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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 well-being 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 grounds, 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 Needs Facilities Assessment, which underpins and informs the emerging Local Plan. The reports in bold have been published as part of the Garden Village Consultation.

The six reports are the:

- Tandridge Community and Stakeholder Consultation 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 (this Report);
• Likely Requirements for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision for a Garden Village

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 agreed a Preferred Strategy for the Local Plan. The Preferred Strategy 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

As part of the commission Ethos is required to prepare standards for different types of open spaces, built facilities and outdoor playing pitches, which will help the Council to plan and manage provision within the district. This Report explains the range of open space, sport and recreation typologies covered by the Study and sets out ‘standards of provision’ for the different typologies. The standards are justified by the evidence contained in the Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report (August 2017)\(^1\) and replace the standards set out in the Tandridge District Open Space Assessment (November 2015).

---

\(^1\) Further evidence will be presented in the Playing Pitch Strategy Needs Assessment alongside the integrated Open Space Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment to be published with the Draft Local Plan.
2.0 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Typologies

The typologies for open space are set out in the table below. These typologies are explained in more detail in sections 2.1 and 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typologies with standards</th>
<th>Typologies mapped but no standards&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space Study:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Open Space Study:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allotments</td>
<td>• Education sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>• Outdoor Sports Space (Private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park and Recreation Grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Play Space (Children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Play Space (Youth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessible Natural Green Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Churchyards and Cemeteries&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor, Built and Outdoor (non-pitch) Sports Needs Assessment:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor, Built and Outdoor (non-pitch) Sports Needs Assessment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outdoor Sports Space</td>
<td>• Other sports facilities e.g. gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sports Halls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Swimming Pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> Standards for Churchyards and Cemeteries are analysed at a district wide level

<sup>3</sup> An explanation for not developing standards for these typologies is outlined in the following sections
2.1 Typologies with Standards

2.1.1 Allotments

Allotments provide areas for people to grow their own produce and plants. It is important to be clear about what is meant by the term ‘allotment’. The Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908 obliged local authorities to provide sufficient allotments and to let them to persons living in their areas where they considered there was a demand. The Allotment Act of 1922 defines the term ‘allotment garden’ as:

“an allotment not exceeding 40 poles\(^4\) in extent which is wholly or mainly cultivated by the occupier for the production of vegetable or fruit crops for consumption by himself or his family”

The Allotments Act of 1925 gives protection to land acquired specifically for use as allotments, so called Statutory Allotment Sites, by the requirement for the need for the approval of Secretary of State in event of sale or disposal. Some allotment sites may not specifically have been acquired for this purpose. Such allotment sites are known as “temporary” (even if they have been in use for decades) and are not protected by the 1925 legislation.

\(^4\) 40 Poles equals 1,210 square yards or 1,012 square metres. A Pole can also be known as a Rod or Perch.
2.1.2 Amenity Green Space

This category is considered to include those spaces open to free and spontaneous use by the public, but neither laid out nor managed for a specific function such as a park, public playing field or recreation ground; nor managed as a natural or semi-natural habitat. These areas of open space will be of varied size, but are likely to share the following characteristics:

- Unlikely to be physically demarcated by walls or fences.
- Predominantly lain down to (mown) grass.
- Unlikely to have identifiable entrance points (unlike parks).
- They may have shrub and tree planting, and occasionally formal planted flower beds.
- They may occasionally have other recreational facilities and fixtures (such as play equipment or ball courts).

Examples might include both small and larger informal grassed areas in housing estates and general recreation spaces. They can serve a variety of functions dependent on their size, shape, location and topography. Some may be used for informal recreation activities, whilst others by themselves, or else collectively, contribute to the overall visual amenity of an area.
2.1.3 Parks and Recreation Grounds

This typology brings together the typologies of *Parks and Gardens* and *Outdoor Sports Facilities* as identified in the Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (Groundwork/TSE Research, November 2015) because it became apparent from the results arising from this Study, in particular the mapping and quality audit process, that the distinction between these two typologies is blurred. It has also been noted that the previous open space assessment (2015) makes reference to the cross over in types of provision between the two typologies.

Furthermore, within the district, there are very few formal gardens and many parks and/or outdoor sports facilities were found to be multi-functional, used for both informal and formal recreation. In addition the consultation highlights that people refer to their local park or rec, and communities do not necessarily make a distinction between outdoor sports space and parks and recreation grounds. Therefore, for the purpose of this Study an overarching typology for Parks and Recreation Grounds has been used.

Parks and Recreation Grounds take on many forms, and may embrace a wide range of functions including:

- Play space of many kinds;
- Provision of a range of formal pitch and fixed outdoor sports facilities;
- Informal recreation and sport;
- Providing attractive walks and cycle routes to work;
- Offering landscape and amenity features;
- Areas of formal planting;
- Providing areas for ‘events’;
- Providing habitats for wildlife;
• Dog walking.

When mapping this type of provision, a multi-functional approach to mapping has been adopted as shown in Figure 1, where play spaces, youth spaces and fixed outdoor sports facilities (e.g. tennis courts, bowling greens) are separately mapped. Individual playing pitches (e.g. football, rugby) are not separately mapped as the assessment of these facilities is included within the separate Playing Pitch Strategy.

In calculating the quantity supply of parks and recreation grounds, the total figure includes the general park area plus the fixed outdoor sports facilities. The figure excludes the provision of children and youth play spaces which are considered in a separate typology.

Figure 1  Multi-functional approach to mapping
2.1.4 Play Space (Children and Youth)

It is important to establish the scope of the Study in terms of this type of open space. Children and young people will play/‘hang out’ in almost all publicly accessible “space” ranging from the street, town centres and squares, parks, playing fields, “amenity” grassed areas etc. as well as the more recognisable play and youth facility areas such as equipped playgrounds, youth shelters, BMX and skateboard parks and Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) etc. Clearly many of the other types of open space covered by this Study will therefore provide informal play opportunities.

