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1. Introduction

Introduction and background

The study

1.1 In November 2009, pmpgenesis was commissioned by Cotswold District Council (the Council) to undertake an assessment of open space, sport and recreational facilities across the District.

1.2 The key objectives of the study are to:

- create an accurate audit of existing open space, sport and recreation facilities across Cotswold District;
- identify local needs and aspirations through consultation, a strategic review and a review of existing provision;
- recommend standards of provision (quantity, quality and accessibility) in accordance with PPG17; and
- develop a clear framework to inform practical action to protect and improve open space, sport and recreation facilities.

1.3 This document sets out the key findings of this open space, sport and recreational facilities assessment and has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) and its Companion Guide (September 2002) as well as the Best Practice Guidance for the preparation of open space strategies (CABE Space and Mayor of London May 2009).

1.4 In addition to enabling the Council to adopt a clear vision for the future delivery of open space, sport and recreation facilities, this assessment will form an important component of the evidence base for the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF), including the Core Strategy, and will facilitate informed decision making with regards open space, sport and recreation facilities. In addition, the study will also assist in the Council’s approach to Sustainability Appraisal and the negotiation of S106 agreements.

1.5 The Place Survey (2008) emphasises that satisfaction with the local area is high (89%) and residents are more contented than both national (80%) and regional (85%) averages. In particular, residents are very satisfied with parks and open spaces and consultation reveals that residents and visitors see open spaces as one of the defining features of the character of the District. Strategic planning to ensure the ongoing protection, management and maintenance of such spaces is therefore an important priority for the Council.

Why public open space?

1.6 The profile of open space, sport and recreation facilities is becoming increasingly high on the national stage and the value placed on open spaces by local communities is reflected in the Park Life report (Greenspace, June 2007), which indicates that 92% of all those questioned had visited a park within the last month.
1.7 Open space in Cotswold District is frequently used, and the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the natural countryside are one of the main attractions for both visitors and residents.

1.8 On a national level, PPG17 states that well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives, many of which are also reflective of local priorities across Cotswold District. These include:

- Supporting an urban renaissance
- Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion
- Enhancing health and well being
- Promoting more sustainable development.

1.9 The value of open space is not just recreational. The strategic contribution that open spaces can make to the wider environment includes:

- Defining the local landscape character and providing an appropriate context and setting for built development and infrastructure
- Helping to achieve a softer interface between urban and rural environments
- Emphasising the presence of natural features within the landscape
- Supporting habitats and local wildlife
- Promoting and protecting biodiversity and habitat creation
- Supporting adaptation to climate change and reducing flood risk.

1.10 The foreword to the recently produced guide to the production of open space strategies (CABE Space and Mayor of London 2009) states that:

‘Open space has never been more important than it is today. In the face of new environmental, social and economic challenges, it is essential to our quality of life, our health and well-being and to ensuring a more sustainable future for all. Creation, protection and improvement of a high quality open space network should be at the heart of every authority’s vision for an area.’

1.11 This guidance also reinforces the importance of considering open space, sport and recreation facilities within the planning system. The Government White Paper (May 2007) highlights that minimising climate change and the protection of the environment are two of the key challenges to be addressed. ‘Adapting Public Space to Climate Change’ (CABE Space 2009) advises that well-designed, flexible public spaces offer the most effective opportunity to mitigate threats. The document goes on to highlight that:
‘Spaces that are softer, greener, more organic and natural will store water and are critical to modifying urban temperatures. Green spaces with a generous planting of trees link to form a network offering cooler, cleaner air.......... Urban green spaces form a natural infrastructure that is as critical to support urban life as streets, railways, drainage and sewers’.

1.12 Cotswold District Council has signed the ‘Nottingham Declaration’ on climate change, demonstrating its commitment to reduce its own emissions of ‘greenhouse gases’ and to support others to do the same. With similar objectives, the Gloucestershire Climate Change Forum was set up in 2009 to conduct quarterly reviews of corporate performance on climate change. The effective provision of parks and open spaces will be a key means of ensuring that the Council continues its commitment to work towards the achievement of shared objectives relating to climate change.

1.13 PPS12 (Local Spatial Planning 2008) reinforces the importance of spatial planning in creating strong and prosperous communities. Evaluation of the existing green infrastructure network and the creation of a positive framework for the protection, development and enhancement of open space will contribute to the overall achievement of sustainable development. PPS 3 (Housing 2006) PPS 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation 2005) and PPS 25 (Planning and flood risk 2006) all specifically reference the importance of appropriately designed open space in the creation of sustainable communities. The links between these different areas of open space have been recognised in the recently released consultation draft, “Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment”, which links the natural environment with planning for open space and sport and recreation.

1.14 Changing social and economic circumstances, work and leisure practices, more sophisticated consumer tastes and higher public expectations have placed new demands on open spaces. They have to serve more diverse communities and face competition from developers. Pressure for new development is currently particularly high in Cotswold District. While the provision of open spaces can be challenging, they can promote community cohesion, encourage community development and stimulate partnerships between the public and private sector. Partnership working is particularly important in Cotswold District, where much of the open space is provided by Parish and Town Councils, as well as Cotswold DC and the voluntary sector.

1.15 Parks and open spaces are more accessible to a wider range of people than some sport and leisure facilities and are therefore better able to realise the aims of social inclusion and equality of opportunity. The provision of open spaces and recreation facilities contributes to an ideal, sustainable and thriving community.

1.16 The Park Life Report (Green Space June 2007) highlighted that 83% of those surveyed feel that parks are the focal point of a community. The Active People Survey 3 (2008/09) results indicate that levels of participation in regular sport and physical activity have increased since the Active People Survey 2 (2007/08). Participation in Cotswold District (25.6%) is significantly above the national average (21.6%). The increasing profile of physical activity means that the provision of appropriate formal and informal opportunities for recreation is even more important.

1.17 The benefits of open space are further outlined in Appendix A.
The local context

1.18 Cotswold District Council is a large and predominantly rural district of which over 70% is designated as an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. A further 7% (31 sq miles) falls within areas defined as Special Landscape Areas and 8% lies within the Cotswold Water Park (parts also in adjoining Wiltshire), which is already the largest area of man-made lakes in the UK. The former sand and gravel workings are a nationally important nature conservation resource, as well as being regionally important for recreation and leisure pursuits. This serves to illustrate how important open space, as well as the countryside, is in the District.

1.19 The largest town, Cirencester, is home to nearly a quarter of the District’s 84,000 population and is the fourth largest urban area in Gloucestershire. A further 30% of the District’s population lives in nine principal settlements, specifically: Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh, Bourton-on-the-Water, Chipping Campden, Fairford, Lechlade, Northleach, Stow-on-the-Wold and South Cerney. Populations in these settlements range from 1,000 to 5,000 people.

1.20 The remainder of the District’s population is dispersed in circa 150 villages. Most of these villages are very small in size, and consequently only circa 20 have primary levels of community facilities (school, shop or post office, and a pub or village hall). The 2008 Place Survey reveals that reflecting the dispersion of settlements, access issues and poor public transport are the top priorities for improvement in the District. As a result, access to strategic open spaces and sports facilities is likely to be a challenge for residents. The difficulties in providing an effective public transport system in a District of this nature emphasise the need to ensure that there are local opportunities for informal recreation.

1.21 Despite the rural nature of the District, and the challenges for development with regard the protected land designations, the area has one of the fastest growing populations in the country - this places pressures on existing open spaces, as well as increasing demand for open space, sport and recreation facilities.

1.22 The District experiences high levels of immigration, particularly from London and the South East, and also has a comparably high percentage of house owners whose property is their second home. The current adopted Local Plan seeks to concentrate development in Cirencester and in the nine principal settlements. Population projections across Gloucestershire (Cotswold District Council 2009) indicate that the population of Cotswold District likely to continue to grow at a high rate (and above the Gloucestershire average). The population profile is also changing, and since 2002, there has been a 10% increase in the amount of residents in the District who are of retirement age or older. The provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities that meet the needs of older residents is therefore important.

1.23 The majority of businesses (87%) are small, with workforces of 1 to 10 employees. The dominance of small businesses makes the District less susceptible to structural changes in the national economy. Leisure and tourism are the main industries, comprising 19% of jobs and the service sector employs circa 45% of those working in the District. This emphasises the value of local open space, sport and recreation provision, not only to residents and visitors, but also to the long term sustainability of the economy.

1.24 Despite the rural nature of Cotswold District, there are strong influences from towns in neighbouring authorities on some parts of the District. In particular, Swindon, Cheltenham and Gloucester are located in close proximity to Cotswold District. While sparsely populated, the District is surrounded by a network of motorways and large A roads and nearby towns are therefore easily accessible, particularly for those with access to a private car. This may influence the usage patterns of some types of open space, sport and recreation facilities.
1.25 As a whole, the District has very low levels of deprivation, and according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation, there are no Super Output Areas (SOAs) in the bottom 25% nationally. Despite this, there are two areas in Cirencester (Cirencester Chesterton 2 and Cirencester Watermoor 3) which fall into the bottom 25% of SOAs in Gloucestershire. The Index of Multiple Deprivation does however indicate that some areas fall into the bottom 10% nationally when considering the barriers to access and services. This serves to further illustrate the importance of local open space, sport and recreation provision. Map 1.1 overleaf illustrates the geographical location of Cotswold District.
The Geographical Area

1.26 Analysis of the open space, sport and recreation facilities across the District has been undertaken both on a District wide basis, and also using a settlement hierarchy approach.

1.27 Analysis by settlement hierarchy allows examination of data by size of settlement and ensures that differences in views and aspirations according to the size of the settlement are understood.

1.28 Although settlement hierarchies have been used to guide the standard setting and analysis process, the application of local standards will enable the identification of priorities at settlement level.

1.29 The settlement hierarchy used draws on work undertaken to date by Cotswold District Council regarding the creation of a settlement hierarchy in the District (Cotswold District Council Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper, November 2008) which takes into account the different roles that settlements at each level of the hierarchy have in the overall functionality of the District. No spatial option has yet been finalised, and for this reason, the widest possible settlement classification option has been used (Option SS3). For the purposes of this, Parish boundaries have been used to allocate each settlement into an appropriate hierarchy. Table 1.1 summarises the settlements that are considered to fall into each level of the settlement hierarchy for the purposes of this study.

Table 1.1 - Settlement hierarchy in Cotswold District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Settlements included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester - Category B1 Settlement</td>
<td>Cirencester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns - Category B2 Settlements</td>
<td>Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh and Bourton-on-the-Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns – Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Chipping Campden, Fairford, Lechlade, Northleach, Stow-on-the-Wold and South Cerney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres - Category C2 Settlements</td>
<td>Andoversford, Blockley, Kemble, Avening, Down Ampney, Kempsford, Siddington, Willersey and Mickleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.30 Map 1.2 overleaf illustrates the Parish boundaries in Cotswold District (for those settlements included within the assessment report) and also demonstrates which settlement hierarchy each of the settlements falls into.
Map 1.2 - Settlement hierarchies in Cotswold District
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Report structure

1.31 As highlighted, this report summarises the PPG17 assessment of open space sport and recreation facilities across Cotswold District. It is split into 13 sections as follows:

- Section Two – Methodology
- Section Three – Strategic Context
- Section Four – Parks and Gardens
- Section Five – Natural and Semi Natural Open Space
- Section Six – Amenity Green Space
- Section Seven – Provision for Children and Young People
- Section Eight – Outdoor Sports Facilities
- Section Nine – Indoor Sports Facilities
- Section Ten – Allotments
- Section Eleven – Cemeteries and Churchyards
- Section Twelve – Green Corridors
- Section Thirteen – Summary, Planning Implications and Strategic Framework.
2. Methodology

Undertaking the study

Introduction

2.1 As highlighted in Section 1, this study has been undertaken in accordance with PPG17 and its Companion Guide as well as the Best Practice Guide to the preparation of Open Space Strategies (CABE Space and Mayor of London 2009). PPG17 emphasises the importance of making decisions based on local needs and aspirations as opposed to following national trends and guidelines.

2.2 The Companion Guide indicates that the four guiding principles in undertaking a local assessment are:

- (i) understanding that local needs will vary according to socio-demographic and cultural characteristics;
- (ii) recognising that the provision of good quality and effective open space relies on effective planning but also on creative design, landscape management and maintenance;
- (iii) considering that delivering high quality and sustainable open spaces may depend much more on improving and enhancing existing open space rather than new provision; and
- (iv) taking into account that the value of open space will be greater when local needs are met. It is essential to consider the wider benefits that sites generate for people, wildlife and the environment.

2.3 Paragraph 7 states that:

“local authorities should use the information gained from their assessments of needs and opportunities to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities in their areas”.

2.4 PPG17 sets out the Government’s belief that national standards are inappropriate as they do not take into account the demographics of an area, the specific needs of residents and the extent of built development.

2.5 Setting local standards through the PPG17 process therefore ensures that open space, sport and recreation facilities are tailored to the needs and aspirations of local residents as well as the characteristics and environment of Cotswold District.

2.6 Open space is one of the defining characteristics of Cotswold District and a local approach to the future maintenance and management of these assets is therefore of particular importance.
Types of open space

2.7 The overall definition of open space within PPG17 is:

“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”.

2.8 PPG17 identifies 10 typologies including nine types of green space and one type of urban open space. It states that when preparing assessments of needs and audits of existing open space and recreation facilities, local authorities should use these typologies, or variations of it. These typologies are based on the primary purpose of sites.

2.9 Table 2.1 sets out the typologies used for this assessment of open space across Cotswold District.

Table 2.1 - Typologies of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Description and Examples</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>Includes urban parks, formal gardens and country parks. Subdivided into:</td>
<td>• informal recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal Parks for example Estcourt Park, Barnsley Park, Newark Park, St Michaels Park</td>
<td>• community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Country Parks (offering easy access for countryside recreation) e.g. Cotswold Country Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces</td>
<td>Includes publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (e.g. downlands, commons, meadows), wetlands, open and running water and wastelands.</td>
<td>• wildlife conservation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• environmental education and awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Greenspace</td>
<td>Most commonly but not exclusively found in housing areas. Includes informal recreation green spaces and village greens.</td>
<td>• informal activities close to home or work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• enhancement of the appearance of residential or other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children and Young People</td>
<td>Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people.</td>
<td>• equipped play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ball courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• outdoor basketball hoop areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• skateboard areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teenage shelters and ‘hangouts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Natural or artificial surfaces either publicly or privately owned used for sport and recreation. Includes school playing fields.</td>
<td>• outdoor sports pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• tennis and bowls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• golf courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• athletics tracks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description and Examples</strong></th>
<th><strong>Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Allotments**              | - playing fields (including school playing fields)  
- water sports (including angling, sailing and water skiing)  
- growing vegetables and other root crops  
N.B. does not include private gardens |
| **Cemeteries & Churchyards** | - quiet contemplation  
- burial of the dead  
- wildlife conservation  
- promotion of biodiversity |
| **Green Corridors**         | - walking, cycling or horse riding  
- leisure purposes or travel  
- opportunities for wildlife migration |
| **Indoor Sport and Recreation** | - sports halls  
- swimming pools  
- indoor bowls  
- indoor tennis  
- community halls |

2.10 In addition to considering the primary purpose of each site, the secondary and tertiary function of each space has also been considered. For example, in some settlements, the sports facility may also function as amenity space for informal recreation.

**PPPG 17 - five step process**

2.11 The PPG17 Companion Guide sets out a five step process for undertaking a local assessment of open space.

2.12 The Best Practice Guidance note (Cabe Space and the Mayor of London (2009)) for the preparation of open space strategies advocates a six stage approach which includes scoping of the document as the first stage and the development of a strategy and action plan.

2.13 The key stages that have been followed as part of this assessment are compliant with PPG17 and therefore include:

- Step 1 – identifying local needs  
- Step 2 – auditing local provision  
- Step 3 – setting provision standards  
- Step 4 – applying provision standards  
- Step 5 – creation of clear framework for practical action
2.14 The tasks included within each step are detailed below.

**Step 1 - Identifying local needs**

2.15 PPG17 states that community consultation is essential to identify local attitudes to existing provision and expectations for additional or improved provision. The guidance relies less on the implementation of national standards and places increased emphasis on local needs. The guide to the preparation of open space strategies further supports the need to identify community aspirations. This is particularly important in Cotswold District, where the character of the open space is central to the quality of life for residents, and is one of the main draws for the large numbers of tourists that visit the area.

2.16 A balance of statistical and subjective consultations was carried out to ensure that a wide variety of opinions were heard. Subjective consultation provides an opportunity to test the key themes arising from the statistical evidence.

2.17 Consultations carried out include:

- Household questionnaires
- Internet survey for children and young people
- LDF Steering Group (including District Council Members) and key stakeholders discussion session
- Workshop sessions for Parish Councils
- Questionnaires for sports clubs, allotment holders and friends groups
- Two informal consultations with the local public
- A citizen’s workshop
- One-to-one consultations with Council officers and an online officer consultation survey

2.18 The following paragraphs provide more detail on each of the key elements of the consultation.

**Household survey**

2.19 The household survey provides an opportunity for randomly selected households to comment on the quality, quantity and accessibility of existing open spaces as well as to identify their aspirations for future provision.

2.20 5,000 questionnaires were distributed to households to capture the views of both users and non-users of open spaces. Residents were randomly selected from the electoral register.

2.21 Questionnaires were distributed in a manner that is geographically representative of the population of the Borough. This means that all residents in all parts of the Borough received questionnaires, and the amount of questionnaires sent to each area was proportional to the resident population. Distributing questionnaires to a sample of residents ensures that representatives from all age groups, ethnic groups and genders were provided with the opportunity to give their views. In order to promote an even response rate that is representative of the population profile, residents with the
next birthday in each household were asked to complete the questionnaire. An Access database of responses to the survey has been provided to the Council (Appendix B).

2.22 534 postal surveys were returned (11%). Obtaining more than 400 responses means that the results are accurate to +/- 5% at the 95% confidence interval. This data source therefore provides a reliable evidence base that can be used as the basis for setting standards that are reflective of the needs and aspirations of local residents.

2.23 Surveys were distributed and colour coded to enable identification of the settlement hierarchy in which the resident lives. Postcodes of respondents were also recorded. This means that it is possible to identify how views vary between different settlements.

2.24 All responses to the questionnaire are recorded in an Access 2000 Database that will be provided to the Council at the end of the study.

Workshops

2.25 Workshops were designed to provide community groups with an opportunity to provide more detailed input into the study and give their opinions on requirements for open space, sport and recreation facilities across Cotswold District.

2.26 The workshops help to test the findings of the statistical consultations and provide further detail on some of the issues arising. Workshop sessions were held as follows:

- LDF Steering Group and External Agencies – Monday 07 December 2009. A wide variety of external agencies were invited to join the LDF Steering Group in a discussion session
- Northern Parish Councils – Monday 07 December 2009
- Southern Parish Councils – Tuesday 08 December 2009
- Citizens working group – Thursday 11 February 2010. Citizens were chosen from those randomly selected to participate in the household survey. All residents receiving a survey were offered the opportunity to attend the workshop (by providing their email address or postal address if they wished).

Internet survey for children and young people

2.27 Children are frequent users of open space, sport and recreation facilities so it is important to understand their views.

2.28 Two online surveys were created to capture the views of children and young people. One survey was designed for primary school children and another survey for secondary school children and above.

2.29 The surveys were hosted on pmpgenesis' website during December 2009 and January 2010 and guidance notes were sent to Head Teachers, providing information on the study and support on how to complete the online survey.

2.30 A total of 358 responses were received, providing an adequate sample for analysis regarding the views and aspirations of children and young people relating to open space, sport and recreation provision in Cotswold District.
Postal surveys

2.31 Postal surveys were distributed to a variety of groups in order to collect opinions on open space, sport and recreation provision and to understand visions and aspirations.

2.32 All postal surveys were also hosted online to maximise the response rate and provide recipients with several opportunities to participate. Postal surveys were distributed as follows:

- Council Members – a survey was distributed to all members requesting their views on open space, sport and recreation provision in their ward
- Parish and Town Councils – in addition to receiving an invitation to a workshop, Parish and Town Councils were offered the opportunity to complete a questionnaire outlining the needs and aspirations of their Parish in relation to open space, sport and recreation facilities
- Sports Clubs (to all known sports clubs) – one survey specifically targeted clubs participating in pitch sports while the other focused on those that use other outdoor and indoor venues. These surveys were also posted online to maximise the response rate and provide clubs with several opportunities to respond
- Community Groups – a survey was distributed to representatives of all relevant community groups listed on the Council Local Development Framework database. The questionnaire investigated needs and aspirations as well as current usage of open space, sport and recreation facilities.

Drop-in sessions

2.33 Two drop in sessions were held, specifically:

- 08 October 2009 – Moreton-in-Marsh Market
- 12 February 2010 – Cirencester Market

2.34 These sessions provided members of the public with an opportunity to give their views on open space, sport and recreation facilities and also enabled the views of visitors, workers and tourists to be recorded.

Internal officers

2.35 Consultations with Council officers were held in order to understand the work, focus and key priorities of the Council and to provide a detailed strategic and practical overview to put the study in context.

2.36 In addition, an online survey was circulated to Council officers. This offered the opportunity to express views from both a personal and professional perspective and provided an insight into the views of people who work but perhaps do not live in the area, as well as those who reside within the District.

2.37 82 responses were received to the Council Officers survey.

Step 2 - auditing local provision

2.38 PPG17 states that audits of provision should encompass all existing open space, sport and recreation facilities irrespective of ownership. The logic for this is that all forms of provision can contribute to meeting local needs.
A detailed audit of provision of open space was carried out by Cotswold District Council in line with the typologies summarised earlier in this section. A desk based audit exercise was then undertaken by pmpgenesis to refine this work, ensure consistency and to identify any omitted sites.

As part of the audit process, Parish Councils were also offered the opportunity to cross check the data and feed back any comments and/or amendments.

The multi functionality of open space presents a challenge to the auditing process. In order to address this issue, all spaces have been classified by their primary purpose. This ensures that all spaces are counted only once, but does not negate the need to consider the relationships between different types of open space as part of the study.

Where there is a definitive facility within a larger site (for example a play area or sports pitch within a park) this site has been subdivided to ensure that the various opportunities offered are all considered.

Sites offering more than one type of recreational open space (for example parks containing natural areas) have been classified by their primary purpose, although the multidimensional nature of the sites will be recognised within the individual sections of this report.

In line with PPG17, grass verges and farmland are excluded from consideration. Private gardens are also excluded.

Accessible Countryside has been excluded from the audit process. However, the role that such areas play in meeting the recreational needs of residents will be considered and evaluated during the application of standards.

Following the desk based audit, site assessments were carried out at each site to verify the typology. In addition to checking the audit, the quality of each site and facilities provided was recorded. Audits of quality are particularly important as they enable the identification of the potential for increased use through better design, management and maintenance.

The site assessment process resulted in an overall quality score for each site. The site assessment sheets used are contained within Appendix C.

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the audit, it must be noted that the omission of a site does not necessarily mean that it is not considered to be open space, or a sport or recreation facility and that policies relating to green space are not applicable. Updating the audit will be an ongoing process and the audit will be constantly refined.

Steps 3 and 4 - setting and applying provision standards

PPG17 states that open space standards should be set locally and recommends that national standards should not be used to assess local circumstances.

Local authorities use information gained from the assessment of needs and opportunities (stage 1) to set local standards for the provision of open space, sport and recreational facilities. In order to ensure that the recommended local standards are representative of local needs across Cotswold District Council, standards have been derived directly from the findings of the consultations as well as the analysis of existing provision.

PPG17 recommends that local standards should include:

- 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 and consideration of the cost of using a facility)

2.51 Table 2.3 briefly summarises the process that has been adopted for setting local standards. Standards were set during a workshop.

Table 2.2 - Standard Setting Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Stage</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National standards</td>
<td>Analysis of any existing national standards for each typology. These are usually provided by national organisations e.g. Fields in Trust for playing pitches. It is important to ensure that national standards are taken into account as part of determination of local standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing local standards</td>
<td>Consideration of existing local standards for each typology that are currently applied by the Council. These include standards set out in local planning documents and in other adopted strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current provision</td>
<td>Assessment of the current quantity of provision within the local authority area as a whole and within each of the settlement hierarchies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(quantity standards only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>Figures detailing local standards set by pmpgenesis for other open space projects to provide a benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation (household survey)</td>
<td>Consideration of the findings of the household survey with regards the provision of each type of open space. This analysis provides a robust indication (at the District wide 95% confidence level) of public perception of the existing provision and aspirations for future provision of all different types of open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation comments</td>
<td>Results from qualitative consultations are used to test the key themes emerging from the statistical evidence base and to determine issues of priority importance to residents. These feed into the standards set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmpgenesis recommendation</td>
<td>pmpgenesis recommendation of a local standard. The standard is based on an assessment of the local community need and will be in the form of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• quantity – x hectares per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• accessibility – a distance threshold in metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• quality – a list of essential and desirable features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Full justifications for the recommended local standard based on qualitative and quantitative consultations are provided for each typology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.52 A brief explanation of the purpose of setting each type of standard is set out below.

**Accessibility**

2.53 Accessibility is a key criterion for open space sites. Without good access, the provision of high quality open space would be of limited value. The overall aim of accessibility standards is to identify:

- how accessible sites are;
- how far people are willing to travel to reach open space; and
- areas / settlements that are deficient in provision (identified through the application of local standards).

2.54 Accessibility standards should be derived from an understanding of community views, particularly with regards to the maximum distance that members of the public are willing to travel. The household survey explored the aspirations of the local community with regards the maximum distance residents would expect to travel. The modal response (most common travel time indicated), average travel time and range of responses were all evaluated, and challenged through some of the more subjective consultations. This provided a comprehensive understanding of expectations, as well as current travel patterns.

2.55 Accessibility standards are set in the form of distance thresholds (i.e. the maximum distance that regular users can reasonably be expected to travel to each type of provision using different modes of transport). Application of these standards will then facilitate the identification of areas where residents do not have appropriate access to facilities.

2.56 The cost of access to parks, open spaces and sports facilities was also considered as part of the assessment.

**Quantity**

2.57 The open space audit gives an understanding of the quantity of provision for each type of open space in the District. This level of detail enables the calculation of the amount (hectares) of each type of open space per 1,000 population.

2.58 Quantity standards are developed in conjunction with accessibility standards. The overall aim of the quantity assessment is to:

- provide an understanding of the adequacy of existing provision for each type of open space;
- establish areas suffering from deficiencies in the provision of each type of open space; and
- provide a guide to developers as to the amount of open space expected in conjunction with new development.

2.59 This assessment measures the quantity of provision against the current population. The implications of future population growth are also considered.

**Quality**

2.60 The quality and value of open space are fundamentally different and can sometimes be completely unrelated. Two examples of this are:
A high quality open space is provided but is completely inaccessible. Usage is therefore restricted and as a result the value of the site to the public is limited.

A low quality open space may be used every day by the public or have significant wider benefits such as biodiversity or educational use and therefore has a high value despite its low quality.

2.61 The overall aim of a quality assessment should be to identify deficiencies in quality and key quality factors that need to be improved within:

- Different geographical areas
- Specific types of open space.

2.62 The quality standards set as part of the study are intended to provide information on the features of open space that are important to local residents. These can then be used as a guideline when creating new open spaces and / or upgrading or refurbishing existing facilities.

2.63 Following the calculation of the total scores achieved during site visits, open spaces can then be benchmarked against each other. The quality of existing open space, sport and recreation facilities will be evaluated in the later sections of this report.

Application of local standards

2.64 The application of the local standards enables the identification of deficiencies in terms of accessibility, quality and quantity and also enables analysis of the spatial distribution of unmet need.

2.65 In accordance with the PPG17 Companion Guide, a strategic framework for the planning, delivery, management and monitoring of open space, sport and recreation facilities should have four basic components, specifically:

- geographical areas where existing provision is protected - where the existing level of provision is below or the same as the recommended quantity standard, sites should be protected. Sites of high value to the community should also be protected;
- areas where existing provision should be enhanced - there are two discrete instances where existing provision may be in need of enhancement. In areas where there is a quantitative deficiency of provision but no accessibility issues the Council may wish to increase the capacity of existing provision. Alternatively, in areas where facilities or spaces do not meet the relevant quality standards, enhancements will be required. Site assessments will inform qualitative improvements;
- areas where existing provision should be relocated or redesignated - in order to meet local needs more effectively or make better overall use of land it may be necessary to relocate or redesignate some existing sites; and
- areas where new provision should be considered - new sites should be located either in areas within the accessibility catchments of existing provision but where there is a quantitative deficiency or in areas outside of catchments. The proposed quantity and location of population growth should be taken into account when determining the most appropriate location for new facilities.

2.66 In addition to the above four key components, the potential for disposal of open spaces will be considered. Areas where accessibility improvements are required will also be highlighted.
2.67 The findings of this study should also be used to guide the levels of contribution required for each type of open space within new developments.

2.68 The recommendations contained within the report are based on the findings of the application of the local standards for each typology in the specific settlement hierarchies. They should be used to inform future policy and site allocations as well as the creation of proactive strategies for the ongoing maintenance and improvement of open space, sport and recreation facilities across the District.

2.69 A map of the open space audited in each settlement is provided in Appendix G.
3. Strategic Context

Introduction

3.1 This section provides the local context for the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities, outlining the main strategic documents and their links to this open space, sport and recreation facility audit and strategy. It is essential to ensure that local provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in Cotswold District contributes to wider national and local agendas.

Strategic context

3.2 As indicated, Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) and the Companion Guide, ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities’ are the key overarching documents to shape this study. They reflect a recognition from the Government of the wider benefits derived from the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities, including:

- Supporting an urban renaissance
- Supporting a rural renewal
- Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion
- Health and well being
- Promoting sustainable development

3.3 In addition to PPG17, there are numerous other national documents and agencies that shape the strategic context for open spaces, sport and recreation facilities and as such influence the provision of facilities and the findings of this report.

3.4 Appendix D sets out the national strategic context, including CABE’s recently published Open Space Strategies Best Practice Guidance (2009).

3.5 Table 3.1 overleaf sets out the regional and local context for Cotswold District, considering the documents and their relationship to this study. Documents specific to one type of open space will be included within the typology specific sections 4 – 12.
## Key Issues and Priorities

### Regional Document

**A Better Place to Be – Culture and the South West of England (2008)**

The vision of the strategy is, "...the region choice for vibrant cultural activity where engaged individuals build creative communities...".

The aims of the strategy are:

- harnessing the benefits of population growth and managing the implications of population change;
- promoting economic prosperity, quality of employment and job opportunities;
- challenging deprivation and disadvantage and reducing inequality; and
- enhancing our distinctive environments and the quality and diversity of cultural life.

The study will take into account future population growth and support the enhancement of open space and the natural environment of the District. As a consequence, this study will contribute to the achievement of the key objectives of the South West England Cultural Strategy.

### Local Documents

**Cotswold District Local Plan (2001 – 2011)**

The key policies relating to open space, sport and leisure facilities are:

- **Policy 8** protects Special Landscape Areas from development.

- **Policy 9** protects sites of international, national and local importance for biodiversity, geology and geomorphology from development. Development that harms these sites and sites supporting any legally protected species or its habitat will not be permitted.

- **Policy 10** states that development that would destroy or adversely affect trees or woodland protected by a Tree Preservation Order will not be permitted.

This study will provide evidence to support and update the policies set out in this local plan and will also inform decision making on site specific planning applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategy / Document</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key Issues and Priorities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implications for this assessment of open space, sport and recreation provision</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 11 protects historic parks and gardens from development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 15 states that only development that preserves or enhances the character of conservation areas will be permitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 18 that proposals for development within the Development Boundaries will only be permitted if the siting, appearance and scale of the development respects and does not harm the open space (indicated on the proposals map), environment and character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 33 protects allotments, playing fields and sports facilities from development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 34 states that in residential development, provision may be required for a variety of open spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 35 states that golf courses within the Cotswold AONB will only be permitted if the development makes a positive contribution to the re-creation and enhancement of the landscape character of the area or has no appreciable visual impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy UT.1 indicates that development within the Cotswold Water Park for nature conservation will only be permitted if a number of criteria are met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Strategy DPD</strong></td>
<td>When adopted, the Core Strategy will include the Council’s general spatial vision, development strategy and objectives for delivery through the LDF.</td>
<td>The findings of this study will be used to inform and support policies relating to open space within the core strategy and other DPDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy / Document</td>
<td>Key Issues and Priorities</td>
<td>Implications for this assessment of open space, sport and recreation provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester Town Centre SPD</td>
<td>The aim of the SPD is to propose measures to make Cirencester a better place to visit.</td>
<td>The aims and objectives of the SPD should be taken into account during the preparation of this strategy, which seeks to enhance the quality of open space and the natural environment within the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives of the document include to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• balance the need to manage traffic and improve the appearance of public realm;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• identify the future use of significant sites (including CIR.2 and CIR.8) with the aim of enhancing the town’s function and its historic and natural environment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• achieve environmental improvements to the public realm through S106 agreements; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• propose improvements to signage, street furniture and streetscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold Sustainable Community Strategy (2008 – 2012)</td>
<td>The aims and vision of this strategy are to provide leadership to ensure organisations work together in order to:</td>
<td>The study will seek to promote improvements to the open space network, and will contribute to the achievement of many of the key objectives of the Sustainable Community Strategy. In particular, the effective provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities can promote a healthy and thriving community and support the creation of an attractive and sustainable environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promote a healthy and thriving community; and</td>
<td>Increasing access to open space, sport and recreation facilities will be a key challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• living in an attractive and sustainable environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The objectives of this strategy with relevance to this study are to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• improve transport and access to services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provide more local things to do for young people;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• improve access to services in rural areas, particularly for those that are elderly; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• protect and enhance the Cotswold environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People Plan – Needs Analysis Summary</td>
<td>The aims of this strategy are to:</td>
<td>The effective provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities can promote community safety, physical activity and a healthy lifestyle and as a consequence, this study can support the achievement of many of the aims and objectives of the children and young people’s plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008) – Gloucestershire County Council</td>
<td>• be healthy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• stay safe;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• tackle obesity amongst children and young people;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promote healthy eating and exercise among young people and children;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• improve personal safety; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promote health and wellbeing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Issues and Priorities</td>
<td>Implications for this assessment of open space, sport and recreation provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Community Wellbeing Strategy for Gloucestershire (2008 – 2018)</strong></td>
<td>The effective provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities can contribute to improving health and wellbeing. The achievement of priorities set out in this study can therefore support the attainment of the key goals of the health and community well-being strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity Action Plan for Gloucestershire (2011)</strong></td>
<td>The study will take into account the findings and priorities of the biodiversity action plan and seek to support the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in Cotswold District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Strategy (Cotswold District Council - 2008/09 – 2011/12)</strong></td>
<td>The study will seek to identify any shortfalls in existing facilities for young people, as well as local needs for older residents. Given the role that open space can play in creating a green environment, the study will provide an important evidence base for the Corporate Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotswold Water Park Biodiversity Action Plan (2007 – 2016)</strong></td>
<td>The effective provision of open space, sport and recreation across Cotswold District can provide significant opportunities for sport, leisure and recreation and the key priorities of this action plan will therefore be taken into account within this study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Disorder Strategy (2008 – 2011)</strong></td>
<td>The study has a vision of reducing crime and additionally, reducing the fear of crime occurring. The aims of this strategy which are relevant to this study are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study has a vision of reducing crime and additionally, reducing the fear of crime occurring. The aims of this strategy which are relevant to this study are:
### Key Issues and Priorities

- Prioritising environmental issues such as removal of graffiti and improving paths and lighting;
- Running projects to improve street lighting to reduce fear of crime; and
- Build stronger communities.

### Implications for this assessment of open space, sport and recreation provision

- The study will seek to enhance the quality of open space, sport and recreation facilities in Cotswold District.
- Open space can encourage intergenerational interaction and strengthen community cohesion.

### Strategy / Document


*Although the time period of this strategy has expired, this remains the most up to date Cultural Strategy specifically for the District.*

The main vision of the strategy is to make culture central to people’s lives and to celebrate local traditions.

The themes of this strategy include:

- To improve the availability of information about what is provided in Cotswold District and to offer choice;
- To improve health and wellbeing in partnership with a number of healthcare providers;
- To reduce social barriers and promote inclusion through a variety of activities and services; and
- To celebrate local talents.

### Strategy / Document


*Overall, the strategy seeks to give children the best possible start to life. The vision is to get children involved in and enjoy all forms of play in the local community.*

The priorities of the strategy include:

- To promote health and physical activity;
- To ensure that play is a crucial part of planning at District and Parish levels;
- To encourage and contribute to the development of an open space strategy for the area;
- To ensure all young people and children’s views are heard rather than ‘who shouts the loudest’; and
- To identify gaps in provision and implement actions to fill the gaps.

The study will support the key findings of the Play Strategy by identifying all facilities for children and young people in the District and providing evidence of the key gaps in existing provision.

The study will incorporate the priorities and actions of the play strategy.
### Key Issues and Priorities

Actions of the strategy include to:

- provide opportunities for a range of challenging and free play activities for children aged 8 – 14;
- provide funding to help town and parish councils develop youth shelters and/or games areas;
- offer more mobile skateboard facilities; and
- provide play activities that offer an alternative to sport for children and young people.
Summary and conclusions

3.6 The provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities contributes to the achievement of wider governmental objectives, such as social and community cohesion, urban renaissance and the promotion of healthy and enjoyable lifestyles. In addition, the effective provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities will be instrumental in the delivery of local priorities, including those set out in the Corporate Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy.

3.7 Any development of open spaces (i.e. either provision of new or enhancement of existing spaces) should take into account biodiversity and nature conservation opportunities, as well as facilitate participation increases in sport and active recreation. Consideration should also be given to the implications of projected future changes, including planned housing developments and changes to the population profile.

3.8 Points emerging from the strategic review that are integral to the development of this open space, sport and recreation assessment in Cotswold District include:

- open space, sport and recreation facilities can contribute to the achievement of the wider aims and objectives of a suite of national, regional and local strategies. This emphasises the importance of the effective provision of such amenities;

- the natural environment is a key feature of Cotswold District, providing many recreational opportunities for residents and visitors alike. The protection and enhancement of the environment, particularly the AONB, is a key aim for the Council and is also important to residents and tourists across the authority;

- housing developments and geographical allocations driven by national planning policies and employment land allocations will have a direct impact on open space, sport and recreation provision and sustainability. Population growth will place increasing demands on existing open spaces as well as generating higher needs for recreational open space provision;

- meeting the needs of both young people and older residents and promoting intergenerational interaction is important; and

- the increased focus on improving the health of local residents will raise the profile of open space, sport and recreation facilities. Open space can provide alternative opportunities for physical activity.

3.9 In summary, this review of strategic documents highlights the local importance of maintaining and improving open space sites within Cotswold District. This local needs study and resulting strategy will contribute to achieving the wider aims of a number of local and national agencies and provide evidence for policy documents across the District.
4. Parks and Gardens

Introduction and definition

4.1 This type of open space (as defined by PPG17) includes urban parks and formal gardens that provide opportunities for various informal recreation and community events.

4.2 For the purpose of this study, parks and gardens have been divided into two groups; formal parks and country parks. Formal parks include both urban parks and formal gardens, for example St Michael’s Park (Cirencester) and Queen Victoria Gardens (Moreton-in-Marsh). The primary purpose of these sites is informal recreation.

4.3 There are a number of privately owned parks in Cotswold District, such as The Bathurst Estate and Cirencester Park, which allow free public access. These sites are highly valued by residents in the District and maintaining and increasing access to these sites is important.

4.4 Country parks are defined as large areas of land offering easy access for countryside recreation. Country parks are strategic facilities that serve a large catchment area. The country parks in the District are currently managed by Gloucestershire County Council.

4.5 Country parks have been considered in the context of natural open space due to the similarities between these two typologies in nature and function and will therefore be discussed in section 5.

4.6 In addition to the recreational opportunities provided by parks, these large green spaces provide structural and landscaping benefits to the surrounding local area. They also frequently offer ecological benefits, particularly in more urban areas. The provision of parks to break up urban landscapes is becoming increasingly important, particularly in light of concern regarding climate change.

4.7 Parks often contain a variety of facilities and amenities, including some that fall within different categories of open space (e.g. children’s play facilities, sport pitches and wildlife areas). For classification purposes, the different open spaces within parks have been separated according to the PPG17 typology under which they most appropriately fall. Large green areas, footpaths, lakes and less dense woodland will provide the park area (total hectares) and the other facilities will be included separately under their own typology classification. This ensures that open spaces are not counted twice within this study.

4.8 As well as considering the provision of formal parks across the District, it is important that the interrelationship of these facilities with other types of open space (in particular those providing opportunities for informal recreation – country parks, natural and semi natural spaces and amenity spaces) is considered. In areas deficient in the provision of formal parks, these types of open space can play a vital role in providing residents with access to informal recreation opportunities. As a higher order facility, formal parks in close proximity to the home reduce the need to provide amenity green space. This will be returned to in Section 6.

4.9 This section considers the quality, quantity and accessibility of parks and gardens across Cotswold District.
4.10 9% of residents in Cotswold District use formal parks more frequently than any other type of open space and 15% of residents visit this type of open space at least once a week. Formal parks are particularly well used within Cirencester and the Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 Settlements), highlighting the value of these spaces in the urban parts of the District.

Context

4.11 The Cotswold District Local Plan emphasises the need to protect parks and gardens from development. Policy 11 of the plan protects historic parks and gardens from development.

4.12 Supporting this, the value of formal parks, particularly within the urban settlements, was highlighted by residents throughout consultation. Formal parks are perceived to provide a range of facilities and opportunities and as a consequence, sites were considered to be excellent family facilities. A fear of parkland being lost to development was given as one of the main reasons why respondents to the household survey feel that the amount of formal parks is insufficient.

4.13 Abbey Grounds, St Michael's Park (both Cirencester) and Queen Victoria Garden's (Moreton-in-Marsh) were viewed as particularly high quality parks.

