

# Green Space Strategy

---

Gedling Borough Council

2012 - 2017

If you would like this information in a different format, for example Braille, audiotape, large print or computer disc, or community languages, please contact Gedling Borough Councils One Stop Shop on (0115) 901 3901

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chapter 1 Introduction	3
Chapter 2 Gedling Profile	9
Chapter 3 Internal and external influences	12
Chapter 4 Community Views	19
Chapter 5 Parks and Gardens.	29
Chapter 6 Natural and Semi Natural Green Space	45
Chapter 7 Amenity Green Space	59
Chapter 8 Provision for Children’s and Young People	66
Chapter 9 Outdoor sports Provision	90
Chapter 10 Allotments	112
Chapter 11 Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	129
Chapter 12 Green Corridors	149
Chapter 13 Overall Summery	157
Chapter 14 Resourcing the Strategy	166
Chapter 15 Delivering the Strategy (Inc Action Plan)	171
Chapter 16 Monitoring and Review of the Strategy	181
<b>Appendices:</b>	
Appendix 1: Chapter 4 Community Views (Additional Information)	182
Appendix 2: Chapter 5 Parks & Gardens (Additional Information)	187
Appendix 3: Chapter 7 Amenity Green Space (Additional Information)	196
Appendix 4: Chapter 8 Provision for Children and Young People (Add Info)	199
Appendix 5: Chapter 9 Outdoor Sport Provision (Additional Information)	209
Appendix 6: Chapter 11 Cemeteries & Burial Grounds (Additional Information)	216
Appendix 7: Chapter 14 Resourcing Green Spaces (Additional Information)	217
Appendix 8: Equality Impact Needs Assessment	225
Glossary of Terms	233

# **1 Introduction**

## **1.1 Need for the Strategy**

The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy will enable longer-term strategic planning and management of parks. This involves establishing a strategic role and intended use of parks and open spaces taking into account the need of organised and informal leisure activities, the environment, and the outcomes of Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17) Open Space and the needs of different groups in society.

Gedling Borough Council recognises the importance of Parks and Open Spaces to people when considering living, working and doing business. The strategy is driven by a community need and increasing customer expectations which will enable parks and open spaces to be an integral part of community life. In doing this the strategy makes a commitment to help deliver corporate goals.

There is a realisation that there is a growing emphasis on partnership working in order to continuously improve. This strategy provides a framework and coordinated approach to help internal and external partners integrate their aims and objectives into parks and open spaces.

The existing strategies related to Parks and Open Spaces have led to many improvements but it is now time to review this strategy in light of the achievements. The 2012 – 2017 Parks and Open Spaces Strategy builds on the work of the previous strategies and takes into account relevant national regional and local policies and strategies.

This strategy is aimed at parks professionals, planners, developers, plus community groups, local authorities, partner organisations and funding agencies. It aims to bring together various previous strategies and audits into an all encompassing document.

## **1.2 Scope of the strategy and definitions**

A large proportion of this strategy consists of a PPG17 audit of green spaces in the borough. After a brief overall summary at the end, there is a section on resourcing and delivering the strategy and an action plan to ensure its delivery.

PPG17 specifies that open space should be taken to mean:

‘all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity.’

Open space plays a vital role in meeting people’s recreational needs in both formal and informal roles from organised sports to walking, bird watching and picnics.

Access to open space and thus recreational activities is integral to sustaining a decent quality of life.

The strategy considers 8 different types of space – parks and gardens, amenity green space, children’s and young people’s space, natural and semi natural green urban spaces, outdoor sports facilities, allotments, cemeteries and green corridors.

The table below defines each of these areas using national definitions.

Table 1.1: PPG 17 National definitions and local examples

Type	Description	Examples from Gedling Borough Council
Parks and Gardens	Including urban parks, country parks and formal gardens	Arnot Hill Park
Amenity Green Space	Including informal recreational spaces, green spaces in and around housing, domestic gardens and village greens	Gedling Road, opposite the arrow pub
Provision for children and young people (fixed play areas)	Including play areas, skate parks, outdoor basketball hoops, ball courts and other informal areas (teenage hanging out areas and shelters)	Church Lane Play Area Papplewick Play Area
Natural and semi natural urban green spaces	Including woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands, wetlands, open and running water, wastelands and derelict open land and rock areas – cliffs, quarries and pits	Netherfield Lagoons Gedling Woods
Outdoor Sports Facilities (with natural or artificial surfaces and either publicly or privately owned)	Including tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks, school and other institutional playing fields and other outdoor sporting areas	Burton Road Recreation Ground, Conway Gardens
Allotments, community gardens	Opportunities for those people who wish to grow their own produce as part of the long term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion.	Killisick Allotments



Cemeteries and churchyards	Quiet contemplation and burial of the dead, often linked to the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.	Redhill Cemetery
Green Corridors	Walking, cycling or horse riding, whether for leisure purposes or travel, and opportunities for wildlife migration.	The River Trent

**Source: PPG 17 Planning for open space, sport and recreation**

Although the strategy adheres to PPG17 typologies it recognises that open space is multifunctional. For instance the functions of Arnot Hill Park include Parks and Gardens and also provision for children and young people.

Civic Spaces, which include civic and market squares and other hard surface areas are not included in this strategy.

**1.3 Vision**

The strategy has the following the vision:

“To provide sufficient quality, inviting green spaces that are open and accessible to all and that enhance the quality of life of everyone living, working or visiting Gedling Borough.”

This will be achieved focusing on the following priorities to provide a range of open spaces and recreational experiences.

- To enhance people’s quality of life through the provision of sufficient, accessible, attractive green spaces.
- To promote the central role that green spaces play in contributing to the Boroughs biodiversity, sustainability and heritage.
- To provide open spaces and play and sports facilities to enable residents to undertake a wide range of recreational and educational activities for healthy living.
- To actively involve the community in their local open spaces.
- Increase participation in green spaces for sport and recreation.

**1.4 Importance of parks and open spaces**

Parks and open spaces play an important role in the lives of many people. In 2010 CABE Space reported in Urban Green Nation: Building the Evidence Base that 91% of people believe that parks and open spaces improve the quality of life. Locally the Place Survey (2008) has identified that 74 percent of Gedling residents are satisfied with parks and open spaces and that that 65 percent of them visited a park or open

space in the last month. This makes it the most used leisure facility in the Borough. They are fundamental in delivering shared priorities and meeting the needs of a cross cutting agenda. Some of the benefits include:

- **Economic** – a well managed green space will add value to surrounding properties , attract employment and help to create a good image.
- **Social** – they provide an opportunity to meet, relax, take exercise and hold events.
- **Environmental** – in urban areas especially open spaces can provide the green lungs to mitigate against climate change. They also provide a haven for wildlife .
- **Education** – green spaces can be an excellent venue for learning firsthand about the natural environment and can provide a stimulus for many areas such as art and design.
- **Health** – Parks and Open Spaces have proven to improve the mental and physical health of a person. Natural England estimates savings of £2.1bn a year to the NHS by improving green spaces.

## **1.5 The development of the strategy and consultation**

Information from a wide variety of sources has been used in the development of the Strategy. Representatives from a cross section of the Gedling residents have been asked what they like, dislike and wish for open spaces.

### **Consultation**

Extensive consultation has been undertaken to understand the usage habits and views of the Boroughs residents population. Consultation has included:

Public Consultation – In December 2010 questionnaires were distributed asking residents thoughts on the quality, quantity and accessibility of the different types of green space in the borough. There was a total of 424 responses.

Sports Clubs – In 2010 questionnaires were sent out to all sports clubs asking for their thoughts on the quality and quantity of the facilities they use. 31 responded including those clubs with the largest memberships.

Door to door survey - Consultation was also under taken by John Hiley consultants in 2009. This was a random household 500 survey which included a set of questions related to parks.

Individual site surveys – Nine parks across the Borough were surveyed individually between 2008 and 2010 to ascertain user's opinions. There were a total of 225 responses.

Friends of group – In 2010 each of the friends groups were asked a variety of questions in relation to the open space they support. A friends group is a group of residents have got together because they have an interest in a local green space.

Young People Consultation – In 2011 online and hard copies of questionnaires were sent to the schools in Gedling asking children their thoughts on where they play. There were a total of 353 responses.

Parish Councils – Parish Councils were consulted on their facilities and future plans using questionnaires.

In addition to this the Place Survey 2010 gathered information on a wide range of council functions including attitudes to parks and open spaces.

### **Site audits**

This section comprises of a Public policy guidance assessment of the quantity, quality and accessibility of Gedling's Parks and Open spaces. A variety of audits have been completed over the last 7 years, of which are still relevant to this strategy. These include:

- Playing pitch and non-pitch strategy and action plan (2003)
- Children's Play Area Strategy (2003). From this all play areas in the Borough have been updated mapped and categorised using Play England's guidelines.
- Recreational Open Space Assessment (2003).
- Burial Space Audit (2004).
- Playing pitch quality audit conducted in 2008, by Sport and Landscape Development, Consultancy and Advisory services
- Golf Facility Provision Audit (2002)
- Allotments Strategy (2004)
- Nottinghamshire Standard Parks Audit (2009)

### **Policy Research**

National Regional and local Policy has been researched to pick out those elements that apply to the management of the Borough's Parks and Open Spaces.

The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy has been developed alongside the production of strategic planning documents for Gedling and also the review of Gedling's Supplementary Planning guidance document for open space provision.

An equality impact assessment has been carried out not just on this strategy, but on the current services being offered by Gedling Borough Council that are related to parks and open spaces.

## **Usage and Demand for Facilities**

Prospects4sport consultancy has conducted a Sports Audit on behalf of Gedling Borough Council to identify current, local trends in sports participation and the future participation including facility requirements. This has included consultation with sport clubs through a questionnaire being sent to all sports clubs who operate in Gedling and direct consultation with clubs through the local Sport, Football and Cricket Forums. Consultation also took place with National Governing bodies of Sports to identify future plans. This information has then been used alongside Sport England's Active People's survey data.

## 2. Borough profile and priorities

### Serving People; Improving Lives

#### 2.1 About Gedling Borough

Gedling Borough is located in the heart of Nottinghamshire and includes a substantial part of the Greater Nottingham conurbation. It borders Sherwood Forest to the north, the River Trent to the south-east and the City of Nottingham to the south-west.

The Borough has a distinctive mix of urban and rural areas. It is made up of Greater Nottingham's north and eastern suburbs and of villages located in some of Nottinghamshire's most picturesque countryside. It covers an area of 46.3 square miles or 120 square kilometres, with a large proportion being hilly.

The majority of Borough's population live in the main suburban areas of Arnold, Carlton, Gedling, Mapperley and Netherfield. The remainder live in the ten rural parishes of Bestwood Village, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Lambley, Linby, Newstead, Papplewick, Ravenshead, Stoke Bardolph and Woodborough. The Borough's eleventh parish, Colwick, forms part of the suburban area.

#### 2.2 Vision

In 2011 Gedling Borough Council agreed a new vision for the Borough and a set of values and key priorities that will help to shape its delivery towards this vision. This vision is as follows:

**“The best place to live and work and the best Council around - best through the eyes of residents and staff”**

#### 2.3 Values

The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy is committed to delivering this new vision for Gedling. Its development and future delivery will be shaped by the following values of Gedling Borough Council:

**A caring and fair Council** (one that treats customers, residents, partners and staff well; one that is a pleasure to deal with; one that champions the needs of disadvantaged individuals and groups)

**A listening Council** (one that welcomes different perspectives; is open to feedback; one that listens to and involves the people it serves)

**An ambitious Council** (one that wants the very best for its public; one that innovates; sets the pace; is never satisfied and constantly hungry for improvement)

**A responsive Council** (one that delivers and meets its promises; one that knows and understands its public; is sensitive to different needs and acts accordingly)

**An efficient Council** (one that is responsible with its resources; that avoids waste and makes the most of what it has; one that seeks out new funding opportunities)

## **2.4 Gedling Now Profile and Priorities**

Gedling Now is a statistical profile that highlights some of the key issues currently facing the Borough. It is presented by the 6 priorities of Gedling Borough Council:

- People
- Homes
- Jobs
- Place
- Performance
- Recreation

This Parks and Open Spaces Strategy has drawn upon this statistical evidence base and this section highlights some key findings for consideration when delivering the strategy. For more detail on the full findings of Gedling Now please refer to the Gedling Now profiles which are available at [www.gedling.gov.uk](http://www.gedling.gov.uk).

## **2.5 Key Findings**

The table below highlights some of the key findings from Gedling Now and what this means for the Parks and Open Spaces Strategy.


<b>Gedling Now 2011</b>	
<b>Key findings</b>	<b>What does it mean for this Strategy?</b>
71% of residents said they were satisfied with parks and open spaces in 2010; this is down from 74% in 2008	Delivery of this Strategy will help ensure our residents remain highly satisfied with Gedling's parks and open spaces. It sets out recommendations derived from consultation with the public and users of open spaces
The number of dwellings in the borough is set to increase to meet housing need.	This strategy needs to ensure that the future need for parks and open space provision is met as housing numbers increase.
The proportion of the Borough's residents who are 60 and over is estimated to rise significantly by 2031.	Open space provision must reflect the needs of an increasing older population, in terms of the type and accessibility.
There has been an improvement in childhood obesity levels for both reception class and year 6 in 2009/10, compared to 2008/09.	Providing enough quality and accessible play facilities that are used by Gedling's children will make a positive contribution to tackling the levels of obesity amongst children.
23.9% of adults were classed as obese in 2010 rising from 23.5% in 2009.	Sufficient and accessible open space for adult recreation in the Borough can help to tackle the rising levels of adult obesity in Gedling.
Netherfield and Colwick, St Marys, Killisick and Bonington have the highest health deprivation and disability (with levels significantly worsening in St Marys and Bonington wards in 2010 compared to 2007).	Promoting good quality and accessible open space provision in these local areas can help to reduce the health inequalities suffered by the residents who live there.
A fifth green flag award has been achieved for Arnot Hill Park.	Continuing to provide the broad range of quality provision at Arnot Hill Park increases pride amongst residents and provides all ages with an opportunity to get active and enjoy the local environment.
Targeted work continues in the Priority Neighbourhoods of Netherfield & Colwick, Newstead Village, Killisick Estate, Phoenix Estate, Arnold Area and St Mary's Ward	The Borough's Priority Neighbourhoods suffer most from higher levels of deprivation. Ensuring residents in these areas have accessible and high quality open space can help improve their quality of life and well-being.
3,420 children live in poverty – with the highest level seen in Killisick Ward at 37.8%.	Gedling has high levels of child poverty. This Strategy can help ensure there are easily accessible facilities in the Borough that offer free recreational opportunities for these children and their families.
The level of adults participating in sport and active recreation (3 x 30 minutes of exercise per week) fell from 23.7% in 2009/10 to 21.3% in 2010/11 according to the Active People Survey 2010.	This Strategy needs to ensure that the Borough's residents have sufficient opportunity to participate in sport and active recreation in our parks and open spaces.

### **3. Internal and external strategic influences**

In developing an open space strategy it is important to consider the strategic factors that will influence the strategy both internally from existing policies and practices within Gedling Borough Council and externally by identifying the implications from strategies and policies of key government departments and other agencies. The legislation and policies have three levels national, regional and local. Within this context, there are different types of legislation and policy: those that are directly concerned with open space provision and those where open space makes a contribution but are not the principal subject of a wider policy initiative.



## Parks and Open Spaces Strategy - Diagram linking strategies and policies



### 3.1 National Policy Context

The national agenda for Parks and Open Spaces has changed dramatically over recent years with the main driving force behind this being the change in national politics. With this in mind many of the documents referred to in this section derive from the labour government, but are still considered important to reflect upon in this strategy.

Although Caba space is no longer in operation the Labour government encouraged improvements to parks and open spaces with the appointment of CABA in 2003. It was established with the existing Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABA) to champion high quality planning, design and the management and care of parks and public spaces.

This recognised the value of good quality green space and its potential contribution to wider quality of life issues including:

- Urban renaissance
  - Health and wellbeing
  - Social inclusion and community development
  - Education and lifelong learning
  - Environment and ecology
  - Heritage and culture
- Promoting more sustainable development

Living Places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), 2003 (revised 2006). This highlighted that the state of the local environment affects and reflects the well-being of the people living there. Whether it is the town centre, local park or the street on which we live, it is important that they add to the quality of life and they are safe and attractive places.

As part of the Cleaner, Safer, Greener policy, a series of 'How to' guides were published. The document How to Create Quality Parks & Open Spaces was published in 2005 and updated in 2007. Among the recommended actions in this document are steps to develop a shared vision, and a strategy for fulfilling it by: consulting the community; working with partners; providing evidence for resource management; using the Green Flag Award scheme as an indicator of success; and finally striving to create spaces are high quality and fit for purpose.

In 2009, the government published World Class Places: the government's strategy for improving quality of place, a joint publication between Communities and Local Government and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. This emphasises the importance of ample high quality green space and green infrastructure in providing 'quality of place'. Its objectives include putting the public and community at the

centre of 'place-shaping', and revising planning guidance to reflect the vital and multifunctional role of the green infrastructure.

In July 2002 the Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) covered Sport, Open Space and recreation and recommended that local authorities undertake robust assessments of existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities and then set locally derived standards for provision within their areas. PPG17 is in the process of being replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Sustainable Communities: building for the future (ODPM 2003) has set out a range of policies resources and partnerships designed to achieve a joined up approach to local living environments. At the core of this publication were a series of policies to address the housing shortage, within a wider context of raising the quality of life. It is to ensure that open and green spaces contribute to better quality of life and sustainable communities.

Sport England is responsible for advising the Government on sports and acts as a statutory consultee on certain developments relating to sports pitches. In 2003 it produced a guide to assist the production of playing pitches strategies "Towards a Level Playing Field". This document was used in the production of the playing pitch assessment for the Borough (2003).

The National Play Strategy for England (2008) highlights the importance of play which includes making open spaces attractive to children and young people. There is also a move to recognise that there is play value in risk. The introduction of managed risk through risk benefit analysis of play areas will have a major impact on the design of these areas. This is a fundamental change since the 2004 strategy.

The Green Flag is a national scheme, which sets out to recognise and reward high standards in parks and open spaces. It was launched in 1996 designed to recognise and encourage good quality public parks. Eight criteria are used to evaluate whether a park should receive an award. These are:

- That it is welcoming, accessible and has good signage
- That it offers a healthy safe and secure environment
- That it is clean and well maintained
- That it is maintained using sustainable and environmentally sound methods
- That where applicable, it promotes the value of conservation and care of historic heritage
- That it promotes community involvement in the management of the site and involves the community in the provision of recreational or conservation activity
- That the site is marketed effectively

- That there is a coherent management plan for the site.

Gedling Borough Council achieved this target in 2007 with a Green Flag at Arnot Hill Park and has retained it for each subsequent year.

At the heart of the current Coalition Government's agenda is the ethos of creating a Big Society where greater power is put in the hands of local people away from more centralised control of public services. Strands of Big Society include greater community empowerment where local people can take a greater role in making decisions and helping to shape their local area through community budgets or neighbourhood plans. It also includes the opening up of public services giving the opportunity for organisations from other sectors, such as community associations, charities or clubs to compete to offer quality services.

Much of this transition will be happening through the implementation of the Localism Act 2011. The Act aims to give greater flexibilities for local authorities to be more innovative when dealing with local neighbourhoods. Schemes such as 'community right to bid for assets' and 'community right to challenge' aim to give communities greater opportunities to manage both local buildings of community value and important local services.

In practice local communities and neighbourhoods will require support and guidance to enable them to be truly empowered. The transition of local groups, forums, associations or clubs being enabled to play a greater role in running local facilities and managing local budgets, will require the development of their skills, confidence and capacity building.

The Localism Act also contains provisions to make the planning system clearer, more democratic, and more effective.

This will involve:

- **Abolition of regional strategies** that previously set targets for future housing provision in local areas.
- **Neighbourhood planning** to allow communities, both residents, employees and business, to come together through a local parish council or neighbourhood forum and say where they think new houses, businesses and shops should go – and what they should look like. As part of neighbourhood planning, local community may also wish to build new homes, businesses, shops, playgrounds or meeting halls.
- **Revise the Community Infrastructure Levy** that allows local authorities to require developers to pay a levy for new infrastructure when they build new houses, businesses or shops. The Act allows the levy to be spent on things other than infrastructure and will ensure some of the money raised from the levy goes directly to the neighbourhoods where development takes place.

### **3.2 Regional Policy context**

**Regional spatial strategies** (RSS) provided regional level planning frameworks for the regions of England outside London. (In London, spatial planning is the responsibility of the mayor.) They were introduced in 2004. Their revocation was announced by the new Conservative/Liberal Democrat government on 6 July 2010

Regional Spatial Strategies were expected to:

- establish a 'spatial' vision and strategy specific to the region - for example, identifying in general terms areas for development or regeneration for a period of about 20 years ahead
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development
- establish regionally specific policies, which are expected to add to rather than replicate national ones
- address regional or sub-regional issues that may cross county, unitary authority or district boundaries
- outline housing figures for district and unitary authorities to take forward in their local development frameworks
- establish priorities for environmental protection and enhancement, and define the 'general extent' of areas of green belt
- produce a regional Transport Strategy as part of the wider spatial strategy
- outline key priorities for investment, particularly in infrastructure, and identify delivery mechanisms, in order to support development
- identify how the region's waste should be dealt with
- be consistent with and supportive of other regional frameworks and strategies.

The Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan has been produced by the partnership of organisations which form the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group. Many other groups and local experts have contributed, and the targets and actions have been approved by all key partners. The format and content are consistent with Government guidance.

### **3.3 Local Policy Context**

At the heart of the first open spaces strategy was the need to meet the requirements Planning Policy Guidance 17. A supplementary planning guidance document was produced to set out the councils approach to planning obligations when considering planning application for development, including obligations for provision of new or enhancement of existing green space through Section 106 contributions. A review of this document is taking place alongside the development of this strategy.

## **Other influencing local strategies**

Allotments Strategy (2004 – 2008)

Aligned Core Strategy (adoption expected 2013)

Children's Play Area Strategy (2004)

Making Play Matter (2007-2012)

Playing Pitch Strategy (2003)

Recreation Open Space Strategy (2003)

Sports & Physical Activity Strategy, Changing Lifestyles (2005 - 2015)

## **4. Involving Communities**

Consultation is seen as an important element in the development of the Parks and Open Space strategy and PPG17 audit. Consultation has been managed to ensure that it is effective and that any issues raised can be addressed.

In order to achieve a balanced co-ordinated approach and ensure maximum public participation a series of consultations were carried out over a phased period of time. This included establishing the views on open space provision among users and non-users in Gedling. The key methods used were:

- Public consultation surveys
- Door to door survey of residents
- Surveys conducted with users of the parks
- Young people's survey
- Sports club survey
- Allotment association survey
- Friends of groups survey
- Parish council survey
- School survey
- Focus groups
- Internal consultation.

### **4.1 Public consultation survey**

In order to develop a strategy and set local priorities it was essential to consult with the local community to gain an insight into local needs and aspirations. The Council undertook consultation with residents within the Borough of Gedling.

Consultation went live in September 2010 through online and hard copies of the questionnaires. It was made available to local people until the January 2011. The survey was advertised in the local press, on the council website, in the local "Contacts" Magazine which is distributed to every household in the borough. It was also advertised through the Leisure Services email bulletin which holds a data base of over 6000 leisure card holders. It was advertised internally within the council through using the intranet and email system and by email to partners such as the Primary Care Trust. Paper questionnaires were made available at Gedling Borough Councils One Stop, each of the five Leisure Centres and distributed to the libraries.

A total of 424 surveys were returned. This number of responses provides a substantial statistical evidence base. Residents were asked their views and opinions on open spaces and sports facilities in the area in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility.

The survey was designed to assess the views of the residents, their attitude and aspirations with regard to open spaces across the borough. The analysis of the results can be found in appendix 4a. The key findings were:

- The most frequently used green spaces were parks and gardens and natural green space. The least used facilities were allotments and cemeteries.
- The most common method of travel to facilities is walking and driving. Significantly more people walk to parks and gardens, natural green space, amenity green space, provision for children, school playing fields and green corridors than drive.
- 97% of responders felt that travelling time to green spaces was acceptable.
- 79% thought there were enough public accessible open space in the Borough and 16% did not.
- Across the type of opens spaces the quality in the borough is considered as good. Parks and Gardens were considered as very good.
- Cleanliness was rated as the best aspect of green spaces with 19% considering it was very good and 48% as good. The range of facilities was considered most need of improvement.
- The top four reasons for visiting green space in Gedling were; to go for a walk, to relax, to improve health and to take the family.
- Barriers relating quality were higher priorities than barriers relating to access. The most common reason given as a barrier was dog fouling with 14% of responders feeling this was an issue.

## **4.2 Door to Door Survey**

In May 2009 470 respondents were interviewed from a sample of 500 in a door to door survey of residents. The residents were asked questions about Parks and Open Spaces in Gedling and Leisure Centres and Community Centres. The results complement the more recent public survey described above. The survey did not define Park and Open Spaces into the PPG17 typologies. In the survey parks and green spaces, Children's play provision and outdoor sports provision were included in what was defined a park for the purposes of the survey.

This door to door survey provides additional information on:

- The profile of residents that use parks and open spaces in Gedling
- Why people use the parks
- Reasons why parks are not used more often
- Parks people avoid using and reasons
- Feeling of safety in the parks
- What would improve safety in parks



## Demographics from respondents

When analysing the data from the door to door survey it was important to take into account the demographics of the responders in comparison to the profile of the borough. Due to the nature of the survey it was possible to collect data from residents that reflected the profile of the borough.

The door to door survey showed the majority of families with dependent children use their local parks and playing fields at least weekly and lone adults are least likely to use them. 46% of people between 25-44 use parks and play fields on a weekly basis. After 45 years old the older the person is the frequency of visits reduces.

## Reason for visiting the Parks

The door to door survey showed some differences in the reasons why people use the parks in comparison to the public consultation. For example the door to door survey highlighted people use the parks mainly for children's play and walking. Although the public consultation highlighted children's play as relatively popular it was not the most popular reason why people visited the parks on a weekly basis. However it must be taken into account that a higher proportion of responders in the public consultation were over 45 and more likely not to have dependent children. Other reasons why residents visit on a regular basis such as going for a walk reflected that of the public consultation findings.

Table 4.1: Reasons why parks are not used more often

Time	30%
Health/age/disability	18%
No children living at home	13%
Prefer country walks	10%
Lack of interest	8%
Transport/Distance	5%
Anti-social behaviour	4%
No dogs	4%
Weather	3%
Travel to other local authority areas instead	2%
No-one to go with	2%
Dog fouling	1%

Those surveyed were asked if there were any reasons why they do not use the parks more often. The most common reason why people do not use the parks more often was due to personal time restraints and the second most common was Health/age/disability. Despite 18% providing this reason the public consultation showed that only 1% felt that accessibility standards around the parks was below average. Therefore it can be concluded that getting to the parks is more of an issue. 13% of people felt that because children were not living at home there was not a

strong enough reason to visit the parks. The public consultation showed that dog fouling and litter were more of an issue than vandalism and antisocial behaviour however when residents were asked during the door to door survey what the single biggest problem was young people hanging around and dog fouling were clearly the two biggest issues. People were also asked why they do not visit the parks more often with, antisocial behaviour (5%) more of an issue than dog fouling (1%). In addition when surveyed respondents were asked why they avoid parks. The main reasons were:

- Young people (35%)
- Fear of crime (13%)
- Dog fouling (9%)
- Antisocial behaviour (5%)
- Vandalism (5%)
- Isolation (5%)

Overall 91% of people felt safe when using parks in Gedling Borough Council. To improve safety in parks the most popular suggestions were to use park wardens, better policing, better lighting, fencing, CCTV and more activities for youths.

#### **4.3 Parks user survey**

Nine parks across the Borough were surveyed individually to ascertain user's opinions. There was a total of 225 responses from 2008-2010. These results inform the parks and gardens section of the PPG17 audit. Users were asked questions on frequency of visits, length of stay, methods of travel, activities undertaken and the quality of the park. These results are reported on in the Parks and Gardens section of this strategy.

#### **4.4 Sports Club Survey**

In September 2009 a survey was sent to all sports clubs who use outdoor facilities in the Gedling Borough. A total of 31 responses were received. The breakdowns of clubs were as follows:

- football – 16 responses
- cricket – 4 responses
- bowls – 6 responses
- golf – 3 responses
- rugby – 1 response
- tennis – 1 response.

Clubs were asked to rate the quality of open space facilities they use, on a scale from 1 (poor) to 10 (very good).

Clubs were most dissatisfied with car parking facilities, 6 clubs rated them with the lowest possible score. Clubs were most satisfied with the changing areas with 14 changing areas considered 8 or above. However 6 changing areas were given the lowest score of 1. Taking these results into account it is important to consider the sports facilities at open spaces on an individual basis.

Clubs were asked if they have sufficient facilities and 33% felt there were not sufficient facilities at their club venue. Comments included:

- Additional full size pitches and mini pitches
- Better location that houses all teams
- Dry play facilities
- Would like their own ground

The most popular comments from clubs in relation to improvements to the existing facilities these included:

- Bigger changing rooms
- Better storage
- Better maintenance e.g. bowls greens
- Car park is too small
- Better marking out of pitches
- Improved practice facilities

A full analysis of these results are described later in this strategy. This includes cross analysis on where additional or better facilities have been requested.

#### 4.5 Allotment Association Consultation

In April 2010 a survey was sent to all 5 allotment associations in the borough and 4 responses were received. The associations were asked about the range of facilities provided, quality, current usage, the main issues, future priorities and plans associated to the site.

**Quality** - All 4 associations rated the overall quality of the allotments provided as good or excellent. Chandos was considered as being excellent, this was despite it

Table 4.2: How sports clubs feel about the quality of the open space they use

1=poor, 10=excellent

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Playing Area	1	2	5	2	10	0	6	4	3	4
Car Parking	6	5	2	3	4	3	4	5	3	3
Changing Area	6	0	2	5	2	3	3	4	3	7

having less facilities and services on site than some of the other sites. The main quality issues affecting the associations include:

- no toilets (two responses)
- vandalism (two responses)
- poor service with regard to repairs
- availability of land
- managing expectations of new allotment holders (high turnover)
- voluntary nature of committee
- dissemination of good practice could be improved

**Quantity-** All three sites that did not have any vacant slots had between 25-50 people on waiting lists. Only Stoke Lane Allotment association had a marketing plan to increase awareness/advertised their allotment.

**Access** - All allotment associations felt that travelling time was acceptable. Most people either used a car or walked. Travelling time for driving was between 5-10 minutes and walking between 10-20 minutes.

The main priority for the future from all three associations was more allotment sites. The second most popular priority was improved on site facilities. Chandos and Leapool Allotment had plans to improve the allotments, which included better facilities for people with disabilities and new toilets and meeting room.

### **Friends of Group Survey**

At the time of consultation Friends of Groups were consulted through completion of a questionnaire. The Friends of Groups were asked questions in relation to quality and future plans for their associated park. The overall view of the quality of parks they represented ranged from average to excellent. Jackie Bells being excellent, Arnot Hill Park good and Gedling House Woods average. Issues were individual to each park, however vandalism was an issue at Gedling House Woods and Arnot Hill Park. All Friends of Groups felt there needed to be more parks and open spaces and better quality. More details of the consultation are provided the specific section later in the report.

### **Parish Council Survey**

Formal consultation took place with the Parish Councils in September 2009. The consultation was in the form of a questionnaire. The consultation has allowed the site inventories to be updated, get an indication on the level of usage, condition and identify any future aspirations of the Parish Councils. These responses have been integrated into the audit of each specific in this audit.

## **Schools Survey**

Questionnaires were forwarded to all schools within the Borough (Primary and Secondary) which resulted in 44 responses. The following provides an overview of the opinions provided in relation to outdoor facilities located on education sites.

69% of schools responded to say they had sports facilities on their sites.

12 schools (50%) of which currently do not have community use stated they would consider community use in the future. All these were primary school and are listed below.

- Arno Vale Primary school
- All Hallows Primary School
- Arnold View Primary School
- Burton Joyce Primary School
- Carlton Central Primary School
- Westdale Primary School
- Seely C of E Primary School
- Stanhope Primary School
- Linby and Papplwick Primary School
- Robert Mellors Primary School
- St Wilfrids c of E Primary School

Outdoor facilities at education sites include mini, junior and senior football pitches, hockey (grass pitches), rugby, cricket, synthetic turf pitches, Multi use game area and tennis courts. Schools were asked to rate the quality of their own facilities. Quality varied significantly from poor to excellent with the majority assessing their facilities as good or average. 5 schools have plans to improve sports facilities in the future.

## **4.6 Children & Young People**

All schools in Gedling were invited to participate in an online survey or complete a hard copy version of the same questionnaire. 353 questionnaire responses were received from the ages of 4 to 15.

Figure 4.1: Frequency of visits by Children and Young People to parks and open spaces





Figure 4.2: Frequency of visits by Children and Young People to play areas



When asked about the frequency of visits to parks and open spaces in Gedling, over 50% stated they use parks and open spaces once a week or more. 7% never use open spaces. When questioned specifically about visits to local play areas (provision for children and young people), the number of children who never use them increased to 16% however 50% still used play areas once a week or more.

Children and young people were asked what their perfect place to play would have. The most popular answers were places to make dens and lots of play equipment.

Respondents were also asked whether facilities for children and young people could be improved in their area. The majority stated that they feel facilities could be better

(56% of respondents), with the following most popular comments being made in relation to necessary improvements:

- Reduce the amount of litter and dog fouling
- There is no playground near us (Mapperley Plains School)
- More equipment on the parks with particular reference to climbing equipment
- Less vandalism
- More space
- More woods and rocks (natural play)
- Improved safety
- Less rubbish and graffiti and more places/dens for young children to go

A more detailed analysis of the results are described in the provision for children and young people's audit later in this strategy.

#### **4.7 Internal consultation**

It was important that during the production of the assessment that internal officers and council members were aware of the development of the assessment and strategy. Internal consultation was carried out with council officers, from Planning, Direct services, Leisure Services. The key themes from consultation have been reviewed in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility:

##### **Quality**

- overall the green spaces are well maintained
- some high quality play areas in the urban conurbation
- dog-fouling issues
- quality of pavilions require improvements
- parks require more monitoring to reduce antisocial behaviour
- play areas are being damaged by dogs and suffer from graffiti
- more conservation work could be done on our parks
- the role third tier government plays in maintenance and management of open space (short term and long term)

##### **Quantity**

- more football pitches are required
- a lack of tennis facilities in the Arnold area
- there is an over demand of allotment plots. Plots could be halved to help meet demand
- the amount of amenity green space varies across the borough
- more burial space required. A crematorium would be advantageous
- amenity green space is overall well provided, however, some areas have a shortfall

- more provision for play areas for children and young people is required, in particular for older children (skate parks, shelters)

### **Accessibility**

- limited car parking at cemeteries and issues with one way system within the cemetery
- opening up more school sites for community use should be considered
- there has been no sustained strategy for open space
- a need for direction in development of sites
- a potential large future public open space provision on Gedling Colliery site.



## 5. Parks and Gardens

### 5.1 Definition

This type of open space includes urban parks, formal gardens and country parks that provide opportunities for various informal recreation and community activity.

This typology also has many wider benefits as supported by the site assessments. Parks provide a sense of place for the local community, ecological and educational, help to address any social inclusion issues and also provide structural and landscape benefits to the local area.



Figure 5.1: Arnot Hill Park, Arnold

### 5.2 Strategic context

A national survey commissioned by Sport England, the Countryside Agency and English Heritage was undertaken during 2003, looking at the provision of parks within England. The aims of the survey were to establish:

- how many adults in England use parks
- what activities people take part in when visiting parks
- the reasons people visit particular parks
- the levels of satisfaction with the amenities on offer
- why some adults do not use parks

The definition of a park used in the survey was very broad and included both formal provision such as town parks, country parks, recreation grounds and also less formal provision such as village greens and common land.

The findings of the study were:

- just under two thirds of adults in England had visited a public park during the previous 12 months
- there is a distinct bias in the use of parks by social groups, with almost three quarters of adults from the higher social group visiting a park compared with only half of those from the lower social group
- people from black and ethnic minority communities also have relatively low participation as well as adults with disabilities
- over eight in 10 adults who had used a park in the previous 12 months did so at least once a month during the spring and summer with almost two thirds visiting a park at least once a week. Women tended to visit parks more often than men.
- it is estimated that the 24.3 million adults who use parks make approximately 1.2 billion visits to parks during the spring and summer months and 600 million visits during the autumn and winter months – a total of 1.8 billion visits a year
- the most popular type of park visited was an urban or city park

Local consultation identified that only 5% of responders did not use parks and gardens. This makes parks and gardens the most important typology of green space. 93% of responders had used a park in the last 6 months and 52% stated that they used them at least once per week.

### 5.3 Quantity

Due to the limited number of responses from those who did not use parks, robust data was not available to gauge those residents opinions on whether there were enough parks and gardens in the borough.

Many of the facilities residents would expect to be included in the qualitative analysis below are not. To prevent duplication in the analysis, sites are categorised by their primary purpose so many park sites have been audited under the category of “outdoor sports facility” or “Natural green space”.

The sites in the borough which have a primary use as a park and garden are listed below:

Table 5.1: Quantity audit of Parks and Gardens in Gedling Borough

Site name	Size in ha	Ward	Urban/Rural
Newstead Country Park	88.9	Newstead	Rural
Newstead Abbey Park	62.9	Newstead	Rural
Alpin Crescent	0.07	Valley	Urban
Valley Road	1.51	Carlton Hill	Urban

Hereford Road Open Space	0.18	Gedling	Urban
Willow Park	1.91	Gedling	Urban
Arnot Hill Park	8.3	Kingswell	Urban
Burntstump Country Park	20.02	Newstead	Rural
Newstead Railway Station	4.20	Newstead	Rural
Woodthorpe Library Gardens	0.16	Woodthorpe	Urban
Bestwood Country Park	279	Bestwood Village	Rural
Plains Estate Park	0.34	Mapperley Plains	Urban
Downham, Overstrand, Carmel	0.06	Kingswell	Urban
Coronation Gardens	0.12	Gedling	Urban
Gedling post office	0.12	Gedling	Urban
Total	467.9		

The audit recorded 467.9 hectares of parks and gardens in the borough with a proposed additional 120 hectares as a part of the Gedling Country Park development in the Gedling ward. These sites vary considerably in size from very small areas such as small gardens accompanying Woodthorpe Library to large sites such as Bestwood Country Park.

