facilities. For swimming pools 29% would travel up 20 minutes. For sports/leisure centres 23% would travel up 20 minutes. Only around 7% of users would travel for longer than this to use such facilities.

In contrast, for significant numbers of residents, some indoor facilities need to be much more locally accessible before they will be used. For example 64% of users of village halls and community centres would not wish to travel more than 10 minutes, of which 24% would expect to travel 5 minutes or less.

It is clear from the above that for both indoor and outdoor facilities there is great variance in respondents’ apparent willingness to spend time travelling to different types of facilities. In drawing up the “access” element of specific local standards for different kinds of open space/facility, it is clearly very important to take careful note of all of these findings (combined with the preferred mode of travel options discussed below).

An accompanying question asked what mode of transport respondents were likely to use to get to such facilities (where they would use them).
## Open Space and Outdoor Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Drive/ car</th>
<th>Bus/ other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds and parks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for teenagers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor playing fields for football etc.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis/netball courts</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal open spaces for ball games etc</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For most typologies walking is the norm, most notably for facilities such as play areas (86%); footpaths/bridleways and cyclepaths (84%); recreation grounds and parks (82%); and informal open spaces (80%).

However, a majority of respondent households would normally drive to artificial turf pitches (60%) and water recreation facilities (53%). In addition, a higher proportion of households would normally drive rather than walk to tennis/netball courts; outdoor bowling greens; and playing fields.
In relation to indoor sports and recreation facilities respondents are more likely than not to drive to all facilities except village halls and community centres; most notably in the cases of specialist sports facilities (64%) and swimming pools (59%).

Walking is the preferred mode of travel for a clear majority of respondent households accessing village halls and community centres (63%).

For a small but significant minority access by cycling is important. For example, 8% prefer to cycle to their local sport/leisure centre, gym, and specialist indoor sports centre. 4% make use of the bus/other transport mode to visit specialist indoor sports facilities.

It is not of course surprising that in broad terms walking is the predominant mode of travel to facilities such as local parks, children’s play areas, recreation grounds, and other informal recreation areas. In contrast, motorised transport is more common for larger and more specialised facilities such as swimming pools and leisure centres which may be some distance removed from many potential users. It is however of great importance when it comes to drawing up the access element of local standards in terms of whether access thresholds should primarily be provided in terms of walking, cycling or drive times.

The main implications for deriving access standards are that, in general, walk times would be more appropriate for:

- Parks and recreation grounds
- Informal open space
- Play areas for children
- Teenage facilities
- Woodlands and wildlife/nature areas
- Allotments
- Rights of way
- Village halls/community centres

Based on the above drive times would, in general, be more appropriate for:

- Swimming pools and leisure centres
- Specialist sports facilities
- Artificial turf pitches
- Tennis courts and bowling greens
• Gym/health and fitness facilities

The 3 main reports will also discuss in detail the way different typologies should be treated in relation to spatial planning standards. For example, recommendations for footpaths’ bridleways and cyclepaths may not be focused on specific quantity or distance/time threshold standards.

**Importance of Footpath/cycle access**

Residents were asked if they would cycle or walk further or more often if the quality of their journey by foot or bike to a nearby open space or facility was improved.

- 61% of households confirmed that they would be prepared to walk/cycle further if the quality of the route was improved
- 72% also said that if the quality of the route was improved they would make the journey more often.

This is a significant finding in terms of illustrating the potential benefit of ensuring good foot and cyclepath access to facilities.

The detailed findings from this section will be used when drawing up the access elements of relevant standards for different kinds of open space elsewhere in the study.
2.1.7 Key Issues and priorities for improvement

Households were also asked what their priorities for improvement in provision were. Findings are illustrated on the table below. Respondents were asked to rate the need for new or improved facilities by indicating priorities at three levels – high, medium or low.

**Open Space and Outdoor Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Spaces and Outdoor Facilities - Priorities for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to Open Space and Outdoor Facilities the category highlighted by the largest number of households as a high priority for potential improvement/new provision was woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves (61%) followed by better footpaths, bridleway and cyclepath provision (59%).

Other notable high priorities for improvement noted by significant numbers were informal open spaces (58%) and parks and local recreation grounds (57%).
Children’s play areas also score quite highly as a priority need (a combined high/medium priority choice for 68% of households - 45% high/23% medium). Access to areas for water recreation was rated similarly (a combined high/medium priority choice for 62% of households - 35% high/27% medium).

Swimming Pools and indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor Facilities - Priorities for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High: 20% Medium: 21% Low: 20% Not a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Leisure Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High: 23% Medium: 19% Low: 17% Not a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym/Health &amp; Fitness facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High: 22% Medium: 22% Low: 25% Not a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Indoor Sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High: 8% Medium: 22% Low: 22% Not a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Halls and Community Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High: 18% Medium: 19% Low: 23% Not a priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For indoor sports and leisure facilities in general, fewer households highlighted high priority needs. Improvements to swimming pool provision gained the highest proportion of high priority ratings (29%) along with an additional 30% of medium priority ratings.

Following this, improvements to sport and leisure centres were rated as a high priority by 23% with an additional 40% of medium priority ratings.

Kind of Improvement Needed

Associated questions asked households to indicate whether the kind of priority need was primarily for more facilities, improved quality of existing, or improved access. In relation to the priorities noted above these findings are shown in the charts below:
From this it can be seen that:

- The category where it is particularly clear cut that the primary need identified is for more facilities is provision for teenagers (63%).
- Other typologies with a high proportion indicating a need for more, rather than improvements in quality include: informal spaces; water recreation facilities; tennis courts; play areas; and artificial turf pitches.
- For other typologies quality improvements to existing provision is the more common kind of improvement need suggested e.g. footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths (46%); parks and recreation grounds (43%); and playing fields.
- Nearly half of respondents (47%) thought that no improvements were needed for bowling greens.
Swimming Pools and Indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor facilities - kind of improvement needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Swimming Pools**
  - Additional facilities: 5%
  - Improvement to existing: 31%
  - Improved access: 16%
  - No improvements needed: 48%

- **Sports and Leisure Centres**
  - Additional facilities: 2%
  - Improvement to existing: 35%
  - Improved access: 13%
  - No improvements needed: 50%

- **Gym/Health & Fitness facilities**
  - Additional facilities: 4%
  - Improvement to existing: 34%
  - Improved access: 21%
  - No improvements needed: 41%

- **Specialist Indoor Sports facilities**
  - Additional facilities: 4%
  - Improvement to existing: 25%
  - Improved access: 27%
  - No improvements needed: 22%

- **Village Halls and Community Centres**
  - Additional facilities: 4%
  - Improvement to existing: 22%
  - Improved access: 22%
  - No improvements needed: 52%

From this it can be seen that:

- In general, for all the typologies of indoor sport and leisure facilities (other than specialist facilities) more households highlight the primary need being improvements to existing facilities rather than for additional facilities/improved access.
- For specialist indoor sports facilities nearly twice as many respondents suggest that the primary need is for additional facilities (45%) rather than improvement to existing facilities (25%); but this category also has the highest proportion of responses indicating no improvements needed (27%).
2.2 Stakeholder Views - Public Health

2.2.1 Introduction - the general value of open spaces and physical activity to health

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) have pointed out that "physical activity is not only fun and enjoyable, it is essential for good health, helping to prevent or manage over 20 conditions and diseases. This includes heart disease, diabetes, some cancers and obesity. It can also help improve people's mental health and wellbeing." 

NICE Local Authority Briefing - Public health

Supporting people of all ages to be more physically active can help local authorities meet their new public health responsibilities. Specifically, it will impact on a range of indicators identified in the public health and the adult social care outcomes frameworks including:

• use of green space for exercise/health reasons
• child development
• excess weight in children and adults
• proportion of physically active and inactive adults
• self-reported wellbeing and health-related quality of life
• falls and injuries in the over-65s
• mortality from cardiovascular diseases (including heart disease and stroke), cancer and respiratory diseases.

More specifically in relation to the Open Spaces Study, Public Health England has provided a health equity briefing: Local action on health inequalities: Improving access to green spaces.

Public Health England - health equity briefing: Local action on health inequalities: Improving access to green spaces. Summary of key points

• There is significant and growing evidence on the health benefits of access to good quality green spaces. The benefits include better self-rated health; lower body mass index, overweight and obesity levels; improved mental health and wellbeing; increased longevity.
• There is unequal access to green space across England. People living in the most deprived areas are less likely to live near green spaces and will therefore have fewer opportunities to experience the health benefits of green space compared with people living in less deprived areas.
• Increasing the use of good quality green space for all social groups is likely to improve health outcomes and reduce health inequalities. It can also bring other benefits such as greater community cohesion and reduced social isolation.
• Local authorities play a vital role in protecting, maintaining and improving local green spaces and can create new areas of green space to improve access for all communities. Such efforts require joint work across different parts of the local authority and beyond, particularly public health, planning, transport, and parks and leisure.

Providing opportunities for physical activity by developing and maintaining appropriate facilities such as parks and open spaces is therefore very important in relation to promoting better public health. Public Health services nationally therefore tend to have an interest in all aspects of active recreation facility provision; and this is reflected in the views of the team in Tandridge District.

6 NICE Local government briefing [LGB3] - April 2013
2.2.2 Tandridge District Council Public Health - Corporate Policy Manager

Tandridge District Council fully recognises the value of open space, sport and leisure in relation to promoting health and wellbeing and public health objectives. The Corporate Policy Manager noted that:

- The main strategy document guiding the District Council's approach to public health and open space is the Wellbeing Space Strategy (2015).
- There is a District Health and Wellbeing Board including the District Council; East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group; Surrey County Council (Public Health, Adult Social Care, and Children’s Services); Tandridge Trust Leisure; and various other organisations with an interest in health and wellbeing.
- The District Health and Wellbeing Board links with the County Council Health and Wellbeing Board.
- In addition to working with strategic health partners it is important to work in partnership with local partners such as parish councils and local community organisations who have an interest in open space, sport and recreation.
- The general priority targets for the District Health and Wellbeing Board are: improving mental health; encouraging healthy weight; and reducing excess alcohol consumption.
- The Wellbeing Space Strategy highlights that open spaces such as parks, commons, sports pitches, woodland and allotments play an important role in helping people lead healthy lives; and that access to good quality green space is associated with a range of positive health outcomes including better self-rated health; lower body mass index scores, overweight and obesity levels and improved mental health.
- Health data from the County Council is reviewed each year at district level and this helps identify specific areas of priority for the targeting of local health projects.
- Examples of local projects include: Wellbeing Prescription - GPs and other providers refer patients to a Wellbeing Advisor, who signposts them to a range of activities across the district; Free Outdoor Gyms – the District Council has built eight free to use outdoor gyms across the district; Community Gardening in Caterham which offers opportunities to get involved with the Community Art Garden, located in Queens Park Gardens; and Get Active 50+ (in partnership with Active Surrey). The District Council has also worked with Tandridge Leisure Trust to deliver free gym inductions.
- The aim for the future as regards public health and open spaces is that the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study should be used alongside demographic and health data to guide investment into and the best use of the various types of open space.
- Another important development will be to continue to improve joined-up working between key internal District Council functions such as Spatial Planning, Economic Development, Parks and Countryside and Policy and Wellbeing.

2.2.3 Surrey County Council – Public Health Lead and Physical Activity Lead

The Public Health lead officer highlighted the general importance of open space, sport and recreation in relation to supporting a number of objectives of the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board. She also signposted the study to national research of the kind noted in 2.2.1 above.

The Physical Activity lead officer supplied specific data relating to physical activity data for Tandridge and highlighted a number of useful statistics such as:
• Tandridge has one of the lowest percentages of physical activity levels in Surrey, and is one of the highest in terms of not achieving 30 minutes physical activity per week.

• She specifically pointed out that:
  
  o **% of Tandridge adults who do any walking at least 5 times per week**: 46.8% (slightly lower than England and South East) – 2015
  
  o **% of Tandridge adults who do any cycling at least 3 times per week**: 1.5% (worse than England and South East) - 2015

The Physical Activity lead officer also noted that compared with England “Tandridge have a higher percentage of 65+ population which may explain lower rates of physical activity”.