To a child, the whole world is a potential playground: where an adult sees a low wall, a railing, kerb or street bench, a child might see a mini adventure playground or a challenging skateboard obstacle. Play should not be restricted to designated ‘reservations’ and planning and urban design principles should reflect these considerations.

However, there are a number of recognised types of play area including Local Areas for Play (LAPs), Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs), Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs), school playgrounds, informal ball courts, and ‘hang out’ areas.

The Study has recorded the following:

- Play Space
- Teenage Facilities

The former comprises equipped areas of play that cater for the needs of children up to and around 12 years of age. The latter comprises informal recreation opportunities for, broadly, the 13 to 16/17 age group, and which might include facilities like skateboard parks, basketball courts and ‘free access’ MUGAs. In practice, there will always be some blurring around the edges in terms of younger children using equipment aimed for youths and vice versa.

The previous open space study (Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (Groundwork/TSE Research, November 2015) included provision for children and young people as one typology, however, having assessed provision on the ground and considered feedback from community consultation, it became clear that the needs of these users and types of facilities are quite distinct. Therefore, the current Tandridge Open Space, Sport and

---

5 MUGAs are also included within the Outdoor Sports Provision typology (section 2.1.7).
Recreation Facilities Assessment allows for a separate assessment for children’s and youth facilities.

**Play space (Children)**

Play Areas are an essential way of creating safe but adventurous places for children of varying ages to play and learn. The emphasis in play area management is shifting away from straightforward and formal equipment such as slides and swings towards creating areas where imagination and natural learning can flourish through the use of landscaping and natural building materials and the creation of areas that need exploring.

**Play Space (Youth)**

This category includes skate parks/BMX tracks and MUGAs for ease, as most of these are predominantly used by young people and have been installed with this key client group in mind.

Teenagers should not be ignored, it is important to create areas for ‘hanging out’ such as shelters and providing them with things to do such as bike ramps. Currently recognisable provision for teenagers is few and far between.
2.1.5 Accessible Natural Green Space

For the purpose of this Study, natural and semi-natural green space covers a variety of spaces including meadows, woodland, copses, river valleys and lakes all of which share a trait of having natural characteristics and biodiversity value, and are also partly or wholly accessible for informal recreation.

The nature of the geography of Tandridge means there are large tracts of open countryside, much of it is private land used for farming, however, there is significant access to the countryside provided through the Rights of Way network. It was not the intention of this audit to survey and map all these areas, but to focus on sites where there are definitive boundaries or areas of natural green space which have some form of public access.

Access to these spaces may be provided via statutory Rights of Access or permissive codes allowing the public to wander freely, or via defined Rights of Way or permissive routes running through them. In some cases, access may not be fully clear, however, there was evidence of some level of informal use and access.

Some sites may provide access in different ways, for example, rivers or lakes are often used for water recreation (e.g. canoeing, fishing, sailing). Whilst access may not be available fully across all areas of these sites (e.g. the middle of a lake or dense scrub in a woodland), the whole site has been included within the assessment.

Some natural spaces were found to have no access at all, and whilst they cannot be formally used by the general community, they can be appreciated from a distance, and contribute to visual amenity, green infrastructure and biodiversity. Whilst every effort was made to exclude these spaces from the assessment, as already identified, in certain sites access was not always clear.
The local consultation and research elsewhere (Natural England\(^6\)) have identified the value attached to natural spaces for recreation and emotional well-being. A sense of ‘closeness to nature’ with its attendant benefits for people is something that is all too easily lost in built up areas. Natural green spaces can make important contributions towards local biodiversity and can also raise awareness of biodiversity values and issues.

### 2.1.6 Churchyards and Cemeteries

The district has numerous churches and cemeteries and these provide significant aesthetic value and space for informal recreation such as walking and relaxing. Many are also important in terms of biodiversity. Their importance for informal recreation, aesthetic value and contribution towards biodiversity must be acknowledged, and as such, investment in their upkeep, maintenance and quality is an important factor.

Within Tandridge, there is also a need for additional burial space, as the existing supply is being exhausted, and unlikely to meet future needs. Whilst most open space studies would not set standards for this type of provision (as per the previous Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings November 2015), in Tandridge there is a particular need to understand existing provision and to take a strategic view as to the future requirements for burial land. The methodology for this assessment is therefore different to the assessment of other types of open space\(^7\).

---

\(^6\) Natural England have published a variety of health and the natural environment publications at [http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/127020](http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/127020)

\(^7\) This will be explained in detail within the main Open Space Study report.
2.1.7 Outdoor Sports Space, in Community Use

For the purpose of setting a standard, Outdoor Sports Provision includes sports pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens, Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and ancillary space that is available for use by members of the general community—either informally, or as part of an organized club or group.

In practice, the above definition of community use will include a wide range of management regimes from ‘free access’, through ‘pay-as-you-go’; and, to membership of clubs and groups. Whether, individual facilities are considered to be available for general community use depends of several factors, including:

- Type of facility (and whether its size and design might be of use to the community at large, or at least significant groups within the community);
- The cost of using facilities, and whether these might generally be considered to be affordable;
- The times and days of availability (times of most demand for the general community are likely to be in the evenings and at the weekends, as well as during mid-week lunchtime (popular for people at work)).
- The extent to which such use by the community is ‘assured’ over the longer-term.