The Office of National Statistics predicts the population in Gedling borough has increased to 112,735 in 2009. This equates to 4.15 hectares per 1000 population. There is a significant difference in the provision of parks and gardens in urban and rural areas. Although the majority of sites are located in urban areas many of these sites are small. Arnot Hill Park in the north of the borough is the only significant site located in the urban conurbation which is heavily used.

The larger sites are located in the rural areas of the borough. A number of agencies have identified the need for an additional site, falling into the category of parks, to service the urban fringe area.

The Wildlife Trust and English Nature both suggest that Gedling Colliery is an ideal site, with the potential to service the community as a large informal recreational space, should it be successful in gaining funding to be opened as a public park.

There are a number of other sites around Gedling which have other primary purposes but are also used as parks; these sites also need to be taken into account when planning future provision. These sites mainly include outdoor sports facilities, natural and semi natural green space.

Gedling has three key open spaces of over 10 hectares in size that can be classified as country parks. These spaces have significant environmental and nature conservation value as well as a recreational function:

Table 5.2: Parks and Gardens over 10 hectares

Site	Size (hectares)	Ownership	Main Functions
Bestwood Country Park	279	Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council	Grasslands, picnic areas, woodland, bridleways/cycle paths, adventure playground.
Burntstump Country Park	20.5	Gedling Borough Council	Parkland, woodland, small lake, cricket pitch, picnic areas, hard surface paths.
Newstead Abbey	63	Nottingham City Council	Formal gardens, parkland.
Newstead Country Park	89.9	Newstead Parish Council, run by Newstead Enterprise	eco-build Education and Visitor Centre, small lakes, bridleways/cycle paths half of site is classified as a SINC

Qualitative feedback from the public consultation highlighted the amount of parks is adequate. Residents felt the sizes of parks could be increased, for example comments were made that even Arnot Hill Park was too small and that there are few opportunities to cycle in parks around Gedling Borough. This issue could also be addressed by developing green corridors across the borough.

It is recommended the current provision of 4.15 per 1000 is maintained, however the total hectare provided currently will need to be increased to accommodate an increase in population.

Gedling Borough Council's Five Year Lands Supply Report 2011 states that it does not have a supply of land for housing for the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. It recommends the development of 436 dwellings per year however is unable to meet this and has set out the estimated housing supply for this period. Over the five years this is a total of 1136 in the Principle Urban Area (PUA) and 275 dwellings in the Non Principle Urban Area of the borough. This equates to 55 dwellings in Non PUA and 227.2 dwellings per year in PUA.

Based on an average dwelling occupation of 2 people per household this is a total population increase of 2822. This is 2272 residents in the urban areas and 550 in the rural areas of the borough. In order to maintain the quantity standard 27.8 ha of land needs to be allocated for parks and gardens in the next 5 years.

Therefore the proposed Gedling Country Park will be an essential addition to the boroughs Parks and Gardens. However in addition to this feasibility studies also need to take place to ascertain if any existing amenity green space in areas of deficiency can be improved to make it usable as a Park and Garden or if any outdoor sports pitches can be enhanced increasing their multi functionality. These areas are highlighted in the accessibility section of this section.

<p><b>Recommended Quantity Standard</b></p> <p>4.15 hectares per 1000 population</p>
--

## 5.5 Quality of Provision

Public consultation results revealed the overall quality rating of Parks and Gardens from those who responded was very good. Table 6.3 shows 45% of responders felt the standard was very good with the majority of others feeling the quality was either good or average. In fact 84% of responders felt the Parks and Gardens were good or better. This is the highest satisfaction level amongst all typologies.

Table 5.3: Public consultation quality rating of Parks and Gardens

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
45%	39%	14%	2%	0%

Public consultation provided a number of individual comments in relation to the quality of parks and gardens in the borough.


The most common comments were:

- litter and dog fouling was the most common concern for residents
- car parking, particularly due to charges at Arnot Hill Park (parking restrictions have now been relaxed)
- safety was an issue in relation to gangs and unleashed dogs. A uniformed presence (warden or police) is wanted at park sites
- wheel chair access to parks (examined closer in the accessibility section of this report)
- there were site specific comments regarding Arnot Hill Park, both positive and negative. Positives included the range of facilities and negatives included issues such as car parking. One resident commented “there is nothing like Arnot Hill Park within walking distance from of my house.” More details are provided later in this report

User consultation was conducted at green spaces across the boroughs which are categorised using value Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE) categorisations as a Park or Garden.


## User Consultation

Figure 5.2: Overall quality of Parks and Gardens



The standard of grass and maintenance of trees, flowers and scrubs were rated the best aspects of the parks and gardens with 83% rating them good or better. Cleanliness also rated well with 70% of responders rating it good or better. Despite these positive responses we also recorded significant issues of dog fouling and with football teams leaving litter after matches and youths leaving quite often broken bottles. Care and protection of the nature and wildlife that live in the park and the current range of facilities require most improvement.

Figure 5.3: Users overall impression of individual parks and gardens in Gedling Borough



Arnot Hill Park was considered the best park out of those where user surveys took place with 88% of responders feeling it was good or better. Burton Road was considered the worst with only 30% feeling the park was at a good standard or better. Improvements have now taken place at Burton Road to improve the quality of the park. There were a number of comments requesting more sporting events and coaching opportunities on the parks.

### Site Specific Consultation

Public, user and Friends of Group’s consultation have been used to examine the different parks and gardens across the borough. A detailed analysis can be found in appendix 5a. The key findings from each site were:

**Arno Vale** – The quality of grass was considered as the best aspect and protection of nature and wildlife considered as in most need of improvement.

**Arnot Hill Park** was the highest rated facility with maintenance of trees, flowers and plants being one of its main strengths. Although still rated as good the area most in need of improvement was the range of facilities.

**Burton Road** was considered the park which required the most improvements. The standard of cleanliness and the protection of nature were considered the area which required most improvement and the standard of the grass being the positive aspect of the park. Since the survey improvements have taken place to the park.

**Burntstump Park** - The standard of cleanliness and the quality of sports facilities are areas which users felt required most improvement with the standard of the grass being the best rated aspect of the park.

**Colwick Recreation Ground** was rated positively; the main strengths were the maintenance of trees, flowers and scrubs and range of facilities. Colwick Recreation Ground is adjacent to Colwick Country Park managed by Nottingham City Council which enhances what it has to offer. Cleanliness and dog fouling were the main areas for concern

**Conway Road** - Most of the users rated the majority of the different aspects of Conway Road as very good. The standard of cleanliness was considered the best rated aspect.

**Jackie Bells** - The care and protection of nature and wildlife at Jackie Bells was considered as poor by the majority of responders, this is no doubt influenced by its urban location.

The range of facilities and sports facilities was considered the best aspects of the park although there were a number of requests for toilet and refreshment facilities

**Killisick Recreation Ground** is influenced by its sub urban location with care and protection nature and wildlife considered the area in need of the most improvement. The maintenance of trees, flowers and scrubs was its best quality

**King George, Arnold** - The Quality of Sports facilities were considered as poor at King George V, Arnold. Cleanliness was considered as one of the better aspects of this park.

**Lambley Lane** -The standard of grass was considered to be the main strength of the site. The quality of the sports facilities was considered as the main area for improvement. Literal responses described the park as a windswept desolate underutilised area.

**Standhill Road, Carlton** -The main areas of improvement were care and protection of nature and wildlife play facilities for teenagers. Since the user consultation was completed improvements have taken place to the children's and teenage play facilities on the park.

### **Site Quality Assessments**

The Green Flag Criteria provide a national standard for parks and gardens. However green flag accreditation is a costly and time consuming procedure and can only be achieved if the site meets a required standard and provides the facilities identified in their criteria, therefore Arnot Hill Park is the only site in Gedling with the award.

In response to this situation Parks Officers in Nottinghamshire have developed the Nottinghamshire Standard. This standard is derived from Green Flag and uses a self assessment and peer led assessment model. It allows the parks and gardens in Gedling to be assessed based on the following green flag criteria:



- a welcoming place
- healthy, safe and secure
- clean and well maintained
- sustainability
- conservation and heritage
- community involvement
- marketing

0-1	2-4	5-6	7	8	9	10
Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exceptional

One downside to the use of the above quality assessment is it does not take account of the limitations on certain sites in as much as they will never be able to achieve a 100% score due to restrictions in some of the factors they are being judged upon. For example its location near a main road is a limiting factor which cannot easily be changed. To take account of this the scoring has been adapted to take account of these limiting factors. This has been achieved by establishing a 'potential score'.

In order to decide on which green spaces to assess the Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE) classification of parks has been used. Those parks classified under APSE category A, B or C have been assessed. This has resulted in not all the parks and gardens within the quantity audit being given a quality rating.

Classification categories

### **Category A park**

Category A parks are formally defined parks/open spaces/recreation areas having at least a 3 mile catchment area and at least 20 of the facilities from the facility list (see Appendix 5a)

### **Category B parks**

Category B parks are a formally defined park/open space/recreation area having at least a 0.75 mile catchment area with a least 10 facilities from the facility list (see appendix 5a)

### **Category C parks**

Category C parks are a park/open space/recreation area having at least a 0.25 mile catchment area with at least 6 facilities from the facility list (see Appendix 5a).

The table below provides a summary of the results.

Table 5.4: Nottinghamshire Standard Gedling Borough results

Summary of Site Inspections by Scores & Gap in Quality of Provision (Summer 2010 Assessment)								
APSE Classification	Site Location	Site Score	Potential Score	Difference (Gap)	No. of Assessment Criteria	Average Site Score divided by Assessment	Average x 7 to get Green Flag Score	Pass
C	Breckhill	139	187	48	25	5.6	39	Fail
B	Arnot Hill Park	226	241	15	27	8.4	59	pass
C	Arno Vale Rd	116	141	25	19	6.1	43	Pass
B	Burntstump CP	159	191	32	24	6.6	46	Pass
B	KGV Standhill	147	173	26	23	6.4	45	Pass
C	Carlton Hill Rec	136	157	21	22	6.1	43	Pass
C	Cavendish Rd	113	136	23	20	5.6	39	Fail
C	Church Lane	153	182	29	23	6.6	46	Pass
B	Colwick Rec	148	164	16	23	6.4	45	Pass
B	Conway Road	136	159	23	24	5.7	40	Fail
C	Jackie Bells	141	156	15	22	6.4	45	Pass
B	Burton Road	128	166	38	23	5.6	39	Fail
C	Killisick Rec	139	163	24	23	6.0	42	Pass
B	KGV Arnold	125	156	31	21	5.9	41	Fail
B	Lambley Ln (N)	140	171	31	25	5.6	39	Fail
B	Lambley Ln (S)	121	154	33	23	5.2	36	Fail
C	Newstead	124	141	17	20	6.2	43	Pass
B	Oakdale Road	175	210	35	26	6.7	47	pass
C	Thackerays Ln	138	163	25	24	5.7	40	Fail
C	Queensbower	129	138	9	20	6.4	45	Pass
60% in the field evaluation (score 42 out of 70). Score over 42 to gain a pass.								

The average quality score for the borough was 6.1% which is fair. The highest scoring site was Arnot Hill Park with a score of 8.4 rated as very good. The lowest scoring site was Lambley Lane South which scored 5.2 rated as fair. It is recommended an improvement plan is produced to prioritise future improvements to the parks.

Taking into account of the consultation and the quality assessment scores the following quality standard has been set.

**Recommended Quality Standard**


A welcoming, clean, well maintained site that is free from vandalism and dog fouling that provides a range of facilities for all users creating a feeling of safety.

All sites to achieve a Nottinghamshire Standard score of at least 6 or 42 when applied to green flag standards

The Nottinghamshire Quality Standard provides the basis for new provision and also a benchmark for existing parks.

## 5.6 Accessibility

Figure 5.3: Accessibility of the Parks and Gardens in Gedling Borough




From a user's perspective access to the parks and gardens was one of the mostly highly rated aspects of the green space consultation with 91% stating that access was either good or very good. The users felt the sites which required the most improvements were King George V Arnold where 45% rated access as fair and Standhill where 6% of responders felt access was poor.

Literal feedback provided some specific issues with sites for example Lambley Lane was considered an issue when football matches are being played. The limited car parking facilities results in cars being parked on both sides of the road.

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

The graph below identifies the response given in the survey of local people in 2010 identifying how they normally travel to access the park or public garden they use.

Figure 5.4: Preferred mode of transport to Parks and Gardens in Gedling Borough



The accessibility standards set by other local authorities range from 10 -15 minutes, with the greater number set at 15 minutes walk. Based on public consultation the most popular mode of transport to parks and gardens is on foot.


**Recommended Accessibility Standard**  
14 minute walk, 1.1km or 510 metres straight line distance

### 5.7 Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas and quantity deficiencies

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



Figure 5.5: Map of Parks and Gardens included in the quantity audit with catchment areas




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 5.17 above shows open spaces identified with a primary purpose of a Park and Garden through the quantity audit. It excludes Newstead Abbey located to the west of Ravenshead due to a current charge of £4.00 for adults to access. When only using this data it shows a number of areas with a deficiency. However this map does not take into account the following key considerations:



- Parks and Gardens located within the boundaries of neighbouring authorities as they could be within the catchment area of Gedling Borough residents.
- Depending on the facilities and size of the park each facility will have a different catchment area.
- Many parks have not been included in the map due to them holding other primary purposes despite residents considering them as a park. For example Lambley Lane playing field has been audited as an outdoor sports facility because of its primary use as a football pitch however it also has a range of other facilities. This green space is therefore a Category B APSE park.

Figure 5.18: Map of Parks and Gardens including those considered APSE A, B, C category parks



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 5.18 above shows the catchments of green spaces with a primary purpose of as a Park and Garden and other green spaces with an APSE parks and gardens classification of A, B or C.

These parks and gardens provide a wide range of facilities and are capable of providing space for a large number of activities and people as well as attracting people from outside the borough. The map only shows the walking catchment of the parks and gardens therefore does not consider that some parks and gardens will have a larger catchments area due to their size and amenities and people willing to drive to access them. However public consultation did recognise it is important for residents to have a park and garden within walking distance from their home and is the reason for the catchment areas displayed. The parks in figure 5.17 are freely accessible and open for use by all sections of the local community and therefore Newstead Abbey has not been included, due to the cost of visiting. Some sites include facilities for sport such as grass pitches, tennis or bowls; others provide fixed play equipment or multi use courts for children and young people. This map therefore shows a more realistic coverage of open spaces which residents would consider a park and garden.

It can be seen from Figure 5.17 that despite the Carlton area being the most comprehensively covered area for parks and gardens in Gedling, there are still pockets of areas in Carlton without provision. Other deficiency areas include Bonington, St Mary's ward and the boundary between Woodthorpe ward and Porchester ward. The proposed Gedling Colliery Park has also been included in the map which is identified by the larger circle to show the potential walking distance threshold of the proposed park.

Figure 5.17 shows a large deficiency of parks and gardens in the rural areas. Much of the rural areas however are covered by natural and semi-natural green space and therefore any rural areas that are considered deficient in natural and semi-natural green space and parks and gardens should be considered an area for improvement.

### **Cross boundary analysis**

Open spaces provided by the City Council are within the catchment areas of some residents of Gedling Borough. Woodthorpe Grange is a park on the boundary line of Gedling Borough and the City Council. Its catchment area covers the south west of the Woodthorpe ward. There are also outdoor sports facilities and a play area just off Breckhill Road which although are not considered as an APSE category A, B, C park does provide an element of open space in the area. The south west of Woodthorpe ward is therefore not considered an area of deficiency.

There are parks and gardens within the City Council boundary on Valley Road, the catchment area of this green space is considered to have a minor impact on the residents in the Daybrook ward.

The City Council also manage Colwick Country Park which is close to the boundary line of Netherfield and Colwick ward. This site is joined to Cowlick Recreation Ground and therefore covers a very similar catchment area.

## **5.8 Summary and recommendations**

- As a quantity standard, the Council should seek, as a minimum, to maintain local provision to 4.15ha per 1,000 population. However to do this more parks and garden facilities will need to be provided to accommodate the predicted increase in population due to housing developments. It is therefore vital that existing plans for a Country Park at the Gedling Colliery site are achieved.
- When enhancing provision ensure priority is made in urban areas of deficiency as this covers the largest concentration of residents
- The Council should aspire to maintaining Green Flag status at Arnot Hill Park and aspire to establishing another site as a green flag destination park, preferably outside of the catchment area of Arnot Hill Park and within the urban conurbation.
- To make improvements in quality and diversity of existing provision in particular protection and enhancement of wildlife where possible.
- To prioritise improvement to parks and gardens based on the Nottinghamshire Standard.



## 6. Natural and Semi-natural green space

### 6.1 Definition

This type of open space includes woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (eg downlands, commons, meadows), wetlands, open and running water, nature reserves and wastelands with a primary purpose of wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Natural and semi-natural green space exists as a distinct typology but also as discrete areas within the majority of other green space typologies.



Figure 6.1: Natural Green space within Burntstump Country Park

### 6.2 Strategic context and consultation

At a national level studies tend to focus on the value of more formal elements of sports and recreation facilities; however, English Natural & Semi-Natural Greenspaces, including Urban Woodland Nature (now Natural England) and The Woodland Trust have recognised the importance of natural and semi-natural greenspace and have devised their own accessibility standards, some of which will be examined later in this study

The countryside and natural environment of Gedling is varied and distinctive with much of the district's land recognised as being of high landscape value. The borough has a mix of urban and rural areas with the rural areas mainly located in the north west of the borough.

The previous recreational open space assessment (2004) noted Gedling is made up agricultural land and according to some agencies the area has low biodiversity.

There are exceptions to this for example Burntstump Country Park with its areas of acid grasslands which is a national priority in the Biodiversity Action Plan.

Natural and semi natural green space provide some form of ecological, structural and landscaping benefits such as providing a buffer between housing and other areas.

Local strategic documents make specific reference to green spaces within the borough. A number of policies relating to the Gedling landscape are contained within the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005. These policies relate to the issues of countryside protection, areas of outstanding natural beauty and landscape enhancement. In addition to this the Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan ('Action for Wildlife') was published in 1998. Action for Wildlife is the framework for nature conservation in Nottinghamshire. It sets out priorities and targets, which guide the work of organisations in the county.

Public consultation results identified that only 11% of responders did not use natural green space. This makes natural green space 3<sup>rd</sup> most important and frequently used typology of green space. 86% of responders had visited a park in the last 6 months and 38% stated that they used them at least once per week.

### 6.3 Setting quantity provision standards

An audit was completed to identify the natural and semi natural green space in the borough which identified 549 hectares in total across the borough. This includes sites of importance for nature conservation (SINCs), local nature reserves (LNRs) and other area within Gedling which through consultation have been referred to as Natural or Semi-Natural green space. 143 ha of the land in the audit shown below is also classified under other typologies such as cemeteries but have been included due to it being a SINC.

There is a total of 406 ha of natural and semi-natural space not classified under any other typology. The majority of these sites are located in the rural conurbations (64) of the borough with only eight located in urban wards. The Office of National Statistics 2009 estimated 112,735 people live in Gedling, this equates to 4.86 ha of natural and semi-natural per 1000 population.

Table 6.1: Site audit results of Natural and Semi-natural green space

SITE_NAME	SIZE_HA	Definition	WARD	AREA
Loop Road Wood, rear of Chandos St Allotments.	0.9	Other	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
The Hobbucks	14	Other	Killisick ward	Urban
Woodborough Conservation Areas	1.3	Other	Woodborough Ward	Rural
Surgeys Lane	0.1	Other	St. Mary's Ward	Rural

Netherfield Lagoons	51.0	LNR	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Emmanuel Avenue (Churchfield Plantation)	0.2	Other	Porchester Ward	Rural
Beeston Close	0.7	Other	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Gedling House Woods and Meadow	7.0	LNR	Gedling Ward	Urban
Ashwell Street / Bourne Street Walkway	0.1	Other	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Ravenhead Knoll	0.4	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Longdale Plantation	28.3	SINC	Caverton Ward	Rural
Longdale Heath	1.5	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Fox Covert	8.5	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Raceground Hill	7.5	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Mill Pond Plantation	3.9	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Cornwalls Hill Grassland	1.7	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Stockhill Grasslands, Lambley	6.7	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Pasture	5.7	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
The Woodpeckers, Burton Joyce	0.9	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Grasslands	3.6	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Scrub	3.2	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Crock Dumble	5.2	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Barrons Plantation with Gedling Wood	6.2	SINC	Gedling Ward	Urban
Harveys Plantation Meadow	1.1	SINC	Gedling Ward	Urban
New Plantation, Burton Joyce	9.4	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Lambley Dumble Grassland	7.8	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Lambley Dumble Pasture	3.5	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Lambley Dumble	3.0	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Marshy Grasslands, Lambley	2.7	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Catfoot Lane Grassland	2.9	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Fox Covert Grasslands, Lambley	0.7	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Grassland / Hedge, Lambley	1.3	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Mapperley Plains Paddocks	1.5	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Fox Wood	3.8	SINC	Lambley Ward	Rural
Grassland (Horse Grazed), Calverton	0.7	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lamp Wood	5.7	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Georges' Lane Scrub	0.6	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Bestwood Sand Quarry	22.8	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Trumpers Park Wood	4.0	SINC	Ravenshead Ward	Rural
Linby Village Disused Railway	2.1	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Joes Wood	1.4	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Aldercar Wood	11.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Linby - Newstead Disused Railway	3.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Calf Pasture	10.9	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural

Break Lane	0.5	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Seven Mile Railway	4.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Calverton Pit Mineral Railway	8.3	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lodge Farm Grassland, Calverton	1.5	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Roadside Verge, Calverton	0.6	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Little Rickets Lane Scrub	2.9	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Newstead Dismantled Railway Sidings	9.2	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Linby Paddock	0.7	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Wighay Road Grassland	3.3	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Moor Pond Wood	5.7	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Top Wighay Farm Drive	0.6	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Bestwood Duckponds	18.1	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
North Dumble	1.0	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Bestwood Parkside Grasslands	20.8	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Pit Tip Top Plantation	25.0	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Gedling Colliery Site and Dismantled Railway	35.1	SINC	Gedling Ward	Rural
Appleton Dale	7.5	SINC	Gedling Ward	Rural
Dark Lane, Calverton	0.7	SINC	Calverton Ward	Rural
Burton Joyce Cemetery	0.8	SINC	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Bestwood Country Park	62.8	SINC	Bestwood Village Ward	Rural
Woodborough Cemetery	0.4	SINC	Woodborough Ward	Rural
Linby Churchyard	0.4	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Newstead Football Pitch	1.1	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Newstead Cemetery	0.5	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Carlton Cemetery	5.1	SINC	Valley Ward	Urban
Linby Quarries	55.1	SINC	Newstead Ward	Rural
Gedling Cemetery	0.7	SINC	Gedling Ward	Rural
Midland Wood (Whimsy Park)	16.2	Other	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban

Note: Since the audit of Natural Green Space Catfoot Lane Grassland has been removed as a SINC.

It must also be noted there are a number of sites not included in the audit due to them not being classified as SINC's and having another primary function that still provide elements of natural or semi natural green space. For example this includes land categorised under the typology parks and gardens such as Burntstump Country Park. Reference to these are made later in this report. Although it is important to audit all of the SINC's many are not accessible to the public or are too small to attract visits from a reasonable distance. It is recommended further work is conducted to identify how many of these are accessible by the public.

Nationally English Nature is working towards a corporate standard of one hectare of designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR) per 1000 population. At the time of the Recreational Open Space Audit in 2004 Gedling House Woods was the only designated LNR in Gedling. This 10 hectare site encompasses mature woodland and meadowland. This resulted in Gedling being well below English Natures

standard. Since then the meadow new to the site has been designated as a LNR site. Netherfield Lagoons have also been designated as an LNR. Both of these are considered to be in the urban conurbation of the borough.

These LNR sites equate to a total of 58 hectares. The current provision of designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR) is 0.51ha per 1000 population, which is below national standards of 1 ha per 1000 population.

The Recreational Open Space assessment in 2004 recommended Midland Wood (Whimsy Park) to be considered as a site with the potential to be developed into LNR status. However since this study it is not considered as a site of importance for nature conservation (SINC). LNR designation would create a good foundation for the site's long term protection particularly with its location in the urban conurbation. The Friends of the Hobbucks community group also have plans to designate the Hobbucks as a LNR, however it also has not been identified as a SINC.

Consultation with Natural England is also recommended to identify further sites that have potential to be designated as a Local Nature Reserve.

Nottinghamshire County Council is responsible for the restoration of mineral and waste sites within Gedling to open space. A number of sites have been identified as having the potential to be developed or are currently in the process of being developed as open space which will have elements of natural green space within them.

#### Gedling Colliery

A section of this site has been designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Gedling Colliery is awaiting funding to develop into a country park which will be classified as a Park and Garden. However it is important to note the area designated as a SINC is not the land identified to be used as a country park.

#### Newstead Colliery

Through £500,000 of lottery funding through the village SOS scheme this area has now been converted and is working towards country park status. This has been classified under Park and Gardens typology. The majority of this site is within Gedling, however some is in the Ashfield District.

#### Calverton Colliery

Since the previous recreational open space assessment areas of the colliery have been restored to Forest Enterprise specifications. There is mixture of woodland and heathland in open countryside with informal public access.

### **Setting a Quantity Standard**

Public consultation initially suggests the current provision level of 4.86 ha per 1,000 population is about right. 90% of responders to the public consultation felt there was enough natural green spaces in the borough.

**RECOMMENDED QUANTITY  
STANDARD**  
4.86 ha per 1,000 population

Gedling Borough Councils Five Year Lands Supply Report 2011 states that it does not have a supply of land for housing for the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. It recommends the development of 436 dwellings per year however is unable to meet this and has set out the estimated housing supply for this period. Over the five years this is 1136 in the Principle Urban Area and 275 dwellings in the Non Principle Urban Area of the borough. This equates to 55 dwellings in Non PUA and 227.2 dwellings per year in PUA.

Based on an average dwelling occupation of 2 people per household this is a total population increase of 2822, Based on an average dwelling occupation of 2 people per household this is a total population increase of 2822. This is 2272 residents in the urban areas and 550 in the rural areas of the borough.

If no additional natural green spaces are provided this will reduce the ha per 1000 to 4.75. Based on the housing requirement for Gedling to maintain the current level of open space with a primary purpose of natural green space an additional 12.5 ha of land will need to be allocated.

#### **6.4 Quality**

There are no definitive national or local quality standards although the Countryside Agency state that such land should be managed to conserve or enhance its rich landscape, bio-diversity, heritage and local customs.

Table 6.2: The public perception of the quality of natural and semi natural green space

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
37%	44%	16%	2%	1%

Public consultation results revealed the overall quality rating of natural and semi natural greenspace from those who responded was good. The table above shows

44% of responders felt the standard was good with the majority of others feeling the quality was either very good or average. 81% of responders felt the standard was good or better.

When comparing responders feelings about the quality of natural and semi natural green space to other types of green space it was rated as the equal 2nd highest in quality just below parks and gardens. It is also useful to note user consultation revealed one of the highest demands for improvement to open spaces was to the care and protection of nature and the environment. This information implies there is a need as a minimum to maintain the currently level of natural green spaces per 1000 population and to improve the care and protection of nature and wildlife not just only in natural green spaces but in those open spaces which have other primary purposes.

Public consultation provided individual comments in relation to the quality of natural green spaces in the borough. These were not always areas which were used primarily as a natural green space. Dog fouling has been raised as a significant problem throughout green spaces with natural green spaces included in this. There were also a few comments made regarding a fear of crime in woodland areas and that natural green space within Burntstump park has been neglected and not managed. Further investigations will need to take place to identify the scale of the issues.

There has been recognition of improvement in natural green space in Gedling mainly through improvement to Netherfield Lagoons. The recent establishment of a country park in Newstead is also thought to have had a positive impact on the residents of Newstead Village in terms of increasing provision of natural green space.

The suggested quality standard for natural and semi-natural open space needs to take into account the aspirations of the public and also the Countryside Agency's quality standard of well-managed conservation land encompassing bio-diversity and environmental education.

**LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD**  
“A publicly accessible, spacious, clean and litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourage wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Sites should be maintained to protect nature conservation interest with interpretative signage and safety features where appropriate.”

Due to the abundance of this type of open space in the rural areas, it is of paramount

importance that all such open space is governed by a local quality vision. As such the standard is based on public aspirations and provides an all-encompassing standard for this important typology of open space.

The quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing natural and semi-natural open space to achieve in terms of enhancement. Consideration should be taken to conduct site assessments based on quality on all natural and semi natural green spaces in the borough ensuring they take into account public and user perceptions of the space. This will allow for benchmarking to take place between sites and enable improvement to be prioritised.

## **6.5 Accessibility**

It is also important to consider residents accessibility thresholds to natural and semi-natural green space. Although national quantity standards are not being met, local expectations and the location of significant natural green spaces will provide more information as to if the local demand is being met.

Natural England “Nature Nearby” Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance 2010 has a clear focus on the accessibility of natural green space therefore applying provision standard in this way needs to be considered when establishing if the currently level of natural green space meets local needs.

Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) provides a set of benchmarks for ensuring access to places near to where people live.

These standards recommend that people living in towns and cities should have:


- an accessible natural greenspace 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 (16 minutes walk)
- one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home
- one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home

Accessibility standards should also be set based on local residents expectations.

The graph below identifies the response given in the survey of local people in 2010 identifying how they normally travel to access natural green space.

Figure 6.2 Mode of transport used to access natural green space





56% of respondents across the district indicated that the preferred mode of transport to natural sites was on foot. 75% of those who use this type of open space at least once a week will walk compared to a 50% split for those who use this type of open space about once per month or less. Those who use natural green spaces at least once a week are more likely to live closer, 67% of those who use the open space more than once per week live less than 10 minutes away compared to 54% who use the open space less than once per month. This data concludes a walking accessibility standard should be set. Improving this standard is more likely to lead to an increase in residents visiting natural green spaces more often. This would only be achievable through the change of use of other green spaces to a natural or semi-natural green spaces or taking into account natural or semi natural green space in future housing developments.

Across the borough, the 75% of respondents believes a reasonable travel time is 16 minutes and therefore is the standard set. The recommendation is in line with the majority of other local authority standards for travelling distance to a Natural or Semi Natural green space. A 16 minute walk equates to about 1400m along roads and paths or 560 metres straight line distance from each site. Straight line distance has been calculated by applying a 40% reduction from 1400m.

**RECOMMENDED  
ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD  
16 minute walk**

## 6.6 Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

Figure 6.3: Map of Natural and Semi Natural Green Space in Gedling with 16 minutes walking catchment



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

The map above shows the buffer areas or threshold for the recommended 16 minute walk to designed SINC's and LNR. The buffer zones of the SINC's are shown in green and the buffer zones of the LNR are shown in purple. The maps shows there is good provision of SINC's in the rural conurbations of the borough and a good provision of LNR in the south of the borough. In addition to the SINC's and LNR there are other open spaces which are considered to have valuable natural or semi natural green space. These open spaces have a primary purpose under other typologies and therefore are not shown on the map but are taken into account when identifying areas of deficiency. In addition the Hobbucks has a primary typology of a natural green space and is not plotted due to it not being designated as a SINC or a LNR. It is located to the north of the Killisick Ward. The threshold areas on the map take into account public consultation results and do not consider how the size of the natural green space will affect the distance residents are willing to travel.

Natural England accessibility standards state it is important the size of the natural green space is taken into account when setting accessibility standards. Natural England implies any space under 2 ha is not significant enough to attract visitors from a reasonable distance and a site over 20ha will hold a catchment area of 2000 metres. Gedling has four areas with sites larger than 20 hectares, Netherfield Lagoons, Longdale Plantation in the Calverton Ward, Linby quarry and Bestwood Village which has a variety of natural green space. It is important to noted there are other sites within Gedling over 20 hectares not classified as a natural or semi-natural green space which do hold elements of this and therefore must be considered. This includes Bestwood Country Park, Burtstump and Newstead Abbey. There are also other green spaces with natural and semi natural green space elements located outside of the boundaries of the borough whose catchment area will reach to Gedling residents these include Colwick Park, Woodthorpe Park and Colwick Woods.

Figure 6.4: Map of Natural and Semi Natural Green Space in Gedling over 20ha with a 2000 metre catchment.





Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Using National England guidelines the 2000 metre catchment has been applied to the areas of Gedling which have a site over 20ha. The map also includes the proposed country park development in the Gedling ward. As stated earlier 90% of the respondents to the household survey implied the amount of natural and semi-natural open space in Gedling was sufficient. This opinion was endorsed when setting the minimum standards for provision. However it is evident that when taking both maps into consideration there are large areas where there is no provision of natural and semi-natural green space. In the

rural areas this includes north of Ravenshead and the north of Calverton. This conclusion is supported by literal responses in the public consultation where Ravenshead was considered to have lack of Natural and Semi-natural green spaces. This is hampered by Newstead Abbey not being freely accessible due to visitors having to pay.

In the urban areas the main deficiencies are in central wards of the borough. This is true even when taking into account the proposed Gedling Country Park development and natural green space within the city boundaries.

Particular wards in the urban conurbation with a deficiency include Bonington, Daybrook, Woodthorpe, Mapperly Plains, St Mary's Ward, Carlton and Carlton Hill wards. Arnot Hill Park is located in the Kingwell ward and therefore will provide elements of natural green space within it and although the maps indicate that Killisick ward is lacking natural or semi-natural green space the Hobbucks is located in this ward and therefore the deficiency is not as high.

When taking out any space under 2 ha due to it being not significant enough to attract visitors and also taking into account the larger catchment of sites over 20ha there was not any significant difference in deficiency areas.

In order for the quantity deficiencies in the urban areas to be addressed natural and semi-natural green space will need to be created in the urban conurbations mentioned above. Due to limited green space opportunities are expected to be limited. Earlier findings report the care and protection of the environment in parks and gardens could be improved. Therefore it is recommended an analysis is undertaken in the urban deficiency areas to assess whether other types of open space can fulfil the natural and semi-natural function or whether new provision is required in certain areas providing there is space available.

In addition to the natural and semi-natural greenspaces there are significant areas of the countryside that offset locational deficiencies in natural and semi-natural open space sites. These lie outside and between the urban settlements of the district. These areas provide the residents of Gedling with additional visual, recreational and landscape benefits. There is a good network of public rights of way throughout the rural areas, and a range of circular walks that are promoted by the Council.

## **6.7 Recommendations**

- Protect the current level of provision of natural and semi-natural sites across both rural and urban areas of Gedling Borough including those which are SINCS or LNRs
- Ensure new provision of natural and semi-natural sites is located in Gedling East and Carlton wards as a matter of priority. This could be through the

enhancement of space with other primary purposes and development of the Gedling Colliery site which could also be considered as a site for LNR status.

- To conduct a quality audit of semi natural and natural green space in the borough.
- Consult with Natural England on potential sites for LNR status and consider LNR status for Midland Wood (Whimsy Park) and the Gedling Colliery site



## 7. Amenity Green Space

### 7.1 Definition

This type of open space is most commonly found in housing areas. It includes informal recreation spaces and greenspaces in and around housing, with the primary purpose of providing opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancing the appearance of residential or other areas.

Public consultation results identified amenity green space as the second most important type of open space by respondents with 89% using them in the last six months.



Figure 7.1: An area of amenity green space at Church Lane

### 7.2 Quantity

The total amount of amenity green space audited was 59 hectares (ha). The Office of National Statistics predicts the population in Gedling Borough has increased to 112,735 in 2009, this equates to a current provision level of 0.52ha per 1,000 population.

The average size of an amenity green space site in the district is 0.47ha. There is a total of 38 hectares of amenity green space for the urban areas equating to 0.40ha per 1,000 population urban conurbations. In the rural conurbation of the borough there is a total of 21 hectares equating to 0.90ha per 1,000 residents.

Although this initially indicates a disproportionate amount of amenity green space being in the rural areas of the borough consideration needs to be taken into account of the accessibility of the sites before decision are made as to a over or under

provision of this typology in specific area. Other local authorities have also stated that any site under 0.2 ha is not large enough to hold a recreational value.

The only national standard for the level of informal open space provided is 0.5 hectares per 1000 population. This is based on the current U.K average of all applicable local authorities' provision standards as highlighted in the Government's 'Rethinking Open Space Report' (2001).

Overall public opinion suggests that the majority of residents are content with the amount of amenity green space, consultation revealed amenity green space was very much valued by the residents and preservation important. Although overall the public felt there was enough green spaces, there were comments of a lack of amenity green space in specific areas of the borough. There was also a concern from one member of public that amenity green space was not being considered as a part of new housing developments.

Particular areas noted in consultation for a lack of amenity green space was Ravenshead and Newstead. Since the consultation has taken place the new housing development in Ravenshead will include amenity green space. There is also considered to be a high amount of other green spaces in Newstead in comparison to other areas of the borough particularly due to the establishment of Newstead Country Park.

Many comments about amenity greenspace have actually been about quality rather than quantity. There can sometimes be a feeling of deficiency due to the quality of existing provision rather than the actual quantity of a functional open space near to housed areas. It is recommended consideration of the future provision of amenity green space is taken on a site by site basis taking into account other types of green space in the area. Consequently the standard proposed for both the rural and urban areas is in line with the actual current provision and with demand. Therefore it is suggested an overall standard of 0.52ha per 1,000 population is applied.

RECOMMENDED QUALITY STANDARD  0.52 ha per 1,000 population
--

Gedling Borough Councils Five Year Land Supply Report 2011 states that it does not have a supply of land for housing for the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. It recommends the development of 436 dwellings per year however is unable to meet this and has set out the estimated housing supply for this period. Over the five years this is 1136 in the Principle Urban Area and 275 dwellings in the



Non Principle Urban Area of the borough. This equates to 55 dwellings in Non PUA and 227.2 dwellings per year in PUA.

Based on an average dwelling occupation of 2 people per household this is a total population increase of 2822. This is 2272 residents in the urban areas and 550 in the rural areas of the borough. In order to maintain the quantity standard 1 ha of land needs to be allocated for amenity green space in the next 5 years.

### **7.3 Quality**

There are no national or local quality standards for amenity greenspace. The overall quality of amenity greenspace across the district through public consultation are considered to be good with 68% stating the standard was good or better.

A suggested quality standard for amenity greenspace should include elements of the findings from consultation ensuring the public's aspirations are met. Dog fouling and littering was considered a major issue across the whole of the borough. There were also requests for more edible planting in public spaces. From the public consultation, the highest rated aspirations for those regularly using amenity greenspace most frequently were clean and litter free.