Current provision

4.14 There are currently 11 formal parks located within the four settlement hierarchies in Cotswold District. The total amount of land dedicated to this type of open space equates to 1,270 hectares. This includes all land, regardless of ownership. Three of the Parks are owned by Parish Councils.

4.15 Of these, only one site has no public access (Gatcombe Park) and three sites have restricted access (Cirencester Park East, Easington Lodge Park and Abbotsford Park, Stow on the Wold). There is a charge for access to both Easington Lodge Park (a National Trust Property) and Abbotsford Park.

4.16 There are a further 20 sites located in smaller villages in the District. Of these, 2 sites have no access and nine have restricted access.

4.17 District wide, The following parks are recorded on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens:

- Abbotswood, Stow on the Wold (restricted access)
- Adlestrop House and Park
- Daylesford House (Private)
- Batsford Park (Restricted access)
- Eyford Park
- Lodge Park (Restricted access)
- Stowell Park (Restricted access)
- Cirencester Park East (Restricted access)
- Westonbirt Arboretum (Restricted access)
- Sherborne House (Restricted access)
- Barrington Park
4.18 There is a diverse and wide range of formal parks within the District. For example, Abbey Grounds (Cirencester) serves a predominantly recreational function and contains sports facilities and a children’s play area whereas Abbotsford Park (Stow-on-the-Wold) contains open parkland and woodland areas and provides aesthetic benefits and informal recreation opportunities to users.

4.19 The size of formal parks ranges significantly from just 0.02 hectares (Oxford Street Gardens, Moreton-in-Marsh) to over 1,052 hectares (Cirencester Park). This further emphasises the variety of formal parks in Cotswold District.

4.20 The quantity of formal parks across the four settlement hierarchies across the District is summarised in Table 4.1 below. Sites over 30 hectares have been excluded from quantity calculations due to their tendency to skew the figures. Gatcombe Park, Avening, has also been excluded as there is no public access to the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,853</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.21 The key issues emerging from Table 4.1 and consultations relating to the quantity of formal parks include:

- the current provision of formal parks equates to 0.40 hectares per 1,000 population;

- a high level of satisfaction with the provision of formal parks is evident from findings to the household survey. Nearly two thirds (64%) of respondents feel that provision is sufficient while only 23% of residents state that provision is insufficient;

- the high level of satisfaction is reflected in all settlement hierarchies. The greatest level of satisfaction is found in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlements), where 82% of residents feel that provision is sufficient. Quantity findings support this perception, with the greatest current provision and provision per 1,000 population found in this settlement hierarchy. Cirencester was identified as being particularly well served in terms of formal parks throughout consultation and it was suggested at the drop in sessions that there are sufficient parks and gardens in the main settlements, particularly in the north of Cotswold District; the lowest level of satisfaction is portrayed in the Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements). Supporting the perceptions of residents, it is within this settlement hierarchy where the lowest provision per 1,000 population is found (0.21 hectares);

- other consultations support the high level of satisfaction portrayed by respondents to the household survey. Over three quarters of respondents to the officers survey (78%) feel that the provision of formal parks is sufficient, respondents to the elected members survey generally state that provision is adequate and no issues regarding the quantity of formal parks were raised by Parish/Town Councils;

- elected members stated that providing formal parks within the more rural areas of the District is challenging, particularly with regards access to facilities and ensuring that parks are sustainable in the longer term. This suggests that there is an expectation that residents in the small rural villages have to travel outside of their settlement to access a formal park. Few elected members highlighted issues with the amount of formal parks available, although it was highlighted that while Cirencester is well provided for, there remain some parts of the town with more limited access to parks;

- reflecting the findings above, maintaining and enhancing the quality of formal parks rather than increasing the quantity of this type of open space was identified by all consultees as the priority, over and above the provision of new facilities throughout consultation; and

- the main reasons given by respondents to the household survey who feel that the quantity of provision is insufficient include the amount of parkland / open space that has been lost to development and a perceived lack of formal parks in close proximity to the home. This suggests that the protection of and increasing access to existing formal parks in the District will be key priorities.

4.22 Full consultation findings are set out in Appendix E.

**Setting quantity standards**

4.23 The recommended local quantity standard for formal parks has been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and is summarised overleaf. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.
4.24 The recommended local standard has been set at the existing level of provision. This is reflective of the high level of satisfaction with the current provision of formal parks in the District. Deficiencies within individual settlements may still be identified when the standard is applied at a settlement level later in this section. In some settlements, provision will fall below the recommended standard whereas in others the suggested standard will already be achieved.

**Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F - standards and justification and worksheet)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.40 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.40 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

A high level of satisfaction with the current provision of formal parks was portrayed throughout consultation. Nearly two thirds (64%) of respondents to the household survey and over three quarters of respondents to the officers’ survey (78%) feel that the provision of formal parks is sufficient. Few issues regarding the quantity of formal parks were portrayed by elected members and Parish Council representatives and it was recognised that formal parks are not expected within the smaller rural villages. Maintaining and enhancing the quality of formal parks rather than increasing the quantity of this type of open space was identified as the priority.

Based on the above, the recommended quantity standard has been set to reflect the existing level of provision. Setting a standard at this level will prioritise enhancing the quality of parks as well as protect these sites from development.

**Quality**

**Current position**

4.25 The quality of formal parks was assessed through site visits. The key issues emerging from site assessments and consultations relating to the quality of formal parks are as follows:

- Positive perceptions regarding the quality of formal parks were evident from responses to the household survey. Over half of respondents feel that the quality of formal parks is good (53%) and 23% indicate that the quality of this type of open space is excellent. Only 6% of residents feel that the quality of formal parks is poor. Aside from country parks, formal parks are rated the highest quality type of open space in Cotswold District by residents;

- These high levels of satisfaction are reflected in all settlement hierarchies. The greatest level of satisfaction is found in the Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements) and the lowest level of satisfaction is located in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements);

- Other consultation findings support the high level of satisfaction evident in responses to the household survey. Two thirds of respondents to the officers’ survey state that the quality of formal parks is either good or excellent and those Parishes that have formal parks indicate that the quality of provision is good. Overall, parks are perceived to be clean and well maintained by these consultees;
less positive perceptions regarding the quality of parks were portrayed by respondents to the young people’s survey. Over half of respondents feel that the quality of parks is ok, but could do with some improvements (53%). The key areas for improvement focused on the maintenance of facilities (with litter, graffiti and vandalism identified as an issue and some young people suggesting that the facilities need tidying up) as well as the need to provide a wider range of better quality equipment;

Queen Victoria Gardens (Moreton), Abbey Grounds and St Michaels Park (both Cirencester) were highlighted as high quality sites at drop in sessions. Queen Victoria Gardens (Moreton-in-Marsh) and St Michael's Park (Cirencester) have park rangers, which may be one of the reasons why these parks were rated so highly by residents;

site assessments support the household survey perceptions with the condition of formal parks generally rated as good or very good. The condition of Westonbirt Arboretum was rated as excellent. Formal parks were identified as being clean, tidy and well maintained, reflecting the findings of consultations;

the majority of sites are identified as containing seating and bins. St Michael’s Park, Abbey Grounds (both Cirencester) and Westonbirt Arboretum both also contain toilet facilities; and

misuse of sites and dog fouling were identified as problems experienced by frequent users of formal parks. However, site assessments did not identify these issues as problematic.

4.26 All consultation findings relating to the quality of formal parks are found in Appendix E.

Setting quality standards

4.27 The recommended local quality standard for formal parks is summarised below. Full justification and consultation for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

4.28 The quality standard summarises the features that residents consider to be an important determinant of the quality of provision.

Quality Standard (see Appendix E)

Recommended Quality Standard

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the vision for formal parks should incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers, trees and shrubs</td>
<td>Footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
<td>Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accessibility

4.29 A lack of local access to facilities was one of the main reasons given by those respondents to the household survey who felt that the quantity of formal parks in the District is insufficient. Increasing access to existing provision will therefore be important.

4.30 The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived directly from the findings of the local consultations.

4.31 According to the household survey, the significant majority of current users walk to access a formal park (70%) with a travel time of less than 10 minutes (60%) most frequently experienced. Only 10% of users travel over 20 minutes to access a formal park. This indicates that current users of formal parks visit sites in close proximity to their home.

4.32 In contrast to travel patterns portrayed by current users, over half of respondents to the household survey would expect to drive to access a formal park (56%). This suggests that residents are prepared to travel to access a formal park.

4.33 Differing travel modes are portrayed by respondents within the settlement hierarchies. In Category B1 (Cirencester) and B2 (Market Towns) settlements the majority of residents expect to walk to a formal park (68% and 50% respectively). However, within the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres (Category C1 and C2 Settlements) over 70% of respondents would expect to drive. This indicates that residents in the urban areas expect to have local access to a formal park while residents in the smaller rural settlements expect to travel outside of their settlement to access a formal park. Improving access routes to formal parks for residents in the smaller rural settlements will therefore be important, as provision is less likely to be located within the settlement itself.

4.34 The cost of accessing formal parks was not identified as an issue during consultation, however several of the parks charge entrance fees for use (including Lodge Park). These sites are likely to function as a destination venue, rather than a local park used for everyday purposes. While cost was not explicitly raised as an issue, the opening hours of some of the private parks, such as Cirencester Park, were perceived to be restrictive.

4.35 Site assessments indicate that a large number of formal parks are located in close proximity to a bus stop, making them easily accessible by public transport. However, the need to increase disabled access to formal parks is clear, with only three sites identified as having appropriate access for disabled residents. The rural nature of the District means that improving public transport is however particularly challenging.

Setting accessibility standards

4.36 The recommended local accessibility standard for formal parks is summarised overleaf. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.
Accessibility Standard (see Appendix E)

Recommended Accessibility Standard

480m catchment (10 minute walk time) in Cirencester and Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 Settlements)

30 minute drive time in the Small Towns and Local Service Centres (Category C1 and C2 Settlements)

Justification

Current users of formal parks walk to access a site (70%). However, the majority of respondents to the household survey would expect to drive to access a formal park (56%). Differing expectations within the settlement hierarchies are clear, with residents in the more urban settlements (Cirencester and Market Towns) expecting to walk to access a site and residents in the smaller rural settlements (Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres) indicating that they would travel by car.

Of those residents that prefer to walk to a formal park, the average travel time is 22 minutes and most common travel time is significantly lower at 10 minutes. The most common response in Cirencester and the Market Towns is consistent with the district wide response.

Of those residents that expect to drive, the average travel time is 24 minutes and the modal response is slightly higher at 30 minutes. The modal response within the Small Local Service Centres is consistent with the district wide response.

Based on the above, two standards have been set - a 10 minute walk time in Cirencester and the Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 Settlements) and a 30 minute drive time in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres (Category C1 and C2 Settlements). This standard is reflective of the aspirations of local residents and also seeks to ensure that the provision of parks is sustainable longer term.

Applying provision standards

4.37 The application of the recommended quality, quantity and accessibility standards provides an understanding of the existing distribution of formal parks. Table 4.2 overleaf summarises the application of the quantity standard by settlement hierarchy.
Table 4.2 - Application of the quantity standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Future shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-4.21</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nb. Figures may not sum exactly as they have been rounded

4.38 Table 4.2 indicates the following:

- the existing standard is set at 0.4ha per 1000 population, reflecting the current level of provision. This means that there is only a minor overall shortfall of formal parks (0.24 hectares) at the current time, which is caused by rounding of figures. However, based on future population increases the need for parks is expected to increase, and there will be shortfalls of just below 4 hectares by 2026. This suggests that more parks will be required to accommodate future population increases;

- only within Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) is the provision of formal parks above the recommended standard; and

- the greatest shortfall of formal parks (against the local standard) is found in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements). There is currently a shortfall of 4.21 hectares within this settlement hierarchy. There is however no expectation that park are provided locally within this hierarchy.

4.39 Application of the standard at a settlement by settlement level alongside use of minimum size criteria will enable calculations relating to the minimum size of settlements in which a formal park would be expected. This will be returned to later.

4.40 Settlement calculations indicate that only within Cirencester, Moreton-in-Marsh and Stow-on-the-Wold is the provision of formal parks above the minimum standard. It must however be noted that in Andoversford and Northleach, there are sites which exceed 30 hectares, meaning that residents are able to access facilities in these parts also. The greatest shortfall of formal parks is found within the following settlements:

- Tetbury – 2.147 hectares
- South Cerney – 1.41 hectares
- Bourton-on-the-Water – 1.32 hectares
- Lechlade – 1.19 hectares
Accessibility

4.41 The application of the accessibility standard for formal parks is outlined in Maps 4.1 and 4.2 overleaf. Formal parks have been shaded in different colours of green to reflect the extent of public access to sites. Public means that the park is openly accessible to the public, restricted means that the park is not open all year round and may have limited opening hours and private indicates that the park is not accessible to the public at all.

4.42 Map 4.1 indicates that formal parks are predominantly located in the east of Cotswold District. All residents in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres have access to a site within a 30 minute drive time. However, key areas of deficiency are evident in the Market Towns (Category B2 settlements), with residents in Tetbury and Bourton-on-the-Water unable to access a formal park within a 10 minute walk time.

4.43 Map 4.2 indicates that when applying a 480m catchment to all settlement hierarchies clear deficiencies are evident across the District, particularly within the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres.
Map 4.1 - Formal parks in Cotswold District
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Priorities for future delivery

4.44 This section considers the District wide issues that need to be addressed. These issues arise through the application of the local quality, quantity and accessibility standards. Consideration is also given to issues in specific settlements.

4.45 In line with the principles of PPG17, the priorities are set out under the headings of:

- Quality enhancements
- Environmental role of parks
- Sustainability of parks
- Protection of existing provision
- Disposal
- New provision
- Redesignation
- Enhancing access routes.

Quality enhancements

4.46 Maintaining and improving the quality of formal parks was viewed as important throughout local consultation. Although the quality of formal parks was perceived positively during local consultation and this was supported by site assessments, due to the value of these sites to residents and visitors, as well as overall satisfaction with the amount of parks provided, qualitative improvements were seen as more of a priority than the creation of new parks. Qualitative improvements should include improvements to site infrastructure (bins, benches, footpaths) etc, the facilities within the site and the overall management and maintenance of facilities.

4.47 Consultations demonstrated the importance of providing facilities to meet the needs of a range of all sectors of the population. The local quality standard indicates that a high quality formal park should be well maintained and should contain a variety of flowers, trees and shrubs and toilets. Footpaths, seating, dog bins, level surfaces and parking facilities are viewed as desirable features of a formal park. It is clear that residents view the functionality of the site as being particularly important. Site assessments reveal that the quality of sites is high, and no specific improvements were identified. Consultation however indicated that Blenheim Park, Moreton-in-Marsh, should be prioritised for improvement, particularly with regards the site infrastructure and the overall site maintenance.

PG1

Continue to develop and enhance the quality of existing formal parks in the District. Drive a structured programme of improvements with clearly defined outputs to create an overall network of sustainable parks. This should include the production of parks management plans and should focus on ensuring that all parks contain the facilities required by the local standard. Improvements should include enhancements to site infrastructure (bins, benches, footpaths) etc, the facilities within the site and the overall management and maintenance of facilities.
4.48 No parks within Cotswold District have achieved a Green Flag award. The Green Flag award programme recognises high quality green spaces and parks in England. Achievement of a green flag award can raise the profile of a park and increase the number of visitors to the site. Research undertaken by www.greenspace.org indicates that tourists make a special effort to visit award winning parks. The achievement of such an award also demonstrates best value, and can help lever external funding through improvement grants that award winners are eligible to apply for. The Green Flag criteria seek to promote best practice management principles, including community involvement, meeting with the localism agenda.

Strive to achieve a Green Flag award at a minimum of one of the parks in the District. This will link to the preparation of a management plan, outlined in Recommendation PG1.

PG2

Sustainability of parks

4.49 The long term sustainability of parks is a key issue in Cotswold District. Making best use of the available assets at parks and incorporating sustainable management practices is essential in ensuring the future of this type of open space. This is particularly important given the nature of the district and the challenges of providing formal parks in such rural areas.

4.50 Friends Groups can play a central role in securing the long term sustainability of parks by providing invaluable volunteer support and increasing revenue at parks, by holding events, for example. Friends groups also often contribute to the maintenance of the site and provide a day to day interface with users. Furthermore, Friends Groups are often eligible for external funding, which other bodies are not.

4.51 Friends of Westonbirt Arboretum are the only dedicated friends group in the District. The group works alongside the Forestry Commission to help with the running and management of Westonbirt. Specifically, the friends group raises funds and provides voluntary support to increase awareness of the environment. Aside from this group, park rangers are located at two parks in the District and Council staff are responsible for the management of other formal parks. The Council should work with other providers of open space, such as Parish Councils, to initiate the creation of friends groups at parks in the District. The support of volunteers is becoming ever increasingly invaluable in light of the recent pressure on budgets.

Work with providers of open space in the District such as Town and Parish Councils to initiate the creation of friends groups at all parks. Once groups are established, provide ongoing advice and support.

PG3

Environmental role of parks

4.52 As well as functioning as a recreational resource, parks have an important environmental role within the District.

4.53 Sites such as Westonbirt Arboretum contain a range of rare trees, native habitats and wildlife. The Forestry Commission is responsible for the management of Westonbirt Arboretum and already incorporates sustainable landscape management techniques at this site. Many parks are part of the wider ecological network of the district and are key components of wildlife corridors and other green infrastructure networks.
4.54 Following this example, the Council and providers of parks within the District should seek to incorporate sustainable management practices, such as not cutting grass in certain areas to create natural areas, to promote biodiversity and create a healthy ecosystem at parks. Linking with recommendation PG1, the creation of management plans at parks may be important in the achievement of this aim.

| PG4 | Work with providers of open space in the District to incorporate sustainable management techniques to promote biodiversity and create a healthy ecosystem at parks in the District. |

**Protection of existing provision**

4.55 The Cotswold District Local Plan emphasises the importance of parks and gardens, with Policy 11 seeking to protect all historic park and gardens from development.

4.56 As highlighted, the value of formal parks was emphasised throughout consultation. The wide range of facilities provided and variety of sites in the District was identified as one of the main reasons why this type of open space is used frequently. Specifically, formal parks are viewed as focal points of the community, providing a particularly valuable resource for families. Many residents who identified the need for more provision were concerned about the loss of existing spaces, rather than perceiving that additional provision is required.

4.57 Nearly all formal parks within Cotswold District serve unique catchments and as a consequence are important to the local community. Furthermore, application of the quantity standard indicates that pressure on this type of open space will increase significantly in the future as population grows.

4.58 In consideration of the importance of formal parks to residents, the unique catchments these sites serve and the value of sites from both a recreational and biodiversity perspective, these sites should be protected from residential development. The provision of formal parks will also be important in mitigating the impact of climate change in the larger settlements.

| PG5 | In light of the importance of formal parks, ensure that Local Development Framework policy protects existing sites from residential development. The loss of a park should only be permitted where it can be proven that there is no demand for the facility, or that improvements to another site will be of greater value to residents in the immediate catchment of the park to be lost. |

**Disposal of facilities**

4.59 There are no recommendations for the disposal of existing formal parks. There is however potential to expand the functionality of some sites to include other types of open space, for example the incorporation of natural and semi natural open space within parks. This will be returned to within section 5.
New provision

4.60 The recommended local standard is set to reflect the existing level of provision, and application of this standard at a District wide level reveals a very small shortfall, due to rounding only. Provision in all settlement hierarchies, except Cirencester however, currently falls below the minimum standard, and these shortfalls will increase significantly as the population grows, producing an overall deficiency of over 4 hectares by 2026. This suggests that new provision will be required in order to accommodate future population growth. To provide a clear indication as to where new provision is required, it is essential to take an accessibility led approach.

4.61 Accessibility mapping reveals that a number of residents in the Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements are unable to access a site within a 480m catchment. Given that there are both future quantitative shortfalls of formal parks (which will be caused by new developments) and accessibility deficiencies in the District, the provision of formal parks should therefore be considered as part of new development.

Ensure that Local Development Framework policy requires new housing developments to contribute towards (or provide on site where they are large enough to be reasonably expected to do so) the provision of new, or enhancement of existing, formal parks where possible and appropriate. Where the supply of formal parks in the surrounding area is sufficient, policy should ensure that contributions are required for qualitative improvements.

4.62 The key priorities for new provision are set out by settlement hierarchy in the sections that follow.

Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)

4.63 Application of the accessibility standard indicates that nearly all residents in Cirencester have access to a formal park. However, residents in Stratton and the east of Cirencester are unable to access a formal park within the recommended 480m catchment (Figures 4.1 and 4.2).
Figure 4.1 - Deficiencies of formal parks in Stratton
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Figure 4.2 - Deficiencies of formal parks in the east of Cirencester
4.64 Quantitative analysis indicates that the current provision of formal parks is sufficient to meet current and future demand. Furthermore, Cirencester Park (1,052 hectares), which has been excluded from quantity calculations, is located within this settlement hierarchy, although there is only restricted access to this site.

4.65 Swindon Road acts as a barrier to access for residents in the east of Cirencester trying to access formal parks (particularly on foot). In addition to being outside the catchment of a formal park, residents in the south of Stratton and the east of Cirencester are also outside of the recommended 240m catchment for amenity green space (discussed in Section 6). This means that residents do not have access to any informal recreation opportunities.

4.66 The lack of any open space however within this area of Cirencester means that opportunities to provide a new formal park within this location are limited.

4.67 In the short term, priority should be given to providing safe access routes (for pedestrians and cyclists) to the closest parks (St Michael’s Park and Abbey Grounds) ensuring that these sites are accessible by public transport. In the long term, to alleviate deficiencies in the east of Cirencester, opportunities to provide a new park within this locality should be taken.

| PG7 | Improve pedestrian routes and cycleways between East Cirencester and St Michael’s Park and Abbey Grounds. Provide a new park within East Cirencester if the opportunity arises. |

**Market towns (Category B2 Settlements)**

4.68 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the overall amount of formal parks in the Category B2 Settlements is below the recommended minimum standard and there are shortfalls of formal parks within both Bourton-on-the-Water and Tetbury. The largest shortfall of formal parks in the District is found in Tetbury.

4.69 Supporting the quantitative analysis, accessibility mapping reveals that all residents in Tetbury and Bourton-on-the-Water are outside of the catchment of a formal park. Residents to the east and south of Moreton-in-Marsh are also unable to access a formal park within the recommended catchment. These issues are illustrated in Figures 4.3 – 4.5.
Figure 4.3 - Deficiencies of formal parks in Tetbury
Figure 4.4 - Deficiencies of formal parks in Bourton-on-the-Water
Figure 4.5 - Deficiencies of formal parks in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh
4.70 Application of the quantity standard within Tetbury indicates that there is currently a shortfall of 2.14 hectares of formal parks. Westonbirt Arboretum, the closest park to Tetbury, is circa 2.5 miles away and this site has restricted access. Tetbury is also identified as one of the main locations for new development, which means that pressure on existing provision will grow in the future.

4.71 When considering the provision of other typologies, residents in Tetbury have access to some form of informal open space. The existing provision of amenity green space can provide opportunities for a site to be upgraded to a park. However the size and location of amenity spaces within Tetbury (all of which are below 0.2ha) mean that they are not suitable for this purpose. In the short term, focus should be placed on improving access to Westonbirt Arboretum via safe pedestrian and cycle routes (and public transport if possible). Longer term, in consideration of the large quantitative shortfall and accessibility deficiencies (and restricted access at Westonbirt Arboretum), as well as the projected population growth, a new park is required.

**PG8**

*Provide a formal park within Tetbury.*

4.72 Application of the quantity standard reveals that there is currently a shortfall of 1.32 hectares of formal parks within Bourton-on-the-Water, indicating that increased provision will be required to accommodate demand. In addition, the majority of residents in Bourton-on-the-Water, particularly in the west of the settlement, do not have access to either a park, or other type of informal open space. In light of the quantitative shortfall and lack of access to informal open space, opportunities to provide a formal park within Bourton-on-the-Water should be seized.

4.73 In the short term, focus should be placed on improving access routes to Sherbourne Park and Eyford Park (located approximately 2 – 3 miles away).

**PG9**

*Provide a formal park in the west of Bourton-on-the-Water.*

4.74 Residents in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh are outside the catchment of both formal parks and other informal open space. Access to informal open space in the west of the settlement for residents in the east is further limited due to the location of the railway line, which acts as a barrier to access.

4.75 Although residents in the east are unable to access a formal park or informal open space, quantitative analysis indicates that the current provision of formal parks is above the minimum standards, due to the high levels of existing provision in the west of the town. Consultation did not highlight demand for a new park at the current time. In the short term therefore, focus should be placed on improving access to Queen Victoria Gardens and Oxford Street Gardens by increasing and enhancing sustainable transport routes (e.g. footpaths, cycle paths etc.).

4.76 However, Moreton-in-Marsh is the focus for new development and pressure on existing formal parks will therefore increase in the future, particularly if this development is situated to the east of the town.

**PG10**

*Provide a new park to the east of Moreton on the Marsh if new development is located in this area.*

*Improve access routes to Queen Victoria Gardens and Oxford Street Gardens from the east of the town.*
4.77 There is a shortfall of formal parks in all settlements, with the exception of Stow-on-the-Wold, with the second greatest shortfall in the District found in South Cerney (1.41 hectares). Lodge Park, Northleach (153 hectares), which has been excluded from quantity calculations, is also located in this settlement hierarchy.

4.78 Although there is a shortfall in quantitative terms, accessibility mapping illustrates that all residents have access to a formal park within the recommended 30 minute drive time catchment.

4.79 During consultation, as indicated by the local accessibility standard, residents in the rural settlements indicated a willingness to travel significantly further to access a formal park with 70% of residents in the Small Towns stating that they would expect to drive to access a formal park. This means that there is an expectation that formal parks are not provided locally within the settlements.

4.80 In addition to having access to a formal park within a 30 minute drive time, nearly all residents have access to some form of informal open space within a 240m catchment. This indicates that residents have local access to informal open space and recreation opportunities, supporting the suggestion that new provision is not required.

4.81 As the population grows and the population profile changes, the requirement for localised parks may arise. The quantity standard demonstrates that the highest demand is likely to be in South Cerney. To date, consultation has not specifically identified demand for additional formal parks in the Small Towns. Should demand be identified (through for example the formation of a friends group or an approach to the Parish Council), given that the provision of formal parks is not required, the creation of pocket parks should be considered. These are small spaces managed and run by the community, providing a local resource for local people.

4.82 In addition to the creation of local pocket parks, given the expectation that residents in these settlements will travel for up to 30 minutes to reach a formal park, cycle routes and public transport links between these settlements and existing parks should be improved.

**PG11**

| Improve links between small towns and formal parks by improving public transport routes (where possible) and providing cyclepaths. |
| Provide small local pocket parks if a friends group can be created. Particular focus should be placed on South Cerney, which has the highest shortfall. |

**Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)**

4.83 Accessibility mapping reveals that all residents have access to a formal park within the recommended 30 minute drive time.

4.84 However, application of the quantity standard indicates that the provision of formal parks in the settlement hierarchy is below the recommended minimum standard, with there being a current shortfall of 4.21 hectares. Quantitative analysis within the settlements indicates that there is a shortfall of formal parks in all settlements, with the greatest shortfall found in Blockley (0.83 hectares).

4.85 Despite there being a quantitative shortfall of formal parks in 73% of respondents to the household survey within this settlement hierarchy indicated that they would expect to drive to a formal park,
highlighting the expectation that formal parks are not provided within the locality and reflecting the local standard.

4.86 Like in the small towns, where demand is evident through the formation of friends groups, or proactive approaches to the Parish Council, pocket parks should be formed. As discussed in Section 6, within Down Ampney, Kempsford and Mickleton, access to other forms of informal open space (amenity green space and natural open space) is limited. This means that residents in these settlements have limited local recreation opportunities and the creation of pocket parks may provide an important community resource. Residents in Blockey and Kemble do have access to informal amenity space and demand may therefore be lower, although community involvement in these sites should still be encouraged.

4.87 In addition to the creation of local pocket parks, given the expectation that residents in these settlements will travel for up to 30 minutes to reach a formal park, cycle routes and public transport links (where possible) between these settlements and existing parks should be improved.

PG12

Improve links between local service centres and formal parks by improving public transport routes (where possible) and providing cycle paths.

Work with the community to create pocket parks in the local service centres. Focus particularly on settlements that do not currently have any access to informal open spaces, specifically Down Ampney, Kempsford and Mickleton.

Redesignation

4.88 Nearly all formal parks within Cotswold District serve unique catchments and are therefore highly valued local facilities. Furthermore, application of the quantity standard indicates that there is an overall shortfall of formal parks within the District. Based on this, there are no recommendations for the redesignation of formal parks within Cotswold District. There may however be an opportunity to upgrade some existing amenity green spaces (discussed earlier in this section) to parks.

Increasing access to parks

4.89 Good access to parks and gardens is as important as the provision of high quality sites, as without effective access routes, sites will be underused and consequently undervalued. Access to parks within a rural area, such as Cotswold District, is particularly important as provision within some of the smaller settlements is limited. Increasing access to existing formal parks in areas of deficiency identified earlier will be particularly important. As highlighted earlier there is a specific need to increase access to existing formal parks within:

- East of Cirencester - St Michael’s Park and Abbey Grounds
- Stratton - Cirencester Park and Abbey Grounds
- Tetbury - Westonbirt Arboretum
- Bourton-on-the-Water - Sherbourne Park and Eyford Park
- East of Moreton-in-Marsh - Queen Victoria Gardens and Oxford Street Gardens
- Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres
4.90 Developing the green infrastructure network (footpaths, cycle paths etc.) and public transport network, particularly within the rural settlements where provision is limited, will be a priority. Improving public transport links will be particularly challenging given the rural nature of Cotswold District. The Cotswold District Council Sustainable Community Strategy sets this as a key target, and any improvements made should take into account the location of parks and the need to connect residents with open spaces.

PG13

Seek to improve access to existing formal parks through the development of safe and effective pedestrian and cycle routes linking key settlements with parks and gardens. Ensure that where possible, formal parks are located on public transport routes.

4.91 As identified earlier, site assessments indicate that only three formal parks within the District are accessible for people with disabilities. Given that parks were identified through consultation as being a focal point for the community, and in particular sites which can promote the integration of all sectors of the community, providers should seek to increase access to formal parks for disabled users, making formal parks accessible for all.

PG14

Seek to improve access for disabled users to formal parks in the District by evaluating and overcoming existing barriers to use, drawing on the site assessments as a starting point.

4.92 A number of formal parks within Cotswold District are privately owned and allow public access at the discretion of the land owner. These sites, such as The Bathurst Estate and Cirencester Park, are highly valued by local residents and significantly contribute to the provision of formal parks in the District. Throughout consultation the need to maintain and increase access to these private sites was emphasised. Ongoing dialogue to achieve this goal should be initiated by the Council

PG15

Negotiate with landowners to maintain and increase access to private parks and gardens within Cotswold District.

Summary

4.93 Formal parks are a highly valued type of open space in Cotswold District. This type of open space is frequently used by residents and parks are considered to be particularly important facilities for families.

4.94 There is a variety of formal parks within Cotswold District. Sites range from those with a range of facilities, such as sports facilities and a play area, that serve a predominantly recreational function to those parks which provide landscaping and aesthetic values, enabling relaxation and informal recreation. The benefits of parks are wide reaching and these sites are as valuable for the habitats they offer as the recreational opportunities that they provide.

4.95 The quality of formal parks was perceived positively throughout consultation, with this type of open space rated highly in comparison to other typologies of open space in the District. Site assessment findings support the consultation perceptions, with the condition of formal parks rated as good or very good. Westonbirt Arboretum was specifically identified as an excellent quality site.
4.96 However, future population increases will mean that provision falls below the recommended minimum standard and shortfalls will exceed 4 hectares by 2026. Increased provision will therefore be required in order to accommodate future population growth.

4.97 Formal parks are predominantly located in the east of the District. All residents in the rural settlements have access to a formal park within the recommended 30 minute drive time. However, key areas of deficiency are evident in Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water and Moreton-in-Marsh.

4.98 It is therefore recommended that the key priorities for the future delivery of provision of formal parks in Cotswold District through the Local Development Framework (LDF) and / or other mechanisms are to:

- ensure that the LDF contains policies that protect formal parks from development;
- drive a strategic programme of qualitative improvements using the findings of the site assessments and through the creation of management plans;
- provide new formal parks within east of Cirencester, Tetbury and west of Bourton-on-the-Water;
- provide a new park within the east of Moreton-in-Marsh if new development occurs to the east of the town;
- promote community involvement to create pocket parks in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres;
- increase access to existing formal parks through the creation of effective cycle routes and footpath network and seek to ensure that where possible, parks are located on public transport routes;
- increase disabled access to formal parks in the District by identifying and overcoming existing barriers; and
- initiate dialogue with landowners to maintain and increase access to private parks and gardens.
5. Natural and Semi Natural Open Space

Introduction and definition

5.1 This type of open space includes woodlands, urban forestry, scrubland, grasslands (e.g. downlands, commons and meadows), wetlands, nature reserves and wastelands with a primary purpose of wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Such sites within Cotswold District include Cutsdean Quarry and Kemble Wood.

5.2 Natural and semi natural open space is frequently found within other types of open space, such as parks, and in some instances there may be some sites classified as amenity green space or parks that have a secondary function as natural and semi natural open space. This serves to highlight the overlap between typologies. Natural open spaces also frequently fulfil similar roles to parks, as highlighted in Section 4. Examples of formal parks that serve a secondary function as natural open space are Westonbirt Arboretum and Cirencester Park.

5.3 In addition to natural and semi natural open space, Cotswold District contains a vast amount of countryside, some of which is accessible to residents and visitors and therefore serves a similar function to natural and semi natural open space.

5.4 Part of Cotswold District was designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in 1966 and this area is protected as a special landscape of national importance. The Cotswold AONB is the largest of 40 AONBs in England and Wales and significantly contributes to the character of the District.

5.5 The Cotswold Water Park is a particularly important natural open space in the District. The site covers 10,000 hectares and is one of the biodiversity hot spots in the South West. The Cotswold Water Park contains 140 lakes (of which 10 are designated as SSSIs), six wildflower meadows (designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)) and is internationally and nationally important for wintering wildflower. The protection of this site is a key priority within the District and the Cotswold Water Park Biodiversity Action Plan aims to make the water park a premier site for nature conservation. In addition to being a site of importance for conservation and biodiversity, the Cotswold Water Park also serves a recreational function, providing a number of activities including fishing, golf, walking and water sports.

5.6 Country parks are larger sites often located outside of settlement boundaries that offer a less structured environment than formal parks. They act as a gateway to the wider countryside and enable residents to experience countryside and natural open space. For the purposes of this study, country parks have been considered alongside natural and semi natural open space.

5.7 There are four country parks within the District, specifically Cotswold Country Park, Neigh Bridge Country Park, Crickley Hill Country Park and Kilkenny Viewpoint and Picnic Area. These sites provide access to informal countryside recreation opportunities and also promote biodiversity and nature conservation. Consultation indicates that these sites attract a number of visitors to the District and are particularly important to the tourism economy.
5.8 Although natural and semi natural open space plays a key role in wildlife conservation, biodiversity and climate change, the recreational opportunities provided by these spaces are also important. It is essential that an appropriate balance between recreational use, biodiversity and conservation is achieved.

5.9 This section outlines the context and key consultation findings relating to natural and semi natural open space and country parks and the recommended local standards. These local standards are then applied in order to understand local issues and priorities.

**Context**

5.10 The Cotswold District Local Plan emphasises the importance of protecting parks and gardens and natural and semi natural open space from development. Policy 11 protects historic parks and gardens from development and policies 8, 10 and 15 protect the natural environment, including the AONB, Special Landscape Areas, sites of importance for biodiversity, conservation areas and woodland, from development.

5.11 The protection of the natural environment is further emphasised in the Cotswold Sustainable Community Strategy, with an objective of the strategy being the protection of the Cotswold environment.

5.12 Specifically, the importance of protecting the Cotswold Water Park is outlined in the Cotswold Water Park Biodiversity Action Plan. The aim of the plan is for the water park to become a premier conservation area by 2050.

5.13 Natural and semi natural open space is the most frequently visited type of open space in the District, with 33% of respondents to the household survey indicating that they use natural or semi natural open space more frequently than any other type of open space. Country parks are the third most popular type of open space in Cotswold District, with 13% of residents indicating that they use this type of open space more frequently than any other.

5.14 Reflecting many of the key strategic documents, the need to protect country parks and natural and semi natural open space from development was emphasised during consultation. These sites were considered to contribute to the character of the District and the perception that natural open space had recently been lost to development was one of the main reasons given by respondents to the household survey who stated that provision is insufficient.

**Current position**

5.15 In line with the character of the district, there is an abundance of natural and semi natural open space, with there being a total of 883.35 hectares spread across 34 sites within the four settlement hierarchies. An additional 3,142.83 hectares is located in villages outside of the settlement hierarchies. This provision is supported by large areas of local countryside and the Cotswold AONB, some of which is accessible to residents.

5.16 There are 19 sites over 40 hectares in size and four of these sites exceed 100 hectares. This indicates that there are a number of large natural and semi natural open spaces supported by a network of smaller sites. Excluding these larger sites, the total provision within the District equates to approximately 1,975 hectares. Only one site over 40 hectares is located within the four settlement hierarchies (Cotswold Water Park, which does not have full public access).
5.17 In addition to the recreational function of many natural and semi natural open spaces, there are numerous sites of particular importance for their nature conservation and wildlife value, including:

- Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) - Cotswold Beech Woods
- National Nature Reserves – Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods
- Circa 25 sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- One local nature reserves – Leckhampton Hill.

5.18 Table 5.1 summarises the distribution of natural and semi natural open space across the District. It must be noted that many natural and semi natural open spaces fall outside of the settlement hierarchies and are located in close proximity to villages, whereas in reality they serve residents in larger villages and towns. This will be picked up through application of the accessibility standard.

5.19 Sites over 40 hectares have been excluded from quantity calculations due to their tendency to skew figures. Their role in the provision of natural and semi natural open space will however be considered during the application of local standards.

Table 5.1 - Provision of natural and semi natural open space across Cotswold District (excluding sites over 40 hectares)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>166.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>87.30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>300.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,853</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.20 The key issues emerging from Table 5.1 and consultations relating to the quantity of natural and semi natural open space include:
• an abundance of natural and semi natural open space in the District. Current provision equates to 5.19 hectares per 1,000 population;

• the majority of natural and semi natural open space is situated within the Small Towns (166 hectares) and Local Service Centres (87 hectares). There is limited provision within Cirencester with only 1.45 hectares located in this settlement hierarchy. This is perhaps unsurprising as this area is more urban than any other in the district;

• a high level of satisfaction with the current quantity of natural and semi natural open space is evident from responses to the household survey with almost two thirds of respondents indicating that the provision of natural and semi natural open space is sufficient (63%). Only 30% of residents feel that provision is insufficient;

• findings within the settlement hierarchies generally support the district wide results. Unsurprisingly (given the character of the area) the greatest level of satisfaction is found in the Local Service Centres. Noticeably lower levels of satisfaction are found in the Market Towns and Cirencester, which may be reflective of the more urban nature of these settlement hierarchies. Supporting these perceptions, the lowest current provision and provision per 1,000 population are found in these settlement hierarchies;

• other consultations support the high level of satisfaction portrayed by respondents to the household survey. Over three quarters of respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey indicate that provision is sufficient (77%), seven out of 10 respondents to the elected members' survey state that provision is sufficient (with those who feel that provision is insufficient representing more urban wards, such as Tetbury and Rivers Meet) and 80% of respondents to the officers survey indicate that the quantity of natural and semi natural open space is sufficient to meet demand. Officers suggest that the District is characterised by large quantities of natural open space, and the majority of concerns relating to this type of open space referred to a lack of access to existing spaces, rather than to the need to provide more of such spaces. This view was echoed in discussions at the LDF Steering Group and at the Parish Council workshop, the need to increase access to the Cotswold Water Park was raised. The need for additional woodland was also highlighted;

• the need to protect natural and semi natural open space from development was emphasised throughout all modes of consultation. One of the main reasons given by those respondents to the household survey who stated that the provision of natural and semi natural open space is insufficient was the perceived loss of natural open space to residential development. This view was particularly expressed at the drop in sessions and residents workshop; and

• the biodiversity and habitat value of natural and semi natural open space was recognised during local consultation, particularly at the LDF Working Group workshop and drop in sessions. The need for a balance between recreation and conservation was identified.

5.21 The quantity of country parks was perceived positively throughout local consultation. 61% of respondents to the household survey and 80% of respondents to the officers’ survey state that provision is sufficient. The majority of Parish Councils had no opinion regarding the provision of country parks, but indicated that they would not expect to find this type of open space within the local area. Increasing access to country parks, particularly within the larger settlements, was identified as important.

5.22 Of those residents who indicated that the quantity of this type of open space is insufficient, a lack of access to country parks was identified as the main reason for their response. This means that increasing access to county parks rather than increasing the quantity of this type of open space may be a means of improving levels of local satisfaction.
5.23 The need to protect country parks from development was also emphasised during consultation. Although the need to increase the provision of country parks was not emphasised, elected members stated that the abundance of the countryside in the District provides the opportunity for new country parks to be provided within Cotswold District.

5.24 Full consultation findings are set out in Appendix E.

Setting quantity standards

5.25 The recommended local quantity standard for natural and semi natural open space has been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

5.26 In addition to taking on board the consultation findings, the standard also draws on other local targets, looking at the importance of natural open space from both a recreational and wider benefit perspective. In particular, open spaces are instrumental in the drive to adapt to climate change and the Wildlife Trust specifically references the value of natural and semi natural open space to this end.