The standard will also cover synthetic pitches. Hockey clubs are now required to play all competitive matches on synthetic pitches. The Football Association and the Rugby Football Union are both promoting synthetic pitches for training, and certain matchplay. Synthetic pitches can therefore sometimes be a substitute for grass pitches.

2.1.8 Leisure Centres (including sports halls and swimming pools), in Community Use

Sports halls and swimming pools are basic components of community indoor/built sports provision. They are essential elements of the overall community sporting infrastructure. Between them they can host a range of ‘wet’ and ‘dry’ activities and facilities. However, they are in themselves just basic units, and are often part of larger complexes, such as leisure centres, which accommodate other facilities and associated activities.

Leisure centres hosting pools, sports halls and other facilities can offer something more than the sum of the total parts, and the synergy between different elements and activities within a leisure centre can provide economic, health and social benefits greater than if the elements stand in isolation.

For the purpose of the standard, two basic components are covered in this Report; indoor swimming pools and sports halls. However, the Study covers many other forms of sports provision that might be integrated with sports halls and swimming pools to provide greater multifunctionality, attractiveness for use and economies of scale.

---

*MUGAs are also included with the Play Space (Youth) typology (section 2.1.4).*
Provision must be available for by members of the general community, as explained above.
2.2 Typologies with no standards

2.2.1 Education

Many schools and colleges have open space and sports facilities within their grounds. This may range from a small playground to large playing fields with several sports pitches. Public access to these spaces is often restricted and in many cases forbidden. Nevertheless, many of the sports facilities are used by local people on both an informal and formal basis.

Sports clubs may have local informal arrangements with a school to use their pitches, and in some cases more formal ‘dual-use’ agreements may be in place. School grounds can also contribute towards the green infrastructure and biodiversity of an area.

Quantity and access standards have not been proposed for education sites. This is because they are not openly accessible to the public and whilst important to the local community, there is less opportunity for the Council to influence their provision and management. Furthermore, community access to education sites is assessed within the separate Playing Pitch Strategy for Tandridge.

The separate outdoor sport and leisure centre standards, proposed in this report, suggest ways in which education facilities might help contribute and count towards achieving acceptable standards of provision, if subject to binding community use agreements.
2.2.2 Outdoor Sport (Private)

Outdoor sports space with limited public access (e.g. private sports grounds), have also been recorded and mapped where known. Private sport space makes up an important part of outdoor sports provision across the district, and forms an important part of the community facilities. The private sports spaces have been mapped separately to publicly accessible sites, to determine exact provision of the different types of provision.

The separate outdoor sport standard, proposed in this report, suggests ways in which private outdoor sport facilities might help contribute and count towards achieving acceptable standards of provision, if subject to binding community use agreements.

2.2.3 Other Sports Facilities

In addition to sports halls and swimming pools, the Study is considering facilities such as gyms, activity studios, and athletics tracks. It is not appropriate to set standards of provision for such facilities. However, recommendations will be made relating to such provision as part of the Open Space Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment to be published alongside the draft Local Plan.
3.0 Existing provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities

This section provides information on the existing quantity of different types of open space. Quantity statistics are provided for the whole district and by parish (see figure 2). These statistics have been used to inform the development of standards (section 4).

**Figure 2  Map of Parishes in Tandridge**

The table below shows the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities across the whole district. Figures for amenity green space show quantities of all sites and those less than 0.15ha (see section 4.3).
Table 1  Provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Existing Provision (Ha)</th>
<th>Existing Provision (Ha/1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space (&lt;0.15ha)</td>
<td>34.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space (all)</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Grounds (combined)(^9)</td>
<td>77.72</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Grounds</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Space (Fixed)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space (Children)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space (Youth)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Natural Green Space</td>
<td>994.85</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Space (Private)</td>
<td>58.87</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Sites</td>
<td>420.85</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Swimming Pools(^10)</td>
<td>638 sqm</td>
<td>7.29 sqm/1000 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Halls(^11)</td>
<td>12 court units</td>
<td>0/14 court/1000 persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables below show the provision of open space (in hectares and hectares per 1000 population) by parish. The figures for indoor swimming pools and sports halls have not been provided.

---

\(^9\) These figures consist of combination of parks and recreation grounds and outdoor sport (fixed).

\(^10\) The figure for swimming pools covers indoor pools based at the three local authority leisure centres, and with assured community use. There are other pools in the local authority, operated by schools and commercial clubs, but these are not available through assured community use agreements.

\(^11\) The figure for sports halls covers 4 x badminton court units based at local authority and state school venues. There other sports halls, but these are either unavailable for community use on an assured basis; and/or, are small single court venues, that can be better described as ‘activity halls’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Amenity Greenspace</th>
<th>Parks and Recreation Grounds (combined)</th>
<th>Parks and Recreation Grounds</th>
<th>Outdoor Sport (Fixed)</th>
<th>Play (Child)</th>
<th>Play (Youth)</th>
<th>Accessible Natural Greenspace</th>
<th>Cemeteries and Churchyards</th>
<th>Outdoor Sport (Private)</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>115.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham on the Hill</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113.86</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsfield and Farleigh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127.74</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormansland</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felbridge</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>338.4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>96.78</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>27.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.77</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130.92</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whyteleafe</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>19.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Existing provision of open space by parish (ha/1000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Amenity Greenspace</th>
<th>Parks and Recreation Grounds</th>
<th>Outdoor Sport (Fixed)</th>
<th>Play (Child)</th>
<th>Play (Youth)</th>
<th>Cemeteries and Churchyards</th>
<th>Accessible Natural Greenspace</th>
<th>Outdoor Sport (Private)</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham on the Hill</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsham and Farleigh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>147.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormansland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felbridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>40.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>94.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>347.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whyteleafe</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>55.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 The development of standards

4.1 Introduction

Following the completion of the assessment of local needs (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report) and the audit of provision (the first two steps of this Study), new standards of provision for open space, sport and recreation facilities are set out below. This section explains how the standards for Tandridge have been developed, and provides specific information and justification for each of the typologies where standards have been set.