The majority of amenity greenspace sites generally provide structural and landscaping benefits, social inclusion and health benefits and amenity benefits. It is therefore important they are located so they are a focal amenity for the local community. The quality standard guides the vision for any new provision and acts as a benchmark for existing amenity greenspace to achieve in terms of enhancement.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>QUALITY STANDARD</b></p> <p>“A clean and well maintained greenspace site with well kept grass and varied vegetation, and large enough to accommodate informal play. Sites should have appropriate ancillary facilities (benches, litter bins) and landscaping in the right places providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment.”</p>
--

It is recommended further studies are undertaken to establish a measurable quality standard for amenity green space which will allow for comparison of standards over time.

### **7.4 Accessibility**

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

Local consultation results stated that 70% felt it appropriate to be able to walk to amenity green space. The 70% threshold for amenity greenspace was a 10 minute walktime which was felt as being acceptable by the responders. When doing this barriers such as rivers and major roads should be considered. This represents a distance of approximately 800 metres or 480 metres as a straight line distance. This also needs to be treated with caution as people may have mistaken another form of greenspace as local amenity space (despite being given a description). The standard also need to take into account the fact that open spaces serve catchment areas that varies according to the size and nature of the site.

The strategy recognises that amenity greenspace is the local spaces that are designed for children to play informally close to home as such the strategy recommends that people should have access to amenity greenspace taking under 8 minutes to walk to this equates to within 600m of where they live. This walk should be accessible and safe.

<p>RECOMMENDED ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD 8 minute walk 643 metres(m) or 386 m straight line distance</p>
---


It is important to recognise that where there may be accessibility deficiencies these may be addressed by local sites such as parks and gardens or natural and semi natural green spaces that may serve the same function as amenity green space in providing formal space for people near to where they live.

### **7.5 Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas and quantity deficiencies**

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

From a quantitative perspective the district has a significant supply of amenity greenspace in general terms.

Figure 7.2: Map of Amenity Green space over 0.2ha in the north of the borough with an 8 minute walk catchment area.




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 7.2 shows the audited amenity green space in the north of the borough. It shows deficiency in two main areas of Bestwood Village and Ravenshead Village. When considering deficiency in amenity green space it is important to consider other typologies. The provision in Ravenshead covers the north east of the village. This was considered a deficiency area in other typologies such as outdoor sports provision and natural/semi natural green space. Although not complete yet there are also plans for amenity green space on the new housing estate next to Ravenshead Leisure Centre. It is recommended the area north west of the village is prioritised for amenity green space. Bestwood Village has an abundance of other typologies within a 8 minute walk that can fulfil the requirements of an amenity green space. This includes outdoor sports provision and Bestwood Country Park.



Figure 7.3: Map of Amenity Green space over 0.2ha in the south of the borough with an 8 minute walk catchment area.



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 7.3 shows the audited amenity green space in the south of the borough. At first glance it shows a number of areas with a deficiency of amenity green space. However in most cases where these deficiencies are highlighted on the map there are parks and gardens or outdoor sports pitches located in these areas.

For instance Kingswell ward has Arnot Hill Park located within it and the deficiency in the Valley ward is where Richard Herrod playing field is located. The Bonington ward is another ward which has a small area without amenity green space located just north of the cemetery. Close to this area is agricultural land with informal areas for walking but a lack of informal areas for play.

The A60 is a catchment area barrier for any green space on the opposite site of the road of the cemetery.

Taking other types of green spaces into account the areas in the south of the borough which are considered to have a deficiency are:

- the south west of Porchester Ward
- the northern corner of St James ward

## **7.6 Summary, conclusions and recommendations**

Amenity green spaces can be large useful areas of land but also can be small pieces of land within housing estates that may be too small to have any significant recreational value. However there is an aesthetic value of small amenity green space sites within housing areas.

The overall quantity of amenity greenspace across the district is considered to be good.

The accessibility maps clearly show some areas of the district lack this type of open space. It is these areas where the Council should prioritise new provision provided there is the land available to do so.

### **Recommendations**

- Protect and enhance all amenity green space in the district if it is considered to hold recreational value (over 0.2ha) and where there is a limited amount of other green space within the local area.
- Ensure all new developments located in areas without amenity green space allow for the establishment of such a space, except where residents are close by to an appropriate park and garden site and there is excess of provision in that area.
- When amenity green space is provided ensure they are located as a focal amenity for the local community.
- Establish a measurable quality standard for amenity green space which will allow for comparison of standards over time and more accurately identify recreational value for each site.

## 8. Play Provision for Children and Young People

### 8.1 Definition

Children's needs are diverse including places for physically active play and quiet games, places which encourage social contact and places which allow them to be mobile whether on foot or by bicycle. Play will take place at various open spaces, including recreation areas, nature reserves, and common land. However as per PPG17 this typology focuses on play which takes place in equipped play areas, ball courts, skateboard areas and teenage shelters with a primary purpose to provide opportunities for play and social interaction involving children and young people.

The PPG states that local authorities should audit existing facilities, the use made of them, access in terms of location and the opportunities for new open space and facilities. Both quantitative and qualitative elements of open space, sports and recreational facilities should be considered within the audits.

It also states local authorities should use the information from their audits and assessments of needs and opportunities to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities in their areas'. The standards will be set in the following areas.

- Quantitative elements (how much new provision may be needed);
- A qualitative component (against which to measure the need for enhancement of existing facilities);
- Accessibility (including distance thresholds).

Using the standards and taking into account local demand will inform the planning process and help redress 'quantitative and qualitative deficiencies' in provision.



Figure 8.1: Jackie Bells Children's Play Facility, Netherfield

This section will assess the current demand for and the supply of children's play areas and will provide a:

- reasoned conclusion about the adequacy of the existing provision to meet current and future demand
- local standard for the quality of children's play facilities
- local standard for provision of children's play area and other open space based on provision per head of population
- framework for planning policies to protect existing facilities and facilitate the provision of new and improved spaces including the use of Section 106 and Community infrastructure Levy agreements to secure developer contributions

## **8.2 Strategic context and consultation**

Under the Children's Act, Local Authorities have a responsibility to provide appropriate provision for children and young people, to support their development, and deliver on the identified key outcomes of the Act. This includes addressing community safety needs, by providing safe and secure facilities for children and young people.

There are numerous benefits deriving from play as defined in Best Play (2000) and the Charter for Children's Play (2007).

Providing places for children and young people to play will:

- promote children's development, learning, creativity, independence, self esteem, knowledge and understanding
- keep children healthy and active and active children become active adults
- foster social inclusion and help children understand the people and places in their lives and also to learn about their environment and develop their sense of community involvement.
- provide children with opportunities to enjoy freedom and exercise choice and control over their actions
- offer children opportunities for testing boundaries and exploring risk
- help reduce the involvement of children and young people in anti social behaviour and plays a part in social cohesion

The latest statistical information through the Gedling Now report highlights childhood obesity as improving at year 6 but still requiring attention. The provision of play facilities provide physical activity opportunities which will help reduce obesity in children.

Public consultation revealed play areas were the third most visited type of open space with 58% visiting such a space at least once in 6 months. 50% of children who responded to the children’s survey stated they use their play area once a week or more.

### **National Playing Fields Association - The Six Acre Standard**

In order to appropriately assess children’s play areas it is important to categorise the facilities based on their main characteristics.

Children’s play areas in Gedling have been sub-divided into categories in line with the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) play area categories. The NPFA is known as Fields in Trust.

The NPFA (Fields in Trust) provides guidance in relation to quantity, quality and accessibility and categorises them as described below, this will be referred to in more detail later in this report.

Local Area for Play (LAP).

Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP).

Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP).

Table 8.1: The main characteristics of LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs

	<b>Local Area for Play</b>	<b>Locally Equipped Area for Play</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play</b>
Age group	Up to 6 years.	4-8years.	Older children.
Walking time from home	1 minute.	5 minutes.	10 minutes.
Location	Adjacent to a well used pathway, overlooked by houses and on a flat site that is well drained.	Adjacent to a well used pathway and on a flat site that is well drained.	Adjacent to a well used pathway and on a flat site that is well drained.
Minimum activity zone	100m <sup>2</sup> .	400m <sup>2</sup> .	1,000m <sup>2</sup> divided into 2 parts; at least 465m <sup>2</sup> of hard surface area and equipped play space area.
No. and type of play equipment	Demonstrative play features to enable children to identify space as their own domain.	At least 5 types of play equipment where at least 2 are individual items rather than part of a combination. Impact absorbing surface beneath and around play equipment.	At least 8 types of play equipment to allow developmental play amongst younger children and moderate/adventurous play for older children.



Buffer zone	5m depth including planting.	10m depth including planting and other physical features.	30m depth including planting and other physical features.
Fencing	600mm high fencing and barrier to limit speed of child entering or leaving the facility.	1m high fencing with two pedestrian gates & barriers to limit speed of child entering/leaving the facility.	1m high fencing with two pedestrian gates & barriers to limit speed of child entering/leaving the facility.
Furniture	Seating.	Seating and a litter bin.	Seating and litter bins at each access point. Secure bicycle parking facilities.
Signs and notices	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children.	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children, and name and tel. no. of facility manager.	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children, and name and tel. no. of facility manager.

Both the LEAP and NEAP categories have been subdivided into three categories taking into account the minimum size of equipped play area and the minimum number of play units. As a consequence the radial straight-line distance is also increased accordingly.

To take account of the combined LEAP/NEAP category highlighted in the NPFA's Six Acre Standard the report includes a final play area category called Settlement Equipped Play Area (SEAP) which includes a multi-use games area, skateboard/BMX park and youth shelter.

The previous playing pitch strategy included a Destination Equipment Area Play (DEAP) category. This is very similar to a SEAP however considered to have facilities which will attract visitors from across the entire borough. No play areas in the current strategy are considered to be to a DEAP.

Table 8.2: Gedling Borough Council play area categories

Play area type	Min. size equipped play area	Min. no. of play units	Radial straight-line distance for play area
LAP	100m <sup>2</sup>	Less than 5 types of play unit	80m
LEAP(1)	400m <sup>2</sup>	5 types of play unit	240m
LEAP(2)	600m <sup>2</sup>	6 types of play unit	360m

LEAP(3)	800m <sup>2</sup>	7 types of play unit	480m
NEAP(1)	1,000m <sup>2</sup>	8 types of play unit	600m
NEAP(2)	1,200m <sup>2</sup>	9 types of play unit	750m
NEAP(3)	1,400m <sup>2</sup>	10 types of play unit	900m
SEAP	1,600m <sup>2</sup>	11 types of play unit	+1,000m

Legend: LAP – Local Area for Play, LEAP – Locally Equipped Area for Play, NEAP – Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play and SEAP – Settlement Equipped Area for Play.

Similar to the previous children’s play area strategy this study takes into account additional facilities that could be located near to play areas that would further extend its catchment zone.

This takes into account the local context of the play area such as whether it stands alone, is located on a recreation ground or on an area with formal sport and recreation facilities. In the case of the latter two, the catchment zone of the play area increases by 10% if it is located on a recreation ground and by 20% if it is located on an area with formal sport and recreation facilities. The rationale for this is that it is assumed that people will travel greater distances to sites that have a greater variety of facilities.

#### Minimum acceptable size standards

With regards to the minimum size standards there are national standards for LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs, these are:

- LAPs – a minimum size area of 100 square metres
- LEAPs – a minimum size area of 400 square metres
- NEAPs – a minimum size area of 1000 square metres.

#### Site area multipliers

For planning purposes there is a need to determine site area multipliers to determine the area of space required for development of play areas. The national standards for this are:

- LAPs – activity zone 100sq m plus a 5m buffer zone on all residential sides. Site area multiplier – 4.0 if a residential area on all sides
- LEAPs – activity zone 400sq m plus a 20m buffer zone on all residential sides. Site area multiplier – 9.0
- NEAPs – activity zone 1000sq m plus 125m buffer zone on all residential sides. Site area multiplier – 10.0

Consideration also needs to be taken as to the location of play areas in relation to residential housing. For examples it is recommended ball courts are located more than 40 metres from the nearest residential property.

### 8.3 Quantity

The table below shows a breakdown of play facilities in Gedling Borough and compares it to information provided in the previous Play Area Strategy in 2003. There are currently a total of 42 children’s play area sites within the Borough which is a slight reduction from 2003. This is due to the removal of a number of local areas of play due to poor location leading to low usage and high maintenance costs. This is been supplemented by an increase in facilities for older children in response to local demand.

Table 8.3: Comparison of the number of play areas from 2003 to 2011

	2003	2011
LAP	17	7
LEAP1	7	4
LEAP2	6	5
LEAP3	6	9
NEAP1	1	4
NEAP2	3	3
NEAP3	1	2
DEAP	1	0
SEAP	5	8
Total fixed play areas	46	42

The NPFA recommends a minimum standard for outdoor play space of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) for 1,000 people. Outdoor playing space is not the same as public open space, it is space that is safely accessible and available to the general public, and of a suitable size and nature, for sport, active recreation or children's play. It is a significant component, but not the only form of open space. The standard should be broken down into 1.6 hectares (4 acres) of outdoor sport space and 0.8 hectares (2 acres) of Children's playing space. This includes casual or informal playing space within housing areas.

There is currently 3.26 ha of equipped play area and 132.50 ha of casual play area (total of 135.77 ha) see table 8.4. This is an increase in the total area of equipped facilities from the previous strategy but a decrease in casual play areas. This is partially due to casual play areas changing use to become large equipped play areas.

Table 8.4: Hectare provision per 1,000 head of population

	<b>EPA</b>	<b>CPA</b>	<b>Total ha</b>	<b>Pop.</b>	<b>RP</b>	<b>APAS</b>	<b>D/S</b>	<b>T – D/S</b>
Bestwood Village	0.09	0.48	0.57	1,655	1.32	0.34	-0.46	-0.75
Bonington	0.04	0.62	0.66	6,863	5.49	0.10	-0.70	-4.83
Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph	0.16	8.98	9.14	3,555	2.84	2.57	1.77	6.30
Calverton	0.08	9.91	9.99	6,903	5.52	1.45	0.65	4.47
Carlton	0.14	1.38	1.52	6,911	5.53	0.22	-0.58	-4.01
Carlton Hill	0.09	4.26	4.35	7,204	5.76	0.60	-0.20	-1.41
Daybrook	0.70	2.24	2.94	4,997	4.00	0.59	-0.21	-1.06
Gedling	0.18	5.40	5.58	6,758	5.41	0.83	0.03	0.17
Killisick	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,709	2.17	0.00	-0.80	-2.17
Kingswell	0.23	15.10	15.33	4,699	3.76	3.26	2.46	11.57
Lambley	0.23	0.02	0.24	1,977	1.58	0.12	-0.68	-1.34
Mapperley Plains	0.10	3.12	3.22	6,885	5.51	0.47	-0.33	-2.29
Netherfield and Colwick	0.34	7.20	7.54	7,042	5.63	1.07	0.27	1.90
Newstead	0.31	63.13	63.44	2,103	1.68	30.16	29.36	61.75
Phoenix	0.00	0.36	0.36	4,962	3.97	0.07	-0.73	-3.61
Porchester	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,806	5.44	0.00	-0.80	-5.44
Ravenshead	0.28	0.09	0.37	5,636	4.51	0.07	-0.73	-4.14
St James	0.04	0.42	0.46	4,476	3.58	0.10	-0.70	-3.12
St Marys	0.04	3.16	3.20	6,801	5.44	0.47	-0.33	-2.24
Valley	0.12	2.00	2.12	4,001	3.20	0.53	-0.27	-1.08
Woodborough	0.02	1.74	1.75	1,852	1.48	0.94	0.14	0.27
Woodthorpe	0.10	2.90	3.00	6,992	5.59	0.43	-0.37	-2.59
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>132.50</b>	<b>135.77</b>	<b>111,787</b>	<b>89.43</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>46.34</b>

(Population data derived from census 2001)

*Legend*

EPA: Equipped Play Area

CPA: Casual Play Area

RP: Required Provision - based on 0.8hectare standard

APAS: Available Play Area space - hectare per 1000

D/S: Deficiency/Surplus - hectares per 1000

T-D/S: Total Deficiency/Surplus (hectares)

The table 8.4 provides a standard of play provision per 1,000 population in comparison to the NPFA prescribed standard of 0.8 ha per 1,000. It shows a wide variation across the Borough, with the greatest deficiency in the wards of Porchester, Carlton, Bonington, Ravenshead and Phoenix. Although this information provides an overview of provision in the borough, it does not take into account the number of young people living in each ward.

Table 8.5: Hectare provision per 1,000 head of population aged under 16

	<b>EPA</b>	<b>CPA</b>	<b>Total ha</b>	<b>U16 Pop.</b>	<b>RP</b>	<b>APAS</b>	<b>D/S</b>	<b>T – D/S</b>
Bestwood Village	0.09	0.48	0.57	282	0.23	2.02	1.22	0.34
Bonington	0.04	0.62	0.66	1,408	1.13	0.47	-0.33	-0.47
Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph	0.16	8.98	9.14	542	0.43	16.86	16.06	8.71
Calverton	0.08	9.91	9.99	1,354	1.08	7.38	6.58	8.91
Carlton	0.14	1.38	1.52	1,246	1.00	1.22	0.42	0.52
Carlton Hill	0.09	4.26	4.35	1,450	1.16	3.00	2.20	3.19
Daybrook	0.70	2.24	2.94	998	0.80	2.94	2.14	2.14
Gedling	0.18	5.40	5.58	1,276	1.02	4.37	3.57	4.56
Killisick	0.00	0.00	0.00	709	0.57	0.00	-0.80	-0.57
Kingswell	0.23	15.10	15.33	839	0.67	18.27	17.47	14.66
Lambley	0.23	0.02	0.24	287	0.23	0.84	0.04	0.01
Mapperley Plains	0.10	3.12	3.22	1,212	0.97	2.65	1.85	2.25
Netherfield and Colwick	0.34	7.20	7.54	1,507	1.21	5.00	4.20	6.33
Newstead	0.31	63.13	63.44	432	0.35	146.84	146.04	63.09
Phoenix	0.00	0.36	0.36	1,059	0.85	0.34	-0.46	-0.49
Porchester	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,225	0.98	0.00	-0.80	-0.98
Ravenshead	0.28	0.09	0.37	878	0.70	0.42	-0.38	-0.33
St James	0.04	0.42	0.46	778	0.62	0.59	-0.21	-0.16

St Marys	0.04	3.16	3.20	1,361	1.09	2.35	1.55	2.11
Valley	0.12	2.00	2.12	804	0.64	2.64	1.84	1.48
Woodborough	0.02	1.74	1.75	291	0.23	6.01	5.21	1.52
Woodthorpe	0.10	2.90	3.00	1,314	1.05	2.29	1.49	1.95
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>132.50</b>	<b>135.77</b>	<b>21,252</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>6.39</b>	<b>5.59</b>	<b>118.77</b>

(Population data derived from census 2001)

The table above provides a standard of play provision per 1,000 population aged 16 or under in comparison to the NPFA prescribed standard of 0.8 ha per 1,000.

The table shows a wide variation across the Borough, with the greatest deficiency in the wards of Porchester, Phoenix, Killisick, St James and Bonington and Ravenhead.

There is a significant difference in the amount of casual play areas within different wards across the borough. Newstead has a substantial amount of land available for casual play space which significantly affects the overall view of the amount of casual play space across the borough. Other wards have minimum areas available for casual play, Killisick has none. Although this information gives an insight into the level of provision across the borough by ward the analysis does not take into account the catchment areas of each play area and their ability to cross over ward boundaries. Therefore a deficiency of play provision in a ward may be met by a play area in a neighbouring ward which has a larger catchment area than just the ward it is located in.

This data is therefore more useful to rural communities where play area catchments are less likely to cross ward boundaries. In addition the information above indicates some wards have adequate provision. However certain areas of the ward could have poor access due to barriers such as main roads or the play area is located in the corner of a ward with the catchment of the play area not reaching across the whole of the ward.

### **Quantity Consultation**

Consultation in regard to children's play provision was conducted as a part of the public consultation and children and young people's consultation. Both consultation methods revealed a lack of provision in the Mapperley Plains area with one response suggesting a small play area on the opposite of Chase Farm entrance. In order to reduce this deficiency a play facility will be provided on the housing development at the top of Arnold Lane, using 106 funds.

There was also demand for maintaining the number of play areas in Calverton particularly Seely Park. The feedback from the consultation suggested the biggest lack of provision is for older children. It revealed older children were using equipment designed for young children alongside other comments requesting more provision for older children. Skate parks and Multi use games areas would be more appropriate

for children of this age. Comments were also made about the lack of equipment on specific sites for younger children.

Consultation suggests there should be an increase in the current provision. However the NPFA assessment shows the current provision is above the national standard of 0.8 ha per 1,000 at 1.21 ha per 1,000.

Out of the 0.8 ha NPFA standard it is recommended that 0.25 ha be equipped. The current level of equipped by areas is only 0.029 ha per 1000. Out of this 1.81 ha is targeted at younger children (0.001618 ha per 1000 population) and 1.45 ha for older children (0.001298 ha per 1000 population). This reflects consultation results which show a demand of facilities for younger and particularly older children.

For planning purposes the recommended local standards are shown below.

<p><b>RECOMMENDED QUANTITY STANDARD</b></p> <p>1.21 hectares per 1,000 population</p> <p><b>Fixed play provision</b></p> <p><u>Younger Children</u> 0.001618 hectares per 1,000 population</p> <p><u>Older Children</u> 0.001298 hectares per 1,000 population</p>
--

As referred to earlier in relation to accessibility there are a number of factors that affect resident’s perceptions of the quantity of play provision in their local area. These include road networks, type of play area and also the quality of a local facility may be poor and therefore residents will feel there is not enough play provision.

#### 8.4 Quality

Public consultation results revealed the overall quality rating of Childrens play areas from those who responded was good.

The table below shows 66% of responders felt the standard was good or better. Although this is considered as very positive when comparing responder’s feelings about the quality of Childrens provision to other typologies it was rated as the 6th highest in quality.

Table 8.6: Public consultation ratings of children’s play areas

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
-----------	------	---------	------	-----------

23%	43%	26%	6%	1%
-----	-----	-----	----	----

Public consultation provided strong feelings about children’s fixed play areas in the borough.

There were a number of comments acknowledging the improvements that had been made to children’s play facilities over the last 5 years. Specific play facilities praised were Jackie Bells, Lambley, Burton Joyce, Arnot Hill Park and Queens Bower. However there were a number of areas around the borough that were considered to have outdated equipment and were in need of updating.

These play areas included, Burton Road, Breckhill and Lambley Lane and all those in Calverton Village. Since the consultation has taken place Burton Road play area has been redeveloped.

There were also comments in regard to a lack of equipment for particular age groups at specific parks. Users felt that Church Lane was lacking in under 5 equipment, Lambley Lane from 7 to 12 years, Breckhill and Arnovale Road for older children.

There were comments in relation to a lack of facilities for children with disabilities. Consultation with Officers revealed most of these are due to the age of the equipment however the new park opposite Arnbrook School and Muirfield Road Play Areas were reported to have limited wheelchair access to the play ground facility.

Litter and dog fouling in particular was perceived as an issue across the borough. Cavendish Road, Muirfield Road and Willow Park were perceived to be an issue. Residents also requested signs are made clear on Jackie Bells to prevent dogs being walked on the site.

Public consultation and the Childrens consultation reported issues in relation to antisocial behaviour. This included vandalism taking place on play areas and gangs regularly gathering at Church Lane, Burton Road and Arno Vale Road.

Figure 8.2: What stops children from feeling safe.






Figure 8.2 shows the results from children's consultation. Children have reported strangers and gangs as being the most significant issues which prevent children from feeling safe.

In addition to what stops children feeling safe the children were asked a number of other questions in relation to the quality of play. The key findings are:

- 70% of children love playing in Big play areas in comparison to 27% playing in small play areas
- the most popular activities that children enjoy are going to the cinema (70%), playing computer games (61%) and riding their bike (57%)
- 40% chose playing in the playground or play area as one of their most popular activities

Figure 8.3: Children were asked what their perfect play space would have



Children were asked what improvements could be made to play in their area. Lots of play equipment and places to make dens were the most popular responses. Qualitative responses revealed a demand for new facilities which increases the element of risk through adventure play and natural play such as woodland and rocks.

### Quality Audits

The PPG17 states that 'Good quality assessments and audits, leading to clear strategies supported by effective planning policies, will provide vital tools for resolving potential conflicts that arise between different uses and users of open space, sports and recreational facilities'.

All fixed play areas in Gedling were audited taking account of Play England, Field in Trust and ROSPA guidelines to establish local standards for the quality of play area. This has enabled a quality score to be produced allowing for Childrens play areas to be benchmarked across the borough.

The quality inspections consider the following:

- Balancing
- Jumping
- Age separation
- Climbing
- Rotating
- Access for people with Disabilities
- Crawling
- Sliding
- Gliding
- Rocking
- Group Swinging
- Agility
- Single Swinging
- Seating
- Ball Play
- Presentation of the equipment
- Access to the site
- Feeling of Safety
- Fitness

The suggested quality standard for provision for children and young people should reflect the national LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs standards and include elements of public's aspirations.

Play area assessments took place and scores given taking into account NPFA categories. For example smaller play areas generally offer lower play value due to size, but they may still meet the public aspirations due to them catering for younger children. The template for the quality assessment can be found in Appendix 8a. Information describing each play area including its play area category, catchment area and quality score can be found in appendix 9b.

The scores can be rated on a value line that reflects the overall quality of the site. The value line used is similar to neighbouring authorities. The value line is outlined below with each site listed below it.

Table 8.6: Value line analysis of play area quality

16%-30%	31%-45%	46%-60%	61%-75%	76% +
Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
Stoke Lane Play Area	Albert Avenue/Carlton Hill	Killisick Teen Area	Church Lane	Valeside Gardens
Valley Road	Off Longdale Lane	Coppice Farm School	Queens Bower	Jackie Bells
	Park Road Recreation Ground (William Lee)	Arnot Hill Park teen facilities	Stanhope	
	Abbey Gates	Ravenshead ball court	Colwick Recreation	
	Arno Vale Playing Field	Adbolton Avenue Play Area	King George V, Standhill Road	
	Lambley Lane Recreation Ground South	Lambley Lane RG, rear of School Catfoot Lane		
	Lambley Lane Recreation Ground North	Haddon Road Play Area		
	Salop Street Play Area	Edison Way Play Area		
	King George V Recreation Ground, Arnold	Thackerays Lane Recreation Ground		

	James Seely Playing Fields, Main Street	Newstead Teen area and MUGA		
	Church Road/Chestnut Grove Play Area	Village Hall, Linby Lane		
	The Square	Arnot Hill Park Teenage Area		
	Muirfield Road	Killisick Recreation Ground Play Area		
	Oakdale Drive	Burton Road Recreation Ground		
	Newstead School Play Area	Colwick Recreation Ground teen facilities'		
	Lingwood Lane Playing Field			
	Cavendish Play Space			

Overall, the quality scores for play areas were considered as average with a medium score of 52%. Urban areas of the borough were considered to have better quality fixed play areas than the rural area. The medium score in urban areas was 55% whilst in rural areas it was 43%. No play areas in the rural area were considered to have good quality fixed play provision. It is recommended to focus on facilities that have a score of below 40%. This will improve the overall average score. It is also interesting to note that SEAPS provided better quality play provision than other categories, this is mainly due to work undertaken in recent years to enhance existing facilities by providing facilities for teenagers.

**QUALITY STANDARD**

“A site providing a suitable mix of well maintained formal equipment with an enriched play environment to encourage informal play and recreation by children and young people. A safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes ancillary facilities such as 'hang out shelters' and seating where appropriate.”

To strive for all play sites to have a quality assessment score of 40% or above.

## 8.5 Accessibility

The NPFA states that despite an ageing population, children’s needs for playing space are significant and an assessment of that need differs to that of the older population for land for sport and recreation. The children’s playing space standard is

based upon the provision of a range of facilities within a neighbourhood, which is intended to meet a variety of needs for children from different age groups.

The Six Acre Standard states an important factor is the time it takes to reach the play area. There are other important factors such as the features, quality and security of the playing space (which influences its perceived value) and use.

Table 8.7: Walking time to distance standards

Walking time		
Time	Straight line distance	Pedestrian route
1 mins.	60m	100m
5 mins.	240m	600m
15 mins.	600m	1,000m

Note: estimates of walking time were established through trials with children of different age ranging from 4 to 14, and by using a representative sample of pedestrian routes.

The NPFA advises that where possible actual walking distance should be used to ascertain the catchment area of a particular play area. This is supported by the public consultation where 75% of responders preferred to walk to play facilities. Straight line distances do not necessarily take account of barriers that may impinge or hinder access to the play area such as major transport infrastructure (e.g. roads and railways, watercourses and private land). The NPFA recommends the provision of different types of play area which have been designed to meet the specific needs of each age group of children. This standards have been show in table 8.1 and 8.2 earlier in this section.

As well as using national standards PPG17 states it is important to take into account local expectations therefore public consultation has been used to identify an accessibility standard. Public consultation revealed it takes less than 5 minutes for 44% of responders to travel to a play area and 82% stated it takes less than 10 minutes to travel to their nearest play area. Almost all responders were satisfied with the distance they have to travel to these play areas.

Taking into account NPFA guidance a recommended standard of 5 minutes travelling time has been set for facilities targeted at younger children (LAPs and LEAPS). A second standard has also been set for older children's facilities where a 15 minute walk time has been introduced. However this may not always be possible due to the density of housing in certain areas of the borough lacking green space.




**RECOMMENDED  
ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**  
All residents are to have access to a site with provision for children  
and young people within the distances stated below

5 minute walk (400m) except  
15 minute walk for NEAPs (1.2km)

**8.6 Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas**


Figure 8.4: Overview of the catchment area of fixed play areas in Gedling using NPFA recommended catchment



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.



Figure 8.5: A map of the central urban conurbation of the borough showing the catchment area of the of fixed play areas in Gedling using NPFA recommended catchment.




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

NPFA standards have been applied to each play area and the results shown in the maps above. The majority of the borough is within a catchment area of a play facility, however the maps show an area in the centre of the urban conurbation without sufficient play areas. The map above to the right shows the centre of the urban conurbation. Specific areas without a play facility include Porchester ward, Mapperley Plains ward near Mapperley top and the boundary line of valley, Carlton Hill and Carlton ward. A play area is due to be installed at the top of Arnold Lane on Mapperley plains which will reduce the deficiency in this area



Figure 8.6: Catchment areas of Neaps and Seap fixed play areas in Gedling using NPFA recommended catchment




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 8.6 shows the NPFA catchment areas of the fixed play areas in Gedling taking into account the equipment designed for older children. There are a number of areas of deficiency including Porchester Ward, Bestwood Village, the northern side of Bonington ward, the north of Ravenshead ward, Stoke Bardolph, Lambley and Woodborough ward.

It is recommended in future where land is available Neaps and Seaps are located in areas with the highest deficiency (those areas with a neap or Seap furthest away) and areas with the highest need. For example this could be an area which has as high proportion of young people and antisocial behaviour issues.



Figure 8.7: All fixed play areas in the borough with local catchment areas using the locally set standard.



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 8.7 above combines all the fixed play area in Gedling and applies the local catchment area to each play area.

The results show broadly similar findings to when NPFA catchment areas are applied.

However more areas are shown as having a deficiency due to catchment areas being smaller.

When prioritising areas for improving fixed play provision it is recommended to consider both the NPFA standards and the local catchment standards. In doing this



the areas with the highest deficiency are Porchester ward, Mapperley Plains ward near Mapperley top and the boundary line of valley, Carlton Hill and Carlton ward.

Figure 8.8: Laps and Leaps (children aged 4- 8 years) play areas using the 5 minute public consultation catchment area accessibility standard




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.



Figure 8.8 identifies a vast amount of areas in the borough without a LAP or LEAP within a 5 minute walk catchment area. It would be unrealistic for all residents to be within a 5 minutes walk of a LAP or LEAP, it is therefore recommended to ensure an even distribution across the borough. This data also conflicts with public consultation which states play areas are within a closer distance for the majority of residents, the reasons for this are due to residents classifying other green spaces as informal play spaces such as sports pitches.

Figure 8.9: NEAPs and SEAPs (children aged 8 onwards) years) play areas using the 15 minute public consultation catchment area accessibility standard



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 8.9 shows the distribution of Neaps and SEAPs across the borough. Based on the current situation it would be once again unrealistic for all residents to have a NEAP or SEAP within the designated catchment area. It is recommended future NEAPs and SEAPs are located in areas with the highest deficiency (those areas with a NEAP or SEAP furthest away) and areas with the highest need. For example this could be an area which has as a high proportion of young people and antisocial behaviour issues.

## **8.6 Summary, conclusions and recommendations**

The majority of provision for children and young people are of a satisfactory quality and easily accessible, and are therefore enjoyed by the residents of Gedling. It should be a priority of the Council, working in partnership with Parish Councils as appropriate; to improve the quality of all appropriately located sites falling below a quality score of 40%.

It may be possible where appropriate to place play areas within amenity green space sites and park and garden sites where there are currently no such facilities. This would help achieve the local standard for this typology but would decrease the other typologies hectare; this is not considered to be a significant issue however assessing each site individually to ensure provision for other typologies is maintained is recommended.

The context of an increase in provision of play areas would depend on local needs i.e. teenage or young children provision. The use of natural features rather than traditional equipped play facilities should also be considered as a pro-active measure to combat the existing vandalism and mis-use problems. It will also meet the aspirations of young people in the borough.

### **Recommendations**

- Protect and enhance (where required) all children and young persons sites in the district.
- Develop an action plan to upgrade all sites appropriately located sites falling below a 40% quality score. In doing so take into account the viability of improving experience through landscape design and natural play.
- Investigate whether any amenity green space or park and garden sites in areas where there is a deficiency of play equipment already have elements of play in them, and establish if they could have a play area located on them. When doing this it is important to consider the deficiencies between different age groups.

- When identifying new play areas to apply NFPA minimum acceptable size requirements and site area multiplier to ensure the area of space required. To revise the play strategy using the findings from the Parks and Open Space strategy and to offer support to Parish Councils to help improve play provision in their area.
- Subject to land being available to seek resources for additional provision of play areas in the Mapperley Plains area near Mapperley top, the north side of Porchester ward and also around the border of Carlton Hill, Carlton and Valley ward.

## 9. Outdoor Sports Facilities

### 9.1 Definition

The assessment of sports facilities covers outdoor facilities as described in the PPG17 typology.

Outdoor sports facilities is a wide-ranging category of open space and includes natural surfaces, publicly and privately owned, which are used for sport and recreation. Examples include playing pitches, bowling greens and tennis courts.

Gedling Borough Council owns, maintains and provides sports pitches so that its partners, the Sports Clubs of Gedling, can provide regular sports opportunities for the people of Gedling. The Sports Clubs of Gedling provide 75% of the sport which takes place in Gedling.

It focuses on provision across Gedling that are dedicated to the promotion of outdoor sport and it is important to note that in terms of outdoor sport there are facilities within other typologies such as grass pitches in parks. Artificial surfaces are not included in this PPG17 audit.



Figure 9.1: Bowls Green at Arnot Hill park

### 9.2 Strategic context and consultation

The provision of formal outdoor sports facilities as part of sport and recreation services can have a positive impact across the social policy agenda, helping the local authority to achieve social inclusion, community development, community safety, lifelong learning, healthy living and sustainable development objectives.

Public consultation results identified that outdoor sports facilities are an important type of open space being the 4<sup>th</sup> most popular with 58% of responders using them



within the last 6 months and 22% stating they use them on a weekly or daily basis. However 39 % stated they never use them.

Gedling Borough is considered to have a strong structure of large clubs in comparison to neighbouring authorities. Some of these clubs activities take place on non Gedling Borough Council land. Gedling Borough Council currently have 29 Gedling based clubs using their outdoor facilities.

A survey was sent to all the sports clubs in the borough. 66% of responders felt they had sufficient facilities for the teams at the club. Those who did not feel there were sufficient facilities, identified a mixture of quantitative and qualitative deficiencies.

### 9.3 Quality

The quality of sports pitches has been assessed using the following methods:

- Public Consultation
- Sports Club Consultation
- User Consultation
- Playing Pitch Technical Assessments
- NPFA (Fields in Trust) non-technical quality assessment

#### Public Consultation

Table 9.1: The public perception of the quality of outdoor sports facilities

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
22%	45%	29%	4%	1%

Public consultation results revealed 45% of responders felt the standard was good with 67% of responders felt the standard was good or better. The public were asked to provide qualitative feedback on the quality of the sports pitches which highlighted litter and dog fouling as the main issues. Litter was reported to be an issue on Breckhill, Church Lane, Richard Herrod and Burton Road. Dog fouling was reported to be an issue on Richard Herrod and Breakhill. One suggestion was to ban the walking of dogs on sports pitches.

#### Sports Club Consultation

Sports clubs were asked to rate the quality of the facilities they use in terms of surface quality, car parking and changing facilities. The table below shows the overall rating across the borough. Appendix 9a shows how each club who returned the questionnaire rate the facilities they use.

Table 9.2: Sports Club consultation quality rating

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Average Quality Rating (1 poor, 10 excellent)</b>	<b>Average Quality rating GBC facilities only</b>
Playing Area	6.6	5.2
Changing Facilities	5.1	5.9
Car Parking	6.0	5.28

Overall the changing facilities were considered to require the most improvement out of the three areas.

However when only looking at Gedling Borough Council owned facilities the playing area and car parking were the areas which required the most improvement. When analysing the data in more detail the quality of each outdoor sports facility varied considerably. It is therefore important to identify areas for improvement on a site by site basis.

Table 9.3: Gedling Borough Council sport by sport facility quality analysis

	Playing Area	Changing Facilities	Car Parking
Football	6.3	7.3	6.03
Cricket	4.6	4	5
Bowls	4.6	5.5	4.5

Bowls – One of the main issues around playing areas for the bowls clubs was due to over watering of the rinks. The quality audit also highlighted limited car parking at Haywood Road which lowered the overall rating of car parking facilities.

Football – The quality of football pitches is considered better in comparison to other sports. However water logging is an issue at Burton Road and the playing surface at Lambley lane is considered very poor.

Cricket – Particular areas of concern for Cricket clubs included the standard of wicket at Lambley Lane and the changing facilities at Burntstump.

Newstead also have reported issues of vandalism and car parking due to the car park being across the road and out of site from the playing area.

The cricket nets at King George V, Arnold also need removing or repairing.

Consultation responses were received from clubs who play at the same site and their perceptions of the site varied considerably. For instance junior teams were less concerned over the quality of the changing rooms and more concerned over car parking. Adult teams required improved changing rooms but were less concerned about car parking. This information could be taken into account when planning pitch usage in the future.



## **Playing Pitch Technical Assessment**

In 2008 a technical appraisal was conducted by Sport and Landscape Development a sports consultancy, to determine the quality of the sports pitches owned by Gedling Borough Council. A summary of the results can be viewed in appendix 9b and a copy of the full report is available on request.