5.27 The quantity of existing natural and semi natural open space is high in Cotswold District and the nature of natural open spaces means that to an extent, these sites are difficult to replicate. Recognising the need to set a realistic standard for new provision however, a district wide standard has been set in line with Natural England standards. This standard will be applied to new development only and should not be applied to identify existing shortfalls or deficiencies. In order to preserve the quantity of natural space across Cotswold District, existing space will be protected.
Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F - standards and justification and worksheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.19 hectares per 1,000 population (excluding sites over 40 hectares)</td>
<td>2 hectares per 1,000 population for new residential developments – standard not to be applied to existing provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing provision to be protected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification

A high level of satisfaction with the current quantity of natural and semi natural open space is evident from responses to the household survey with almost two thirds of respondents indicating that the provision of natural and semi natural open space is sufficient (63%). Other consultations support the findings of the household survey.

The need to protect natural and semi natural open space from development was emphasised throughout consultation. A recent loss of natural and semi natural open space was identified as one of the main reasons why residents stated that provision is insufficient. In addition to protecting existing space from development, the provision of new semi natural space as population increases will also be important, to ensure that consistent levels of accessible provision are maintained.

A standard of 2 hectares per 1000 population has therefore been set in line with Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGst). While this standard is below the level of existing provision, it ensures that the quantity of natural open space required as part of new development is realistic and deliverable. This standard should be applied to new development only and should not be used to identify existing deficiencies or surpluses. All existing open spaces will be protected from development.

Country parks

5.28 In light of the nature of country parks, and in order to ensure that the local standards are realistic, no quantity standard has been set. This should ensure future priority is given to improvements to the quality and access routes to existing sites rather than to the creation of new country parks.

5.29 The rationale behind this is summarised below and overleaf. Further detail is provided in Appendix E.
Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F - standards and justification and worksheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No local standard. Existing provision to be protected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification

A high level of satisfaction with the amount of country parks was portrayed during local consultation. 61% of respondents to the household survey state that the provision of country parks is sufficient and this high level of satisfaction is reinforced in other consultation findings. The need to protect country parks and maintaining and increasing access to existing sites were identified as the priorities.

The nature of these facilities means that the creation of new sites is challenging and would be a strategic facility and therefore not a localised decision. Given these issues, no quantity standard has been set for country parks. Instead, focus should be placed on improving the quality of existing facilities and maximising access to these sites.

Quality

Current position

5.30 Site assessments were not undertaken at natural and semi open spaces in the District. The key issues emerging from consultations relating to the quality of natural and semi natural open spaces are as follows:

- overall, respondents to the household survey have a positive opinion regarding the quality of natural and semi natural open space in the District, with 35% rating this type of open space as excellent and 46% indicating that the quality of provision is good;

- a positive perception regarding the quality of natural and semi natural open space is also evident from other consultation findings. Over three quarters of respondents to the officers’ survey indicate that the quality of this type of open space in excellent or good (77%), only two out of the 10 respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey feel that provision is below average quality and the majority of respondents to the elected members survey state that the quality of natural and semi natural open space is good or excellent;

- litter and dog fouling were identified as problems experienced by frequent users of natural and semi natural open space and Council officers. This suggests that there is a need for enhanced maintenance at natural and semi natural open spaces;

- a clean and litter free site, footpaths and nature features were identified as essential features of a natural open space by respondents to the household survey;

- the need for appropriate infrastructure, for example car parking, at natural and semi natural open spaces was emphasised by respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey. This was perceived to be particularly important in providing facilities for visitors and also minimising the impact on local villages. This suggests that residents and visitors travel across the District to access this type of open space; and
• the designation of part of Cotswold District as an AONB is highlighted as reinforcing the good quality landscape by respondents to the officers’ survey.

5.31 Country parks are rated the highest quality type of open space in the District, with over three quarters of respondents to the household survey indicating that the quality of these sites is excellent or good.

5.32 Other consultations reinforce the high level of satisfaction portrayed by respondents to the household survey. 73% of respondents to the officers’ survey feel that the quality of country parks is good, all respondents to the elected members’ survey rate the quality of country parks as above average and no quality issues were raised by Parish/Town Council respondents.

5.33 A clean and litter free site, appropriate level footpaths, nature features and dog and litter bins are identified as essential features of a country park by respondents to the household survey. Toilets, parking and appropriate signage were identified as desirable features of a site, highlighting the importance of country parks for visitors.

**Setting quality standards**

5.34 The recommended local quality standards for natural and semi natural open space and country parks are summarised overleaf. Full justifications and consultation for the local standards are provided within Appendix E.

5.35 The quality standards summarise the features that residents consider to be important determinants of the quality of provision.
Quality Standard (see Appendix E)

Natural and semi natural open space and Country Parks

Recommended Quality Standard

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the vision for natural and semi natural open space should incorporate:

Natural and Semi Natural Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td>
<td>Trees and shrubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>Dog walking area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural features</td>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information and signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog bins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate, level footpaths</td>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature features</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and dog bins</td>
<td>Appropriate signage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessibility

Natural and semi natural open space

5.36 Improving access to natural and semi natural open space, particularly within the larger settlements was identified as a priority throughout consultation. In particular, the lack of access to parts of the Cotswold Water Park was a key issue raised frequently throughout the consultation process.

5.37 The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived directly from the findings of the local consultations.

5.38 The significant majority of current users of natural and semi natural open space walk to access a site (80%). 55% of current users travel for 5 minutes or less and 87% travel for less than 15 minutes. This indicates that current users of natural open space use sites in close proximity to their home.
5.39 Similar to the travel mode portrayed by current uses, the majority of respondents to the household survey would expect to walk to a natural or semi natural open space (68%). 27% of residents would expect to drive. This suggests that although residents expect to find a natural open space within close proximity to their home, some are prepared to travel to access these spaces. The findings are reflected in all levels of the settlement hierarchy.

5.40 The most common expected travel time is 10 minutes and the average travel time is slightly higher at 12 minutes. The most common travel time is consistent in the Category B1 (Cirencester) and B2 (Market Towns) Settlements, however residents in the more rural parts of the District expect natural open space to be in closer proximity to the home, with the modal response being 5 minutes. This is perhaps reflective of the more rural setting of these areas.

5.41 The need to promote access to the countryside was emphasised during consultation. Increasing the amount of publicly accessible natural open space was also viewed as important, and the large number of private sites was identified as one of the main reasons why respondents to the household survey indicate that provision is insufficient. Improving access to natural and semi natural spaces was also identified as a key issue in the Parish / Town Council workshop and the LDF workshop. In particular, the need to improve access to the Cotswold Water Park was emphasised.

5.42 Cost was not raised as an issue regarding access to natural and semi natural open space and most sites are accessible free of charge. Cost is however perceived to impact on the usage of country parks, which will be returned to later

Country parks

5.43 Maintaining and increasing access to country parks was identified as being more important than increasing the amount of sites during local consultation. Specifically, the importance of maintaining public access and increasing access to sites via public transport was highlighted as important. Furthermore, Council officers stated that car parking charges are a barrier to access.

5.44 Half of current users of country parks walk to access a site while 48% currently drive. This split in transport patterns suggest that while some residents use these sites because they are in close proximity to the home, many residents are willing to travel distances to reach these facilities, reinforcing the strategic nature of country parks. 65% of residents would expect to travel less than 14 minutes to reach a country park.

5.45 Nearly three quarters of respondents to the household survey would expect to drive to a country park (72%) and only 21% would expect to walk to access these sites. These findings demonstrate a recognition of the more strategic nature of this type of open space.

5.46 The average travel time indicated by those residents who expect to drive is 18 minutes. The most common expected travel time is 30 minutes. The most frequently referenced response time is generally consistent within the settlement hierarchies. However, within Cirencester (Category B1 Settlements) the modal response is 10 minutes. This indicates that residents in Cirencester expect to travel significantly less to access a country park than residents in other parts of the district. Even with these discrepancies, it is clear that residents are willing to travel to access a country park.

Setting accessibility standards

5.47 The recommended local accessibility standards for natural and semi natural open space and country parks are summarised overleaf. Full justification for these local standards is provided within Appendix E.
Accessibility Standard (see Appendix E)

Natural and Semi Natural Open Space and Country Parks

**Recommended Accessibility Standard**

| 480m (equivalent to 10 minutes walk) to natural and semi natural open space |

| 30 minute drive time (public transport) to country parks |

**Justification**

The significant majority of both current users (80%) and local residents (68%) would expect to walk to a natural or semi natural open space. 87% of current users travel for less than 15 minutes to access a site and the most common travel time expected by residents is 10 minutes.

The recommended accessibility catchment for natural and semi natural open space has therefore been set at a 10 minute walk time (480m).

In contrast, nearly three quarters of respondents to the household survey would expect to drive to a country park (72%). The average expected travel time is 18 minutes and the most common travel time is 30 minutes. Throughout all modes of consultation, residents identified an expectation to travel to access a country park and the strategic nature of this type of open space was recognised.

Based on the above, a 30 minute drive time standard has been set for country parks. In the long term, the aim is for residents to be able to access country parks by public transport.
Applying provision standards

5.48 The application of the recommended quality, quantity and accessibility standards provides an understanding of the existing distribution of natural and semi natural open space and country parks.

Natural and semi natural open space

5.49 In light of the high levels of provision and uneven distribution of natural and semi natural open space across Cotswold District, the recommended quantity standard is to be applied to new provision only. It is therefore inappropriate to state areas of existing deficiency when measured against the recommended 2 hectares per 1,000 population.

Country parks

5.50 Given that no quantity standard has been set for country parks, it is not appropriate to state areas of deficiency.

Accessibility

5.51 The application of the accessibility standard for natural and semi natural open space and country parks is outlined in Maps 5.1 - 5.2 respectively (overleaf). Map 5.3 evaluates the interrelationship between country parks and natural and semi natural open space.
Map 5.1 - Natural and semi natural open space in Cotswold District
Map 5.2 - Country parks in Cotswold District
Map 5.3 - Country Parks and Natural and semi natural open space in Cotswold District
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5.52 Map 5.1 indicates that natural and semi natural open space is fairly evenly distributed across the District. The majority of residents in the four settlement hierarchies have access to a site within the recommended catchment. However, areas of deficiency are particularly evident in Tetbury, Cirencester, Moreton-in-Marsh, Tetbury, Kemble and Down Ampney.

5.53 Map 5.2 illustrates that the majority of residents have access to a country park within a 30 minute drive time. However, a number of residents in the north of the District, including those in Moreton-in-Marsh, Blockley, Chipping Campden, Mickleton and Willersey are unable to access a site within this drive time.

5.54 Map 5.3 illustrates that country parks are predominantly located in close proximity to natural and semi natural open space, which means that local accessibility deficiencies are not reduced by the presence of country parks. Country parks do however provide a different experience to natural and semi natural open space and both are therefore a valuable resource.

**Priorities for future delivery**

5.55 This section considers firstly the district wide issues. Consideration is then given to issues within specific settlements.

5.56 The priorities are set out under the headings of:

- Quality enhancements
- Contribution towards tourism economy
- Protection of existing provision
- Increasing provision
- Redesignation
- Disposal of facilities
- Enhancing access routes

**Quality enhancements**

5.57 Country parks and natural and semi natural open space are rated amongst the highest quality types of open space in the District. Very positive perceptions were portrayed during consultation and the need to maintain and enhance the quality of country parks and natural and semi natural open space was emphasised. All modes of consultation reveal that maintaining and enhancing the quality of these spaces, and improving access to these sites is of greater importance to residents than the provision of more sites. The existing quality of these spaces was however recognised, with improvements to the quality of other types of open space prioritised over natural open space by all responding Parish and Town Councils. Areas where improvements are of greater priority (where consultation identified higher dissatisfaction) include Cirencester and Fairford.

5.58 The recommended quality vision, based upon local consultation, identifies a well maintained site, appropriate, nature features and dog and litter bins as essential features of a high quality country park. A well maintained site, footpaths and nature features were identified as essential features of a high quality natural or semi natural open space.
5.59 Litter and dog fouling were identified as problems by users of natural and semi natural open space. Dog fouling was also perceived to be a major issue at country parks and the footpaths at sites were identified as being in need of enhancement, with Parish Councils in Fairford and Compton Abdale in particular highlighting this issue. The need for car parking at natural and semi natural open space was also identified during consultation, and attendees at the LDF workshop highlighted the importance of effective signage. This is particularly important if sites are to attract visitors as well as local residents.

5.60 In addition to maintaining and managing country parks and natural and semi natural open space for recreational use, these types of open space are particularly important for biodiversity and nature conservation. For example, Cotswold Country Park contains a variety of trees, wildlife and habitats. In light of the importance of this type of open space for nature conservation and biodiversity, sympathetic management of sites should be incorporated within any future management programme. Alternatively, consideration should be given to prohibiting public access on certain sensitive areas of sites to ensure their long term sustainability. Achieving a balance between recreational use and environmental sustainability will be a challenge.

### Contribution to the tourism economy

5.61 Country parks and larger strategic natural open spaces attract a large number of visitors to Cotswold District. The Cotswold Water Park is a particularly popular destination for visitors to the District, although ongoing issues with the lack of access to parts of this area were raised throughout all consultations. The water park contains a beach and provides a variety of activities for tourists, including fishing, golf, watersports, walking and cycling.

5.62 These strategic open spaces contribute to the local economy by attracting tourists to Cotswold District. Information on some of these open spaces, such as the Cotswold Water Park and Westonbirt Arboretum, is provided on tourism information websites and the District Council website. Many visitors to the area travel specifically to experience the AONB, countryside and the associated natural and semi natural open spaces and country parks. The Council should however continue to seek to raise awareness and promote the country parks and larger strategic natural open spaces located in the District, to increase visitor numbers and contribute to enhancing the tourism economy.
NSN2

Continue to promote the country parks and larger strategic natural open spaces both to residents within the District and further afield (through the internet for example) to raise awareness of potential visitors to the area.

**Protection of existing provision**

5.63 The *Cotswold District Local Plan* and *Sustainable Community Strategy* emphasises the importance of protecting natural and semi natural open space from development. Specifically, a number of policies in the local plan reference the need to protect the AONB and sites of importance for nature conservation.

5.64 As referenced already, the importance of protecting this type of open space was one of the key themes throughout consultation. A loss of natural open space to development was given as one of the main reasons why respondents to the household survey stated that provision is insufficient.

5.65 As emphasised in recommendation NSN1, natural and semi natural open spaces are valuable not just from a recreational perspective, but also in terms of conservation and biodiversity. The protection of these sites will also be a key component of the strategy to reduce climate change and promote urban cooling.

5.66 Application of The Woodland Trust Accessibility standard further reinforces the need to protect existing natural and semi natural open space and indicates that despite the rural environment of the district, residents in the District have more limited access to natural open space than those in some other parts of the country. Table 5.2 overleaf summarises the implications of the application of the Woodland Trust Access to Woodlands Standards.

5.67 Table 5.2 overleaf indicates:

- residents in Cotswold District have significantly less access to accessible woodland (defined as woodland that is formally accessible to the public) in comparison to the county average;

- access to inaccessible woodland (defined as woodland that is inaccessible to the public) is significant above the county average. This supports consultation findings, indicating that while there may be an abundance of natural and semi natural open space and woodland in the District, access to these spaces is limited; and

- the proportion of the population who would require new woodland to meet the standards (rather than access to existing sites) is below the county average, reinforcing the abundance of natural and semi natural open space, and the access issues that are evident, in the District.
### Table 5.2 - Application of the Woodland Trust Accessibility Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Cotswold District</th>
<th>Gloucestershire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Woods</td>
<td>% population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>54.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible Woods</td>
<td>% extra population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m if existing woods opened</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% extra population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km if existing woods opened</td>
<td>67.46</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Creation</td>
<td>% population requiring new woodland creation for access to a 2ha+ wood within 500m</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>65.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% population requiring new woodland creation for access to a 20ha+ wood within 4km</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum area of new woodland required for 2ha+ woods within 500m</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum area of new woodland required for 20ha+ woods within 4km</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NSN3**

In light of the importance of natural and semi natural open space in the District, ensure that Local Development Framework policy protects all sites. Natural open space should only be lost to development if it can be proven that the site has no recreational or conservation value and that the benefits of development would outweigh the impact of the loss of the site. These exception criteria should be set out in policy.
5.68 While no quantity standard has been set for country parks, it remains important to protect these sites from residential development. Current user patterns indicate that Country parks are District wide strategic facilities that serve a large catchment and are important in attracting tourists to Cotswold District. The value of this type of open space was emphasised during local consultation and country parks are the third most frequently used type of open space in the District. The importance of protecting country parks from development was highlighted throughout consultation.

NSN4

Given the importance of country parks in the District all sites should be protected through policies in the Local Development Framework.

**Increasing provision**

5.69 Consultation identified a high level of satisfaction with the amount of country parks in the District. In light of the nature of country parks, the creation of a new country park is challenging. While there are no recommendations for increasing the number of country parks and no specific demand identified, opportunities to increase the provision of country parks should be considered. The provision of country parks provides a key means of increasing access to the local countryside as well as providing new amenities for the benefit of tourists.

5.70 A high level of satisfaction with the provision of natural and semi natural open space was portrayed during consultation. However, 30% of respondents to the household survey stated that provision was insufficient, highlighting a level of dissatisfaction with the current quantity of this type of open space by some residents. Naunton Parish Council indicated that investment in new space is required and Tetbury and Riversmeet wards were also perceived to be lacking in natural space. Access to existing provision was perceived to be as big an issue as the provision of new space.

5.71 The key priorities for the creation of new semi natural open space are set out by settlement hierarchy in the sections that follow. In some instances, the deficiencies may be rectified by providing access to an existing natural open space, rather than the creation of a new semi natural site.

**Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)**

5.72 Only one natural or semi natural open space is located within Cirencester. Unsurprisingly, given the urban nature of the area, the lowest current provision and provision per 1,000 population is found in this settlement hierarchy. Illustrating this limited provision, application of the accessibility standard indicates that only a small number of residents in the east of Cirencester can access a natural or semi natural open space within the recommended 480m catchment (Figure 5.1).
Figure 5.1 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Cirencester and Stratton
5.73 Although a number of residents in Cirencester do not have access to natural or semi natural open space, they do have access to other forms of informal open space, particularly formal parks. This means that with the exception of those in East Cirencester, residents have access to at least one type of informal open space.

5.74 Cirencester Park already contains areas of woodland and natural open space and this site also links to Frampton and Sapperton Commons (natural open space). In the short term, to reduce the impact of deficiencies in the west of Cirencester, it will be necessary to provide sustainable transport routes to Cirencester Park through the provision of pedestrian and cycling routes. Longer term, the presence of formal parks in Cirencester provides the opportunity to locate natural open space within these sites and this should be considered at Abbey Grounds to alleviate accessibility deficiencies.

5.75 In addition to being outside the recommended catchment of a natural or semi natural open space, residents in the east of Cirencester and Stratton do not have access to other forms of informal open space and the Swindon Road restricts their access routes to existing sites. The provision of recreational open space is therefore important (considered in Section 4). Residents are however located only just outside of the catchments to Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park and initial focus should therefore be placed on increasing access to Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park through the development of the pedestrian and cycle routes. Furthermore, it will be important to enhance access to the countryside to the east of this area of deficiency. If a new park is provided in line with recommendations in Section 4, natural and semi natural open space should be incorporated within this site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSN5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian and cycle routes to Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park from the west and east of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate natural open space within Abbey Grounds and within any new park provided in the East of Cirencester (Recommendation PG7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market towns (Category B2 Settlements)**

5.76 A total of 45.22 hectares of natural and semi natural open space, distributed across four sites, is located within this settlement hierarchy. Three of the four sites are located within Bourton-on-the-Water and one site is located within Moreton-in-Marsh. No natural or semi natural open spaces are situated within Tetbury. Despite the comparatively high number of sites in Bourton-on-the-Water, accessibility mapping illustrates that deficiencies are found within all three of the market towns (Figures 5.2 – 5.4).
Figure 5.2 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Tetbury
Figure 5.3 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Moreton-in-Marshal
Figure 5.4 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within the north west of Bourton-on-the-Water
5.77 Although residents in Tetbury are outside the catchment of a natural or semi natural open space they do have access to amenity green space within a 480m catchment. This means that residents do have access to some form of informal open space. This does not however, negate the need for natural open space. Consultation specifically identified the need for enhanced access to natural and semi natural open space in Tetbury and there are also no formal parks in the town, meaning that opportunities to provide a new site are limited.

5.78 To alleviate deficiencies within this settlement, opportunities to increase the provision of natural or semi natural open space in Tetbury should be seized. This will be particularly important as the population of the town grows and this housing growth may provide opportunities, as well as inform the location of new provision. Consideration should be given to the location of sites:

- at either ends of the town (i.e. north and south or east and west) maximising the number of residents who have access to a site (the location should be chosen with an understanding of where new development will take place); and

- in the centre (in conjunction with the provision of a new park (Recommendation PG8).

**NSN6**

*Increase the provision of semi natural open space in Tetbury.*

5.79 Similar to that of Tetbury, residents in Moreton-in-Marsh have access to informal open space in the form of amenity green space. Queen Victoria Gardens (a formal park) is also accessible for residents in the west of the settlement. This site does contain informal natural open space in the form of woodland and therefore while a deficiency is identified, this is not a short term priority. If population growth occurs to the west of the town however, pressure on existing natural space will grow, and new natural space should be provided alongside new development.

**NSN7**

*Provide new semi natural open space to the west of Moreton-in-Marsh if this area experiences population growth. Locate any new sites in an area which is accessible to the greatest number of residents.*

5.80 Residents in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh do not have access to any form of informal open space and access to open space in the west of the settlement is further restricted due to the location of the Swindon Road. Increasing the provision of natural and semi natural open space in this location is therefore a priority. As recommended in section 4, consideration should be given to providing a formal park in this location and natural open space could be incorporated within this site.

**NSN8**

*Provide natural and semi natural open space in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh*
Residents located in the north west of Bourton-on-the-Water are also outside the catchment of other types of informal open space. This means that informal recreation opportunities in this location are limited. However, Bourton Gravel Pits (31.28 hectares) and Temple Ham Meadow (11.30 hectares) are two large natural open spaces located on the east of the settlement boundary. In the short term, focus should be placed on improving access routes to these sites for residents in the north east of Bourton-in-the-Water through the development of the green infrastructure network (e.g. footpaths, cycle paths). Longer term, opportunities to increase the provision of natural open space in this location should be considered, particularly if new development occurs in this area, as this will increase pressure on already limited resources.

**NSN9**

- Improve access routes to Bourton Gravel Pits and Temple Ham Meadow for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Provide new natural and semi natural open space in the north west of Bourton-on-the-Water.

**Small towns (Category C1 Settlements)**

A total of 13 sites containing 166.04 hectares of natural and semi natural open space are located within the Small Towns. In addition to these sites, Cotswold Water Park (535 hectares) is also located within this settlement hierarchy.

Application of the accessibility standard indicates that the majority of residents within the settlements have access to a site within the recommended 480m catchment. However, residents in Stow-on-the-Wold and Chipping Campden are outside the catchment of a natural or semi natural open space (Figures 5.5 and 5.6).
Figure 5.5 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Stow-on-the-Wold
Figure 5.6 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Chipping Campden
5.84 Although residents in Stow-on-the-Wold and Chipping Campden do not have access to natural open space the majority do have access to other forms of informal open space, particularly amenity green space. This means that residents do have access to some form of local informal open space.

5.85 Abbotsford Park (54 hectares) is a large formal park located in the west of Stow-on-the-Wold. Although this site has a primary purpose as a formal park, it does contain areas of woodland and therefore has a secondary function as a natural open space. Access to the site is however restricted and therefore has limited impact on the existing deficiency.

5.86 In the short term, access to Abbotsford Park through the development of pedestrian routes and cycleways should be improved. Given that there is no natural and semi natural space within the town, new natural open space is required, particularly in the event of population growth. New provision should be located at either side of the settlement (to maximise the number of residents able to access sites) and the location should take into account new housing development.

NSN10
Provide natural and semi natural open space in Stow-on-the-Wold. New sites should be located at either side of the settlement to maximise the number of residents who have access to these spaces.

5.87 While there are deficiencies of natural and semi natural space within Chipping Campden, Campden Wood (74.28 hectares), Dover’s Hill (73.45 hectares) and Weston Park (74.28) are three large natural open spaces located to the west of Chipping Campden on the edge or just outside of the settlement boundary. The presence of these sites means that localised deficiencies are of more limited significance. In the short term, focus should be placed on improving access to these sites by providing cycling and walking routes. Residents expect local provision however, and new provision situated within the settlement boundaries is therefore required, particularly in the event of population growth. Given the location of the existing sites to the west of the town, priority should be given to new sites in the east.

NSN11
Provide new natural and semi natural open space to the east of Chipping Campden potentially through the creation of sites to be managed by the local community.

Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)

5.88 The second highest amount of natural and semi natural open space is located within the Local Service Centres. Overall, 14 sites equating to 87.30 hectares of natural and semi natural open space are situated within the settlement hierarchy. The majority of sites are located within Avening (5 sites) and Blockley (3 sites) with only one site situated within each of Kemble, Kempsford and Down Ampney. No sites are located within Andoversford or Willersey.

5.89 Nearly all residents in Andoversford, Blockley, Kemble, Kempsford, Mickleton, Willersey and Down Ampney are outside the recommended catchment of a site (Figures 5.7 - 5.12).
Figure 5.7 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Andoversford
Figure 5.8 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Blockley
Figure 5.9 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Kemble
Figure 5.10 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Kempsford
Figure 5.11 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Mickleton
Figure 5.12 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Down Ampney
Figure 5.13 - Deficiencies of natural and semi natural open space within Willersey
5.90 In addition to being outside the catchment of a natural or semi natural open space, the majority of residents within Andoversford, Blockley, Kemble, Kempsford, Willersey, Mickleton and Down Ampney are also unable to access any other forms of informal open space, meaning that deficiencies are of greater significance.

5.91 The lack of informal space places increased emphasis on access to the countryside. Localised space (both amenity and natural) is however still important. To reduce accessibility deficiencies in the short term, focus should be placed on increasing access, through the development of the green infrastructure network, to natural and semi natural open spaces within close proximity to Andoversford, Blockley, Kemble, Kempsford, Mickleton and Down Ampney, specifically Dowdeswell Wood (Andoversford), Burton Wood and Norcombe Wood (both Blockley), Kemble Wood (Kemble), Cotswold Water Park (Kempsford), Bakers Hill and Old Coppice (Mickleton) and The Folley and Down Ampney Pits (Down Ampney). Longer term, in light of the lack of access to local natural open space, opportunities to increase the provision of natural and semi natural open space should be considered, potentially through the creation of sites to be managed by the local community.

**NSN12** I increase the provision of natural and semi natural open space in Andoversford, Blockley, Kemble, Kempsford, Mickleton, Willersey and Down Ampney, particularly in the event of population growth.

**Redesignation**

5.92 A number of natural and semi natural open spaces, particularly within the Smaller Villages, are located within close proximity to one another and therefore serve similar catchments. Accessibility mapping has however revealed that access to natural and semi natural open space within the settlement boundaries is limited. These sites therefore serve a valuable function in providing access for residents located within settlements where access to natural and semi natural open space within the immediate proximity is limited. In addition to this, these sites are particularly valuable in terms of biodiversity and wildlife and nature conservation. Based on this, there are no recommendations for the redesignation of any natural or semi natural open spaces.

**Disposal of facilities**

5.93 There are no recommendations for the disposal of existing natural or semi natural open space.

**Increasing access**

5.94 There are two means by which access to natural open space can be increased, specifically;

- By improving routes to these sites
- By providing access to a site for the general public which is currently private

5.95 Application of the accessibility standard has revealed that access to local natural and semi natural open space is limited, particularly within the Cirencester and the Market Towns. Specifically, natural and semi natural open space is predominantly located outside of settlement boundaries, meaning that a large number of residents within these settlements are unable to access a site.

5.96 Providing new natural or semi natural open space within the more densely populated urban settlements, such as Cirencester, may not be possible. Therefore, particularly in the short term, increasing access to existing natural and semi natural open space in the District is a key priority.
5.97 Increasing access to natural and semi natural open space, particularly within the larger settlements was identified as a priority throughout consultation and promoting access to the countryside was also viewed as important. Application of the local standards has revealed that improving access routes to existing sites is particularly important in the following locations:

- Cirencester - Cirencester Park
- Stratton – Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park
- Bourton-on-the-Water - Bourton Gravel Pits and Temple Ham Meadow
- Stow-on-the-Wold – Abbotsford Park
- Chipping Campden - Campden Wood, Dover’s Hill and Weston Park
- Andoversford, Blockley and Kemble - Dowdeswell Wood (Andoversford), Burton Wood and Norcombe Wood (both Blockley) and Kemble Wood (Kemble)

5.98 The cost of accessing country parks (due to car parking charges) was also highlighted as a key issue during consultation. Improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes will provide residents with an alternative to the private car.

Seek to increase access to existing natural and semi natural open space in the District through the development of new cycle routes and pedestrian walkways, and the enhancement of existing routes.

NSN13

5.99 As well as improving access between and within settlements on foot, appropriate public transport links are also essential to maximise usage of larger strategic sites. Specifically, Cotswold Water Park is the largest natural open space in the District and is an important site both in terms of recreation and conservation. The need to increase access to this site was emphasised throughout consultation.

5.100 Country Parks in particular are predominantly located within the centre and south of the District and outside of settlement boundaries, meaning that most residents are not within walking distance of a site. Although challenging given the rural nature of the district, increasing access to these sites by public transport will be particularly important. Improvements to the public transport network were highlighted as a key strategic priority.

Improve access to strategic natural and semi natural open spaces and country parks by ensuring that where possible, existing and new sites are located on public transport routes.

NSN14

5.101 Although it was recognised during consultation that there is an abundance of natural and semi natural open space in the District, like formal parks, it was stated that a lot of sites are not publicly accessible and this is clear through the audit of existing provision. Application of the Woodland Trust accessibility standard reinforces this issue, with the amount of publicly accessible woodland significantly below the county average and the amount of inaccessible woodland significantly above the county average. Improvements to the amount of space that is publicly accessible will help to rectify existing deficiencies, and will maximise the value of natural open space to the public. The Council should work with landowners of natural and semi natural open space to secure public access to existing provision.
Work with providers of natural and semi natural open space in the District to secure public access to existing provision.

Summary

5.102 Natural and semi natural open space and country parks are popular types of open space in the District. Natural and semi natural open space is the most frequently used typology and country parks are the third. Most of Cotswold District is designated as an AONB and there is an abundance of natural and semi natural open space in the District. The provision of natural and semi natural open space contributes significantly to the character of the District.

5.103 The need to protect country parks and natural open space from development was a key theme throughout consultation. The Cotswold District Local Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy emphasise the importance of protecting these types of open space from development, particularly sites of importance for nature conservation and the Cotswold AONB.

5.104 While recreational opportunities should be encouraged at natural and semi natural open space and country parks, this should be balanced with conserving and promoting biodiversity.

5.105 Application of the accessibility standard has revealed that natural and semi natural open space is predominantly located outside of settlement boundaries. Local access to sites natural and semi natural open space, particularly the more urban settlements, is therefore limited. Key areas of deficiency are evident in Cirencester, Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh, Bourton-on-the-Water, Chipping Campden and Stow-on-the-Wold. Opportunities to increase the provision of natural and semi natural open space in these settlements should be seized, particularly in the event of population growth, either through the provision of new spaces or the incorporation of natural space within other existing sites.

5.106 Other than providing new natural and semi natural spaces, increasing access to natural and semi natural open space and country parks through the development of the green infrastructure network (footpaths and cycle routes) within and between settlements and public transport routes will be a key means of improving access to natural and semi natural space for residents. Providing public access to existing private sites will help to address the deficiencies identified. Improving the quality of existing natural and semi natural spaces from both a recreational and biodiversity perspective will also be important.

5.107 It is therefore recommended that the key priorities for the future delivery of provision of natural and semi natural open space and country parks that should be addressed through the Local Development Framework and/or other delivery mechanisms are to:

- incorporate a policy protecting existing natural and semi natural open space and country parks within the Local Development Framework;
- ensure that ongoing improvements to biodiversity and conservation management are encouraged, and that recreational use of sites is balanced with biodiversity and the maintenance of habitats;
- maintain and enhance the quality of country parks and natural and semi natural open space within the District and incorporate sympathetic management techniques at sites of importance for nature conservation and biodiversity. This may include the development of country park management plans;
- increase the provision of natural and semi natural open space, particularly in areas of deficiency, by either providing new sites, encouraging the creation of natural and semi natural areas within other larger sites, such as parks or providing access to existing private sites; and
- seek to enhance access routes (in particular footpaths and cycle paths) to maximise access to existing spaces and ensure that residents benefit from the abundance of natural open space that characterises the district.
6. Amenity Green Space

Introduction and definition
6.1 This type of open space is most commonly found in residential areas. It includes informal recreation spaces, green spaces and village greens in and around housing, with a primary purpose of providing opportunities for informal activities close to home or work. Amenity green space is also often used for landscaping purposes.

6.2 The function of this type of open space overlaps with many others, in particular parks and gardens and natural areas. Amenity space can also provide informal opportunities for children’s play where there are no other facilities. It is important therefore to consider the provision of amenity green spaces in the context of other types of open space.

6.3 There is much research relating to the links between the provision of high quality open space and a reduction in crime. Given that amenity space is perhaps the most local type of open space provided, high quality and well designed open space will be essential in order to discourage misuse and encourage a culture of respect.

6.4 This section sets out the strategic context, key findings of the consultations and recommended local standards. The standards are then applied to evaluate the adequacy of the existing amenity green space and the associated demand for these spaces. Standards are also applied in the context of other open spaces with overlapping functions.

Context
6.5 Amenity green space is a valued type of local open space within Cotswold District. Nearly a quarter of respondents to the household survey (22%) use amenity green space at least once a week and the value of spaces such as village greens, in the smaller rural settlements was emphasised during consultation.

6.6 In addition, amenity green space is viewed as an important type of open space for children and young people. This type of open space is perceived to offer informal play and recreation opportunities for children and young people and a lack of space for children to play was given as one of the main reasons why respondents to the household survey stated that the provision of amenity green space is insufficient. This suggests that amenity space, as well as equipped play facilities perform an important role in providing opportunities for children and young people, as well as for residents of other ages.

Current position
6.7 49 amenity green space sites equating to 12.66 hectares are located within the four settlement hierarchies. An additional 45 sites are situated outside of the settlement hierarchies in the smaller villages. The majority of amenity green spaces are owned by Parish or Town Councils.

6.8 The provision of amenity green space in Cotswold District is summarised in Table 6.1 overleaf.
Table 6.1 - Provision of amenity green space across Cotswold District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>57,853</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9 The key issues emerging from Table 6.1 and consultations relating to the quantity of amenity green space include:

- the current provision of amenity green space equates to 0.22 hectares per 1,000 population;
- a difference in opinion regarding the quantity of amenity green space was evident from responses to the household survey. 38% of respondents feel that the provision of amenity green space is sufficient whilst 36% of respondents hold the opposing view, suggesting that provision is insufficient;
- the greatest level of satisfaction is evident in the Market Towns where 50% of residents feel that provision is sufficient. The highest dissatisfaction is portrayed in the Small Towns; 42% of respondents state that provision is insufficient;
- analysis of the distribution of existing amenity spaces demonstrates that provision is equitably distributed across the settlement hierarchies, with provision per 1000 population varying only between 0.24 and 0.20. The lowest level of provision per 1,000 population is found in the Small Towns, where the highest level of dissatisfaction is evident;
- the majority of residents who are dissatisfied with the quantity of existing provision indicate that there are no appropriate spaces near to them and that there is a lack of space for children to play. This suggests that there is a direct lack of amenity green space in some areas of the District and that this type of open space is particularly valuable for children and young people. There may also be a crossover with views on equipped facilities for children and young people;
other consultations generally exhibit a higher level of satisfaction with the current amount of amenity green space. Over half of respondents to the officers’ survey (57%) and the majority of Parish/Town Clerks state that the provision of amenity green space is sufficient. Amenity space was not identified as the type of open space most in demand by any Parish or Town Council. Officers indicated that improving the functionality of these spaces was of greater priority. Furthermore, 49% of respondents to the children’s survey indicate that there are lots of grassed areas near their home and 72% of respondents to the young people’s survey state that there are enough or more than enough grassed areas within close proximity to their home; and

- elected members and attendees at drop in sessions were less positive regarding the provision of amenity green space. Members state that provision within Tetbury, Ampney Coln and Thames Head wards is insufficient and attendees at drop in sessions felt that there is a lack of informal open space within the smaller villages. It was however stated that residents in these villages have access to the countryside, indicating that the provision of amenity green space is not a priority.

6.10 Full consultation findings are set out in Appendix E.

**Setting quantity standards**

6.11 The recommended local quantity standard for amenity green space has been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and is summarised below. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

6.12 The recommended local standard has been set slightly above the existing level of provision to reflect the amount of residents who are dissatisfied with the quantity of amenity green space. The recommended standard takes into account the key issues arising from consultations as well as the distribution of existing provision.

**Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F - standards and justification and worksheet)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.22 hectares per 1000 population</td>
<td>0.23 hectares per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

A difference in opinion regarding the quantity of amenity green space was evident during local consultation. 38% of respondents felt that the provision of amenity green space was sufficient whilst 36% of respondents held the opposing view, suggesting that provision is insufficient. This split in opinion was evident within all settlement hierarchies and one of the main reasons given by those residents who stated that provision was insufficient. This split in opinion was evident within all settlement hierarchies and one of the main reasons given by those residents who stated that provision is insufficient was a lack of appropriate spaces near their home. This suggests that there is a direct lack of provision in some areas of the District.

Based on the above, the local standard has been set slightly above the existing level of provision. Setting a standard slightly above the existing level of provision will ensure that sites are protected and that new provision can be sought in areas of deficiency.
Quality

Current position

6.13 The quality of amenity green space was assessed through site visits undertaken by the Council. The key issues emerging from site assessments and consultations relating to the quality of amenity green space are as follows:

- the quality of amenity green space was generally perceived positively by respondents to the household survey. 48% of residents indicate that the quality of amenity green space is average and 35% of respondents feel that the quality of this type of open space in good;

- overall perceptions are generally reflected within the settlement hierarchies. However, polarised views are evident in the Small Towns, with 54% of residents rating the quality of amenity green space as good and 36% poor. This suggests that the quality of amenity green space across settlements of this size is particularly varied;

- other consultation findings reflect the household survey results. Respondents to the officers’ survey consider the quality of amenity green space to be good (40%) or average (33%), half of respondents to the young people’s survey feel that the quality of amenity space is ok but is in need of some improvements and Parish/Town Council respondents are generally positive about the quality of amenity space. Elected Member respondents have a difference in opinion regarding the quality of this type of open space however, with provision in Tetbury in particular highlighted as being poor quality;

- the main improvements identified by respondents to the young people’s survey included the provision of bins and seating (litter was highlighted as a particular problem in the general comments) and it was also felt that these spaces would benefit from lighting;

- the value of amenity green space for children and young people was emphasised by attendees at the residents’ workshop and respondents to the young people’s survey. Amenity green space was identified as often used for a kickabout. The need to ensure that the design of amenity green spaces encourages participation and interaction for all age groups was also a focal point of consultation. Supporting this, it was emphasised that it is important to improve the functionality of amenity green space and provide appropriate facilities;

- site assessment findings provide a more positive view than consultations regarding the quality of amenity green space with the condition of amenity green space sites generally rated as good. Sites were identified as being well kept and well maintained and the boundaries of sites were stated as being in excellent condition. The visits however did reveal the issues raised in consultation, concluding that some sites are limited in their function with no infrastructure (e.g. bins and benches) or recreational equipment located on site;

- Joyce’s Pool (Didmarton) was identified as a poor quality site. Vandalism was evident on this site and the need for increased maintenance was identified.

Setting quality standards

6.14 The recommended local quality standard for amenity green space is summarised overleaf. Full justifications and consultation for the local standard are provided within Appendix E.
Quality Standard (see Appendix E)

Recommended Quality Standard

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that amenity green space should incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
<td>Nature features including shrubs and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter bins</td>
<td>Lighting (larger sites only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog bins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessibility

6.15 The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived directly from the findings of the local consultations.

6.16 All residents who use amenity spaces more frequently than any other type of space walk to their favourite site. 80% travel for five minutes or less while the remainder travel below 10 minutes. This suggests that most residents use sites in very close proximity to their home.

6.17 Consistent with the travel mode portrayed by current users, over three quarters of respondents to the household survey expect to walk to an amenity green space (79%). 20% of residents would prefer to drive. The average travel time indicated by respondents is 9 minutes and the most common response is lower at 5 minutes.

6.18 The overall modal response (5 minutes) is the same across all settlement hierarchies with the exception of the Local Service Centres, where the most common response is 10 minutes. This suggests that residents within this size of settlement expect to travel further to access an amenity green space. This may be reflective of the limited number of sites in this settlement hierarchy (9) and therefore residents current travel patterns.

6.19 Although a lack of informal open space within some of the smaller villages was identified during consultation, it was acknowledged that the provision of informal open space is not a priority due to the local access to the countryside. It was felt that improving access routes to the countryside is as important as the provision of more localised amenity green spaces.

6.20 Site assessments reinforce the local nature of amenity green space, with only a limited number of sites located in close proximity to public transport routes or having on site/nearby car parking. This reflects the fact that the majority of these sites are designed for use by the local residents who would walk to the site.

6.21 The need to improve access to amenity green space for the disabled is clear, with only six sites identified as being accessible for disabled users.
6.22 No access issues regarding cost were raised during consultation in relation to amenity green spaces and there are no access charges for any amenity space in the district.

**Setting accessibility standards**

6.23 The recommended local accessibility standard for amenity green space is summarised below. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

**Accessibility Standard (see Appendix E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Accessibility Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240m (equivalent to 5 minutes walk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Current (80%) and expected (79%) travel patterns identify a clear preference for walking to an amenity green space. 80% of current users travel for 5 minutes or less and the most common travel time expected by respondents to the household survey is also 5 minutes.

Based on the above, the local accessibility standard has been set at a 5 minute walk time (240m). This standard reflects the expectation of residents that an amenity green space will be found in close proximity to their home.