The justification for the standards draws on consultation from the recent resident and stakeholder surveys, and where relevant makes comparisons with evidence from the Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (November 2015). This comparison is particularly useful in assessing if there has been any significant change in opinions and perceptions of open space, sport and recreation facilities in Tandridge, which in turn informs the need for revised standards.

The standards for open space, sport and recreation facilities have been developed in-line with the NPPF. Standards comprise the following components:

- **Quantity standards**: These are determined by the analysis of existing quantity, consideration of existing local and national standards and benchmarks and evidence gathered from the local needs assessment. It is important that quantity standards are locally derived and are realistic and achievable. The recommended standards need to be robust, evidence based and deliverable through new development and future mechanisms for securing contributions through on site provision and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

- **Accessibility standards**: These reflect the needs of potential users. Spaces likely to be used on a frequent and regular basis need to be within easy walking distance and to have safe access. Other facilities where visits are longer but perhaps less frequent, for example country parks, can be further away. Consideration is also given to existing local or national standards and benchmarks.

- **Quality standards**: The standards for each typology are derived from the quality audit, existing good practice and from the views of the community and those that use the spaces. Again, quality standards should be achievable and reflect the priorities that emerge through consultation.

The standards that have been proposed are for **minimum guidance levels of provision**. So, just because geographical areas may enjoy levels of provision exceeding minimum standards does not mean there is a surplus, as all such provision may be well used.
### 4.2 Summary of open space, sport and recreation facilities standards

**Table 4: Summary of open space, sport and recreation facilities standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity standards (ha/1000 population) for analysing existing provision</th>
<th>Quantity standards (ha/1000 population, unless otherwise stated): requirements from new development</th>
<th>Access standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>720 metres or 15 minutes straight-line walk time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>See standard for Natural Green Space</td>
<td>480 metres or 10 minutes straight-line walk time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Grounds (Publicly accessible only)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>480 metres or 10 minutes straight-line walk time 10 minute drive time for larger multi-functional facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space (Children)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>480 metres or 10 minutes straight-line walk time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space (Youth)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>600 metres or 12-13 minutes straight-line walk time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Green Space</td>
<td>ANGST</td>
<td>1.0 to include natural and amenity green space for new provision</td>
<td>ANGST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyards and Cemeteries</td>
<td>To Follow</td>
<td>To Follow</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Space (Public and Private)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.46, comprised of: Pitch sports space (1.26); and, Greens and Courts (0.2)</td>
<td>480 metres or 10 minutes straight-line walk time for local venues. 10 minutes drive time for larger facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comprising: Sports halls- 0.273 court units/1000 people; and</td>
<td>10-15 minutes drive-time (or ideally the equivalent time by foot in urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Quantity standards (ha/1000 population) for analysing existing provision</td>
<td>Quantity standards (ha/1000 population, unless otherwise stated): requirements from new development</td>
<td>Access standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools</td>
<td>10.52 sqm/1000 people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying gym and studio space (both to meet needs and ensure viability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for new provision</td>
<td>3.71 ha/1000 (excluding provision for leisure centres).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Allotments

**Summary of quantity and access standard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Access Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20 ha/1000 population</td>
<td>720m (15 minutes straight-line walk time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing national or local standards**

National standards for allotments and other such open spaces are difficult to find. The closest thing appears to be those set out by the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). These are as follows:

- Standard plot size = 250sqm (330 sq yards)
- Paths = 1.4m wide for disabled access
- Haulage ways = 3m wide
- Plotholders shed = 12sqm
- Greenhouse = 15sqm
- Polytunnel = 30sqm

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (November 2015) recommended the following local standards for allotments:

- Quantity: 0.125 ha/1000
- Access: 800m

**Quantity standard for allotments**

- The household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that 76% of all respondents from the household survey ‘never’ use allotments (this was the second least used type of open space facility);
- The existing average level of provision across the district is 0.20 ha/1000. Numerous parishes have no provision; of those that have allotments, the level of provision varies significantly;
- The household survey identified that 51% of people felt there should be more allotments, however, 44% felt there are enough;
- Consultation with parish councils identified several areas where there is an unmet demand for allotments, however an equal number also identified that they had sufficient provision, with some vacant plots;
- Discussions with council officers highlight the need to at least maintain existing levels of provision, and ensure new development provides allotments in those areas of identified need;
- A minimum standard of 0.20 ha/1000 is justified for analysing existing provision and for new provision.
Access standard for allotments

- Responses received in relation to acceptable travel times to allotments from the recent resident’s survey identified a mix in responses, with 27% wanting allotments within 5 minutes, 34% within 10 minutes, 26% within 15 minutes and 10% up to 20 minutes; of this, the highest percentage of people (60%) walk to allotments;
- It is considered that the availability of allotments is more important than having them very close to home, nevertheless there is some demand for facilities relatively nearby. Therefore, a standard of no more than 15 minutes straight-line walk time (720 metres) is justified.

Quality standards for allotments

The household survey identified that respectively 5% and 27% of people felt allotments were very good or good, whilst the majority, 43% felt they were average.

Compared to other typologies of open space, fewer comments were received in relation to the quality of allotments, furthermore the information gathered in relation to allotments is more difficult to assess in comparison to other types of open space. The reason for this is twofold: firstly, the number of people who actually use allotments is very low compared to the numbers who use other types of open space and, therefore specific comments relating to the quality of allotments are less frequent; secondly, the majority of allotments sites are locked, and the quality audit only allows for assessment against key criteria such as the level of cultivation and general maintenance, which is less comprehensive than the assessments of other open space.