The sites considered to be in the best condition were:

- Burton Road Recreation
- Church Lane
- Colwick Recreation

The sites considered to require the most improvement were:

- Breckhill Recreation Ground
- King George V Recreation Ground, Arnold
- Thackerays Lane Recreation Ground

Officer consultation revealed the report is a good representation of the condition of the sites since the appraisal was completed. However it is important to note the appraisal was conducted in April near the end of the football season and is only a snap shot of the condition of the surfaces. King George V, Arnold is currently in a better condition mainly due to a reduction in the amount of matches played.

The appraisal commented on grass cover, length of grass, slope and evenness. It did not assess on the appropriateness of the size of the playing area, adequateness of safety margins and evidence of issues such as dog fouling and litter. An overview of the findings can be referred to in Appendix 9b.

## **National Playing Field Association (NPFA) Quality Assessment**

The NPFA suggests quality standards for outdoor sports facilities. These include criteria such as gradients, orientation, ancillary accommodation, planting and community safety. Quality Inspections have been undertaken via a site visit and completion of a non-technical visual inspection. The pitch visit proforma provided as part of the Sport England Electronic Toolkit has been used. This will allow comparison with pitch quality findings in future years with other local authorities who have completed local assessments.

The key qualitative aspects of provision include:

- pitch slope
- presence of ancillary facilities
- pitch evenness
- presence of common problems
- grass cover
- proximity to transport network
- condition of equipment

- presence of training facilities

When conducting the NPFA assessment, other methods of assessment were considered. For example, grass cover quality was informed by the technical playing pitch assessment and the rating of ancillary facilities was influenced by sports club consultation.

Auditing outdoor sports facilities is often difficult especially sites that are leased or in private ownership. Bowling greens for example are often screened and protected by fencing and hedging to prevent vandalism and protect the green. In total 27 sites have been assessed 23 of these were Gedling owned sites.

Audits were completed on all of Gedling Borough Council owned facilities and therefore it was decided to focus the analysis on Gedling Borough owned facilities. The NPFA assessment was restricted due to limited information on the number of match cancellations and number of matches being played per season on licensed pitches. It is recommended this information is gathered in the future to ensure a robust NPFA assessment.

In order to compare and categorise the quality of facilities a value line has been created which is similar to that of neighbouring authorities.

Table 9.4: the value line set for outdoor sports facilities.


0 – 15%	16%-30%	31%-45%	46%-60%	61%-75%	76% +
Very Poor	Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent

Table 9.5: Comparison of quality between Gedling Borough Council owned pitches and changing facilities.

Quality Range Outdoor Sport Area	Quality Range	Variance	Average Quality	Quality Rating
<b>GBC owned pitches</b>	47 – 81%	34%	<b>68%</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>GBC Changing facilities</b>	15 – 93%	78%	<b>55%</b>	<b>Average</b>


Table 9.5 shows the range in the quality of Gedling Borough Council owned changing facilities is much greater than the pitches and the pitch compares favourably in comparison to the changing facilities.

Figure 9.2: A summary graph of the quality of Gedling Borough Council owned outdoor pitches.



Of the sites that were audited 82% rated as good or better in terms of quality and 18% rated as average. The main issues with the pitches were in relation to dog fouling and limited grass cover with overuse being the main reason given. The sites considered to have the best quality pitch were King George V Arnold and the Bowls Green at Arnot Hill Park. King George usage has been low over the last 12 months due to Arnold Town Football moving sites.

Figure 9.3: A summer graph of the quality of Gedling Borough Council owned changing facilities.



The majority of outdoor sports pitches assessed had changing facilities. The only Gedling Borough Council site identified without changing facilities was Church Lane. The closest changing facilities to Church Lane are located at Redhill Leisure Centre

a 5 minutes' walk from the playing pitch. Five changing facilities were not able to be audited due to access difficulties.

The quality of changing facilities varied considerably. Bestwood was rated as very poor and Netherfield boys and girls pavilion was rated as excellent. The Changing facilities at Carlton Forum Leisure Centre were also rated as excellent however consideration of the distance players need to walk to use the changing facilities at Carlton Forum was not included in the assessment criteria.

The overall rating of Gedling Borough Council owned changing facilities is considered as average. It is recommended to focus on upgrading those facilities which are below average to at least an average standard. This will improve the overall quality of changing facilities by a minimum of 9%.

Table: 9.6: Summary of the average pitch and changing room quality depending on ownership.

	Average pitch quality	Average changing quality
Gedling Borough Council	68%	55%
Non Gedling Borough Council sites	75%	80%

Although a limited number of non Gedling Borough Council owned facilities were audited initial findings indicate the pitch quality and changing facilities are significantly better quality than on Gedling Borough Council owned sites with the average pitch quality of Gedling Borough Council owned facilities being 7% lower than that of pitches not owned by Gedling Borough Council.

Changing facilities were 25% better in quality in non Gedling Borough Council changing facilities. It is strongly recommended that more non Gedling Borough Council sites are assessed before any conclusions are made. A summary of all the sites assessed can be referred to in appendix 9c. Conducting a full level playing field analysis would also allow a comparison of the number of games played and the impact this has on the quality of the pitches.

There are a number of clubs who are keen for improvements to facilities, particularly those whose focus is around junior development. These clubs book facilities on a weekly basis through Gedling Borough Council or have a Licence agreement term of 5 years.

Although licence agreements provide more ownership to the club the current length limits most clubs from taking enough ownership to allow them to gain planning permission and source external funding to improve the facilities. Netherfield Boys Girls Football club is an example within Gedling where a 21 year licence has enabled the building of a new pavilion on the Richard Herrod playing pitches.

### **Summary of findings from quality assessments**

- Poor playing surface are due to drainage, water logging and unevenness.

- The standard of changing facilities varies considerably. One does not have any and others have inadequate number of changing rooms relative to pitch numbers.
- The public perception of the quality of facilities can be impacted by the quantity of facilities on a site. However officer quality assessments also highlight issues with the quality of specific facilities.
- No or limited off-street parking provision at venues not meeting the customers needs. This not only affects the users of the playing pitches but could be a highway safety issue with vehicles parking on-street.
- Dog fouling was considered an area for concern across a number of parks.

### **Setting the Quality Standard**

The quality standard has been set based on expectations of existing users and through quality assessments of each site.

#### **Setting the quality standard**

All outdoor sports facilities should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter, with level, well drained and good quality surfaces. Sites should provide good quality ancillary facilities, where appropriate, including changing accommodation, toilets, car parking and facilities for a range of age groups. The maintenance and management of sites should continue to ensure safety and effective usage. Gedling Borough Council owned facilities should aim to meet the outdoor facility standard score of 66% and Changing Room percentage of 59% or above

This quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing facilities to achieve in terms of enhancement. It reflects Gedling's Cultural Strategy "Leisure our Culture" produced in 2005 which highlighted the importance of making improvements to the sports pitches.

The study above has prioritised existing sites that require investment to ensure all sites meet the quality standard set.

Using commuted sums, and other funding the Council must aim to reduce the number and proportion of inadequate facilities identified in this study. This could be done by either investing in existing facilities or providing new facilities of the appropriate standard. In the longer term, improvements to facility provision should increase use and help meet demand for pitches within the Borough.

GBC should review the adequacy of provision as part of a rolling programme every three to five years to identify inadequacies in provision and revise priorities as applicable.

If the quality of a site becomes too poor it is often misinterpreted as a quantity deficiency rather than a quality issue. This is most appropriate in regards to the quality of changing facilities at some sites making their usage restrictive and must be considered as a part of the recommended playing pitch assessment

## **9.5 Quantity of outdoor sports provision**

Public consultation results initially indicate there are enough outdoor sports facilities in the borough. 99% of responders felt the time it takes to travel to their nearest outdoor sports facility is acceptable.

There are 93 outdoor sports facilities in Gedling which cover a range of sports. These include facilities managed by schools and the voluntary sector as well as by the Council.

The audit of outdoor sports facilities identified 212 hectares of land allocated to outdoor provision, this does not include all weather pitches and golf courses.

Out of the 93 sites 34 do not allow any form of community access even through bookings, most of these are school sites. Sport club consultation revealed many schools that do allow community access have hire charges that are too expensive preventing the clubs using some of the community accessible facilities. Since consultation was completed schools within Gedling have changed to academy status. This has enabled more flexibility and has resulted in a recent increase in the use of school facility by community sports clubs. Only the sites owned by Gedling Borough Council or the Parish Council allow access for informal use.

The total amount of hectares takes into account the whole of the recreation sites which in many cases incorporates facilities within other typologies such as fixed children's play provision.

Therefore in accordance to NFPA standards the data has been adjusted to take into account the footprint of the outdoor facility, when taking this into account the hectares available for community outdoor sports use is 163 hectares, which equates to 1.44 hectares per 1000 population, this is below the national standard of 1.6 hectares per 1000 population.

### **Assessment of local demand**

Prospect 4 Sport, consultants, was commissioned to undertake an audit of sports demand in Gedling Borough.

This audit took into account consultation completed as a part of the parks and open spaces strategy and also included consultation with, Clubs at the Gedling Sports Club Forum, Cricket Forum, the Gedling School Sport Partnership and National Governing Bodies, a summary of the report is described below.

## **Bowls**

Number of pitches / courts - 15 greens, 1 indoor (6 rinks)

Number of clubs- 10

### Summary

The demand for bowls remains constant but there is no evidence of any foreseeable growth in demand. It would appear that current demand can be satisfied using the existing facilities.

## **Cricket**

Number of pitches / courts -9 Gedling Borough Council owned sites, 7 Voluntary provision and 11 educational sites.

Number of clubs - 14

Number of teams - 83

The demand for adult cricket is steady; however the growth in junior cricket is very substantial, doubling in the last 2 years.

The clubs within Gedling aim to continue to grow their junior sections in particular females and are likely to be limited in their growth by lack of suitably trained coaches and pitches.

The lack of indoor nets is also a significant barrier to development.

Papplewick and Linby Cricket Club require additional 1 pitch to be used every week at weekends and extra nights in the evening for junior matches.

## **Football**

Number of pitches / courts: - 136 total: 72 senior, 64 junior, Plus 5 Synthetic Turf Pitches

Number of clubs- 103

Number of teams - 61 senior, 79 junior, 3 women

The demand for football remains strong, 28% of clubs report limits to their growth due to lack of suitable facilities.

Table 9.7: Future requirement of football clubs

Name of club	Future requirements
Calverton Minors Welfare FC	All weather pitch to enable mini soccer matches throughout the winter
Carlton Town JFC	3 main soccer pitches and 1 mini soccer pitch. More car parking spaces
Netherfield Albion FC	3 adult pitches
Netherfield Boys, girls and seniors	2 -3 pitches and all weather pitch (full size)
Netherfield Colts FC	2 pitches

Consultation with the sports club revealed a strong evidence of need for additional facilities in relation to quantity. Demand initially indicates additional full size pitches are required. However junior matches are also played on this pitch, when they could be played on smaller pitches. Consultation has also revealed the need for clubs to be based on one site to play home matches.

Four of the football teams identified in the table above are located on the southern side of Gedling, therefore consideration needs to be taken to identify suitable facilities for these clubs. With just over a third of current provision accounted for by school playing fields, increasing access to schools' facilities through community use, if required, may help to address under provision.

It is recommended to assess more closely the requirement for each club as quality can affect a clubs desire for additional facilities. For example Gedling Southbank FC are searching for better facilities due to the inadequate facilities on Lambley Lane. It may be that these facilities can be catered for by better matching of clubs with existing facilities or improving existing facilities.

A full level playing field analysis will take into account the impact of quality of facilities on future pitch requirements.

The Nottinghamshire Football Association are very keen to see an expansion in the numbers of Third Generation pitches. Third Generation or 3G pitches as they are known, represent a new development in synthetic turf. The pitch itself looks like natural grass with similar playing characteristics, non-abrasive and can be used with rubber studs. It can be used for rugby training but importantly it can be used for competitive football matches and meets with FA and UEFA standards.

Development of 3G pitches could reduce the pressure on the turf pitches and provide capacity for further expansion of the clubs within the borough, Calverton Minors Welfare have expressed interest in pursuing this route.

The Football Association are also proposing a restructure of junior football. Gedling Borough Council needs to consider the impact of this on the football pitch facility provision, which is likely to involve the remarking of pitches across the borough.

## **Hockey**

Number of pitches / courts - 2

Number of clubs -2

Number of teams – 7

Nottingham Hockey Club has a very small junior section in comparison to other clubs of similar size, and there is great potential to use the good facilities at Goosedale to generate demand for junior hockey, a lack of suitable facilities currently stop any developmental work taking place within the borough with Nottingham Hockey club at Goosedale being the only suitable facility.

Redhill Ladies Hockey Club in previous years were based at Redhill Leisure Centre, however the size and quality of the surface means it is no longer suitable. Although



participation in Hockey is not reported to be on the increase improving the provision for Hockey is likely to attract teams back to the borough.

### **Golf**

Number of golf courses- 3 sites (3 x 18 hole courses)

Number of clubs -3

A golf provision audit was conducted 2002, Information in relation to facility provision within the audit is still current.

In addition to the sites in Gedling borough there are a number of golf courses within the catchment area of Gedling residents, these are listed below:

- Bullwell Forest Golf Course
- Coxmoor Golf Club
- Leen Valley golf course
- Notts Golf Club - Hollinwell
- Nottingham golf Centre Bulwell Hall
- Oakmere Golf course
- Radcliffe on Trent Golf centre
- Rufford Park Golf Course
- Sherwood Forest Golf Course

The supply of golf courses in Gedling and within a drivable distance from Gedling Borough is good. The demand for golf is in slight decline and there is no evidence of any foreseeable growth in this demand. It would appear that demand can be met from the existing facilities.

### **Netball**

Number of pitches / courts Indoor: Outdoor: 23 on primary school sites; 10 on secondary school sites

Number of clubs -1

It appears that there are enough facilities available within Gedling for the local demand, The only source of growth for the sport within the borough stems from participation at school, and possibly. Return to netball initiatives focus on 'real basics' where the aim is to encourage new ladies to come back to netball by giving them the chance to learn the current rules, develop their skills and techniques and take part in friendly games However if the clubs are to survive they will require significant help from the NGB and sports development.

### **Rugby Union**

Number of pitches / courts 13 adult, 1 junior

Number of clubs- 2

Number of teams - 25

The demand for adult rugby is in decline but there appears to be strong demand for junior rugby within Gedling.

The two rugby clubs within the borough own and manage their own facilities.

Mellish RFC appears to be able to manage successfully the increase junior demand. Paviers RFC are having to restrict training and matches due to pressure on the pitches, this will limit the growth of rugby within the borough. Paviers in the past have used facilities at Colonel Frank Seely School in Calverton, but found the changing facilities inadequate.

Paviers require two additional full size senior pitches in the right location and with appropriate facilities. It is recommended Gedling Borough Council consult with the club to identify future facilities or to explore sources of funding for a 3G pitch.

### **Tennis**

Number of pitches / courts- Schools – 33 courts, Tennis clubs – 15 courts, Leisure centre – 3 courts

Number of clubs - 8

The demand for tennis remains strong but there is no evidence of any foreseeable growth in demand. Further research would be necessary to confirm that peak time demand can be met satisfactorily using the current facilities.

### **Setting quantity provision standards**

In setting local standards for outdoor sports facilities there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, neighbouring authority provision, site assessments and consultation on local needs.

Whilst local provision has been assessed against national standards and needs have been identified by consultation with sports clubs, at the time of this report up-to-date information was not available on current usage levels for each site and its impact on quality of playing surfaces and ancillary facilities.

Therefore more robust evidence is needed to accurately identify level of demand; It is recommended a review of the playing pitch strategy is completed taking into account Sport England Level Playing Field Model.

In summary, the quantity standard for this typology has been set for broad planning needs only and does not identify specific future requirements of outdoor sports provision.

The NPFA 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 4 acres (ie 1.62 per 1,000 population) for outdoor sport - includes pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens, tennis courts training areas and croquet lawns.

Sports club consultation indicates demand for additional pitches in Football, Cricket and Rugby totalling 10.5 ha. Without more detailed work done on the Playing Pitch Strategy it is difficult to assess if additional land is required or if existing land and

provision can be used more efficiently. This strategy will take into account the impact of usage and quality of provision on demand.

Gedling Borough Councils Five Year Lands Supply Report 2011 states that it does not have a supply of land for housing for the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. It recommends the development of 436 dwellings per year however is unable to meet this and has set out the estimated housing supply for this period. Over the five years this is 1136 in the Principle Urban Area and 275 dwellings in the Non Principle Urban Area of the borough. This equates to 55 dwellings in Non PUA and 227.2 dwellings per year in PUA.

Based on an average dwelling occupation of 2 people per household this is a total population increase of 2822. This is 2272 residents in the urban areas and 550 in the rural areas of the borough. Taking this into account if no additional outdoor provision is provided in five years time provision per 1000 population will drop to 1.41ha.

Although the quantity standards give a holistic perspective of general needs, the wide range and size of outdoor sports pitches from football pitches to bowling greens are not taken into account.

Recommended quantity standard for  
broad planning purposes:

1.44 ha per 1000 population

## 9.6 Accessibility


There are no definitive national or local accessibility standards

Although the primary use of outdoor sports provision is to play competitive sport, outdoor sports facilities are also used for multiple purposes such as dog walking and recreational sport. 22% of the respondents to the public consultation identified using outdoor sports facilities on a weekly basis or more.

The graph below shows the main modes of travel to outdoor sports facilities identified by local people during the public consultation.

The graph shows driving and walking are the two main preferred modes of travel, with driving having a slightly higher number of respondents. The use of public transport has a very limited response as does cycling, this may be a result of cost, connectivity or poor access.

Figure 9.4: Preferred method of transport



Public consultation revealed the 75th percentile response for those who regularly use an outdoor sports facility was 16 minutes of travel time.

73% of those who did not regularly visit an outdoor sports facility said there was one within 10 minutes of their home, this indicates public perceptions of how far a sports facility is away from their home are closer than it actually is.

Out of those people who use sports facilities most frequently, 53% travel by car and 41% walk. Public consultation responders reported it takes less than 10 minutes for the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile to walk to their nearest outdoor sports facility and less than 15 minutes when driving.

This information identifies a threshold of 10 minutes for how far people are willing to walk and once this threshold is met the preferred method of travel is to drive. 99% of responders reported that outdoor sports facilities were within an acceptable travelling distance from their home, therefore using a car to access outdoor sports facilities is considered as acceptable.

A recommended walk time catchment of 10 minutes and 15 minutes drive be set as the local standard. It is recommended further user consultation is conducted each year to build on the data already provided to identify accessibility standards.

Public Consultation Recommended  
Accessibility Standard

10 minute walk  
15 minutes drive

The public consultation has taken the views of all residents who use this type of open space for the multiple purposes. However it is also important to consider those who use outdoor sports facilities solely for its primary purpose.

Consultation has revealed it is important for Gedling Southbank FC and Paviers RC to be based on a single site for their matches. Those teams who have been required

to use facilities away from the home venue (other than for away matches) have experienced complaints from parents and players to the extent that in some instances parents were not willing to travel to play the games.

### **9.7 Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas**

It must be noted this PPG17 methodology does not take into account a number of other factors that affect the demand and latent demand of outdoor sports pitches.


The Playing Pitch Strategy provides more robust data on this, it is recommended the playing pitch studies are updated in the next couple of years and combined with the findings of this PPG17 audit to ensure their continued accuracy.

In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with unmet local needs, we apply only the accessibility standard for this typology. Quantity standards for this typology can be misleading as different outdoor sporting facilities have different hectarages, eg a golf course is incomparable with an outdoor bowling facilities in terms of size.

A 15 minute drive has been based on driving 24 miles per hour which equates to 6 miles or 3.6 mile straight line travelling distance applying a 40% reduction. Within a 15 minutes drive a person can travel across a large proportion of the borough therefore it is obvious without using a geographical information system there is an adequate supply of outdoor sport provision across the borough with no areas not within the 15 minutes catchment drive.




Figure 9.5: A ten minutes walking catchment distance from all outdoor sports provision audited in the north of the borough.



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.



Figure 9.6: A ten minutes walking catchment distance from all outdoor sports provision audited in the south of the borough



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 9.5 and 9.6 show the catchment area of 10 minutes for all the outdoor sports provision in the borough. This equates to a 495 metre straight line distance from each site.


The purple (darker) circles mainly outside of Gedling boundaries are the outdoor sports facilities with a ten minute buffer located in the city boundary.



The majority of residents have outdoor sports provision within a 10 minute catchment area with only a small part of Porcester, Ravenhead, Netherfield and Colwick ward and not covered.

This typology is the most accessible of all the typologies. However, as a vast number of the outdoor sports facilities are school sites, access can be difficult and on an informal basis. Many school sites do not allow community access at all, despite being the only outdoor sports facility in the catchment.


Figure 9.7: A ten minutes catchment distance from outdoor sports provision audited in the south of the borough excluding inaccessible facilities for clubs



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.



Figure 9.8: A ten minutes catchment distance from outdoor sports provision audited in the north of the borough excluding inaccessible facilities for clubs



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 9.7 and 9.8 shows when only accessible outdoor sports facilities are considered a number of other areas within Gedling Borough are not within the 10 minute walking catchment. The main areas include the north of Ravenhead ward, Mapperley Plains south, the south of Kingwell ward and most of Porcester ward. The only outdoor provision located outside of the borough boundaries that are within a walking distance from Gedling residents are those located at Woodthorpe Grange.

Consultation with sports clubs show for those who belong to a club travelling distance from home to the outdoor sports facility varies. Generally the acceptable travelling time is longer than those who responded to public consultation. It is recommended this is considered when identifying suitable locations for sports clubs in the future.

## **9.8 Summary, conclusions and recommendations**

Sports clubs report a static or steady increase in memberships across the borough. However different areas of the borough have different sports requiring pitches. Initial findings justify the case for seeking additional playing pitches from new development. Depending on the results of the playing pitch strategy this demand could be met through sourcing funding for a 3G sports facility and or improving the quality of existing outdoor sports provision.

The land use planning policies within the revised core strategy should seek to encourage greater participation in sport and recreation through an appropriate distribution of good quality facilities to meet the needs of the various communities within the Borough.

### **Recommendations**

- Protect existing sports and recreation facilities from redevelopment.
- Promote greater use of existing sport and recreation resources.
- Acquire new open space provision in association with new development.
- To improve the quality of changing facilities based on the results of the NPFA quality assessment.
- To conduct a review of the playing pitch strategy to provide more robust evidence to identify the full extent under provision and over use of pitches in the south of the borough. This will include closer monitoring of pitch cancellations and matches played on licensed pitches.
- Once demand for additional pitches has been confirmed it is recommended to engage the education sector to investigate further use of these facilities .
- To conduct a feasibility study on the provision of alternative playing surfaces taking into account future demand of football in the south of the borough and meet the demands Rugby in the north of the borough.
- To support Gedling Southbank who wish to find alternative provision which is better quality and can host all teams.
- Consider the impact of the FA plans to change the structure of junior football.

- Review the maintenance of bowls greens taking into consideration sports club consultation comments.
- It is recommended that the revised Local Plan/Core Strategy includes a general policy stating its aim for provision of sport and recreation. The statement made in the previous Recreation Open Space Assessment (2003) is still relevant. This policy is shown in Appendix 9d.

## 10. Allotments and Community Gardens

### 10.1 Definition

This includes all forms of allotments with a primary purpose to provide opportunities for people to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. This type of open space may also include urban farms.



Figure 10.1: Community allotment activity taking place at Stoke Lane

### 10.2 Strategic context and consultation

Like other open space types, allotments can provide a number of wider benefits to the community as well as the primary use of growing produce. These include:

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

Public consultation results identified that allotments were seen as the least important type of open space by respondents with 70% never using them. For residents who used allotments 78% thought there was more than enough publically accessible open space in the borough. Parish Councils, allotment associations and Gedling Borough Council Officers were also consulted which has informed this report.

#### **Community Allotments**

A trend which could influence demand is group plots. In Netherfield there is currently a successful Community plot and several schools sites also have school plots. These offer grown your own educational opportunities and can prepare people with the skills for when they acquire their own plot. These plots limit availability in plots for individuals and therefore it is recommended a policy is introduced to allow one

community allotment plot per Gedling Borough Council owned site. Over the last 5 years some sites managed by associations such as Stoke Lane site have created community allotments within their sites.

### 10.3 Current position and quantity of Allotments

Overall there are 14 allotment sites in the borough. This equates to approximately 870 allotment plots in Gedling with an estimated 28.4 hectares of land available. These sites are distributed throughout the urban and rural areas of the borough.

Table 10.1: Allotment site audit

Allotment Name and Area	Urban/ Rural	Site Area (ha)	Number of Plots
<b>Arnold &amp; Redhill</b>			
Gedling Grove	Urban	1.28	48
Howbeck Road	Urban	0.55	20
Killisick, Hawthorn Crescent	Urban	0.84	31
Leapool, Redhill	Urban	2.61	97
Rookery Gardens	Urban	0.17	9
<b>Burton Joyce</b>			
Criffin Road/ Trent Lane	Rural	4.3	89
<b>Calverton</b>			
Bonner Lane/ Paddock Close	Rural	2.5	60
Collyer Road	Rural	1.89	66
<b>Carlton</b>			
Robin Hood Cavendish Road/ Huckerbys Field	Urban	4.69	131
<b>Gedling</b>			
Stoke Lane & Victoria Allotments	Urban	5.43	209
<b>Netherfield</b>			
Chandos Street	Urban	1.76	57
<b>Newstead</b>			
Tilford	Rural	0.05	8
Bottom Gardens	Rural	2.25	15
<b>Woodborough</b>			
Foxwood Lane	Rural	1	30
<b>TOTAL</b>		28.4	870

Since the production of the Gedling Allotment Strategy in 2004 the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners have reviewed its recommended standards. They now recommend a national standard of 20 allotments per 1,000 households (ie 20 allotments per 2,000 people based on 2 people per house) or 1 allotment per 200 people. This equates to 0.125ha per 1,000 population based on an average recommended plot size of 250 metres squared.

## **Urban Areas**

Gedling Borough Council is responsible for eight allotment sites, occupying an area of 17.20 hectares (602 allotment slots), which are sited in Arnold, Carlton, Gedling and Netherfield. Of these sites those allotments at Leapool, Gedling Grove, Chandos Street, New Robin Hood and Stoke Lane are operated through self-managed associations.

The 2001 census recorded 89,761 people and 38,295 households living in these urban areas of the borough. Since 2001 1907 properties have been built in urban areas of the borough which totals the current provision at 40,202 households. This is equivalent to 15 allotments per 1000 households and below the national standard. Demand for allotment plots is outstripping supply with a waiting list at all of the sites. At the time of consultation the average waiting list at the allotment sites in the urban areas of the borough was 44 plots per site. This is despite public consultation showing there were a high number of people who had no view on the provision of allotments.

Gedling Borough Councils Five Year Lands Supply Report 2011 states that it does not have a supply of land for housing for the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. It recommends the development of 436 dwellings per year however is unable to meet this and has set out the estimated housing supply for this period. Over the five years this is 1136 in the Principle Urban Area and 275 dwellings in the Non Principle Urban Area of the borough. This equates to 55 dwellings in Non PUA and 227.2 dwellings per year in PUA.

Based on an average dwelling occupation of 2 people per household this is a total population increase of 2822. This is 2272 residents in the urban areas and 550 in the rural areas of the borough.

Based on this forecast and using the national standards for allotment provision 28 additional allotment plots will be required across the borough and 23 of these will be required to be within the catchment area of the Nottingham Principal Urban Area over the next 5 years. This is in addition to the current provision not meeting national standards.

## **Rural area**

Consultation with parish councils revealed a wide variety of usage of allotment sites throughout the District. The Parish Councils at Calverton, Burton Joyce, Newstead and Woodborough have their own allotments, which they manage independently by associations in the Parishes. Therefore out of the 6 rural wards there is no provision of allotments within the catchment areas of Ravenshead and Lambley, however Lambley Village is within the driving catchment area of Woodborough's Parish Councils allotment provision and provision within the urban



conurbation of the borough. Accessibility standards and catchment areas are referred to later in this report.

The 2001 census recorded 22,026 people and 9256 households living in rural areas of the borough. Since 2001 484 additional new properties have been built therefore totalling 9740 households in rural areas of the borough. There are 268 allotment plots in the rural areas. This is equivalent to 27 allotments plots per 1000 households which exceeds national standards. However consultation has revealed all sites in the rural areas of the borough are oversubscribed.

**Calverton Parish Council** previously were significantly oversubscribed but were able to use the former Lee Road Recreation Ground for new allotment space and there is now an estimated waiting list of 10 plots. 5 residents on the waiting list at Calverton do not live within the parish boundaries and the parish now only allow parish council residents to join it.

**Woodborough Parish Council** have a mixture of residents and non Woodborough residents on their waiting list and have now introduced a policy to only allow Woodborough residents to join. To also tackle the problem of oversubscribed plots the parish have also introduced a new policy to divide plots as they become available. The Parish Council currently have 30 plots covering a 1 Hectare site, dividing these plots could result in the size of plots not meeting the 250 sq metre per plot standard, but create 60 plots. Consultation with those who manage the sites indicate smaller plots would still meet the needs of the local community.

**Lambley Parish Council** does not have any provision for allotments but is located within the accessibility standard (acceptable driving travelling distance) of Woodborough Allotments and some allotment sites in the urban conurbation. Lambley Parish Council have reported demand for allotments and have requested support in identifying land.

**Burton Joyce Parish Council** have introduced a new policy to divide plots as they become available. The current average size of plots at Burton Joyce is 483 square metres. This is almost double the provision standard set therefore dividing the plots is feasible whilst still complying with the 250 sq metre per plot standard. The waiting list now stands at 37, of which 7 are residents of Burton Joyce.

**Newstead Parish Council** since the publication of the previous Allotment Strategy has acquired land at Bottom Gardens on a lease from Nottinghamshire County Council. This has created 15 additional allotment plots. Despite this there were still 5 potential plot holders on the waiting list at the time of consultation, all of whom live within the parish and meet the parish council policy of allocating plots to residents only.

**Ravenshead Parish Council** have received enquiries from the Ravenshead Garden Society requesting space for allotments however no suitable land has been identified and therefore there are no plans to provide any allotments in the near future.

**Bestwood Village Parish Council** does not have any provision for allotments.

For planning purposes the demand for plots in the rural areas of the borough excluding those who do not live within the parish is:

Table 10.2: Allotment demand in the Rural Parish owned sites

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Plot demand</b>
Calverton	5
Burton Joyce	7
Woodborough	0
Newstead	15
Ravenshead	Unknown (no sites)
Bestwood	Unknown (no sites)
Total	27

The average size of waiting list in the rural areas of the borough at the time of consultation was 7 plots.

### **Setting the standard and future need**

#### **Urban Areas**

The current level of provision of allotment plots in the urban conurbation is equivalent to 15 allotment plots per 1000 households. This is below the national standard of 20 allotment plots per 1000 households. Demand for allotment plots is currently outstripping supply with a waiting list at the sites local in the urban areas. Anecdotal evidence from those managing allotment sites has revealed that many residents are applying for plots on multiple sites; therefore the actual number of residents wanting a plot is likely to be lower than the total number on the waiting list. Due to this it is difficult at this stage to identify a local standard based on local demand. However it is clear the current level of provision is not meeting the current level of demand. Until the local demand for allotment plots is identified it is recommended that national standards is aspired to.

#### **Rural Areas**

The current level of allotment provision in the rural conurbations of the borough is 27 allotments plots per 1000 households. Parish Councils were able to provide data as to the area of residence of those who are on their waiting lists and therefore accurately inform on latent demand. Based on these waiting lists there is a demand for 27 plots. Using this information a recommended quantity standard can be set for rural areas. To meet the current level of demand for allotment plots the standard needs to be set at 30 allotment plots per 1000 households.

### **Recommended Quantity Standard**

#### **Urban Areas**

20 allotments plots per 1000 households

#### **Rural Areas**

30 Allotment plots per 1000 households

### **Meeting the Quantity Standard**

#### **Urban area**

Latest estimates show there are 40,202 households in the urban areas of Gedling therefore to meet the recommended quantity standard for this area there needs to be 804 plots. There are currently 606 plots in this area and therefore 202 plots are required or 5.05 hectares of land made available for additional plots.

Gedling Borough Councils Five Year Land Supply report (2011) predicts that 1136 dwellings from 2012-2017 in urban areas.

Based on this over the next 5 years 23 plots will also be required. When adding this to the current under provision there will be an overall future demand for 225 plots or 5.6 hectares of land. Before acquiring land for allotment provision research is required to accurately identify local demand based on the existing waiting lists. In addition to this reducing the size of allotment plots needs to be considered to meet some of this demand.

#### **Rural Area**

There is current demand for 27 additional allotment plots. Based on the predicted increase in population there will be a predicted demand for 5 additional allotment plots totalling 32 additional allotment plots required in the rural conurbation over the next 5 years. This is equivalent to 0.8 hectares of land. These plots will need to be located within a suitable accessibility catchment area of any future housing development.

The average size of allotments in the borough is 264 square metres which is slightly above the national standard. Due to many residents on the waiting list willing to take on smaller plots it is thought that demand can be met using the current supply of land available for allotment provision in most rural areas of the borough other than Newstead, which may require additional land to meet the current level of demand. It is currently not clear what the current level of demand for allotment plot in Bestwood Village and Ravenshead parishes.

Table 10.3: Urban/Rural analysis

Analysis Area	Total Site Area (ha)	Size of average size of plot (square metres)
Urban Areas	17.3	288

Rural Areas	8.85	318
-------------	------	-----

Table 10.4: Average plot size at each allotment site in Gedling borough

Allotment Name	Urban/Rural	Average size per plot (m2)
<b>Arnold &amp; Redhill</b>		
Gedling Grove	Urban	267
Howbeck Road	Urban	275
Killisick, Hawthorn Crescent	Urban	271
Leapool, Redhill	Urban	269
Rookery Gardens	Urban	189
<b>Netherfield</b>		
Chandos Street	Urban	309
<b>Carlton</b>		
Robin Hood Cavendish Road/ Huckerbys Field	Urban	358
<b>Gedling</b>		
Stoke Lane & Victoria Allotments	Urban	260
<b>Newstead</b>		
Tilford	Rural	63
Bottom Gardens		167
<b>Woodborough</b>		
Foxwood Lane	Rural	333
<b>Burton Joyce</b>		
Crifftin Road/ Trent Lane	Rural	483
<b>Calverton</b>		
Bonner Lane/ Paddock Close	Rural	227
Collyer Road	Rural	236

The table above shows the average plot size in urban areas is above national standards but below that of plots in rural areas of the borough. Within the urban areas all of the sites provide a similar average size plot apart from Rookery Gardens which is below national standards and Cavendish Road which is higher than national standards. None of the urban sites have an average plot size which is high enough over the national standard to allow for the splitting of plots without the size of plots

dropping below national standards. However if a policy is made to split plots Cavendish Road would be the preferred site for this to happen, due to its average plot size being significantly higher than the other sites in the urban areas. Quantity standards in the urban area cannot be met by splitting plots unless plot sizes are reduced significantly below national standards.

In the rural areas Burton Joyce and Woodborough Parish Council have already introduced a policy to split plots when they become available. Burton Joyce could have 172 plots on the site whilst still meeting national standards. This alone would allow the rural areas to meet the current level of demand, however Burton Joyce is outside of the catchment area of residents on the waiting lists at other rural sites (see figure 10.3 below). Woodborough currently have a lower average plot size which could lead to plots being provided which are below the recommended size and Newstead already have allotment plots below national standards.

Allotment associations currently feel residents on the waiting list are prepared to take on a plot which is less than the 250 square metre standard and there is evidence of number of exiting plots not being cultivated to their full potential.

### **10.5 Accessibility**

With regards to accessibility there is no definitive national or local standard for allotment open space.

The public consultation revealed 68% of regular users are within an average 10 minute driving travelling distance from their allotment site. In addition to this 76% of people who do not regularly visit an allotment site stated there was an allotment within ten minutes diving distance of their home. This indicates there is not any significant issue with the current location of sites.

The vast majority of plot holders either drive or walk to their sites with both methods being equally as popular. Therefore an accessibility standard has been set for both methods. For planning purposes priority should be given to other types of open space with a walking accessibility standard providing there is demand for that open space in the designated area.

Allotment providers reported that driving takes between 5- 10 minutes and walking between 10- 20 minutes.

<p>Recommended Accessibility Standard</p> <p>20 minute walk 10 minutes drive</p>
--

Allotments are one of the least used typologies and due to this there were a limited number of responses when residents were asked how far they travel to their allotment. However after consulting the managers of each allotment site and reviewing the accessibility standard set is similar to neighbouring authorities the accessibility standard is reasonable.


A 20 minute walk equates to about 1600m along roads and paths, which is approximately equivalent to an 860m straight line distance from each site (applying a reduction of 40%).

A 10 minute drive averaging 24 miles per hour equates to 4 miles or 2.4 miles straight line travelling distance (applying a reduction of 40%).

## 10.6 Applying accessibility standards

The Geographical information map below identifies the accessibility boundaries of each site based on the acceptable travelling distance by walking and driving.

Figure 10.2: Allotments and threshold areas in the North of Gedling Borough




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.



Figure 10.2 shows the catchment areas for the allotments located in the North of the Borough. The transparent purple area (larger circular areas) shows the driving catchment area and the light blue transparent circles (smaller) the walking catchment area. Deficiencies have been highlighted in the following areas:

- Residents who live in Ravenshead do not have an allotment site within an acceptable travelling distance.
- Despite showing Bestwood Village is within the driving catchment area of an allotment site due to the road network it is considered as being an area of deficiency
- Due to the location of the allotments in Woodborough the majority of residents in Woodborough do not have access to an allotment within the walking distance standard. However current usage indicates the majority are willing to drive.
- Residents in Lambley have accessibility issues in relation to the walking to allotments, however residents are within drivable accessibility standard of Woodborough Allotments and other sites within the urban areas of the borough such as Stoke Lane and Howbeck. Note: Only Woodborough residents have access to the plots at Woodborough due to Parish policy.
- Within the urban areas residents who live in the Bonington ward and on the west side of the Daybrook ward do not have an allotment within the walking distance standard, however are within a driving distance.

Figure 10.3: Allotments and threshold areas in the South of Gedling Borough



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 10.3 shows the catchment area for the allotments located in the South of the Borough. The transparent purple areas (larger) shows the driving accessibility standard and the light blue transparent circles (smaller areas) walking accessibility standard. When taking into account the driving accessibility standard any area in the south of the borough is accessible. However there are a number of areas in the south within wards that are not considered accessible by walking. This takes place most significantly in the following wards.