More broadly in relation to access to green spaces and health benefits she noted that:

• Being close and having access to green spaces in residential areas is positively associated with increased overall levels of physical activity across age groups. Amongst older people five year survival rates are positively associated with proximity of access to space for walking, nearby parks and tree-lined streets, independent of socioeconomic status. You can read more about this in the Faculty of Public Health paper (Great outdoors: how our natural health service uses green space to improve wellbeing) via: [http://www.fph.org.uk/uploads/r_great_outdoors.pdf](http://www.fph.org.uk/uploads/r_great_outdoors.pdf)

• In the UK a correlation has been observed between those living closest to greener areas and reduced levels of mortality, obesity and obesity-related illnesses. This has been linked to higher levels of exercise, but causality has not been demonstrated. See the Parliamentary Office of Science & Technology paper (Green Space and Health) at: [http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/POST-PN-0538/POST-PN-0538.pdf](http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/POST-PN-0538/POST-PN-0538.pdf)

The Physical Activity lead officer also provided a copy of Surrey’s physical activity strategy.
2.3 General Community – Key Findings

This section provides some key consultation findings from the Tandridge District household survey and public health stakeholders.

Quantity

**Open Space**

- There are a number of typologies where respondents suggest more are needed. Over 60% of respondents suggest a shortfall of informal open spaces - for ball games, picnics, hobbies, dog walking etc; woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves; facilities for teenagers; and rights of way.
- Following this, other aspects where there was considered to be an overall shortfall by a majority were: children’s play areas; local parks and recreation grounds; water recreation facilities; and allotments.
- Nearly three quarters of households thought that overall there are enough outdoor bowling greens. Smaller majorities think that in general there are enough tennis courts and grass playing fields.

**Indoor Facilities**

- A clear majority of households reported that overall there are currently enough of all of the various kinds of indoor sport and leisure facilities; most notably in relation to village halls/community sports centres; swimming pools; and gym/health and fitness facilities.
- The two kinds of facility where a significant minority of respondent households believe that overall there is a need for more are sports/leisure centres and specialist indoor sports facilities such as indoor bowls and tennis centres.

Quality

**Open Space**

- For all kinds of outdoor facilities/open spaces a majority of households suggested that in general they were of average or better quality (though the most common rating tended to be only "average"). However, for some typologies there were notable levels of dissatisfaction with general levels of quality as noted below.
  - Nearly half of households reported the overall quality of outdoor facilities for teenagers as being either poor or very poor. The quality of MUGAs, water recreation facilities and artificial turf pitches - was rated as poor or worse by around a third of respondents.
  - In contrast some kinds of facilities/open spaces were rated relatively highly in terms of quality. These include: parks and recreation grounds; woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves; play areas; and rights of way.

**Indoor Facilities**

- In broad terms respondent households appear quite satisfied with the quality of indoor sports and recreation provision. All are commonly rated as being of average or better quality.
The indoor facilities most commonly regarded as being of good or very good quality by nearly half households are swimming pools; sport and leisure centres (48%); and gym/health and fitness facilities (47%).

The quality of specialist sports centres was not rated quite as highly. Similarly for village halls and community centres.

Access

Open Space

In general, a majority of household respondents report that they would not normally travel more than 15 minutes to visit the different kinds of open spaces and outdoor facilities. There is considerable variation however between the typologies. For example:

- 39% of user households are prepared to travel 16 minutes or more to visit water recreation facilities; 31% of households are prepared to travel that long to make use of use of artificial turf pitches; and 30% to access MUGAs.
- In contrast, for significant numbers of residents, facilities need to be much more locally accessible before they will be used (for example, play areas, parks and recreation grounds, and informal open space areas - for ball games, picnics, hobbies, dog walking etc).
  - 82% of users would expect play areas to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 45% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
  - 73% of users would expect local parks/recreation grounds to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 39% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
  - 73% of users would expect informal open spaces to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 29% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.

For most typologies walking is the norm, most notably for facilities such as play areas, footpaths/bridleways and cyclepaths, parks and recreation grounds; and informal open spaces. However, a majority of respondent households would normally drive to artificial turf pitches and water recreation facilities. In addition, a higher proportion of households would normally drive rather than walk to tennis/netball courts; outdoor bowing greens; and playing fields.

Indoor Facilities

- Nearly two thirds of users are prepared to travel up to 15 minutes to use some facilities such as specialist indoor sports facilities. 18% of these would travel up to 20 minutes and 12% more than 20 minutes.
- In the cases of swimming pools and sports leisure centres nearly 60% of users are prepared to travel up to 15 minutes to make use of such facilities. For swimming pools 29% would travel up 20 minutes. For sports/leisure centres 23% would travel up 20 minutes. Only around 7% of users would travel for longer than this to use such facilities.
- In contrast, for significant numbers of residents, some indoor facilities need to be more locally accessible before they will be used. For example 64% of users of village halls and community centres would not wish to travel more than 10 minutes, of which 24% would expect to travel 5 minutes or less.
Importance of footpath/cycle access

- 61% of households confirmed that they would be prepared to walk/cycle further if the quality of the route was improved; and 72% also said that if the quality of the route was improved they would make the journey more often.

Priorities

Open Space

- The category highlighted by the largest number of households as a high priority for potential improvement/new provision is woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves (61%) followed by better footpaths, bridleway and cyclepath provision (59%).
- Other notable high priorities for improvement noted by significant numbers are informal open spaces (58%) and parks and local recreation grounds (57%);
- Children’s play areas also score quite highly as a priority, as did access to areas for water recreation.

Indoor facilities

- For indoor sports and leisure facilities in general, fewer households highlighted high priority needs. Improvements to swimming pool provision gained the highest proportion of high priority ratings.
- Following this, improvements to sport and leisure centres are rated as a high priority by 23% with an additional 40% of medium priority ratings.

Public Health and other issues

- Tandridge District Council fully recognises the value and importance of access to open space, outdoor recreation facilities and indoor leisure facilities, in relation to improving health and wellbeing and in relation to residents' quality of life.
- The Council’s Wellbeing Space Strategy (2015) specifically highlights that open spaces such as parks, commons, sports pitches, woodland and allotments play an important role in helping people lead healthy lives; and that access to good quality green space is associated with a range of positive health outcomes’
- Examples of District Council health projects include: Wellbeing Prescription; Free Outdoor Gyms; Community Gardening in Caterham; and Get Active 50+ (in partnership with Active Surrey).
- The District Council has also worked with Tandridge Leisure Trust to deliver free gym inductions.
- The Surrey County Council Public Health lead officer highlighted the general importance of open space, sport and recreation in relation to supporting a number of objectives of the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Some sectors of the community face particular barriers to access such as disabled people; children and young people; households in the more isolated rural areas and those in the more deprived wards of the study area.
3.0 Neighbouring Authorities and Parish Councils

3.1 Introduction

This section provides information and feedback from neighbouring local authorities and local parish councils. It is important to consult with neighbouring local authorities under the "duty to co-operate" requirement. This places a legal duty on local planning authorities, county councils in England and public bodies to "engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters".7

The need to consult and engage with local parish councils arises from the fact that many parish councils are responsible for the management of open spaces, play areas and recreation grounds; and the local councils also tend to have a good understanding of local needs and priorities in relation to local sport, play and recreation facilities.

Section three comprises two main sub-sections:

- Neighbouring authorities – Cross boundary and strategic issues
- Parish councils

There is a summary of key issues at the end of the section. The information and findings of this section will be taken forward in the main reports.

3.2 Neighbouring authorities - Cross boundary and strategic issues

3.2.1 Overview – Tandridge District Council Planning Policy Officer

Tandridge District Council shares borders with Bromley, Croydon, Reigate and Banstead, Crawley, Sevenoaks, Wealden and Mid Sussex.

A number of open space, sport, and recreation facility planning related issues were noted that are known to be of relevance to neighbouring local authorities, for example:

- Bromley - discussion has been had about how we can link up green infrastructure across the North Downs Way.
- Croydon - initially there were no issues.
- Reigate and Banstead - there needs to be consideration of how to link up green infrastructure, particularly across the Surrey Hills AONB. There has also been discussion about linking up green tourism across East Surrey, including the promotion of cycling routes.
- Crawley – no specific issues identified currently.
- Sevenoaks - green infrastructure needs to be considered.
- Wealden – the High Weald AONB also crosses both authorities.
- Mid Sussex - green infrastructure needs to be considered.

Other points noted included:

7 See https://www.gov.uk/guidance/duty-to-cooperate
The Ashdown Forest zone of influence – with Wealden we have agreed an interim Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) Strategy. There has been a high court decision on the way that transport impacts from the Ashdown Forest have not been properly considered, which will mean that the ‘in combination’ effects of transport will need to be given further consideration in the Local Plan. This is still to be determined through additional mitigation work.

With Sevenoaks, we are working on a revised SAMM Strategy alongside Wealden and the other authorities involved. A visitor survey has been undertaken in summer 2016 to work out the distances that people travel to visit the Ashdown Forest. More integration of the data is required by Tandridge. Annual monitoring on recreational use within Ashdown Forest will be undertaken so that additional information on visitors to the Ashdown Forest can be understood.

3.2.2 Neighbouring Local Authorities

Planning policy officers were also contacted from the seven authorities noted above to check if they had identified any cross border issues that they thought should be taken into account. Comments and observations from officers of these authorities are provided below.

London Borough of Bromley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes(updates on relevant studies)</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/PPG17 study</td>
<td>The original one was never published and is currently being updated as an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit. This has never been to committee, so is not a matter of public record.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Study</td>
<td>The last one was completed by the Leisure Services Dept., in 2004.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play/Youth strategy</td>
<td>Children’s Strategy for 2012 to 2015</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

London Borough of Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes(updates on relevant studies)</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Recreation Study</td>
<td>Due for completion in May 2017. The document is being finalised and will need to go through a sign off process before being released as strategy.</td>
<td>Croydon is working with the FA and wider national partners on the Parklife programme, which aims to provide two high quality, financially viable, Football ‘hub’ facilities within the borough to meet local demand. An application to the programme is planned for summer 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Study</td>
<td>Due for completion in May 2017.</td>
<td>The PPS will make a number of recommendations on sites in the south of Croydon, most notably on Purley Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 The officer responses were collected via an emailed pro-forma.
9 These comments will be taken forward and considered in the main report.
### Crawley Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes/updates on relevant studies</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Green infrastructure SPD (2016)</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/PPG17 study</td>
<td>Completed 2013</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Study</td>
<td>Completed 2013</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Character Assessment</td>
<td>Completed 2012</td>
<td>Landscape Character Assessment (copy provided). Area 6 borders Tandridge and touches on some issues and potential for enhancement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mid Sussex District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes/updates on relevant studies</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Green infrastructure mapping has been undertaken</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Study</td>
<td>Completed 2015 (Same as Sport/Recreation strategy)</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdown Forest Joint SAMM Strategy</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>This is a joint strategy between the affected local authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes/updates on relevant studies</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/PPG17 study</td>
<td>We are in the process of updating the PPG17 Report at the moment. We are in the process of undertaking site visits and our residents/ sports clubs etc. Consultation is due to commence this week (4th April) and run over April.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sevenoaks District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes/updates on relevant studies</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Not yet started</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/PPG17 study</td>
<td>Previous completed in 2009. 2017 study in draft form</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport/Recreation strategy</td>
<td>Previous completed in 2009. 2017 study in draft form</td>
<td>SDC residents use facilities in Tandridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Study</td>
<td>Previous completed in 2009. 2017 study in draft form</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wealden District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Notes/updates on relevant studies</th>
<th>Comments and observations – cross border issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Underway.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/PPG17 study</td>
<td>Underway.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport/Recreation strategy</td>
<td>Underway.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Study</td>
<td>Underway.</td>
<td>None highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdown Forest Joint SAMM Strategy</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
<td>Wealden District Council is working with Tandridge District Council to mitigate recreational impacts on the Ashdown Forest by way of joint a SAMM strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Parish Councils

Within the Tandridge District Council area there are 21 parish councils. Surveys were sent to the local councils followed up by reminders and phone calls as needed. The following 17 parish councils responded:

- Bletchingley
- Burstow
- Caterham Valley
- Chaldon
- Crowhurst
- Dormansland
- Felbridge
- Godstone
- Horne
- Lingfield
- Nutfield
- Outwood
- Oxted
- Tatsfield
- Warlingham
- Whyteleafe
- Woldingham

Replies were not received from Caterham on the Hill; Chelsham and Farleigh; Limpsfield; and Tandridge.