---

**Applying provision standards**

6.24 The application of the recommended quantity and accessibility standards provides an understanding of the existing distribution of amenity green space. Table 6.2 summarises the application of the quantity standard for amenity green space by settlement hierarchy.

**Table 6.2 - Application of the quantity standard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>2010 Current shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
<th>2026 Future shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2.62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.25 Table 6.2 indicates the following:

- The provision of amenity green space is below the recommended minimum standard, with a current shortfall of 0.65 hectares. Application of the standard taking into account future population projections indicates that this shortfall is expected to increase to 2.62 hectares by 2026;

- The provision of amenity green space is above the minimum standard in Cirencester. However, future population increases will mean that provision will fall below the recommended standard; and

- The highest shortfall of amenity green space is found in the Small Towns.

6.26 Application of the quantity standard within the individual settlements indicates that only within Bourton-on-the-Water, Blockley, Lechlade and Willersey is the provision of amenity green space above the minimum standard both currently and in future years, taking into account projected population growth. The greatest current shortfalls in provision can be found in:

- Tetbury - 0.49 hectares
- South Cerney - 0.36 hectares
- Mickleton - 0.38 hectares
- Stow-on-the-Wold - 0.36 hectares

6.27 The above findings indicate that there may be a requirement to increase the provision of amenity green space within the District, particularly within those settlements where there are high quantitative shortfalls and where population growth will be significant, such as Tetbury.

Accessibility

6.28 The application of the accessibility standard for amenity green space is outlined in Map 6.1 overleaf.

6.29 Map 6.2 considers the interrelationship between amenity green space and other forms of informal open space – formal parks, country parks and natural open space. Where residents are within 240m of a formal park (the recommended catchment for amenity green space), as a higher order facility, the formal park negates the need for amenity green space.
Map 6.2 - Formal parks, country parks, natural and semi natural open space and amenity green spaces
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6.30 Map 6.1 indicates that amenity green space is relatively evenly distributed across the District. The majority of residents in the Small Towns have access to a site within the recommended 240m catchment. However, key areas of deficiency are evident in Cirencester, Northleach, Bourton on-the-Water, Avening, Down Ampney, Kempsford and Mickleton.

6.31 Map 6.2 indicates that while there are areas that are deficient in amenity green space, the majority of residents in the District have access to at least one type of informal open space within a 240m catchment. However, residents in Kempsford, Down Ampney and the north of Chipping Campden, Bourton on-the-Water and Mickleton are outside the catchment of a formal park, country park, natural open space or amenity green space. Opportunities for informal recreation are therefore particularly limited in these settlements.

Priorities for future delivery

6.32 This section considers the district wide issues that need to be addressed. Consideration is then given to issues within specific settlements.

6.33 In line with PPG17, the priorities are set out under the headings of:

- Quality enhancements
- Protection of existing provision
- Redesignation and disposal
- New provision
- Enhancing access routes

Quality enhancements

6.34 The value of amenity green spaces, particularly within the smaller villages where they function as village greens and are often the only form of informal open space, was evident throughout consultation.

6.35 Although the quality of amenity green space was generally perceived positively during local consultation, the need for enhancement at some sites was identified. Half of respondents to the young people's survey stated that the quality of amenity green space is ok and in need of improvement and one Parish Council identified that this type of open space requires more investment than any other within their Parish. The need to improve the functionality of amenity green space was also recognised during consultation and it was considered important to ensure that amenity green spaces (and other types of informal open space) are accessible to, and cater for, residents of all ages.

6.36 The recommended quality vision, based upon local consultation, identifies effective maintenance and litter bins as essential features of high quality amenity green spaces. Seating, nature features and lighting at larger sites are perceived to be desirable features. Site assessments reveal that there are a number of amenity green space sites in need of increased site infrastructure, such as bins and benches.

6.37 Priority should be given to enhancing the quality of amenity green space, prioritising those sites of low quality or sites which provide the only informal recreation opportunity within the settlement. Site visits identified the required improvements set out in Table 6.3.
### Table 6.3 - Required Quality Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Identified area for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northleach, Westwood Community Centre Amenity Space</td>
<td>Northleach</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Benches, bins and improvements to grass cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrington Road AGS</td>
<td>Chipping Campden</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Grass Cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Gardens Open Space</td>
<td>South Cerney</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Improved ancillary facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester, Abbey Way</td>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>Category B1 Settlements</td>
<td>Improved range of vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester, Cranhams Lane Amenity Space</td>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>Category B1 Settlements</td>
<td>Improved site infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester, Springfield Road</td>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>Category B1 Settlements</td>
<td>Improved site infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester, Vyners Close</td>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>Category B1 Settlements</td>
<td>Increased range of vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechlade, Allcourt Meadow</td>
<td>Lechlade</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechlade, Lodersfield</td>
<td>Lechlade</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechlade, Swansfield</td>
<td>Lechlade</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Piece</td>
<td>South Cerney</td>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>More bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriel Grove AGS</td>
<td>Moreton in Marsh</td>
<td>Category B2 Settlements</td>
<td>Provision of benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Close AGS</td>
<td>Bourton on the Water</td>
<td>Category B2 Settlements</td>
<td>Provision of benches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Protection

6.38 Amenity green space is an important local resource for residents in Cotswold District. This type of open space is regularly used by residents and serves an important function in the smaller villages, often providing residents with the only informal recreation opportunity in the settlement. Village greens are particularly valuable to residents as they often provide a focal point for community life. In light of the importance of amenity green space, consideration should be given to protecting existing valuable amenity green spaces from residential development.

6.39 Valuable amenity green spaces include those which serve unique catchments and those which are frequently used. Amenity spaces are the only type of informal space in Tetbury, Chipping Campden, Mickleton and Kempsford, meaning that they can be particularly valuable. Provision in Northleach, Down Ampney and Kemble is particularly important as there is only one amenity space in each of these villages.

### Redesignation and disposal

6.40 There are a number of amenity green spaces within the District that are located in close proximity to one another and serve similar catchments. Specifically, overlapping catchments are evident in a number of the larger settlements, particularly in Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh and the south of Cirencester. In this instance the value of some of the sites may be limited and therefore consideration should be given to the disposal of some provision in favour of enhancing the quality of a nearby site. Application of the quantity standards does however indicate that shortfalls exist in Tetbury, suggesting that spaces are small. While these sites are not required to meet accessibility standards, prior to the disposal of sites, consideration should be given to the adequacy of the remaining sites to meet the needs of residents as well as to the specific function of the site in question. While currently, provision is above minimum standards in Cirencester and Moreton-in-Marsh, population growth will see provision fall below recommended levels. The overlapping catchments are illustrated in Figures 6.1 to 6.3.
Figure 6.1 – Overlapping catchments in Tetbury
Figure 6.2 - Overlapping catchments in Moreton-in-Marsh
Figure 6.3 - Overlapping catchments in Cirencester
6.41 However, before considering the disposal of an amenity green space site it will be important to contemplate alternative uses for the site. For example, although the site may not be valuable in its current form as an amenity green space there may be a deficiency of natural open space and therefore the site could be designated as natural open space to alleviate existing deficiencies. Alternatively, the site could be used to meet deficiencies in allotments or outdoor sports. Consideration of the need for the site to fulfil different functions prior to disposal is in line with recommendations in PPG17. It must be noted however that the majority of amenity green spaces serving similar catchments in the District are very small and often unsuitable for redesignation as another type of open space, such as a formal park, natural open space or sports facility. There are however deficiencies of natural open space in some of the areas where there is an abundance of amenity green space.

| AGS3 | Consideration of the disposal of an amenity green space proven surplus to requirements should only be given if the site is not required for alternative use as another type of open space. Policy should ensure that appropriate criteria for decision-making are set. |

### New provision

6.42 The local quantity standard for amenity green space has been set above the existing level of provision, indicating that there is a need for additional amenity green space in some parts of the District.

6.43 Application of the quantity standard indicates that there is currently a small shortfall of 0.65 hectares of amenity green space within Cotswold District.

6.44 Projected population increases indicate that demand for amenity green space in the District will rise significantly by 2026 (creating a shortfall of 2.62 hectares) and accessibility mapping identifies a number of deficiencies, particularly within Cirencester, Northleach and Bourton on-the-Water. It will therefore be important to ensure that amenity green space is provided as part of new developments.

6.45 However, when determining areas where new provision is required, it is important to take an accessibility led approach. For example, although there may be sufficient amenity green space in quantitative terms, residents may still be outside the catchment of a site due to the location of existing provision. This means that new provision may still be required in order to address these accessibility deficiencies. The quantity standard in particular should be used to identify the amount of new provision required. The accessibility standard guides where the space should be located.

| AGS4 | Ensure that policy requires contributions towards amenity green space as part of new development as appropriate. Promote an accessibility led approach to determine levels of provision required as part of new development and use the quantity standards to determine the amount of contribution that will be required. |

6.46 The requirement for new provision to meet current demand within settlements in the District is outlined overleaf.
**Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)**

6.47 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the current provision of amenity green space is above the minimum standard. However, based on future population projections, there will be an expected shortfall of 0.43 hectares.

6.48 In contrast to the findings of the application of the quantity standards, accessibility mapping reveals that the majority of residents in Cirencester and Stratton are outside the catchment of an amenity green space. The amenity spaces that are provided are all located in close proximity to each other, meaning that despite the high levels of provision in quantitative terms, there remain deficiencies.

6.49 When considering the location of other forms of informal open space, deficiencies are reduced, with a number residents having access to at least one type of informal open space with a 240m catchment. However, areas of deficiency do remain in the east of Cirencester and Stratton (Figure 6.4). Residents these areas are also outside of the catchment areas for parks and natural open spaces, meaning that opportunities for informal recreation are limited, and emphasising the importance of providing new spaces, particularly in the event of population growth.
Figure 6.4– Deficiencies of informal open space in the east of Cirencester and Stratton
Opportunities for informal recreation are limited within the east of Cirencester and in Section 4 it is recommended that a formal park should be provided within this location. The location of a formal park within the area of deficiency would negate the need for amenity green space, as a higher order facility. In the short term, the importance of improving access routes to existing sites was also emphasised, in particular, improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes linking residents with the Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park should be prioritised.

**AGSS5**

Improve access routes to Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park for pedestrians and cyclists. Provide a new park in East Cirencester.

**Market towns (Category B2 Settlements)**

Application of the accessibility standard indicates that nearly all residents in Tetbury have access to amenity green space within the recommended 240m catchment despite shortfalls in quantitative terms. The shortfall of amenity green space within Tetbury (0.49 hectares) is the highest in the District, suggesting that although well distributed, sites are small. Deficiencies are however evident in the north of Bourton-on-the-Water and east of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Supporting the findings of the application of the accessibility standards, quantitative analysis indicates that the provision of amenity green space is below the minimum standard in the settlement hierarchy as a whole, and at a settlement level, only within Bourton-on-the-Water is the provision of amenity green space above the minimum standard.

In addition to being outside the catchment of amenity green space, residents in the north of Bourton-on-the-Water and east of Moreton-in-Marsh are also unable to access any other form of informal open space within a 240m catchment (Figures 6.5 and 6.6). This means that informal recreation opportunities are limited in these locations.
Figure 6.5 - Deficiencies of informal open space in the north of Bourton-on-the-Water
Figure 6.6 - Deficiencies of informal open space in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh
Section 4 recommends that a new formal park is provided to the west of Bourton-on-the-Water and if development occurs, to the east of Moreton-in-Marsh. The location of formal parks within these areas deficient in amenity green space would largely negate the need for amenity green space, although depending upon the location of population growth, provision may be required as part of new development to ensure that residents are within the local 240m catchment of a facility.

Although residents in Tetbury have access to amenity green space within the recommended 240m catchment, as previously highlighted, the greatest quantitative shortfall of amenity green space in the District is found within this settlement. None of the sites are above 0.2 hectares, suggesting that they are at capacity and have limited functionality. Supporting this, consultation with the elected member for Tetbury suggests that there is additional demand for amenity green space with the current provision rated as ‘nearly enough’.

Section 4 highlights the need for a new park within central Tetbury, and this would improve the provision of informal recreation opportunities and reduce the demand for amenity space. Given the good level of access to existing amenity spaces, the provision of a new park should be prioritised over new amenity spaces.

Tetbury is also highlighted as an area where sites may be potentially surplus to requirement. Should a site be lost, reinvestment in other sites may improve the overall functionality of existing spaces. While given the good access, no new provision will be required in Tetbury at the current time, new sites will be particularly important as the population grows, as the quantity of amenity green space is already below the recommended minimum standard.

| AGS6 | Ensure that new amenity green space is provided in Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water and Moreton-in-Marsh as part of new development. |

Small towns (Category C1 Settlements)

The highest shortfall of amenity green space is found within the Small Towns. There is a current shortfall of 0.40 hectares and based on projected population growth, this is expected to increase to 0.95 hectares by 2026. Shortfalls are evident within all of the settlements with the exception of Lechlade.

Despite a large quantitative shortfall of provision, accessibility mapping illustrates that the majority of residents in South Cerney, Fairford, Lechlade and Stow-on-the-Wold have access to an amenity green space. However, a number of residents in Northleach and Chipping Campden are outside the recommended catchment of an amenity green space.

Although many residents in Northleach are outside the catchment of an amenity green space they do have access to natural and semi natural open space within a 240m catchment and this site provides recreational opportunities. Furthermore, the majority of residents in this settlement do have relatively large gardens. This means that residents have access to informal recreation opportunities and the provision of amenity green space is not as much of a priority.

Application of quantity standard within Northleach indicates that there is a current shortfall of 0.14 hectares. Future population increases will see this increase by 2026. Should development take place to the north of the town, in the area of existing deficiency, new amenity space should be provided. Local amenity space should also be provided if demand is identified, by either an approach to the Parish Council, or the creation of a friends group to support the development of a new site.
AGS7

Provide amenity green space or pocket park in the north of Northleach, particularly if development occurs in this part of the town. Ensure that new amenity green space is provided in Northleach as the population grows.

6.62 Residents in Chipping Campden outside the catchment of an amenity green space are also unable to access any other type of informal open space within a 240m catchment (Figure 6.7). This means that there is a lack of informal recreation opportunities within the settlement.
Figure 6.7 – Deficiencies of informal open space in Chipping Campden
6.63 Despite the lack of informal recreation opportunities, the majority of houses do have significantly sized gardens and there is good access to the nearby countryside. The provision of amenity green space is therefore not as much of a priority.

6.64 Quantitative analysis indicates that there is a current shortfall of 0.14 hectares of amenity green space in Chipping Campden that is expected to increase to 0.22 hectares by 2026. Consultation has not specifically identified additional demand for amenity green space in Chipping Campden at the current time, however should a friends group be established, new provision should be created to support this group in the identified area of deficiency to the north of the town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGS8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the creation of new amenity space / pocket park in Chipping Campden should a friends group be created to support the management and maintenance of a site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)**

6.65 Only within Blockley and Willersey is the provision of amenity green above the minimum standard. Based on future population projections there will be an expected shortfall of 0.62 hectares within the settlement hierarchy as a whole.

6.66 Accessibility mapping reveals however that the majority of residents in Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney, Kempsford and Mickleton are outside the recommended catchment of an amenity green space. With the exception of Down Ampney, there is no provision in any of these settlements. The only site in Down Ampney is located in the far west, meaning that people living in other parts of the village are outside of the catchment.

6.67 In addition to being outside the catchment of amenity green space, residents in Andoversford, Down Ampney, Kempsford, Avening and Mickleton are also unable to access any other type of informal open space within a 240m catchment. This means that informal recreation opportunities are limited. Parks are not expected in settlements of this size, meaning that the provision of amenity spaces takes on greater importance. The current distribution of open spaces in these settlements can be viewed on the settlement by settlement maps.

6.68 Despite the lack of informal recreation opportunities in Andoversford, residents are in close proximity to Sandywell Park and the countryside. Furthermore, the majority of houses in this area of deficiency do have large gardens. This means that the provision of amenity green space is of lower priority.

6.69 Section 4 recommends the provision of pocket parks in settlements where demand is identified through the creation of friends groups. Such provision would negate the need for amenity green spaces.

6.70 Current shortfalls of amenity green space equate to 0.38 hectares in Mickleton, 0.29 hectares in Kempsford, 0.26 hectares in Avening and 0.09 hectares in Down Ampney. In addition to having a lack of access to informal open space, access to open space outside the settlement boundary in Down Ampney is limited. These shortfalls, coupled with the accessibility deficiencies mean that amenity space or pocket parks are required in these settlements.
Provide amenity green space in Mickleton, Kempsford, Avening and Down Ampney. Any provision should be located centrally to maximise the number of residents within close proximity of the site. Amenity space should also be provided as part of any new development.

AGS9

Application of the quantity standard indicates that there is a current shortfall of 0.15 hectares in Andoversford which is expected to increase to 0.17 hectares by 2026. While new provision is not a priority at the current time, new provision will be required as the population grows, particularly if the location of new development means that residents are outside of the catchment of an existing facility. Provision also falls below the minimum standard in Kemble, although all residents are within the appropriate catchment of a space.

AGS10

Ensure that new amenity green space is provided as the population grows in Andoversford.

It is important to note that section 4 recommends considering the need for formal parks within Andoversford and Kemble. Should a formal park be provided within these settlements, this will negate the need for additional amenity green space.

Increasing Access

Amenity green space is fairly well distributed across the District and a large number of residents have access to a site within the recommended 240m catchment. Accessibility deficiencies are however evident in a number of settlements, including Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water and Chipping Campden.

Improving access to amenity green space (as well as the quality of provision) within settlements where there is a lack of other forms of informal open space is particularly important. Settlements within the District where amenity green space is the only form of local informal open space include Tetbury, Chipping Campden, Mickleton and Kempsford.

Amenity green space can play an important role in providing linkages to other larger open spaces, such as formal parks and natural open space. Improving footpaths, disabled access and ensuring safe routes will be priorities for increasing access to amenity green space. Increasing disabled access to amenity green space was highlighted as a key area for improvement during site assessments.

Seek to increase access to amenity green space, particularly in settlements where this type of open space is the only local form of informal open space, such as Tetbury, Chipping Campden, Mickleton and Kempsford. Improving footpaths, disabled access and ensuring safe routes should be prioritised.

AGS11

There is an abundance of countryside within Cotswold District. Providing appropriate routes to the countryside is particularly important in settlements where there is a lack of access to informal open space, such as parks and amenity green space. Throughout the consultation process, the perceived importance of the countryside, and the importance of access to this resource, was highlighted. The Council and partners should seek to increase access through the ongoing development of the green...
infrastructure network (e.g. footpaths and cycle paths). Cycle paths were highlighted as a particular priority throughout consultation.

6.76 Amenity green space is a local form of open space and sites often serve specific neighbourhoods, particularly within the rural settlements. In order to maximise access to amenity green space in the District, it is important that this type of open space links with the Public Rights of Way Network and is accessible to residents living in all parts of villages. There is a large network of footpaths, cycle routes and disused railway lines within Cotswold District and utilising these natural resources could increase access to amenity green space significantly. This will be returned to within section 12 (Green Corridors).

AGS12 Seek to increase access to the countryside by providing pedestrian walkways and cycle routes from settlements, to areas of accessible countryside. Towns and villages identified as being deficient in open space should be prioritised. These include Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water, Moreton-in-Marsh, Chipping Campden, Northleach, Mickleton, Andoversford, Kempsford, Avening and Down Ampney.

Summary

6.77 The value of amenity green space was recognised during consultation. This type of open space is used regularly by local residents and is perceived to offer local access to informal recreational opportunities. The provision of amenity green space in settlements where there is a lack of other types of informal open space is particularly important.

6.78 Application of the quantity and accessibility standards indicate that there is a shortfall of amenity green space within the District. Key areas of deficiency are located in Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water, Northleach and Chipping Campden.

6.79 It will be important to ensure that new developments include the provision of amenity green space to address the needs of the projected future population, particularly where the location of the new development means that residents fall outside the catchment of existing amenity green spaces.

6.80 It is therefore recommended that the key priorities for the future delivery of amenity green spaces in Cotswold District that should be addressed through the Local Development Framework and/or other delivery mechanisms are to:

- Work with providers to enhance the quality of amenity green spaces in the District;
- protect valuable amenity green space from residential development, protecting particularly sites where usage is particularly high and /or the site is the only green space within a catchment area and only consider disposal where the site is surplus to requirements and not required for any other use as open space;
- ensure new developments contribute to the provision of amenity green space; and ensure new provision is provided as population grows, particularly in Cirencester, Stratton, Tetbury, Northleach, Chipping Campden and Andoversford;
- provide new amenity green space or pocket parks in Mickleton, Kempsford, Avening and Down Ampney; and
- seek to ensure that amenity spaces are linked by the public rights of way network and that they become an important component of the green infrastructure of the District.
7. Provision for Children and Young People

Introduction and definition

7.1 PPG17 states that the broad objective of provision for children and young people is to ensure that they have opportunities to interact with their peers and learn social and movement skills within their home environment. At the same time, they must not create nuisance for other residents or appear threatening to passers by.

7.2 This typology encompasses a vast range of provision, from small areas of green space with a single piece of equipment (similar to the typology of amenity green space) to large, multi purpose play areas. It considers equipped provision only.

7.3 PPG17 notes that categorising facilities under one umbrella often ignores the needs of older children. Each site and range of equipment has a different purpose and often serves a different age group and target audience. Provision of facilities for children does not necessarily negate the need for facilities for young people and vice versa.

7.4 In light of the differences between provision for children and young people, this typology has been subdivided and facilities for children and young people have been analysed separately.

7.5 Provision for children is taken to include equipped children’s play areas and adventure playgrounds that are perceived to cater for children under 12. Toddlers play areas are also considered under this classification. These facilities are referred to as facilities for children throughout this report. Where a site contains equipment for both toddlers and children, this is classified as one site.

7.6 Facilities for young people includes the following types of provision:

- Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)
- Skate parks
- Basketball courts
- Youth shelters
- Informal kickabout areas
- BMX tracks
- Play areas / adventure playgrounds targeting teenagers.

7.7 It is anticipated that these facilities would serve young people over the age of 12. These facilities are referred to as facilities for young people throughout this report.

7.8 In addition to the above, a number of youth centres have also been identified in the District. These facilities can be highly valuable to young people and will be discussed in further detail throughout this section.
The majority of schools are currently inaccessible to the community outside of school hours, however, play areas at these sites have been considered as part of this assessment. Government agendas seek to place schools at the heart of the community, therefore, in future years, school sites may be central to community life and offer opportunities outside of curricular hours for children and young people.

Parks, amenity green space and natural open space can play an important role in providing children and young people with informal recreation opportunities. For example, a park can be used by children for playing a game of football and an amenity green space may be used as a place to meet friends. These types of open space therefore provide an important function for residents of these age groups within Cotswold District.

As well as the specific role that equipped facilities for children and young people fulfil, the interrelationship with other types of open space, including parks and amenity areas, will therefore also be considered.

This section of the report sets out the strategic context, key findings emerging from consultation and an assessment of current provision for children and young people. Local standards have been derived from the consultation undertaken as part of this study and are therefore representative of local needs. The application of these standards provides the Council with a number of policy options for the delivery of facilities for young people and children.

**Context**

The *Cotswold Play Strategy* outlines a commitment to increasing the amount quality of facilities for children and young people within the District. Actions of the plan include to:

- provide opportunities for a range of challenging and free play activities for children aged 8 – 14;
- provide funding to help Town and Parish Councils develop youth shelters and/or games areas;
- offer enhanced provision of mobile skateboard facilities; and
- provide play activities that offer an alternative to sport for children and young people.

The importance of facilities for children and young people in Cotswold District was clear from consultation. 14% of respondents to the household survey indicated that they use play areas at least once a week and facilities for children and young people were a regular topic for discussion, particularly for Parish Council representatives.

It is clear that there several Parishes/Towns are working to increase the quantity of and enhance the quality of existing provision. Parish and Town Councils are the main providers of children’s play areas and facilities for young people and supporting the work of these Councils will be essential in ensuring the effective provision of facilities for children and young people.

**Current position**

**Children’s play areas**

There are a total of 43 play areas within the four settlement hierarchies in Cotswold District. The current provision equates to 4.05 hectares and the average size of a site is therefore 0.09 hectares. An additional 38 play areas are located within small villages in the District, providing an additional 3.50 hectares.
7.17 The majority of sites are owned by Parish or Town Councils. 27 sites are private play areas located on school sites, these sites are in Gloucestershire County Council ownership and do not allow public access. One private site is located at the Cotswold Water Park.

7.18 The provision of children’s play areas in Cotswold District is summarised by settlement hierarchy in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 - Provision of children’s play areas across Cotswold District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>57,853</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.19 The key issues emerging from Table 7.1 and from consultations relating to the quantity of children’s play areas include:

- the current provision of children’s play areas equates to 0.070 hectares per 1,000 population. Provision is significantly greater in the Small Towns and Local Service Centres, both in terms of the number of sites and provision per 1,000 population. This is perhaps reflective of the fact that more provision is required to serve a smaller number of people in these areas;

- a difference in opinion regarding the provision of children’s play areas is evident from responses to the household survey. 44% of respondents feel that provision is insufficient while 40% of residents state that there are not enough facilities;

- the greatest level of dissatisfaction is found in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) where half of residents consider provision to be insufficient. Supporting these findings, the lowest current provision (0.31 hectares) and provision per 1,000 population is found within this settlement hierarchy (0.02 hectares);
the greatest level of satisfaction is found in the Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements), where nearly two thirds of respondents (63%) consider provision to be sufficient. Quantity figures support this perception, with the second highest current amount of land (1.84 hectares) and provision per 1,000 population (0.12 hectares) located within this settlement hierarchy;

- the size of sites varies significantly from 0.005 hectares to 0.39 hectares. This indicates that the type and amount of play provision and equipment provided varies significantly;

- other consultations also provide an inconclusive view regarding the provision of children’s play areas. Respondents to the officers’ survey portrayed higher levels of dissatisfaction with the provision of children’s play areas, citing a number of larger villages which do not currently have play areas, whereas seven of the ten respondents to the elected members’ survey indicated that provision within their ward is sufficient (deficiencies were identified in Rivers Meet, Ampney Coln and Fairford). Half of respondents to the Parish and Town Council survey indicated that provision is sufficient and particular priorities were identified in Avening and Fairford. This suggests that there are varied levels of provision within different settlements across the District;

- supporting the inconclusive perceptions highlighted by the findings of the household survey, 39% of respondents to the children’s survey indicated that provision is sufficient while 43% believed that there are some facilities but that more are required; and

- a variety of reasons were given by respondents to the household survey for their views on the quantity of play areas. While the majority of residents who feel that there are insufficient facilities indicated that more are required, or that there are none in their locality, some residents identified qualitative issues (for example all of the facilities are poor quality) rather than a need for additional facilities. This indicates that there is a need to balance the quantity and quality of provision. At the drop in session, the amount of facilities provided in Cirencester was perceived to be good.

7.20 Full consultation findings are set out in Appendix E.

**Facilities for young people**

7.21 Eight facilities for young people are located within the four settlement hierarchies. Current provision equates to 0.68 hectares which means that the average size of a site is 0.06 hectares. A further four facilities are located in smaller villages in the District. The majority of sites are owned by Parish and Town Councils.

7.22 In addition to these facilities, four youth centres are located in Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh, Stow-on-the-Wold and Chipping Campden. These facilities have been excluded from quantity calculations, but are considered in the application of the accessibility standard.

7.23 The provision of facilities for young people in Cotswold District is summarised in Table 7.2 overleaf.
Table 7.2 - Provision of facilities for young people within Cotswold District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>57,853</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.24 The key issues emerging from Table 7.2 and from consultations relating to the quantity of facilities for young people include:

- the current provision of facilities for young people equates to 0.012 hectares per 1000 population;
- a high level of dissatisfaction with the amount of facilities for young people is evident from responses to the household survey. Only 14% of respondents view provision to be sufficient, while 64% indicate that there are not enough facilities. This level of dissatisfaction is higher than for any other type of open space and indicates that the quantity of facilities for young people is a key issue;
- high levels of dissatisfaction are evident across all settlement hierarchies, with over 60% of residents in each hierarchy indicating that there are not enough facilities. The greatest level of dissatisfaction is found in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) where over three quarters of respondents state that provision is insufficient (77%). Quantity figures support this perception with only one site located within the town;
- other consultations reinforce the high level of dissatisfaction portrayed by respondents to the household survey. 70% of respondents to the officers’ survey indicate that there are not enough facilities for young people and Parish/Town Council and elected member respondents conclusively indicate that the provision of facilities for young people is insufficient;
only 12% of respondents to the young people’s survey are satisfied with the current facilities for their age group. 40% of young people indicate that there are no facilities for young people in close proximity to their home and BMX tracks, skate parks and MUGAs were identified as the new facilities young people would like most;

- the lack of facilities for young people was emphasised during drop in sessions and workshops. Stratton and Moreton-in-Marsh were specifically identified as two settlements where increased provision is needed. A lack of skate parks within the District was emphasised and the provision of MUGAs and goal posts were viewed as solutions to reducing deficiencies;

- a lack of play facilities for disabled young people was highlighted and it was stated that there is a lack of non-sporting facilities for young people after school hours. Due to the rural nature of the District, increasing access to school facilities will be important; and

- the lack of facilities for young people was the main reason given by those residents who were dissatisfied with the current quantity of provision. This further reinforces the perception that there is a lack of facilities for young people in the District and suggests that quantity of facilities is a major issue.

7.25 Full consultation findings are set out in Appendix E.

Setting quantity standards

7.26 The recommended local quantity standards for children’s play areas and facilities for young people have been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and are summarised below and overleaf. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendix E.

7.27 The recommended local standards for both types of facilities have been set above existing levels of provision to reflect the key consultation findings on the quantity of facilities for both children and young people.
Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F - standards and justification and worksheet)

**Children’s Play Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.070 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.075 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

A difference in opinion regarding the provision of children’s play areas was portrayed by respondents to the household survey. Other consultations also provide an inconclusive perception regarding the quantity of children’s play areas.

Based on the above it is recommended that the quantity standard for children’s play areas is set slightly above the existing level of provision. Setting a standard at this level ensures that deficiencies can be identified and new facilities can be provided, but ensures a strategic approach to provision enabling a focus on enhancing the quality of existing sites where this is more appropriate.

The recommended standard takes into account the number of additional facilities that would be required to ensure that all residents living in settlements of an appropriate size are within the recommended accessibility catchment of a facility.

**Facilities for young people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.009 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.040 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Dissatisfaction with the provision of facilities for young people is the most conclusive of all types of open space in the District. Nearly two thirds of respondents to the household survey (64%) consider provision to be insufficient and other consultations support this perception, highlighting a clear need to increase the amount of facilities for young people.

In light of the conclusive dissatisfaction with the current facilities, the recommended quantity standard has been set above the existing level of provision. Setting a standard at this level will identify gaps in provision and ensure that new facilities can be included as part of new developments. The standard has been set at a level which takes into account the number of additional facilities that are required to meet the recommended accessibility standards for residents living in settlements of an appropriate size and provides a realistic target for the future provision of facilities for young people across Cotswold District.
Quality

Children's play areas

7.28 The quality of children’s play areas was assessed through site visits undertaken by the Council. The key issues emerging from site assessments and consultations relating to the quality of children’s play areas are as follows:

- respondents to the household survey view the quality of play areas relatively positively. 41% consider provision to be good or better and the same proportion rate facilities as average. 18% of residents however indicate that the quality of play areas is poor, a higher level of dissatisfaction than is evident for some other types of open space. This indicates that the quality of some play areas may be poor;

- the greatest level of satisfaction with quality of children’s play areas is found in the Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements) where 60% of residents consider the quality of play areas to be either good or excellent;

- the highest level of dissatisfaction is located within the Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements) where over two thirds of respondents (70%) state that the quality of play areas is average or poor;

- other consultations also provide a generally positive perception regarding play areas. Half of respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey feel that the quality of play areas is either good or excellent and 80% of respondents to the elected members survey and 60% of respondents to the officer’s survey rate the quality of play areas as average or above;

- litter and rubbish on play areas was identified as an issue by over a quarter of respondents to the children’s survey (30%). Over half of respondents feel that there is lots of equipment provided (51%);

- site assessments also provide a positive perception regarding the quality of play areas. The condition of sites was generally rated as very good and only two sites were identified as being in poor condition. The majority of sites were identified as being well maintained;

- litter, vandalism and graffiti, misuse of the site and dog fouling were highlighted as the key issues experienced by frequent users. However, site assessment findings do not support these perceptions, with litter and vandalism only evident on a limited number of sites;

- the children’s play area at Abbey Grounds was identified as a high quality facility. Site assessments reveal that this site is in good condition;

- the need to ensure that facilities for children are more challenging was highlighted. Over half of respondents to the children’s survey stated that facilities are boring (57%);

- a lack of natural play facilities within Cotswold District was perceived to be an issue by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop. The need for a combination of equipped play facilities and natural play was emphasised and viewed as a solution to the requirement to provide challenging and exciting play facilities; and

- the importance of involving children and young people in the design of facilities was emphasised. Specifically, attendees at the Parish/Town Council workshop highlighted the success of involving children and young people in the design of new facilities. This was considered to provide a sense of ownership and be important if children are to respect the facilities that are provided. Given that vandalism and graffiti are perceived to be key issues at such facilities, this is of particular significance.
Facilities for young people

7.29 The quality of facilities for young people was assessed through site visits undertaken by the Council. The key issues emerging from site assessments and from consultations relating to the quality of facilities for young people are as follows:

- a clear level of dissatisfaction with the quality of facilities for young people is evident from responses to the household survey. Over half of respondents (55%) rate the quality of facilities as poor and only 13% of residents feel that they are good or excellent. Dissatisfaction is higher than that for all other types of open space and combined with the negative perceptions regarding the quantity of facilities, highlights that provision for young people is a major issue;

- the high level of concern about the quality of facilities is reflected across all settlement hierarchies, particularly within Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) and Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements);

- site assessments provide a more positive view regarding the quality of facilities for young people with the condition of sites rated as good. This suggests that negative perceptions regarding the quantity of facilities may be influencing views on the quality of sites;

- other consultation findings reinforce the negative perception regarding the quality of facilities for young people portrayed by respondents to the household survey. 43% of respondents to the officers’ survey rate the quality of facilities as poor, the majority of respondents to the elected members’ survey feel that the quality of facilities is poor or very poor and over half of respondents to the young people’s survey (55%) state that facilities are ok and in need of enhancement or poor and in need of extensive improvement;

- a variety of suggestions were made on how to improve the quality of facilities for young people. Common responses included: providing lighting, ensuring that there is appropriate and up to date equipment, employing play workers, ensuring that sites are clean and well maintained and including areas within sites that can be used to hang out. The need to ensure that facilities are specifically targeted at the teenager age group was highlighted;

- the importance of involving young people in the design of facilities was emphasised. Specifically, attendees at the Parish/Town Council workshop highlighted the success of involving children and young people in the design of new facilities, for example, the new youth shelter in Moreton-in-Marsh.

Setting quality standards

7.30 The recommended local quality standards for provision for children and facilities for young people are summarised below and overleaf. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendix E.

7.31 The quality standard summarises the features that residents consider to be important determinants of the quality of provision.
Quality Standard (see Appendix E)

Children’s play areas

**Recommended Quality Standard**

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the vision for children’s play areas should be/incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
<td>Clear and defined boundaries creating a dog free area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Safety and Play Value guidelines <a href="http://www.rospa.com/leisuresafety/adviceandinformation/playsafety/legal-aspects.aspx">link</a></td>
<td>Involvement of local children in the design, management and maintenance of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and dog bins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities for young people

**Recommended Quality Standard**

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the vision for facilities for young people should be/incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Level surfaces and clearly defined footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
<td>Clear and defined boundaries creating a dog free area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and dog bins</td>
<td>Involvement of young people in the design, management and maintenance of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating and shelter e.g. ‘hang out areas’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Accessibility**

**Children’s play areas**

7.32 Nearly three quarters of current users (73%) walk to access a play area. The majority of users experience a journey time of up to 10 minutes (58%). 30% of users travel between 10 and 15 minutes.

7.33 Consistent with the travel patterns portrayed by current users, 84% of residents would expect to walk to a children’s play area. The average expected travel time and most common response is 10 minutes. This highlights the expectation that children’s play areas should be located in close proximity to the home.

7.34 Site assessments emphasise the local nature of children’s play areas with only a limited number of sites located in close proximity to public transport routes. 13 sites were identified as being accessible for the disabled, suggesting that there is a need to increase disabled access to play areas in the District.

7.35 Cost was not identified as an issue for play areas, and there are no charges to use any of the play areas included within the audit.

**Facilities for young people**

7.36 All frequent users of facilities for young people walk to access a site with a travel time of 5 minutes most commonly experienced.

7.37 Over two thirds of respondents to the household survey would expect to walk to a facility for young people (69%), while 21% of residents would expect to drive. The average expected travel time is 12 minutes and the most common response is slightly lower at 10 minutes. Similar to the findings for children’s play areas, this highlights an expectation that facilities for young people should be located in close proximity to the home.

7.38 Site assessments indicate that a number of sites are located in close proximity to public transport routes.

7.39 Cost was not identified as barrier to the use of facilities for young people, and there are no charges to use any of the sites included within the audit.

**Setting accessibility standards**

7.40 The recommended local accessibility standards for children’s play areas and facilities for young people are summarised below. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendix E.
Accessibility Standard (see Appendix E)

Children’s play areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommended Accessibility Standard</strong></th>
<th>480m (equivalent to 10 minutes walk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification**

Consultation highlights an expectation that children's play areas are to be provided locally. Both current and expected users of children's play areas highlight a clear preference for walking to access a site. The majority of current users travel for up to 10 minutes and the average expected travel time and most common response is also 10 minutes.

Based on the above, a local accessibility standard of 480m (10 minutes walk) has been set. This standard reflects the expectation that play areas are to be provided locally and is representative of both current and expected user travel patterns. As well as reflecting the views of the residents of the District, the standard will encourage an appropriate balance between the quantity and quality of facilities and ensure that provision is deliverable longer term. The recommended standard is also in line with Fields In Trust national standard for a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP).

Facilities for young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommended Accessibility Standard</strong></th>
<th>480m (equivalent to 10 minutes walk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification**

Current and expected travel patterns highlight a clear preference for walking to facilities for young people. The average expected travel time is 12 minutes and the most common response is 10 minutes.

Based upon the most common response, a local standard of 480m has been set. This standard ensures that facilities are provided locally and application of the standard will enable existing deficiencies to be identified. As well as reflecting the views of the residents of the District, the standard will encourage an appropriate balance between the quantity and quality of facilities and ensure that provision is deliverable longer term.

Applying provision standards

7.41 The application of the recommended quantity and accessibility standards provides an understanding of the existing distribution of children’s play areas and facilities for young people. Tables 7.3 and 7.4 summarise the application of the quantity standard for children’s play areas and facilities for young people respectively by settlement hierarchy. It must be noted that these figures provide an indication only, as due to the local nature of these facilities and the expectation that they will be provided in the majority of settlements, more sites are required to serve residents of smaller rural settlements than in the more urban areas of Cotswold District.
**Table 7.3 - Application of the quantity standard for children's play areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Future shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB totals may not sum exactly due to rounding

7.42 Table 7.3 indicates the following:

- the provision of children's play areas falls below the recommended local standard, with there being a current shortfall of 0.29 hectares. Based on future population projections this shortfall is expected to increase to 0.93 hectares by 2026;

- the provision of children's play areas within the Small Towns and Local Service Centres is above the minimum standard based on current and future population projections; and

- the largest quantitative shortfall is found in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement). There is currently a shortfall of 1.13 hectares within this hierarchy.

7.43 Settlement calculations indicate that provision is above minimum standards within 11 settlements. The greatest shortfalls in the District are found in:

- Cirencester – 1.13 hectares
- Tetbury – 0.27 hectares
- Blockley – 0.10 hectares
- Moreton-in-Marsh – 0.07 hectares

7.44 Application of the quantity standards therefore suggests that there is a need to increase the amount of children’s play areas in the District, particularly in Cirencester.
Table 7.4 - Application of the quantity standard for facilities for young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Future shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB totals may not sum exactly due to rounding

7.45 Table 7.4 indicates the following:

- the current provision of facilities for young people is insufficient to meet demand with a shortfall of 1.63 hectares. Future population increases will further exacerbate this shortfall creating an expected deficiency of 1.98 hectares by 2026;

- the provision of facilities for young people is insufficient to meet the recommended local standard within all settlement hierarchies; and

- the greatest shortfall is found in the Small Towns.

7.46 Application of the quantity standard within the individual settlements indicates that the provision of facilities for young people is insufficient to meet demand in all settlements. This indicates that new facilities for young people may be required in many settlements. The greatest shortfalls are located in:

- Cirencester – 0.46 hectares
- Tetbury – 0.12 hectares
- Moreton-in-Marsh – 0.05 hectares
- Bourton-on-the-Water – 0.13 hectares

**Accessibility**

7.47 The application of the accessibility standard for children’s play areas and facilities for young people is outlined in Maps 7.1 and 7.2 overleaf.
Map 7.1 - Provision for children in Cotswold District

Cotswold District Council - PPG17 Study on Open Space, Sport and Recreation
Map 7.1: Provision for Children in Cotswold District

- Children’s Public Play Area
- Children’s Private Play Area
- 10-minute Walk Time
- Cotswold District

0 5 10
kilometres
Map 7.2 - Provision of facilities for young people in Cotswold District

Cotswold District Council - PPG17 Study on Open Space, Sport and Recreation
Map 7.2: Provision of Facilities for Young People in Cotswold District
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7.48 Map 7.1 indicates that children’s play areas are fairly evenly distributed across the District. The majority of residents in the larger settlements have access to a site and there is good access to play areas within the small villages. However, key areas of deficiency are evident in Bourton-on-the-Water, Andoversford and Kempsford.

7.49 Map 7.2 indicates that access to facilities for young people is limited. Facilities are predominately located in the north and south of the District. Key areas of deficiency are evident in Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water, Northleach, Lechlade, Chipping Campden and South Cerney.