- Gedling ward
- Netherfield and Colwick ward.
- Porchester ward
- Woodthorpe ward
- Lambley ward

In addition to the above the location of the allotments in Burton Joyce means some areas of Burton Joyce are not within the 20 minute walking catchment area.



## Cross boundary analysis

Figure 10.4: Cross Boundary threshold analysis of allotment provision across Nottingham City and Gedling Borough Council boundaries.



The map above shows the boundary line between City and Gedling Borough Council. Nottingham City Council allotments have been plotted on the map and the Gedling Borough walking threshold has been applied.

Colwick Woods Allotments partially meets the deficiency in the Netherfield and Colwick wards. Woodthorpe Allotments also meets the walking deficiency in the west side of the Woodthorpe Ward.

The City Council managed sites prioritise plots based on being a city resident and current hold a waiting list of over 300.

When analysing the boundary between Ashfield District Council and Newark and Sherwood, the allotment plots located on Bestwood Road, Hucknall are within a driving catchment of Bestwood Village and allotments located off Wigwam Lane are within a driving catchment of Linby and Papplewick.

Allotments are also located on Dale Lane, Blidworth which are in driving distance of Ravenshead however these plots are only available to Blidworth residents.

### **Identifying geographical areas taking into account quantity deficiencies**

Deficiencies in allotment space have been identified throughout the borough by using the accessibility standards set, the majority of these deficiencies are based on allotments not being within the walking distance threshold. Public consultation revealed that accessibility to the current provision of allotment plots in the urban areas of the borough is considered as acceptable, this is despite a number of areas within Gedling which are not within the walking threshold of an allotment site. Taking this into account it can be concluded that driving to allotment sites is an acceptable option but having an allotment site within walking distance is preferred.

Due to the large catchment areas for drivers there is flexibility when identifying additional land for allotment provision particularly in the urban conurbation of the borough and therefore existing sites could be extended. This option will ensure the sites are managed through existing arrangements promoting efficiency. If this option is preferred extensions over two urban allotment sites is recommended, Leapool on the north side of the borough and Stoke Lane in the south. Investigations would need to take place as to if land can be made available. Alternatively if it is viable to identify a new site in the Mapperley Plains area, a location between Porchester and Woodthorpe ward would be preferred due to the lack of provision within the walking threshold. The need for additional allotments would be increased if there were any housing developments in this area.

Before allocating additional land for allotments it must be taken into account that allotments are demand-led open spaces; therefore there is no point in providing allotments in areas if there is no demand. It is important to accurately assess the local demand by merging the waiting lists and assessing the level of demand within areas of poor provision such as Ravenshead. It is also important to consider the long term trends in allotment demand.

### **10.6 Quality**

Allotments and community gardens have no definitive national or local quality standards for their provision.

Public consultation results revealed the overall quality rating of allotments was good.

The table below shows 38% of responders felt the standard was good with the majority of others feeling the quality was either very good or average. In terms of quality the public rated allotments 3<sup>rd</sup> best out of the 8 typologies.

Table 10.5: Public consultation rating of the quality of allotment provision

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
29%	38%	27%	3%	3%

Allotment providers were also asked how they would rate the quality of their allotments.

Table 10.6: Allotment providers rating of their provision

Leapool	Good
Stoke Lane	Good
Chandos	Excellent
Gedling Grove	Good
Howbeck Allotment site	Good
Killisick Allotment	Good
Rookery Gardens	Good
Robin Hood	Good
Trent Lane	Good
Newstead (x2)	Average
Calverton	Good
Woodborough	Good

At present all the sites in the borough are at a minimum of a good standard other than Newstead. Sites must continue to or aim to meet a good standard and be protected.

Table: 10.7: Allotment Facilities

Site name	Water	Toilets	Sheds	Fencing	recycling	access	skips	Car park	Plot watch
Leapool	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Stoke Lane	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Chandos	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Gedling Grove	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Howbeck Allotment site	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Killisick Allotment	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Rookery Gardens	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
New Robin Hood	YES	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No	YES	NO
Parish Managed									
Trent Lane	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Newstead	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
Calverton	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Woodborough	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Note: Sheds available include those provided by tenants

The facilities at each site vary and therefore improvements to the sites will be individual to each site. However all allotment sites must consider raised beds in order to improve accessibility for those in need of this facility. Representatives from the allotment associations felt best practice could be shared between sites.

Listed below are the main issues raised by those who manage the allotments in the urban conurbation and what the managers felt should be the priorities for future.

### **Main Issues**

- No Toilets (Chandos, Stoke Lane, Collyer Road)
- Vandalism (Chandos, Stoke Lane, Robin Hood, Collyer Road, Newstead)
- Availability of land
- Expectations of new allotment holders (high turnover)
- Poor Service from the council with regard to repairs (Chandos, Stoke Lane) and identifying more land
- Water supply (Trent Lane, Robin Hood, Newstead)
- Poor dissemination of good practice
- Voluntary nature of allotment committees

Note: Vandalism and lack of toilet facilities were the most common issues. At the time of writing this report there had been a number of break-ins to sheds on allotments sites across the borough.

### **Priorities for future**

- More Plots at Robin hood Allotments, Rockery Gardens, Howbeck, Killisick, Leapool, Newstead, Gedling Grove, Stoke Lane and Chandos Street allotment sites.
- Improved onsite facilities i.e toilets (3)

### **Setting the Quality Standard**

The quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing allotments and community gardens to achieve in terms of enhancement.

#### **Quality Standard**

A clean, well kept and secure site with clearly marked pathways to and within the site that encourages sustainable communities biodiversity and healthy living with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs.

## **10.7 Summery conclusions and recommendations**

The demand for allotment plots is currently out stripping the supply in the majority of areas in the borough and therefore should be treated as a priority for action.



## Quantity and accessibility

- All allotment sites should be protected against development unless;
  - long term poor usage is shown and then sites should be considered for redesignation to another type of open space.
  - Alternative land can be use for allotment provision that is considered to be in a better location and is not classified as another open space typology.
- To consider setting up an allotment forum to share best practice and manage a shared waiting list to allow a more accurate understanding of the level of local demand. This will be particularly relevant to allotments sited in the urban areas of the borough and would allow best practice to be shared more effectively. For example in community safety.
- Gedling Borough Council and allotment associations in the urban areas of the borough to investigate the feasibility of reducing the sizes of allotment plots to below the national standard of 250 metres squared. This will help meet demand and meet the needs of customers who are unable to manage larger plots.
- To identify additional land for allotment provision within the urban conurbation once a better understanding is gained of the local demand for allotment plots. It is recommended a cost benefit analysis exercise is conducted on the provision of a new site in comparison to the extension of existing sites.
- To conduct consultation and feasibility study into selling Chandos Street Allotments and relocating on a larger site to provide better facilities. The difference between the sale of Chandos Street as development land and purchasing land should provide funds for a new larger site, therefore contributing to meeting levels of demand.
- To support Newstead Parish Council in meeting their current level of demand for plots.
- To support Lambley Parish Council in identifying land for allotment provision.
- To identify the local level of demand for allotments from those residents who live in Ravenshead and Bestwood Village
- To consider introducing a policy allowing one community allotment plot per Gedling Borough Council owned site.

## **Quality**

The quality of the allotment plots are currently rated at a minimum of good. It is therefore recommended any improvements in quality should be secondary to increasing the number of allotment plots.

- For Gedling Borough Council to provide support where required to help allotment associations and parishes.
- Seek external funding to improve the quality of allotment sites.

## 11. Cemeteries and Churchyards

### 11.1 Definition

Churchyards are encompassed within the walled boundary of a church and cemeteries are burial grounds outside the confines of a church. These include private burial grounds, local authority burial grounds and disused churchyards. The primary purpose of this type of open space is for burial of the dead and quiet contemplation but also for the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.



Figure 11.1: Redhill Cemetery, Arnold

### 11.2 Strategic context and consultation

Cemeteries and churchyards can provide a significant amount of open space in some areas particularly in rural areas. In other areas they can represent a relatively minor resource in terms of the land, but are able to provide areas of nature conservation and are often among the few areas of green space where the local community is able to have some contact with the natural world.

Although many have restricted access they still provide a useful resource for the local community. A wide variety of habitats can often be found supporting those in other open space types such as semi-natural and natural areas.

In addition, cemeteries and churchyards provide the following wider benefits to the local area:

- ecological
- structural and landscape
- 'sense of place'
- cultural and heritage value.

Public consultation results identified that other than allotments and school playing fields Cemeteries were seen as one of the least important type of open space by respondents with 48% never using them and only 45% of responders visiting a cemetery within the last 6 months.

### **11.3 Setting provision standards**

#### **Quantity**

Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17) Annex states "*many historic churchyards provide important places for quiet contemplation, especially in busy urban areas, and often support biodiversity and interesting geological features. As such many can also be viewed as amenity greenspaces. Unfortunately, many are also rundown and therefore it may be desirable to enhance them. As churchyards can only exist where there is a church, the only form of provision standard which will be required is a qualitative one.*"

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>QUANTITY STANDARD</b> <b>No local standard set</b></p>
--

For cemeteries, PPG 17 Annex states "*every individual cemetery has a finite capacity and therefore there is steady need for more of them. Indeed, many areas face a shortage of ground for burials. The need for graves, for all religious faiths, can be calculated from population estimates, coupled with details of the average proportion of deaths which result in a burial, and converted into a quantitative population-based provision standard.*"

It is possible for the Council, upon examination of population and burial rate data, to approximate the amount of land needed for the current and future population.

#### **Future Trends in the Gedling Area**

Data obtained from the Census 2001 and national statistical database facilitates an analysis of the population of the area to assist in planning for future cemetery provision.

There are various factors to be considered:

- Age structure and mortality rates
- Religion
- Ethnicity
- Population Change
- Increase in cremations

## Age Structure

The first important issue relates to age structure of the population. The graph below illustrates the percentages of the population by age group, comparing Gedling with the whole of England and Wales:

Table 11.1: Age Breakdown in Gedling Borough, Nottinghamshire East Midlands and England, 2008

Age Group	Gedling	Nottinghamshire	East Midlands	England
0-14	16.2%	16.7%	17.0%	17.6%
15-29	17.5%	18.0%	19.8%	20.0%
30-44	20.9%	20.8%	20.6%	21.3%
45-59	20.5%	20.4%	19.6%	19.1%
60 to 74	16.2%	15.8%	15.0%	14.2%
75 and Over	8.6%	8.2%	8.7%	7.8%


Source: Population Estimates Unit, Office of National Statistics: Crown Copyright 2008

It can be seen that Gedling's age structure is very similar to that of the rest of England, although a higher proportion of Gedling's population is older. There are proportionately less 18 to 29 year olds in Gedling and proportionately more 45 to 84 year olds. This will have an impact on burial rates in Gedling.

## Mortality Rates

Mortality rates vary according to age, Gedling's mortality rates follow the national trend.

Figure 11.2: Deaths rates by gender and age group in Gedling in 2009



The number of deaths in any given population is influenced by the age structure. The lowest mortality rates can be found amongst 1 to 54 year olds, but then mortality rates dramatically increase.

Lower birth rate and falls in death rates for older people have contributed to a considerable increase in the number of people living longer. This is illustrated in the chart below:

Figure 11.3: Population change by Age Group, Gedling Borough, 2001-2008




Figure 11.3 shows the population change by age group between 2001 and 2008 in Gedling Borough. According to population estimates, for this period the Borough has an ageing population with the number of residents who are 60 and over having increased by nearly 11% and the percentage of under 45s has decreased by over 12%.

Table 11.2: Sub national population projection age 60+, Gedling Borough

Year	Population Total	% of projected population	% change from 2006
<b>2006</b>	<b>26,500</b>	<b>24%</b>	
<b>2026</b>	<b>35,700</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>2031</b>	<b>37,900</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>43%</b>

Source: 2006-based sub-national population projections, Office of National Statistics, 2008

Table 11.2 shows that based on the mid-2006 population estimate, the over 60 population of Gedling Borough is set to rise further by 2026 and rises again until 2031.

The information above indicates that, in about 20 years' time, a relatively large proportion of the population will be in the age groups with the highest mortality rates, this will have an impact on current and future demand for burial space in Gedling.




## Religion

Hindus, Sikh and Buddhists all prefer cremation whilst Jewish and Muslim people prefer burial. It is therefore appropriate to examine the religious beliefs of the population that our cemeteries are designed to serve.

The chart below compares Gedling with England and Wales in terms of non-Christian religious affiliation:

Figure 11.4: Gedling: Religion (Excluding Christianity)



It can be seen that Gedling has relatively low numbers adhering to the non-Christian faith and a high proportion of people indicating that they have no religious belief or affiliation. The numbers for Gedling given in the Census 2001 can be allocated to preferred choices of funeral. It is recommended this information be updated once Census 2011 data has been released.

Table 11.3: Preferred choices of funeral

<b>Cremation</b>		<b>Burial</b>	
Buddhist	191	Jewish	119
Hindu	364	Muslim	697
Sikh			486
	<b>1,041</b>		<b>816</b>
<b>Funerals per year</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>8</b>

The figure given for funerals per year is calculated by applying the national average mortality rate to the given population.


Burial and cremation facilities should provide a service that meets the needs of these specific groups, but the numbers are not sufficiently large enough to have a major impact in the Gedling area. However the needs of different religions must continue to be taken into account in the service provision provided by cemeteries in Gedling.

### Ethnicity

The ethnic origin of the population affects demand for burial space.


People of Black African and Caribbean origin prefer burial, whereas people of Asian, Indian origin prefer cremation. This reflects the predominant religious beliefs in these cultures. The graph below shows a comparison of the ethnicity of Gedling and the whole of England and Wales:

Figure 11.5: Gedling Ethnicity (Excluding white British)



It can be seen that the population of the Gedling area is less ethnically diverse than England and Wales as a whole. Gedling most closely mirrors England and Wales as a whole in the Black Caribbean group, who prefer burial to cremation.


Figure 11.6: Breakdown of Black and Minority Ethnic Population in Gedling Borough, 2007



Source: Neighbourhood Statistics, Office of National Statistics, 2007

According to 2007 population estimates, 8.4% of Gedling's population are from a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) group, including those people defined as White Other. Figure 6 shows that the largest ethnic group in the Borough is White Other at 1.9%, followed by Indian (1.3%), Caribbean (1%) and Pakistani (0.9%). Figure 7 shows the increase in the proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic residents since 2001 when it stood at 5.2%.

Figure 11.7: Changing trend in the proportion of the Black and Minority ethnic population in Gedling Borough, 2001-2007



Source: Neighbourhood Statistics, Office of National Statistics, 2007

The steady increase in the rise of Black and Minority ethnic population will have an impact in the demand for specific types of burial. However local data on the number of burials of black or ethnic population has revealed the number of burials is not linear to the increase in population. Local officer knowledge has indicated these cultures often conduct burials outside of the borough.

Religion, ethnicity and choice of burial or cremation are often closely linked. The following data from the Office of National Statistics gives an over view of the situation in Gedling in terms of age structure:

Table 11.4: Age structure, hence mortality rates, varies between ethnic groups


Estimated resident population by ethnic group and age, mid-2009 (experimental statistics)			
Figures in thousands	Age		
	0-15	16-64	65+
Gedling			
White	<b>17.5</b>	61	24.2
Mixed	<b>1.0</b>	0.8	0
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>			
Indian	0.2	0.9	0.1
Pakistani	0.4	0.8	0.1
Bangladeshi	0	0.1	0
Other Asian	0.1	0	0
All Asian or Asian British	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>0.2</b>
<b>Black or Black British</b>			
Black Caribbean	0.2	0.9	0.2
Black African	0.1	0.5	0
Other Black	0.0	0.1	0
All Black or Black British	0.3	1.5	0.2
<b>Chinese</b>	0.2	1	0
<b>Other ethnic groups</b>			
<b>All Ethnic Groups</b>	20.7	69.4	25
<b>Source: Adapted from the Office of National Statistics</b>			

After the White group the profile of the borough in terms of ethnic minorities is low particularly when comparing to the national situation. There is no noticeable pattern in the age categories of different ethnic which will have a significant impact on an increase in the number of burials.

### Population Change

The chart below illustrates deaths in England and Wales since 1976.

Figure 11.8: Deaths in England & Wales 1976 to 2001



There is clearly a decline in both the number of deaths and the underlying death rate during this period. At first glance this information indicates the number of deaths will continue to decrease. However overall, there has been a 4.4% increase in the population of the UK since 1981. 80% of this growth is due to net natural change, i.e. more births than deaths. The population of the UK is projected to increase gradually from 58.8 million in 2001 to reach 63.2 million by 2026. 60% of the projected 4.3 million increase between 2001 and 2026 is attributable to the assumed level of net inward migration. The remainder is due to the projected natural increase.

Longer-term projections suggest that the population will peak around 2040 at nearly 64 million and then gradually start to fall.

It is necessary to state the obvious: In the longer term population growth and the aging population in Gedling Borough will lead to increased demand for burial space.

### **Cemetery Capacity**

Burials in cemeteries fall into the following categories:

#### Full body burial

- New purchased graves
- Reopened purchased graves
- Unpurchased graves


#### Cremated Remains

- New purchased graves
- Reopened purchased graves
- Cremation plots

In Gedling's the proportion of graves sold in advance has changed significantly.


In order to establish the capacity that Gedling, has remaining it is useful to examine actual data. The graph below shows the numbers of graves excavated in Gedling Cemeteries over the last 5 years:

Figure 11.9: New Graves Pre-purchased and used from 2006 to 2010



Over the last 5 years 6% of new graves have been purchased in advance of need. This is a significant drop from 32% recorded in the previous audit which took into account data from 1999 to 2004. This is partially due to Redhill nearing capacity and therefore the pre purchasing of graves being restricted.

Figure 11.10: Comparison of the average number of graves used per year over two five year periods.



Over the last 5 years (2006-2010) the number of graves used has significantly increased in comparison to the audit in 2004. In addition to this only 33% of graves excavated have been re-openers over the last 3 years, this is a 22% reduction since the last audit in 2004. These trends will significantly change previous projections on



the length of time it was predicted to take for the sites to reach capacity. This is a particular issue for Redhill Cemetery which is close to capacity.

Table 11.6: The table below summarises the burial capacity within each of the Council's cemeteries at August 2011.

	<b>Unused Plots</b>	<b>New Graves Used Per Year</b>	<b>Graves Reserved Per Year</b>	<b>Graves Sold Per year</b>	<b>Years left</b>
<b><i>Gedling Borough Council</i></b>	<b>8150</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>20</b>
Gedling Cemetery	150	14	5	19	8
Carlton Cemetery	7500	168	21	189	40
Redhill Cemetery	500	187	0	187	2.7

Please note that the graves sold per year including pre-purchased graves have been calculated as an average of the last 5 years sales. With an increasing and aging population it is likely that these figures will increase.

There are a number of graves that were sold to individuals with a 100 year exclusive rights of burial that are now returning to the Council for use. The majority of these are buried in but have capacity for further burials. There are a number of issues associated with re-using these graves, therefore a small number will also be returned to the Council for use but will total less than five a year and therefore does not significantly affect capacity predictions.

At current rates of use, in less than 3 years time Redhill Cemetery's supply of new graves will be exhausted. The demand on new grave space at Carlton Cemetery will increase dramatically, affecting the longevity of the cemetery:

These estimates are based upon the current volume and pattern of demand for new graves. This does not take into account increase in population, increase in ageing population, local death rate per 1000, slight increase in black and ethnic minority residents all of which will contribute to an increasing demand for burial space. It would therefore be prudent to take a long term view now and identify means of prolonging the availability of grave space in Gedling.

If no additional burial space is provided and it is assumed those who would have originally been buried at Redhill would now be buried at either Gedling or Carlton this would mean by 2034 Gedling would have no available burial land remaining.

It is a priority that land is in the borough before the supply of burial space at Redhill is exhausted. When doing this consideration needs taken into account accessibility requirements. This is referred to later in this report.

These figures do not include for a change in demand for burial space by non residents. Officer knowledge has reported an interest from residents who live within the city boundaries around Carlton Hill area of the borough to use the Carlton Cemetery due to its location in comparison to Nottingham City's provision of burial space. This is particularly the case from the Muslim community. Due to the limited availability of burial land and the subsidy paid by Gedling residents a surcharge of 4 times the resident fees is applied to non-residents if they to use a cemetery in Gedling Borough. This appears to maintain demand at a reasonable level that it does not threaten the needs of Gedling residents and it should therefore be maintained.

The pre-purchasing of graves should also be restricted to prevent a high volume of pre-purchased graves and allowed for close monitoring of burial ground capacity. On any new burial sites it is also recommended to explore alternative methods for burials, with the aim to conduct more burials per square metre. This will increase the capacity of the cemeteries and reduce the burden of identifying additional land for burial space. It also has the potential to reduce the maintenance costs of cemeteries. An option could be to include making burials blocked chambers. This reduces the space required by about 30% therefore on a row of 50 graves this would result in approximately 14 extra graves. A raft could also be constructive for memorials and therefore reducing maintenance costs.

### **Providers of Burial Space in and around Gedling**

When considering Gedling's provision of burial facilities, it is essential to be aware of the impact of other providers both within and outside the Borough of Gedling. These fall into the following categories:

- The Church
- Parish Councils
- District and Unitary Authorities
- Private Sector

The most significant factors to be considered are the demand for new graves and the remaining space. This enables an estimate of the number of years the burial authority will be able to meet demand for new graves

Table 11.7: Existing cemetery space capacity in privately owned facilities.

Burial Authority	Location	Status	Burials per year				Years left
			Unused	New	Reopen	Total	
All Hallows, Gedling	SK618 426	Full					
St Michael's, Linby	SK534 508		5	2	2	4	3
St James', Papplewick	SK545 515		5	1	1	2	
St Helen's, Burton Joyce	SK647 436	Full					
Holy Trinity, Bulcote	SK656 447		15				
St Luke's, Stoke Bardolph	SK646 416		10	2		2	5
St Wilfrid's, Calverton	SK617 491	Full					
Holy Trinity, Lambley	SK631 454	Full					
St Swithun Woodborough	SK631 476	Full					
Church @ Epperstone	SK650 485		100	2		2	50
Church @ Oxton	SK630 514	Infilling		1		1	
Church @ Gonalston	SK682 474	Infilling		1		1	

Churchyards in the area are full or reaching capacity. Generally the demand for burial in the churchyards listed that have space is low as the communities in which they are situated are small.

However, it can be seen that the churchyards in Linby, Papplewick and Stoke Bardolph have a very limited number of new graves left.

Grave excavation is difficult at all 3 churchyards:

- St Michael's Linby: rock at 350mm depth
- St James' Papplewick: single depth only due to high water table
- St Luke's Stoke Bardolph: single depth only due to high water table

Papplewick are currently negotiating two extensions.

Table 11.8: Existing cemetery space capacity in Parish owned facilities

Burial Authority	Cemetery	Location	Size	Unused	Total	Burials per year			Years left
		Grid ref	Ha	Plots	plots *	New	Reopen	Total	
<b>Burton Joyce Parish Council</b>	Yes	SK647 435	1.00	200	1,996	20		20	10
<b>Calverton Parish Council</b>	Yes	SK616 497	1.25 (+2.1)	250 (+4000)	2,495	10	10	20	25(+200)
<b>Lambley Parish Council</b>	Yes	SK635 452	0.50	10	998	2	4	6	5
<b>Linby Parish Council</b>	No								
<b>Newstead Parish Council</b>	Yes	SK516 523	0.75	300	1,497	3	3	6	50
<b>Papplewick Parish Council</b>	No								
<b>Stoke Bardolph Parish Meeting</b>	No								
<b>Woodborough Parish Council</b>	Yes	SK630 482	0.25	225	499	8		8	19

Note: Data above is a combination of 2004 data from the previous audit and information provided through parish council consultation

\* The figure for total plots is calculated from the area of the cemetery estimated from the O.S. map.

It can be seen that some communities are well served:

- Newstead Parish Council has additional land adjacent to the cemetery for a future extension.
- Burton Joyce Parish Council allows residents only, or those with a very strong connection with the village.
- Lambley Parish Council has only 5 years burial space left and have indicated that they wish to make provision for burials beyond this period.
- There are no parish council cemeteries in Linby or Papplewick, and Stoke Bardolph where churchyards are full.

Table 11.9: Predicted cumulative increase in burials at Gedling Borough Council owned cemeteries per year due to other burial grounds in the Gedling area reaching capacity

Year	2011	2014	2016	2021	2030	2070
Burials per year	1	3	7	27	35	40

Table 11.9 shows other burial grounds in the Gedling area will have minimal impact on an increase in demand at Gedling Borough Council owned cemeteries over the next 10 years. However in 2021 there will be a significant increase in the number of burials that will take place at Gedling Borough Council cemeteries due to other providers reaching capacity, totalling an additional 27 burials per year. Based on this based on current provision burial space in Gedling Cemeteries will reach capacity in 19 years (2030).

### Other Providers

#### Tithe Green Burial Ground

Provided and managed by the Oxton Estate, this green burial site extends to 40 acres 16.19 hectares. The concept is that the site consists of areas of dedicated trees interspersed with areas of graves.

Trees are not planted on individual graves and Coffins must be biodegradable.

In the 5 years since the site has opened they have carried out 140 burials and sold 160 plots in reserve. Demand increases annually, but the Estate has further land that could be used for green burial in due course. There would therefore appear to be an extensive supply of green burial facilities near Gedling.

#### Calculation of how much space is required for a new cemetery

As a burial authority we need to ensure there is enough burial land to meet the requirement of the population of Gedling Borough, this includes taking into account the provision available outside of the local authorities ownership.

Various factors can be used to calculate the burial provision that Gedling should provide for its resident population. The following table contains data from Gedling

combined with various other factors to provide the area required for a 30 years period:

Table 11.5: Burial provision calculation

Factor	Calculation			Notes
Population of the area	112,735			Office of National Statistics 2009
Death rate per 1,000 per annum	9.99			National average. Listed by United Nations (2005-2010)
Cremation rate in the area	70.0%			Estimate
% Burials in existing graves Average	33%			Based over a three year period 2008-2010
Life expectancy required of cemetery	30	years		
Grave space size	9ft	x	4ft	Standard plot size
% allocated for roads & landscaping	30%			Average over a cemetery
Area required for anticipated use	7.2	acres		Calculated figure

## 11.4 Quality

There are no definitive national or local standards for the quality of cemeteries and churchyards.

Table 11.9: The public perception of the quality of Gedling cemeteries

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
24%	44%	30%	2%	1%

Public consultation in the table above shows 68% of responders felt the standard was good with the majority of others feeling the quality was average. When comparing responders feelings about the quality of cemeteries to other types of



green space it was rated as the equal 4<sup>th</sup> highest in quality with amenity green space and green corridors.

Public consultation produced only one comment in relation to cemeteries which requested they were kept open for longer and additional lighting was provided. It is recommended further consultation is carried out with the visitors of cemeteries. This will help set a more robust benchmark in relation to quality and allow for prioritisation of improvements in the future.

### **Operational Management and customer service standards.**

Gedling Borough Council offers a quality service. For example it offers face to face contact with the bereaved an informative brochure and a website that not only informs on the service Gedling Borough Council offers, but also sign posts customers to other organisations involved in the bereavement process. Due to the Victorian design of the cemeteries vehicle access is an issue. For example there is limited space for vehicles to turnaround during funerals. Due to reburial taking place at the cemeteries this will always be an issue, unless additional space is acquired. It is recommended the design of any new burial space takes into account of vehicle traffic. Consideration should also be given to the Adoption of the Institute of Cemetery and Crematorium Management (ICCM) Charter for the Bereaved and Regular assessment through the Charter Assessment process as a way of ensuring best practice continues to take place.

The quality standard below provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing cemeteries and churchyards to achieve in terms of enhancement. The quality standard has been developed through officer consultation, public consultation and guidance from the ICCM Charter for the Bereaved.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>QUALITY STANDARD</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">A well maintained, clean and safe site with the provision of seating areas, clear footpaths and car parking either on site or nearby. The site will encourage biodiversity through providing varied vegetation and aim to be an oasis for personal quiet contemplation.</p>
---

Only Redhill Cemetery currently meets this standard due to Gedling and Carlton Cemeteries having no car park provision. However the other aspects of the quality standard are considered excellent with Carlton Cemetery being classified as a site of importance for nature conservation.

## **11.5 Accessibility**

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

Public consultation revealed that 98.5% of residents who responded felt cemeteries were within an acceptable travelling distance. 83% of responders reported it took less than 20 minutes and 50% stated there was a cemetery within a ten minutes travelling distance from their home. These percentages were similar when comparing those who used cemeteries and those who did not. This indicates there is not any significant issues with the current location of cemeteries.

Cemetery users were also asked what their normal mode of transport was to their local cemetery. 45% of users walk to their local cemetery, 51% drive, 3% cycle and 1% by bus. When comparing preferred mode of transport to travelling time there was insignificant difference between the travelling time and mode of transport. Most residents preferred the travelling distance to a cemetery to be less than 20 minutes.

Table 11.10: the time it takes residents to travel to their nearest cemetery

	Less than 5 mins %	6 to 10 mins %	11 to 20 mins %	21 to 30 mins %	31-60 mins %	More than 60 mins %
Walk	31	31	32	12	3	0
Drive	32	32	36	14	3	

The Office for National Statistics as a part of the census 2001 reported 24% of households in Gedling did not have access to a car or van. It is therefore important to consider access to public transport when planning new sites, particularly for the elderly or more infirm members of local communities.

There is no requirement to set catchments for this type of green space as it cannot easily be influenced through planning policy and implementation. However consultation has revealed there is an acceptable travelling distance for access to cemeteries which the borough is currently meeting.

**RECOMMENDED  
ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**

***Less than 20 minutes drive  
(including access to public  
transport)***

Whilst there are residents willing to travel further than the accessibility standard and many people do not need to travel more than 10 minutes to reach a cemetery this distance reflects a reasonable and justifiable maximum threshold based on

engagement with residents.

## **11.6 Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas**

The location of existing cemeteries across the borough are meeting the expectations of residents, however burial space is becoming limited in the north of the borough due to burial space at Redhill Cemetery forecasted to be at capacity within 3 years. A 20 minute drive covers the time it takes to travel from the furthest points in the borough. It is therefore possible to take into account additional provision on the basis of Carlton and Gedling Cemeteries reaching capacity in the future. Due to limited availability of land the only available space will be on the outside of the urban conurbation of the borough. This will restrict resident's ability to walk and therefore car park facilities must be provided and preference to a site with public transport links. The accessible settlements study for Greater Nottingham, February 2010, identifies areas within a 5 minute walk (400m) and an hourly or better service on weekdays. The report shows the urban conurbation of the borough is well covered by public transport and also the main rural settlements. It is recommended when locating a new cemetery this study is considered.

Although needed for the burial of the dead, cemeteries and churchyards also provide an open space to be used on an opportunity-led basis – ie where there are churchyards and cemeteries, there are opportunities for wildlife and use of the open space by the public for walking and relaxing. This must be taken into account when applying provision standards across the borough for other types of green space due to land having multiple purposes. For example cemeteries can also act as a natural green space and be used as a quiet resting place. Churchyards in rural areas also provide a sense of place and will be of high value to the local community.

It is Gedling Borough Council responsibility as a local authority to maintain cemeteries once they are closed to burials. It is currently maintaining 7 cemeteries which are closed or not being used. These sites must continue to be maintained to their current standard and must be protected. More details of the sites maintained are shown in Appendix 11a.

## **11.7 Recommendations**

- To seek additional land for burial space taking into account the burial space in the borough reaching capacity in the next 30 years. This includes Redhill, Carlton, Gedling Cemeteries, parish council own sites and privately own burial spaces.
- To continue with the current pricing policy for non-residents and introduce restrictions on pre-purchasing graves for funeral directors.

- To explore alternative methods for burials, with the aim to conduct more burials per square metre.
- To conduct a site audits of the cemeteries using a local quality assessment model resulting in a measurable quality standards for each cemetery. This should be used to maintain the cemeteries at their current standard.
- To conduct consultation with the users of cemeteries by conducting annual surveys to those visiting the cemeteries and also allow users to provide feedback on the service and facilities using a variety of methods

## 12. Green Corridors

### 12.1 Definition

This open space type includes towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and disused railway lines. The primary purpose is to provide opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding whether for leisure purposes or travel and opportunities for wildlife migration. They may also link different pieces of green space to one another, to create a green infrastructure network.



Figure 12.1: The River Trent, Stoke Bardolph

### 12.2 Strategic Context

Green corridors are linked to the concept of environmental infrastructure and the need to provide connected and substantial networks of accessible multi-functional green space, in urban fringe and adjacent countryside areas.

Green corridors and links are valued for recreation and/or wildlife. Some are identified solely because they assist the movement of wildlife, for example the disused railway lines, while others assist the movement of both people and wildlife. Green corridors also support environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling. These opportunities for informal recreation will help keep the public active and improve health within the local area.

The value of a park or open space increases significantly when it is easily accessible and connected to a larger system. It is therefore important that existing open spaces, wherever possible, be incorporated into an overall network. Green corridors have a role to play in connecting places that are attractive to people, wildlife and business.

Green corridors therefore are not just about green spaces. They are also concerned with connecting people via a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways from doorstep to countryside. It therefore provides opportunity to link open spaces within the urban area, and to link urban areas with the countryside.

The council aims to develop community recreation by promoting greater access to the countryside for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, emphasising public footpaths and bridleways.

### 12.3 Key Consultation Findings – Green Corridors

Public consultation results identified Green Corridors as being the 5<sup>th</sup> most popular type of green space with 53% of the population using them within the last 6 months.

### 12.4 Quantity Audit

With regards to green corridors, the emphasis of PPG17 is on urban areas. It uses the typology from the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce Report that is an ‘urban typology’. Furthermore, elements of PPG17 are contradictory to the Companion Guide on this issue, where despite PPG17 suggesting that all corridors, including those in remote rural settlements should be included, the Companion Guide suggests that unless a green corridor is used as a transport link between facilities i.e. home and school, town and sports facility etc, it should not be included within an audit. For the purpose of this report all corridors including public rights of way are have been reported on.

Gedling falls within a high pressure area for traffic because it lies between the City and Mansfield, situated in the north of the County. The urban nature of the area creates substantial pressure on the countryside left and in particular public rights of way.

Gedling has approximately 800 public rights of way, which are administered through the County Council. The proportionate spread of rights of way in Gedling is:

Table 12.1: Public rights of way in Gedling borough

<b>Definitive Classification</b>	<b>Length (kilometres)</b>
Byways	0.32km
Footpaths	103.176km
Bridleways	17.869km

Figure 12.2: Public rights of way in Gedling Borough





Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.


Figure 12.2 identifies the designated public rights of way in Gedling. There are numerous bridleways and footpaths spanning mostly the rural areas of the borough. These are not all interconnected, however the Council's series of circular walks and rides aim to improve access opportunities and form some useful links with the river Trent and natural and semi natural green space. Gedling Borough Council's Heels, Wheels and Hooves booklet identifies a variety of short and long walks around Gedling borough. Papplewick Parish Council in Partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council in 2005 produced the Public Paths Strategy 2000-2015 which proposes to develop old railway line trails and improve the path network around



Papplewick. Disused railways in the borough including the former Gedling Colliery site form useful small green corridors therefore should be protected. Opportunities to use established linear routes, such as disused railway lines, roads or river banks as green corridors should be exploited. In addition links to the wider area need to be established.

The previous Recreation Open Space Assessment (2004) identified the areas of Ravenshead, Linby, Newstead and Papplewick with a lack of rights of way and residents of these areas most often have to travel by car to go for a walk. Since this consultation improvements have been made in Newstead due to the development of the Country Park.

Figure 12.3: Public rights of way in the Gedling Borough Urban conurbation



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Figure 12.3 shows very few public rights of way in the urban conurbation. Where public rights exists of way these very are often over a small distance and do not interconnect other green spaces. Quite often these public rights of way connect




green space to the road network enabling them to be accessible. Due to the extent of development there is limited opportunity to develop any green corridors in these areas.

Figure 12.3 does not show all the paths used in the urban conurbation. For example a path exists around the perimeter of Mapperly Golf Course which has not been designated as a public right of way. In some areas, green corridors have also been identified as amenity greenspace. For example the stretch of land running from Mapperly top to the traffic lights on Gedling Road. Where this occurs, the primary purpose has been deemed to be amenity greenspace although they also function as green corridors.

The Companion Guide to PPG17 expresses the view that there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard for green corridors. Policy should promote the use of green corridors to link housing areas to the cycle networks, town and city centres, places of employment and community facilities such as schools, shops, community centres and sports facilities. Using this definition from the information provided in this report Gedling borough has as limited amount of green corridors. This is supported by the East Midlands Green Infrastructure Strategy reporting Gedling having limited green corridors with the river Trent being the only significant corridor.

Figure 12.4: Catchment area for The River Trent corridor



Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

It is important to focus on the impact of Gedling's only formally recognised green corridor. Figure 12.4 shows catchment levels for the green corridor along the river Trent in the district taking into account walking distance equivalent to 10 minutes. This is shown by the light blue line in the map above. It shows a minimal amount of residential areas within the catchment and is not considered a transport link between facilities. It is therefore particularly important to conduct work in order to identify any green corridors even on a small scale.

Following the Companion Guide to PPG17, it is not recommended that a provision standard be set.

**RECOMMENDED  
QUANTITY STANDARD**  
No local standard to be  
set

## 12.5 Quality and Value of Green Corridors

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

- a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation
- ground not soft enough to allow a horse or cycle to sink into it
- a path on unvegetated natural surfaces

Table 12.2 The public perception of the quality of natural and semi natural green space

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
18%	49%	27%	5%	0%

Public consultation results revealed the overall quality rating of green corridors from those who responded was good. Table 12.2 shows 49% of responders felt the standard was good with the majority of others feeling the quality were either very good or average. 67% of responders felt the standard was good or better. When comparing responder's feelings about the quality of green corridors to other typologies it was rated as equal 4<sup>th</sup> highest in quality.

Green corridors are a key part of strategies produced by organisation such as the British Waterways and the Environment Agency. Since the Recreational Open Space Assessment in 2004 public access on the embankment of the river Trent from

Stoke Bardolph lock to Netherfield Lagoon has been improved and allowed for the extension of the cycle pathway. The Ramblers Association identified a concern with the path that runs from the Trent Bridge area into Colwick. An extension of the route was considered with flood prevention works however was deemed not feasible due to cost and businesses blocking the route. Public consultation revealed litter and dog-fouling were the most significant problems experienced by respondents who use green corridors most often.

A quality standard for green corridors should therefore consider the issues above to meet the needs of the public. This quality standard provides the vision for any new provision and also a benchmark for existing green corridors to achieve in terms of enhancement.