3.3.1 Responses overview

Some broad findings from the survey were that:

- 10 of the 17 parish councils who responded were directly responsible for the management of various local spaces and outdoor recreational facilities. Only two managed indoor halls.
- 10 of the local councils who responded noted that there was a need for additional or improved open space, play, sport and recreation facilities within their parish.
- The sectors of the community most commonly identified as being poorly served in relation to their needs were children, young people/teenagers, older people and sports teams.

Quality factors - open space provision

We asked the local councils to highlight what they thought, in general, were high priorities as regards qualitative factors of recreational open spaces. The quality factors most commonly deemed to be of a high priority as regards recreational public open spaces are that:

- They should be easy to get to for all members of the community.
- They should be safe and secure for those using them.
- Equipment and grounds should be of high quality and well maintained - they should be clean and free from litter and graffiti.

Other factors specifically highlighted included:

- There should be enough open space to enable ball games to be played, i.e a grassed area of sufficient standard that would enable games to be played informally - such as cricket and football.
- Need for accessible information about the maintenance regime for each open space (e.g. seasonal cutting, wildlife protection, volunteering etc) via websites. Provision of signage to encourage people to take home their litter; and historic information available if relevant.
- Open spaces should be well lit or not hidden with trees and foliage so that people feel safe.
- Seating should be provided on footpaths at the point where the views are good.
Summary of Identified needs for improvement

The table below covers issues of quantity, quality and access for a range of facilities. An “X” in a box indicates an identified need for improvement/lack of provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Councils</th>
<th>Indoor Facilities</th>
<th>Winter pitches - football/rugby</th>
<th>Cricket pitches</th>
<th>Tennis courts</th>
<th>Multi Use Games Areas</th>
<th>Bowling greens</th>
<th>Children's play areas</th>
<th>Teenage facilities (e.g. skate parks)</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Parks, rec. grounds, village greens etc.</th>
<th>Wildlife areas, nature reserves</th>
<th>Footpath/bridleway/cyclepath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormansland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whyteleafe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The needs of individual parishes are quite varied. The more frequently highlighted typologies are:

- Indoor facilities – varied needs including village hall improvements, additional space, indoor bowls, youth club space, sports halls and swimming pools.
- Play areas and youth facilities – new provision for some but primarily for refurbishments and improvement to existing facilities.

3.3.2 Parish specific issues

Unmet needs and aspirations for improvement

As part of the survey we also asked the open questions "are you aware of any particular groups within your community whose needs are not currently met" and "if you have, or are aware of, any specific projects, plans and aspirations for improving open space and outdoor recreation facilities in the Parish please tell us". Individual parish responses are shown in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Groups whose needs not being met</th>
<th>Current plans and known aspirations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Outdoor shelter near children’s playpark. Better disabled access to club premises and improved parking on Grange Meadow – sports association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>A local team has been struggling to find a pitch where they can train and play football.</td>
<td>A Community Garden is under construction at the moment in Smallfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Valley</td>
<td>None specifically identified.</td>
<td>To maintain existing and future designated open spaces and community playgrounds for the use of all sectors of the community and ensure unrestricted access. Our green open spaces are of increasing importance as much of the CR3 area has seen increased development, consisting of flats and houses with small / or no garden. Open spaces and community playgrounds are vital to maintain the quality of life for residents. Picnic at Timberhill Recreation Ground in June Waller Pain Cycle Ride in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>None specifically identified.</td>
<td>Extract from Village Plan 2016-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.1 Environment

1.1.a Present footpaths and bridleways

- Continue with footpath walks and review the current format of Spring, Autumn and Bounds Walks, so that there is increased participation.
- Continue with Working Party on Bridleways and ensure that any necessary work is identified and reported to the Council for action.

Ongoing

1.1.b New footpaths

Pursue the legal adoption of proposed new footpath(s) across the Surrey National Golf Course with SCC.

Consult with SCC about the possibility of doing this when the future of the Golf Course is known

1.1.c Burial Ground

Continue maintenance of the St. Lawrence’s Burial Ground.

- Advisory Group to meet annually
- Up to 4 Working Parties each year with Downlands
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Community and Stakeholder Consultation (August 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular working parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.e Document and maintain the village’s biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and maintain a database / map that shows where species of interest are known to be present, and also vulnerable connections between habitat patches. This would help with providing environmental feedback on planning applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>We cannot provide play facilities for young children of the Parish or Older people. We think that a playground and an outdoor gym would be a great idea for the green next to the village hall and create more of a village centre.</td>
<td>We are developing a Neighbourhood Plan which will focus on our village history, countryside, footpaths and opening up our village for the benefit of others. Crowhurst Parishioners have generally lived in the village a long time and are very proud of its heritage. The wish to retain this heritage and history for future generations is paramount as too is the retention of our open spaces, countryside, agricultural background, whilst also encouraging small business development in disused farmyard buildings. We plan to develop plans to open up our footpaths to more people. Signage, route plans, border paths, etc will help us to achieve our aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormansland</td>
<td>Virtually no facilities for young people.</td>
<td>Skate park and outdoor gym on Recreation Ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>None specifically identified.</td>
<td>Clearing and improving the heath and woodlands in Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>There could be better provision for older people e.g. A bowling green or indoor bowls.</td>
<td>Lingfield Parish Council would like to purchase a small site to provide allotments if suitable land should become available. This would replace the site in Newchapel Road, which is currently leased. Lingfield Sports Association (which incorporates the football and cricket clubs) would like to obtain a long lease on Godstone Road Sports Ground to enable them to apply for grant funding to improve facilities. Tandridge District Council is only offering a 7 year lease. Most grant providers require at least 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>Improved and reliable public transport. The Charles Maw Trust playground (High St) needs updating.</td>
<td>Nothing currently planned – Under continual review Nutfield Marsh undergoing a regeneration process to return it to its former natural state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
<td>Facilities for teenagers; there is little public transport so teenagers cannot travel out of the village to use facilities elsewhere.</td>
<td>The MUGA and playground were built using grants, donations and Parish Council funds. The Parish Council are trying to lobby the National Trust to create a natural playground in the woods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>There could be, in the future, a separate tennis court.</td>
<td>To be included in our Neighbourhood Plan. PFA who manage Furze Corner may have a requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>Warlingham Football Club would like a dedicated</td>
<td>None specifically identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community and Stakeholder Consultation (August 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Need for new/improved provision and typology specific comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bletchingley | **Indoor facilities:** OK  
**Winter pitches:** OK.  
**Cricket pitches:** OK, former pitch disused because lack of demand, will probably become junior football pitch. (Good facilities in next parish Nutfield).  
**Tennis Courts:** OK (good facilities in next village Godstone).  
**MUGAs:** OK (current basketball pitch has hard surface).  
**Bowling Greens:** OK, active club exists.  
**Play areas:** OK, Several exist already.  
**Youth facilities:** OK, good skateboard ramps already exist.  
**Allotments:** OK, two locations already and usually no waiting list.  
**Parks and recreation grounds:** OK, well provided already.  
**Wildlife and nature areas:** OK, Several woodlands –Surrey Wildlife Trust & National Trust and more wildlife areas being created following sand extraction in the north of the parish.  
**Rights of way:** OK, well provided already.                                                                                           |
| Burstow      | **Winter pitches:** No indoor or all weather training facilities available.  
**Tennis Courts:** No tennis courts available  
**Bowling Greens:** No bowling green in the village.  
**Play areas:** Adequate for the existing number of children.  
**Youth facilities:** A box track and additional skateboarding ramps would be desirable.  
**Allotments:** OK, two locations already and usually no waiting list.  
**Parks and recreation grounds:** No village green.                                                                                     |
| Caterham Valley | **Indoor facilities:** Soper Hall, Miller Centre.  
**Winter pitches:** Caterham School, Stafford Road Recreation Ground  
**Play areas:** Timberhill Recreation Ground, Tillingdown Playground, Stafford Road Recreation Ground.  
**Parks and recreation grounds:** Stafford Road Recreation Ground, Timberhill Recreation Ground, Tillingdown Playground, White Knobs Way and Manor Park  
**Wildlife and nature areas:** White Knobs Way, Manor Park, Woods near Caterham School, Caterham Viewpoint.  
**Rights of way:** Woods near Caterham School.                                                                                           |

The detailed parish responses relating to aspects of quantity and quality of the various elements are provided in the table above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Other: Not sufficient facilities in Caterham Valley. Cricket pitch, allotments, tennis courts and bowling green on Caterham on the Hill have to be used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Crowhurst | **Indoor facilities:** The village hall needs refurbishment and some investment in upgrading the facilities. If this was done it would be more attractive and would be used more often as the location is fantastic. Also, the car park is too small for larger events, cars end up being parked on the road, which is very dangerous as cars drive very fast.  
**Cricket pitches:** We would like one.  
**MUGAs:** We would like one.  
**Play areas:** Include near the MUGA.  
**Parks and recreation grounds:** Not officially a village green, but we would like to make it such.  
**Wildlife and nature areas:** We would like to protect certain parts of the village and make them into wildlife reserves.  
**Rights of way:** We make good use of our footpaths and are keen to increase their number, therefore encouraging people to come to the area for countryside rambles. |
| Dormansland | **MUGAs:** None existing  
**Bowling Greens:** None existing.  
**Youth facilities:** None - potential demand.  
**Allotments:** None existing. |
| Felbridge  | **Indoor facilities:** The current facility is heavy utilised, and additional Hall space might be used but difficult to know whether it would be viable.  
**Allotments:** Private allotments exist within the Parish.  
**Rights of way:** Cycleways are desperately needed |
| Godstone  | **Play areas:** We have a play area on Godstone Green but it is not suitable for children aged 0-5. This would be a good addition |
| Horne     | **Indoor facilities:** Horne Parish are in dispute regarding the sale of the Parish Hall.  
**Winter Pitches:** None.  
**Cricket pitches:** One - facilities need attention i.e. there is no electricity.  
**Tennis Courts:** None.  
**MUGAs:** None.  
**Bowling Greens:** None.  
**Play areas:** None.  
**Youth facilities:** None.  
**Allotments:** None.  
**Parks and recreation grounds:** None.  
**Wildlife and nature areas:** Heath area - needs attention.  
**Rights of way:** Need attention and clearing. Bridleways need connecting to each other, this would increase use. |
| Lingfield | **Indoor facilities:** An indoor bowls facility would be desirable  
**Winter Pitches:** The facility at Talbot Road needs improvement. The pavilion needs upgrading, the pitch tends to get waterlogged. Lingfield Football Club would be able to advise whether the Godstone Road facility is adequate but we are aware that they are being denied a lease long enough to give access to grant funding (by Tandridge District Council).  
**Cricket pitches:** I believe Lingfield Cricket Club is well provided for in terms of pitches but they should be contacted for their views. They are also affected by the refusal of a long lease from Tandridge District Council.  
**Tennis Courts:** We have one tennis court.  
**MUGAs:** We could do with a MUGA.  
**Bowling Greens:** We have no provision. |
### Community and Stakeholder Consultation (August 2017)

#### Jenners Field

**Play areas:** We have a good quality play area at Jenners Field and a smaller one at Talbot Road.

**Youth facilities:** We have a skate park.

**Allotments:** The Parish Council owns the allotment site at Centenary Fields and this is fully tenanted most of the time. We lease some land adjacent to The Pollards in Newchapel Road. We struggle to keep this fully tenanted because of the lack of security over the lease. The landowner does not wish to enter into a long lease. This site also provides allotments for Dormansland. We currently have ten vacant plots on this site.

**Parks and recreation grounds:** We have two recreation grounds which are well maintained by Tandridge District Council.

**Wildlife and nature areas:** We have a Nature Reserve managed by an active committee.

**Rights of way:** We have footpaths and bridleways which are regularly used by the Walking for Health group.

#### Outwood

**Indoor facilities:** Indoor facility for Youth Club; the Lloyd Hall Management Committee do not allow the hall to be used for indoor games such as table tennis, so the Youth Club has now had to close.

**Play areas:** There is a small play area in the grounds of the village hall; a larger natural play area could be created in the woods near the cricket field.