7.50 As previously identified, it is important to consider the role that parks, amenity green space and natural open space play in providing informal play opportunities. Areas deficient in parks, amenity green space and natural open space may increase the importance of play facilities in an area. Conversely, the presence of parks and amenity spaces provides the opportunity to create a facility within these pre-existing areas of open space. The provision of parks, amenity green space and natural open space in relation to children and young people’s facilities is illustrated on Maps 7.3 and 7.4 overleaf.

7.51 Maps 7.3 and 7.4 indicate that the majority of residents in Cotswold District have access to either a children’s play area and informal open space or facility for young people and informal open space. Accessibility deficiencies are however evident in Andoversford, Kempsford, Mickleton and Down Ampney.
Map 7.3 - Provision of children's play areas, formal parks, country parks, natural and semi natural open space in Cotswold District
Map 7.4 - Provision of facilities for young people, formal parks, country parks, natural and semi natural open space in Cotswold District
Priorities for future delivery

7.52 The remainder of this section outlines the key priorities for children’s play areas and facilities for young people that have arisen from local consultation and the application of the quantity, quality and accessibility standards. Issues within specific settlements are also referenced.

7.53 In line with the principles of PPG17, the priorities are set out under the headings of:
- Quality enhancements
- New provision
- Redesignation
- Disposal of facilities
- Enhancing access routes

Quality enhancements

7.54 Although increasing the quantity of provision, particularly facilities for young people, was identified as a key theme during consultation. Enhancing the quality of provision was also identified as important, particularly by children and young people. Nearly a quarter of respondents to the children’s survey state that play areas have litter and rubbish on them and over half of respondents to the young people’s survey indicate that facilities for their age group are in need of improvement or extensive improvement (55%).

7.55 The Play Strategy for Cotswold District identifies the need to provide challenging and free play opportunities for all children aged 8 – 14. This is supported by consultation findings with over half of respondents to the children’s survey who use play areas indicating that they are boring (57%) and 36% of respondents to the young people’s survey indicating that facilities are boring. The need to make facilities for children and young people more challenging and exciting was particularly emphasised by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop.

7.56 The provision of challenging play opportunities is supported in guidance developed by Play England, specifically in the recent publications Managing Risk in Play Provision and Design for Play. The guidance moves away from the provision of traditional swings and slides and encourages the development of more innovative opportunities, including natural play environments. Adherence to this guidance is therefore likely to see a greater overlap and interrelationship between natural open spaces, informal open spaces such as parks and amenity green spaces and provision for children and young people in future years. It is likely that a successful approach to the provision of play will encompass both traditional facilities and newer challenging natural play environments.

7.57 Refurbishment of existing play facilities to create challenging and exciting play opportunities was identified as the top priority by respondents to the children’s survey for improving the quality of existing spaces. The provision of natural play facilities was viewed as a solution to making provision for children and young people more challenging and exciting by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop.
Where the opportunity to upgrade a play facility is identified, seek to provide challenging and exciting play facilities that encourage children to explore their boundaries and balance risk and safety. This may include the creation of natural play areas which link with the surrounding environment as well as equipped play facilities.

7.58 Involving children and young people in the design of facilities was viewed as important during consultation. Parish and Town Council representatives identified a number of successful projects that have involved children and young people in the design of facilities. Specifically, the new youth shelter in Queen Victoria Gardens (Moreton-in-Marsh), which involved young people in its design, has created a sense of ownership and has resulted in a lack of vandalism and graffiti at this site.

7.59 Involving children and young people in the design of facilities can ensure that they are tailored to meet the needs of the local community, maximise usage and create a sense of ownership amongst these age groups. The Council should work with providers of facilities for children and young people to encourage the involvement of children and young people in design and management of their local sites.

Providers of facilities for children and young people should seek to consult with children and young people in the local community and engage these groups in the design and management of new sites and refurbishment of existing sites.

Children’s play areas

7.60 Although generally positive perceptions regarding the quality of children’s play areas were portrayed during local consultation and supported by site assessments, the need to enhance the quality of play areas was identified.

7.61 23% of respondents to the children’s survey indicated that play areas have litter and rubbish on them and 28% of children feel that play areas are boring. Over a third of respondents to the officer’s survey rated the quality of play areas as poor or very poor (40%). Representatives for the parishes of Avening, Naunton and Windrush indicated that investment in children’s play areas is a top priority. Litter, vandalism and graffiti, misuse of the site and dog fouling were highlighted as the key issues experienced by frequent users and this was supported by findings from the children’s survey. The need to refurbish some play areas and provide more exciting facilities was particularly emphasised.

7.62 The recommended quality vision identifies a well maintained site, facilities for the young that meet safety and play value guidelines and litter and dog bins as essential features of a children’s play area.
Site visits identified the following key areas for improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Suffolk Place Play Area</td>
<td>Tetbury Town Council</td>
<td>Benches getting worn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northleach playground</td>
<td>Northleach with Eastington Town Council/Northleach King George V Playing Field Trust</td>
<td>Equipment quite old and needs replacing but not in a dangerous condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Gardens playground</td>
<td>Chipping Campden Town council</td>
<td>Frequency of grass cutting and cleaning up of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameson Close, Playground</td>
<td>Moreton Town Council</td>
<td>Improve condition of play equipment and graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Green Playground</td>
<td>Blockley Parish Council</td>
<td>More frequent grass cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansfield Children’s Play Area</td>
<td>Lechlade Town Council</td>
<td>Some uprights missing in fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work with providers to enhance the quality of children’s play areas in the District, using the above list taken from site visits as a starting point. Focus should be placed on ensuring sites are well maintained and contain appropriate play and ancillary facilities. Avening Parish Council indicated that investment in play facilities is their top priority.

Facilities for young people

A high level of dissatisfaction with the quality of facilities for young people was portrayed during consultation. Over half of respondents to the household survey consider the quality of facilities for young people to be poor, 56% of respondents to the young people’s survey indicate that facilities are in need of improvement and the majority of elected members rated the quality of facilities as poor or very poor.

The recommended quality vision identifies a well maintained site, facilities for young people that meet play value and safety guidelines, litter and dog bins and seating and shelter as essential features of a facility for young people.
Site visits reveal that Cirencester BMX area is a key priority improvement, with the current quality of provision considered to be poor, and improvements to the maintenance and boundaries required. Consultation also indicated that the quality of existing facilities in Fairford is poor and in need of improvement.

**CYP4**

Work with providers to enhance the quality of facilities for young people in the District. Focus should be placed on ensuring sites are well maintained and contain appropriate street furniture (e.g. lighting, bins and benches).

**Protection**

Children’s play areas are highly valued local facilities within Cotswold District. 14% of respondents to the household survey use play areas at least once a week and this type of facility was a topic of regular discussion throughout consultation.

The local quantity standard for children’s play areas has been set above the existing level of provision identifying the need to protect and increase provision within the District. Application of the accessibility standard reveals that the majority of children’s play areas serve unique catchments, particularly within the Small Villages, and are therefore are a highly valued local resource.

A lack of facilities for young people was identified as a key issue during consultation and similar to the findings for children’s play areas, accessibility mapping illustrates that nearly all facilities for young people, particularly within the Small Villages, serve unique catchments. Further emphasising the need to protect existing provision, application of the quantity standard indicates that there is currently a large shortfall of provision.

Due to the value of facilities for children and young people serving unique catchments, these sites should be protected from development.

**CYP5**

Seek to protect valuable facilities for children and young people serving unique catchments through the LDF. Facilities should only be lost to development where it can be proven (and supported by local consultation at the time of the decision) that there is no demand for a facility or that improvements to another site in the immediate catchment of the original site will be of greater value to residents. A lack of use of the existing site should not be taken to indicate that there is no demand.

**New provision**

The local quantity standards for facilities for children and young people have been set above the existing level of provision, recognising the need to increase the amount of sites within the District.

It is important to take an accessibility led approach when identifying areas of deficiency. This means that the accessibility standard should be used to guide where new provision is required, rather than the quantity standard. New provision should be located in areas that are outside the recommended accessibility catchment of a children’s play area or facility for young people where there is sufficient demand (ie enough houses outside of the catchment of an existing site) to justify a new facility. The quantity standard is used as a guide to identify the number of houses that are required to sustain a facility, and the approximate number of facilities that are required.
7.73 In terms of the application of standards for new development, there may be a conflict between the quantity standard and accessibility standard. For example, a substantial new development which incorporates family housing may require two play areas to ensure full accessibility coverage for both new residents and if in an area of deficiency, existing residents. However the quantity standard might not be of a level equivalent to two play areas. In such situations the Council should direct the developer to prioritise the accessibility standard over the quantity standard. The play areas provided should still meet with quality standard.

| CYP6 |
| Ensure that policy requires contributions towards facilities for both children and young people as part of new development as appropriate. Promote an accessibility led approach to the determination of levels of provision required as part of new development. |

7.74 The requirement for new provision within settlements in the District is considered in the sub sections that follow.

**Children’s play areas**

*Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)*

7.75 The greatest quantitative shortfall of children’s play areas is found in Cirencester with there being a current shortfall of 1.13 hectares. Despite a large quantitative shortfall, accessibility mapping reveals that the majority of residents have access to a site. Only within the west of Cirencester and south of Stratton are residents outside the catchment of a play area (Figure 7.1).
Figure 7.1 - Deficiencies of facilities for children in the west of Cirencester
7.76 Although there are deficiencies in the west of Cirencester a large proportion of this area of deficiency is retail land and a children’s play area is therefore not required. Furthermore, residents in this location also have access to informal open space, specifically Cirencester Park, and are located within 800m of the play area in St Michael’s Park (although outside of the recommended catchment). This means that residents have access to informal play and recreation opportunities. The provision of a play area within Cirencester Park would enable the existing deficiency to be addressed. In the short term, focus should be placed on increasing access to St Michael’s Park play area for residents in the west of Cirencester through the creation of safe footpaths and cycle routes.

7.77 Consultation with elected members suggests that the provision of play areas within Cirencester is about right. However, respondents to the children’s survey who indicate that they go to Chesterton Primary School or Bibury Primary School indicate that more facilities are needed. 61% of children indicate that more play areas are needed and a new play area is identified as the second most popular new facility children would like in their local area.

7.78 Residents in the south of Stratton outside the catchment of a play area are also unable to access informal open space. This means that both formal and informal play opportunities are limited in this area of Stratton and that this area is therefore a particular priority.

7.79 Baunton Lane Playground is the only play area situated within Stratton and this site is located on the northern boundary of the settlement. This means that residents in the south have to travel a significant distance to access this site. In light of this and the large quantitative shortfall within the settlement hierarchy a new play area should be provided within the south of Stratton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYP7</th>
<th>Provide a new play area in south Stratton and in Cirencester Park.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.80 Future population increases suggest that pressure on existing provision will increase in the future creating an expected shortfall of 1.36 hectares. Given the existing shortfalls of provision, as well as the need to meet accessibility standards, new facilities will be required in line with population growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYP8</th>
<th>Provide new play areas within new developments which fall outside of the catchment for an existing play area in Cirencester.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Market towns (Category B2 Settlements)**

7.81 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the provision of children’s play areas is below the minimum standard with a current shortfall of 0.314 hectares.

7.82 Although there is a quantitative shortfall, accessibility mapping illustrates that nearly all residents in the three settlements have access to a site within the recommended 480m catchment. The only clear areas of deficiency are found in the south of Bourton-on-the-Water and east of Moreton-in-Marsh (Figures 7.2 and 7.3).
Figure 7.2 - Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the south of Bourton-on-the-Water
Figure 7.3 - Deficiencies of children's play areas in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh
7.83 When considering the provision of informal open space (Map 7.3), residents in the south of Bourton-on-the-Water outside the catchment of a play area do have access to informal open space, particularly natural open space. This means that residents do have access to informal recreation opportunities.

7.84 The location of informal open space provides the opportunity for a children’s play area to be located within these existing sites. However, the natural open space located in the area of deficiency is unsuitable due to it mainly consisting of lakes and reservoirs. The amenity green space in the area is also unsuitable due to its location in front of houses and along main roads.

7.85 Bourton-on-the-Water Playing Fields is a large outdoor sports facility located in the south of the settlement. This site contains sports pitches and tennis courts and acts as a focal point for the community. The provision of a play area on this site would alleviate deficiencies in access to play for residents in the south of the town.

**CYP9** Provide a play area within Bourton-on-the-Water Playing Fields.

7.86 As highlighted throughout this report, residents in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh are unable to access informal open space and this is further exacerbated by Swindon Road, located on the west of the estate, acting as a barrier to access. This means that there is a lack of both formal and informal play and recreation opportunities in this location. Consultation with children in Moreton-in-Marsh (Longborough School) identified a need for additional play areas.

7.87 Settlement calculations indicate that there is a current shortfall of 0.07 hectares (approximately 2 play areas) in Moreton-in-Marsh. In light of this, and the lack of access to existing provision the Council should seek to provide a play area within the east of Moreton-in-Marsh. Recommendation PG10 highlights the importance of providing a park within this area of the town, particularly in the event of housing growth to the east of Moreton-in-Marsh. The location of a play area within this park would rectify existing deficiencies.

**CYP10** Provide a play area within the east of Moreton-in-Marsh, potentially within a new park.

7.88 Provision within Tetbury is below the minimum quantity standard, however all residents are able to access a facility. No demand for additional facilities was identified through consultation and new provision is therefore not required at the current time.

7.89 Application of the quantity standard indicates that there will be an expected shortfall of 0.47 hectares (12 play areas) by 2026 and deficiencies are evident in all three settlements. Ensuring that existing provision is able to cope with demand is therefore essential. Where new development is outside of the catchment for existing sites, additional facilities will be required.

**CYP11** Provide new facilities in line with population growth in the Market Towns.
Small towns (Category C1 Settlements)

7.90 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the provision of children’s play areas is above the minimum standard both now and in the future. Supporting these findings, accessibility mapping reveals that nearly all residents have access to a site within the recommended 480m catchment.

7.91 In addition to having access to play areas, there is also a good distribution of informal open space within the settlements, which means that residents have access to both formal and informal play opportunities.

7.92 Although nearly all residents in the settlement hierarchy have access to a play area, the play area located in the south of Chipping Campden is situated on a school site. This site is not publicly accessible, and therefore access to play areas in the south of the settlement is in reality limited. Consideration should be given to securing this site for public access outside school hours. In the event that this is not possible, or that additional provision is required, new facilities should be considered. The Town Council is currently considering the provision of a new facility, to be located on the Recreation Ground.

7.93 While all residents are able to access a play facility in Fairford, consultation identified demand for further facilities, suggesting that the current facilities are not meeting local need. This should be investigated further as it may be that current facilities are not of the right type (or targeting the right age group) to service the needs of the local residents, or that they are not in the right place.

CYP12 Negotiate formal access to the play area on a school site in Chipping Campden or provide a new facility within the town.

Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)

7.94 Application of the accessibility standard reveals that provision in Kemble and Blockley is below the recommended minimum quantity standard. The shortfall within Blockley (0.10 hectares) is the third greatest within all settlements in the District. Residents in Kemble and Blockley however have access to a play area within the recommended 480m catchment. With the exception of Kempsford (where there is no provision), residents in all other settlements have access to a play area within the recommended distance threshold.

7.95 There are no play areas and residents outside the catchment of a play area in Kempsford are also unable to access informal open space. This means that there is a lack of formal and informal play opportunities within the settlement and a play area is therefore required.

CYP13 Provide a play area within Kempsford. Any new play area should be located in an area which is accessible to the greatest number of residents.

7.96 As previously highlighted, while residents in Kemble and Blockley are able to access play facilities, there is currently a shortfall of provision against the quantity standard. This suggests that there may be a requirement for increased provision to accommodate future demand, particularly to support population growth. 18% of respondents to the children’s survey who go to Kemble Primary School indicate that more play areas are needed and a new play area is specified as the second most popular new facility children would like near their home.
7.97 While provision is currently above minimum standards in Avening, population growth will see the amount of facilities fall below the recommended level and Avening Parish Council identifies the need for further facilities in the town. New facilities are therefore required in the medium term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYP14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide new facilities in line with population growth in Blockey, Kemble and Avening, and in other settlements where new development is located outside of the catchment of existing facilities.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facilities for young people**

*Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)*

7.98 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the provision of facilities for young people is below the minimum standard with a current shortfall of 0.46 hectares. Supporting the quantitative findings, accessibility mapping reveals that the majority of residents in Cirencester and Stratton are outside the catchment of a facility (Figure 7.4).
Figure 7.4 - Deficiencies of facilities for young people in Cirencester
7.99 Based on the application of the quantity and accessibility standards there is a clear need for increased provision within the settlement hierarchy. When considering the interrelationship between play facilities and informal open space (Map 7.4) within Cirencester, the majority of residents are able to access a minimum of some informal open space (and these sites provide opportunities for the provision of equipped facilities for young people). However, residents in the north east of Cirencester and south of Stratton are outside the catchment of both facilities for young people and informal open space. Consultation reveals strong views that there is a need for more facilities for young people within the town.

7.100 The location of facilities for young people within Abbey Grounds and St Michael's Park would alleviate deficiencies in these parts of the town. In addition to this, new facilities are also required in the north east of Cirencester and south of Stratton. Cirencester Town Council is currently consulting with the local community on proposals to provide a skatepark and BMX track at Kingshill Lane, Cirencester. The implementation of these proposals would address much of the identified deficiency.

CYP15 Provide facilities for young people within Abbey Grounds, St Michael’s Park, the north east of Cirencester and south of Stratton.

Market towns (Category B2 Settlements)

7.101 Application of the accessibility standard illustrates that residents in Bourton-on-the-Water, north of Tetbury and east of Moreton-in-Marsh are outside the recommended 480m catchment of a facility for young people (Figures 7.5 – 7.7). While it appears that residents in south Tetbury are able to access a facility, this is actually a youth centre and therefore does not fit directly into the PPG17 classifications for facilities, as it has limited opening hours and more restricted access.
Figure 7.5 - Deficiencies of facilities for young people in Bourton-on-the-Water
Figure 7.6 - Deficiencies of facilities for young people in the north of Tetbury
Figure 7.7 - Deficiencies of facilities for young people in the east of Moreton-in-Marsh
Settlement calculations indicate that there is a quantitative shortfall in all three settlements. Shortfalls within these settlements are the second, third and fourth highest of all settlements in the District.

When considering the distribution of informal open space in the identified areas of deficiency, all residents in Tetbury have access to a site, although on the whole, facilities are too small to accommodate a facility for young people. Although residents in the south east of Tetbury appear to have access to a facility for young people, this facility is a youth centre. Youth centres are not specifically classified as facilities for young people within PPG17, however they can provide an important function in providing young people with a place to meet friends, ‘hang out’ and participate in a number of activities. Tetbury Youth Centre may therefore be meeting the needs of young people in the south east of Tetbury. The respondent to the elected members survey for Tetbury indicates that there is not enough facilities for young people in the settlement, suggesting that there is demand for additional facilities and new facilities should be prioritised outside of the local catchment for the youth centre.

Residents in the north of Bourton-on-the-Water and east of Moreton-in-Marsh are outside the catchment of both a facility for young people and informal open space. Drop in sessions highlighted particular demand for additional facilities for young people in Moreton-in-Marsh.

In light of the quantitative shortfalls and lack of access to facilities for young people, to alleviate existing deficiencies new facilities should be provided within Bourton-on-the-Water, east of Moreton-in-Marsh and north or centre of Tetbury.

| CYP16 | Provide facilities for young people within Bourton-on-the-Water, east of Moreton-in-Marsh (potentially within a new park) and the north or centre (potentially within a new park) of Tetbury. |

Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)

Quantitative analysis indicates that the current provision of facilities for young people is below the minimum standard, with a shortfall of 0.51 hectares. Accessibility mapping illustrates this shortfall, with residents in Northleach and Lechlade outside the catchment of a facility for young people (Figures 7.8 and 7.9).
Figure 7.8 - Deficiencies of facilities for young people in Northleach
Figure 7.9 - Deficiencies of facilities for young people in Lechlade
Settlement calculations reinforce the overall quantitative shortfall, with shortfalls in provision found in all settlements in the hierarchy. The greatest shortfall is located within Lechlade (0.12 hectares).

Although residents in Northleach and Lechlade are outside the catchment of a facility for young people, they do have access to informal open space. The location of these sites provides the opportunity for facilities for young people to be located within them.

Reflecting the demand identified above, Northleach Town Council has set up a Multi Use Games Area Working Group to consider installing a MUGA within Northleach. Consultation undertaken by the Town Council has identified a clear need for a MUGA within Northleach and The Westwoods Centre, on Basset Road, has been identified as the preferred site for this MUGA. To alleviate deficiencies in Northleach the Council should support this proposal.

Lechlade Recreation Ground is an outdoor sports facility that currently contains tennis courts and a synthetic turf 5 a side pitch. This 5 a side pitch is classified as a sports facility, however, it does provide recreation opportunities for young people in Lechlade and therefore in reality has a secondary function as a facility for young people. However, an action of the Play Strategy is to provide play activities that offer an alternative to sport for children and young people and there are currently no facilities in the town.

Although residents in Stow-on-the-Wold and Chipping Campden appear to have access to a facility for young people, the facilities in these settlements are youth centres. Therefore, while potentially meeting the needs of young people (consultation did not identify specific demand for additional provision at this time), there is a need to investigate demand for more formal facilities for young people, such as youth shelters, MUGAs and skate parks within these settlements in order to meet with local standards.

Application of the quantity standard indicates that there currently is a shortfall of 0.35 hectares of facilities for young people in the Local Service Centres. Based on future population projections, this shortfall is expected to increase to 0.41 hectares by 2026.

Accessibility mapping illustrates these shortfalls, with residents in Andoversford, Blockley, Kempsford, Mickleton, Willersey, Avening and Down Ampney all outside the catchment of a facility for young people as there are no facilities within any of these settlements.
7.114 In addition to a lack of access to facilities for young people, residents in Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney, Kempsford and Mickleton are also outside the catchment of informal open space, meaning that informal recreation is limited.

7.115 In order to meet with recommended standards facilities for young people should be provided in Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney, Kempsford and Mickleton. The quantity standard however suggests that the size of these settlements is only just large enough to justify a facility. Currently, only within Kempsford and Avening has demand for additional facilities been identified. At the Parish Council workshop it was stated that there is lack of facilities for young people in Kempsford, with young people currently travelling to Fairford to access sites. Avening Parish Council recently surveyed residents and provision for young people emerged as a key issue. Given the size of these settlements, and the fact that no specific demand has been identified at the current time, the mobile skatepark (managed by Cotswold District Council) should be used to serve the needs of young people in areas currently devoid of provision, such as Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney and Mickleton. The use of this skatepark is a key priority of the Play Strategy. New permanent facilities will be required as the population grows.

| CYP20 | Provide a facility for young people in Kempsford. In the short term, use the mobile skatepark to service the needs of young people in Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney and Mickleton. Longer term, a facility for young people should be provided in each settlement. |

7.116 The majority of residents in Blockley outside the catchment of a facility for young people do have access to informal open space in the form of Blockley Village Green. This site already contains sports facilities and a children's play area. To alleviate deficiencies in Blockley consideration should be given to locating a facility for young people within Blockley Village Green. Demand for a facility in Blockley has already been identified and Fosseway Housing are considering the provision of a site. Options for facilities may include a skatepark, BMX track or Multi Use Games Area.

| CYP21 | Provide a facility for young people within Blockley Village Green. |

**Increasing access to existing facilities**

7.117 Providing opportunities for all children aged 8 -14 to participate in challenging and exciting play is a key priority of the Play Strategy. Central to the achievement of this goal is maximising access to existing facilities for children and young people in Cotswold District.

7.118 Application of the accessibility standard has revealed that a large number of residents in various settlements are outside the catchment of a children's play area and / or facility for young people. In light of the rural nature of the District, increasing access to sites through the location of facilities for children and young people on public transport routes, particularly for facilities for young people, will be important. Although increasing access by public transport is challenging given the rural nature of Cotswold District, improving the public transport network is identified as a priority in The Cotswold District Council Sustainable Community Strategy.

7.119 Developing the green infrastructure network (e.g. footpaths, cycle paths, disused railway lines etc.) will also be essential in maximising access to existing provision in the District. This is also central to the delivery strategy for other types of open space and will be of particular importance in areas of higher density housing where opportunities to provide facilities are more limited.
Facilitate access to play areas and facilities for young people by providing safe footpaths and cycle routes between large residential neighbourhoods, play facilities and other green spaces.

Encourage the development of facilities on sites that are easily accessible by public transport.

27 children’s play areas are private facilities located on school sites, 10 of which are located within the settlement hierarchies considered in this report. School play facilities are particularly valuable in settlements where there is a lack of other public facilities and the Council should seek to increase access to such facilities. Increasing access to other school facilities, such as sports facilities, is also important and this will be returned to in section 8.

Work with schools to increase community access to school play facilities in the District, prioritising schools located in settlements without other facilities for children. There may be particular opportunities in Avening, Chipping Camden and Kempsford.

There are no recommendations for the redesignation of facilities for children or young people. The majority of sites are provided as part of larger parks or open spaces and are highly valued local facilities serving unique catchments.

The majority of children’s play areas and nearly all facilities for young people serve unique catchments and therefore provide a valuable local resource to residents. Furthermore, application of the quantity standard indicates that the quantity of children’s play areas and facilities for young people is insufficient to meet demand. In light of this, there are no recommendations for the disposal of facilities.

Children’s play areas and facilities for young people were key themes to emerge from local consultation. The need to increase the provision of facilities, particularly for young people, was highlighted, in addition to enhancing the quality of existing provision. The importance of ensuring that facilities are fit for purpose and challenging and exciting was regularly emphasised.

The Cotswold Play Strategy outlines a commitment to both increasing the amount of facilities for children and young people in the District and enhancing the quality of existing facilities. The strategy also indicates that it is important to ensure that play opportunities are accessible for all children and young people aged 8 – 14 in Cotswold District.

Analysis indicates that the current provision of facilities for children and young people falls below the recommended quantity standards reinforcing the need to increase provision, particularly with regards to facilities for young people.

Accessibility mapping reveals that children’s play areas and facilities for young people are generally well distributed across the District and predominantly serve unique catchments. However, key areas
7.127 The key priorities for improving the provision of children’s play areas and young people’s facilities over the Local Development Framework period therefore are:

- seek to provide challenging and exciting play facilities that encourage children to test their boundaries and balance risk and safety. Play facilities should be designed in line with the Play England guide for creating successful play spaces and Play England’s Performance Indicators. Encourage and promote the involvement of children and young people in the development of new facilities;

- target improvements to the existing provision for children and young people using the quality standards and site assessments undertaken to guide improvements. Ensure that new provision also meets the recommended quality standards;

- provide new facilities for children and young people in areas currently devoid of provision, specifically in Cirencester, Stratton, Bourton-on-the-Water, Moreton-in-Marsh, Northleach, Blockley and Kempsford and investigate the need for new facilities in areas of identified demand. In smaller settlements, use the mobile skatepark (managed by Cotswold District Council) to meet short term demand, particularly in Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney and Mickleton.

- seek to negotiate formal access agreements to facilities on school sites; giving particular consideration to opportunities in Avening, Chipping Camden and Kempsford

- in light of shortfalls in provision, improve access routes to existing facilities. In addition, given the challenges of providing local facilities in all settlements, public transport links should be maximised and particularly for young people, sites should be located in areas with good public transport links.
8. Outdoor Sports facilities

Introduction and definition

8.1 PPG17 guidance considers the provision of both indoor and outdoor sports facilities. For clarity, indoor and outdoor sports are separated into two distinct typologies within this document. This section considers the provision of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District.

8.2 Outdoor sports facilities are a wide ranging category of open space which includes both natural and artificial surfaces for sport and recreation that are either publicly or privately owned.

8.3 Facilities included within this category are:
- Natural turf playing pitches (including football, rugby, cricket and hockey)
- Synthetic turf pitches
- Tennis courts
- Bowling greens
- Athletics tracks

8.4 In addition to these facilities, water sports and opportunities for cycling and walking are also considered.

8.5 Outdoor sports facilities are often a focal point of a local community, functioning as a recreational and amenity resource in addition to a formal sports facility. This is particularly true of pitches, which often have a secondary function of dog walking and ‘kickabout’ areas. In particular, outdoor sports facilities in some of the smaller villages of the District are particularly multifunctional.

8.6 The effective provision of formal and informal facilities for sports will be instrumental if participation is to increase in line with national and local targets, which seek to get one million people more active by 2012.

8.7 The Sport England National Strategy is set out under three headings, specifically Grow, Sustain and Excel. If Cotswold District is to achieve the long term ambition of excelling, it will be essential to ensure that all facilities at all levels are of the highest quality and are fit for purpose.

8.8 The recently completed Place Survey (2008) indicates that satisfaction with the quality of sports and leisure facilities is relatively low (50%). However, in contrast to the findings of the Place Survey (2008), Active People Survey results indicate that satisfaction levels have increased from 66.2% in 2007/08 to 72.9% 2008/09. The effective provision of high quality outdoor sports facilities will be important in increasing satisfaction with current sports and leisure facilities in the District. Satisfaction with facilities is also an important means of encouraging residents to participate in sport and physical recreation.
8.9 This section sets out the context for outdoor sports in the District and provides an overview of provision and the issues raised. Further more detailed studies should be undertaken in order to fully establish demand for playing pitches, using the methodology set out in Towards a Level Playing Field, a guide to the preparation of Playing Pitch Strategies.

**Context**

**Active People Survey results**

8.10 The Active People (AP) Surveys (conducted in 2005/06 and repeated in 2007/08 and 2008/09) included a widespread survey of adults aged 16 and over living in England. The Survey gathered data on the type, duration and intensity of participation in different types of sport and active recreation, as well as information about volunteering, club membership, people receiving tuition from an instructor or coach, participation in competitive sport and satisfaction with local sports provision. The key results for Cotswold District Council, the South West Region and the national averages are set out in Table 8.1 below. Full details on the Active People survey can be found at [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey.aspx). The surveys are termed AP 1 (2005/6), AP 2 (2007/8) and AP 3 (2008/9).

**Table 8.1 - Active People Survey Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Cotswold District</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation (3x30 minutes of moderate intensity exercise)</td>
<td>AP1: 24.5%</td>
<td>AP2: 23.3%</td>
<td>AP3: 25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club membership</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8.11 Table 8.1 indicates that levels of participation and tutoring are above both national and regional averages. Club membership is below national and regional averages and the proportion of people who compete is below the national average. Encouragingly, participation has increased significantly (by 2.3%) between the years 2007/08 and 2008/09, suggesting that demand for sport is increasing. The amount of residents taking part in competitive sport is however declining.
Market segmentation

8.12 Sport England has developed nineteen sporting segments to help us understand the nation’s attitudes and motivations – why they play sport and why they don’t. This facilitates decision making to ensure that facilities cater for the needs and expectations of local residents.

8.13 The research builds on the results of Sport England’s Active People Survey, the Department of Culture, Media and Sport’s Taking Part survey and the Mosaic tool from Experian. It informs Sport England’s Strategy and Business Plan 2008-2011 and helps ensure that money is invested into areas that will have the greatest impact.

8.14 Residents are classified according to their key characteristics and analysis of the dominant market segments provides an indication as to the type of facilities that may be required if certain groups are to become active. The key characteristics of some of the dominant population groups in Cotswold District are illustrated in Table 8.2 below. Full details of these groups, and all of the 19 segments can be found at [http://www.sportengland.org/research/market_segmentation.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/market_segmentation.aspx)

8.15 Table 8.2 considers only the most dominant sectors in Cotswold District.

**Table 8.2 - Dominant market segments in Cotswold District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Sports that appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim (Settling down males)</td>
<td>Age 26-35&lt;br&gt;Sporty male professionals, buying a house and settling down with a partner</td>
<td>Canoeing, skiing, hockey, golf, cycling, climbing, squash, football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe (Fitness class friends)</td>
<td>Age 18 – 25&lt;br&gt;Single Graduate/professional</td>
<td>Body combat, swimming, gym, tennis, netball, pilates, running and aqua aerobics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip (Comfortable mid-life males)</td>
<td>Age 46-55&lt;br&gt;Mid-life professional, sporty males with older children and more time for themselves</td>
<td>Sailing, gym, football, jogging, badminton, golf, cycling, cricket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger and Joy (Early retirement couples)</td>
<td>Age 56 – 65&lt;br&gt;Mature or part time</td>
<td>Swimming, walking, aqua aerobics, bowls, sailing, shooting, golf and fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph and Phyllis (Comfortable retired couples)</td>
<td>Age 65+&lt;br&gt;Mature or retired</td>
<td>Bowls, golf, tennis, table tennis, snooker, walking, fishing and swimming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.16 ‘Tim’ is the most dominant market segment in Cotswold District while ‘Ralph and Phyllis’ is the segment most above the national average.

8.17 Market segmentation information can be used to provide an indication as to which type of activities there is likely to be demand for within the District. For example, as ‘Tim’ is the most dominant segment in the district, based on the characteristics of this segment, there may be high demand for sports such as canoeing, cycling and golf. In order to encourage ‘Ralph and Phyllis’ and ‘Roger and Joy’ to participate, it may be necessary to provide opportunities to participate in lower impact activities, such as bowls, walking and fishing. Market segmentation therefore highlights the
importance of providing a range of sporting opportunities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population, rather than just the more traditional type of outdoor sports facility such as playing pitches.

**Strategic context**

8.18 At national level, particularly in the run up to the 2012 Olympics, sport and active recreation is a priority. It is hoped that the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games can be the catalyst for increased participation across the country and leave a legacy of high participation and high quality facilities.

8.19 Of particular relevance to this assessment of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District are the following key factors:

- There are national and regional targets to increase participation and to get one million people more active – the successful achievement of these targets will impact on the demand for facilities
- Participation is no longer just about sport – in order to reduce health inequalities and address issues of health decline there are moves to increase the contribution of sport and active recreation to overall levels of physical activity – this includes maximising the roles of parks and other open spaces (as highlighted in other sections of this report) as well as building on formal sports participation
- Agencies are now working to reduce the participation gap and increase voluntary and community sector involvement
- There is a drive to improve the sustainability of resources and to maximise the use of existing facilities, such as school assets.

**Regional and sub regional context**

8.20 The *South West Regional Plan for Sport* expired in 2008. However, Active Gloucestershire has developed a *Strategic Framework for Promoting Sport and Physical Activity in Gloucestershire (2006)*, which builds on the principles of the Regional Plan for Sport.

8.21 The vision of the strategy is to make Gloucestershire a physically active and successful sporting county. Target outcomes of the strategy include:

- increasing participation by 1% per annum;
- to widen representation of Gloucestershire residents at national and international level by improving development pathways; and
- to work with partners and stakeholders to support a more active and successful county through improved access to facilities and opportunities, better health and well being and stronger, safer communities.

8.22 The effective provision of high quality, accessible outdoor sports facilities will contribute to the achievement of these outcomes.

**Local context**

8.23 The *Cotswold District Local Plan* emphasises the importance of protecting school playing fields from development. Policy 33 states that development on school playing fields will not be permitted.
8.24 The Local Plan also supports increasing the provision of outdoor sports facilities in the District. Policy 35 states that golf courses within the Cotswold AONB will be permitted based on a number of conditions and Policy UT.1 indicates that development within the Cotswold Water Park for water based sport and recreation will be permitted assuming a series of criteria are met.

8.25 Although only 5% of residents use outdoor sports facilities more frequently than any other type of open space in Cotswold District, 20% of residents indicate that they use outdoor sports facilities at least once a week.

8.26 Increasing community access to school facilities was identified as important by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop. Although access to secondary school facilities was viewed as a key strength, it was stated that community use should be extended to other schools in the District.

8.27 The remainder of this section summarises firstly the quantity of outdoor sports facilities as a whole and then the supply of each of the different types of facility.

**Quantity of provision**

8.28 A total of 314.04 hectares of outdoor sports facilities (excluding golf courses) is located within Cotswold District. Golf courses have been excluded from calculations due to their tendency to skew figures. These facilities include public, private (e.g. sports clubs) and school facilities.

8.29 Of this, 189.23 hectares are located within the four settlement hierarchies, while a further 124.81 hectares is provided outside of these areas in the smaller villages.

8.30 In addition to these outdoor sports facilities there are also four race courses in the District, located at Andoversford, Didmarton, Paxford and Siddington. One polo ground is also situated at Beaufort Polo Club. There are 10 sites providing opportunities for golf, three of which are located within the four settlement hierarchies. In total these three sites cover 155 hectares.

8.31 The Cotswold Water Park has been classified within the natural and semi natural open space typology, however this site also provides outdoor sport and recreation opportunities for residents in and visitors to Cotswold District. This site will also be considered later in the water sports section.

8.32 Where facilities are located within other types of open space, the overall area dedicated to each pitch or court has been deducted from the size of the other open space. This avoids double counting of site area but ensures that the presence of pitches within the other types of open space is taken into account.

8.33 The provision of outdoor sports facilities within the four settlement hierarchies in the Cotswold District is summarised in Table 8.3 overleaf.
Table 8.3 - Outdoor Sports Facilities in Cotswold District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (hectares)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category B1 Settlement</td>
<td>79.43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B2 Settlements</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C2 Settlements</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>189.23</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>57,853</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.34 The key issues emerging from Table 8.3 and from consultations relating to the quantity of outdoor sports facilities across the District are:

- the current provision of outdoor sports facilities equates to 3.27 hectares per 1,000 population; The amount of facilities provided is relatively inconsistent across the district, with only 1.78 hectares per 1000 situated in the Category C2 settlements compared to over 4 hectares per 1000 in Category B1 Settlements. This area also contains the greatest amount of outdoor sports facilities in hectares;

- varying degrees of satisfaction with the current quantity of outdoor sports facilities are evident in the household survey, with more residents suggesting that the quantity of bowling greens, golf courses and grass pitches are about right than are dissatisfied, but shortfalls in synthetic turf pitches, athletics tracks and tennis courts are identified;

- supporting the household survey findings, bowls club representatives indicate that the amount of bowling greens is more than sufficient to accommodate demand;

- in contrast to the findings of the household survey, the majority of responding football clubs indicated that there are no enough grass pitches. However, responding cricket and rugby clubs indicated that grass pitch provision for their sport is sufficient;

- other consultations also provided a varied opinion regarding the provision of outdoor sports facilities. A slightly higher proportion of Parish Council respondents indicated that provision was sufficient than those who suggested that there are not enough facilities, over half of respondents to the survey for young people state that provision is insufficient (51%) and elected members demonstrated various perceptions regarding the quantity of facilities; and

- the amount of outdoor sports was generally perceived to be sufficient by attendees at the residents’ workshop.
8.35 The recommended local quantity standard for outdoor sports facilities has been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and is summarised overleaf. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

8.36 This standard represents a broad standard only which can be used to determine the levels of contribution required from new development. Localised demand for each type of facility is discussed later in this section and standards to determine the adequacy of each type of facility and any new provision required are suggested. Sport specific strategies, building on the information collected (for example a Playing Pitch Strategy) should however be developed to inform decision making for each type of sport.

**Quantity Standard (see Appendices E and F - standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.27 hectares per 1000 population</td>
<td>3.28 hectares per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Outdoor sports facilities are very much demand led and the outdoor sports facility typology encompasses a wide variety of different facilities including athletics tracks, pitches, golf courses and bowling greens. In order to understand the demand for outdoor sports facilities in a greater level of detail, it is therefore essential to consider each type of sports facility separately. The above standard should be used for broad planning need to determine the likely impact of new developments and the contributions that are therefore required.

A difference in opinion regarding the provision of outdoor sports facilities was portrayed by respondents to the household survey. The slight majority of residents indicated that the provision of grass pitches, golf courses and bowling greens is sufficient, however, the amount of synthetic turf pitches, golf courses and tennis courts was perceived to be insufficient. Other consultations also provided an inconclusive view regarding the amount of outdoor sports facilities.

In light of the evident level of dissatisfaction with the provision of outdoor sports facilities, it is recommended that the local standard is set slightly above the existing level of provision. Setting a standard just above the existing level of provision will allow for a focus on enhancing quality and increasing access to existing facilities but should encourage the provision of additional facilities where they are required.

**Current provision - quality**

8.37 The quality of existing outdoor sports facilities was assessed through site visits undertaken by the Council. The key issues emerging from site assessments are discussed later in this section within the sports specific commentary.

8.38 The site visits undertaken assess the outdoor sport site as a whole and do not specifically consider the degree to which a facility can be considered fit for purpose. Assessments considering this issue would be required as part of more detailed facility specific studies. The site visits do however, provide an indication as to potential issues arising at sites and specific comments are made where sites are perceived to be particularly good or poor.
8.39 Issues arising from consultation with regards to the quality of outdoor sports facilities include:

- responses to the household survey suggest that the quality of outdoor sports facilities is perceived to be good. For all facility types (with the exception of athletics tracks) the majority response is good. More people are dissatisfied with the quality of synthetic turf pitches than with any other facility;

- other consultation findings generally support the household survey perceptions. All Parish Council respondents indicate that the quality of outdoor sports facilities is either good or average and 60% of respondents to the elected members’ survey state that the quality of facilities is good or average;

- cleanliness, changing facilities, appropriate drainage, seating and a litter free playing area were identified as key components of a high quality outdoor sports facility by respondents to the officers’ survey who use this typology more frequently than any other; and this concurs with aspirations evident in responses to the household survey; and

- the need for more changing facilities was highlighted as the key issue by sports clubs who use grass pitches in the District. The importance of having high quality competitive match and training facilities to support the development of clubs was also raised.

**Setting provision standards - quality**

8.40 The recommended local quality standard for outdoor sports facilities is summarised overleaf. Full justifications and consultation relating to the quality of provision for the local standard are provided within Appendix E.

8.41 There are two key components relating to quality which are essential to the effective provision of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District, specifically:

- ensuring that facilities are fit for purpose in terms of the construction of the pitch, court or green; and

- ensuring that the management of these facilities is effective and meets local aspirations.