Clean, well maintained, safe and secure routes with clear, level and well drained paths, which are provided the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation. The green corridor should provide links to major open spaces, urban areas and community facilities. Sites should provide a natural wildlife accommodation such as seating and toilets where appropriate” habitat and cyclist provision.

There is currently no information available to fully assess the quality of green corridors other than the literal responses from the public consultation. It is therefore recommended quality assessments are completed on the green corridors.

## 12.6 Accessibility

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

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

**RECOMMENDED  
ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**  
No local standard to be  
set

Our aim should be to provide where possible an integrated network of high quality green corridors linking open spaces together and provide opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport.

A report produced by the Department of Transport named 'Delivering Sustainable Transport for Housing Growth (2010)' highlights the need for measures that ensure maximum use of public transport; that reduce dependence on cars; and that support more cycling and walking. Therefore any new development should include green corridor links to other open spaces and community facilities. This will help address qualitative deficiencies of existing green corridors and capitalise on opportunities to increase and enhance the existing network.

## **12.7 Summary, conclusions and recommendations**

Gedling borough is fortunate to have a key green corridor that stretches the length of the district, despite it being located on the southern border of the borough. This green corridor provides opportunities for informal recreation, particularly walking and cycling. However provides limited opportunity to incorporate this into everyday routines such as travelling to work due to its location.

The development of a green corridor network will help provide opportunities for informal recreation and improve the health and well-being of the local community.

Future development needs to encompass linkage provision between large areas of open space, create opportunities to develop the green corridor network and utilise potential development sites such as dismantled railway lines and public rights of way that already exist.

### **Recommendations**

- Continue with local plan protection policies to stop inappropriate development at green corridor sites. This includes the protection of disused railways as they are key to the transport policies affecting open space, sport and recreation facilities.
- Ensure that appropriate green corridor linkages and improvements are key to all new large housing sites where possible.
- Adopt the quality standard for all current and future green corridors and to conduct a quality audit on green corridors.
- To conduct a study to identify any linear routes. This could inform on small scale green corridors.
- Improve the promotion of green corridors and circular routes around the borough with aspirations of developing disused railways into formal pathways.



## Section 13 – Overall Summary

### 13.1 Introduction

The study has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, July 2002) and its Companion Guide “Assessing Needs and Opportunities” (September 2002). IT has also reflected upon previous audits and strategies related to green space in the borough. There is a total of 1161.59 hectares of open space audited under the PPG17 typologies.

The overall aim of the project was to:

- to carry out the audit and assessment in accordance with PPG17 and its Companion Guide
- identify local needs through assessment
- audit all public and private existing open space, sport and recreational facilities within the District, including school sites, allotments and built facilities
- set local provision standards
- apply local provisions standards
- produce options for actions policies

This section summarises the key findings of the study, typology looking at quantity, quality and lists the key findings.

### 13.2 Overview of Quantity analysis

Figure 13.2 below provides an overall view and summery of the quantitative findings by its primary typology. The sites may house a number of typologies, for example, a park may include a children’s play area and sports pitches, but the site may have been classified as a sports pitch because this accounts for a higher percentage of its total hectarage. The only exception to this is chidrens play areas where all play areas have been included despite being included on a site classified under a different typology. Although this has created duplication the impact is minimal due to only 3.26 ha being fixed play areas.

Table 13.1 Overview of Quantity analysis

Typology	Total Hectare	Current provision	National guidelines	Proposed local standard	Reasoning
Allotments	28.4 ha	Urban - 20 allotment plots per 1000	20 allotment plots per 1000	Urban – 20 allotments plots per 100	Urban areas – local demand cannot be accurately measured, therefore

		households  Rural 27 allotment plots per 1000 households	households	households  Rural - 30 allotment plots per 1000 households	national standard set.  Rural – standard set on local demand
Outdoor Sports Facilities	163 ha	1.44 ha per 1000 population	1.6 per 1000 population	1.44 ha per 1000 population	A playing pitch strategy needs to be produced to accurately identify level of demand
Amenity Green Space	59 ha	0.52 ha per 1000 population	0.5 ha per 1000 population	0.52 ha per 1000 population	Local demand varies depending on the area of the borough and availability of different typologies
Provision for children and young people	3.26 ha  132.5 Casual (includes other typologies)	Younger Children - 0.001618 ha per 1,000 population Older Children - 0.001298 ha per 1,000 population  1.21ha per 1000 population	Fixed 0.25 ha per 1000 population  Casual – 0.8 ha per 1000 population	0.0289 ha per 1000 population  1.21 ha per 1000 population	Limited space in urban areas of the borough where additional play areas are required limit the opportunities to increase this standard
Parks and Gardens	467.9 ha	4.15 ha per 1000 population	N/A	4.15 ha per 1000 population	Until more information is available on the likelihood of developments in this area taking place it is difficult to increase this standard.

Natural and semi natural green space	406 ha	4.86 Ha per 1000 population Local Nature Reserve 0.51 per 1000 population	Non available  Local Nature Reserve 1 ha per 1000 population	4.86 ha per 1000 population	Until feasibility studies are conducted on the development of future Local Nature Reserves, increasing the proposed standard is difficult
Green Corridors	17.20 ha	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cemeteries	16.83 ha	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	1161.59 ha	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: Green corridor ha is derived from previous Recreational Open Space Strategy (2003)

### 13.2 Quality standards

Quality standards have been set and where possible have been made measurable to improve the ability to monitor improvements.

#### Parks and Gardens

A welcoming, clean, well maintained site that is free from vandalism and dog fouling that provides a range of facilities for all users creating a feeling of safety.

All sites to achieve a Nottinghamshire Standard score of at least 6 or 42 when applied to green flag standards.

#### Natural and Semi natural Green space

A publicly accessible, spacious, clean and litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourage wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Sites should be maintained to protect nature conservation interest with interpretative signage and safety features where appropriate.”

#### Amenity Green Space

A clean and well maintained greenspace site with well kept grass and varied vegetation, and large enough to accommodate informal play. Sites should have appropriate ancillary facilities (benches, litter bins) and landscaping in the right places providing a spacious outlook and overall enhance the appearance of the local environment

#### Children’s and Young people fixed play provision

A site providing a suitable mix of well maintained formal equipment with an enriched play environment to encourage informal play and recreation by children and young people. A safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes ancillary facilities such as 'hang out shelters' and seating where appropriate. To strive for all play sites to have a quality assessment score of 40% or above.

### **Outdoor Sports Facilities**

All outdoor sports facilities should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter, with level, well drained and good quality surfaces. Sites should provide good quality ancillary facilities, where appropriate, including changing accommodation, toilets, car parking and facilities for a range of age groups. The maintenance and management of sites should continue to ensure safety and effective usage. Gedling Borough Council owned facilities should aim to meet the outdoor facility standard score of 66% and Changing Room percentage of 59% or above

### **Allotments**

A clean, well kept and secure site with clearly marked pathways to and within the site that encourages sustainable communities, biodiversity and healthy living with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs.

### **Cemeteries**

A well maintained, clean and safe site with the provision of seating areas, clear footpaths and car parking either on site or nearby. The site will encourage biodiversity through providing varied vegetation and aim to be an oasis for personal quiet contemplation.

### **Green Corridors**

Clean, well maintained, safe and secure routes with clear, level and well drained paths, which are provided the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation. The green corridor should provide links to major open spaces, urban areas and community facilities. Sites should provide a natural wildlife and accommodation such as seating, toilets cyclist provision where appropriate.

## **13.3 Key Findings**

The following summaries the key findings by typology.

### **Parks and Gardens**

- As a quantity standard, the Council should seek, as a minimum, to maintain local provision to 4.15ha per 1,000 population. However to do this more parks and

garden facilities will need to be provided to accommodate the predicted increase in population due to housing developments. It is therefore vital that existing plans for a Country Park at the Gedling Colliery site are achieved.

- When enhancing provision ensure priority is made in urban areas of deficiency as this covers the largest concentration of residents
- The Council should aspire to maintaining Green Flag status at Arnot Hill Park and aspire to establishing another site as a green flag destination park, preferably outside of the catchment area of Arnot Hill Park and within the urban conurbation.
- To make improvements in quality and diversity of existing provision in particular protection and enhancement of wildlife where possible.
- To prioritise improvement to parks and gardens based on the Nottinghamshire Standard.

### **Natural Green Space**

- Protect the current level of provision of natural and semi-natural sites across both rural and urban areas of Gedling Borough including those which are SINCS or LNRs
- Ensure new provision of natural and semi-natural sites is located in Gedling East and Carlton wards as a matter of priority. This could be through the enhancement of space with other primary purposes and development of the Gedling Colliery site which could also be considered as a site for LNR status.
- To conduct a quality audit of semi natural and natural green space in the borough.
- Consult with Natural England on potential sites for LNR status and consider LNR status for Midland Wood (Whimsy Park) and the Gedling Colliery site.

### **Amenity Green Space**

- Protect and enhance all amenity green space in the district if it is considered to hold recreational value (over 0.2ha)
- Ensure all new developments located in areas without amenity greenspace allow for the establishment of such a space, except where residents are within accessible distance to other types of green space which can also fulfil its role.
- When amenity green space is provided ensure it is located where it can be a focal point for the local community.
- Establish a measurable quality standard for amenity green space which will allow for comparison of standards over time and more accurately identify recreational value for each site.

## **Provision for Children and Young People**

- Protect and enhance (where required) all children and young persons sites in the district.
- Develop an action plan to upgrade all sites falling below a 40% quality score. In doing so take into account the viability of improving experience through landscape design and natural play.
- Investigate whether any amenity green space or park and garden sites in areas where there is a deficiency of play equipment already have elements of play in them, and establish if they could have a play area located on them. When doing this it is important to consider the deficiencies between different age groups.
- When identifying new play areas to apply NFPA minimum acceptable size requirements and site area multiplier to ensure the area of space required. To revise the play strategy using the findings from the Parks and Open Space strategy and to offer support to Parish Councils to help improve play provision in their area.
- Subject to land being available to seek resources for additional provision of play areas in the Mapperley Plains area near Mapperley top, the north side of Porchester ward and also around the border of Carlton Hill, Carlton and Valley ward.

## **Outdoor Sports Facilities**

- Protect existing sports and recreation facilities from redevelopment.
- Promote greater use of existing sport and recreation resources.
- Acquire new open space provision in association with new development.
- To improve the quality of changing facilities based on the results of the NPFA quality assessment.
- To conduct a review of the playing pitch strategy to provide more robust evidence to identify the full extent under provision and over use of pitches in the south of the borough. This will include closer monitoring of pitch cancellations and matches played on licensed pitches
- Once demand for additional pitches has been confirmed it is recommended to engage the education sector to investigate further use of these facilities.
- To conduct a feasibility study on the provision of alternative playing surfaces taking into account future demand of football in the south of the borough and meet the demands Rugby in the north of the borough.
- To support Gedling Southbank who wish to find alternative provision which is better quality and can host all teams
- Consider the impact of the FA plans to change the structure of junior football.
- Review the maintenance of bowls greens taking into consideration sports club consultation comments.



## Allotments

- All allotment sites should be protected against development unless;
  - long term poor usage is shown and then sites should be considered for redesignation to another type of open space.
  - Alternative land can be used for allotment provision that is considered to be in a better location and is not classified as another open space typology.
- To consider setting up an allotment forum to share best practice and manage a shared waiting list to allow a more accurate understanding of the level of local demand. This will be particularly relevant to allotments sited in the urban areas of the borough and would allow best practice to be shared more effectively in areas like community safety.
- Gedling Borough Council and allotment associations in the urban areas of the borough to investigate the feasibility of reducing the sizes of allotment plots to below the national standard of 250 metres squared. This will help meet demand and meet the needs of customers who are unable to manage larger plots.
- To identify additional land for allotment provision within the urban conurbation once a better understanding is gained of the local demand for allotment plots. It is recommended a cost benefit analysis exercise is conducted on the provision of a new site in comparison to the extension of existing sites.
- To conduct consultation and feasibility study into selling Chandos Street Allotments and relocating on a larger site to provide better facilities. The difference between the sale of Chandos Street as development land and purchasing land should provide funds for a new larger site, therefore contributing to meeting levels of demand.
- To support Newstead Parish Council in meeting their current level of demand for plots.
- To support Lambley Parish Council in identifying land for allotment provision.
- To identify the local level of demand for allotments from those residents who live in Ravenshead and Bestwood Village
- To consider introducing a policy allowing one community allotment plot per Gedling Borough Council owned site.
- For Gedling Borough Council to provide support where required to help allotment associations and parishes improve the quality of sites
- Help seek external funding to improve the quality of allotment sites.

## Cemeteries

- To seek additional land for burial space taking into account the burial space in the borough reaching capacity in the next 30 years.

- To continue with the current pricing policy for non-residents and introduce restrictions on pre-purchasing graves for funeral directors.
- To explore alternative methods for burials, with the aim to conduct more burials per square metre.
- To conduct site audits of the cemeteries using a local quality assessment model resulting in a measurable quality standards for each cemetery. This should be used to maintain the cemeteries at their current standard.
- To consult with the users of cemeteries by conducting annual surveys to those visiting the cemeteries and also allow users to provide feedback on the service and facilities using a variety of methods

### **Green Corridors**

- Continue with local plan protection policies to stop inappropriate development at green corridor sites. This includes the protection of disused railways as they are key to the transport policies affecting open space, sport and recreation facilities.
- Ensure that appropriate green corridor linkages and improvements are key to all new large housing sites where possible.
- Adopt the quality standard for all current and future green corridors and to conduct a quality audit on green corridors.
- To conduct a study to identify any linear routes. This could inform on small scale green corridors.
- Improve the promotion of green corridors and circular routes around the borough with aspirations of developing disused railways into formal pathways.

### **13.4 Conclusions**

There is a distinct split in the Borough between the urban and rural areas. Throughout this study where appropriate the different needs of the rural and urban areas have been recognised and different standards have been proposed, where appropriate, in order to better meet the needs of the different areas.

It is recognised with the proposed local quantity standards, a large amount of new open space will need to be created within the borough. Whilst much of this new space will come from new housing developments, it is key for the Council to ensure that existing areas also benefit otherwise there is a danger of creating an unhealthy distinction between the new and old developments.

The standards set in this document should be used as a guide to minimum provision rather than used as an absolute rule. There will be a need to apply the standards with a degree of flexibility on occasions due to geographical or demographical reasons.

It is recommended that the Council should focus work that best meets the priorities of the borough. For example although children and young people provision has less

usage than other typologies it will be important to focus work on this area to provide diversionary activities that reduces anti-social behaviour, which is a key objective. It is also recognised that some quality issues, for example an unsafe children's play area, will need immediate attention and will need to be prioritised. In addition new forms of funding may require a shift in priorities.

In some of the more densely populated urban parts of the borough, opportunities for meeting identified deficiencies in green spaces are limited by the absence of green space. Similarly, in some rural areas where most land is in private ownership, securing public access to green spaces may not be possible. However, the opportunities presented by new residential developments may offer the flexibility to achieve enhanced levels of greenspace provision, recognising that the current standards represent an assessment of the minimum amounts required.

The relationship between the Council and parish councils will be key to meeting quality, quantity and accessibility standards. Policy change in the distribution of parish aid should be assessed to identify the impact it will have on the maintenance of open space. Opportunities need to be explored to identify how the governments Big Society agenda and the introduction of the Localism Act can be used to best meet the recommendations within this strategy.

## **14. Resourcing Green Spaces**

### **14.1 Introduction**

CABE Space within its manifesto (2004) stated that, in order to attract the resources to improve open space:

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

These are essential to gain financial support (both internally and externally) for improvements to existing provision or new provision.

### **14.2 Sustainability of funding**

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

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

For Green spaces in Gedling to be developed it will be essential to gain any financial support (both internally and externally) for improvements to existing provision or new provision. This section looks a series of different mechanisms for the funding of open space.

### **14.3 Potential sources of income.**

#### **1. Sale of Council land**

Generating and reinvesting resources obtained from land which is surplus to Requirements. This is, however, likely to be a long process, and ultimately may prove difficult to achieve.

If considered feasible at some future stage, reinvestment would:

- secure political credibility for the sale of land
- provide sufficient funding to carry out significant rather than purely minor open space improvements. It should, however, be realised that the process may

take two/three years to introduce, owing to planning, legal and other restrictions which could delay its introduction

- also, this mechanism is likely to be create public controversy and its success depends on how the process and sale of land is conveyed to the public in terms of benefits and outcomes.

## **2. Section 106 planning agreements**

Circular 05/05 was issued to provide guidance to local authorities in England on the use of Section 106 agreements. Obligations from Section 106 agreements are defined as “private agreements negotiated between local planning authorities and person with an interest in a piece of land (or “developers”) and intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms”. Section 106 agreements can be used to achieve environmental improvements. Once a strategy framework has been established, the process of obtaining these improvements will be enhanced because they can be used to achieve specific purposes, for instance:

- providing walking and cycling routes
- obtaining open space in areas of deficiency
- funding open space improvements.

It should of course be noted that such agreements have to meet the test of Circular 05/2005 ‘Planning Obligations’, and that developers should not be required to pay for facilities which are needed solely in order to resolve existing deficiencies. IT is important to also note that some councils have used part of the contributions towards revenue ‘Development Officer’ posts; eg in North Nottinghamshire.

There are also maintenance considerations to be taken into account; ie significant costs may arise, particularly if new open space is acquired. It may therefore be necessary to obtain an endowment fund wherever possible to cover these ongoing costs. In light of this strategy the supplementary Planning guidance is to be reviewed. This will address some of the shortfall of the existing policy which include the currently policy only concentrating on 3 types of provision and maintenance cover of 10 years.

## **3. Community Infrastructure Levy**

The Community Infrastructure Levy came into force in April 2010. It allows local authorities in England and Wales to raise funds from developers undertaken new building project in their area. the money can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. This includes park improvements and green spaces.

#### **4. Business funding/sponsorships**

Although opportunities may be limited in this financial climate there may be opportunities to gain sponsorship for the development of green spaces, for example playgrounds.

#### **5. Partnership arrangements with the voluntary sector**

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

#### **6. Lottery funding**

This includes the Heritage Lottery Fund if works are carried out which are of outstanding interest and importance to the national heritage. Funding is provided for whole-park projects, the conservation of park features or park activities. Projects must be designed to involve all stakeholders, must demonstrate sustainability, and must demonstrate the heritage value of the park in question. Arnot Hill Park is an example of where Heritage Lottery Funding has improved a park.

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

#### **7. Review of pricing**

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

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

#### **8. Living spaces**

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

- improving local parks
- creating or improving pocket parks or community gardens
- creating or improving play or seating areas
- cleaning up neglected residential land



- restoring village greens
- carrying out planting schemes on estates or verges
- creating or improving nature areas or city farms
- restoring local cemeteries
- restoring paths, gateways, ponds or boundaries.

### **9. The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme**

The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme allows registered landfill operators to contribute 6.2% of their annual landfill tax liability to environmental bodies approved by the organisation ENTRUST.

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

### **10. Local heritage initiatives**

Local Heritage Initiatives are to assist local communities in the preservation of their environment, landmarks and traditions including archaeological, natural, built and industrial heritage. A community group could investigate and celebrate a historic park, prepare a public exhibition in a park, and repair a feature. Heritage Grants are available from the Heritage Lottery Fund. English Heritage supports the Heritage Grant Fund for historic parks and gardens where there is a significant risk of losing important landscape features.

### **11. The Tree Council**

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

### **12. The Esmee Fairburn Foundation**

The Esmee Fairburn Foundation aims to improve quality of life, particularly for people who face disadvantage. Eligible activities include the preservation and enhancement

of open space, and good management of woodlands, gardens and allotments. The size of grant is not limited, with the average award for the year 2002 being £33,500.

### **13. Others**

The degree of funding will define the scope and timescale over which any developments could be implemented. It is therefore essential to carefully consider all possible sources of funding. These should include Council capital and revenue funding but should also include consideration of:

- the release of existing funds
- commercial opportunities such as the franchising of facilities such as catering outlets

- the delegated management of facilities such as outdoor sports; commercial sponsorship (eg floral bedding)
- increased income from events and activities

Further detailed information regarding grants can be found in *Claiming Your Share: A Guide to External Funding for Parks and Green Space Community Groups*, obtainable from <http://www.greenspace.org.uk>. Other funding providers specific to the type of green space are listed in Appendix 13a

#### **14. Funding strategy**

It is assumed that sufficient financial resources will not be available immediately to meet all the identified needs. To ensure strategic development of all the potential projects in Gedling Borough it is necessary to:

- give all partners, providers and users the opportunity to add to this long list of projects and ensure that it evolves as necessary throughout the course of this strategy
- develop a set of criteria against which projects can be judged, in order to assess which of the potential projects should be developed first
- make priorities against this criteria.

## **Section 15. Delivering the Strategy.**

The detailed actions necessary to deliver the vision, aims and objectives adopted in this strategy are set out in the following action plan. For each objective a set of actions is given with timescales and those responsible for delivery. The action plan will be reviewed and updated yearly until the end of the strategy period.

The Green Spaces Strategy action plan will be delivered using the existing revenue budget. However as a result of the comprehensive spending review, the department has had to make efficiencies over the next three years to this revenue budget. In order to maintain a high level of service, and still deliver, the service is looking at efficiency savings, income generation and greater use of volunteers

# Action Plan

## Aim 1 To enhance peoples quality of life through the provision of sufficient, accessible, attractive green spaces

ACTION PLAN			
What do we want to achieve	How are we going to do it	Timescale	Lead & Key Partners
<p><b>Objective 1.1:</b> To address supply and demand issues for identified typologies to meet existing and future needs of residents, workers and visitors.</p>	<p>The strategy sets recommended quantity standards for all the relevant PPG17 typologies in order to ensure that Gedling Borough has a minimum standard of green space provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Gedling has an agreed amount of green and play spaces</li> <li>• The standards are used to identify parts of the Borough that are currently deficient as regards the amount of various green space typologies, so as to inform proposals to increase or if necessary decrease green space in different parts of the borough as identified in the PPG17 audit. (E.g. Address the current play area shortage in the Mapperley Plains area).</li> <li>• The provision of green space will be increased as the population grows.</li> <li>• Ensure that Gedling has a good balance of different types of green space by addressing current deficiencies identified in the PPG 17 audit.</li> <li>• The Strategy will support and inform Planning Services in preparation of the Local Plan and in any local community/neighbourhood plans. Areas where there is deficiency will be identified and recommendations made.</li> </ul>	<p>2012 onwards</p> <p>When applicable</p> <p>2012 onwards</p> <p>2012 onwards</p> <p>2012 onwards</p>	<p>Parks &amp; Street Care Services (PASC) Planning Services</p> <p>All stakeholders</p> <p>Planning / PASC Services</p> <p>Planning Services Parks &amp; Street Care Services (PASC)</p> <p>Planning Services Parks &amp; Street Care Services (PASC)</p>
<p><b>Objective 1.2:</b> To achieve clean, attractive high quality green spaces across Gedling Borough, including spaces that are nationally recognised for their quality and attractions.</p>	<p>The strategy sets recommended quality standards for all the relevant PPG17 typologies in order to ensure that Gedling Borough has a good provision of high quality green space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards will be used to identify green spaces within the Borough that fall below the correct/acceptable standard, so as to inform proposals to improve green space in different parts of the borough. Work to existing specification which will automatically start to bring up the standard of the Medium or Small parks which currently fall below.</li> </ul>	<p>2013</p>	<p>Service Manager Parks and Street Care (PASC)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>• Develop Site Management Plans for all Large Sites, along with generic site management plans sites for Medium and Small Parks.</li> <li>• Develop a volunteers action plan opportunities.</li> <li>• To increase the standard of all green space sites to achieve a Nottinghamshire Standard score of at least 6 Or 42 when applied to Green Flag standards.</li> <li>• Achieve service standards set out in the specification.</li> <li>• Through the application of best practice design principles and utilise in-house skills and specialist where appropriate</li> <li>• Through site management plans</li> <li>• Consultation on introducing "No Smoking Zones" in play areas</li> <li>• Achieve performance indicator set in Corporate Plan (2011-2015 to remove offensive graffiti within two working days and high visibility within 10 working days).</li> <li>• Review every 6 months the specific teams created to ensure high standard of cleanliness.</li> <li>• Utilise the Community Payback Scheme to clear litter hot spots.</li> <li>• Parks Rangers trained to issue Fixed Penalty Notices</li> <li>• Draft new Tree Policy for adoption, then work to the policy to continually provide quality tree management and encourage the provision of urban trees to provide shade from heat and identify areas for further planting.</li> <li>• Cyclical inspections on a three year rolling programme to determine and complete required works in a timely manner.</li> <li>• Create A Skilled Workforce through expansion of the apprenticeship scheme to 2 (2012/13) and 3 (2015/16), subject to an appropriate curriculum becoming available from local colleges and provide two internships at managerial / supervisory level.</li> <li>• Create a Skilled Workforce through performance management, the implementation of the training matrix and the appraisal</li> </ul>	2018	Parks Development Officer
	2013	Parks Development Officers and Parks Rangers
	Throughout strategy	PASC Services All Teams
	Throughout strategy	
	On all new play areas	PASC Services All Teams
	2015 then yearly	Development Officers
	2015	Development Officers
	3 monthly	Operations Manager PASC & Street Cleansing Teams
	Throughout strategy	Operations Manager PASC & Street Cleansing Teams
	Throughout strategy	Probation Service
	2013	Neighbourhood Service & Parks Rangers
	2013	Service Manager, PASC
	3 Year Inspections	County Council Tree Officer
	2015 / 2026	Service Manager PASC / All PASC Staff
	Yearly	Service Manager PASC

	<p>system. Keep training up to date with relevant legislation. .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop clear employment pathways.</li> </ul>	2012/13	Service Manager PASC
<p><b>Objective 1.3:</b> To ensure everyone living, working and visiting Gedling Borough has easy access to well-maintained safe open spaces</p>	<p>The strategy sets recommended access standards for all the relevant PPG17 typologies in order to ensure that Gedling Borough has a good provision of accessible green space that is fully DDA compliant.</p> <p>Where there is a deficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards will be used to identify parts of the Borough that are currently deficient in terms of access to the various green space typologies, so as to inform proposals to improve access in different parts of the borough. (e.g. The creation of a new Gedling Country Park on the site of the former Gedling Colliery).</li> <li>• The provision of accessible green space is increased as the population grows.</li> <li>• Gedling has a good balance of different types of accessible green space.</li> <li>• To apply the following principles to the location and design of play spaces: The Play England manual 'Design for Play'. 10 principals for Play. Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents design guides. The Association of Play Industries design guide lines. Play spaces should be located where there is good natural Surveillance from street and neighbouring houses. Play spaces should be located on accessible green space where feasible and include elements of natural and free play A buffer zone should be provided around play areas</li> <li>• All play areas should be designed to be inclusive for children and young people with disabilities. Where there are deficiencies they are identified and recommendations will be acted upon.</li> <li>• Investigate the possibility of increasing levels of cycling within the borough's green infrastructure through, routes to schools through parks and open spaces and promote family based cycling activities.</li> <li>• Carry out disability access audits for all the main parks and open spaces, then develop a plan to prioritise and implement access improvements are identified in the access audits.</li> </ul>	<p>2012 onwards</p> <p>On all new play areas</p> <p>2012 onwards</p> <p>2014 onwards</p> <p>2013/14/15</p>	<p>Development Officers</p> <p>Planning Services / PASC Services</p> <p>Development Officers</p> <p>Development Officers and Service Manager PASC / Groundwork / Notts City Council / County Council</p> <p>Development Officers</p> <p>Development Officers</p> <p>Development Officers</p>



## Aim 2 To promote the central role that green spaces play in contributing to the Boroughs biodiversity, sustainability and heritage

<b>ACTION PLAN</b>			
What do we want to achieve	How are we going to do it	Timescale	Lead & Key Partners
<b>Objective 2.1:</b> Protect the Biodiversity of the many habitats found in the borough's urban and rural green spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure any development works protect and conserve vulnerable habitat's and protect and enhance all native species to ascertain any losses that might occur. This should be a routine part of the decision making process.</li> </ul>	2012	PASC Services / Planning Services
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertaken biodiversity surveys for all applicable sites and update the specification to take account of any changes. Work to reduce sources of harm to habitat and associated species and create and develop new habitat sites, including link green corridors.</li> </ul>	2015	Parks Development Officer / Notts Wildlife Trust / County Council / Park Rangers / Volunteers / Universities / Planning
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Act on national guidance and best practice guidelines, e.g. DEFRA hedge cutting and review the specification accordingly in relation to aspects such as habitat piles from cuttings for invertebrates, reptiles and small mammals.</li> </ul>	2015	County Council / PASC Services / Parks Development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where applicable analyse grass cutting regimes and machinery used, review changes to accommodate best practice to encourage biodiversity. For example, leaving cuttings in piles on site to be used by invertebrates and reptiles.</li> </ul>	2013	PASC Services Operational Staff
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Audit current practices to determine where pesticides are being used, for what purposes and which chemicals are used. Particular attention should be paid to fine turf areas, rose gardens and hard surfaces.</li> </ul>	2015	PASC Services Operational Staff
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with volunteer groups and other partners to develop and manage open space areas within cemeteries with initiatives such as wildflower meadows and other suitable habitat areas.</li> </ul>	2014	Service manager, PASC Services / Development Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement organic cultural methods or Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategies in parks, and seek alternatives to chemical pesticides where possible.</li> </ul>	2015	PASC Services Operational Grounds Maintenance Staff
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare Management Plans for Bestwood Country Park, Burntstump Country Park and Gedling Country Park. Management statements for all other countryside sites, LNR's, SSSIs and SINCs with action plans for delivery. Consult and involve relevant local groups regularly on proposed management.</li> </ul>	2020	Parks Development / Notts Wildlife Trust / County Council / Park Rangers / Volunteers / Universities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure protection by designating new sites as Local Nature Reserves E.g. The Hobucks and Midland Woods sites.</li> </ul>	2015	Parks Development / Notts Wildlife Trust / Park Rangers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with Gedling Conservation Trust and the Royal Society for</li> </ul>		

	Protection of Birds on making the Trent Valley area, and in particular the Netherfield Lagoons a valuable green corridor and important LNR for the Borough's residents.	2012	Parks Development / Gedling Conservation Trust / County Council / Park Rangers / Volunteers / RSPB
<b>Objective 2.2:</b> Promoting Sustainability within the Parks Service and modify practices to adapt to Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recycle 100% of tree produce for either biomass or as a timber product for carving and joinery</li> <li>Ensuring that local residents recognise the role that green spaces can play in mitigating effects of Climate Change so that the potential benefits of green space for the Borough as a whole can be maximised.</li> <li>Provide a peat free service - Source suppliers who use peat free compost.</li> <li>Use water retaining pellets in flower beds, hanging baskets, shrub beds to reduce the amount of watering required.</li> <li>Where possible plant perennials and reduce bedding plants.</li> <li>Broaden tree and other plant species selection to cope with climate change and research potential new habitats whilst controlling invasive species.</li> <li>Review the management of existing green spaces and trees within the boroughs to reduce the risk of flash flooding from intense periods of rainfall causing high levels of surface water run-off.</li> <li>Review maintenance regimes of gulley's, grids and drainage assets, continue to identify priority areas most at risk such as the Lambley Dumbles, and amend as required to cope with changing climate conditions. (Inc. Sand bag materials and storage for emergency response)</li> <li>Plant 100 new trees per year in the Borough parks and open spaces.</li> <li>Look at effective cost effective ways of green waste recycling and provide education and learning opportunities regards disposal of waste by recycling via junior ranger events.</li> </ul>	Yearly	PASC Tree Team
		2025	PASC Services / Sustainability Officer
		2015	PASC Operations Manager
		2012 onwards	PASC Grounds Maintenance Operative Team
		2012	Grounds Maintenance Team
		2016	Service Manager PASC / PASC Operations Team
		2014	Service Manager PASC / PASC Operations Team
		Monthly	Service Manager PASC / PASC Operations Team
		Yearly	Service Manager PASC / PASC Operations Team / Woodland Trust /Volunteer Groups
		2012 onwards	Service Manager PASC / PASC Development Officer / Parks Rangers / School Groups
<b>Objective 2.3:</b> Protect and preserve the archaeological features and heritage in Parks and Open Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforce the byelaws to deter metal detecting, bottle digging, unauthorised vehicle use and other activities which may damage archaeological remains.</li> </ul>	Throughout strategy	PASC Services

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Closely monitor the potential impact that events and other activities may have on historic landscapes and fabric, and, where necessary, take action to limit or preclude such activities where there is a clear risk of significant erosion or damage.</li> </ul>	Throughout strategy	PASC Services
--	--	---------------------	---------------

### Aim 3 To provide open spaces and play and sports facilities to enable residents to undertake a wide range of recreational and educational activities for healthy living

<b>ACTION PLAN</b>			
What do we want to achieve	How are we going to do it	Timescale	Lead & Key Partners
<b>Objective 3.1:</b> To promote the role green spaces play in contributing to the boroughs health and well-being by promoting sport and physical activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To deliver the recommendations in the Playing Pitch Strategy.</li> </ul>	2014 onwards	Sports Development / Parks Development Officer / Service managers PASC / Leisure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop further links with the local health service to promote physical activity within parks and open spaces.</li> </ul>	2015	Sports Development / Parks Development Officer / Service managers PASC / Leisure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Free training for volunteer leaders of health walks.</li> </ul>	2015	Sport Development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through working with Sports Development Team to encourage external clubs to utilise parks. E.g. Tennis Coaching, fitness classes etc.</li> </ul>	2015	Sports Development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor usage in parks and play areas</li> </ul>	2014	Development Officers / Groundwork
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote parks through the delivery of the Parks and Open Spaces Marketing Plan.</li> </ul>	2012	Development Officers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase free opportunities to exercise.</li> </ul>	2012	Parks Development Officers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor the effects (using PCT standard Health Questionnaire) in order to gather a robust evidence base.</li> </ul>	2015	PASC Management Team
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore partnerships with Gedling Leisure</li> </ul>	2012	Service Manager PASC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review lease agreements with boot camp trainers</li> </ul>	2013	Parks Development Officers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to achieve the Allotments standard.</li> </ul>	Yearly	Parks Development Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By using Gedling Borough Council's Allotment Standard continue to build on these relationships on the relationships with the associations</li> </ul>	Throughout Strategy	Parks Development Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attain updated figures for the number of plots, occupancy of sites and accurate waiting list data. Each site will be asked to submit this data on a quarterly basis and develop a checking system to</li> </ul>	2013	Parks Development Officer

	<p>reduce multiple site holders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% utilisation of current allotments.</li> </ul>	2012	Parks Development Officer
<b>Objective 3.2:</b> Expand on the Opportunities for and from the Education Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage University students to undertake dissertations and research projects in parks and open spaces</li> <li>Work with local schools to become more involved in parks and open spaces either as outdoor classroom, education about the environment e.g. pond dipping to gain a greater understanding and respect for parks and open spaces.</li> <li>Develop clear employment pathways.</li> </ul>	2015	Parks Development Officers
		2015	Parks Development Officers
		2012	Service Manager PASC
<b>Objective 3.3:</b> Promoting Links between Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct surveys of the borough to map and assess the green infrastructure. Such data can then be used to identify any deficient areas that might receive priority action and any linking areas that might be used to establish green walking and cycling routes including any required signage.</li> <li>Include options for linked green spaces within any Community / Neighbourhood Plans.</li> </ul>	2020	Parks Development Officer / Sustrans
		2015	Service Manager PASC

#### Aim 4 - To actively involve the community in their local open spaces.

<b>ACTION PLAN</b>			
What do we want to achieve	How are we going to do it	Timescale	Lead & Key Partners
<b>Objective 4.1:</b> To promote community cohesion and community involvement in the stewardship and use of green spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting stewardship of green spaces through support for the Green Flag</li> </ul>	2015	Development Officers / Friends Groups
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Award (formally Green Pennant) for community groups and develop new friends groups.</li> </ul>	2020	Development Officers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft a Parks Service Marketing Plan to increase community awareness and involvement and implement any recommendations.</li> </ul>	2014	PASC Management Staff / Parks Development Officers /
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involve the local and wider community in decision making around major improvement projects and in the design of new green spaces.</li> </ul>	2012	Development Officers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish an annual programme of events and activities taking</li> </ul>	2012	Development Officers / Leisure / Marketing & Communications / Local Media

	<p>place on parks and open spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the work of the Friends Groups to other internal and external agencies.</li> <li>Continue to develop partnership working opportunities such as those already in place with Groundwork and Greenwood Trust.</li> </ul>	<p>2012</p> <p>2012 onwards</p>	<p>Development Officers</p> <p>Development Officers / Friends Groups</p>
<p><b>Objective 4.2:</b> Increase the number of active volunteers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the number of active volunteers by 5% 2013 then 2% annually.</li> <li>Promote physical activity through volunteering on conservation tasks within parks and open spaces.</li> </ul>	<p>2012 onwards</p> <p>2012 onwards</p>	<p>Development Officers / Friends Groups</p> <p>Development Officers / Friends Groups</p>
<p><b>Objective 4.3:</b> Support new and existing community involvement in the design of green space and play areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carry out resident, community and school consultations when upgrading or redesigning existing green space and when designing and constructing new green spaces.</li> <li>Ensure local people have the opportunity to take part in decision making. Investigate feasibility of forming a 'Friends of' group to take effective community ownership of existing and new green spaces.</li> </ul>	<p>2012 onwards</p> <p>2012 onwards</p>	<p>Service Manager, PASC / Development Officers / Friends Groups</p> <p>Service manager, PASC / Development Officers / Friends Groups</p>

### Aim 5 – Increase participation in green spaces for sport and recreation.

<b>ACTION PLAN</b>			
What do we want to achieve	How are we going to do it	Timescale	Lead & Key Partners
<p><b>Objective 5.1:</b> Promote increased outdoor sport and recreation participation through targeted programming and outreach.</p>	<p>There are many good reasons for individuals to take part in outdoor recreation and sport, from physical and mental health to sociability to strengthening community and family ties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage Gedling Boroughs aging population to partake in healthy but non strenuous activities such as walking</li> <li>Promote activity opportunities to new residents and visitors to the Borough, some of whom may have experienced different kinds of outdoor recreation—or may have little information about the activities available</li> <li>Design more attractive outdoor recreation environments for young people. Carry out consultations to ensure we understand their changing interests.</li> <li>Explore innovative ways of linking outdoor experiences with the electronically focused and connected world of young people.</li> </ul>		

<p><b>Objective 5.2:</b> Identify constraints to using sports and recreation facilities and determine how to negotiate them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consult on the constraints on people's ability to take part in and enjoy recreational and sports activities. Reasons previously cited include: time, cost and lack of a companion. Investigate opportunities to resolve such constraints.</li> </ul>	2013	Parks Development
<p><b>Objective 5.3:</b> Ensure all green spaces are safe and secure using best practice design principals and necessary policing methods including the use of CCTV to reduce levels of environmental crime and antisocial behaviour.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where a green space is under-used due to anti-social behaviour the Parks and Street Care Team will work with partners to tackle the anti-social behaviour and achieve legitimate use.</li> <li>Link with Police Community Support Officers and Neighbourhood Management teams to provide additional staffing and enforcement on borough's green spaces as needed.</li> </ul>	<p>2012 onwards</p> <p>2012 onwards</p>	<p>PASC Services / Police (PCSO's) / Dog Warden / neighbourhood Wardens / Locality Co-ordinators.</p> <p>PASC Services / Police (PCSO's) / Dog Warden / neighbourhood Wardens / Locality Co-ordinators</p>



## **Section 16. Monitoring and evaluating the strategy**

It is recommended a steering group is created consisting of representative from relevant departments to meet twice per year with more regular meetings for any smaller sub groups required. This group should focus on delivery of the action plan for the strategy which they can monitor and evaluate.