For allotments, a number of general recommendations are made in relation to quality, which should include the following:

- Well-drained soil which is capable of cultivation to a reasonable standard;
- A sunny, open aspect preferably on a south facing slope;
- Limited overhang from trees and buildings either adjacent or within the site;
- Adequate lockable storage facilities, and a good water supply within easy walking distance of individual plots;
- Provision of composting facilities;
- Secure boundary fencing;
- Good access within the site for both pedestrians and vehicles;
- Good vehicular access into the site and adequate parking and maneuvering space;
- Disabled access;
- Toilets;
- Notice boards.
4.4 Amenity Green Space

Summary of quantity and access standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Access Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5 ha/1000 population</td>
<td>480 metres (10 minutes straight-line walk time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing national or local standards

There is no national guidance suggesting a standard for the provision of amenity green space. The Fields in Trust (FIT) ‘Six Acre Standard’ proposes casual or informal playing space should be provided within housing areas as part of the overall standard. This is equivalent to 0.4 – 0.5 ha/1000 population of informal space for play.

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (November 2015) recommended the following local standards for amenity green space:

- Quantity: 0.67 ha/1000
- Access: 800m

Quantity standard for amenity green space

- Existing average level of provision in the district is 0.42 ha/1000 population (for sites greater than 0.15 ha in size);
- The household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that 68% of people felt there was a need for more informal open space areas, whilst 31% felt there were enough;
- Provision varies significantly across parishes, some with no provision and some far exceeding the average level of provision;
- Considering the above factors, there is a justified need to seek a marginal increase in the existing average level of provision. It is considered that a standard of 0.5 ha/1000 would provide a reasonable baseline to assess current levels of provision and to inform the requirements from new development;
- The minimum size of a space that will be considered acceptable and count towards open space provision is 0.15 ha in size (about the size of a mini football pitch). This will avoid a proliferation of small amenity spaces which have no real recreation function. Any spaces below this size will be acceptable in terms of their visual amenity, SUDs function etc but would not count towards the required level of provision for recreational use;
- The provision of amenity green space from new development should be provided jointly with requirements for natural green space (see section 4.6).
Access standard for amenity green space

- The household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that people want spaces relatively close to home (44% less than 5 minutes, 29% less than 10 minutes, 15% less than 15 minutes), and that they access these spaces by foot (80%);
- Therefore, a standard of 480 metres (10 minutes’ walk time) is proposed.

Quality standards for amenity green space

The household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that 6% of people felt this type of provision was very good, 31% good, 41% average and 22% stated poor or very poor.

The audit of provision as well as the consultation has identified the importance attached by local people to open space close to home. The value of ‘amenity green space’ must be recognised especially within housing areas, where it can provide important local opportunities for play, exercise and visual amenity that are almost immediately accessible. On the other hand open space can be expensive to maintain and it is important to strike the correct balance between having sufficient space to meet the needs of the community for accessible and attractive space, and having too much which would be impossible to manage properly and therefore a potential liability and source of nuisance. It is important that amenity green space should be capable of use for at least some forms of public recreation activity.

It is therefore recommended that in addition to the minimum size threshold identified above, that all amenity green space should be subject to landscape design, ensuring the following quality principles:

- Capable of supporting informal recreation such as a kickabout, space for dog walking or space to sit and relax;
- Include planting of high quality trees and/or shrubs to create landscape structure and biodiversity value;
- Include paths along main desire lines\(^\text{12}\) (lit where appropriate);
- Be designed to ensure easy maintenance.

\(^{12}\) Routes that are clearly well used
4.5 Parks and Recreation Grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Access Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 ha/1000 population for publicly accessible space</td>
<td>480 metres (10 minutes straight-line walk time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 minutes drive time for larger multi-functional facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing national and local policies

Fields in Trust (FIT), previously known as the National Playing Fields Association promoted the Six Acre Standard of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) per 1000 persons, but with a specific provision of 1.6-1.8 hectares per 1000 persons of outdoor sports space (and 0.8 hectares per 1000 people for children’s play of which around 0.3 hectares should be equipped provision). The new FIT ‘Benchmark Standards for Outdoor Sport and Play’ also suggest similar overall levels of provision as a guide to local authorities, although FIT does accept the importance of developing locally researched standards.

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (November 2015) recommended the following local standards for Outdoor Sports Facilities:

- Quantity: 1.35 ha/1000
- Access: 4km

Quantity of parks and recreation grounds

- Existing average level of provision in the district is 0.93 ha/1000;
- There is an additional 0.71 ha/1000 of private sports space which includes a variety of uses (excluding golf clubs);
- Only 6 parishes have no provision, whilst provision in the other parishes varies significantly;
- The recent household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified the following which is relevant to parks and recreation grounds:
  - 57% felt there is a need for more local recreation grounds/parks whilst 42% felt there are enough;
  - 45% felt there is a need for more outdoor playing fields, whilst 54% felt there are enough;
- Considering the above factors, there is a justified need to seek a marginal increase in the existing average level of provision. It is considered that a standard of 1.0 ha/1000 would provide a reasonable baseline to assess current levels of provision and to inform the requirements from new development;
- Whilst no standards are proposed for privately managed facilities, the value of this provision for community use is recognised, it is therefore recommended that appropriate policy is adopted to afford protection to these spaces within the Local Plan.
Access standard for parks and recreation grounds

- The recent household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that 82% of people walk to local parks and recreation grounds, and that 39% walk for up to 5 minutes, 34% up to 10 minutes and 18% up to 15 minutes;
- For outdoor playing fields, 45% of people walk and 46% use the car, of this 20% travel for up to 5 minutes, 30% up to 10 minutes and 29% up to 15 minutes;
- The findings indicate that people do want local parks close to home, but are willing to travel further to facilities that have playing pitches and outdoor sport facilities. It is therefore justified that two standards for parks and recreation grounds are adopted:
  - A walk time of 10 minutes (480 metres) to local facilities;
  - A drive time of 10 minutes to facilities which are multi-functional including 2 or more sports pitches.