8.42 The quality standard below highlights the key aspirations for sports facilities emerging from public consultation. In addition to this, facilities should meet National Governing Body (NGB) and Sport England quality criteria. These criteria are available online at http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/design_guidance_notes.aspx.
Quality Standard (see Appendix E)

Recommended Quality Standard

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the vision for outdoor sports facilities should incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean / litter free</td>
<td>Appropriate specification for key users (designed in accordance with NGB guidance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good site access</td>
<td>Changing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately maintained to NGB standards</td>
<td>Accessible pricing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting provision standards - accessibility

8.43 The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived from the findings of the local consultations.

8.44 The majority of current users of outdoor sports facilities either walk (48%) or drive (43%) to access a site. The remaining users cycle. The significant majority of current users travel for less than 10 minutes to access a facility, suggesting that current users use outdoor sports facilities within close proximity to their home.

8.45 Respondents to the household survey expect that outdoor sports facilities should be accessed by car. With the exception of grass pitches, where 54% of residents would expect to walk, the majority of respondents expect to drive. The expectation that grass pitches are local to the home may be influenced by those residents who wish to use pitches for informal use, as well as for competitive sport.

8.46 Unlike the overall district wide picture, residents in the Category B1 Settlement (Cirencester) expect to find outdoor sports facilities in close proximity to their home, with the majority of respondents indicating that they would expect to walk to tennis courts and bowling greens as well as to grass pitches.

8.47 Respondents to the Parish / Town Council and elected members surveys suggest that access to outdoor sports facilities is generally average or good, therefore portraying positive perceptions.

8.48 Community access to secondary school sports facilities was identified as a strength in the District by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop. However, increasing community use of other school facilities in the district was identified as important, particularly in the smaller villages where these facilities can provide a vital resource.
8.49 The need to improve the public transport network to increase access to facilities for residents in the rural settlements was highlighted by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop. It was stated that services finish too early meaning that it is difficult for residents in the rural settlements using facilities in Cirencester to travel back home. Encouraging community use of private and school facilities was seen as a solution to this problem, given the challenges that are associated with improving the public transport network.

8.50 Site assessments reveal that while some outdoor sports facilities serve wide catchments, there are many that are predominantly for local residents. Many sites have parking facilities and are in close proximity to a bus stop, however, some sports facilities are highlighted as being a local resource with no dedicated parking or bus stop located nearby. This demonstrates the varied provision of outdoor sports facility in the District.

8.51 Parking and signage to sites were identified as the two features requiring improvement regarding access to outdoor sports facilities. The need to improve the amount of changing and toilet facilities, as well as to enhance disabled access is evident. Site assessments reveal that 35 sites have no changing accommodation of toilets and only 36 sites were identified as being accessible for disabled users. The cost of accessing sports facilities was not highlighted as an issue during consultations.

8.52 The recommended local accessibility standards for outdoor sports facilities are summarised below. Full justification for these local standards is provided within Appendix E. The recommended standard reflects the different aspirations for different types of facilities.

**Accessibility Standard (see Appendix E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Accessibility Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minute walk (grass pitches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minute drive (synthetic turf pitches, bowling greens and tennis courts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minute drive (athletics tracks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes drive (golf courses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Districtwide, a clear preference for driving to all types of outdoor sports facilities, with the exception of grass pitches, was evident from responses to the household survey. While residents in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) expressed a view that more facilities should be in walking distance, in order to maximise the sustainability of sports facilities and to provide an appropriate balance between quantity and quality, drivetime standards have been set.

The recommended travel times for each type of facility are based on the preferred travel mode and most common expected travel time indicated by respondents to the household survey.

The standards reflect the expectation that grass pitches are expected to be provided in close proximity to the home and the recognised need to travel to more specialised facilities, such as synthetic turf pitches. Whilst a walk time standard for grass pitches will be applied, it is suggested that for competitive sport, residents may still need to travel further to reach appropriate facilities.
Applying provision standards

Quantity

8.53 In order to provide an overview of sports provision in Cotswold District, the quantity standard can be applied and this is set out in Table 8.4.

8.54 The application of the standard provides an understanding of areas of deficiency; however the standard should be used largely to determine the impact of new development, rather than existing gaps in provision. The application of the standard at a settlement hierarchy level should be treated as indicative only. This is particularly important as most residents would expect to drive to facilities (as confirmed by the accessibility standard) and the settlement hierarchy in which the facility is located is therefore of relatively limited significance. Furthermore, the local standard does not take into account potential participation increases, or consider the impact of changes in the participation profile of different sports which may cause variations in demand for facilities.

Table 8.4 - Application of quantity standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Future shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category B1 Settlements</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B2 Settlements</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>-7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C2 Settlements</td>
<td>-15.82</td>
<td>-20.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-28.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.55 Table 8.4 highlights the following:

- the current provision of outdoor sports facilities is below the recommended standard, with there being a minor shortfall of 0.53 hectares. However, future population projections indicate that shortfalls are expected to increase significantly by 2026;

- the provision of outdoor sports facilities within Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) is above the minimum standard both at the current time, and following projected population growth in 2026; and

- the greatest shortfall is found in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements).

8.56 The local quantity standard has not been applied within individual settlements, as it is not reasonable to expect all types of outdoor sports facilities to be provided within each settlement in the District. Specific issues relating to key settlements and to different facility types will be explored later in this section.
Accessibility

8.57 Map 8.1 overleaf summarises the distribution of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District. It indicates that:

- there is a good distribution of grass pitches in the District, which means that the majority of residents, particularly within the larger settlements, have access to grass pitches within the recommended 480m catchment;

- synthetic turf pitches are predominantly located within the more urban settlements, such as Cirencester and Bourton-on-the-Water, however almost all residents are within the suggested 10 minute catchment of a facility;

- bowling greens are predominantly located in the south and north of the District. This means that a large number of residents in the centre of the district are outside the recommended catchment of a site. Key areas of deficiency are evident in Bourton-on-the-Water, Northleach and Andoversford;

- the majority of residents have access to a tennis court within the recommended 10 minute drive time. Only within Andoversford and a number of small villages are residents outside the catchment of a site; and

- nearly all residents have access to a golf course within a 20 minute drive.

8.58 The distribution of each type of facility will be discussed further later in this section.
Priorities for future delivery

8.59 This section highlights the main district wide issues that need to be addressed and then discusses sport specific issues and priorities.

District wide issues

Facilitation

8.60 There are many different providers of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District. This ranges from Parish/Town Councils, private/voluntary sports clubs and Trusts to educational establishments. Cotswold District Council provides only a minority of facilities in the District. Therefore in order to promote a co-ordinated approach to outdoor sports facility provision, it will be essential that the Council works in partnership with providers in the District. A coordinated approach to facility provision will be particularly important in light of the rural nature of Cotswold District. In particular, facilities at school sites were highlighted as being central to the future delivery of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District throughout the consultation process.

OSF1 The Council should seek to support and coordinate all partners and providers of outdoor sports facilities in order to promote a joined up approach to facility provision.

Protection

8.61 The local quantity standard has been set slightly above the existing level of provision to reflect the current level of dissatisfaction with the provision of outdoor sports facilities. Application of the quantity standard therefore reveals that provision is below the recommended minimum standard. Consultation demonstrates that there are perceived shortfalls of grass football pitches, as well as demand for additional tennis courts, athletics tracks and synthetic turf pitches.

8.62 Outdoor sports facilities are a valued resource in Cotswold District. They are frequently used and provide residents with access to both formal and informal sport and recreation opportunities. In light of the importance of outdoor sports facilities to residents, and their role in increasing physical activity and promoting a healthy lifestyle, as well as the high levels of use that sites currently receive, it will be important to ensure that all sites are protected from development unless it can be proven that the site is surplus to demand, or that development of one site will result in improved facilities at a nearby site.

8.63 Sport England places an emphasis on the protection of playing pitches and it is their policy to object to any planning application which will result in the loss of a playing field unless it meets one of the five exceptions defined in A Sporting Future For the Playing Fields of England.

8.64 Paragraph 10 of PPG17 requires that before any open space can be lost to residential development, it must be demonstrated that it is surplus to requirements, not only in terms of its existing use, but also in respect of any other functions of open space that it can perform. Sport England planning guidance highlights this point and reinforces that this requirement should be considered prior to the recommended disposal of any site.

8.65 These principles should be incorporated through the inclusion of appropriate policies in the Local Development Framework (LDF). Further enhancing the importance of outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District, there are currently no recommendations for disposal or redesignation of any sports facilities and indeed some consultations identified deficiencies in the quantity of provision, meaning that the protection of existing sites is particularly important.
Increasing access

8.66 Due to the rural nature of the District and wide spread distribution of small villages, maximising access to outdoor sports facilities is essential, particularly in areas of deficiency. Effective access routes will ensure that facilities provided can be sustainable and strategically located.

8.67 Analysis of the distribution of existing facilities indicates that although there is an even distribution of grass pitches, more specialised facilities, such as synthetic turf pitches, are predominantly located within the more urban settlements, such as Cirencester. This means that access to these facilities for residents living in the smaller rural settlements is challenging. The drivetime standard that has been set for most types of outdoor sports facility requires residents to travel, and the provision of appropriate routes is therefore essential if sports participation is not to be negatively impacted upon.

8.68 Supporting this, access to more strategic facilities from the smaller villages was identified as an issue by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop. Attendees stated that a poor public transport network was the main reason behind this. As well as improving public transport networks, increasing access to outdoor sports facilities through other forms of sustainable travel (e.g. walking, cycling) should also be prioritised.

8.69 Although community access to secondary school facilities was identified as a strength in the district by attendees at the LDF Working Group, the need to increase access to other schools was emphasised. This was perceived to be particularly important in the smaller rural villages, where schools often provide a vital resource to local residents and may be the only type of open space and / or sports facility in the village. Increasing access to school facilities was also identified as important by attendees at the Parish Council workshops and Residents workshop.

8.70 Community use of school facilities provides a means of ensuring that residents in smaller settlements still have access to local sports facilities without the need to travel great distances. Use of school facilities by the community will be a key determinant of the role that schools play in community life. Successful models involving the use of schools outside of school hours have seen such facilities becoming the hub of community life.

8.71 In consideration of the importance of school facilities, particularly within the smaller rural settlements, the Council should seek to negotiate formal community use agreements with all schools in the District, focusing particularly on those located in areas of deficiency (highlighted within the sport specific sections that follow).
8.72 The Sport England produced document, Win Win Scenario (http://www.sportengland.org/support_advice/building_schools_and_sport.aspx) sets out a series of benefits of community use agreements, including:

- Increased attainment of pupils and integrating the school within the community
- Achieving key outcomes of every child matters
- Attracting more funding
- Developing better facilities

8.73 The document provides clear guidance on the implementation of successful community use agreements, along with examples of where these principles have been successfully achieved. Advice given includes:

- Strategic planning and the roles of Local Authorities
- Consultation
- Partnerships
- Resourcing the work
- Business planning
- Design and procurement
- Disability equality
- Revenue funding
- Governance, legal and insurance
- Management structures
- Staffing
- Marketing and hard-to-reach groups
- Booking and membership systems
- Repairs, maintenance and renewals
- Keeping the revenue finances on track
- Monitoring and evaluation.
Seek to negotiate formal community use agreements of outdoor sports facilities at all schools in the District. Use the Sport England Guidance Win Win as a starting point for discussions and strategic planning.

Prioritise schools in areas where there are no community facilities, or where specific deficiencies are identified that can be rectified by opening up a school site. Sir William Romney School (Tetbury) should be considered the main priority.

**Sport specific issues**

8.74 Table 8.5 summarises the distribution of grass pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens and synthetic turf pitches across Cotswold District. Provision outside of the four settlement hierarchies has been included due to the provision of several strategic facilities within these parts and the drivetime standard that has been set. This is important as there is no aspiration to provide these facilities locally.

**Table 8.5 - Specific Sports Sites within Cotswold District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Grass Pitches</th>
<th>Synthetic Turf Pitches</th>
<th>Tennis Courts</th>
<th>Bowling Greens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category B1 Settlements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B2 Settlements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C1 Settlements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C2 Settlements</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of settlement hierarchy</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.75 Table 8.5 indicates that aside from grass pitches, outdoor sports facilities are fairly evenly distributed across the settlement hierarchies in the District. All settlement hierarchies have at least one site of all types of facilities. Almost half of all grass pitch sites are found within the Small Villages.
**Tennis courts**

**Context**

8.76 In order to facilitate tennis development, the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) intend to develop a hierarchy of provision which will include international High Performance Clubs (10 nationally), High Performance Clubs and County Accredited clubs, which will be the satellite and feeder clubs. The LTA are now focussing their investment in facilities around a club structure through their ‘Club Vision’ initiative.

8.77 The key objectives of the strategy in underpinning and enhancing the overall vision of the LTA are to:

- develop a comprehensive network of training and competition facilities;
- continue developing all year round playing facilities – emphasising covered courts and floodlighting;
- accelerate the building of acrylic and clay courts – the LTA's preferred performance surfaces; and
- assist development programmes at a local level by supporting the provision of enhanced facilities.

8.78 Priority facility types identified include:

- covered courts
- floodlighting
- day courts
- practice walls

8.79 Gloucestershire Tennis supports the LTA national priorities.

**Current provision**

8.80 There are currently 22 sites containing 64 tennis courts located within Cotswold District. Excluding school courts, there are a total of 24 tennis courts in the District. This indicates that only 38% of tennis courts are located on public or private club sites, suggesting that access to a large number of courts may be limited for the general public.

8.81 The current total provision equates to 0.76 courts per 1,000 population or one court for every 1,322 residents. Excluding school facilities, provision equates to 0.28 courts per 1,000 or one court for every 3,524 residents. This further highlights the importance of school sites and the need to ensure that such facilities are accessible to the general community.

8.82 St Michael's Park (Cirencester), Chipping Campden Recreation Ground, Bourton-on-the-Water Playing Fields, High Street Sports Ground (South Cerney) and Lechlade Recreation Ground are the only public tennis courts in the District. The remaining sites are owned by private/voluntary sports clubs, such as Cirencester Tennis Club. While these are accessible to the general public on a membership basis, they frequently do not permit pay and play use and therefore discourage casual play.
Adequacy of existing provision

8.83 Dissatisfaction with the current quantity of tennis courts was portrayed by respondents to the household survey. The greatest level of dissatisfaction with current provision was found in the Category C1 Settlements (Small Towns).

8.84 Although residents indicate that the current provision of tennis courts is insufficient to meet demand, accessibility mapping (Map 8.2) reveals that the majority of residents have access to a tennis court within the recommended 10-minute drive time. Only residents in some of the small villages are outside the catchment of a site.

8.85 Despite the majority of residents having access to a tennis court, in reality public access to a number of courts is limited due to their location at educational or private sites. Publicly accessible tennis courts are only located in Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water, South Cerney, Chipping Campden, Northleach, Lechlade and there is a tennis club in Fairford. Therefore, residents in some of the larger settlements, such as Moreton-in-Marsh, Tetbury and Stow on the Wold do not have local access to public tennis courts. There are however courts in all of the above settlements except Stow-on-the-Wold.

8.86 The limited quantity of public pay and play facilities, alongside the levels of dissatisfaction, means that an increase in the quantity of publicly accessible pay and play tennis courts is required, particularly in the settlements above. In the first instance, this could be achieved by providing public pay and play access to tennis courts located on educational sites. Increasing community access to sites in areas of deficiency within the Category B2 and C1 Settlements, such as Sir William Romley School (Tetbury) will be important. The use of the facilities at the Fire College in Moreton-in-Marsh will also reduce unmet demand in this area.

8.87 There are no tennis courts within the majority of Small Local Service Centres (C2 settlements) and no facilities at school sites. Transport routes to larger settlements will therefore be important.

8.88 In consideration of the existing dissatisfaction with the current provision of tennis courts (which is due to the lack of public access as much as the fact that facilities are not provided), access should be negotiated to existing school facilities in Tetbury, and new facilities considered in Stow-on-the-Wold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENNIS 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate access to tennis courts at William Romney School in Tetbury (in line with recommendation OSF 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek opportunities to provide tennis courts in Stow-on-the-Wold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.89 The quality of tennis courts was generally perceived to be good (50%) or average (31%) by respondents to the household survey. 14% of residents rated the quality of tennis courts as poor, suggesting that there is room for improvement.

8.90 Site assessments provide a positive perception regarding the quality of tennis courts, with sites generally rated as good. The quality of private tennis clubs was rated higher than public courts, with Cirencester Tennis Club and Moreton Tennis Club, both examples of this, achieving ratings of excellent.

8.91 In consideration of the level of dissatisfaction portrayed by respondents to the household survey and limited number of public courts in the District, improvements to the quality of courts will be particularly important to ensure that residents have access to high quality opportunities for tennis, even if they have to travel to reach these. Key priorities identified through site visits include:
- Chipping Campden School Playing Fields - tennis courts require investment; and
- King George V Playing Fields Tennis Courts - Northleach - pavilion requires improvement

As well as ensuring that facilities are of appropriate quality, they should also be affordable to residents.

**TENNIS 2**

Work with providers to enhance the quality of tennis courts to meet Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) standards. Prioritise improvements at Chipping Campden School and King George V Playing Fields, Northleach.
Bowling greens

Context

8.92 There are 35 affiliated Counties to the English Bowling Association (EBA), to which a total of 2,700 clubs are members nationwide. The current national priority remains to generate interest in the game from, and increase participation figures of, young people. The scheme is a partnership initiative with the purpose of providing a pathway to enable children and young people to participate in the sport of bowls and to develop their potential to whatever appropriate level they so wish. The EBA is anticipating that all Counties will be involved during this next year so there is no reason why any young person with potential to progress in the sport should not be afforded an opportunity to be considered for these events.

8.93 The main rationale behind encouraging young people to the game is the declining membership figures across the country.

8.94 The priorities of Gloucestershire Bowling Association reflect those of the National Body and aim to promote these key aims and objectives to all clubs.

Current provision

8.95 Eight sites containing bowling greens are located within Cotswold District. These sites are as follows:

- Blockley Bowls Club
- Chipping Campden Bowling Green
- Cirencester Lawn Bowls Club
- Cotswold Water Park Bowling Green
- Fairford Bowling Club
- Moreton-in-Marsh Bowling Green
- Tetbury Bowls Club
- Weston Sub-Edge Bowling Club

8.96 Chipping Campden Bowling Green and Moreton-in-Marsh Bowling Green are the only public facilities in the District. The remaining six greens are private club sites.

8.97 All eight sites contain one green which means that the current provision of bowling greens equates to 0.10 greens per 1,000 population or one green for every 10,572 residents. All but one of these sites (Weston Sub Edge Bowling Club) is located within one of the four settlement hierarchies.

Adequacy of existing provision

8.98 A large proportion of respondents to the household survey had no opinion regarding the quantity of bowling greens (64%), suggesting a lack of demand for increased provision. Of those residents who did have an opinion, 18% suggest that the amount is about right and 15% believe there to be not enough bowling greens. This therefore provides an inconclusive perception.
The provision of bowling greens was considered to be more than sufficient to meet demand by bowls clubs responding to the sports club survey. Specifically, Moreton Bowls Club stated that there are enough facilities to accommodate increases in membership.

These findings therefore suggest that all clubs currently have access to sufficient facilities to meet their needs. Sport England Market Segmentation indicates Cotswold District has a high proportion of residents who have a propensity to play bowls.

In order to capitalise on this, and increase physical activity in these groups, as well as to enhance the appeal of bowls to a wider spectrum of the population, the opportunity to promote the sport should be taken. Support should therefore be given to bowling clubs to facilitate this activity.

Application of the accessibility standard (Map 8.3) reveals that bowling greens are located in the north and south of the District, which means that a large number of residents in the centre of the District have to travel further than the recommended 10 minutes to reach a site. Key areas of deficiency are evident in Bourton-on-the-Water and Northleach.

Although consultation did not identify the need for additional bowling greens within the District, the demand for bowling greens within Bourton-on-the-Water and Northleach should be evaluated, particularly as future population growth is expected in these areas. It may be appropriate to run taster sessions in order to gauge the level of interest. The cost of accessing such facilities should also be taken into account.

Positive perceptions regarding the quality of bowling greens were portrayed by respondents to the household survey. Over half of respondents with opinions state that the quality of bowling greens is good (51%) and 31% of residents rate the quality as average. 9% of respondents rate the quality of bowling greens as excellent. Reinforcing this, no quality issues were raised by responding bowls clubs to the sports club survey.

Accessibility mapping reveals that the majority of bowling greens in the District serve unique catchments and are therefore a valued local resource. They are also particularly important facilities to the clubs that they serve. In consideration of this, and the limited number of greens in the District, the quality of existing sites should be maintained and enhanced where improvements are identified. Site visits did not identify any priority improvements at the current time. Only Moreton-in-Marsh Bowling Club, Tetbury Bowling Club, Fairford Bowling Club and Blockley Bowling Club were however identified as being accessible to disabled users, indicating that the remaining sites are in need of access improvements.
Seek to maintain the quality of bowling greens to meet national governing body standards. Focus particularly on improvements to access at:

- Chipping Campden Bowling Green
- Cirencester Lawn Bowls Club
- Cotswold Water Park Bowling Green
- Weston Sub-Edge Bowling Club
Map 8.3 - Bowling greens in Cotswold District
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**Synthetic turf pitches**

8.106 Four full size synthetic turf pitches (STPs) are located within Cotswold District. Bourton-on-the-Water Leisure Centre is the only public site in the District, with the remaining three STPs located on educational sites.

8.107 All four STPs are sand based, which means that they are suitable for hockey but have limited function for rugby or football (they are suitable for football training only). Bourton-on-the-Water Leisure Centre is the most recently built STP (2005) and the pitch at the Royal Agricultural College is the oldest (1989), however this STP was refurbished in 2003. The pitch at Deer Park School was built in 2003 and the facility at Rendcomb College in 1999. This suggests that there is an ageing stock of STPs in the District that may require refurbishment in the short to medium term.

8.108 In addition to these four full size STPs, three five a side STPs are located in Blockley, Down Ampney and Lechlade.

8.109 Active Places Power reveals that the current provision of STPs in the District equates to 0.05 pitches per 1,000 population. Table 8.6 illustrates that this means that the amount of STPs in Cotswold District is above the national average and in line with the regional average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>STPs per 1,000 population (pitches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotswold District</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.05</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adequacy of existing provision**

8.110 An inconclusive perception regarding the provision of STPs is portrayed by respondents to the household survey with over two thirds of respondents (67%) indicating that they have no opinion regarding the quantity of STPs. Of those residents who do have an opinion, 17% indicate that there are not enough STPs and 13% feel that provision is about right.

8.111 General comments from the household survey did identify demand for additional STPs and one responding football club to the sports club survey stated that there are is a lack of training facilities in the District. These findings suggest that there is some demand for additional provision. Analysis of other sport England tools (FPM national run) indicates that there is some unmet demand for synthetic turf pitches, largely due to the capacity of existing facilities. The unmet demand is less than 1 pitch.

8.112 Application of the accessibility standard (Map 8.4) indicates that STPs are predominantly located in the north and south of the District. Despite this, the majority of residents in the Category B1, B2, C1 and C2 Settlements have access to an STP within the recommended 10 minute drive time. Only within Tetbury, Andoversford and some of the Smaller Villages are residents outside the catchment of a site.
8.113 Although these residents are outside of the catchment of an STP, there are several synthetic turf pitches located just outside of the District boundary, meaning that residents in these areas do have access to STPs. Consultation demonstrated that there is demand for a new facility in Fairford, however this is not evident through the application of standards at the current time.

8.114 In consideration of the findings of Active Places Power and the good level of access to sites within and outside of the District, there is currently no requirement for additional synthetic turf pitches. However, longer term, population growth, as well as changing patterns in participation will mean that an additional facility is required.

8.115 This facility should be located at a school site in order to maximise use of the site. Tetbury is the largest town where residents are currently outside of the catchment of a facility.

| STP 1 | Provide a new STP at a school site as the population grows. |
| Inventigate opportunities to locate this facility in Tetbury. |

8.116 Positive perceptions regarding the quality of STPs are evident from responses to the household survey. Nearly half of respondents state that the quality of STPs is good (43%) and 31% of residents indicated that the quality is average. 16% of respondents felt that the quality of STPs is poor. No specific quality issues were identified by respondents to the sports club survey.

8.117 Although the quality of STPs was generally perceived positively during consultation, based on the age of existing facilities there likely to be a requirement for the replacement of the existing carpets in the short to medium term. The actual timeframe of replacement will be dependant on the current usage of and condition of a site.

| STP 2 | Educate providers in the importance of establishing a sinking fund to ensure that ongoing refurbishments of facilities can take place. |
Athletics

8.118 No dedicated athletics tracks are located within Cotswold District. The only athletics provision is found at educational establishments, where schools mark grass athletics tracks out on a seasonal basis.

8.119 The nearest athletics tracks are located at the Prince of Wales Stadium in Cheltenham and Blackbridge Athletics Track in Gloucester. Both of these tracks are 400m synthetic with 6 lanes. There is an 8 lane straight at the Prince of Wales Stadium and a 6 lane straight at Blackbridge Athletics Track.

Adequacy of current provision

8.120 Active Places Power reveals that the regional average for athletics tracks is 0.04 lanes per 1,000 population and the national average is 0.05 lanes per 1,000 population. Based on the population of the District, this suggests that there is a requirement for a four lane athletics track. This size of track is generally a practice track.

8.121 Nearly three quarters of respondents to the household survey had no opinion regarding the quantity of athletics tracks (72%). Of those residents that did express an opinion, 20% state that there are not enough athletics tracks and only 6% indicate that provision is about right. These findings are reflective of the lack of a dedicated athletics track in the District.

8.122 Cirencester Athletics Club is the only athletics club in the District. The club is linked to Cirencester Triathlon Club and has approximately 150 members ranging from the ages of 17 to over 70. The club currently trains at Cotswold Leisure Centre in the winter months and at Deer Park School in the summer, using the grass field. Consultation with the club did not identify any specific issues with regards to the quantity of athletics tracks. However, a lack of appropriate training facilities, particularly during the winter months was identified. The lack of appropriate athletics facilities was also highlighted during workshop discussion sessions and it was indicated that this inhibits club development.

8.123 In consideration of the lack of a dedicated athletics track in the District and identified demand for additional training facilities by Cirencester Athletics Club, consideration should be given to providing a four lane practice track in the District. This facility could provide a base for Cirencester Athletics Club and support the future development of the club. Any new facility should be located in Cirencester, where there is the highest population and good transport links, as well as an existing club who are keen to use the facility.

ATHLETICS

Provide a four lane practice track in Cirencester.
**Golf courses**

**Context**

8.124 The vision for golf in England is the result of a partnership between the English Golf Union, English Ladies Golf Association (ELGA) and Professional Golfers Association developed to meet the challenges faced in the game. The vision is:

“To allow England to become the leading golfing nation in the world by providing more opportunities for participants to start, stay and succeed in the game.”

8.125 The following are identified as the key challenges for golf in England:

- The need to overcome perceptions that golf is time consuming;
- The need to maximise club membership – there is the target to grow the active members of affiliated clubs by 50,000 over the next five years;
- Retention of 18-30 year olds – perceived as low when compared to other groups;
- The need to constantly review the impact of introductory programmes – golf ranges are acknowledged as crucial facilities within the ‘start’ or FUN-damentals phase of the development pathway as identified by the Long Term Athlete Development Model. The ELGA views them as important facilities in increasing female participation levels; and
- In overall terms the target is to attract an additional 400,000 golfers into the game over the next five years.


8.126 At present there is no facility strategy for golf in England although a Golf Development Strategy has been produced to feed into the Whole Sport Plan for Golf.

8.127 The main aims of the English Golf Union (EGU) are:

- to promote the game of golf and increase people’s awareness;
- to introduce more people to golf regardless of age, gender or background;
- to provide opportunities for people to sustain their involvement and regularly participate in golf; and
- to make it easier to join a golf club by improving accessibility and affordability.

8.128 In the context of Sport England’s objectives, this strategy encompasses ‘start’ (recruitment) and ‘stay’ (retention). The EGU define three main sections in golf development:

- Junior golf (under 18) – promotion and developing opportunities;
- 18-30 year olds – retention of golfers and sustaining participation; and
- Introducing people of any age – ‘Get into Golf’ structure.
Specifically in relation to facility provision, the strategy seeks to strengthen the accessibility, affordability and quality of affiliated golf clubs in England and to develop relationships with golf ranges and other golfing facilities.

Gloucestershire Golf Union is governed by the English Golf Union, adopting the national priorities and delivering them on a regional level. The Golf Union relies heavily on co-operation from affiliated clubs to promote grass roots golf and participation by people in target groups such as women and children.

**Current provision**

There are eight golf courses within Cotswold District. Six sites are 18 hole courses and there are two 9 hole courses at Westonbirt Golf Course and Shipton Golf Course. A Par-3 Course is located at Cotswold Hill Golf Course and there is also a driving range at Broadway Golf Club.

Five of the eight golf courses allow pay and play access, which means that 63% of golf courses in the District are publicly accessible. This indicates that public access to golf courses in the District is generally good.

In addition to providing the opportunity to play golf, golf courses provide important habitats for wildlife and are therefore important in terms of biodiversity. They provide many of the priority habitats of the Gloucestershire Biodiversity Action Plan, including ponds, hedgerows, heathland and woodland.

**Adequacy of current provision**

Active Places Power, an online tool provided by Sport England to support strategic planning for sport, reveals that the current provision of golf courses in the District equates to 1.79 holes per 1,000 population. This figure is significantly above both national and regional averages, suggesting that provision is sufficient to meet needs.

**Table 8.7 - Active Places Power Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>Golf Courses per 1,000 population (number of holes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotswold District</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from the household survey provide inconclusive views regarding the quantity of golf courses, with 60% of residents having no opinion. 21% of residents believe that provision is about right while 15% of respondents indicate that there are not enough golf courses in the District.

Supporting the findings of Active Places Power, accessibility mapping (Map 8.6) reveals that nearly all residents in the District have access to a golf course within the recommended 20 minute drive time. Only residents in Lechlade and a number of small villages in the east of the District are outside the catchment of a site.
8.137 While these residents are outside the catchment of a golf course within Cotswold District, they do have access to golf courses in adjoining local authorities, such as Burford Golf Course, Highworth Community Golf Complex and The Wychwood Golf Club. This therefore negates the need for additional golf courses to be provided in the District.

8.138 Given that there is no demand for additional provision; given the overall aims of the EGU, as well as the population profile of the District (which suggests that high proportions of residents may have the propensity to enjoy golf) focus should be instead placed on improving access to existing facilities. Providing access to golf courses by public transport, as well as ensuring that the pricing structure is accessible to all residents, can increase the amount of residents who regularly visit golf courses. Site visits reveal that three golf courses (Andoversford, Cotswold Hills and Minchinhampton (situated in Stroud District), as well as the three hole course) are currently located on bus routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOLF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where possible, ensure that all golf courses are located on public transport routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with providers to ensure that the pricing structure at golf courses facilitates affordable access for local residents and consider interventions such as ‘Back to Golf’ (taster sessions to reintroduce people to the sport) to improve participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.139 The majority of respondents to the household survey consider the quality of golf courses to be good (63%). 17% rate them as average and 14% excellent. Only 6% of residents consider the quality of golf courses to be poor. These findings highlight positive perceptions regarding the quality of golf courses.

8.140 Site visits reveal that the quality of provision is high, with most facilities rated as good or excellent. Only Westonbirt Golf Course is identified as being in need of improvement (the pavilion). Ongoing maintenance and improvement of these facilities will be important if additional users are to continue using the facilities.
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Grass pitches

8.141 Grass pitches are important from both a sporting and informal recreation perspective. In addition to providing opportunities for competitive sport, grass pitches also offer residents opportunities for informal recreation, such as walking or a ‘kickabout’.

Current provision

8.142 A total of 120 sites contain grass pitches. The type of pitches located at these sites varies in terms of both sport and size.

8.143 The majority of grass pitches in the District are located on stand alone sites, such as private/voluntary sports clubs, with only a limited number of grass pitches located within larger sites, such as parks. Within the four settlement hierarchies, 38% of pitches are located on educational sites, meaning that public access to them may be limited, but also emphasising the role that provision at school sites can play.

8.144 Map 8.7 shows the distribution of grass pitches. It can be seen that when including pitches at school sites, almost all residents are within the suggested accessibility standard of a grass pitch, even though this standard is set at a walk time, which is a particularly challenging catchment. This serves to highlight the role that school sites could play in local community provision.

Adequacy of current provision

8.145 Half of respondents to the household survey had no opinion regarding the amount of grass pitches in the District. Of those residents who did have an opinion, 37% indicated that provision is about right while only 10% stated that provision is insufficient, suggesting that the provision of grass pitches is generally perceived to be adequate.

8.146 Reinforcing the household surveys findings, general comments from residents indicated that the quantity of grass pitches is perceived to be good, with at least one pitch located within the majority of settlements in the District. In contrast to these findings, a number of responding football clubs indicated that the current quantity of grass pitches is insufficient to meet demand and clubs report difficulties in accessing pitches for match play. This indicates that while there are sufficient opportunities for informal play, there is a need for more pitches that can be used for competitive football.

8.147 Application of the accessibility standard reveals that grass pitches are evenly distributed across the District, with nearly all residents having access to a site within a 10 minute walk time. Only residents within a handful of small villages are outside the catchment of a grass pitch.

8.148 Based on the above findings, there is some limited evidence to support an increase in provision at the current time. Football clubs did identify demand for additional provision and it is these groups that use facilities regularly. Given these issues, in order to provide a clear picture regarding the adequacy of playing pitch provision and to comply with Sport England policy, a playing pitch strategy should be undertaken in line with Towards a Level Playing Field. It may be that some of the deficiencies identified by clubs can be addressed by increasing access to school sites, as highlighted in Recommendation OSF 4.

Pitches 1

Undertake a playing pitch strategy in line with Towards a Level Playing Field, to provide a robust assessment of the adequacy of grass pitch provision in the District.
8.149 Over half of respondents to the household survey consider the quality of grass pitches to be good (52%). 35% of residents rate the quality of pitches as average and only 8% of respondents feel that the quality of pitches is poor. Residents therefore portray a positive perception regarding the quality of grass pitches in the District.

8.150 In contrast to the findings of the household survey, football club respondents to the sports club survey indicate that the quality of pitches is poor. Poor drainage at Council pitches was specifically identified as an issue. The need for more appropriate and high quality facilities was emphasised, and this was considered important in supporting the development of clubs in the District.

8.151 The quality of cricket and rugby pitches was perceived to be good by respondents to the sports club survey. However, disabled access, changing facilities and parking were identified as issues. This suggests that infrastructure improvements are required at grass pitch sites.

8.152 Site assessments reveal that grass pitch sites are generally rated as being in good condition. Sites were identified as being well kept with the sports equipment in good condition. However, Leighterton Playing Fields, Moreton-in-Marsh Football Club, Lower Oddington Sports Field and Withington Cricket Ground were stated as being in poor condition and in need of enhanced maintenance.

8.153 Other specific improvements identified during site visits are as follows:

- Four Acres Playing Field – repair clubhouse
- Withington Cricket Club – repair pitches and tidy site
- Moreton-in-Marsh FC – improve quality of pitches and post
- Stow-on-the-Wold Cricket Club – pavilion in need of repair
- Rodmarton Cricket Club – grass needed cutting at time of site visit
- George Lane Sports Ground, Chipping Campden – improve pitch surface
- Upper Dowdes Cricket Club – improved signage and access required. Pitch appeared unused
- Sir William Romney School – replace cricket nets

8.154 Providers should seek to enhance the quality of grass pitches in the District.

PITCHES 2

Support providers (through planning and guidance) to enhance the quality of pitch provision across the district focusing particularly on the issues identified above.
**Water sports**

8.155 Water sports are popular within Cotswold District. Many activities take place in the District including angling, sailing and water skiing and there are many established clubs including South Cerney Angling Club and Bowmoor Sailing Club.

8.156 The Cotswold Water Park is Britain’s largest man-made group of lakes (140 lakes) and covers an area of 40 square miles. The site provides a wide range of water-based activities including canoeing/kayaking, waterskiing and windsurfing. The site is regularly used and is a vital resource for residents of and visitors to Cotswold District.

8.157 Increasing access to the Cotswold Water Park was identified as a key issue throughout consultation. In light of this and the strategic importance of the Cotswold Water Park, access to this site should be increased. The water park contains approximately 150km of pathways, bridleways and cycleways and the Council should seek to link this network of green corridors to the wider Green Infrastructure Network in the District. In light of the usage of the water park by visitors, increasing access to this site by public transport will also be important.

| WATERSPORTS 1 | Seek to increase access to Cotswold Water Park through the development of the Green Infrastructure Network and public transport routes. Work to achieve connectivity between the network of pathways, bridleways and cycleways in the Water Park and the remainder of the district. |

8.158 In addition to increasing access to Cotswold Water Park the Council should continue to promote water sports activities, clubs and venues in the District. For example, by updating the Cotswold Leisure Directory and providing further information on the Council website. More promotion may ultimately increase usage from both residents and visitors, therefore contributing to the sustainability of the water sports and tourism economy in the district.

| WATERSPORTS 2 | Continue to promote water sports activities and venues in the District by updating the Cotswold Leisure Directory and providing further information on the Council website. |

**Cycling and walking**

8.159 The Cotswolds AONB and large areas of countryside offer walkers and cyclists a number of recreational opportunities in the District. The Cotswold Hills, networks of country lanes and other terrains provide users with a variety of different routes to travel around the District.

8.160 Cotswold District Council promotes cycling and walking by providing maps of different routes and there are a number of bicycle hire shops dispersed throughout the district. The variety of cycling and walking routes attracts a large number of visitors and many cycling and walking holidays take place in the District. To maintain and increase participation in sport and recreation and encourage healthy lifestyles, the Council should continue to promote cycling and walking routes in the District. Improvements to the amount of cycle routes and pedestrian walkways have emerged as a key priority throughout this study, and walking and cycling routes are discussed further in Section 12, Green Corridors.
Summary

8.161 Outdoor sports facilities are a wide ranging category of open space which includes both natural and artificial surfaces for sport and recreation. Facilities can be owned and managed by councils, sports associations, schools and individual sports clubs, with the primary purpose of participation in outdoor sports. Examples include:

- playing pitches;
- athletics tracks;
- bowling greens; and
- tennis courts.

8.162 In addition to these facilities, water sports, cycling and walking are also popular in Cotswold District. There are a large number of venues/routes for these activities to take place and the Cotswold Water Park is an important site for residents and visitors.

8.163 A local standard has been set for outdoor sports facilities in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility. The local quantity standard should be used for broad planning purposes only, to determine the likely impact of new development on the demand for sports facilities in the area.

8.164 For each sport, this section considers the key issues that have been considered at an overview level. In order to accurately define the need for playing pitches in the district, and in line with Sport England policy, a full playing pitch strategy, in line with the methodology set out in Towards a Level Playing Field, should be undertaken. This is particularly important given the issues raised, which suggest that there are deficiencies of pitches in the district.

8.165 The key issues arising from analysis of the current provision and consultation with regards to outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

- Tennis Courts – The majority residents have access to a tennis court within the recommended catchment, however, there is a lack of public access to facilities, with many courts being located on school sites. Dissatisfaction is evident with the amount of tennis courts, and agreements to access facilities on school sites should be prioritised, particularly in Tetbury;

- Bowling Greens – The current quantity of bowling greens is sufficient to meet demand and the quality of existing provision is good. However, accessibility deficiencies are evident in the centre of the District. While there is no evidence to suggest that additional bowling greens are required, taster sessions should be run in larger settlements without greens (Bourton-on-the-Water and Northleach) in order to establish demand. The characteristics of the population suggest that the propensity of residents to participate in sports such as bowls is high;
• Synthetic Turf Pitches – The quantity of STPs is generally sufficient to meet demand although there are some areas where residents are outside of the catchment for appropriate facilities and some reports of difficulties accessing facilities for training. In the short term, focus should be placed on enhancing the quality of existing STPs, particularly as some are nearing the end of their lifespan, through the implementation of sinking funds (money set aside over time to support the replacement of the facility). Longer term, and as population grows, new provision will be required. The location of existing facilities suggests that Tetbury would be the optimum location for new provision;

• Athletics Tracks – There is no dedicated athletics track in the District. Consultation indicates that there is demand for such a facility, particularly in Cirencester where there is an existing successful club that struggles to find appropriate facilities. Consideration should be given to the provision of a four lane practice track in the District, located within Cirencester;

• Golf Courses – The amount of golf courses is adequate to meet demand and nearly all residents have access to a site within or in close proximity to the District. The quality of existing provision is also high and focus should therefore be placed on increasing access to existing facilities and ensuring that these sites are accessible to all sectors of the population;

• Grass Pitches – The current provision of grass pitches is generally perceived to be adequate, although football clubs identify unmet demand. A series of quality improvements are required to existing sites and to meet unmet demand, it will be necessary to improve access to school facilities. A full playing pitch strategy in line with Towards a Level Playing Field should be carried out in order to refine these issues;

• Water sports – water sports are particularly popular in Cotswold District and there are a variety of opportunities for residents and visitors. Further promotion of these opportunities, as well as facilitating the ongoing development and improvement of such venues would ensure that the role of these sports in the district continues. A lack of access to the Cotswolds Water Park arose as a key issue throughout consultations and improving access to this site is a key priority.

8.166 It is therefore recommended that the key priorities for the future delivery of provision for outdoor sports facilities in Cotswold District that should be addressed through the Local Development Framework include:

• protect all outdoor sports facilities from development in line with Sport England policies and exception criteria;
• support improvements to the quality of outdoor sports facilities. Sites should meet National Governing Body criteria;
• seek to increase access to outdoor sports facilities in the District through the development of the Green Infrastructure Network and improvement of public transport routes;
• negotiate community use of all school outdoor sports facilities, using guidance set out in the Sport England document Win Win. This will be particularly important for tennis courts. Sir William Romney School in Tetbury should be treated as a particular priority;
• provide a 4 lane athletics training track in Cirencester;
• prioritise qualitative enhancements of bowling greens and synthetic turf pitches and provide a new synthetic term pitch (potentially in Tetbury) as the population increases; and
• undertake a Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) in line with Towards a Level Playing Field to further investigate the specific demand for pitches.
9. Indoor Sports Facilities

Introduction

9.1 PPG17 states that it is essential to consider the role that indoor sports facilities play in meeting the needs of local residents.