A report will be compiled by the Parks and Street Care Section of the Council and for each year of the strategy detailing the main achievements and projects which have taken place. This report will be circulated to all partners involved in the strategy. The report should include case studies showing the positive impact it has had on the local communities.

There are recommendations within the strategy advising for additional work to be completed on the audit process. For example this includes conducting quality audits on typologies which previously have not been audited. It is therefore recommended to introduce a rolling programme of updates to the PPG17 audit taking into account these recommendations. This will also ensure resources are managed and the improvements are monitored and measured.

A draft of the strategy has been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) and actions from this assessment were considered in the production of the action plan for the strategy.

## **Appendix 1: Chapter 4 Community Views (Additional Information)**

In order to develop a strategy and set local priorities it was essential to consult with the local community to gain an insight into local needs and aspirations. The Council undertook consultation with residents within the Borough of Gedling. The public consultation survey set out to identify and establish the following:


- The usage of open space, sport and community recreational facilities by residents within the Borough
- The value local people attach to open space, sport and community recreational facilities
- The attitude of local residents towards open space, sport and community recreation facilities
- Attitudes to the level of existing provision and facilities
- The frequency of use by local residents to the differing types of provision
- Main mode of transport local residents use to access open space, sport and community recreational facilities
- The views of residents on the accessibility of open space, sport and community recreational facilities
- The barriers that prevent or reduce local use of open space, sport and community recreational facilities
- Local needs and expectations

### **Demographics from respondents**

When analysing the data from the public consultation it was important to take into account the demographics of the responders in comparison to the profile of the borough. Due to the nature of the survey there was a noticeable difference between the demographics of the responder and the population of Gedling. This was taken into account when considering the results and is why consultation with children and young people was conducted as a separate survey.


The majority of respondees were female (61%), with the majority being between 30 - 44 years of age (35%). Only 0.2% of responses were from persons under 16 and 1.2% from persons aged 16 to 24. In fact 66% of respondees were aged between 30 and 59. 87% described their ethnic origin as White British an additional 3% being White Irish/other. The ethnic origin falls broadly in line with Borough population statistics, however there was a higher proportion of female respondents than the borough profile.

Figure 4.1: Frequency of visits by typology



Four typologies stand out as the most frequently used (daily/weekly), these are parks and gardens and natural green space. Of those questioned the least used facilities were allotments and cemeteries.

Figure 4.2: Most Common mode of transport used to reach green spaces in Gedling in percentage



The most common method of travel to facilities is walking and driving. It is interesting to note that significantly more people walk to parks and gardens, natural green space, amenity green space, provision for children, school playing fields and green corridors than drive. Travelling by driving is more popular when reaching cemeteries, outdoor sports facilities and indoor facilities such as swimming pool, sports halls and gyms. Other modes of transport (public transport, cycle) account for between 0% and 5% within each typology.

## Travel times

Residents were asked to identify how long it took to travel to their nearest open space and whether this travel time was acceptable.

Table 4.1: Travel times and travel modes

Open space type	Mode of travel	Average travel time (minutes)	Equivalent distance 3mph walk (miles)	Equivalent Distance Walking (metres)
<b>Parks and Public Gardens</b>	Walk	14	0.32	510
<b>Natural Greenspaces</b>	Walk	16	0.35	560
<b>Green Corridors</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Amenity Greenspace</b>	Walk	8	0.34	386
<b>Play spaces for children/young people</b>	Walk	5 for LAPS and LEAPS	0.11	182
		15 for Neaps	0.33	546
<b>Outdoor Sports Facilities</b>	Walk	10	0.31	495
	Drive	15	3.6	5793
<b>Allotments</b>	Walk	20	0.53	860
	Drive	10	2.4	3862
<b>Cemeteries and churchyards</b>	Dive	20	7.2	11587

LAPS =Local Areas for Play LEAPS= Local equipped areas for play NEAPS = Neighbourhood Areas for play


The table above provides details of reasonable travel times to open spaces as identified by consultees and the preferred mode of transport. The expected travel time is calculated to the top 75 percentile in line with PPG17 guidance.

Responders were asked if the time it takes to travel to each typology was acceptable. Overall 97% of responders felt that travelling time was acceptable. In addition to this respondees were asked if there were enough public accessible open space in the Borough. 79% thought there was and 16% did not.

## Quality

Local residents were asked to rate the quality of facilities using the descriptions – very good, good, average, poor and very poor. The graph below summaries the responses of those who use the facilities.

Figure 4.3: Perceptions of quality of open spaces



The general opinion of people in Gedling is that the quality of open space on the whole is good across all typologies other than parks and gardens which were very good. The worst performing outdoor facilities were school playing fields and outdoor sport facilities. Although these are rated as good they had a lower average rating than other outdoor typologies. In addition to the public consultation in Gedling consultation took place on Parks and Open Spaces as a part of the Place Survey. In 2010 71% of residents were satisfied with Parks and Open Spaces in Gedling.

Table 4.1: Quality ratings of specific aspects of open spaces in Gedling

Local residents were also asked to rate some factors on the sites they visited the most. The table below shows respondents responses to these factors

	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	No opinion
<b>Standard of cleanliness</b>	18.9%	47.9%	24.8%	3.8%	0.9%	0.7%
<b>Design and appearance</b>	12.7%	48.1%	30.2%	3.1%	0.7%	0.9%
<b>Visitor facilities</b>	8.5%	32.5%	40.1%	7.1%	0.9%	5.9%
<b>Children and young peoples facilities</b>	11.8%	36.8%	25.7%	4.5%	0.9%	13.7%
<b>Outdoor sports facilities</b>	11.6%	39.9%	25.7%	3.3%	0.7%	12.5%
<b>Range of wildlife</b>	14.9%	34.2%	29.0%	5.2%	0.9%	8.7%
<b>Access around the sites</b>	17.9%	48.6%	22.6%	0.9%	0.2%	4.5%

<b>Choice and range of facility across the Borough</b>	7.8%	20.8%	12%	1.7%	0.2%	1.9%
--	------	-------	-----	------	------	------

The majority of respondees rate the facilities as good. Cleanliness was rated as the best with 19% considering it was very good and 48% as good. Access around the sites was also considered positively with 18% thinking it was very good and 49% as good. Visitor facilities had the worse ratings with 7% considering the visitor facilities as poor.

### Why people visit places in Gedling

Local residents were asked the reasons why they visited public open space in Gedling. The top four reasons given were; to go for a walk, to relax, to improve health and to take the family. Residents were also asked about barriers to visiting public open space. The most common reasons given as a barrier for use were; dog fouling (14%), quality of facilities (8%) and lack of facilities (7.5%). It is interesting to note that those barriers high up the agenda are related to quality and those quoted less regularly are related to access e.g. too many road to cross (1.2%) limiting long term illness (0.9%), no one to go with (1.7%)

Table 4.2: Rating of specific issues on open spaces in Gedling

	<b>A very big problem</b>	<b>Significant problem</b>	<b>A fairly big problem</b>	<b>Significant problem</b>	<b>Occasional problem</b>	<b>Not a very big problem</b>	<b>No Problem</b>	<b>No opinion</b>
<b>Vandalism &amp; Graffiti</b>	3.1%	6.8%	12.3%	6.8%	42.7%	21.9%	7.3%	3.1%
<b>Litter Problems</b>	5.2%	13.9%	12%	13.9%	36.3%	20.3%	7.8%	0.9%
<b>Anti-social behaviour</b>	4%	4.7%	11.6%	4.7%	38.2%	20.5%	14.9%	3.1%
<b>Dog fouling</b>	8.5%	15.8%	12%	15.8%	34.4%	17.9%	5.9%	1.9%

Local residents were also asked to rate some specific factors on the sites they visited the most. The table below shows respondents responses to these factors. The table shows that “dog fouling and litter” are seen as the biggest issues.

## Appendix 2: Chapter 5 Parks & Gardens (Additional Information)

### APSE Park Categories

APSE performance networks has split the various types of parks, open spaces and play areas into four categories: types A, B, C and D. Each park, open spaces and play areas are assessed according to how many of the following facilities each site possesses.

### Facility list


Aquarium\*  
Arboretum\*  
Artificial sports pitch\*  
Aviary\*  
Bandstand\*  
Boating Lake\*  
Bowling green\*  
Car parking\*  
CCTV/Other security\*  
Changing facilities/pavilion\*  
Defined park boundary\*  
Dog bins  
Footpath  
Formal/memorial beds/floral displays\*  
Full access to all park areas for disabled persons  
Glasshouses/floral conservatory\*  
Hard surface for play/kick about area/kicking wall  
LEAP play area\*  
LAP play area  
Litter bins  
Multiple play/adventure play\*  
Museum\*  
Paddling pool  
Site based staff (i.e Park rangers/wardens, maintenance staff, games attendants, offices\*  
Petanque  
Pet's corner\*  
Pitch & putt\*  
Plant collection (NCCPG)  
Putting greens  
Refreshments facilities\*  
Seating  
Signage  
Single sports pitch  
Single play unit  
Tennis/netball courts\*  
Toilets\*  
Visitor and/or information centre\*  
Visitor Facilities\* (i.e. railways, bouncy castles, model boating pond)  
War memorials/statues/sculptures/follies  
Water features/fountains  
Woodland walk\*



## Appendix 2: Parks & Gardens Continued (Additional Information)


### User consultation survey analysis

Figure 5.4: Arno Vale user survey



The quality of the grass was considered as the best aspect of the park and the care and protection of the nature and wildlife that live in the park was considered the area in need of the most improvement with 21% considering it as very poor.

Figure 5.5: Arnot Hill Park user survey




Arnot Hill Park was the highest rated facility with maintenance of trees, flowers and plants being one of its main strengths. Areas most in need of improvements were the range of facilities. Public and user consultation revealed a variety of literal responses. The themes resulting from the comments were:

- there were a number of responses explaining that Car Parking charges have discouraged people from using the park (Car Parking charges have now been relaxed)
- more challenging play equipment for older children
- improvement of security and lighting to encourage use in winter
- better quality/cleaner toilets
- other comments requesting improvements to the range of facilities included barbeque area and better facilities for picnics. For example more benches and tables

The Friends of Arnot Hill Park were consulted on their thoughts about the park. They rated the overall quality of the Park as good and stated the reason for this being improvements to the park in recent years. The Friends of group still felt improvements could be made these included more investment in facilities improved maintenance including the toilets, reduction of vandalism and taking away car parking charges. The park has retained its Green flag status for the last 5 years and has a management plan. Within this future improvements include raising awareness of the park.


Figure 5.6: Burton Road Recreation Ground user survey



Overall Burton Road was considered the park which required the most improvements. The standard of cleanliness and the protection of nature were considered one of the areas which required most improvement with the standard of the grass being the positive aspect of the park. The literal responses reported issues with gangs causing an issue with the feeling of safety. There were a number of responses asking for more plants, scrubs and flowers. There was also demand for

more play equipment targeted at an older age group. Since this survey was completed new teenage and junior facilities have been installed.

Figure 5.7: Burntstump Park user survey




The standard of cleanliness and the quality of sports facilities are areas which users felt required most improvement with the standard of the grass being the best rated aspect of the park. The cricket wicket facilities are often used as an area to play casual football causing damage to the playing surface. The cricket clubs that use the facilities have reported issues with the wicket and quality of the pavilion. A number of responses reported issues with dog fouling and litter around the public house.

There were also comments from users who felt the protection of nature could be better with the condition of the pond being poor and a lack of protection of birds during the breeding season.

There were also issues with car park charges, however since the user survey was completed car parking charges have been revised and there is now two hours free car parking on the site.

Figure 5.8: Colwick Recreation Ground user survey



Users of Colwick Recreation Ground generally had a positive opinion of the park; the main strengths were the maintenance of trees, flowers and scrubs and range of facilities. Colwick Recreation Ground is adjacent to Colwick Country Park managed by Nottingham City Council which enhances what it has to offer.


The main area of improvement was considered to be cleanliness, dog fouling being a cause for concern. Literal responses reported a need for more challenging play equipment and teen facilities, better lighting and toilet facilities.

Note: Since the user consultation was completed capital improvements have taken place on the play facilities at Colwick.

Figure 5.9: Conway Road user survey

Most of the users rated the majority of the different aspects of Conway Road as very good. The standard of cleanliness was considered the best rated aspect.


Figure 5.10: Jackie Bells user survey



The care and protection of nature and wildlife at Jackie Bells was considered as poor by the majority of responders, this is no doubt influenced by its urban location. The range of facilities and sports facilities was considered the best aspects of the park although there were a number of requests for toilet and refreshment facilities.


The Friends of Jackie Bells felt the quality of their park was excellent, the new facilities have encouraged more children and parents to use the park. The most significant issues at the Park were identified as a lack of staffing and supervision of the site and community safety issues. There was also a request for additional bins, seating and improvement in accessibility. The group felt the up keep of the recently provided facilities was essential to ensure the local people keep respecting their local park.

Figure 5.11: Killisick Recreation Ground




The standard of maintenance of the trees, flowers and scrubs were considered as the best aspects of the park and the care and protection of the nature and wildlife that live in the park was considered the area in need of the most improvement with 30% considering it as poor or very poor. Specific qualitative responses included more seating and events.

Figure 5.12: King George V, Arnold user survey




The Quality of Sports facilities were considered as poor at King George V, Arnold. Sports consultation revealed the cricket nets being in very poor condition and in need of dismantling. The pavilion was also considered to be in very poor condition. The range of facilities was also considered to be a main area for improvement. Cleanliness was considered as one of the better aspects of this park. Literal responses included more seating around the play area and teen facilities.

Figure 5.13: Lambley Lane user survey



The standard of grass was considered to be the main strength of the site. The quality of the sports facilities was considered as the main area for improvement. This is also reflected in the consultation with sports clubs who use the facilities. The other main area of improvement was considered to be the range of facilities and standard of cleanliness. Literal responses described the park as a windswept desolate underutilised area. Users felt more could be made of the play area.

Figure 5.14: Standhill Park user survey



The areas of strengths of the site were considered to be the standard of the grass and maintenance of the trees flowers and scrub, both had satisfaction levels of good or better of over 70%.

The care and protection of nature and wildlife was considered the area in most need of improvement with 21% of responders stating it was poor.

The main areas of improvement in the literal responses focused around an improvement of play facilities for teenagers. Since the user consultation was completed improvements have taken place to the children’s and teenage play facilities on the park.



## Appendix 3: Chapter 7 Amenity Greenspace (Additional Information)

### Site audit of Amenity Green space

SITE_NAME	SIZE HA	WARD	URBAN_RURAL
Bestwood Avenue/Close	0.61	Bonington Ward	Urban
Bestwood Lodge Drive Estate	6.21	Bonington Ward	Urban
Bewcastle Road	0.03	Bonington Ward	Urban
Ernehale Court	0.10	Bonington Ward	Urban
Larkspur Avenue/ Lodge Farm	0.01	Bonington Ward	Urban
Muirfield Road	0.66	Bonington Ward	Urban
Stanhope Crescent	0.10	Bonington Ward	Urban
Woodchurch Road Bestwood	1.00	Bonington Ward	Urban
Bramble Drive (Honeywood Gardens)	0.01	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Cherrywood Gardens	0.09	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Foxhill Road	0.17	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Holly Avenue/ Cross St. Carlton	0.03	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Honeywood Garden	2.22	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Standhill Road Flats	0.10	Carlton Hill Ward	Urban
Carlton Business Centre	0.04	Carlton Ward	Urban
Carlton Hill Flats	0.37	Carlton Ward	Urban
Carlton Square Offices	0.01	Carlton Ward	Urban
Cromwell St Flats/ Walton Court	0.24	Carlton Ward	Urban
Moreland Court	0.22	Carlton Ward	Urban
Orchard Avenue	0.01	Carlton Ward	Urban
Southdale Drive	0.09	Carlton Ward	Urban
Bagnall Avenue Hostel	0.05	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Byron Street/ Wordsworth Street	0.03	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Coleridge Cresecnt	0.13	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Danes Close	0.05	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Nottingham Road Flats	0.12	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Queensbower Road / Bestwood Lodge Drive	2.10	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Seagrave Court	0.01	Daybrook Ward	Urban
St Albans Road Flats/ Furlong St Flats	0.05	Daybrook Ward	Urban
St. Albans Road Flats	0.02	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Top Valley, Oxclose Lane	0.58	Daybrook Ward	Urban
West Street/ High Street Avenue	0.07	Daybrook Ward	Urban
Bramble Court	0.19	Gedling Ward	Urban
Brooklands Drive	0.13	Gedling Ward	Urban
Burton Pastures	0.60	Gedling Ward	Urban
Burton Road Burton Joyce	4.15	Gedling Ward	Urban
Conway Road	0.85	Gedling Ward	Urban
Coronation Walk Bungalows	0.14	Gedling Ward	Urban
Coronation Walk/Burton Road	0.22	Gedling Ward	Urban
Salford Close	0.14	Gedling Ward	Urban
St. Austin's Court	0.10	Gedling Ward	Urban

Bonnington Drive Flats	0.04	Killisick Ward	Urban
Brook Avenue	0.50	Killisick Ward	Urban
Kilbourne Road	4.29	Killisick Ward	Urban
Killisick Court	0.22	Killisick Ward	Urban
Kilbrook Avenue	0.06	Killisick Ward	Urban
Oakdale Road	0.09	Killisick Ward	Urban
Taverhillfield Court, Kilbrook Ave	0.02	Killisick Ward	Urban
Brookfield Road	1.28	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Brookfield Road Flats	0.05	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Downham Close	0.21	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Gedling Grove Flats	0.14	Kingswell Ward	Urban
Arnold Hill Community Centre	0.01	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Edison Way Square	0.08	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Howbeck Road/ Gleneagles Drive	0.11	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Spinningdale Open Space	0.57	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Wemberley Road/ Plains Road Open Space	1.93	Mapperley Plains Ward	Urban
Bailey Court	0.03	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Bourne Mews	0.46	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Britannia Court	0.14	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Curzon Street Flats	0.09	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Curzon Street/Ley Street	0.02	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Hotspur Drive	0.25	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Kingsley Drive / Rochester Avenue	0.02	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Kingsley Drive Open Space	0.96	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Ley Street Community Centre	0.02	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Meadow Road Flats	0.05	Netherfield and Colwick Ward	Urban
Charles Close	0.16	Phoenix Ward	Urban
Phoenix Avenue Recreation Ground	0.29	Phoenix Ward	Urban
Princess Close	0.07	Phoenix Ward	Urban
Oxclose Lane Estate	0.16	Sherwood Ward	Urban
Beck Street/Worth Street Flats	0.05	Valley Ward	Urban
Bentinick Road	0.16	Valley Ward	Urban
Cavendish Crescent	0.03	Valley Ward	Urban
Foxhill Road Flats	0.01	Valley Ward	Urban
Foxhill Road/ Cavendish Road Footpath	0.02	Valley Ward	Urban
Ian Grove	0.03	Valley Ward	Urban
Radcliffe Gardens	0.02	Valley Ward	Urban
Woodthorpe Drive	0.12	Woodthorpe Ward	Urban
Church Road / Chestnut Grove Play Area	0.47	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Lendrum Court	0.51	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Stoke Bardolph	0.27	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural

Stoke Lane/Station Road	0.83	Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph Ward	Rural
Broom Road	0.28	Calverton Ward	Rural
Calverton Open Space	1.64	Calverton Ward	Rural
Collyer Road / Mews Lane	0.01	Calverton Ward	Rural
Dunelm Drive	2.36	Calverton Ward	Rural
Governors Field, Main Street	1.90	Calverton Ward	Rural
Jumelles Drive / Longue Drive	0.31	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lee Road	0.07	Calverton Ward	Rural
Lee Road Rec Ground	0.70	Calverton Ward	Rural
Manor Road Garages Calverton	0.29	Calverton Ward	Rural
Nabarro Court Calverton	0.37	Calverton Ward	Rural
Renals Way / Brickenell Road	0.23	Calverton Ward	Rural
Seely Avenue	0.46	Calverton Ward	Rural
Spindle View	0.20	Calverton Ward	Rural
Thorndale Road / Park Road	0.37	Calverton Ward	Rural
Coppice Road/ Mapperley Plains	0.05	Lambley Ward	Rural
Cromwell Crescent Lambley	0.04	Lambley Ward	Rural
Hucknall Road Recreation Ground	1.09	Newstead Ward	Rural
Linby Village	0.04	Newstead Ward	Rural
Newstead Colliery Open Space, Tilford Road	3.07	Newstead Ward	Rural
Papplewick Moor Road	1.00	Newstead Ward	Rural
Rear of Griffins Head	0.17	Newstead Ward	Rural
Plains Road Mapperley, Mapperley Miners Welfare Cl	0.97	Porchester Ward	Urban
St. Andrew's House, Digby Avenue	0.21	Porchester Ward	Urban
Westdale Lane Community Centre	0.09	Porchester Ward	Urban
Westmoore Close Housing Area	0.45	Porchester Ward	Urban
Westmoore Court	0.18	Porchester Ward	Urban
Haddon Road	0.18	Ravenshead Ward	Urban
Cavendish Road Bungalows	0.04	St. James Ward	Urban
Orchard Court	0.22	St. James Ward	Urban
Wollaton Avenue Community Centre	0.05	St. James Ward	Urban
Asda Shrubbery (High Street)	0.02	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Calverton Road	0.21	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Church Lane Flats	0.07	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Church Street/Coppice Road Flats	0.06	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Rookery Gardens	0.31	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
St Mary's Church/Rest Garden	0.75	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
St Marys Close Flats	0.02	St. Mary's Ward	Urban
Rushcliffe Avenue Community Centre	0.02	Valley Ward	Urban
Park Avenue Woodborough	0.01	Woodborough Ward	Urban
Smalls Croft	0.33	Woodborough Ward	Urban
Marshall Hill Drive, Carlton Hill	2.00	Carlton Ward	Urban
Arnold Vale road	1.40	Woodborough Ward	Urban
		Rural Total	16.73 ha
		Urban Total	42.40 ha
		Overall Total	59.13 ha

## Appendix 4: Chapter 8 Provision for Children and Young People (Additional Information)

### *Play Value Proforma (Derived from Play England and ROSPA )*

Site Name:

Number of pieces of equipment:

Weather

:

Assessment By:

Date:

#### Toddlers

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Balancing		<b>1</b>	
Crawling (Short tunnels etc)		<b>1</b>	
Hiding		<b>1</b>	
Climbing		<b>1</b>	
Jumping/bouncing		<b>1</b>	
Rolling		<b>1</b>	
Rocking		<b>1</b>	
Rotating		<b>1</b>	
Sliding		<b>1</b>	
Swinging		<b>1</b>	
Sensory Items (sight, smell and sound) Traffic is negative.		<b>3</b>	
Textural Variety (two types of material = 1, three types plus = 2)		<b>2</b>	
3+Primary Colours (bold colours)		<b>2</b>	
Toddler Seating		<b>1</b>	
Does it lend to Imaginative play. Score relates to number of items that allow for imaginative play 0 > 1 = 1 2 > 3 = 2, 3+ = 5		<b>5</b>	
Interactive ability (Items encouraging group) pieces of equipment 1 or 2 = 1 3 or 4 = 2 5+3		<b>3</b>	

#### Juniors

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Balancing		<b>2</b>	
Crawling (Short tunnels etc)		<b>1</b>	
Rocking		<b>1</b>	
Rotating		<b>1</b>	
Rotating (Multi-use i.e. roundabouts etc)		<b>2</b>	
Rocking and rotating (Mobilus, Waltz etc)		<b>4</b>	
Sliding conventional (i.e. slide etc)		<b>1</b>	
Sliding (Firemans pole etc)		<b>1</b>	
Swinging (Single)		<b>1</b>	
Swinging (Group)		<b>2</b>	
Gliding (Aerial runways etc)		<b>2</b>	
Hanging		<b>1</b>	
Climbing (ladders, climbing wall and net)		<b>3</b>	
Agility (Clatter bridges etc)		<b>2</b>	
Ball Play (Basketball/netball/football) when encouraging competition more marks		<b>4</b>	

Parental Seating (in Toddler section)			
		1	

**Total** 27 0

### Teenagers

Criteria	No. of pieces of equipment	Max	Score
Interaction - Number of items which allow for group play. 4=4 marks 1=1 mark etc		4	
Sports Simulation / Dynamic Equipment / Competition. Site caters for 1 sport site caters for more than one sport, site allows for competition, equipment is multi use		4	
Fitness equipment 4= broad range of fitness equipment including cardio and muscular items 3 = less than 6 items but cardio and muscular present 2= only one type of equipment present but more than 1 in quantity 1= one peice of equipment		4	
Rocking and rotating (Mobilus, Waltz etc) one mark for Rocking, one for rotating, an extra mark if there is more than 1 item.		4	
Swinging (Group) Up to two marks for a basket swing, up 2 marks for a rope swing 1-2 marks depends on quality		4	
Gliding (1 = glide rail, 2= small to midium sized Aerial runways 3 = large aerial runway)		3	
Climbing (Climbing walls etc) 1= climbing present 2= Climbing applicable for all ages		2	

Textural variety Textural Variety (two types of material = 1, three types plus = 2)manipulate natural and fabricated materials			2	
Wheeled Play (for bikes, skateboards etc) flow, mix of obstacles and terrain			6	
3+ Primary colours			1	
Interactive ability (Items encouraging group) pieces of equipment 1 or 2 =1 3or 4=2 5+3			3	
Junior Seating			1	
Imaginative play (Area lending to use of child's magination, floor graphics, pretend play, local connection)			4	
Educational Play (abacus etc)			1	

48 0

### SITE ASSESSMENT

Criteria	Max	Details	Score

Textual variety 1-2 materials used =1 3+ is two marks. manipulate natural and fabricated materials		<b>2</b>	
Graphics - one mark each of these: graphics present, children involved in producing it, it includes humour,		<b>3</b>	
Teenage Seating areas/shelters . Seating - 1 mark for good location, 1 mark for seat rests, 1 mark for normal seating. Shelter -1 mark for a shelter present, 1 mark for good location of shelter, 1 mark for panels		<b>6</b>	
Ball Play number of sports (football, basketball/netball, cricket) 1 mark line markings, 2 marks surface condition,		<b>6</b>	
Wheeled Play (for bikes, skateboards etc) 2 marks for ancillary facilities e.g seating area, 2 marks for flow, 2 marks for mix of obstacles and terrain		<b>6</b>	
<b>Total</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Is the play area well used?</b>	<b>1= not used 5=very well used</b>	<b>5</b>	
------------------------------------	---	----------	--

Physical Safety, including secure boundary, vandalism, personal safety, maintenance of equipment, feeling of safety	<b>5</b>	Over looked cctv, self closing gate	
Minimum of two gates and self closing	<b>2</b>		
Access suitable for pushchairs and wheelchairs (	<b>2</b>	one mark for gates being DDA compliant and one for level access)	
Age separation	<b>3</b>	clearly defined area which allows Childrens to easily transfer areas	
Access for disabled (in reference to activities provided by equipment)	<b>3</b>	1=1-2, 2=3-4, 3=5+	
Adult Seats	<b>1</b>		
Bike storage	<b>1</b>		
Suitable litter bins	<b>1</b>		
appropriate signage	<b>1</b>		
Layout? location is a part of the through fair, and location in area	<b>2</b>		

## Appendix 4: Chapter 8 Provision for Children and Young People (Additional Information)

Gedling Borough fixed play areas.

### Arnold settlement

#### *Bonington*

Site name	PAC (play Area Category)	NPFA CATCHMENT (m) (radial straight line)	Quality Score
Muirfield Road	LEAP2	400	44%
This is an important, well-used site. It is situated at the rear of Warren Primary School on a small recreation ground. The facility has the capacity to accommodate some casual games use.			

#### *Daybrook*

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Salop Street Play Area	LEAP3	530	40%
This site provides fixed play provision for residents of the Daybrook ward. It includes an equipped area alongside grassed casual space with fixed football goals. It is a heavily vandalised site. Nevertheless, it remains an important local facility with a viable future if maintained to an appropriate standard.			
Queens Bower Road	SEAP	1300	66%
This site provides fixed play provision for residents of the Daybrook ward and also the surrounding area, including within the city boundaries. It includes a large multi use games area, zip wire and equipment for older children. It also includes an area for young children. It is a well used site and is an important local facility with a viable future if maintained to an appropriate standard. The teen facilities to this site have proven to be of great value to the local area. A skate facility would improve the quality score; however there is no appropriate location for this type of facility.			

#### *Kingswell*

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Thackerays Lane Recreation Ground	LEAP1	270	56%



<p>This site is on a busy road close to the Nottingham City boundary. It includes a significant area of casual open space. In practice, it services residents in the City as well as those living within its immediate catchment. Equipment at the site has recently been improved and its location next to casual open space adds to its value. the quality score reflects a lack of equipment for juniors however this is not considered an issue due to Arnot Hill Park in close vicinity</p>			
Arnot Hill Park	LEAP3	530	62%
<p>The site, within Arnot Hill Park, has received investment with support from the Heritage Lottery Fund. As part of this investment programme, the children's playground has been improved. It is an important play facility with a LEAP3 classification and attracts users from a wide catchment. The overall site is large and of significant informal and formal recreational value. There is also a skate park and ball court facility on the same site, however this is about a three minutes walk apart and therefore has been scored separately (see below).</p>			
Arnot Hill Park Teenage Area	SEAP	1300	57%
<p>The skate park and ball court is a significant facility with a wide catchment. It has been categorised as a SEAP due to the site's location within a park of significant informal and formal value. The score was restricted due to there not being facilities which allow for climbing swinging etc therefore reducing the play value. The skate board park could also be improved to make it more challenging to the users.</p>			
Arno Vale Playing Field	NEAP3	900	36%
<p>This is a significant facility which is well used due to it having equipment for all age groups. It has a wide catchment, which is further enhanced by its location within a recreation ground. This play area received a low quality score due to the age of some of the equipment and it accommodating all age groups but not providing high play value for any specific group.</p>			
King George V Recreation Ground	LEAP1	270	41%
<p>This is a well-used facility, located close to local shops. It is, overall, a large site including 3 ha of casual play space. The quality score was impacted by poor access and playing surface.</p>			

### **Mapperley Plains**

<b>Site name</b>	<b>PAC</b>	<b>NPFA CATCHMENT (m)</b>	<b>Quality Score</b>
Edison Way Play Area	LAP	60	54%
<p>Situated at the end of a relatively new housing estate this play area has equipment limited to younger children. There is a small area of amenity green space next to the play area, but not large enough to increase the play areas appeal.</p>			
Killisick Recreation Ground Ball Court and outdoor gym	SEAP	1100	55%

Over the last 5 years this site has been enhanced to accommodate equipment for older children and teenagers. This equipment includes a well used ball court and recently introduced outdoor gym which is also very popular. The quality score from an older children's aspect is limited due to a lack of equipment for juniors which allows for gliding, swinging as group activities. The equipment for younger children has a good area of multi-play equipment. It is adjacent to a large playing field site and is not locked at night. As a consequence the site is vulnerable to vandalism. Its position within a recreation ground, close location of a ball court and outdoor fitness equipment contributes to its overall amenity value. Despite the age of the equipment the site has a excellent range of equipment toddlers and adequate range for juniors which have contributed to the good quality score in comparison to other facilities in Gedling.

Coppice Farm School	LEAP2	360	48%
---------------------	-------	-----	-----

Situated nearer the top end of Coppice Road this relatively new play area. However its location near residential properties has resulted in limitations to opening hours.

### **St Marys**

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
St Marys Recreation Ground (Church Lane)	LEAP3	480	64%

This LEAP3 site is situated near formal sports pitches and car parking at the rear of St Mary's Church. Its overall value to the local resident population is increased by its location and recent refurbishment. Housing outside of the site's immediate radial catchment, specifically to the east of St Marys ward is not fully serviced by this site. The quality score was limited due to a lack equipment for toddlers but enhanced by the natural play element and its ability to enhance imaginative play.

### **Woodthorpe**

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Breck Hill Road Recreation Ground	LEAP3	530	38%

This is a small site. It is part of a larger pitch site that includes 3 ha of land. Although the playground itself is small, its location adjacent to the larger field is important. The site is a regular venue for junior football and school holiday programmes. Consequently, the playground is well used by young people.

### **Carlton settlement**

#### **Carlton**

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Oakdale Drive	LEAP2	380	44%
This site is located within a formal park setting and has substantial local significance. Its quality score was limited due to poor access for push chairs and wheel chairs.			
Albert Avenue/Carlton Hill	LEAP2	360	31%

This site is well used and is close to a shopping area. However due to the size of land available and therefore equipment provided it has a low quality score.

### ***Carlton Hill***

<b>Site name</b>	<b>PAC</b>	<b>NPFA CATCHMENT (m)</b>	<b>Quality Score</b>
Valley Road	LEAP3	530	24%
This is a large, locally significant site, which also incorporates 5 aside football goals and synthetic goalposts.			
King George V, Standhill Road	SEAP	580	64%
This play area has recently been refurbished which and now has a good range of equipment increasing its appeal. The site now has a good range of equipment for juniors teenagers			

### ***Gedling***

<b>Site name</b>	<b>PAC</b>	<b>NPFA CATCHMENT (m)</b>	<b>Quality Score</b>
Lambley Lane Recreation Ground South	LAP	80	39%
The overall site is split into two by a road. Residents consider the small play area to be in need of more equipment for young children (e.g., spring animals).			
Lambley Lane Recreation Ground North	NEAP3	900	38%
This larger site to the south of the LAP, is well used and identified as valuable by local residents. It attracts users from a wide catchment through its provision of skateboard ramps and a basketball hoop. However its location away from the LAP and near to the busy Arnold Lane restricts access.			
Burton Road Recreation Ground	SEAP	1100	63%
This is a refurbished site, which previously suffered from vandalism. The new teen facilities aim to encourage more appropriate use of the facilities. This site was previously classified as a LEAP however due to the capital developments can now be classified as a SEAP.			

### ***Netherfield and Colwick***

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>PAC</b>	<b>NPFA CATCHMENT (m)</b>	<b>Quality Score</b>
	Bells Field	SEAP	1100	72%
This is a significant site incorporating a skate park, 5 a-side football area and basketball hoops. Consequently, it has a wide catchment.				
	Valeside Gardens	LAP	80	85%
This is a small LAP site, with a limited local catchment. However it has excellent equipment for the target age group. It is an important site which services the local area and is well used.				

Colwick Recreation Ground	SEAP	1100	62%
This site is situated within Colwick Recreation Ground and is located near the young children's play facilities. It consists of a teen shelter and ball court Consequently; it very effectively services the local catchment, which contributes to its overall amenity value.			

### ***Phoenix***

Ref	Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
	Adbolton Avenue Play Area	LAP	70	52%
This is a small site in the Phoenix ward. It is on an area of informal recreation land and suffers from vandalism.				

### ***St James***

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Stanhope school	LEAP 3	480	68%
This site is located next to the school and has good equipment for its target audience therefore gets good use.			

### ***Valley***

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Carnarvon Grove Play Space	LAP	60	42%
This is a small site, bordered by two roads. It is in an area with little other provision and is important locally.			
Cavendish Play Space	NEAP1	240	38%
This site is located next to Carlton Cemetery on a reasonable sized green space, although with it being on a incline limits it use. It consists of a ball courts and play facilities for younger children.			

### **Rural areas**

#### ***Bestwood Village***

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
The Square	LEAP1	270	44%

This is a LEAP1 facility with a range of large and small equipment. Owned by the Parish Council, there is some limited casual play space on the site. It is locally well used with easy pedestrian access from throughout the village. The lack of play value in the equipment mainly due to its age has resulted in a quality score of 44%

### ***Burton Joyce and Stoke Bardolph***

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Church Road/Chestnut Grove Play Area	NEAP2	600	42%
This is a large site, the amenity value of which is increased by virtue of its location adjacent to the local recreation ground. The quality has been limited due to the age of the equipment.			
Stoke Lane Play Area	LAP	60	23%
This is a small grassed area, funded by the Parish Council, which services a small isolated community. The amount of children it caters for needs to be assessed before a decision is made to improve the facilities.			

### ***Calverton***

Ref	Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
	Park Road Recreation Ground (William Lee)	SEAP	1100	33%
This is a large 13 piece site with adjacent space for casual ball games. Although not all the equipment has rubber or bark safe fall areas, the site is well used.				
	James Seely Playing Fields, Main Street	LAP	80	42%
This is a LAP with a small range of equipment and a small radial catchment. The quality score was limited to poor access to the site.				

### ***Lambley***

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
Lambley Lane RG, rear of School Catfoot Lane	LEAP3	580	52%
Recently Refurbished and located next to the school this facility provides equipment to meet the needs of the children in the village. The quality score was limited due to repetition in equipment. For example there were a number of pieces of equipment that provided play balancing value. Adjoined to the site is also a small playing field.			

### ***Newstead***

Site name	PAC	NPFA CATCHMENT (m)	Quality Score
-----------	-----	--------------------	---------------

Newstead School Play Area	LEAP2	400	44%
This site is located adjacent to the area's primary school and caters for the Village.			
Newstead Skateboard park. Land north of former records office	NEAP 2	750	60%
A large skateboard park and play equipment located next to a good plot of amenity green space with recreational value.			
Newstead Village MUGA	NEAP1	600	56%
This is located within the village centre near to the community centre. This has been assessed separately to the skateboard park due to the distance between the two facilities.			
Rear of Village Hall, Linby Lane	NEAP2	830	57%
This, stand alone, site is a large LEAP2 facility. It is owned and managed by the Parish Council. It is adjacent to an area of casual play space able to accommodate informal ball games and is considered to be more than adequately meeting the needs of local people. More improvements are planned to the facilities which should increase its quality score.			