Quality standards for parks and recreation grounds

For local parks and recreation grounds, the household survey identified that 6% of people felt this type of provision was very good, 44% good and 34% average, the rest stated facilities were poor or very poor. For outdoor playing fields 1% of people felt this type of provision was very good, 27% good and 44% average, the rest stated facilities were poor or very poor.

Local parks and recreation grounds were identified as the fourth highest priority for improvement (with 57% stating they are a high priority for improvement) within the district. This figure was much lower for outdoor playing fields, with 25% stating they are a high priority for improvement.

National guidance relevant to this typology is provided in the ‘Green Flag’ quality standard for parks which sets out benchmark criteria for quality open spaces. For outdoor sports space, Sport England has produced a wealth of useful documents outlining the quality standards for facilities such as playing pitches, changing rooms, MUGAs and tennis courts plus associated ancillary facilities. The Rugby Football Union has provided guidance on the quality and standard of provision of facilities for rugby, and the England and Wales Cricket Board has provided guidance for cricket facilities. It is recommended that the guidance provided in these documents is adopted by the Council, and that all new and improved provision seeks to meet these guidelines.
4.6 Play Space (children and youth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Access Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>0.03 ha/1000</td>
<td>480m (10 minutes straight-line walk time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Play Space</td>
<td>0.02 ha/1000</td>
<td>600m (12-13 minutes straight-line walk time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing National and Local Policies

The FIT guidance recommends provision of 0.8 hectares per 1000 people for children’s play of which around 0.3 hectares should be equipped provision. These standards have been criticised in recent years because they are often seen as undeliverable, and can result in a proliferation of play areas that can be difficult to maintain. These standards may also set unrealistic aspirations in built up areas where insufficient land is available to provide facilities, especially higher density development on brownfield sites. An additional problem is that the current FIT guidance does not specifically cover the needs of most teenagers within the ‘Standard Youth Provision’.

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (November 2015) recommended the following local standards for ‘play provision for children and young people’:

- Quantity: 0.10 ha/1000
- Access: 600m

Quantity standards for play

- Current average levels of provision of children’s play space is 0.03 ha/1000 population, for youth space it is 0.01 ha/1000 population;
- The household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that 59% of people felt there is a need for more children’s play space, and 40% felt there is enough. Whilst 64% of people felt there was a need for more youth facilities, with 35% identifying sufficient provision;
- Provision of children’s play space varies across parishes with only 4 having no provision, and others not differing significantly. For youth space, this differs considerably with only 7 parishes having provision;
- The Parish survey identified the priority for children’s play space was on improving existing facilities as opposed to providing additional facilities, there was however, some identified need for additional youth facilities;
- Considering the above, there is a clear need to increase the provision of youth space, therefore a standard of 0.02 ha/1000 is recommended. For children’s space, there is less identified need for additional facilities, with a focus on improving existing quality, therefore a standard in line with current levels of provision of 0.03 ha/1000 is justified.
Access standards for play

- The household survey identified that for children’s play space 86% of people walk to facilities, and 45% want facilities within 5 minutes and 37% within 10 minutes;
- For teenage facilities, 57% walk and 23% drive, and 23% indicating users are willing to travel slightly further to teenage facilities than children’s facilities. In light of these findings, the following access standards are justified:
  - Children’s provision – 480m (10 minutes straight-line walk time); and
  - Youth Provision – 600m (12-13 minutes straight-line walk time).

Quality standards for play

The household survey identified that 5% of people identified children’s play space as very good, 36% as good and 38% as average. For youth facilities, 3% was very good, 14% good, 36% average and 36% poor. This indicates there is less satisfaction with the quality of youth facilities compared to children’s facilities.

In terms of adopting quality standards for children’s and teenage facilities, Play England are keen to see a range of play spaces in built up 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.

Moving forward, Play England would like their new Design Guide; ‘Design for Play’ to be referenced and added as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in standard configuration. Play England has also developed a ‘Quality Assessment Tool’ which can be used to judge the quality of individual play spaces. It has been recommended that the Council consider adopting this as a means of assessing the quality of play spaces in the district. Play England also highlight a potential need for standards for smaller settlements and rural areas where the doorstep, local, neighbourhood, and destination hierarchy is unlikely to be appropriate.

Disability access is also an important issue for Play England and they would like local authorities to adopt the KIDS\textsuperscript{13} publication; ‘Inclusion by Design’ as an SPD. Their most recent guidance document, ‘Better Places to Play through Planning’ gives detailed guidance on setting local standards for access, quantity and quality of playable space and is considered as a background context for the standards suggested in this study.

---

\textsuperscript{13} KIDS, is a charity which in its 40 years, has pioneered a number of approaches and programmes for disabled children and young people. KIDS was established in 1970 and in 2003, KIDS merged with KIDSACTIVE, previously known as the Handicapped Adventure Play Association.
4.7 Accessible Natural Green Space

For Natural Green Space, there are a number of national standards recommended by Natural England and the Woodland Trust, which are summarised below.

Natural England Accessible Natural Green Space Standards (ANGSt)

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

Woodland Trust Access Standards

The Woodland Trust also produced access standards:

- 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.