9.2 The methodology for the assessment of indoor facilities is slightly different to other PPG17 typologies in that specific demand modelling can be undertaken in line with Sport England parameters. As such, Sport England's Facilities Planning Model (FPM) and Active Places Power have been used to assess local demand, supplemented by feedback from local consultation, to ensure that the findings and key priorities are based on understanding local needs and expectations.

9.3 It should be noted that, given the wider catchments that indoor sports facilities serve, it is not deemed appropriate to assess facilities on a settlement by settlement basis.

9.4 The main facilities included within this category for Cotswold District are:

- Sports halls
- Swimming pools
- Health and fitness facilities
- Indoor bowls facilities
- Community Halls

9.5 The provision of indoor sports facilities that meet local and national standards will be key to the delivery of local, regional and national objectives, including those of Sport England and the County Sports Partnership, which have been reviewed in section eight of this report.

Consultation

9.6 General findings from the research and consultation undertaken for this study relevant to indoor sports facilities are summarised below and overleaf:

- household survey results show that:
  - 23% of residents use sports halls (8% at least once a week) and 41% of residents use community halls (13% at least once a week);
  - 50% of residents use swimming pools (13% at least once a week);
  - 23% of residents use health and fitness facilities (7% at least once a week); and
  - 3% of residents use indoor bowls facilities (1% at least once a week)

- the majority of respondents to the household survey consider the provision of all types of indoor sports facilities to be adequate, with only a relatively small proportion stating that there are not enough facilities at present:
- only 10% of residents consider there to be ‘not enough’ sports halls and only 8% of residents consider there to be ‘not enough’ community halls;
- only 10% of residents consider there to be ‘not enough’ swimming pools; and
- only 8% of residents consider there to be ‘not enough’ health and fitness facilities.

- a relatively large proportion of household survey respondents did not have an opinion on the quality of indoor sports facilities, however of those that did, the majority consider provision to be average or good (with the exception of indoor bowls which is rated poorly), specifically:
  - swimming pools: 18% rate pools as excellent, 49% rate them as good, 23% rate them average and 11% rate them as poor;
  - sports halls: 9% rate sports halls as excellent, 49% rate them as average, 34% rate them as good and 9% rate them as poor;
  - community halls: 9% rate community halls as excellent, 51% rate them as good, 33% rate them as average and 8% rate them as poor;
  - health and fitness suites: 12% rate health and fitness suites as excellent, 51% rate them as good, 29% rate them as average and 9% rate them as poor; and
  - indoor bowls: 7% rate indoor bowls facilities as excellent, 30% rate them as good, 32% rate them as average and 32% rate them as poor.

- findings show that a higher proportion of respondents in the Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements) and Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements) consider indoor sports facilities to be poor quality;

- workshop sessions with key stakeholders highlighted that:
  - the provision of village/community halls in the District is viewed as a key strength. These facilities were identified as being well used and providing a vital resource to the local community. Many of the rural communities have village halls and they provide a local opportunity for residents; and
  - community access to secondary school sports facilities was also identified as a strength.

- respondents to the sports club survey indicated that the quality of indoor sports facilities is good or average. The key issues affecting clubs were perceived to be a lack of voluntary assistance and membership retention;

- 67% of children surveyed said that they consider the indoor sports facilities near their home to be ‘clean and tidy’ and 31% said that they are ‘new and in good condition’; and

- 44% of young people surveyed said that they perceive indoor sports facilities to be ‘clean, tidy and well-maintained’, whilst 19% said that they are ‘in need of some improvements’. 12% consider indoor sports facilities to be poor.

9.7 At the drop in sessions, access to indoor facilities, particularly in the North of the District, was perceived to be a key issue. As well as issue with transportation to facilities, it was highlighted that some facilities exist (specifically the Fire College in Moreton-in-Marsh) which have limited opening times or restricted access for residents. It was suggested that there are no accessible facilities for residents in this part of the District.
9.8 According to the Active People 3 survey (outlined in more detail in Section 8) 73% of residents in Cotswold District are satisfied with the quality of sports facilities. This has increased significantly from the Active People Survey 2 (2007/08).

9.9 Cost was not raised as an issue with indoor sports facilities during consultations, although it was highlighted as being important to ensure that facilities are accessible to all (through concessionary rates etc).

**Current position**

9.10 A broad review of indoor sport and recreation facilities has been undertaken to guide future planning within Cotswold District. This review was based on the Active Places database, the Facilities Planning Model (FPM) and relevant information gleaned from consultation.

9.11 This review considers the facilities owned by Cotswold District Council and also takes into account facilities owned by other providers, including schools and commercial providers.

9.12 Provision of sports halls (including community/village halls), swimming pools, health and fitness facilities and indoor bowls has been considered in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility. For clarity, the provision of each type of facility is considered individually.

**Quality**

9.13 The PPG17 Companion Guide reinforces that design and management are factors integral to the successful delivery of a network of high quality sport and recreation, stating that:

“**Quality depends on two things: the needs and expectations of users, on the one hand, and design, management and maintenance on the other**”.

9.14 Quality standards are therefore subdivided into two components, specifically:

- Management and maintenance
- Design specification

9.15 The key objectives underpinning this are:

- to ensure that high standards of management and customer service are attained, which meet or exceed customer expectation and lead to a quality leisure experience for all users of facilities; and
- to provide clear guidance relating to facility specifications, ensuring suitability of design for the targeted range of sports and standards of play as well as individual requirements for specialist sports and uses.

**Management of indoor facilities**

9.16 Quest is the UK Quality Scheme for Sport and Leisure and is sponsored by Sport England, Sport Scotland, the Sports Council for Wales and Sport Northern Ireland. It is a quality accreditation and seen as a tool for continuous improvement, designed primarily for the management of leisure facilities and leisure development. Quest defines industry standards and good practice and encourages their ongoing development and delivery within a customer focused management framework.
9.17 The Quest accreditation is therefore synonymous with high quality and good practice and achievement of this at facilities across the District should be targeted. Some of the benefits of Quest include:

- Quest can help achieve best value, through the external assessment and benchmarking of services
- It provides a framework for continuous improvement, facilitating service enhancement and reducing the costs of poor quality
- Financial improvement to performance, through a planned approach to improved effectiveness
- Encouraging staff ownership and development.

9.18 At present there are no facilities within the District that have achieved Quest accreditation.

9.19 As well as reflecting Quest practice, the management of indoor sports facilities should reflect the views and aspirations of the local community. Residents consider the following key issues to be of particular importance in the provision of a high quality indoor facility:

- Cleanliness of changing facilities (17%)
- Maintenance of facility (13%)
- Cost of facilities (13%)
- Range of activities (12%).

9.20 The recommended local quality standard for indoor sports facilities is summarised below. The aspirations are derived directly from the findings of local consultations.

**Quality Standard - Indoor sports facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Secure parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate maintenance of facilities</td>
<td>Welcoming staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs that are accessible to all residents</td>
<td>Clear booking procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of activities</td>
<td>Accessible routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and specification in line with National Governing Body (NGB) requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.21 Improvements to the quality of existing facilities were highlighted as being of greater importance than increases in the overall quantity of provision.
9.22 In line with PPG17 recommendations, in addition to establishing a quality vision for sports facilities based on local community needs, facilities should meet with appropriate technical specifications.

Quality Standard (design and technical)

| QS 1 | All new build and refurbishment schemes to be designed in accordance with Sport England Guidance Notes, which provide detailed technical advice and standards for the design and development of sports facilities. |

9.23 A full list of Sport England Design Guidance Notes can be found on the Sport England website and are available to download free at http://www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/design_guidance_notes.aspx.

9.24 The space requirement for most sports depends on the standard of play - generally the higher the standard, the larger the area required. Although the playing area is usually of the same dimensions, there is a need to build in provision for increased safety margins, increased clearance height, spectator seating, etc. Similarly, design specification varies according to the level of competition with respect to flooring type and lighting lux levels, for example.

9.25 Sport England Design Guidance Notes are based on eight standards of play. Consideration should be given to the desired specification of the facility in question at the outset.

Supply and demand analysis - developing standards

9.26 In order to evaluate the adequacy of existing facilities, supply is compared to estimated demand. The foundation of all demand assessments is the analysis of the demographic nature of the resident population within the local authority area. Consideration is also given to the impact of facilities in surrounding local authorities.

9.27 The findings of supply and demand models should inform the development of provision standards. Quantity standards should only be applied through the planning process where new facilities are required, and where part of the need for new provision is generated by the impact of the new development. The application of provision standards will be critical in the event of significant population growth.

9.28 Sport England’s Facilities Planning Model (FPM) is a key tool for measuring the supply and demand for sports halls and swimming pools. The national runs conducted in 2008 and 2009 were based on over 65,000 records collected as part of the National Benchmarking Service as well as specific surveys carried out across the country with the purpose of updating the FPM. The parameters used in the FPM are therefore directly representative of usage. This means that the use of the FPM for analysis of the provision of sports halls and swimming pools provides a robust understanding of supply and demand in an area and consequently of the adequacy of supply to meet demand.

9.29 The FPM considers the quantity and type of provision, as well as the appropriateness of the facility to meet the needs of residents in its catchment area. The adequacy of existing indoor sports provision is discussed by typology over the following pages.
Sport halls

Context

9.30 Within Cotswold District there are currently 16 facilities that contain sports halls, which comprise 21 sports halls. Sport England planning tools measure halls according to the number of badminton courts that they offer. In Cotswold District, there is a total of 55 badminton courts. Of these, two facilities have halls containing more than four badminton courts; at Cotswold Leisure Cirencester (6 court hall) and The Cotswold School (8 courts in total including a 5 court hall plus a two and a one court hall). Table 9.1 overleaf provides information on each of these sites.

9.31 The FPM only includes sports halls available for community use that are 3 badminton courts or more in size, and ancillary halls where on the same site. The level of community access is also considered. Cotswold District has a total supply of 36 badminton courts which fit within the Sport England definitions. This is the equivalent of 25 courts when taking into account the hours that the facilities are available for community use. In terms of provision per 10,000 population, this equates to 4.2 courts per 10,000 population which is above both the regional (4.0 courts) and national averages (3.8 courts).

9.32 The provision of sports halls in Cotswold District is illustrated in map 9.1 overleaf and then summarised in Table 9.1.
Map 9.1 - Provision of sports halls in Cotswold District
Table 9.1 Sports halls in Cotswold District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Number of Badminton Courts</th>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Campden Sports Centre - Chipping Campden</td>
<td>1 court hall and 4 court hall</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester Deer Park School - Cirencester</td>
<td>1 court hall and 4 court hall</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>1966 (1 court hall) and 1992 (4 court hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coln House School - Fairford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold Leisure - Tetbury</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold Leisure - Cirencester</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairford Sports Centre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service College Leisure Club - Moreton-in-Marsh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechlade Memorial Hall and Pavilion - Lechlade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Star College - Ullenwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternoster School - Cirencester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendcomb College - Cirencester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Romneys School - Tetbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chedworth Village Hall - Chedworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cotswold School</td>
<td>1 court hall and 2 court hall</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association / Private (5 courts)</td>
<td>1950. 5 court hall built 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westonbirt Sports Centre</td>
<td>1 court hall and 4 court hall</td>
<td>Private Use / Pay and Play (4 courts)</td>
<td>1950 (1 court hall), 4 court hall built 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of existing provision**

9.33 Consultation demonstrates that the quality of facilities is particularly important to local residents. The age of facilities, along with the quality of the sites may influence how likely residents are to use facilities.
9.34 Site visits were undertaken by the Council which identified that:

- the Cotswold School Leisure Facilities are in excellent condition;
- Tetbury Leisure Centre is in excellent condition; and
- the Cotswold Leisure Centre, Cirencester is a high quality and well used facility.

9.35 Analysis of the Active Places data also shows that four of the halls were built recently, specifically:

- The Cotswold School - five court hall (2009)
- Cirencester Leisure Centre - six court hall (2006)
- Paternoster School – one court hall (2006)
- Westonbirt Sports Centre – four court hall (2005)

9.36 In addition, sports halls at National Star College and Rendcomb College were refurbished in 2008. Facilities that are more than 5 - 10 years old are likely to be poorer in quality, especially those that have never been refurbished.

**Quantity of provision**

9.37 As mentioned above, Sport England’s Facilities Planning Model looks at the current supply of sports halls against demand, identifies any unmet demand (i.e. demand from Cotswold District residents not currently being met by supply) and also the Used Capacity (i.e. how well used the facilities are).

9.38 The Sport England Facility Planning model considers the adequacy of provision to meet demand in 2009 and also looks ahead 10 years to project the situation in 2019. As well as considering facilities that are within Cotswold District, it takes into account the impact of sites that fall outside of the district boundaries but are located in such a place that they still serve some residents of the district. As highlighted previously, the supply of sports halls is measured in the number of badminton courts. Demand is based on the estimated number of visits to a leisure centre per week, drawing on the demographics of the population.

9.39 The key findings from the FPM data run are that:

- the current supply of sports halls which are available for community use is sufficient to meet demand from the resident population in most parts of the District;
- unmet demand (i.e. demand from Cotswold District residents which is not currently being met by supply) across the whole District is equivalent to the capacity of about half of a four badminton court sports hall. However, this unmet demand is spread thinly across the District and there are no specific parts of the district demonstrating high levels of unmet demand;
- the model indicates that 1 sports hall is currently operating at above 80% of capacity (i.e. above ‘comfortable capacity’) - Tetbury. This means that more people want to visit this leisure centre than the facility can cope with;
- by 2019, the model estimates that, assuming there is no change to sports hall provision in the District in that time, the supply of sports halls that will be available for community use will still be sufficient to meet demand from the resident population in most parts of the District;
by 2019, demand for sports halls will increase by the equivalent of a quarter of a four badminton court sports hall. (This figure excludes any future increase in demand due to a growth in sports participation);

as a result, unmet demand for sports halls will increase by the equivalent of a quarter of a four badminton court sports halls. Unmet demand will continue to be spread thinly across the District, with no area demonstrating high levels of unmet demand; and

usage levels at existing sports halls will increase to accommodate the additional demand. The impact of this will be that 1 further sports hall will be operating at above 80% of capacity, taking the total to 2 - Cirencester and Tetbury

9.40 As detailed earlier; consultation undertaken for this study indicated that most residents consider current sports hall provision to be adequate, with:

• over one third of household survey respondents (39%) considering the quantity of sports halls in the Cotswolds to be ‘about right/more than enough’. Only 10% considered there to be ‘not enough’ sports halls in the District;

• more residents in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements) considering the quantity of sports hall provision to be ‘not enough’ compared to other areas of the District; and

• respondents to the sports club survey indicating that the quality of sports halls is good or average.

Access to facilities

9.41 Access to facilities is perhaps the most important determinant of the adequacy of facilities. The findings of the household survey show that 64% of residents expect to travel to a sports hall by car. The average expected travel time is 16 minutes and the most common response is 15 minutes.

9.42 Similar travel modes are portrayed in the Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements) and Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements). However, residents in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) (57%) and Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements) (59%) would expect to walk to a sports hall. This may reflect the more urban nature of these settlement hierarchies.

9.43 The most common response in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres (Category C1 and C2 Settlements) is consistent with the District wide figure of 15 minutes. However, residents in Cirencester and the Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 Settlements) expect to travel less time to access a sports hall (10 minutes). Average travel times range from 11 minutes in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) to 18 minutes in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements).

9.44 Map 9.2 overleaf therefore illustrates the distribution of existing sports halls and demonstrates the catchments, based on a 15 minute drive time catchment (the District wide average). It categorises provision according to the access type, and includes pay and play (public access), private (accessible to members / school pupils only) and sports club access (prearranged sports club access but no public pay and play facilities).
Map 9.2 - Sports Hall Provision in Cotswold District
9.45 Map 9.2 indicates that there is a good distribution of sports halls both in and in close proximity to Cotswold District. This means that nearly all residents have access to a sports hall within the recommended 15 minute drive time. There are however some issues relating to sports facilities and the degree to which they are open and accessible to the general public.

9.46 The FPM data indicates that in terms of access to sports halls:

- 49% of unmet demand is due to residents without access to a car living outside the walking catchment of a sports hall. This is below the regional average (64%) and national average (65%); and

- 51% of unmet demand is due to residents with access to a car living outside driving catchment of a sports hall. This is significantly above the regional average (15%) and national average (8%).

9.47 Given the rural nature of many parts of the District, it is unrealistic to expect that all residents could access a sports hall on foot. Supporting this, local consultation highlighted that most residents expect to drive to use an indoor sports facility. In addition to the larger sports halls, there is a range of smaller community and village halls that act as local facilities and can host a range of activities including dance, yoga, martial arts and aerobics etc. providing a particularly valuable resource in the more rural settlements. These facilities supplement the provision of sports halls and are particularly important in those areas where residents have to travel further to reach a hall.

**Key findings - Sports halls**

9.48 Analysis of the quantity, quality and accessibility of sports halls indicates that overall, there is sufficient quantity to meet demand in most parts of the District, now and in 2019. Sports hall provision per 10,000 population in the Cotswolds is also above regional and national average levels.

9.49 Where there is unmet demand, this is spread thinly across the District (and will continue to be in the future), with no areas demonstrating high levels of unmet demand. This suggests that there are no locations where a new sports hall is required.

9.50 Only Tetbury Leisure Centre is currently operating at above a comfortable level (i.e. above 80% of capacity). However, by 2019 Cirencester Leisure Centre is predicted to also be operating above capacity.

9.51 Application of the accessibility standard indicates that there is a good distribution of sports halls in and in close proximity to Cotswold District, meaning that nearly all residents have access to a site within the recommended 15 minute drive time.

9.52 Given the levels of existing provision, the focus should be on:

- increasing the ‘theoretical’ capacity of existing facilities, either by increasing the hours available for community use, or by refurbishing poorer quality facilities – this will reduce the pressure on Tetbury Leisure Centre and Cirencester Leisure Centre and ensure that these facilities can continue to meet the needs of residents. Issues have also been identified in the north of the District with regards restrictions on access to sites - this should be investigated and access increased to maximise the supply of facilities;

- developing future investment strategies for core facilities to ensure that sports halls and changing facilities are adequately maintained and refurbished;
• ensuring that the programming of all sports facilities is complementary and works to achieve the maximum benefit for the local community. Programming in large core facilities should link with the schedule of activity in smaller village halls, providing an overall network of opportunities for residents;

• ensuring that the cost of accessing facilities is appropriate for different client groups; and

• the providers of indoor sports facilities striving to achieve the quality vision and where possible, larger sites should work towards Quest accreditation, the national benchmark for quality.

9.53 Any rationalisation of the existing stock of sports halls will have an impact on the usage levels at other nearby facilities, and may lead to capacity being reached and additional unmet demand being created. Additionally, significant participation increases will also impact on the ability of the current stock of facilities to meet demand. Specific ‘scenario test’ runs of the model would be needed to assess the likely implications of these issues and this can be arranged directly with Sport England should the need arise.

9.54 The impact of new housing developments should be assessed using the Sport England Facility Calculator which provides estimates of the impact of the additional population in terms of demand for facilities. This can be found at: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/sports_facility_calculator.aspx. The calculator indicates that for 1000 residents, demand would be equivalent to circa 0.26 badminton courts.

**Community halls / village halls**

*Current provision*

9.55 In addition to the sports halls identified above, 87 community halls/ village halls have been identified in the Cotswolds. Map 9.3 overleaf identifies the location of these facilities.
Map 9.3  Community halls and village halls in Cotswold District
9.56 The facilities outlined on Map 9.3 were identified via a comprehensive audit by the District Council using the Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) database. In addition to the above, the majority of the schools in the Cotswolds have some form of hall which potentially could be used for recreational activities. This further enhances the supply of community hall facilities across the District.

9.57 Map 9.3 demonstrates that there is a good spread of community/village hall facilities across the District. These provide important local facilities especially in the more rural areas and most have small halls, many of which are suitable for activities such as yoga and aerobics. These therefore to an extent negate the need for further sports halls and reduce the pressure on existing halls, as in many instances, they fulfil the role of a sports hall.

9.58 The main findings from the household survey relating to community/village halls were as follows:

- **Quantity** - almost half (48%) of respondents think the amount of provision is about right or more than enough, whilst only 8% stated that there are not enough. The remainder had no opinion
- **Quality** - 59% rated the quality of community/village halls as excellent or good, 33% rated the quality as average and only 8% as poor
- **Accessibility** - Almost two thirds (62%) of household survey respondents said they would expect to walk to a community/village hall with a journey time of 5-10 minutes. This reinforces the importance of a good spread of local community/village hall facilities
- **Usage** - these types of facilities are regularly used, with 16% of residents indicating that they use community/village halls at least once a week.

9.59 Other consultations reinforced the value of community/village halls in the District. The large number of village/community halls in Cotswold District was identified as a strength by attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop. These types of facilities were perceived to be particularly important in the small villages, where there is a lack of dedicated indoor sports facilities, and were identified as being well used and providing a vital resource to the local community.

9.60 It is recommended that wider and targeted promotion and delivery of sport and physical activities across the District takes place and that more use is made of community/village halls for physical activities and sports development programmes. This is especially important in more rural parts of the District. Programming of these facilities should be linked with that at larger core facilities, providing a complementary network of opportunities and maximising the number of activities that are available to residents.

**Swimming pools**

**Context**

9.61 There are currently 10 indoor swimming pools (across 8 sites) in Cotswold District. Of these six meet Sport England criteria for inclusion - they are indoor pools available for community use, which are 20m or more in length, or at least 160 m², plus any smaller pools on the same site.

9.62 These six pools provide a total of 1,260m² of water space (the equivalent of 976 m² when taking into account the hours that the facilities are available). The provision of the swimming pools in the District is outlined in Table 9.2 overleaf.

9.63 There are three pool facilities owned by the Council – the remaining facilities are on school sites or are commercial facilities.
9.64 The provision of swimming pools in the Cotswolds is illustrated in Map 9.4 overleaf and then summarised in the table that follows.
Map 9.4 - Provision of swimming pools in Cotswold District
Table 9.2 - Provision of swimming pools in the Cotswolds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Size (m²)</th>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourton-on-the Water Leisure Centre</td>
<td>25x9</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcot Spa</td>
<td>16 X 7 3.5x1.5</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Campden Sports Centre</td>
<td>18x9</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold Leisure Cirencester</td>
<td>25x12.5 12.5x10</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service College Leisure Club</td>
<td>25x9</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Spa At Stratton Place</td>
<td>18x5</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Star College</td>
<td>18x10</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westonbirt Sports Centre</td>
<td>25x8.5</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of existing provision

9.65 Analysis of the Active Places data also shows that five of the pools were built in the last 10 years, specifically:

- Calcot Spa (2003)
- Cotswold Leisure Cirencester (2006)
- National Star College (2000 and refurbished in 2008)
- Westonbirt Leisure Centre (2005)

9.66 In addition, pools at the other three sites have all been refurbished since they were first built.

9.67 As mentioned earlier, Sport England's Facilities Planning Model looks at the current supply of swimming pools (in m²) and measures this against demand (calculated by the number of visits per week. This enables the identification of any unmet demand (i.e. demand from Cotswold District residents not currently being met by supply) and also the Used Capacity (i.e. how well used the facilities are). It looks at the 2009 position as well as considering the likely situation in 10 years time. The model takes into account the level of access provided at each site - for example it recognises that public swim is not available at Calcot Spa.

9.68 The key findings from the FPM data run are that:

- in terms of provision per 10,000 population, this equates to 14.8 m² per 10,000 population which is above both the regional average and national average of 12.9 m²;
• demand for pool space in 2009 is 788m² increasing 822m² in 2019 – this means that the total supply of swimming pools in the District is above the estimated level of demand;

• 10.8% of total demand is not being satisfied by supply (i.e. unmet demand) – this compares to 8.6% regionally and 9.2% nationally. This is equivalent to 85m² in 2009 and 89m² in 2019. As highlighted above, none of this unmet demand however is due to lack of swimming pool capacity and is instead related to the location of facilities;

• 58.4% of overall capacity of swimming pools is being used at peak times compared to 56.8% regionally and 57.5% nationally. By 2019 this is expected to increase to 66.6%; and

• At present no swimming pools are operating at or above ‘comfortable capacity’ of 70%. However, by 2019 it is expected that three pools will be operating above capacity, these are Chipping Campden, Cirencester and Westonbirt.

9.69 As detailed earlier; consultation undertaken for this study indicated that most residents consider current swimming pool provision to be adequate, with 44% considering the quantity of swimming pools in the Cotswolds to be ‘about right/more than enough’. Only 10% considered there to be ‘not enough’ swimming pools in the District.

9.70 Although there is overall satisfaction with regards the quality / quantity of swimming pools, views however varied slightly according to location in the district. In particular residents in the North of the district were significantly less positive about provision than those in the south. The Fire Station swimming pool was highlighted as a particular example of a facility which had restricted opening hours and the suitability of the pool at this facility for all sectors of the population (i.e. the depth of the pool) was also questioned by residents at the drop in session. If access to this facility is not improved, pressure on other sites will increase.

Access to facilities

9.71 Findings of the household survey and other consultations show that:

• 68% of residents expect to travel to a swimming pool by car. The average expected travel time is 17 minutes and the most common response is 20 minutes;

• similar travel modes are evident in the settlement hierarchies. However, the majority of residents in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) expect to walk to a swimming pool (64%). This may reflect the urban nature of Cirencester and location of existing provision; and

• the overall modal response (20 minutes) is mirrored in the Market Towns and Small Towns (Category B2 and C1 Settlements). However, residents in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements) and Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) expect to travel for less time to access a pool (10 minutes).

9.72 Cost was not raised as an issue with indoor sports facilities during consultations, although it was highlighted as being important to ensure that facilities are accessible to all (through concessionary rates etc).

9.73 Map 9.5 overleaf therefore illustrates the distribution of existing swimming pools and demonstrates the catchments, based on a 20 minute drive time (the district wide most common response).
Map 9.5 - Swimming Pool Provision in Cotswold District
9.74 It can be seen that when considering access by car, nearly all residents have access to a swimming pool within a 20 minute drive time. In order to assess the degree to which demand is met by the supply of facilities, the FPM takes into account the location of existing swimming pools and the likely means of transport that people will use to reach the site. It also takes into account the profile of the population and the type of facilities that are provided to serve the population.

9.75 The FPM data indicates that in terms of access to swimming pools, 82% of demand is satisfied for those who travel by car compared to just 18% who travel on foot – which is higher than the regional average (15%) and national average (17.7%).

9.76 However, given the rural nature of many parts of the District, it is unrealistic to expect that all residents could access a swimming pool on foot, local consultation highlighted that most residents expect to drive to use an indoor sports facility. Most residents in Cirencester (Category B1 settlement) are able to access a pool on foot, and it is in this town where consultation revealed that demand for local access is highest.

9.77 The FPM data indicates that in terms of access to swimming pools:

- 52% of unmet demand is due to residents without access to a car living outside walking catchment of a swimming pool. This is significantly below the regional average (67%) and national average (81%); and
- 48% of unmet demand is due to residents with access to a car living outside driving catchment of a sports hall. This is significantly above the regional average (31%) and national average (19%).

**Key findings – swimming pools**

9.78 Analysis of the quantity, quality and accessibility of swimming pools indicates that swimming pool provision in the Cotswolds is currently sufficient to meet demand. Provision per 1,000 population is higher than the regional and national average levels.

9.79 Whilst 10% of demand is currently unmet, this is spread across the District and there is not sufficient unmet demand in a single location to justify a new facility. In addition the total unmet demand is only equivalent to 85m² (89m² in 2019).

9.80 None of the unmet demand is due to lack of swimming pool capacity. Instead it is due to the residents living outside the recommended walk time/drive time of a pool. This reflects the rural nature of the District.

9.81 Supply of water space in 2009 and 2019 exceeds demand. There is currently spare capacity in existing pools to cater for increased demand. By 2019, however, three of the pools will be at or nearing capacity (Chipping Campden, Cirencester and Westonbirt). This means that increasing access to other facilities will be essential, in order to take pressure off these sites. Analysis of the Active Places data for swimming pools shows that many of the facilities are relatively new which suggests they are in good condition. Those facilities that are older have all been refurbished.

9.82 While there is overall satisfaction with provision, some issues were raised particularly with regards access to facilities and opening hours of facilities in the North of the District. Improved access to the Fire Station in Moreton-in-Marsh should be treated as high priority.

9.83 Despite this, accessibility mapping reveals that nearly all residents have access to a swimming pool within the recommended 20 minute drive time. Only a small proportion of residents in the small villages are outside the catchment of a site.
9.84 As with sports halls, given the high levels of existing provision, the focus should be on:

- developing future investment strategies for larger leisure centres to ensure that swimming pools and changing facilities are adequately maintained and refurbished;
- ensuring that the schedule of activity in all swimming pools is complementary and works to achieve the maximum benefit for the local community;
- ensuring that facilities are accessible to residents at appropriate times – this is essential, as increased opening hours at sites where access is currently restricted will reduce the reliance on other facilities;
- ensuring that the cost of accessing facilities is appropriate for different client groups; and
- the providers of indoor sports facilities striving to achieve the quality vision and where possible, larger sites should work towards Quest accreditation, the national benchmark for quality.

9.85 The impact of new housing developments should be assessed using the Sport England Facility Calculator which provides estimates of the impact of the additional population in terms of demand for water space. This can be found at [http://www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/sports_facility_calculator.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/sports_facility_calculator.aspx). The calculator indicates that for 1000 residents, demand would be equivalent to circa 9.17m².

**Indoor bowls**

9.86 A purpose built indoor bowls facility is provided within the District at Fairford Bowling Club. The facility:

- was built in 1995 and refurbished in 2004;
- contains two rinks;
- is owned and managed by the club; and
- allows access on a club/community group basis.

9.87 The location of the indoor bowls facility is illustrated in Map 9.6 overleaf.
Map 9.6 - Provision of indoor bowls in Cotswold District
Supply and demand

9.88 Household survey results show that the majority of respondents (88%) have no opinion on the quantity of indoor bowls facilities. However, with the exception of 2% of residents, the remainder of respondents felt that provision was ‘about right’.

9.89 Active Places Power indicates that the amount of indoor bowls provision in Cotswold District is equivalent to 0.02 rinks per 1,000 population, which is lower than the national average of 0.04 rinks and the regional average of 0.06 rinks per 1,000 population.

9.90 Active Places Power data also suggests that only 36% of demand for indoor bowls in the Cotswolds is met. This compares poorly with the England average (58%) and is significantly below the regional average (75%).

9.91 Although the facility was built in 1995, the fact that the facility is only 15 years old and has been refurbished in this time suggests that it is of fairly good quality.

Accessibility

9.92 Local consultation undertaken reveals that 68% of respondents would expect to drive to an indoor bowls rink. The most common expected travel time is 20 minutes and the average travel time is slightly higher at 21 minutes.

9.93 Similar travel patterns are portrayed in the settlement hierarchies, however residents in Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement) expect to travel for less time than those in other areas.

9.94 Map 9.6 illustrates that the indoor bowls facility at Fairford Bowling Club is located in the south east of the District which means that the majority of residents are outside the catchment of the facility.

9.95 Although the majority of residents are outside the catchment of an indoor bowls facility in the District, they are located in close proximity to Cotswold District Bowls Club at the Oasis Centre (Swindon), Carterton Indoor Bowls Club and Chipping Norton Bowls Club. This means that residents do have access to indoor bowls facilities, albeit outside of the District. Given that the English Indoor Bowling Association recommends that residents are within a 20 minute drive time of an indoor bowls facility provision is generally considered to be adequate.

9.96 Consultation did not identify any demand for additional bowls facilities within the district.

Key findings - indoor bowls

9.97 The key findings in relation to indoor bowls are that:

- there is one indoor bowls facility in Cotswold District;
- the quality of the facility is though to be good given its age and recent refurbishment;
- Active Places Power indicates that the Cotswolds has a below level of provision per 1,000 population of indoor bowls rinks compared to England and the south west region;
- only 2% of household survey respondents consider there to be ‘not enough’ indoor bowls facilities in the Cotswolds; and
- the majority of residents have access to an indoor bowls facility within or in close proximity to the District.
9.98 As such, focus should be placed upon:

- maintaining the quality of the existing facility; and
- ensuring that local residents are aware of the indoor bowls facility and programme of activities and that the facilities provided are accessible and affordable.

9.99 Where any additional demand for indoor bowls is identified, this could be met through the provision of short mat and long mat bowls activities within the programming of sports halls or community/village halls.

**Health and fitness**

**Context**

9.100 There are currently 16 health and fitness facilities within Cotswold District providing a total of 446 pieces of equipment (known as stations). The provision of health and fitness is illustrated on Map 9.7 overleaf and then summarised in Table 9.3 that follows.
Map 9.7 - Provision of health and fitness facilities in Cotswold District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Size (Number of Stations)</th>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcot Spa - near Tetbury</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Campden Sports Centre - Chipping Campden</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester College - Cirencester</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold Leisure - Tetbury</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold Leisure Cirencester</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswolds Spa and Leisure Club – near Cirencester</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairford Sports Centre - Fairford</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service College Leisure Club – Moreton in Marsh</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Spa At Stratton Place</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Star College - Ullenwood</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendcomb College - Cirencester</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Agricultural College - Cirencester</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone’s Training Academy and Health Club - Cirencester</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pay And Play</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Watermark – South Cerney</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westonbirt Sports Centre - Tetbury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Registered Membership Use</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.101 Table 9.3 above shows that there is a range of facilities across the District:

- Including both ‘pay and play’ and private membership facilities
- Facilities that range in size – with 9 small facilities containing under 30 stations and 7 medium-sized facilities of which the largest has 65 stations (Cotswold Leisure Centre Cirencester)
- Most facilities are relatively new; with eight having been built during the last 10 years and many of the others having undergone refurbishment.

**Quality of existing provision**

9.102 Consultation undertaken for this study showed that most residents consider the quality of health and fitness facilities to be either excellent or good (62%) or average (29%) and only a small proportion (9%) consider these facilities to be poor.
Supply and demand

9.103 Household survey results showed that 40% of respondents consider the quantity of health and fitness facilities to be ‘about right/more than enough’, whilst 8% consider there to be ‘not enough’. A large proportion (44%) had no opinion. A higher proportion of respondents from the Market towns (12%) (Category B2 settlements) consider there to be ‘not enough’ health and fitness facilities compared to other areas of the District.

9.104 Active Places Power indicates that the amount of health and fitness provision in the District is equivalent to circa 5.55 health and fitness stations per 1,000 population, which is higher than the regional average (5.04) but marginally below the national average (5.59).

Accessibility

9.105 Local consultation undertaken reveals that around two thirds (65%) of respondents would expect to drive to a health and fitness facility. The average travel time is 16 minutes and the most common expected travel time is 10 minutes. Residents in some of the smaller settlements are willing to travel further than 10 minutes.

9.106 The travel modes in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres (C1 and C2 Settlements) are consistent with the overall response. However, the majority of residents in Cirencester and the Market Towns (Category B1 (63%) and B2 Settlements (59%)) expect to walk to a health and fitness suite.

9.107 Map 9.9 overleaf illustrates that there is a good distribution of health and fitness facilities in and outside of the District, which means that nearly all residents have access to a site within the recommended 10 minute drive time.

9.108 Issues were however raised during consultation, particularly with regards the Fire Station, about the restricted opening hours of facilities and the lack of health and fitness facilities which are accessible to residents at all times.
Map 9.8 - Health and Fitness Facilities in Cotswold District
Summary - health and fitness provision

9.109 The key findings in relation to health and fitness facilities are that:

- there are sixteen facilities in the Cotswolds – including both ‘pay and play’ facilities and private facilities;
- the quality of facilities is generally assumed to be good given the ageing stock and positive consultation feedback;
- Active Places Power indicates that health and fitness provision per 1,000 population is higher than the regional and national average levels;
- only 8% of respondents consider there to be ‘not enough’ health and fitness facilities in Cotswold District; and
- nearly all residents are within a 10 minute drive time catchment of a site.

9.110 In light of levels of provision being above average, it is recommended that focus should be placed upon:

- the need for ongoing investment by facility owners into health and fitness facilities to ensure that the gyms, equipment and changing rooms remain in good condition and continue to meet customer expectations;
- ensuring that local residents are aware of the facilities available and that the facilities provided are accessible and affordable; and
- increasing the amount of hours that facilities are available to the general public, in particular at the Fire College, Moreton-in-Marsh, which provides an important resource for residents in the north of the district.

The future provision of indoor facilities in Cotswold District

9.111 Analysis of the current supply and demand of indoor sports facilities concludes that there are sufficient facilities to meet current and future demand in quantitative terms. No additional demand was highlighted for any type of facility.

9.112 Around three quarters (73%) of residents in the Cotswolds are satisfied with local sports provision (Source: Active People Survey), which is in line with the national average. The key area of dissatisfaction raised during consultation related to access and to the limited opening hours of some facilities in the district. Residents in the North of the District were much less satisfied (particularly at drop in sessions) than residents in the south.

9.113 Key issues raised that should be addressed in order to increase participation and use at leisure centres include:

- ensuring that investment strategies are in place for future repairs and maintenance requirements;
- ensuring that the pricing structure is attractive to all sections of the community;
- ensuring that facilities on school sites provide access to the community out of school hours;
• maximising the amount of hours that sites are available to the general public, in particular in the north of the district;

• ensuring that the programming of facilities (schedule of activity) is complementary to one another; and

• ensuring that the most is made of village/community halls for delivery of physical activities, especially in more rural areas.
10. Allotments

Introduction and definition

10.1 The primary purpose of allotments is to provide opportunities for people to grow their own produce as part of the long term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion.

10.2 Like other open types of open space, allotments can provide a number of wider benefits to the community in addition to their primary purpose. These include:

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

Context

10.3 Allotments are becoming increasingly popular nationally, particularly as a result of the role that they can play in encouraging all sectors of the community to participate in active recreation. Allotments offer an alternative active pastime to participation in formal sport, particularly for older residents. In light of the population profile of the district, this type of open space may therefore be of particular importance.

10.4 The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) are responsible for national policy on allotments and consider allotments to be important in terms of bringing together all sections and generations of the community, as well as providing opportunities for people to grow their own produce and promote health and wellbeing. Consultation indicates that this is particularly important in Cotswold District.

10.5 The DCLG aims to ensure that allotments are well managed, and are only disposed of where there is no demand for them and established criteria are met. As a consequence, the Borough, District or Parish are duty bound by the law (Section 23 of the 1908 Allotments Act (as amended)) to provide allotments for their residents if they consider there to be demand. They must take into a consideration a representation in writing by any six registered parliamentary electors or ratepayers. Reflected these principles, policy 33 of the Cotswold District Local Plan protects allotments from development.

10.6 Cotswold District Council does not administer or rent allotments. Instead, Parish/Town Councils, private estates and trusts are responsible for the management of allotments in Cotswold District.

10.7 This section sets out the quality, quantity and accessibility of allotments across Cotswold District.
10.8 There are currently 36 allotment sites located within the four settlement hierarchies in Cotswold District. The total amount of land dedicated to allotments is 42.11 hectares. An additional 29 allotments (42.11 hectares) are located within small villages in the District.

10.9 Parish/Town Councils are the main providers of allotments in the District, providing 27 of the allotments within the four settlement hierarchies. There are three allotments provided by Gloucestershire Diocese and seven allotments owned by private providers or trusts, including two sites managed by the Bathurst Estate.

10.10 In line with the national trend, demand for allotments has increased in recent years and this is reflected in the presence of waiting lists at some sites as well as high demand for allotments evident from respondents to the household survey.

10.11 The quantity of allotments across the District is summarised in Table 10.1.

**Table 10.1 – Provision of allotments across Cotswold District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current provision (ha)</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (ha)</th>
<th>Largest site (ha)</th>
<th>Current population</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>19201</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>15947</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,853</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.12 The key issues emerging from Table 10.1 and consultations relating to the quantity of allotments include:

- the current provision of allotments equates to 0.73 hectares per 1,000 population. This is distributed inequitably across the District, with provision in the Small Local Service Centres triple that of the Small Towns;
- household survey findings indicate that there is a strong perception that additional allotments are needed across Cotswold District. Nearly half of respondents state that...
provision is insufficient (47%) and only 29% of residents feel that there are enough allotments;

- dissatisfaction is evident within all the settlement hierarchies. The greatest level of dissatisfaction is found in the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements) where provision is high in terms of hectarage, but spread over only 6 sites, meaning that residents may have to travel further to reach a site;

- the size of sites ranges significantly from 0.08 hectares to 7.25 hectares, reflecting the varied provision of allotments across the District;

- other consultations support the overall perception that there is a lack of allotments in Cotswold District. Over half of respondents to the officers survey state that provision is insufficient (54%) and the majority of respondents to the Parish Council and elected members’ surveys highlight the need for additional provision, particularly within Preston, Fairford and Tetbury;

- the need for additional allotments was reinforced at LDF working group and Parish / Town Council workshop sessions. Specifically, high demand and large waiting lists were frequently referenced;

- the main reasons given for the negative perceptions by respondents to the household survey relating to the quantity of allotments focused on the long waiting lists which are evident for many sites; and

- 40% of respondents to the household survey who don’t currently rent an allotment plot indicated that they would like one. This further illustrates the high level of demand for allotments in Cotswold District and suggests that demand may continue to increase.

10.13 Full consultation findings are set out in Appendix E.

**Setting quantity standards**

10.14 The recommended local quantity standard for allotments has been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and is summarised overleaf. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

10.15 The standard recommends an increase on the existing level of provision. This is based on the current waiting lists in addition to expressed demand from local residents.
Quantity Standard (see Appendices D and E – standards and justification and worksheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.73 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.76 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification

The need for additional allotments was reinforced throughout consultation. Nearly half of respondents to the household survey (47%) stated that provision is insufficient and this perception was supported by other consultation findings.