### ***Ravenshead***

<b>Site name</b>	<b>PAC</b>	<b>NPFA CATCHMENT (m)</b>	<b>Quality Score</b>
Haddon Road Play Area	LEAP3	480	52%
This play area is situated within a residential estate and is accessed via a walkway away from the main road. The site provides good play opportunities for young children up to the age of nine or ten years. It also has picnic and seating facilities.			
Abbey Gates	LEAP1	240	36%
The Abbey Gates site is situated away from the main road, adjacent to Abbey Gates Primary School. It provides a valuable amenity for the local community with adequate equipment.			
Leisure centre teen area	NEAP1	600	50%
This Multi Games Area is located on a field next the Leisure Centre which increases its appeal			

### ***Woodborough***

<b>Site name</b>	<b>PAC</b>	<b>NPFA CATCHMENT (m)</b>	<b>Quality Score</b>
Lingwood Lane Playing Field	NEAP1	660	44%
This NEAP 1 facility services the whole of the Woodborough settlement. It is a stand alone facility of 1.75 ha overall. It has adequate managed casual play space to accommodate informal ball games. Access to the play area using pushchairs and the age of the equipment limited the quality score.			

## Appendix 5: Chapter 9 Outdoor Sport Provision (Additional Information)

### Sports Club consultation quality scores of facilities

CLUB NAME	LOCATION	PLAYING AREA	CAR PARKING	CHANGING FACILITIES
Arnold Ex Service Veterans FC	Killisick Park (Pitch 2)	10	10	10
Blacks head FC	Burton Road	8	1	10
Standhill BC, Carlton Conway S.C Bowls Club	Conway road Carlton/Netherfield	1	10	10
Carlton Town Juniors FC		5	2	6
Gedling Borough Council Sports & Social Cricket Club	King George v rec, Arnold	8	7	6
Gedling Southbank FC	Lambley Lane	1	3	2
Gedling Southbank FC -Senior Section			4	6
Greyfriars Celtic FC	Burton Road – Pitch 2	7	3	7
Lambley Village Cricket Club	Lambley Lane Cricket Ground	5	7	4
Mapperley Golf Club		7	7	7
Netherfield Colts FC		10	5	1
Newstead Abbey & Village Cricket Club		3	1	8
Papplewick & Linby Cricket Club		5	6	1
Pavoures Rugby RFC		3	2	4
Porchester Bowling Club		9	2	4
Quarrydale United FC	Newstead Recreation Ground	7	8	9
Ramsdale Park Golf Centre		2		4
Springwater Golf Club		7	6	



## Appendix 5: Chapter 9 Outdoor Sport Provision (Additional Information)

### Summary of Playing pitch assessment April 2008

Quality Assessment Review of Gedling Recreation Grounds

Site	Issue	Action
Breckhill Recreation Ground. One Senior pitch	Typical wear patterns on most heavily used areas. With less than 30% ground cover in these areas. Also compacted goal mouth areas with minor undulations.	Vertidrainage = £537.65 +VAT Application of sand top dressing = £3151+VAT Topping of low spots in goal mouth = £174.80 + VAT Over-seeding = 515.95+VAT Fertiliser application = £511.10 Total = £4890.50 +VAT
Burton Road Recreation Ground. Two senior pitches	Both goal mouth areas showed wear and defoliation. Other areas 70-80% cover	Vertidrainage x 2 pitches = £645.15 + VAT Application of sand topdressing x 2 pitches =£3544.88 +VAT Topping of low spots = £262.20 +VAT Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £412.74 + VAT Fertiliser application X 2 = £766.60 + VAT
Carlton Hill Recreation Ground	Both goal mouth areas showed high levels of wear, compaction and defoliation. Other areas 50 - 60% cover. Wings demonstrated better cover of 60-70%	Vertidrainage = £430.10 + VAT Application of sand topdressing = £2363.25 + VAT Topping up of minor low spots in goal mouth areas £174.80 + VAT Over seeding + £412.74 + VAT Fertiliser application = £383.30 Total = £383.30 + VAT
Church Lane Recreation Ground Two senior pitches	Both goal mouth areas showed wear and defoliation. Other areas 70-80% cover. Strip approximately 20m x 2m sward stressed and ground cover poor with stone/gravel at surface	Vertidrainage x 2 pitches = £645.15 + VAT Application of sand topdressing x 2 pitches =£3544.88 +VAT Topping of low spots = £524.40 +VAT Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £619.12 + VAT Fertiliser application X 2 = £766.60 + VAT Total = £6100.15 + VAT
Colwick Recreation Ground 3 senior pitches, one mini	Varying ground cover showed exceptional cover on 1 senior	Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £619.11 + VAT

	pitch and the mini pitches and was very good on the others. Evidence of broad leaved weeds on all 4 pitches	Fertiliser application X 2 = £1149.90 + Selective Herbicide = £786.60 + VAT Renovation works, but not essential Vertidrainage = £1290.30 + VAT Application of sand topdressing pitches =£7089.75 Total = £10,935.66 + VAT
Killisick Recreation Ground 2 senior pitches	Both goal mouth areas showed wear and defoliation. Other areas 60-70% cover	Vertidrainage x 2 pitches = £645.15 + VAT Application of sand topdressing x 2 pitches =£3544.88 +VAT Topping of low spots = £534.40 +VAT Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £309.56 + VAT Fertiliser application X 2 = £766.60 + VAT Total = £5790.59
King George V Recreation Ground One senior pitches	Centre circle areas showed high levels of wear and defoliation with less than 50% cover. Goal mouth areas were found to be compacted and some undulation and low sorts present. Goal mouth area near the main entrance was less than 20%	Vertidrainage = £430.10 + VAT Application of sand topdressing = £2363.25 + VAT Topping of low spots = £262.20 +VAT Over seeding + £412.74 + VAT Fertiliser application = £383.30 + VAT Total = £3851.59 + VAT
Lambley Lane Recreation Ground 3 seniors 2 mini	Cover across goal mouth area one nearest the car park and mini pitch closest to the car park has the poorest ground cover. Other areas were acceptable at 60-70 % or very good with 70-80 % cover with a small amount of wear and defoliation and bare patches. Goal mouth area 3 was particularly worn and compacted.	Vertidrainage = £1505.35 + VAT Application of sand topdressing = £7877.50 + VAT Topping of low spots = £917.70 +VAT Over seeding + £1238.22 + VAT Fertiliser application = £1341.55 + VAT Selective Herbicide = £262.20 Total = £13145.52 + VAT
Ley Street Playing Field One senior pitch	Both goal mouth areas showed wear and defoliation. Other areas 70-80% cover	Rootzone = £131.10 + VAT Over seeding + £154.75 + VAT Fertiliser application = £191.65 + VAT Total = £477.50 + VAT
Newstead Village Recreation Ground Two senior, one mini, one medium	One senior. Ground cover generally satisfactory (60-70%) and three lines. Moderate wear and defoliation around goalmouths	Application of sand topdressing = £7089.75 + VAT Vertidrainage = £1290.30 + VAT Scarification to junior pitch = £330.10 + VAT

	Junior pitch and mini 70-80%. High level of moss. Second senior 70-80%	Over seeding + £825.48 + VAT Fertiliser application = £1149.90 + VAT Total = £10685.53 + VAT
Nottingham Read Recreation Ground	Both goal mouth areas showed wear and defoliation. Other areas 70-80% cover	Application of sand topdressing = £2063.25 + VAT Topping of low spots = £174.80 +VAT Over seeding + £206.37 + VAT Fertiliser application = £383.30 + VAT Total = £3127.72 + VAT
Richard Herrod Leisure Centre One senior, two mini	Typical wear and tear on most heavily used pitches. 30-40% ground cover on in centre circle and goal mouth areas. Touch line also had poor ground cover. Lower wear and tear areas ranged from 60-70% Mini pitches ground cover between 60-70%, however there was a 5m strip on one pitch and centre circle and goal mouth had moderate wear and defoliation on both.	Vertidrainng pitches = £860.20 + VAT Application of sand topdressing =£3544.88 +VAT Topping of low spots = £262.20 +VAT Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £515.95 + VAT Fertiliser application X 2 = £766.60 + VAT Total = £5949.83 + VAT
Standhill Road King George V Recreation Ground One senior, one mini	Typical wear and tear bearing mind a heavily used pitch Goal mouth and centre circle had high levels of wear and defoliation with less than 50% ground cover. Goal mouth areas were compact and some minor undulation and low spots Mini pitch cover was 70-80%, with moderate levels of wear and defoliation in goal mouths and centre circle.	Vertidrainng pitches = £430.10 + VAT Application of sand topdressing =£3151.00 +VAT Topping of low spots = £174.80 +VAT Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £412.74 + VAT Fertiliser application X 2 = £511.10 + VAT Total = £4679.74 + VAT
Thackerays Lane Recreation Ground. One senior pitch	Typical wear and tear on most heavily used pitches. Centre Circle and both goal mouth areas demonstrated high levels of wear and defoliation with less than 60% cover. Goal mouth areas were compacted and some undulations and low spots	Vertidrainng pitches = £430.10 + VAT Application of sand topdressing =£2363.25 +VAT Topping of low spots = £262.20 +VAT Over-seeding x 2 pitches = £412.74 + VAT Fertiliser application X 2 = £383.30 + VAT Total = £3851.59 + VAT

## Appendix 5: Chapter 9 Outdoor Sport Provision (Additional Information)

### National Playing Field Association Quality Assessments

Location	Changing accommodation	Pitch	Ownership
Breckhill	0%	76%	GBC
Burton Road	29%	61%	GBC
Arnot Hill Park	59%	81%	GBC
Conway Road	59%	64%	GBC
Church Lane	0%	61%	GBC
Killisick	68%	73%	GBC
Lambley Lane	51%	73%	GBC
Lambley Lane (2)	59%	66%	GBC
Nottingham Road	39%	65%	GBC
Newstead	68%	66%	GBC
Haywood Road	0%	75%	GBC
Standhill Rec	0%	56%	GBC
Victoria Road	44%	53%	GBC
Colwick	32%	53%	GBC
Carlton Forum	85%	63%	GBC
KGV Arnold	27%	79%	GBC
Thackerays	49%	73%	GBC
Richard Herrod	93%	68%	GBC
Bestwood PR	15%	47%	GBC
Carlton Hill	0%	65%	GBC
Burntstump	29%	69%	GBC
Oakdale	49%	68%	GBC
Muirfield	0%	74%	GBC
Calverton MW	68%	81%	Private
Burton Joyce	93%	79%	Parish
Old Pavions	0%	85%	Private
Woodborough Woods	0%	68%	Parish

## **Appendix 5: Chapter 9 Outdoor Sport Provision (Additional Information)**

The following policy 'Planning for Recreation' should be considered for inclusion within the Plan:

### *Planning for Recreation*

*In conjunction with partner agencies and local communities, the Council will aim to:*

- I. Protect recreational facilities where there is a recognised or expressed need as identified in the Parks and Open spaces strategy.*
- II. Enhance the provision and quality of recreational facilities as demonstrated in the Parks and Open spaces strategy.*
- III. Strive to ensure that recreational facilities are accessible to all sections of the community*
- IV. Encourage the appropriate management of recreational facilities*

It is further recommended that the Council adopt the following policy within the Local Plan:

### *Protection of outdoor recreation facilities*

*Proposals that would lead to the loss of existing or former land used for outdoor sport or recreation will not be permitted where there is a recognised identified need for such facilities. An exception may be made where a Playing Field and Recreational Open Space Impact Assessment, carried out by the developer, is measured against the findings of the Council's PPG17 audit and parks and open spaces strategy and identifies that (one of) the following will be the case:*

- I. Alternative facilities of at least equivalent community benefit, accessibility and value will be made available.*
- II. An excess of outdoor sports or recreational facilities within the catchment area such that the proposals would not lead to a shortfall compared with the Council's standards, taking into account the quantitative and qualitative value of the existing provision.*
- III. The proposals would lead to the retention and enhancement of the existing provision in terms of its quantitative and qualitative value to meet local needs.*

With regard to new and existing recreation provision it is also recommended that the revised core strategy includes a policy for the provision and improvement of outdoor recreational facilities. A suggested policy is highlighted below:

### *Provision and improvement of outdoor recreational facilities*

*Proposals for the provision of formal outdoor recreational facilities will normally be permitted where they:*

- I. Meet the needs of all residents for a range of sporting and recreational opportunities, in terms of quality, accessibility, choice and value*
- II. The size and location of the site is capable of accommodating a viable outdoor recreational facility*
- III. Are located in accessible locations and have alternative modes of access to facilities*
- IV. Have an acceptable impact upon the:*
  - Amenity of surrounding residents and occupiers.*
  - Road network and access into the site.*
  - Townscape, and the*
  - Landscape and ecology of the site*
  - Provide the necessary ancillary facilities to ensure the viability and sustainability of the site*

## Appendix 6: Chapter 11 Cemeteries & Burial Grounds (Additional Information)

Gedling Borough Council Cemetery Maintenance (2011)

Name	Type
Mansfield Lane Cemetery	PRIVATE CEMETERY - WORKING
St Wilfrid's Churchyard	PRIVATE CHURCHYARD
Hollinwood Lane Cemetery	PRIVATE CEMETERY - NON WORKING
Church Street Churchyard, Lambley	CLOSED CHURCHYARD
All Hallows Closed Churchyard, Gedling	CLOSED CHURCHYARD
St Helens Closed Churchyard, Burton Joyce	CLOSED CHURCHYARD
St Marys Churchyard - Garden of Rest	CLOSED CHURCHYARD
Emmanuel Churchyard	CLOSED CHURCHYARD
Bestwood Cemetery	PRIVATE CEMETERY - NON WORKING
Beacon Baptist Church	PRIVATE CHURCHYARD
Cross Street Church	PRIVATE CHURCHYARD
Gedling Cemetery	CEMETERY - WORKING
Carlton Cemetery	CEMETERY - WORKING
Redhill Cemetery	CEMETERY - WORKING



## **Appendix 7: Chapter 14 Resourcing Green Spaces (Additional Information)**

### **Resourcing natural green spaces**

#### **Capital funding for sports facilities**

Areas for improvement identified in the site visits may require either capital or revenue expenditure (or both). There are several potential sources of financial aid. These include:

- Football Foundation
- Rugby Football Foundation
- Sport England

#### The Football Foundation

The Foundation is dedicated to revitalising the grass roots of the game, constructing modern football infrastructure creating facilities that are fit for the game in the 21st century. See [www.footballfoundation.org.uk/](http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/) for more information

#### Rugby Football Foundation

In January 2003, the Rugby Football Union (RFU) announced the commencement of this fund. Community rugby clubs can apply for grants and/or interest-free loans to fund capital facility projects which contribute to the recruitment and retention of players. This funding is available to clubs participating at Level 5 or below.

#### Sport England

##### **Iconic Facilities**

Sport England's Iconic Facilities fund draws on the inspirational pull of London 2012 to create local beacons for grassroots sport. £30m is to be invested over the next three years in innovative, large-scale, multi-sport facilities' projects that are regionally significant for at least two sports and can demonstrate long-term financial viability.

##### **Protecting Playing Fields**

Sport England's funding programme, Protecting Playing Fields ( PPF ) is part of our Places People Play Olympic legacy mass participation programme and is investing £10 million of National Lottery funding in community sports projects over three years from 2011-2014.

##### **Themed Rounds**

Sport England's themed rounds are competitive, targeted National Lottery investment programmes that address specific challenges to community sport and opportunities to increase participation. Themed rounds so far have been Rural Communities, Active Universities and Active Women.

## **Resourcing Childrens play facilities**

### **Heritage Lottery fund**

Offer a range of grants, awarding grants upwards of £3,000.

For example Parks for People

7 Holbein Place, London, SW1W 8NR

Tel: 020 7591 6042/44

Email: [enquire@hlf.org.uk](mailto:enquire@hlf.org.uk) Web: [www.hlf.org.uk](http://www.hlf.org.uk)

### **Co-op Community Dividend**

Offer of cash to voluntary, self help, co-operative or not-for-profit organisations.

Tel: 0115 9873933, Email: [April.Armstrong@co-op.co.uk](mailto:April.Armstrong@co-op.co.uk), Web: [www.co-op.co.uk](http://www.co-op.co.uk)

### **Nottingham Building Society**

Supports worthwhile causes across the region

The Award Panel, Nottingham Building Society, 3-5 Upper Parliament Street, Nottingham. NG1 2BX, Tel: 0115 9564289, Email:

[francesca.grossman@thenottingham.com](mailto:francesca.grossman@thenottingham.com), Web: [www.thenottingham.com](http://www.thenottingham.com)

### **Nottinghamshire County Council Grant Aid for the Voluntary Sector**

A scheme that covers a wide range of projects across Nottinghamshire.

Nottinghamshire County Council, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP

Tel: 0115 977 4336

[http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/home/your\\_council/howweprovideyourservices/partnerships/voluntarysector/grant\\_aid.htm](http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/home/your_council/howweprovideyourservices/partnerships/voluntarysector/grant_aid.htm)

### **Big Lottery Funding - Reaching Communities**

Big Lottery Fund, 1 Plough Place, London, EC4A 1DE

Tel: 0845 410 2030, E-mail: [enquiries@biglotteryfund.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@biglotteryfund.org.uk), Website:

<http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk>

### **Big Lottery Funding - Awards For All**

Grants to help small groups and local communities.

Big Awards for All Apex House 3 Embassy Drive Calthorpe Road Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 1TR

Telephone: 0121 345 7700, Minicom: 0121 345 7666, Fax: 0121 345 8888

<http://www.awardsforall.org.uk/england/index.html>

### **Living Space**

Outdoor spaces can be considered for grants as long as the space is open to the public.

Living Spaces, PO Box 2014, Reading, RG4 7XU

Tel: 0845 6003190, Email: [info@living-spaces.org.uk](mailto:info@living-spaces.org.uk), Web: [www.living-spaces.org.uk](http://www.living-spaces.org.uk)

### **RSWT - Biff award**

Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts (RSWT), The Kiln, Waterside, Mather Road, Newark, Nottinghamshire , NG24 1WT

Tel: (01636) 670000, E-mail: [biffaward@rswt.org](mailto:biffaward@rswt.org) Website: <http://www.biffaward.org>

### **Tesco Charity Trust - Community Award Scheme**

The Tesco Charity Trust Community Award Scheme supports local community projects whose core work supports the welfare of children, elderly people and people with disabilities, which are based in areas where Tesco has stores.

Tesco Charity Trust, PO Box 980, Canterbury, CT1 9DX, Tel: 0845 612 3575

Website: <http://www.tescopl.com>

For applications over £4,000, applicants should contact:

Michelina Filocco, Secretary

Tesco Charity Trust, Tesco House, Delamare Road, Cheshunt, Herts, EN8 9SL

E-mail: [michelina.filocco@uk.tesco.com](mailto:michelina.filocco@uk.tesco.com)

### **SITA Trust enhancing communities programme**

Support projects that make physical improvements to community leisure facilities and historic buildings / structures.

SITA Trust, The Barn, Brinkmarsh Lane, Falfield, South Gloucestershire, GL12 8PT

Tel: (01454) 262910, Fax: (01454) 269090, E-mail: [sita.trust@sita.co.uk](mailto:sita.trust@sita.co.uk), Website:

<http://www.sitatrust.org.uk>

### **The Veolia Environmental Trust**

Ruthdene, Station Road, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DG

Tel: 01902 794 677, Email: [info@veoliatrust.org](mailto:info@veoliatrust.org), [www.veoliatrust.org/](http://www.veoliatrust.org/)

### **Wren Funding**

Waste Recycling Environmental Ltd, WREN House, Manor Farm, Bridgham, Norfolk, NR16 2RX

Email: [info@wren.org.uk](mailto:info@wren.org.uk), Telephone 01953717165, [www.wren.org.uk](http://www.wren.org.uk)

### **Nottinghamshire Community Foundation.**

Grants include RTC fund, The Jones Trust Community Fund and Freemasons Fund Nottinghamshire Community Foundation, Cedar House, Ransom Wood, Business Park, Southwell Road West, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire NG21 0HJ

Community Foundation Advisors - Tel: 01623 620 202, <http://www.nottscf.org.uk/>

Email: [enquiries@nottscf.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@nottscf.org.uk)

## **Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Improvement Scheme**

The objective of this scheme is to regenerate and transform the county's village and town centres, countryside, businesses, leisure and tourism spots. The LIS programme helps local people in local communities develop a local 'pride of place' and responsibility for the environment.

The scheme also aims to promote rural initiatives, market town projects that improve the centre's attractiveness and economic viability, conservation and heritage projects and projects that encourage economic and cultural regeneration.

## **Local Funding**

### **Section 106 agreements**

Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority (LPA) to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission

Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold, Nottingham, NG5 6LU. Tel: 0115 901 3901

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

A planning charge which allows local authorities to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects in their area Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold, Nottingham, NG5 6LU. Tel: 0115 901 3901

### **Health and Social Wellbeing partnership fund**

c/o Sue Coleman, Public Health, NHS Nottinghamshire County, Byron Court, Brookfield Gardens, Arnold, Nottingham, NG5 7ER Tel: 0115 883 1868

### **Gedling Homes**

Gedling Homes, Gedling House, Wood Lane, Gedling, Nottingham, NG4 4AD  
Tel: 0115 883 1868, email [enquiries@gedlinghomes.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@gedlinghomes.co.uk),  
[www.gedlinghomes.co.uk](http://www.gedlinghomes.co.uk)

### **Local Councillors (Ward and County) community project**

Contact Gedling Borough Council for the details on your local councilor. Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold, Nottingham, NG5 6LU. Tel: 0115 901 3901

## **Support for Third Sector and Voluntary Organisations**

**Gedling Council for Voluntary Service**

Gedling Community & Voluntary Services, 22a Main Road, Gedling, Nottingham, NG4 3HP

Tel: 0115 987 1981

Fax: 0115 987 8091

Email: [admin@gedlingcvs.org.uk](mailto:admin@gedlingcvs.org.uk)

**Government Funding Website**

Details of funding for voluntary and community organisations

Web: [www.governmentfunding.org.uk](http://www.governmentfunding.org.uk)

**Resourcing the Strategy**

Listed below are a number of possible options to help resource and provide advice on improving allotment provision in the borough

**Allotments Regeneration Initiative (ARI)**

Information on sources of funding and general advice

Tel: 0117 9631551

Email: [ari@farmgarden.org.uk](mailto:ari@farmgarden.org.uk)

Web: [www.cityfarm.org.uk/ari](http://www.cityfarm.org.uk/ari)

**Gedling Council for Voluntary Service**

Gedling Community & Voluntary Services, 22a Main Road, Gedling, Nottingham, NG4 3HP

Tel: 0115 987 1981

Fax: 0115 987 8091

Email: [admin@gedlingcvs.org.uk](mailto:admin@gedlingcvs.org.uk)

**Food Initiative Group (FIG)**

c/o Groundwork Greater Nottingham, Denman Street East, Nottingham NG7 3GX

**Contact.** Enquiries Tel 0115 978 8212 Fax 0121 978 749

**Website** [www.eastmidlands.groundwork.org.uk](http://www.eastmidlands.groundwork.org.uk)

**Government Funding Website**

Details of funding for voluntary and community organisations

Web: [www.governmentfunding.org.uk](http://www.governmentfunding.org.uk)

**Sustain**

National on-line data base of community food projects

Sustain, 94 White Lion Street, London, N1 9PF

Tel: 0207 8371228, Email: [sustain@sustainableweb.org](mailto:sustain@sustainableweb.org), Web: [www.sustainweb.org](http://www.sustainweb.org).

**B&Q “Better Neighbour” grant**

Grants of between £50-£500 to help a community project get up and running

B&Q plc, Portswood House, 1 Hampshire Corporate Park, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO53 3YX.

Tel: 0800 0926556, Email: [environment.bq@b-and-q.co.uk](mailto:environment.bq@b-and-q.co.uk), Web: [www.diy.com](http://www.diy.com)

### **Co-op Community Dividend**

Offer of cash to voluntary, self help, co-operative or not-for-profit organisations.

Tel: 0115 9873933, Email: [April.Armstrong@co-op.co.uk](mailto:April.Armstrong@co-op.co.uk), Web: [www.co-op.co.uk](http://www.co-op.co.uk)

### **Nottingham Building Society**

Supports worthwhile causes across the region

The Award Panel, Nottingham Building Society, 3-5 Upper Parliament Street, Nottingham. NG1 2BX, Tel: 0115 9564289, Email:

[francesca.grossman@thenottingham.com](mailto:francesca.grossman@thenottingham.com), Web: [www.thenottingham.com](http://www.thenottingham.com)

### **Nottinghamshire County Council Grant Aid for the Voluntary Sector**

A scheme that covers a wide range of projects across Nottinghamshire.

Nottinghamshire County Council, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP

Tel: 0115 977 4336

[http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/home/your\\_council/howweprovideyourservices/partnerships/voluntarysector/grant\\_aid.htm](http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/home/your_council/howweprovideyourservices/partnerships/voluntarysector/grant_aid.htm)

### **Awards For All**

Grants to help small groups and local communities.

Big Awards for All Apex House 3 Embassy Drive Calthorpe Road Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 1TR

Telephone: 0121 345 7700, Minicom: 0121 345 7666, Fax: 0121 345 8888

<http://www.awardsforall.org.uk/england/index.html>

### **Esmee Fairbairn Foundation**

Education, environment and social development. Includes promoting sustainable food systems.

11 Park Place, London. SW1A 1LP

Tel: 020 72974700, Web: [www.esmeefairbairn.org.uk](http://www.esmeefairbairn.org.uk)

### **Gulbenkian Foundation's Social Welfare Programme**

Community projects which regenerate local areas including sustainable solutions to local environmental issues

Tel: 020 76365313, Email: [info@gulbenkian.org.uk](mailto:info@gulbenkian.org.uk), Web: [www.gulbenkian.org.uk](http://www.gulbenkian.org.uk)

### **Living Space**

Outdoor spaces can be considered for grants as long as the space is open to the public.

Living Spaces, PO Box 2014, Reading, RG4 7XU

Tel: 0845 6003190, Email: [info@living-spaces.org.uk](mailto:info@living-spaces.org.uk), Web: [www.living-spaces.org.uk](http://www.living-spaces.org.uk)

### **National Heart Research Fund**

Priority areas are lifestyle interventions such as physical activity and healthy eating, that help to prevent or reduce the risk factors of heart disease

Tel: 0113 297 6206, Web: <http://www.heartsearch.org.uk/lifestyle-grants.htm>

### **Wren Funding**

Waste Recycling Environmental Ltd, WREN House, Manor Farm, Bridgham, Norfolk, NR16 2RX

Email: [info@wren.org.uk](mailto:info@wren.org.uk), Telephone 01953717165, [www.wren.org.uk](http://www.wren.org.uk)

### **The Veolia Environmental Trust**

Ruthdene, Station Road, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DG

Tel: 01902 794 677, Email: [info@veoliatrust.org](mailto:info@veoliatrust.org), [www.veoliatrust.org/](http://www.veoliatrust.org/)

### **Nottinghamshire Community Foundation.**

Grants include RTC fund, The Jones Trust Community Fund and Freemasons Fund Nottinghamshire Community Foundation, Cedar House, Ransom Wood, Business Park, Southwell Road West, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire NG21 0HJ

Community Foundation Advisors - Tel: 01623 620 202, <http://www.nottscf.org.uk/>

Email: [enquiries@nottscf.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@nottscf.org.uk)

### **Useful sites for European funding**

[www.cefet.org.uk](http://www.cefet.org.uk)

[www.welcomeurope.com](http://www.welcomeurope.com)

[www.go-em.gov.uk](http://www.go-em.gov.uk)

### **Local Funding**

#### **Health and Social Wellbeing Partnership fund**

c/o Sue Coleman, Public Health, NHS Nottinghamshire County, Byron Court, Brookfield Gardens, Arnold, Nottingham, NG5 7ER Tel: 0115 883 1868

#### **Gedling Homes**

Gedling Homes, Gedling House, Wood Lane, Gedling, Nottingham, NG4 4AD

Tel: 0115 883 1868, email [enquiries@gedlinghomes.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@gedlinghomes.co.uk),

[www.gedlinghomes.co.uk](http://www.gedlinghomes.co.uk)

#### **Local Councillors (Ward and County) community projects**

Contact Gedling Borough Council for the details on your local councillor. Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold, Nottingham, NG5 6LU. Tel: 0115 901 3901

Sources of Help:

**National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners** (Shirley Fleetwood is the East Midlands Rep, she is Secretary of the Robin Hood Allotment Association in Carlton)

01536 266576



[www.nsalg.org.uk](http://www.nsalg.org.uk)

**National Allotment Gardens Trust**

01752 363 379

[www.nagtrust.org.uk](http://www.nagtrust.org.uk)



# EQUALITY IMPACT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

<b>Policy/Service/Procedure to be assessed</b>	<b>Open Spaces Strategy</b>		
<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	<b>Andrew Whilde, Lance Juby, Sarah Cook</b>	<b>Date: April 2011</b>	
<p><b>Aims/objectives of the Strategy</b></p> <p>To review the quality, Quantity and accessibility of open space in the borough of Gedling by producing a PPG17 Audit, Parks and Open Spaces Strategy. This will support the development of a revised 106 agreement</p> <p>The strategy vision is to provide a network of well planned, well managed parks and open spaces offering a wide variety of opportunities for differing uses and experiences to meet the aspirations of the local communities.</p>			
<b>Key Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Current</b>	<b>Target</b>	

		<b>Performance</b>	
Satisfaction rates in Parks and Open Spaces – Place Survey 2008. Note: this has discontinued but a new local indicators will be produced		74%	74%
% of parks reaching Nottinghamshire Standard		60%	Not yet set
<b>Who are the customers and stakeholders of this service?</b>			
Residents of Gedling. Parks user and non users, visitors to the borough, businesses, Parish Councils, Sports Clubs, Allotment associations, friends of groups, partnership organisations such as Voluntary organisations, Governing bodies of sport, Play England, Planning and policy department GBC, Sport England			
<b>Detail below what information you already have about the impact this strategy has on the following groups including results from consultation, complaints, census:</b>			
<b>Black and minority ethnic people</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Place survey results show that there is no negative impact for this equality strand</li> <li>– Public consultation gathered information on this strand. No trends were noted.</li> <li>– Place survey, demonstrates high percentage of satisfaction rates and segregates information into ethic minority categories. Place survey results show that there is no negative impact for this equality strand</li> <li>– Complaints have not included any information that indicates ethnicity having any impact on the parks and open spaces strategy</li> </ul>		91.8% white British – no other significant groups
<b>Men/women and trans</b>	<p>The profile of the borough show there are slightly more females than males living in the borough (51% females).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The majority of activities in the parks are male dominated. However governing bodies such as the FA are aware and have action plans in place to address the issue</li> <li>– Information on users of the sports pitches, GBC owned allotments and bowls club members</li> <li>– Public consultation which took place to inform the strategy gathered information on this strand. More people who responded to the questionnaire were female, however door to door surveys were also completed which gathered information from residents that reflected the profile of the borough.</li> <li>–</li> </ul>		

<b>Disabled people</b>	Table 4: Residents with a limiting long term illness in Gedling Borough, 2001	
		Number
		Percentage
	With a limiting long-term illness	20421
	Without a limiting long-term illness	91366
Source: Office of National Statistics, 2001		
Not all parks and open spaces are accessible; however the strategy aims to highlight these issues and provide the information to allow these issues to be resolved. Sites are audited based on accessibility therefore future work will be prioritised on those in most need of improvements in these areas.		
<b>Gay/Lesbian/bisexual People</b>	There is little information of the impact that this strategy has on this equality strands	
<b>People from different faiths</b>	There is 71.8% Christian 18.7% no religion in Gedling No other significant groups little information of the impact that this strategy has on this equality strands	

**People of different ages**

Table 1: Age breakdown of Gedling Borough resident population, 2001-2007				
Year	0-19	20-44	45-64	65+
2001	26400	37200	29300	18900
2002	26200	37200	29300	19300
2003	25900	37000	29400	19300
2004	25900	37200	29300	19600
2005	25800	36900	29700	19800
2006	25400	36300	30200	19900
2007	25400	36300	30300	19900
Percentage change 2001-2007	-3.79%	-2.42%	+3.41%	+5.29%

Source: Office of National Statistics, 2008

Gedling Borough has a lower percentage of those aged 0–29 compared to Nottinghamshire and England, while the proportion of those who are over 44 in Gedling Borough is higher than that for the County and England.<sup>1</sup>

The information above shows that the parks and Open Spaces Strategy need to consider the aging population of the borough.

Research indicates that green spaces helps improve social integration for older and young people

<b>How will this event impact on the following groups:</b>		
The events officer takes note of all complaints/compliments, but none received connected to equality issues		
	<b>Positive impact</b>	<b>Negative impact</b>
<b>Different racial groups</b>	Place survey highlights that satisfaction rates amongst ethnic minorities are equal or higher than British white people of whom consists of 91.8% of the population. John Hiley`s research was also representative of the profile of the borough and did not highlight any issues with racial groups	No information available to indicate if language is an issue.
<b>Men/women and trans</b>	The strategy aims to start to address the issue of male dominated usage of pitches. Actions have a ready taken place to improve the feel of safety in parks.	Consultation identified that issues around the feeling of safety has a larger impact on if people visit a park when they are female.
<b>Disabled people</b>	The strategy aims to conduct an audit on all parks and open spaces including play facilities to identify and address any accessibility issues	The strategy has highlighted that needs of this strand might not be being met.
<b>Gay/Lesbian/bi-sexual people</b>	There is insufficient evidence to conclude whether pre strategy services were likely to have a differential impact on lesbian, gay or bisexual	There is insufficient evidence to conclude whether pre strategy services were likely to have a differential impact on lesbian, gay or bisexual people but differential impact is unlikely. A complaints system is in place and ways to

	people but differential impact is unlikely	report hate crime. There have been no reported case of this.
<b>People from different faiths</b>	<p>Burial sites are appropriate for a range of religions. A separate EIA has been completed on this.</p> <p>Work takes place in the parks which promotes Diversity through the organisation of events. For example annual Chinese New Year celebrations</p>	
<b>People of different ages</b>	<p>Sports clubs which are adult dominated are already working towards youth participation. The borough provide a range of facilities that meet the needs of different ages.</p>	<p>Place survey highlights that 18-24 have a significantly lower satisfaction rate than other age groups.</p> <p>The survey also highlights that more activities need to be put on for young people.</p> <p>The strategy also needs to consider the affect that an aging population will have on the parks and open spaces.</p>



**What changes could be made to the policy/service/procedure to address any negative impacts?**

The assessment found that existing Gedling parks and open spaces did not adversely impact on any equalities group through discriminatory practices. However the Assessment clearly identified that some vulnerable groups and individuals expect and need more from parks than currently delivered in order for them to be used more easily

The Assessment found that individuals and communities identified by disability and age have needs that are not being met.

The Assessment found that the parks do not meet the needs for younger people. Increasing the activities and facilities in specific areas of the borough on the parks may improve this.

The Assessment found that services were likely to have a differential impact on lesbian, gay or bisexual people but differential impact is unlikely

The Assessment found that there is insufficient evidence to conclude whether pre-strategy services were likely to be having a differential impact on communities that may be disadvantaged by where they live.

**What monitoring will be carried out to ensure this policy/service/procedure meets diverse needs**

Information will be collected from a sample of the people who visit the event. This information needs to be collected throughout the day due to the different activities attracting different sections of the community. Data will also be collected from the store holders. This information will be collected at the events once Digivey survey equipment in operation. Consultation to see if there is an actual need to provide information in other languages

Yearly review of event programme/services in line with Borough profile. Feedback from previous events.

**What actions will be included in your service plan arising from this assessment?**

Action	Outcome	Date?	Who?
Increase the number of on site staff to provide more activities for young people	Increase in satisfaction rate sin parks and opens spaces	See strategy	Parks Officer

<b>To conduct an accessibility audit on all sites including those not owned by Gedling Borough Council</b>	<b>identification</b>	<b>See strategy</b>	<b>Parks Officer</b>
<b>Develop a network on contacts within the equalities strands to enhance consultation. With particular on young people</b>	<b>To highlight an possible equality issues on specific strands including sexual orientation or religion</b>	<b>See strategy</b>	<b>Parks Officer</b>
<b>Make better use of detached youth work teams</b>	<b>Engage in young people</b>	<b>See strategy</b>	<b>Parks Officer</b>
<b>Increase the number of on site staff to provide more activities for young people</b>	<b>Increase in satisfaction rate sin parks and opens spaces</b>	<b>See strategy</b>	<b>Parks Officer</b>
<b>To conduct an accessibility audit on all sites including those not owned by Gedling Borough Council</b>	<b>identification</b>	<b>See strategy</b>	<b>Parks Officer</b>
<p>Are you satisfied that all aspects of this policy/service/procedure have been thoroughly assessed for all the strands of diversity and that no further investigation is required?      <b>Y</b>  <b>If no then a fuller impact assessment is required.</b></p>			

Signed.....(manager)    Signed.....(Corporate Equality Representative)

## Glossary of Terms

**Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE)** is a not for profit local government body working with councils throughout the UK. It promotes excellence in public services, APSE is the foremost specialist in local authority front line services, hosting a network for front line service including parks and environmental services.

**CABE Space** was part of the Commission for the Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) and is publicly funded by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). CABE Space aimed:

*“to bring excellence to the design, management and maintenance of parks and public space in towns and cities.”*

**Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17)** sets out the policies needed to be taken into account by planning bodies in the preparation of Regional Planning Guidance (or any successor) and by local planning authorities in the preparation of development plans (or their successors).

**Section 106** (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority (LPA) to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission. The obligation is termed a Section 106 Agreement.

**Supplementary planning guidance** provide guidance on local planning matters. They can be quicker and simpler to prepare than development plan documents. There is no requirement for them to be listed in a local planning authority’s local development scheme, so they can be brought forward as circumstances change.

**Multi Use Games Area (MUGA)**. This is an area designed for older children and teenagers to play games. These areas are normally fenced and offer the opportunity to play sports such as football and basketball.

**Sights of Importance for Nature conservation (SINC)** are places that are of at least county-level importance for the wildlife they hold. Nottinghamshire’s SINC’s are home to many rare and scarce species, and some are the last fragments of habitats that were once widespread and typical of the Nottinghamshire landscape. Collectively, they form an essential network of corridors and ‘stepping stones’, allowing the migration and dispersal of species

**Principle Urban Area (PUA)**. The Principal Urban Area includes the built up areas of Arnold, Carlton, Netherfield and Colwick along with the rural areas immediately adjoining them. The remaining areas including the built up areas of the villagers is classed as the Non-Principal Urban Area."