**Youth facilities:** Yes - this would give local teenagers somewhere to play. Also outdoor table tennis would be useful

**Other:** Outdoor gym for all ages to use.

#### Tatsfield

**Indoor facilities:** The village hall is virtually fully booked during term time.

**Winter Pitches:** Could be improved with financial support.

**Cricket pitches:** Could be improved with financial support.

**Tennis Courts:** There are no permanent tennis courts.

**MUGAs:** Sufficient for now.

**Bowling Greens:** We do not have a bowling green.

**Play areas:** Sufficient for now.

**Youth facilities:** No interest.

**Allotments:** We already have allotments.

**Parks and recreation grounds:** Sufficient for now.

**Wildlife and nature areas:** Sufficient for now.

**Rights of way:** Sufficient for now.

#### Warlingham

**Indoor facilities:** We have adequate community halls but there is a need for dedicated gym/indoor sports hall and a public swimming pool.

**Winter Pitches:** need a dedicated ground for Warlingham Football Club.

**Cricket pitches:** Sufficient facilities

**Tennis Courts:** Sufficient facilities

**MUGAs:** Sufficient facilities

**Bowling Greens:** Sufficient facilities. Note - there are bowling greens at Warlingham Great Park just outside the Parish.

**Play areas:** There are insufficient facilities. There is a distinct lack of play facilities in the south east of Warlingham and Hamsey Green Recreation playground is very limited with tired equipment which attracts public complaints.

**Youth facilities:** Warlingham is totally lacking in teenage facilities. The skate park in Mint Walk was vandalised and not replaced due to a lack of funds and local opposition.

**Allotments:** Sufficient facilities

**Parks and recreation grounds:** Sufficient facilities.
**Wildlife and nature areas**: Sufficient facilities. We have a well-loved wildlife and nature reserve in Blanchmans Community Wildlife Reserve.

**Rights of way**: Sufficient footpaths and bridleways but very limited cycle ways. We are not convinced there is a practical answer to the question of cycle ways but would welcome positive and practical proposals to this issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Whyteleafe** | **Indoor facilities**: A public multi-use indoor space e.g. community building including hall.

**Cricket pitches**: Reinstatement at Whyteleafe Recreation Ground and addition of changing rooms.

**Tennis Courts**: Upgrading of ball-court at Whyteleafe Recreation Ground.

**MUGAs**: Installation at Whyteleafe Recreation Ground

**Play areas**: Facility required in the vicinity of Well Farm Heights and Whyteleafe House (Old Rank Building site) in southern end of Whyteleafe.

**Parks and recreation grounds**: Make better use of open space at the centre of Wapses Lodge roundabout. |

**Parish Councils – other comments**

The survey also provided the opportunity to raise any other issues or to make other points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crowhurst</strong></td>
<td>We would like to take the open space out of the hands of TDC so that we can use it for our local community. We want to develop a child's play area and an outdoor adult gym, as well as to better utilise the green for village use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lingfield</strong></td>
<td>Lingfield has a range of active sport and recreation clubs. This is largely due to the commitment and effort of the volunteers who run them. It is important that this study considers the views of these people and I suggest they should be invited to respond. I have listed the larger groups below:- Lingfield Football Club, Lingfield Cricket Club, Lingfield Running Club, Lingfield Victoria Sports and Social Club, Lingfield and Dormansland Community Centre; Lingfield Wildlife Area. Walking for Health St Peter and St Paul’s Church should be contacted regarding burial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whyteleafe</strong></td>
<td>Improvement of existing toilet facilities in Whyteleafe Recreation Ground - we have evidence of this requirement via our own online survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Neighbouring Local Authorities and Parish Councils - Observations and key issues

Neighbouring Local Authorities – Cross Boundary Issues

Section 3.1 above briefly reviewed feedback from neighbouring local authorities in relation to the status of their open space strategies/associated studies and any cross border issues of significance. The variety of documents and strategies in place (and their relevance to current planning policy) is considerable, embracing green infrastructure studies, open space strategies, and sport, recreation and play strategies. The approach adopted by each authority is very much locally derived.

A number of authorities have highlighted the Ashdown Forest Joint SAMM Strategy but in general few cross border and wider strategic issues have been identified. There may be scope for neighbouring local authorities to work more together along these lines to make the most of accessible natural green space resources and to develop additional common themes and agendas.

It is notable that many authorities are currently involved with commissioning new open space related studies or updating previous strategies that are out of date.

Parish Councils

Section 3.2 above provided findings from the parish councils’ survey undertaken for the study. 17 of the 21 local parish councils responded.

General Overview

- 10 of the 17 parish councils who responded were directly responsible for the management of various local spaces and outdoor recreational facilities. Only two managed indoor halls.
- 10 of the local councils who responded noted that that there was a need for additional or improved open space, play, sport and recreation facilities within their parish.
- The sectors of the community most commonly identified as being poorly served in relation to their needs were children, young people/teenagers, older people and sports teams.

Common areas of concern

The needs and aspirations that individual parishes identified were very varied. The more frequently highlighted typologies are:

- Indoor facilities – varied needs including village hall improvements, additional space, indoor bowls, youth club space, sports halls and swimming pools.
- Play areas and youth facilities – new provision for some but primarily for refurbishments and improvement to existing facilities.

Quality factors - open space provision

The quality factors most commonly deemed to be of a high priority as regards recreational public open spaces are that:

- They should be easy to get to for all members of the community.
- They should be safe and secure for those using them.
• Equipment and grounds should be of high quality and well maintained - they should be clean and free from litter and graffiti.

Other factors specifically highlighted included:

• There should be enough open space to enable ball games to be played, i.e a grassed area of sufficient standard that would enable games to be played informally - such as cricket and football.
• Need for accessible information about the maintenance regime for each open space (e.g. seasonal cutting, wildlife protection, volunteering etc) via websites. Provision of signage to encourage people to take home their litter; and historic information available if relevant.
• Open spaces should be well lit or not hidden with trees and foliage so that people feel safe.
• Seating should be provided on footpaths at the point where the views are good.

**Detailed responses on open space typologies**

The parish councils provided detailed responses relating to aspects of quantity and quality of the various elements of open spaces surveyed.
4.0 Parks and Green Space

4.1 Introduction

This section covers consultation responses and findings in relation to non-sporting recreational open spaces, including parks and recreation grounds, natural green spaces, water recreation, allotments and rights of way.

Consultation undertaken for this section included key stakeholder surveys, and a survey of relevant (non-sports) groups and organisations.

The information and findings from this section will be taken forward in the Open Space Study main report.

This section is comprised of seven main sections:

- Review of policy and strategy
- Key Stakeholders - strategic context and overview
- Parks, gardens and recreation grounds
- Allotments
- Natural green space – e.g. wildlife areas, nature reserves and woodlands
- Water recreation
- Footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths.

There is a summary of key points and issues at the end of the section.

4.2 Review of policy and strategy – Tandridge District Council

This section provides a brief overview of relevant City council policy and strategy documents, helping provide a well-established framework and context for future open space planning.

4.2.1 Tandridge District Council Corporate Objectives

The Councils Key Corporate Objectives for 2017/2018 for making Tandridge a vibrant place to live, work and visit will be to:

1. provide high quality, customer friendly services;
2. make efficient and effective use of resources;
3. support residents and protect the local environment;
4. work with local businesses to promote economic growth and employment; and
5. work in partnership with other public services to deliver the best service possible.

While all of these are of relevance to the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment, Objective 3 is of particular importance.

4.2.2 Tandridge District Open Space Assessment (2015)

The 2015 Open Space Needs Assessment aimed to provide a detailed assessment of existing open space provision, and review the qualitative and quantitative need for additional provision now and in the future. The study presented the findings of the assessment and provided advice and recommendations for the development of the Local Plan and Wellbeing Space Strategy.
The specific objectives of the assessment were:

- To establish an up to date baseline of current open space;
- To identify deficiencies or surpluses in the provision of open space;
- To use the audit and assessment to set locally derived open space standards for quantity, accessibility, quality, and intrinsic benefit;
- To inform the future management of open spaces and facilitate decision-making on the current and future needs for open space.

Local Standards

The local standards proposed were:

**Quantity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Existing level of provision (ha per 100 residents)</th>
<th>Recommended quantity standard (ha per 100 residents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>1.36ha&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.35ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play provision for children</td>
<td>0.04ha</td>
<td>0.10ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and semi-natural green space</td>
<td>11.42ha</td>
<td>11.4ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity green space</td>
<td>0.67ha</td>
<td>0.60ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.1ha</td>
<td>0.125ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play provision for children</td>
<td>600m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and semi-natural green space</td>
<td>2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity green space</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities should be clean and litter free, the pitches and playing surfaces should be maintained, safe, level and with good drainage. Toilets, changing facilities and parking should be of an acceptable standard and provided where possible. Bins should be provided to reduce the occurrences of litter and dog fouling problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play provision for children</td>
<td>Sites should be clean / litter free and provide a safe and stimulating environment where possible for children and young people of all ages. Areas should be set aside as dog free and where possible toilets should be provided nearby. Sites should be in areas easily accessible by foot to the local community they are intended to serve with limited barriers to access such as main roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Includes playing fields owned by local sport clubs and providing different levels of community use
Natural and semi-natural green space

Sites should be ‘natural’ and focus on the retention and / or enhancement of high quality natural features and the conservation of flora and fauna and assisted where appropriate by the use of education facilities such as interpretation boards, leaflets, walks and talks. They should be clean, litter free, well signed and with clear paths.

Amenity green space

Sites should be clean and litter free, well maintained with good foot and cycle paths linking the site to the residential areas. It should provide a welcoming and attractive environment with planting of flowers, hedges, trees and shrubs that encourage nature conservation and wildlife. Sufficient bins for litter and dog fouling should be fully integrated into the site, and ancillary facilities such as seating provided where appropriate.

Allotments

Allotments should be clean / litter free, level with good quality soil, drainage and access to a good water supply. They should be well maintained and all those involved in a site’s management and use should encourage biodiversity. Where possible sufficient parking should be made available.

In regards to quantity, the assessment suggested that Tandridge currently has adequate provision of all types of open space with the exception of ‘Play provision for children and young people’ where it identified a lack of appropriate space for older children. The Assessment noted that this could be addressed through adapting existing spaces.

Overall, the quality of open spaces was assessed as being ‘good’ to ‘very high’ though a number of sites such as Talbot Road Recreation Ground and Stychens Way Open Space received low scores. Reasons for low scores included poor signage to sites; lack of amenities such as public toilets, seating, dog foul bins; limited access for disabled users; concerns over personal safety; litter/dog fouling; poor visual quality; and no distinct purpose for particular sites as a result of lack of facilities.

The Assessment also concluded that the majority of open space met accessibility standards in terms of how far people have to travel. The only minor deficiency identified was for ‘Allotments’. Responses from residents and parish councils highlighted the need for improve cycleways with residents suggesting they would be willing to cycle to open space but felt existing provision was too limited or not suitable to enable this. The Assessment noted that whilst overall the district’s open spaces met accessibility standards a number of sites were difficult to find and not well signposted. This included larger open spaces that should be easy to find.

The 2015 standards and findings will be reviewed and new standards proposed in the current study. The new standards will then be applied across the district.

4.2.3 Tandridge District Playing Pitch and Open Spaces Strategy (2005-15)

This study followed the Sport England guidance in place at the time of its completion in 2005 but is out of date. A new Playing Pitch Study is being completed as part of this study.

In 2005 the main sports specific conclusions were:

Football

- All existing football pitches should be retained although consideration needs to be given to adding junior markings onto selected pitches as well as providing dedicated junior pitches where demand is identified.
• Seek to maintain and improve where necessary, the overall condition of football pitches within the district.

**Cricket**

• There appears to be an abundance of cricket pitches within the district. Consultation should be carried out with clubs and the Surrey Cricket Board regarding the long-term sustainability of all clubs within the district. Consideration should be given to the long-term requirement for these pitches.

**Rugby Union**

• All existing rugby pitches should be retained with consideration given to the provision of junior pitches within the district.

**Hockey**

• The need for a floodlit Synthetic Turf Pitch (STP) in the north of the district is recognised. Consideration should be given to supporting existing STP’s and ancillary facilities.

The new 2017 Playing Pitch Study will provide new Planning guidance analysing the supply of and demand for the individual sports.

### 4.2.4  Wellbeing Space Strategy (2015)

This strategy emphasises the key role that all kinds of open spaces can have in relation to improving health and wellbeing; and provides a plan as to how the Council and its partners can maximise that benefit for local people. It notes that by better understanding the district’s wellbeing issues, existing provision and what local communities want, the Council and its partners can target resource more effectively and where it will have the greatest impact.