Local standards

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (November 2015) recommended the following local standards for ‘Natural and semi natural green space’:

- Quantity: 11.4 ha/1000
- Access: spaces >20 ha: 2km; spaces <20 ha: 800m

Proposed standards

Current provision comprises numerous large tracts of natural green space, which often cross the boundaries of a number of parishes. This results in some parishes having large amounts of natural green space (with only 3 having no provision). It is therefore considered that a local quantity standard would not provide any meaningful analysis of existing provision. Furthermore, a standard based on average levels of provision (i.e. 11.99 ha/1000) to inform the requirements for new provision is also considered undeliverable.

It is therefore justified that the analysis should adopt the Natural England ANGSt standards to identify current levels of provision and gaps.

Local standards for securing new levels of provision should be considered in tandem with the provision of amenity green space in new development. The aim would be to provide guidance for development to provide amenity/natural green spaces which have both a recreational and biodiversity value through native planting. There should be a move away from providing
numerous small amenity grassed areas, to providing fewer, larger amenity/natural spaces in new development. This is reflected in the natural green spaces standards below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity standards (ha/1000 population)</th>
<th>Access standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Green Space</td>
<td>ANGST</td>
<td>ANGST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For assessing current and future provision

Requirement from new development

1.0ha per 1000 population to include natural and amenity green space

Quality of natural and semi-natural green space

The household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) identified that 12% of people felt the quality of this provision was very good, 36% good, 31% average and the remaining poor/very poor. Consultation results highlight the value attached to certain attributes of open space, in particular:

- Good maintenance and cleanliness
- Ease of access
- Lack of antisocial behaviour, noise etc.

This suggests that the provision of new or improved open space cannot be considered in isolation from the means of maintaining such space, perceptions of antisocial behaviour, and ease of access from the surrounding environment.

The shape and size of space provided should allow for meaningful and safe recreation. Provision might be expected to include (as appropriate) elements of woodland, wetland, heathland and meadow, and could also be made for informal public access through recreation corridors. For larger areas, where car borne visits might be anticipated, some parking provision will be required. The larger the area the more valuable sites will tend to be in terms of their potential for enhancing local conservation interest and biodiversity. Wherever possible these sites should be linked to help improve wildlife value as part of a network.

In areas where it may be impossible or inappropriate to provide additional natural green space consistent with the standard, other approaches should be pursued which could include (for example):

- Changing the management of marginal space on playing fields and parks to enhance biodiversity.
- Encouraging living green roofs as part of new development/ redevelopment.
- Encouraging the creation of mixed species hedgerows.
- Additional use of long grass management regimes.
- Improvements to watercourses and water bodies.
• Innovative use of new drainage schemes / Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).
• Use of native trees and plants with biodiversity value in high quality soft landscaping of new developments.

The above should in any event be principles to be pursued and encouraged at all times. Further guidance in this regard may be included in appropriate Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).

4.8 Outdoor Sports Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Access Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch sports space</td>
<td>1.26 ha/1000 people</td>
<td>480 metres (10 minutes straight-line walk time) for local venues; and, 10 minutes drive time for larger facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens, courts, MUGAs</td>
<td>0.2 ha/1000 people</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing national and local standards

Fields in Trust (FIT), previously known as the National Playing Fields Association, promoted the Six Acre Standard of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) per 1000 persons, but with a specific provision of 1.6-1.8 hectares per 1000 persons of outdoor sports space (and 0.8 hectares per 1000 people for children’s play of which around 0.3 hectares should be equipped provision). The new FIT ‘Benchmark Standards for Outdoor Sport and Play’ - suggest similar overall levels of provision as a guide to local authorities, although FIT accepts the importance of developing locally derived standards.

The Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (2015) recommended the following local standards for Outdoor Sports Facilities:

- Quantity: 1.35 ha/1000
- Access: 4km

Quantity standards for outdoor sport

The recent household survey (Community and Consultation Stakeholder Report, August 2017) suggested the majority of respondents felt that for most types of outdoor sports space there is sufficient provision. The exception was a perceived need for more ‘informal space for ball games’.

The evidence of the playing pitch needs assessment being conducted as part of this Study suggests that whilst existing sports clubs are not lacking space, it is sometimes not of the right size, and there is sometimes a reliance on more than one site to meet a club’s needs. Existing clubs also aspire to improvements they would like to see to home grounds.

14 To be published alongside the Draft Local Plan
Based on the playing pitch assessment, it is calculated that planned new development in the local authority area will generate a need for 27.1 hectares\textsuperscript{15}.

The level of provision is slightly higher than the standard offered in the Tandridge District Open Space Assessment, Report of Findings (2015), in order to reflect the need for more informal space for ball games.

Major allocations will generate a significant additional demand for such facilities. Whilst in some cases it may be best to provide new provision on-site, in other instances, it may be appropriately provided through the improvement and expansion of existing accessible facilities elsewhere.

Some of the new/improved sports facilities might be jointly provided with schools, or within parks and recreation grounds. Where outdoor sports provision is likely to be managed by a club or school, it must be subject to binding community use agreements (CUA)\textsuperscript{16}.

Where it is considered that the provision of new or improved 3G FTPs for matchplay would be a desirable alternative to new grass pitches, this should be addressed and resolved at an appropriate stage in the planning and development process, with the involvement of all relevant stakeholders. Apart from the complex technical specifications (which are different for football, rugby and hockey), there are other locational and planning/environmental considerations to consider in determining if, when, where, and how such provision should be made\textsuperscript{17}.