The first part of the Strategy outlines national guidance and examples of best practice. It also outlines the Council’s current approach. The second part of the Strategy looks at what the district’s wellbeing needs are; and the third at the open space that is currently provided. The Strategy then identifies whether there are opportunities for things to be done differently so that the Council and its partners can better provide open space that helps local residents and visitors lead healthier lives.
4.3 Key Stakeholders - strategic context and overview

This section includes general comments from the key stakeholders consulted. Responses specific to individual typologies from the stakeholders consulted will be noted under each of the focused topic headings.

4.3.1 Tandridge District Council - Parks and Countryside Service

The District Council’s Parks and Countryside Manager was interviewed and provided a strategic overview of Open Space provision in Tandridge district:

- The Parks and Countryside Service manage a wide range of District Council owned open spaces and outdoor recreation sites including parks, recreation grounds, play areas, youth facilities, sports facilities and amenity spaces. This includes management of on-site buildings such as pavilions and changing rooms. A number of District Council sites and facilities are leased to clubs and local community groups.
- Very generally there seems to be enough open space in total but there is a need to retain the current level and improve what is available. If open space is lost compensatory provision and investment should be provided in new or existing sites.
- The general public appear to highly value their open spaces and they are very important in relation to health and wellbeing.
- Queens Park and Whyteleafe Recreation Ground are regarded as high profile sites based on the range of facilities provided and their value to a wide range of sports and local community interests.
- Broadly speaking sites are distributed throughout the district but the main sites tend to be situated in the north and south of the district, with the central area being less well served.
- The Parks and Countryside Service are developing good links with a number of parish councils in relation to partnership projects to improve facilities. There is currently no widespread demand evident for asset transfer from district to parishes.
- Quality is generally good though budgets for maintenance have been reduced over recent years leading to a comprehensive review of contracts to ensure that maintenance is provided at an appropriate level to match the character of the sites and the needs of local communities.
- Access for disabled people is generally good and care is taken to maximise access in line with the good practice guidance relating to the different kinds of open space/facility.

Additional points relating to the various typologies can be found in the appropriate sections later in the report.

4.3.2 Strategic Organisations

Natural England – Planning Advisor

Standards of provision

Natural England has proposed standards for provision of natural green space, the Accessible Natural Green Space (ANGSt) standard. These standards recommend that everyone, wherever they live, should have accessible natural green space:

- Of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home
• At least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home
• One accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; and
• One accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home; plus
• Statutory Local Nature Reserves at a minimum level of one hectare per thousand population

Natural England suggest that these standards should be a target to achieve; and particularly that everyone, wherever they live, should have an accessible natural green spaces of at least two hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk from home).

Management of Local Sites

Natural England is responsible for the management of protected sites within Tandridge e.g. SSSIs and LNRs.

The importance of Biodiversity and multi-functional open spaces

Natural England encourages the consideration of a Green Infrastructure strategy, which would allow the identification of potential linkages between areas of existing green open space. Green Infrastructure promotes development with a Green Infrastructure component and identification of areas that should be redeveloped into green open space. The development of a Green Infrastructure strategy could include:

• The identification and mapping of all public green space and existing Green Infrastructure and any off site linkages.
• Identification of potential development sites (e.g. garage courts, brownfield sites) that would require Green Infrastructure as part of the development to provide green linkages.
• Green space nearby community facilities (e.g. schools) are identified as places for education and volunteering.

Environment Agency – Planning Advisor

The Environment Agency (EA) noted that they would welcome the opportunity to work with Tandridge District Council and develop a series of actions which would better protect the water environment. They noted that:

• Tandridge District Council falls primarily within the Medway Management Catchment, in particular the Operational Catchment of the Eden. There are also sections of the Mole and Wandle Management Catchments.
• The Environment Agency would recommend that the study reflect the importance of the water environment in the district and ensure the report is both Blue and Green in its review of open space. The River Eden is designated a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and includes several Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
• There are multiple designated and protected areas within the Tandridge District water network, these include;
  o Surface Water Safe Guard Zones
  o Drinking Water Protected Area (at risk)
  o Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area (at risk)
  o Nitrates Directive Area

The EA provided a map of major water network in the Tandridge District and additional information relating to\textsuperscript{11}:

\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix 3
• Issues in the Medway Catchment
• Delivery in the Medway Catchment
• Issues in the Eden Operational Catchment

The EA notes that within the boundary of Tandridge District Council the following reportable Eden water bodies are included:

1. Upper Eden
2. Gibbs Brook
3. Middle Eden
4. Eden Brook
5. Ray Brook
6. Tributary of Eden Brook
7. Hedgecourt Lake SSSI
8. Bay Pond SSSI

The Environment Agency monitor the above list of water bodies and adds “working in partnership we hope to bring about environmental improvement in all of them. Following the obligations as set out in the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which has been passed into UK law, we all have a part to play in this process. It is important that the Open Space Study and Local Plan reflect this important commitment”.

Surrey Wildlife Trust – Living Landscapes Manager

Management of Local Sites


Strategic Overview

The Trust provided a copy of their document: The Living Landscapes - Surrey Wildlife Trust Strategy. The strategy aims to provide “a clear plan to achieve a coherent and resilient ecological network within our county over the coming decades”.

The Trust notes that the Living Landscapes vision “aims to link and create habitats to form large-scale areas rich in biodiversity, in order to secure a healthy long-term future for both wildlife and people”.

In summary they note that the main high-level goals are:

• All existing protected site management plans to be rigorously reviewed as the basis for implementing systematic monitoring programmes to clearly detect and measure change in a set of fully rationalised conservation objectives.
• All non-statutory sites designated in the strategy as “Tier 2” (in relation their high biodiversity value) to be ultimately secured and in positive management.
• Every opportunity for restoring and re-creating Priority habitats to be prioritised by its importance in the network (quantified as proximity to Tier 1 & 2 sites, habitat type and rarity, connectivity function, etc.); with the necessary land management advice scoped and tasked to experienced partnership staff.

They also highlighted that Holmesdale Living Landscape is identified as a Biodiversity Opportunity Area in the strategic document “Biodiversity Opportunity Areas: the basis for realising Surrey’s ecological network
The Woodland Trust - Government Affairs Officer

The Woodland Trust noted that they appreciate the opportunity to input into this document. They highlighted that proximity and access to woodland is a key issue linking the environment with health and wellbeing provision.

Management of Local Sites

The Trust supplied a map of sites that they manage in Tandridge District[^12].

Spatial Planning Standards

The Woodland Trust has researched and developed the Woodland Access Standard (WASt) for local authorities to aim for, encapsulated in their *Space for People* publication. They believe that the WASt can be an important policy tool complimenting other access standards used in delivering green infrastructure for health benefits.

The WASt is complementary to Natural England’s ANGST+ and is endorsed by Natural England. The Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard recommends:

- that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size
- that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people’s homes.

Applying this standard in Tandridge, compared to some other councils in Surrey, gives the following figures (see table below). It shows that Tandridge would particularly benefit from more new small woods close to where people live. This is an excellent opportunity for creating more accessible woodland to improve health & wellbeing opportunities for sustainable communities and neighbourhoods.

### Accessibility to Woodland in Tandridge using the Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tandridge</th>
<th>Woking</th>
<th>Mole Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Trust would like the Open Space Study to aim to increase access to woodland for the people of Tandridge.

[^12]: See Appendix 3
**The importance of biodiversity and multi-functional open space**

*The Case for Trees: Forestry Commission (2010)*

Trees enhance biodiversity. A mature oak can host up to 5,000 species of invertebrate that will form the basis for a healthy food chain that benefits birds and mammals. As a platform for biodiversity trees can link pockets of wildlife that, in time, helps to increase it and thus bring people closer to nature.

The Trust would wish to highlight the important of ancient woodland.

Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable. They are our richest terrestrial wildlife habitats, with complex ecological communities that have developed over centuries, and contain a high proportion of rare and threatened species, many of which are dependent on the particular conditions that this habitat affords. For this reason, ancient woodlands are reservoirs of biodiversity, but because the resource is limited and highly fragmented, they and their associated wildlife are particularly vulnerable.

Their long continuity and lack of disturbance means ancient woodlands are often also living history books, preserving archaeological features and evidence of past land use, from earthworks to charcoal pits. They are also places of great aesthetic appeal, making them attractive for recreation and the many benefits this can bring in terms of health and wellbeing.

The Trust would wish to see ancient woodland protected from development and buffered accordingly.

**Other information/points raised**

- The *Trees or Turf (2011)* report outlines the benefits of converting selected areas of intensively mown grassland to woodland, and in particular the cost savings which can be made.
- The Trust supplied a number of additional typology based comments noted in the appropriate sections below.

*The National Trust – Lead Ranger*

The Trust highlighted their national strategic document: *A shared purpose for our countryside - Our part in restoring a healthier, more beautiful natural environment*

*Management of Local Sites*

The National Trust directly manages open space comprising land at Limpsfield Common, Oxted Downs, Outwood Common and Six Brothers Field at Chaldon.

- Limpsfield Common is a mixture of open grassland areas, secondary woodland and a few small areas of heathland. The area is managed for conservation and public access. The common includes a 9 hole golf course that it is on a long-term lease and two cricket pitches also on leases. Our long-term plan for this property is to maintain the remaining areas of heathland, manage the woodlands for conservation and public access.
- Outwood Common is a mixture of open grassland and secondary woodland. The area again is managed for conservation and public access. There is one cricket pitch/ club on a lease. Our long-term plan is to manage the woodlands for conservation and public access.
• Oxted Downs – Is SSSI chalk downland that is in a 10yr Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) agreement\textsuperscript{13} so is being managed mainly for conservation but also considering public access. The North Downs Way crosses the site. Our long-term ambition it to get the site into favourable condition in regards to SSSI status.

• Six Brothers Field – Is a field that is used as a cricket pitch and public recreation.

\textit{Outdoor recreation in environmentally ‘sensitive areas’}

On our sensitive areas of conservation (SSSI’s) we are very careful in getting a balance in outdoor recreation trying to ensure that it doesn’t have a negative environmental impact on these areas. With increased public pressure this is not always easy, but we have found that by educating visitors about the “importance” of these areas so that they have a better understanding reduces the negative impact. The Trust also supplied a number of additional typology based comments noted in appropriate sections later in this section.

\textbf{Historic England - Planning Adviser}

Historic England note that some open space will have historical significance which should be recognised and taken into account in future planning and management. This is the case even if not formally designated as a Registered Park and Garden or Conservation Area or contain a Listed Building or Scheduled Monument. Surrey Gardens Trust holds an inventory of parks and gardens of local significance.

\textbf{Surrey Countryside Partnerships – Operations Manager}

\textit{Management of Local Sites}

The Downlands Partnership (Surrey CC are the signatory) have a higher level stewardship agreement for aspects of habitat management at Manor Park, Caterham Viewpoint, Long Hill, The Dobbins, Park Ham, Quarry Hangers, Chapel Bank and Blanchman’s Farm. The Downlands Partnership works with volunteers and provides a grazing service, both of which can work on public and privately owned land, across Tandridge, north of the M25.

\textit{Outdoor recreation in environmentally ‘sensitive areas’}

The Downlands Partnership provide a grazing service predominately on chalk grassland, ideally sheep are the best animal for this, however there is a conflict between this and dog walking.

\textit{The importance of biodiversity and multi-functional open space}

Green infrastructure is a hot topic at the moment particularly the importance of maintaining green links, which can include private gardens, through urban areas to link isolated open spaces. Likewise there is increasing evidence of the health benefits of having access to local green space.

The Partnership also supplied a number of additional typology based comments noted in appropriate sections below.

\section*{4.4 Community Organisations Survey (non-sports): overview}

An online survey was set up for local organisations with an interest in green spaces (non-sporting). Responses

\textsuperscript{13} A targeted scheme for farmers and land managers which funds projects to restore habitats (amongst other things), administered by Natural England.
were received from East Surrey Walkers (part of The Ramblers Association); Lingfield Nature Reserves; Caterham & District Horticultural Society; and Caterham Festival committee.

Detailed comments from the groups are found in the typology based sections 4.5 to 4.9 below.

**Quantity**

- All respondents reported that their organisations make direct use of open space or outdoor recreation facilities.
- All groups, other than Caterham & District Horticultural Society, reported that there are enough open spaces and outdoor recreation facilities to meet the needs of their group’s primary activities.

Caterham & District Horticultural Society added “the mental and physical health benefits of access to open spaces is only starting to be understood by the medical profession. Anecdotally, our members feel very connected to their local spaces: allotments, parks and gardens. The proximity to where people live seems to be a key factor. It would be interesting to see mapping of access to allotments and work to address any localised deficits”.

**Quality**

- The general views of these local community organisations who expressed an opinion as regards the overall quality of the different types of outdoor recreational provision in Tandridge District are summarised in the chart and information below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of open space types - Community Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local parks and recreation grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play areas and youth facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife areas, nature reserves etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other green spaces e.g. for dog walking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All of the groups who expressed an opinion think the quality of parks and recreation grounds are either good or very good. Similarly for play areas and wildlife areas, nature reserves and woodlands.
- Opinion on the general quality of allotments and water recreation facilities is divided across the spectrum from very good to very poor.
- The quality of footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths is rated as at least adequate with more rating them as good than adequate. Similarly for amenity green spaces such as grassed areas for dog walking, informal games, picnics etc.
Access

Respondents were asked whether their group faced any access issues in relation to open space and recreational facilities.

Two of the groups noted that they suffer from access issues and their specific comments are noted below

**Lingfield Nature Reserves:** We have provided hard-standing footpaths through the Reserves to allow disabled access, a safe route to school and suitability for children’s pushchairs and bicycles. It is proving very expensive to maintain the surface of this footpath network and local grant-funding is hard, if not impossible, to get.

**Caterham & District Horticultural Society:** Many of the Society's members are elderly or infirm. They are interested in remaining physically active outdoors. They may have downsized and no longer have access to a vehicle, so being able to walk to nearby spaces is important to them. When they move, they may not know where their new local open spaces are. They may have cultivated large allotments or gardens in the past, so they have expertise to pass on. Our younger Society members may be just starting out with new gardens or on allotments, such as at Heath Road or Westway. We find they need access to advice and expertise by word of mouth and cheap sources of allotment supplies.

**Sport and Recreation in environmentally sensitive areas**

The question posed was: ‘Should we have more or less areas for activities that are noisy? If so, where should they go? Is countryside or wildlife damaged by sport and recreational activity?’

The following points were raised by respondents:

- There is a balance to be struck - basically with a rising population in Tandridge, many housed in flats or new houses with small gardens, there needs to be more public provision for recreation (both noisy and quiet), and more access to the countryside in a controlled way.
- Countryside and wildlife not generally damaged by outdoor recreational activity.
- I’m sitting here on a sunny afternoon listening to children shouting and laughing in Queens Park. It’s great. The modern houses they build nowadays have such small back gardens that children need somewhere to go and play. Caterham has been blighted by over development so the families need somewhere.
- All children make noise. Noise does not damage the Nature Reserves.

**Other Issues and Observations**

The survey provided an opportunity to highlight any other issues that didn’t specifically fall into observations on particular typology types. Comments are noted below:

- We know grant funding has been reduced in all areas, but we do hope Tandridge will continue to support all that is done on the Lingfield Nature Reserves. Litter removal always important for our green spaces and evidence of vandalism should be quickly removed.
- Please thank the parks department for all they do keeping the grass and hedges cut and the area tidy.
4.5 Parks and Recreation Grounds

4.5.1 Tandridge Parks and Countryside Manager

Sports Pitches - Over recent years the quality of pitches has been steadily improved by the Parks and Countryside team. Generally, there is a high demand for football pitches though this has reduced slightly over recent years. Demand for cricket has dropped considerably and some clubs have disbanded e.g. Queens Park. Some cricket facilities are still being maintained so that they are not lost for potential new clubs (and to enable casual play).

Tennis courts – District Council courts are available for free at Queens Park (Caterham) and Whyteleafe Recreation Ground. The Courts can be hired for training. Courts are not of good quality and are in need of improvement.

Bowling Greens – Clubs manage District Council owned greens at various sites e.g. in Bletchingley, Caterham, and Felbridge. Generally they keep the facilities at a good standard of quality. Demand appears to be fairly stable and some clubs have a very large membership. Caterham bowls clubs has over 500 members.

4.5.2 Strategic Organisations

Woodland Trust

Trees outside woods are extremely important. We would wish to see tree cover increased overall as this will help to address the threat of tree disease. Planting a range of suitable native trees will help to make our tree stock more resilient.

Old individual trees are an important part of our cultural and landscape heritage: ancient, veteran and notable trees resonate with the history of the landscape and form markers in the lives of individual people and communities. Ancient trees also have a special conservation value, supporting many species of epiphytes, invertebrates and fungi, whilst also providing a habitat for other animals including owls, woodpeckers, other hole nesting birds and bats. In addition, trees make a significant contribution to the urban environment both in visual terms and in helping to abate air pollution and create oxygen.

It is important that there is no further avoidable loss of ancient trees through development pressure, mismanagement or poor practice. The Ancient Tree Forum (ATF) and the Woodland Trust would like to see all such trees recognised as historical, cultural and wildlife monuments scheduled under TPOs and highlighted in plans so they are properly valued in planning decision-making. There is also a need for policies ensuring good management of ancient trees, the development of a succession of future ancient trees through new street tree planting and new wood.

4.5.3 Community Organisations Survey

Comments from the Community Organisations Survey in relation to parks and recreation grounds are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield Nature Reserves</td>
<td>Jenner's Field Recreation Ground in Lingfield is well used and well maintained. We have an excellent play area for small children, an exercise area for older children and adults and skateboard ramps. Footpaths join this area to the Nature Reserves. Talbot Road has a football field that is well-maintained but little used and a children's play area and tennis court also, little used. Lingfield has plenty of these and they are kept in good condition. Always need more rubbish bins and dog bins but TDC cannot fund more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Festival committee</td>
<td>Generally well maintained. Parking difficult near some of them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Allotment Provision

3.6.1 Tandridge Parks and Countryside Manager

The council manage eight allotment sites well distributed across the district and there are at least ten further sites managed by parish councils or others. Most District Council sites have waiting lists though these have been reducing over recent years. Plots vary in size. Sites do not tend to have facilities such as communal meeting buildings or toilets on site. All have good access to water.

4.6.2 Strategic Organisations

National Trust

We have two community orchards, one at Limpfield and one at Outwood, both of which are great community focal points.

4.6.3 Community Organisations Survey

Comments from the Community Organisations Survey in relation to allotments are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield Nature Reserves</td>
<td>We have allotments within the Nature Reserves, managed by the parish council. There is currently a waiting list for these although other allotments have been provided for Lingfield and Dormansland residents in Newchapel Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham &amp; District Horticultural Society</td>
<td>Looking at quantity of provision of allotment sites in Caterham and the wider district. In the next 20 years, our Society feels it is feasible that there may be global food resilience issues. Therefore, it would make sense to see a future for local food production, whether agricultural or at community level e.g. on allotments and community gardens. This is something that the circa 400-strong membership of Caterham &amp; District Horticultural Society would advocate. The Tandridge Open Space Assessment 2015 noted a lack of adequate information on total number of allotment plots in Tandridge District available and the size of these plots. Even if taking a demand-led approach, the Tandridge District Council website currently states all District Council-run sites have a waiting list. The 2015 Assessment found that some allotments in the district were fully occupied and had a few people on the waiting list whilst others had vacant plots. Location and lack of suitability e.g. being difficult to find and having no parking nearby were cited as the main reasons for these vacancies and not a lack of demand. Removing any allotment land sites from productive usage would have a material impact on the already ‘minor deficiency’ identified in the 2015 Open Space Assessment Tandridge District. Furthermore, an increase in flats and terraced houses would support the need for more and not fewer allotments and community spaces. Looking at the technical assessment documents in support of the Tandridge Local Plan, key documents recommend more assessment of the provision of allotments in Tandridge District. There are 22 allotment sites in the district with an estimated total size of 11.20 hectares. This is an estimate, since at the time of writing the November 2015 Tandridge Open Space Assessment, information on the total number of plots available and the size of these plots was not available. Some parish councils were able to provide information on the number of plots available but not the total size of these plots. Therefore overall information on provision of allotments in the district cannot be relied upon currently. Furthermore, in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
public survey on the Tandridge Open Space Assessment, a sizeable proportion of residents were not aware of all the allotments in the district and could not comment on the adequacy of supply. More accurate information was deemed necessary from the parish councils about the number of plots each site contains as well as more information about waiting lists/ demand for plots, before a realistic local quantity standard could be set. Even given this lack of information, the Open Space Assessment concluded there is a minor deficiency in the provision of allotments in Tandridge District: ‘Figure 13 in Appendix 4 shows that there is sporadic coverage of allotments in the District with many parts of the District outside the 800m catchment area for this type of site.’ (Groundwork and TSE Research, Tandridge District Open Space Assessment Report of findings, November 2015). Within the scope and budget of the 2015 Tandridge Open Space Assessment, authors deemed it not possible to cover a number of areas which they believed could warrant further study including: ‘A review of the quantity and quality of allotments in the District and current occupancy levels to identify any shortfalls which may arise with changes to the population and new housing developments.’ We also note that at the time the Wellbeing Space Strategy Tandridge District 2015 was produced, detailed information about allotments was ‘not yet available’ (section 3.4 page 7). In concluding comments in the 2015 Wellbeing Space Strategy Tandridge District, authors recommended: ‘A review of the Wellbeing Space Strategy once growth projections are available in the Local Plan to better understand future need and provision. This should also, as per the 2015 Open Space Assessment recommendations, provide more information about outdoor and indoor sports provision, common land and allotments.’ (Tandridge District Council, Wellbeing Space Strategy Tandridge District, 2015, page 14). The Tandridge District Council Statement of Consultation Local Plan Issues & Approaches (regulation 18) states the action required in response to comments to not build on recreational land, allotments or open spaces is that ‘The Council will continue to prepare the Local Plan in accordance with the standards set for quantity, quality and accessibility of open space and recreation facilities.’ However, as stated, the technical evidence urges caution with applying the standards suggested for allotments without further information. The Statement of Consultation noted an updated version of the Wellbeing Strategy was needed and the associated action was to expand open space typologies which are assessed by it. We therefore urge the completion of this information on allotments to the same degree as other types of open space in updated versions of the Open Space Assessment and Wellbeing Space Strategy. On open space quality, according to size quoted on the Tandridge District Council website, Heath Road allotments is the largest allotment site run by Tandridge District Council in the district at 14,700sqm. We understand the site to be over-subscribed, to the extent that Tandridge District Council is dividing full plots to satisfy demand. The good walking access and presence of a mains water supply renders Heath Road allotments superior to other sites without similar access and facilities. This site was only recently proposed as a local site suitable for development, which our Society strongly objected to. We note that councils cannot dispose of statutory allotment land without the Secretary of State’s consent. Section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 states – “Where a local authority has purchased or appropriated land for use as allotments the local authority shall not sell, appropriate, use or dispose of the land for any purpose other than use for allotments without the consent of the Secretary of State”. At the time, the ecological value of Heath Road allotments was unknown. This, and the value of green corridors and green infrastructure seems to be generally poorly documented in Tandridge. The NPPF advocates that local planning authorities
should facilitate neighbourhood planning. In the case of Tandridge, Heath Road allotments is stated as Local Green Space number 18 in the green space register in evidence for the 10 February 2016 Pre-submission CR3 Forum Neighbourhood Plan. The CR3 Neighbourhood Plan Policy LC01 on allotments is in favour of provision of allotments: ‘The Neighbourhood Plan will support the provision of allotments whether by using land currently owned by local authorities or in the form of community allotments as a part of any future development in excess of 0.4 hectares subject to the provision of adequate off street parking and no serious loss of amenity to neighbouring areas. ‘Development of existing allotments should be prohibited unless suitable alternative arrangements of equal number and convenience can be provided on an alternative site prior to the start of any redevelopment.’ (Pre-submission CR3 Forum Neighbourhood Plan, page 14, February 2016). Regarding health benefits of access to open spaces, our Society membership doesn’t have to be told about this. However, we note that developing a preventative approach is one of six priorities in the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy. This priority will be achieved when more people (children and adults) will be physically active and have a healthy weight. One way of being more healthy is eating more portions of fruit and vegetables, which allotmenteers grow on their plots. The outcome of community gardening and allotmenteering is social cohesion and mental wellbeing. Family memories are made at our Society’s local horticultural shows. Several generations have worked on spaces such as the Vitamin G community garden in Queen’s Park, Caterham and Westway and Heath Road allotments.