\textit{Access standards for outdoor sport}

The recent household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) suggests the majority of respondents would not normally travel more than 15 minutes to use outdoor sports facilities. However, for local facilities (such as in local parks and recreation grounds) the expectation is closer to no more than 10 minutes.

Although travel to many sports facilities will be primarily by car, for local facilities like multi-functional parks and recreation grounds, the expectation will be to be able to walk.

\textsuperscript{15} This figure reflects the projected new population arising from planned new development, applied to existing participation rates, and spatial requirements for pitches, courts, greens and MUGAs. This amounts to 1.46 ha/1000 persons within the new population.

\textsuperscript{16} When an educational or other establishment has sports facilities that are planned, designed, and funded for community use, there should be a Community Use Agreement (CUA) to show how it is intended to operate. This should cover such matters as hours of availability, management arrangements, pricing policy etc. The use of a CUA should help secure well-managed and safe community access to sports facilities on educational and certain other sites that are not directly controlled by or on behalf of local authorities.

\textsuperscript{17} At the time of preparing this report the Football Association recommended that 42 teams could justify the provision of a full-size ‘Third Generation Synthetic Turf Pitch’ for training (largely midweek), but which then could also be used for matchplay at the weekends, subject to the agreement of local clubs and leagues. However, given that clubs and leagues have different matchday and kick-off times, it is not possible to predict the number of (the above) pitches required to satisfy matchplay needs, without cooperation and consensus between local leagues and clubs.
An appropriate access standard is therefore justified as: 480 metres (10 minutes straight-line walk time) for local venues, and, 10 minutes drive time for larger facilities.

**Quality standards for outdoor sports**

The recent household survey (Community and Consultation Report, August 2017) suggests that a majority of households feel that outdoor sports facilities are of average or better quality (though the most common rating tended to be only "average").

The evidence of the playing pitch needs assessment suggests that the overall quality of provision is considered to be at least average to good, and this view is supported by site quality assessments that have been conducted.

Quality standards for outdoor sports facilities should be consistent with design guidance promoted by both Sport England and relevant National Governing Bodies of Sport.\(^{18}\)

Where outdoor sports provision is likely to be managed by a club or school, it must be subject to binding community use agreements.

### 4.9 Leisure Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Access Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprising:</td>
<td>10-15 minutes drive time (or ideally the equivalent time by foot in urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports halls- 0.273 court units/1000 people; and, Swimming pools- 10.52 sqm/1000 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying gym and studio space (both to meet needs and to underpin financial sustainability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing national and local standards**

There are no national and local standards for the provision of leisure centres. However, Sport England provides an online ‘Facilities Calculator’ offering guidance on the levels of provision of sports halls and swimming pools that might be generated expressly from a given population.\(^{19}\)

**Quantity standards for leisure centres**

The recent household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) suggested a clear majority of households reported that overall there are currently enough of all of the various types of indoor sport and leisure facilities; most notably in relation to village

\(^{18}\) [https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/](https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/)

halls/community sports centres (75%); swimming pools (71%); and gym/health and fitness facilities (71%).

However, planned new growth of the scale proposed in the new Local Plan will generate substantial additional demand for leisure centres. The application of the Sport England Facility Calculator suggests that the quantity components of a standard for leisure centres to guide provision relating to planned new housing growth should be: Sports halls- 0.273 court units/1000 people; and, Swimming pools- 10.52 sqm/1000 people.

Accompanying gym and studio space (both to meet needs and to help ensure viability) should also be considered.

In relation to major housing allocations, sometimes it may be important to provide new provision on-site. However in some instances and, subject to good access, it may be more appropriate to provide through the improvement and expansion of existing facilities elsewhere\(^\text{20}\).

Some of the new/improved sports facilities might be jointly provided with schools. Where provision is likely to be managed by a club or school, it must be subject to binding community use agreements.

**Access standards for leisure centres**

The recent household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) suggested that for swimming pools and 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.

An appropriate access standard is therefore justified as 10-15 minute drive-time (or ideally the equivalent time by foot in urban areas)

**Quality standards for leisure centres**

The recent household survey (Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report, August 2017) suggested that 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

\(^\text{20}\) This report only considers the estimated new provision required by the application of the justified standards. Mechanisms for funding and maintaining new or improved provision will be considered through a separate process.
the respondents are swimming pools, sport and leisure centres, and, gym/health and fitness facilities.

Quality standards for outdoor sports facilities should be consistent with design guidance promoted by both Sport England and relevant National Governing Bodies of Sport.²¹

Where leisure centres are likely to be (jointly) controlled by a club, school, or other than by a local authority, they must be subject to binding community use agreements.

---

²¹ https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/
5.0 Application of quantity and access standards

5.1 Quantity of open space

The following table shows how provision of open space using the proposed standards is applied by Parish. The figures are for hectares of open space.

### Table 5 Provision of open space in parishes against proposed standards (hectares)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Amenity Greenspace</th>
<th>Parks and Recreation Grounds (combined)</th>
<th>Play (Child)</th>
<th>Play (Youth)</th>
<th>Accessible Natural Greenspace</th>
<th>Outdoor Sport (Private)</th>
<th>Cemeteries and Churchyards</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>115.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham on the Hill</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>30.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Valley</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>113.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>258.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsham and Farleigh</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>127.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormansland</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felbridge</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>127.40</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>242.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-3.57</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>139.40</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>23.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxsted</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>96.78</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>27.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticey</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>130.92</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whyteleafe</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>19.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>119.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>240.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Access to open space

The following maps show the access standards for each of the typologies of open space for the whole district. Individual maps for each parish and each typology are set out in Appendix 1.

---

22 The application of outdoor sports and leisure centre standards is currently at an early stage, pending the completion of separate playing pitch and built sports facility needs assessments.