Caterham Festival committee I know there are two in Caterham, don’t know about the rest of Tandridge
4.7 Natural green space, wildlife areas and woodlands

4.7.1 Tandridge Parks and Countryside Manager

Surrey Countryside Partnerships, through the Downlands Project, is the primary manager of natural green spaces e.g. wildlife areas and nature reserves, most SSSIs and AONB areas.

4.7.2 Strategic Organisations

Surrey Countryside Service

Tandridge District Council itself owns very little ‘countryside’ in our Partnership area. Most of our area of interest is either designated AONB or AGLV, in addition there are several SSSIs and SNCIs, but only 2 LNRs.

The SSSIs tend to be designated for chalk grassland on the scarp of the North Downs while many of the SNCIs are ancient woodland.

Active management of these areas needs to continue to maintain biodiversity. It would be good to see more sites designated LNRs and use this opportunity to encourage local support through volunteering. Work to link the remaining chalk grassland sites to allow movement of species between them is a priority.

The Woodland Trust

We wish to highlight the huge multi-functional value of woodlands.

Woods provide a range of social, economic and environmental benefits and woodland has been shown to contribute to 10 of the 20 quality of life indicators for the UK.

Public health is one of the biggest challenges facing modern society. Easily accessible woods close to residential areas provide measurable benefits: they encourage people to exercise; help reduce the mental stresses of modern society; improve air quality and reduce respiratory diseases. At present 85% of the population do not have a wood within easy walking distance. We need to remedy this and bring the quality of life benefits trees and woods can offer to our communities.

Woods make particularly outstanding green spaces for public access because of the experience of nature they provide, their visual prominence alongside buildings which offers balance between the built and natural worlds, their low maintenance costs and their ability to accommodate large numbers of visitors.

We would like to see sensitive restoration of Planted Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). Although often damaged, these PAWS sites still retain ancient semi-natural woodland features that existed before conversion, and these can be managed to help restore this valuable habitat. This is the only way of increasing the area of ancient woodland with semi natural characteristics.

The key findings of research carried out by the Oxford Forest Institute into PAWS and their restoration were that most sites retain elements of their previous semi-natural ancient woodland ecosystem. The best way to make the most of these remnants is to change the woodland canopy structure gradually, rather than removing non-native tree species in one go, which has been the most common approach in the past. We have combined this research with our own experience to produce a short guide for woodland owners and managers entitled The Conservation and Restoration of Plantations on ancient woodland sites - available on the Trust’s website - http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/en/about-us/publications/Pages/ours.aspx.
### 4.7.3 Community Organisation Survey

Respondents’ views in relation to Wildlife Areas, Nature Reserves and Woodlands are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group/Organisation Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield Nature Reserves</td>
<td>Lingfield Nature Reserves are very special to the area. A wonderful open space for families, sports, dog walking, education and environment. Lingfield has 26 acres of Nature Reserves on its northern edge which is maintained entirely by volunteers. We have grant funding from both parish and district councils for grass cutting and other maintenance. It is well used by local people, families, dog walkers and for many outdoor interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Festival committee</td>
<td>Plenty of walking and open spaces but some are owned and managed by the City of London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Water Recreation

4.8.1 Environment Agency

The EA highlighted the recreational aspects of the River Eden (Medway) Catchment Action Plan. For example some of its objectives and associated actions are noted below:

- Local community is able to contribute to and be aware of the aims and work of the catchment improvement process – Action Point: Ensure local authorities are aware of the process.
- More people responsibly enjoying the river – Action Point: Better access and use of the river. Increase signage and infrastructure along with organised walks to help inform community about where access is and isn’t possible.
- The river is well-valued and understood by the local community – Action Point: Increase awareness and appreciation of the river by young people. Visits to schools and local groups to talk about the river.
- Improved economic gain from the river - Action Point: Improved use of the river by Tourists

4.8.2 Community Organisation Survey

Respondents’ views in relation to Water Recreation are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield Nature Reserves</td>
<td>We have created two wildlife ponds within the Reserves, both of which are full of wildlife. Volunteers run regular pond-dipping mornings which are well supported by young families through the summer. School visits and youth group visits usually include some pond-dipping, meadow sweeping and tree identification games provided by a Tree Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Festival committee</td>
<td>No rivers or lakes at all in our area. Would be nice but we are on mainly chalk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 Rights of Way - Footpaths, Cycling and Bridleways

In relation to the open spaces study it is important to consider the provision of and need for linear recreational open space in the form of rights of way such as footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths. For this reason, footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths are included in the typologies of open space considered.

4.9.1 Strategic Organisations

Surrey Countryside Partnerships

There is a good network of rights of way, but may be some useful links that could be created, particularly to link bridleways so that horseriders/cyclists can avoid riding on roads if they wish. Surrey CC’s rights of way improvement plan is the reference document for this: https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/environment-housing-and-planning/countryside/footpaths-byways-and-bridleways/rights-of-way-improvement-plan

National Trust

As the majority of our land is open access, we encourage rights of way including permissive ones. Where possible we are keen to ensure that these rights of way are accessible by everyone, but due to the soil type (Wealden clay) on a number of our properties this is not always possible. Our long-term ambition is to provide where conditions allow and when funding is available, all weather surfacing to allow easy access in wetter periods.

With the increase in use of our sites for public access for different recreational activities such as cycling, walking and horse riding we do see more conflicts between different users, so again if funding comes available and the conditions of the specific sites allow us, it would be one of our ambitions to provide dedicated routes for specific users, for example off road cycle tracks.

4.9.2 Community Organisations Survey

Respondents’ views in relation to footpaths, cycling and bridleway provision are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Surrey Walkers (The Ramblers Association)</td>
<td>Very concerned that with Surrey CC budget cuts for 2017-18. Footpaths etc will gradually fall into disrepair at a time when numbers walking and cycling continue to increase, i.e. quality presently adequate will deteriorate because budget going forward insufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield Nature Reserves</td>
<td>Rights of Way are generally quite good. No longer maintained properly by the County Council. Rely on volunteer walking groups walking the paths with secateurs to cut back overgrowth. Hard standing footpaths run through the Reserves and these are regularly used by all members of the public. Other grass footpaths link up with these. A Walking for Health Group goes out once a week from the village centre. They are finding many of the footpaths and bridlepaths are very overgrown - the council no longer maintaining these as they used to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Festival committee</td>
<td>They spent money on a cyclepath beside the Limpsfield Road Warlingham, 60mph on the road and cyclists don't use it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10 Parks, Natural Green Space and Rights of Way: Key Findings

Overview

- The Wellbeing Space Strategy (2015) emphasises the key role that all kinds of open spaces can have in relation to improving health and wellbeing; and provides a plan as to how the Council and its partners can maximise that benefit for local people.
- Queens Park and Whyteleafe Recreation Ground are regarded as high profile sites by the Council based on the range of facilities provided and their value to a wide range of sports and local community interests.
- The importance of partnership working, both with strategic organisations and through parish councils etc. is highlighted.
- Natural England suggests that the ANGst standard should be a starting point for developing a standard for natural and semi natural green space. Variations from this standard should be justified.
- The Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard (WASst - endorsed by Natural England) provides guidance on access to Woodland, which should also be taken into consideration.
- Many stakeholders highlight the importance of biodiversity and having multi-functional open spaces that take biodiversity into account in relation to design and maintenance. A number of stakeholders also note the need to balance access and outdoor recreation with conservation in environmentally sensitive areas.
- The importance of biodiversity, ecological networks and the health and wellbeing benefits associated with access to good quality open space were key issues highlighted throughout the consultation.

Quantity

- The District Council’s Parks and Countryside Manager notes that broadly speaking there seem to be enough open spaces in total but there is a need to retain the current level and improve what is available.
- He also noted that sites are distributed throughout the district but the main sites tend to be situated in the north and south of the district, with the central area being less well served.

Household Survey:

- Over 60% suggest a shortfall of informal open spaces - for ball games, picnics, hobbies, dog walking etc; woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves; facilities for teenagers (64%); and rights of way (62%).
- Other aspects where there was considered to be an overall shortfall by a majority were: children’s play areas; local parks and recreation grounds; water recreation facilities; and allotments.

Quality

- The District Council Parks and Countryside Manager notes that quality is generally good though budgets for maintenance have been reduced over recent years leading to a comprehensive review of contracts to ensure that maintenance is provided at an appropriate level to match the character of the sites and the needs of local communities.
Household survey:

For all kinds of outdoor facilities/open spaces a majority of households suggested that they were of average or better quality (though the most common rating tended to be only "average"). However, for some typologies there were notable levels of dissatisfaction with general levels of quality as noted below.

- Nearly half of households highlighted the overall quality of outdoor facilities for teenagers as being either poor or very poor. The quality of MUGAs, water recreation facilities and artificial turf pitches was rated as poor by about one third of respondents.
- In contrast some kinds of facilities/open spaces were rated relatively highly in terms of quality. These include: parks and recreation grounds; woodlands, wildlife areas and nature reserves; play areas; and rights of way.

Community group survey:

- All of the groups noted the quality of parks and recreation grounds are either good or very good. Similarly for play areas and wildlife areas, nature reserves and woodlands.
- Opinion on the general quality of allotments and water recreation facilities was divided across the spectrum from very good to very poor.
- The quality of footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths is rated as at least adequate with more rating them as good than adequate. Similarly for amenity green spaces such as grassed areas for dog walking, informal games, picnics etc.

Access

Household survey:

- In general, a majority of household respondents report that they would not normally travel more than 15 minutes to visit the different kinds of open spaces and outdoor facilities. There is considerable variation however between the typologies.
- The detailed findings relating to acceptable access times to the various typologies will be considered in detail to help determine the access elements of relevant standards for different kinds of open space.
- 61% of households confirmed that they would be prepared to walk/cycle further if the quality of the route was improved. 72% said that if the quality of the route was improved they would make the journey more often.

Other points raised

- Some sectors of the community face particular barriers to access such as disabled people; children and young people; households in the more isolated rural areas and those in the more deprived areas of the district.
- The District Council’s Parks and Countryside Manager noted that for District Council sites access for disabled people is generally good and care is taken to maximise access in line with the good practice guidance relating to the different kinds of open space/facility.
5.0 Outdoor Play and Youth Facilities

This section provides feedback and information relating to outdoor play and youth facilities. It considers information and views provided by various stakeholders including the District Council, strategic organisations and local groups.

The section is structured into three main parts:

- Review of local Policy and Strategy
- Youth and Play – strategic stakeholders
- Play and Youth Organisations Survey

There is a summary of key points and issues at the end of the section.

5.1 Review of Local Policy and Strategy

5.1.1 Tandridge Play Area Strategy

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment (see below) makes reference to a 2007-2011 Tandridge Play Area Strategy which set out how play areas should be provided and maintained across the district. The Parks and Countryside Manager also noted that a revised Play Strategy was drafted in 2015 but this has not been adopted pending the outcome of this study.

5.1.2 Tandridge District Open Space Assessment (2015)

The 2015 Assessment proposes a local standard for play area provision as noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Existing level of provision (ha per 1000 residents)</th>
<th>Recommended quantity standard (ha per 1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play provision for children and young people</td>
<td>0.04ha</td>
<td>0.1ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying this standard the study concludes that there is an overall deficiency of 4.9ha of play space across the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play provision for children</td>
<td>600m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the standard the study concludes that there is “no major deficiency” though the logic leading to this conclusion is not altogether clear given that the report also notes that 44% of the population in the district are outside the 600 metres distance from an equipped play area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play provisions for children and young people quality standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites should be clean / litter free and provide a safe and stimulating environment where possible for children and young people of all ages. Areas should be set aside as dog free and where possible toilets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should be provided nearby. Sites should be in areas easily accessible by foot to the local community they are intended to serve with limited barriers to access such as main roads.

In relation to application of the quality standard the assessment notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally quality is very good. In addition to maintaining these high quality facilities, we recommend more exciting and challenging games areas designed with older children in mind on existing sites, and the development of more innovative play areas including natural play environments such as wooded adventure play trails in natural open spaces and informal open spaces such as amenity green spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This approach involves making greater use of existing space, rather than acquiring new land, and designing new provision for children and young people in a way that make them ‘blend into’ the natural environment and therefore minimising conflict with other user groups. If these developments come to fruition they will see greater overlap and interrelationship between natural open spaces, informal open spaces, and provision for children and young people in future years. Consulting with young people will ensure that facilities are tailored to their needs and this will encourage greater usage of the sites. Furthermore, studies have proven that involvement in the design of a facility can generate a culture of respect. Given that developments encouraging greater use among teenage children may give rise to concerns among elderly residents over noise and vandalism, this type of engagement early on will be particularly important to prevent such problems arising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More play equipment suitable for under 4 year olds is also recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study will review the play space standards and recommend and apply new standards.

5.1.3 The Surrey Children and Young People’s strategy (2012-17)

The Surrey Children and Young People’s strategy (2012-2017) uses a ‘Lifecourse outcomes’ approach, aiming to ensure Surrey’s children and young people will:

- be happy, healthy, safe and well educated
- have access to high quality leisure, cultural and economic opportunities
- be able to make a positive contribution to society

The main focus areas are family and parenting, pregnancy and early years’ support, education and material wellbeing. The six themes, to all of which play can contribute, are:

1. positive relationships with peers
2. good physical health
3. good mental health
4. leisure activities
5. safety and reduced exposure to risks
6. positive cultural experiences

5.1.4 Play England

Play England has some broad observations about overall policy direction and advice on local standards as summarised below.
**Quantity**

Play England recommend provision of a range of play spaces in all urban environments:

A  Doorstep spaces close to home  
B  Local play spaces – larger areas within easy walking distance  
C  Neighbourhood spaces for play – larger spaces within walking distance  
D  Destination/family sites; accessible by bicycle, public transport and with car parking

They emphasise that play spaces do not just mean formal play areas. While these are included play spaces cover all areas of public open spaces that are "playable" e.g. spaces that are accessible, safe, appropriate for play and where play use is welcomed and encouraged.

They also point out the need for standards for smaller settlements and rural areas where the doorstep, local, neighbourhood, and destination hierarchy is unlikely to be appropriate.

**Quality**

Play England would like the Play England Design Guide *Design for Play* to be referenced and added as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Play England has developed a *Quality Assessment Tool* that can be used to judge the quality of individual play spaces. They recommend that local authorities consider adopting this as a means of assessing the quality of play spaces in the local area.

**Access**

Access is the key element for Play England as referred to in the Quantity section – a range of doorstep, local, neighbourhood, and destination play spaces with appropriate catchments. Disability access is also an important issue for Play England and they would like local authorities to adopt the KIDS publication *Inclusion by Design* as a Supplementary Planning Document.

**Priorities**

Play England has a guidance document: *Better Places to Play through Planning*. The publication gives detailed guidance on setting local standards for access, quantity and quality of playable space. It also shows how provision for better play opportunities can be promoted in planning policies and processes; giving detail of how local development frameworks and planning control can be utilised in favour of child-friendly communities. They recommended that local authorities adopt this guidance generally in terms of play and spatial planning.
5.2 Youth and Play Facilities – Strategic Stakeholders

5.2.1 Tandridge District Council – Parks and Countryside Manager

The Parks and Countryside Manager noted that:

- The District Council manages 35 play areas across the district. 90% of sites have been refurbished since 2008 so quality generally is good. Refurbishments or new facility developments follow good practice design principles such as Design for Play (Play England) and inclusive disability guidance (provided by the disability charity Kids). Queens Park play area is a particularly good example of an inclusively designed facility.
- Youth facilities – there are skate parks/facilities at various sites across the district i.e. Bletchingley (Grange Meadow); Felbridge (Village Hall); Hurst Green (Mill Lane); Lingfield (Jenners Field); and Smallfield (Broadbridge Lane). Quality is variable but generally good.
- MUGAs - There are two Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) in Tandridge i.e. Broadbridge Lane, Smallfield; and Tatsfield Primary School (dual use). There are similar facilities at Queens Park, Caterham; Talbot Road, Lingfield; and Whyteleafe Recreation ground. Quality is generally very good.
- A number of the parish councils also own and/or manage play areas and youth facilities.
- Play space is spread fairly evenly between the north, south, east and west of the district, with greater provision in the more populated areas of Caterham, Hurst Green and Lingfield.
- There is play provision in most of the centres of population, although there is a gap in the Warlingham East, Chelsham and Farleigh ward. Potentially, there could be demand for equipped play space in the communities of: Crowhurst, Felcourt, Shipley Bridge, Nutfield and Chaldon.
- Ideally, play spaces serving small communities will have play provision for all ages and abilities. Larger communities are likely to need to develop a hierarchy of play provision, befitting toddlers, juniors and teenagers.
- There appears to be a shortage of neighbourhood provision (or play space that caters for a whole range of children and young people) to the east of the district, although in the Hurst Green/Oxted/Limpsfield area, Master Park in Oxted is the only area that caters for all age groups.

5.2.2 Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board

Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board was established as part of the Government’s changes to the NHS and became a statutory committee of Surrey County Council on 1 April 2013. The five priorities highlighted in the Board’s strategy are shown below. There is evidence to show that opportunities to play and be physically active outdoors can contribute to the achievement of a number of these objectives, for adults as well as children.14

- Improving children’s health and wellbeing
- Developing a preventative approach
- Promoting emotional wellbeing and mental health
- Improving older adults’ health and wellbeing
- Safeguarding the population

---

4.2.3 The National Trust

The National Trust note that “encouraging youngsters out into the countryside in one of the National Trust key objectives (50 things to do before you are 11 ¾ campaign) Where possible we are keen that these play spaces are as natural as possible making use of what is already there. Where we do have more formal play parks on our properties, for example on Limpsfield Common, we ensure that they are in keeping with the surrounding area”.

4.2.4 Woodland Trust

The Woodland Trust highlight that woods are important spaces for informal play.

"As highlighted in the Public Health White Paper (Healthy Lives, Healthy People; Nov 2010), there are tremendous opportunities for native woodland to contribute positively towards delivering improved mental and physical health. Research shows that woodland can provide benefits for air quality, urban heat island cooling, physical exercise provision and relief from mental illness".
5.3 Play and Youth Organisations Survey

An online survey was set up for local play and youth organisations and responses were received from eight groups: Caterham Scouts, Skaterham, Caterham Children’s Centre, Hurst Green Community Association/Centre, Creative Community, Surrey Clubs for Young People, Girlguiding (1st Felbridge), and the 3rd Oxted Guides.

5.3.1 Overview of findings

Five of the eight organisations made direct use of outdoor play/youth facilities or areas of public open space.

Quantity

- A small majority of the groups thought that there weren’t enough equipped play areas for children aged 12 or under but that there were enough open space areas for informal and natural play.
- A large majority thought that were not enough outdoor facilities for teenagers, most clearly for activity areas such as skate parks but also for MUGAs and youth shelters/areas where teenagers can “hang out”.

Specific comments on the kinds of open space/play facilities that respondents thought were needed are noted below:

- More adventure type facilities, forest school type play, where activities are open ended and can be moved around. Fixed play equipment is fit for purpose but inhibits imaginary play. More play facilitators in parks to encourage team games and social interactions. Better toilet facilities and somewhere to get refreshments. More toddler friendly outside areas with sandpits and water play.
- We have a great open space but in dire need of some serious TLC and updated equipment.
- More green activity spaces for ‘wild’ play/activities and gardening opportunities, including edible plants to cook/eat etc.
- There could be more facilities for teenagers but this is based on how many there seem to be just roaming the street. However it may be because they are choosing not to access facilities that are available.
- I would like to see more opportunities for diversified activities.
- There is a need to look at existing local parks/spaces/venues to see what else could be added to facilities.
- BMX parks and skate parks are needed. Youth shelters can be useful but are not ideal. MUGAs can be useful but are not always well used in our experience.
- When it rains there are not too many covered outdoor spaces available, if any.
- Outdoor classrooms with youth workers to support activities for children and young people.

Quality

- The view on the quality of equipped play areas for children of 12 and under was very varied, with some groups rating quality in general as being good but others as poor.
- The quality of the various kinds of facilities for teenagers was generally rated as poor by a large majority.
Access

Comments on the need for improved access for disabled children and young people were made by a number of respondents such as:

- There is a need for more accessible play areas for young people, such as wheelchair swings and roundabouts; and improved spaces for low cost outdoor activities.
- Improved facilities for teenagers with additional needs, improved toilet facilities and access to low cost activities run in outdoor areas.
- There is a lack of facilities/activities for disabled children and young people.

Priorities for improvement

- The kinds of facilities that were most frequently rated as being a high priority for improvement were play areas with more challenging equipment for teenagers; access to natural areas for play activity; and MUGAs.
5.4 Children and Young People - Key Findings

Quantity

The District Council’s Parks and Countryside Manager noted that:

- Play space is spread fairly evenly between the north, south, east and west of the district, with greater provision in the more populated areas of Caterham, Hurst Green and Lingfield.
- There appears to be a shortage of neighbourhood provision (or play space that caters for a whole range of children and young people) to the east of the district, although in the Hurst Green/Oxted/Limpsfield area, Master Park in Oxted is the only area that caters for all age groups.

Residents’ survey

- A clear majority of respondents (64%) to the residents’ survey believe that overall across Tandridge District there is insufficient provision of youth facilities.
- A smaller majority (59%) also say that overall there are not enough play areas.

Play and Youth Organisations Survey

- A small majority of the groups thought that there weren’t enough equipped play areas for children aged 12 or under but that there were enough open space areas for informal and natural play.
- A large majority thought that were not enough outdoor facilities for teenagers, most clearly for activity areas such as skate parks but also for MUGAs and youth shelters/areas where teenagers can “hang out”.

Quality

The Parks and Countryside Manager noted that:

- 90% of District Council sites have been refurbished since 2008 so quality generally is good.
- Refurbishments or new facility developments follow good practice design principles such as Design for Play (Play England) and inclusive disability guidance (provided by the disability charity Kids).
- Ideally, play spaces serving small communities will have play provision for all ages and abilities. Larger communities are likely to need to develop a hierarchy of play provision, befitting toddlers, juniors and teenagers.

Residents’ survey

- The quality of youth facilities is not rated highly - 83% of respondent households say that they are at best adequate with 47% of those rating them as poor or very poor).
- In general residents have less concern with the quality of equipped play areas across the district (41% rated them as being good or very good in contrast to 22% rating them as poor or very poor).

Play and Youth Organisations Survey

- The view on the quality of equipped play areas for children of 12 and under was very varied, with some groups rating quality in general as being good but others as poor.
- The quality of the various kinds of facilities for teenagers was generally rated as poor by a clear majority.
**Access**

The District Council Parks and Countryside Manager noted that:

- Refurbishments or new facility developments follow inclusive disability guidance (provided by the disability charity Kids).
- Queens Park play area is a particularly good example of an inclusively designed facility.

**Residents’ survey**

- 82% of respondents from the household survey would expect play areas to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 45% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
- A majority of respondents (54%) would be prepared to travel 15 minutes to make use of Multi Use Games Areas (of which 30% would travel up to 20 minutes).

**Play and Youth Organisations Survey**

- A number of organisations commented on the need for improved access for disabled children and young people.

**Priorities for improvement**

The consultation with play/youth organisations looked at the kinds of play and youth facility provision where improvements were most needed.

- The kinds of facilities that were most frequently rated as being a high priority for improvement were play areas with more challenging equipment for teenagers; access to natural areas for play activity; and MUGAs.

**Other Issues / General Observations**

- The Parks and Countryside Manager noted the difficulty in maintaining the quality and adequate maintenance of play and youth facilities when budgets are reducing; and that a number of sites are still in need of refurbishment.
- Following this study the Parks and Countryside Manager noted the need to adopt a new Play Strategy.
- The value of play in relation to improvements to children and young people’s health and wellbeing was highlighted by a number of stakeholders.
- Stakeholders noted the need for well-designed play and youth facilities, the value of consultation with young people and the wider community in that process, and the potential for natural landscaped play areas in which play equipment may not be necessary or simply be a small element of the overall design.
- Play England provide useful guidance on play and spatial planning; play space design; and managing risk in play. Some of these could be adopted as guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents.
6.0 Concluding Remarks

The survey work, stakeholder consultation, desk-based research and group sessions have highlighted a wide range of issues of value to the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Assessment. There is a strong degree of consistency across the various sources on key areas of local need and aspiration from which we can be confident that the findings are robust and reliable, providing a strong evidence base to be combined with the detailed facilities audit.

The information and findings from the Community and Stakeholder Consultation report will be taken forward primarily in the Open Space Assessment report. Relevant findings will also feed into the Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy and the Built Facilities Assessment.