Large waiting lists are evident on a number of sites and there is high demand for allotments, with 40% of residents who do not currently have an allotment suggesting that they would be interested in renting an allotment if sufficient plots were available.

The local standard has therefore been set above the existing level of provision, placing an emphasis on new site development and also the protection of current allotments.

The standard takes into account the amount of additional space required to meet current and future waiting lists (and assumes that waiting lists will be filled by providing half plots). This standard should be applied alongside the accessibility standard to enable the identification of potential latent demand (ie areas below the minimum standard) and to inform decision making on new allotment provision.

In addition to maximising the amount of allotments provided, consideration should be given to alternative management practices, such as half plots.

Quality

Current position

10.16 The quality of existing allotments was assessed through site visits undertaken by the Council. The key issues emerging from site assessments and consultations relating to the quality of allotments are summarised below:

- the quality of allotments is generally perceived positively by respondents to the household survey, with 41% of residents stating that the quality is average and 33% rating the quality of allotments as good. However, 21% of residents did state that the quality of allotments is poor, meaning that allotments are perceived to be of lower quality than some of the other types of open space;

- the greatest level of satisfaction is portrayed in the Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements), where over two thirds of residents rate the quality of allotments as good or excellent (70%);

- other consultations reflect the household survey perceptions. The quality of allotments is generally perceived to be average by respondents to the Parish/Town Council and elected members’ surveys and respondents to the officers’ survey consider the quality of allotments to be good (40%) or average (23%);
vandalism and anti social behaviour were identified as problematic at some allotment sites by attendees at drop in sessions. However, site assessments did not identify these as being issues; and

site assessments reveal that allotments are generally in good condition. In particular, the maintenance of sites was rated highly. Ebrington Allotments (outside of the four settlement hierarchies) and Redesdale Place Allotments (Moreton-in-Marsh) were identified as two sites in need of improved maintenance.

10.17 Full details of comments made during consultation are available in Appendix E.

Setting quality standards

10.18 The recommended local quality standard for allotments is summarised below. Full justifications and consultation for the local standard is provided within Appendix E.

10.19 The quality standard summarises the features that residents consider to be an important determinant of the quality of provision.

Quality Standard (see Appendix E)

Recommended Quality Standard

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the vision for allotments should incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality boundaries</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible water supply</td>
<td>Notice boards at site entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, tidy and well maintained</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and secure</td>
<td>Level surfaces and Footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter bins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessibility

10.20 The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived directly from the findings of the consultations.

10.21 Almost all current users of allotments walk to access a site (91%) with a travel time of up to 10 minutes most commonly experienced (73%). This suggests that current users of allotments use sites in close proximity to their home.

10.22 Consistent with the travel modes portrayed by current users, over three quarters of residents would expect to walk to an allotment (76%). This emphasises that the majority of residents expect allotments to be in very close proximity to their home.
10.23 Of those residents that would prefer to walk, the average expected travel time is 10 minutes and the most common response is also 10 minutes. For those residents who would drive, the average expected travel time is 12 minutes and the most common response is 10 minutes.

10.24 Access to allotments was generally perceived to be good by respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey. However, respondents to the elected members’ survey demonstrated varying opinions regarding access. This suggests that access to allotments may be more limited in some areas of Cotswold District.

10.25 A lack of awareness regarding allotments emerged as a key issue in the household survey. This was given as one of the main reasons for negative perceptions regarding the quantity of allotments in Cotswold District. Improved awareness will be essential if the take up of allotments in Cotswold District is to continue to improve.

10.26 Site assessments reveal that the majority of allotments are accessible by public transport, with bus stops located in close proximity to a number of sites. Only Church Lane Allotments (South Cerney) are accessible for disabled users however, highlighting the need to increase disabled access to allotments in the District.

**Setting accessibility standards**

10.27 The recommended local accessibility standard for allotments is summarised below. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix E. The standard takes into account the expectation that allotments will be provided locally.

**Accessibility Standard (see Appendix E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Accessibility Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minute walk time (480m catchment) Cirencester and Market Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minute drive time – Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Current (91%) and expected (76%) travel patterns highlight a clear preference for walking to allotments. 22% of residents would prefer to drive to access an allotment.

Of those residents who prefer to walk, the average travel time and most common travel time is 10 minutes. Of those residents who would expect to drive, the average travel time is 12 minutes and the most common response is slightly lower at 10 minutes.

To ensure deliverability and sustainability, two standards have been set, a 10-minute walk time (480m) in Cirencester and the Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 Settlements) and a 10 minute drive time in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres (Category C1 and C2 Settlements). Both standards have been set based on the most common response and provide realistic standards in both the rural and more urban areas of the District. They ensure that as far as possible, provision meets the needs of local residents but also takes into account the long-term sustainability of provision.
Applying provision standards

10.28 The application of the recommended quality, quantity and accessibility standards provides an understanding of the existing distribution of allotments. In light of the demand led nature of allotments (which means that the presence of an allotment site can often stimulate more interest, meaning that demand is higher in areas with more sites), this should be treated as an indication only. Table 10.2 summarises the application of the quantity standard by settlement hierarchy.

Table 10.2 - Application of the quantity standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement hierarchy</th>
<th>Current shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Future shortfall / surplus when measured against local standard (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns (Category B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Towns (Category C1 Settlements)</td>
<td>-6.04</td>
<td>-7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-8.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.29 Table 10.2 indicates that:

- District wide, the provision of allotments is below the minimum standard and there is a current shortfall of 1.86 hectares;
- the amount of allotments in Cirencester and the Small Towns (Category B1 and C2 Settlements) falls below the minimum standard, with shortfalls equating to 0.61 hectares and 6.04 hectares respectively;
- the provision of allotments within the Market Towns is above the minimum standard at the current time, however, future population increases will create a shortfall of 0.34 hectares by 2026; and
- only within the Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements) does the amount of allotments exceed the minimum standard both now and in the future.

10.30 Application of the quantity standard at a settlement level suggests that the provision of allotments is below the minimum standard within 14 settlements. Only within Mickleton, Moreton-in-Marsh, Stow-on-the-Wold, Siddington and Kemble is the provision of allotments in line with the recommended standards. The greatest current shortfalls are located in:

- Lechlade - 2.27 hectares (circa 91 plots)
- Fairford - 2.21 hectares (circa 89 plots)
• Tetbury – 1.77 hectares (circa 70 plots)

**Accessibility**

10.31 The application of the accessibility standards for allotments is outlined in Map 10.1 overleaf.
10.32 Map 10.1 indicates that there is a good distribution of allotments across the District and that all residents of the Small Local Service Centres and Small Towns have access to an allotment within the recommended 10-minute drivetime. For those residents in Cirencester and in the Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 settlements), where provision is expected within walking distance of the home, nearly all residents are able to access a site, although there are some gaps in provision to the west of Cirencester.

**Priorities for future delivery**

10.33 The remainder of this section outlines the key priorities for the provision of allotments within Cotswold District that have arisen from local consultation and the application of the quantity, quality and accessibility standards. Issues within specific settlements are also identified.

10.34 In line with the principles of PPG17, the priorities are set out under the headings of:

- Improving the quality of provision
- Maximising the role that allotments play in conservation and biodiversity
- Protecting existing provision
- Disposal and redesignation
- New provision
- Improving access

**Improving the quality of provision**

10.35 Despite generally positive perceptions, consultation findings indicate that the quality of allotments is considered to be lower than other types of open space in the District. 21% of respondents to the household survey and 23% of respondents to the officers’ survey state that the quality of allotments is poor. Specifically, vandalism, graffiti and dog fouling are perceived to be problematic by frequent users of allotments.

10.36 Site assessments found that whilst the condition of allotments was generally rated as good, some sites are in need of enhancement. Site visits reveal the following sites to be of poorer quality and therefore priorities for enhancement:

- Station Road Allotments - Blockley
- Aston Road Allotments - Chipping Campden
- Redesdale Place Allotments - Moreton-in-Marsh.

10.37 The private site in Kempsford is also considered to be under used, and offering potential for improvement.

10.38 The recommended quality vision, based upon local consultation, identifies high quality boundaries, a water supply, a well maintained site, security and safety and litter and dog bins as essential features of a high quality allotment.
Providers should seek to enhance the quality of allotments in the District based upon the findings of site assessments. Priorities include:

- Station Road Allotments - Blockley
- Aston Road Allotments – Chipping Campden
- Redesdale Place – Moreton in Marsh

Maximising the role that allotments play in conservation and biodiversity

10.39 The provision of high quality allotments is important not just from a recreational perspective but also in terms of providing wildlife habitats and contributing towards biodiversity.

10.40 The Gloucestershire Biodiversity Action Plan identifies allotments as one of the priority habitats in the county. The increased use of fertilisers and pesticides on allotments is highlighted as a key threat to conservation. Sympathetic management of allotments should therefore be promoted and encouraged to maximise the diversity of habitats and species at allotments in line with the Gloucestershire Biodiversity Action Plan.

As well as improving the function of allotments from a user perspective, Cotswold District Council should give advice to providers to ensure that the management, maintenance and future planning of these sites takes into account their role in nature conservation and biodiversity.

Protecting existing provision

10.41 The need to protect allotments from development was reinforced by respondents to the household survey. These sites were perceived to be important for a range of reasons, including the health benefits they offer, the habitats and species they provide as well as their contributions towards long term sustainability. Furthermore, 40% of respondents to the household survey who don’t currently use allotments indicated that they would be interested in renting an allotment plot, highlighting a high level of demand. The majority of existing allotments are at capacity, reflecting their value to the local community.

10.42 In order to ensure that the longer term needs of both current and future residents can be met, all sites should be protected from development.

I include a policy within the Local Development Framework that protects allotments from development. Loss of allotments should only be permitted where it can be proven that the site is surplus to requirements and is unlikely to be needed in future years to accommodate population growth.

While new provision should be sourced where possible, in the short term, consideration should also be given to a change in management practice to maximise the number of residents that can
use an allotment. These practices could be adopted at allotments across the District, regardless of ownership. In particular the following options should be considered:

- provide half plots to ensure that the site can accommodate a higher number of residents. Allotment plots at some sites in the District have already been split and this should be extended to all allotments where there is latent demand; and
- ensure that residents have only one allotment plot at any one time. There are some sites in the District where residents currently rent double plots.

Cotswold District Council should encourage providers to implement appropriate policies to promote usage of allotment sites by a wide variety of residents including:

- providing half plots as opposed to full plots to ensure that sites can accommodate a higher number of residents;
- ensuring that residents only have one allotment plot at any one time; and
- promoting appropriate use of allotments.

Disposal and redesignation

The current provision of allotments is below the recommended standards and there is high unmet demand for allotments in the District. There are therefore no recommendations for the disposal and/or redesignation of any allotments in Cotswold District.

New provision

10.45 In light of the demand led nature of allotments, application of the quantity, quality and accessibility standards should be treated as a starting point only. Although standards provide a useful indicator of the amount of provision that can be expected, in many instances, the provision of an allotment in an area can stimulate further interest, and in contrast, demand is lower in areas where no allotments are provided. Detailed research and monitoring of local demand should therefore be undertaken prior to the development of new allotments. Consideration of existing waiting lists / approaches to the Parish Council are particularly useful indicators of latent demand.

10.46 Application of the quantity standard indicates that there is a current shortfall of 1.83 hectares of allotments within the District. This shortfall equates to approximately 73 full allotment plots or 146 half plots. The provision of allotments in all settlement hierarchies falls below the recommended minimum standard.

10.47 As the population grows, demand for allotments is likely to continue to increase and application of the local standards suggests that deficiencies will exceed 8 hectares by 2026. This emphasises that increasing population will place significant pressure on the existing stock of allotments.

Ensure that policy within the Local Development Framework requires contributions towards allotments as part of new development. The local standard should be used to evaluate the impact of the new development.
10.48 The following sub-section considers the need for increased provision to meet current and future demand within each of the settlement hierarchies.

**Cirencester (Category B1 Settlement)**

10.49 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the current provision of allotments is below the minimum standard. However, accessibility mapping reveals that nearly all residents have access to an allotment within the recommended 10 minute walk time. Only in the west of Cirencester are residents outside the catchment of a site (Figure 10.1).
Figure 10.1 - Deficiencies of allotments in the west of Cirencester
10.50 Although residents in the west of Cirencester are outside the catchment of an allotment, a significant amount of this area of deficiency is employment land and the majority of houses have private gardens. The location of an allotment within this area is therefore not a significant priority. New allotments are however required within Cirencester to meet current demand and this has been identified by the Town Council, who are investigating the lease of land within the town for the purposes of providing further allotments.

10.51 In the longer term, population growth will place further pressure on existing provision, creating an overall shortfall of at least 2.91 hectares (116 plots). As well as seeking at least one additional allotment site to meet current demand, it will be essential that new sites are provided as the population grows.

**Market towns (Category B2 Settlements)**

10.52 Application of the accessibility standard reveals that nearly all residents have access to a site within the recommended 480m catchment. Supporting these findings, quantitative analysis indicates that the provision of allotments is above the minimum standard.

10.53 Although the provision of allotments within the settlement hierarchy currently meets quantity standards, based on the future population projections, there will be a shortfall of 0.34 hectares (14 plots). Analysis of provision at a settlement level indicates that only within Moreton-in-Marsh is the provision of allotments above the minimum standard. A shortfall of 0.65 hectares (24 plots) can be found in Bourton-on-the-Water and 1.77 hectares (70 plots) in Tetbury.

10.54 Supporting these identified quantitative shortfalls, consultation with Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council found that 9 people are on the waiting list for an allotment, further highlighting unmet demand within this settlement. Latent demand was also identified during consultation in Tetbury and it was indicated (Members Consultation) that additional allotments are required to meet current demand. Future population growth will further increase demand in these settlements, and new provision will therefore be required.

**Small towns (Category C1 Settlements)**

10.55 The greatest quantitative shortfall of allotments is found in the Small Towns, where there is a current shortfall of 6.04 hectares. In contrast to the findings of the application of the quantity standards, accessibility mapping reveals that all residents have access to an allotment within the recommended 10-minute drive time.

10.56 Supporting the consultation findings, application of the quantity standard at a settlement level indicates that shortfalls are found within all settlements, with the exception of Stow-on-the-Wold. Shortfalls range from 34 plots (Northleach) to 91 plots (Lechlade), indicating that new provision is likely to be required in some settlements to accommodate current and future demand.

10.57 Consultation undertaken with Parish Councils found the following:

- **Fairford** – both allotment sites within this settlement are private sites and are therefore not accessible to the public. Additional demand was also identified during consultation with Members
- **South Cerney** – over 20 people are requesting new plots in the settlement. The Parish Council is looking to provide quarter plots on an unused part of the playing fields within South Cerney
- **Lechlade** – have set up an allotments working group to investigate the feasibility of providing a new site and to identify appropriate locations
10.58 New provision is therefore required in Lechlade, Fairford and South Cerney. In consideration of quantitative shortfalls in Chipping Campden, and Northleach and the expected future population growth in these settlements, demand for increased provision should be monitored and new allotments provided where they are requested by sufficient numbers of residents. There is no evidence of demand for additional facilities in either of these settlements at the current time, although existing provision is well used.

**Small Local Service Centres (Category C2 Settlements)**

10.59 Application of the accessibility standard reveals that all residents have access to an allotment within the recommended 10 minute drive time. Supporting the findings of the application of the accessibility standard, quantitative analysis reveals that the provision of allotments is above the minimum standard.

10.60 Focusing on the individual settlements, analysis indicates that shortfalls of evident in six of the nine settlements, ranging from 0.04 hectares in Kempsford to 0.85 hectares in Avening. Parish Councils in Andoversford and Down Ampney have identified demand for additional allotments. Provision in Mickleton, Siddington and Kemble is just above minimum standards and no evidence of further demand has been collected.

10.61 Analysis of future population increases indicates that the shortfall of allotments is expected to increase within the individual settlements where there is a current shortfall.

10.62 As well as meeting current demand, it is important to consider the need to meet projected demand as the population grows. In consideration of this and the current quantitative shortfalls, demand for additional provision should be monitored (through requests to Parishes and the Parish Plan Process) and the provision of additional allotments should be considered as part of new development.

**PROVIDE NEW ALLOTMENTS IN:**

- Cirencester, particularly the west
- Tetbury and Bourton-on-the-Water
- Fairford, Lechlade and South Cerney
- Down Ampney and Andoversford

Monitor demand in other areas (by recording requests to the Parish Council and through the Parish Plan Process) and support plans to increase provision where additional demand is identified.

**Increasing access to allotments**

10.63 Application of the accessibility standard indicates that there is a good distribution of allotments in Cotswold District, with nearly all residents having access to a site within the recommended catchments.

10.64 A drive time standard has been set in the Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres (Category C1 and C2 Settlements). However, longer term the aspiration should be for residents in these settlements to have local access to an allotment and this is something that Parish Councils are already striving to achieve. In the absence of this local access to allotments, it will be important to
ensure that allotments are accessible to residents who need to travel by car and that they contain parking facilities etc. Given the reliance on walking, to ensure easy access for residents, it will also be necessary to improve local access routes from settlements to allotment plots, through the creation of appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes.

10.65 The Council should work with providers to seek to increase access to allotments in the District through the development of the Green Infrastructure Network (footpaths, cyclepaths etc.). The provision of appropriate facilities at the site to accommodate cyclists (as well as parking) should also be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT 7</th>
<th>Improve access to allotments in Cotswold District through the development of additional footpaths and cycle routes. Ensure that sites contain appropriate facilities such as car parking and cycle storage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10.66 In addition, site visits reveal that only one allotment site is suitable for disabled access (Northleach Allotments), and access was identified as the main area for improvement across all sites. Given the potential of allotments to provide opportunities for all sectors of the population, and their role in bringing together communities, improvements to access at all allotments in the district should be prioritised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT 8</th>
<th>Prioritise access improvements to all allotments in the district to ensure that they are accessible to all sectors of the population. Site visits reveal that only one site is currently accessible to disabled residents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10.67 A lack of awareness regarding the provision of allotments in the District emerged as a key issue for respondents to the household survey and this was given as one of the main reasons for dissatisfaction with the current provision of allotments. The Council should work with providers of allotments to increase awareness of the location and availability of allotments in the District. This may involve creating a database of all known allotments in the District and making it available to residents and ensuring that opportunities are publicised and promoted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT 9</th>
<th>Work with providers to increase awareness of allotments in Cotswold District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary**

10.68 32 allotment sites equating to a total of 42.11 hectares are located within the four settlement hierarchies in Cotswold District. A further 11.64 hectares (29 sites) of allotments are located in small villages in the District.

10.69 Local consultation indicates that the current provision of allotments is insufficient to meet demand. Waiting lists are evident at many sites in the District and there is high demand for allotments, highlighted by the fact that 40% of respondents to the household survey that do not currently use allotments would be interested in renting a plot.

10.70 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the current provision of allotments is below the minimum standard and future population growth will further increase pressure on existing
provision, generating deficiencies of over 8 hectares. Ensuring that the capacity of allotments is sufficient to accommodate future population growth will therefore be important and it should also be ensured that new developments contribute towards the provision of allotments.

10.71 Accessibility mapping reveals that there is a good distribution of allotments in the District, which means that nearly all residents have access to a site within the recommended accessibility catchments. Latent demand has however been identified in towns and villages, with several Parishes indicating that they are actively seeking new allotment land, and waiting lists evident at several sites.

10.72 The key priorities for improving the provision of allotments over the Local Development Framework period therefore include the need to:

- ensure that allotments are protected from development through specific policy within the Local Development Framework;

- allocate new sites for allotments in areas where latent demand / deficiencies are identified and ensure that contributions are required towards allotments as part of new development. Areas where particular demand / deficiencies have been identified include west Cirencester, Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water, Fairford, Lechlade, South Cerney, Andoversford and Down Ampney;

- consider alternative management arrangements at existing sites to maximise the number of residents that can be accommodated;

- improve the quality of existing allotment sites in order to ensure that all sites are of adequate quality to meet the needs of local residents. In particular some sites were identified as requiring improved maintenance. Management and maintenance of allotments should be sympathetic to the biodiversity values of allotments as well as their function as a recreational opportunity;

- improve access to existing allotments for all sectors of the population, including disabled residents and seek to increase access to allotments in Cotswold District through the development of the Green Infrastructure Network; and

- promote opportunities available at allotments to increase awareness of the facilities that are provided.
11. Cemeteries and Churchyards

Introduction

11.1 This typology encompasses both churchyards contained within the walled boundary of a church and cemeteries outside the confines of churches. Cemeteries include private burial grounds, local authority burial grounds and closed churchyards. Although the primary purpose of this type of open space is burial of the dead, rest and relaxation and quiet contemplation, these sites frequently have considerable value for the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.

11.2 Some churchyards contain areas of unimproved grasslands and various other habitats. They can also provide a sanctuary for wildlife in urban settlements and often offer historic value in the more rural landscapes.

11.3 In addition to being important open spaces in the urban areas, cemeteries and churchyards are often significant open spaces in more rural settlements. They can therefore function as an area of open space or a garden, as well as fulfilling their primary purpose.

11.4 Cotswold District Council is a Burial Authority by virtue of S214 (1) of the Local Government Act. There is no statutory duty to create new cemeteries or extensions of existing cemeteries, but burial authorities are under a duty to maintain their existing cemeteries and also to dispose of those who die in the District where other funeral arrangements have not been made. Parish Councils also have the power to provide and maintain cemeteries and burial space under the same local Government Act.

11.5 The District Council operates its cemeteries under the Local Authorities Cemeteries Order 1977 (LACO). This order requires the Council to maintain records of all burials in cemeteries and to prevent loss or damage to these records.

11.6 Only 2% of respondents to the household survey indicate that they use cemeteries and churchyards more frequently than any other type of open space in the District. However, 14% of residents use cemeteries and churchyards at least once a week, indicating that this type of open space is visited on a regular basis.

Current provision

Quantity

11.7 The total amount of land dedicated to cemeteries and churchyards within the four settlement hierarchies is 25.22 hectares. There are 44 sites, 11 of which are cemeteries.

11.8 The majority of sites are located within the small rural villages, with a total of 122 sites (30.76 hectares) in these settlements. Therefore, in total, there are 166 sites, of which 23 are cemeteries and 143 are churchyards. The Church of England is the main provider and manager of cemeteries and churchyards, however, a number of Parish/Town Councils, such as Cirencester, Sherbourne and Sapperton are also responsible for churchyards in Cotswold District.

11.9 Cotswold District Council is responsible for the management of Chesterton Cemetery and Stratton Cemetery both of which are in Cirencester.
Setting provision standards - Quantity

11.10 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 run-down 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."

11.11 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."

11.12 Whilst it is therefore not appropriate to consider a provision standard for churchyards, the future need for cemeteries and burial space should be evaluated.

11.13 Although it is possible to provide an indication of the likely future land use requirements, accurately predicting current and future death rates is difficult, particularly in light of changing burial patterns as well as the evolving population profile.

11.14 It is important, however, to ensure that the long-term burial needs of the population are taken into account as part of future planning in the LDF. The amount of burial space can be determined based on death rates and burial/cremation preferences in the District, rather than the application of a quantity standard per se.

11.15 We have completed an indicative analysis of the projected future requirements for burial space in Cotswold District for the period up to 2026. This has been informed by a series of assumptions around current and future populations, mortality rate trends, and the proportion of people being buried rather than cremated.

11.16 The key assumptions are:

- a base point of 902 deaths per annum in Cotswold District (based on 2008 actual, according to Neighbourhood Statistics);
- a declining mortality rate (in line with national average over the last 10 years) due to an increased life expectancy;
- 25% of deaths are buried, compared to 75% cremations, based on England & Wales average (Cremation Society of Great Britain); and
- a burial plot size of 10ft x 4ft 6in.

11.17 On this basis, 4340 burial plots will be required across Cotswold District up to 2026. This equates to 1.81 hectares.

11.18 This calculation does not, however, account for use of existing burial plots for multiple interments. Burial plots are typically sold on an assumed lease of 50-99 years.
Adequacy of existing provision in Cotswold District

11.19 Consultation found that while the capacity at cemeteries may be sufficient, there is limited capacity at some churchyards in the District, with a number of churchyards now closed. This suggests that while overall provision is sufficient, if it is considered appropriate to accommodate demand for local burials, new provision may be required over the LDF period.

Recommended Quantity Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Recommended Standard (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification

Based on the following key assumptions, 1.81 hectares of burial space will be required in Cotswold District up to 2026:

- a base point of 902 deaths per annum in Cotswold District (based on 2008 actual, according to Neighbourhood Statistics);
- a declining mortality rate (in line with national average over the last 10 years) due to an increased life expectancy;
- 25% of deaths are buried, compared to 75% cremations, based on England & Wales average (Cremation Society of Great Britain); and
- a burial plot size of 10ft x 4ft 6in.

Quality - current position

11.20 Respondents to the household survey consider the quality of cemeteries and churchyards to be good. 63% consider the quality of provision to be good or excellent and only 3% suggest that the overall quality is poor.

11.21 Other consultations also provide a positive perception regarding the quality of cemeteries and churchyards. Nearly a quarter of respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey felt that the quality of cemeteries and churchyards is excellent (23%) and 62% rated the quality of this typology as good. Half of all respondents to the elected members survey indicated that the quality of cemeteries and churchyards is good or excellent. Consultation findings therefore provide a positive view regarding the quality of cemeteries and churchyards in Cotswold District.

11.22 The quality of cemeteries and churchyards was assessed through site visits undertaken by the Council. Site assessment findings support the positive perception portrayed during consultation, with the condition of cemeteries and churchyards generally rated as good or excellent. Sites were identified as being well maintained with good footpaths and vegetation.

11.23 Although the condition of cemeteries and churchyards was generally rated positively, St. Catharine’s R.C. Cemetery and War memorial (Chipping Campden), Thomas Beckett’s Church (Todenham) and St. Catherines Church Cemetery (Westonbirt) were identified as being in poor condition and in need of enhanced maintenance.
11.24 The highest rated aspirations of residents regarding cemeteries and churchyards are clean and litter free (63%) parking (63%), toilets, well kept grass, dog walking and litter bins (all 38%). This indicates that the cleanliness and maintenance of cemeteries and churchyards is important to residents in Cotswold District.

11.25 Vandalism and graffiti, dog fouling and litter were identified as problems experienced by frequent users of this type of open space.

**Setting quality standards**

11.26 As highlighted, it is only appropriate to set a quality standard for cemeteries and churchyards. This should take into account any national or local standards. The recommended quality standard is summarised below.

11.27 Full findings of consultation and justifications for the recommended local standard are provided within Appendix D.

**Quality Standard (see Appendix E)**

### Recommended Quality Standard

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the vision for cemeteries and churchyards should be/incorporate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
<td>Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Litter and dog bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog walking area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility**

11.28 With regards to accessibility there are no definitive national or local standards for cemeteries and churchyards. There is also no realistic requirement to set catchments for such typologies as they cannot easily be influenced through planning policy and implementation.

**Applying provision standards - identifying geographical areas**

11.29 Given that it is not appropriate to set any local accessibility standards it is also not appropriate to identify areas of deficiency or need in relation to accessibility. It is also inappropriate to identify surpluses or deficiencies against a quantity standard. The quantity standard should be used to predict future deficiencies only.
Priorities for future delivery

11.30 The remainder of this section outlines the key priorities for the provision of allotments within Cotswold District. In line with the principles of PPG17, the priorities are set out under the headings of:

- Improving the quality of provision
- Protection and increasing provision
- Disposal and redesignation
- Improving access

Improving the quality of provision

11.31 The quality of cemeteries and churchyards was perceived positively throughout consultation and site assessments. However, although the condition of cemeteries and churchyards were generally rated as good or excellent during site assessments a few sites were identified as being in need of enhancement and frequent users of this type of open space identified vandalism and graffiti, dog fouling and litter as problematic at some sites in the District.

11.32 The local quality vision indicates that parking, well kept grass and a clean and litter free site are essential features of a high quality cemetery or churchyard.

**CC 1**
Encourage providers to undertake improvements to the quality of cemeteries and churchyards across the District. Improvements to St. Catharine’s R.C. Cemetery and War memorial (Chipping Campden) are of particular priority.

11.33 In consideration of the importance of cemeteries and churchyards for biodiversity and wildlife conservation, it will also be important that the quality of cemeteries and churchyards from a user perspective is balanced with biodiversity and the creation of habitats.

**CC 2**
Stakeholders should recognise and promote the nature conservation value of cemeteries and churchyards and develop a greater awareness of ecological management and maintenance of cemeteries and churchyards.

Protection and increasing provision

11.34 Although it is not appropriate to identify areas of deficiency or need in relation to accessibility, it is important to consider the capacity of existing sites to meet future needs. It is apparent that existing cemeteries have a finite capacity and that new provision will therefore be required when sites become full. The application of the quantity standard for cemeteries will enable the projection of future burial needs and will therefore enable the analysis of the adequacy of existing provision.

11.35 Proactive planning is essential in order to ensure the adequate provision of cemeteries. The management and maintenance of sites is a big challenge for the Council as is the provision of new...
Consultation found that while the capacity at cemeteries may be sufficient, there is limited capacity at some churchyards in the District, with a number of churchyards now closed. This suggests that new provision may be required over the LDF period. It is therefore essential that burial capacity is kept under review and that planning for long term burial needs commences prior to 2026 (assuming that burial patterns remain consistent). Even where the total amount of provision is sufficient, the rural nature of the district and the vast geographical area that the district covers means that localised burial space is likely to be required. Many residents are likely to have a preference for the burial of relatives in close proximity to their home. This means that smaller local burial space may be as equally important as larger centrally located cemeteries.

The Council should keep under review the opportunities for the reuse, expansion or acquisition of suitable land to ensure the continued and sustainable provision of local cemeteries and should ensure that communication with Parish Councils includes ongoing monitoring of the adequacy of burial space. The LDF should facilitate the provision of additional burial spaces in areas where new localised provision is required/desired.

### Disposal and redesignation

There are no recommendations for the disposal or redesignation of existing cemeteries and churchyards.

### Increasing access

In order to maximise the usage and value of cemeteries and churchyards in Cotswold District it important that access routes are enhanced. The Council should seek to development sustainable transport routes (e.g. footpaths) to increase access from residential areas to cemeteries and churchyards.

Site assessments reveal that district wide, only 54 cemeteries and churchyards have disabled access, highlighting the need for improvement. Disabled access to this type of open space should be increased to ensure that sites are accessible for all.

### Summary

Cemeteries and churchyards can be significant providers of open space, particularly in rural areas. In towns they can represent a relatively minor resource in terms of the land required, but are important for nature conservation and also offer recreational opportunities for residents.
11.41 Given the nature of cemeteries and churchyards, local standards for accessibility have not been set. Despite this, it remains important to consider the future delivery of cemeteries and churchyards, anticipating future demand as well as assessing the current level of provision.

11.42 The essential and desirable features set out in the quality standards should guide the future development and improvement of cemeteries and churchyards across the District. Site visits indicate that the quality of existing cemeteries and churchyards is high and there is currently a very positive perception of provision.

11.43 In addition to offering a functional value, many cemeteries and churchyards have wider benefits including heritage, cultural and landscape values.

11.44 The key priorities for the future delivery of cemeteries and churchyards across the District therefore include:

- the LDF should facilitate the delivery of additional cemeteries and should project need across the LDF period. Demand should be monitored, particularly for localised burial space as well as larger centrally located cemeteries and churchyards using the recommended local quantity standard;

- recognise and promote the nature conservation value of cemeteries and churchyards and investigate the implementation of ecological management;

- enhance the quality of sites using the essential and desirable features as a guide; as well as seeking to improve access for disabled residents; and

- improve access routes to and within cemeteries and churchyards.
12. Green Corridors

Introduction

12.1 Green corridors are linear routes with a primary purpose of providing opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding, whether for leisure purposes or travel. Green corridors also facilitate wildlife migration. Green corridors therefore include towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and routes along disused railway lines. Green linkages are an essential component of the green infrastructure network of the District.

12.2 Green corridors can be particularly valuable in towns, facilitating links between open spaces and local residential areas. They also provide valuable linkages between the towns and outlying rural settlements. As highlighted throughout this report, in many instances enhancing links between open spaces will be as important as the development of new sites. The importance of linkages between and within different settlements, particularly for cyclists, was a key issue throughout consultation in Cotswold District.

12.3 As well as facilitating wildlife migration, a green corridor network brings the following benefits for local residents:

- it improves access to existing sites;
- it increases the usage levels of existing sites;
- it increases the capacity of existing sites by relieving pressure on ‘honeypot’ locations; and
- it increases the catchment areas of existing sites.

Strategic context and consultation

12.4 Green corridors represent an important opportunity to promote sustainable transport by bicycle and on foot. Provision and use of green corridors will be a key determinant in the achievement of targets for participation in sport and active recreation.

12.5 The Department for Transport recognises the importance of encouraging walking and cycling and has recently published an action plan entitled Walking and Cycling: an action plan (2008). The plan states:

“Walking and cycling are good for our health, good for getting us around, good for our public spaces and good for our society, for all these reasons we need to persuade more people to choose to walk and cycle more often”.

12.6 The Department of Transport goes on to highlight the significant opportunities that exist to encourage residents to walk and cycle more frequently, indicating that:
“Nearly a quarter of all our trips are one mile or less - a generally walkable distance. And 42% are within two miles - less than the average length of a cycling trip. But in addition, walking and cycling provide the vital links to our public transport systems and a ‘no-emissions’ alternative to motor vehicles.”

12.7 This reinforces the need for opportunities to increase levels of physical activity and highlights the need to address any gaps in the green corridor network. Providing a high quality infrastructure will not only increase use of green corridors, but will increase usage of individual open space sites and reduce barriers to access.

12.8 Gloucestershire County Council, as the managing authority for Public Rights of Way, has produced a Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan (PROWIP). Key issues to emerge from consultation were as follows:

- General maintenance issues (e.g. missing signs, poorly maintained stiles)
- Surface issues - cyclists and horse riders share routes but both require different surfaces
- There is a need for more permissive access
- Grazing animals can often cause an obstruction
- Closer working with landowners and representatives is needed.

12.9 Green corridors are a popular type of open space in the District. Over half of respondents to the household survey use green corridors at least once a week and 17% of residents use this type of open space more frequently than any other, making them the second most commonly visited typology in the District.

12.10 The value of green corridors in the District was reinforced throughout consultation, particularly at the Parish/Town Council and residents workshops. It was stated that there is a good PROW network in the Cotswolds, particularly in the north of the District. At both drop in sessions, it was evident that green corridors are a particularly popular attraction for tourists who visit the Cotswolds and the need to maximise the benefits of these natural resources was emphasised. Throughout consultations, it is clear that the array of walking routes in the district is one of the main reasons for visiting the area.

**Current position**

**Quantity**

12.11 The Gloucestershire Public Rights of Way Network is one of the longest networks managed by any county and is made up of 3,400 miles of:

- Footpaths
- Bridleway
- Byways and restricted byways

12.12 Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for the management of 9,662 paths and footpaths that make up 82% of the PROW network.
12.13 The Offas Dyke Path, the Thames Path and the Cotswold Way are the highest profile National Trails that run through the county. The Cotswold Way is being developed with support from Natural England and all three trails receive grant assistance towards maintenance.

12.14 Gloucestershire’s PROW network also includes parts of a number of Sustran cycle routes, including NCN 41 and 45. In addition to this, a number of local projects have resulted in the creation of additional cycle routes. Cycle routes was a key theme of consultation, and there is an identified need for the provision of further cycling routes. In particular, it was suggested that there are insufficient dedicated cycling routes. Many cyclists are forced to use the local roads, which can be dangerous and intimidating. The Cotswold Water Park is a key provider of recreational opportunities in the county. The water park contains 93 miles of pathways, bridleways and cycleways and is regularly used by residents of and visitors to the Cotswolds.

12.15 The development of the Cotswold Canals is an important ongoing project in the district. This project received 18 million lottery grant funding in 2006 and the Cotswold Canals Trust would like to see the development of canal side recreation routes.

12.16 In addition to the existing network of green corridors, there are a number of disused railway lines in the district. The presence of these routes offers the opportunity to increase the green corridor network. The need to maintain and increase the number of green corridors was highlighted throughout consultations.

12.17 The Annex A of PPG17 – Open Space Typology states:

“The need for Green Corridors arises from the need to promote environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling within urban areas. This means that there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard, just as there is no way of having a standard for the proportion of land in an area which it will be desirable to allocate for roads”.

12.18 It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set. PPG17 goes on to state that:

“Instead, planning policies should promote the use of green corridors to link housing areas to the Sustrans national cycle network, town and city centres, places of employment and community facilities such as schools, shops, community centres and sports facilities. In this sense green corridors are demand-led. However, planning authorities should also take opportunities to use established linear routes, such as disused railway lines, roads or canal and river banks, as green corridors, and supplement them by proposals to ‘plug in’ access to them from as wide an area as possible”.
Quality

12.19 Quality is central to the use and value of green corridors both as a recreational resource and also as a means of enhancing wildlife.

12.20 Consultation undertaken as part of the PROWIP indicates that the key issues relating to the quality of sites are general maintenance issues, physical obstructions and surfaces.

12.21 The quality of green corridors is viewed positively by respondents to the household survey. 44% indicate that the quality of provision is good, while a further 19% consider it to be average. Only 10% consider the quality of green corridors to be poor.

12.22 Other consultation findings reinforce the positive perception regarding the quality of green corridors. Respondents to the Parish/Town Council survey consider the quality of green corridors to be good (43%) or average (43%) and 52% of officers indicate that the quality of green corridors is good or excellent.

12.23 The highest rated aspirations regarding green corridors are appropriate footpaths (66%) clean and litter free (66%), nature features (43%) level surface and dog walking facilities (circa 30% each). More residents indicate that the maintenance of footpaths, dog fouling and litter are issues than those who believe that they are no problem.

Setting quality standards

12.24 A quality vision, based on the aspirations of the local community of the Cotswolds has been set. Full justifications for the recommended local standards are provided within Appendix E.

12.25 **Recommended Standards**

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and litter free</td>
<td>Well kept grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined footpaths with a level surface</td>
<td>Flowers, trees and shrubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature features</td>
<td>Appropriate signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities suitable for an array of users (pedestrians, cyclists etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog and litter bins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessibility

Setting accessibility standards

12.26 There is no requirement to set catchments for green corridors due to the linear nature of these routes.
**Applying provision standards**

12.27 As provision standards have not been set for accessibility and quality, there is no opportunity to apply these standards. The aim, however, is to provide an integrated network of high quality green corridors which link spaces together and provide opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport. Corridors also enable the migration of species across the District.

**Priorities for future delivery**

12.28 This section considers the District wide issues that need to be addressed. In line with the principles of PPG17, the priorities are set out under the headings of:

- Partnership working
- Quality enhancements
- Protection of existing provision
- Increasing provision
- Redesignation and disposal
- Increasing access

**Partnership working**

12.29 The PROWIP emphasises the importance of developing effective partnerships. The Cotswold Canals Trust, Cotswold Conservation Board and Cotswold Water Park are identified as key partner organisations.

12.30 Consultation with Gloucestershire County Council further emphasised the importance of partnership working, particularly with regards to the maintenance of the PROW network. Specifically, the Mid Cotswold Track and Trails Group and Cotswold Voluntary Wardens were identified as two very active groups that support the Gloucestershire County Council with the maintenance of the PROW network.

12.31 Also on this subject, the PROWIP identifies a number of recommended practices revolving around joint working with partners and key stakeholders which should be supported.

12.32 Consultation with Parish Councils and local citizens also served to illustrate the work that these groups are doing with regards the creation of new green corridors and the improvement of existing facilities. Partnership working will be central to the effective delivery of the green network if improvements are to continue and the green network is to be sustainable.

---

**GC 1**

Cotswold District Council and Gloucestershire County Council should continue to work in partnership with key stakeholders to develop the PROW and green corridor network in the Cotswolds. Given the success that has been achieved through community engagement with other types of open space, consider the creation of friends groups on key green corridors.
Quality enhancements

12.33 Improvements to the quality of existing corridors will be essential if current usage is to be maintained and increased. The importance of providing a network of high quality, accessible green corridors was emphasised throughout consultation, particularly at the Parish/Town Council and resident workshops.

12.34 The quality of green corridors was generally perceived positively during consultation. However, consultation with Gloucestershire County Council identified general maintenance (e.g. poorly maintained stiles, missing signs) and surfacing as issues regarding the PROW network.

12.35 The recommended quality vision identifies cleanliness, and litter free, accessible footpaths, nature features and level surfaces as essential features of a high quality green corridor. Particular priority for improvement should be given to those areas where access to open space is limited and hence green corridors are an even more important local resource.

**GC 2**

The District Council should work with providers to maintain and enhance the quality of green corridors in the District in line with the quality standard

12.36 The creation of green corridors should not only be considered from a recreational perspective. As referenced earlier in this section, corridors provide an important habitat for wildlife, as well as facilitating migration across the District. The Gloucestershire PROWIP identifies the role of green corridors in the promotion of biodiversity and habitats and the two recommended practices identified in the plan are to:

- seek to fully meet responsibilities set out in the overall Highways Maintenance Biodiversity Action Plan and in line with legal duties (this is the responsibility of Highways Maintenance); and
- work closely with Natural England and the county ecologist on schemes that significantly impact on SSSIs.

**GC 3**

Cotswold District Council / Gloucestershire County Council should educate providers of green corridors to ensure that maintenance regimes at green corridors are sympathetic to the wider role of these sites in terms of biodiversity and habitat creation.
Protection

12.37 Consultation findings emphasise the importance of green corridors to residents in and visitors to the Cotswold District. Green corridors are the second most frequently used type of open space in the District and the importance of this type of open space for residents and visitors was emphasised throughout consultation. Supporting the level of usage that these resources receive, green corridors were one of the most frequently referred to types of open space.

12.38 At drop in sessions and workshops, the good network of green corridors in the Cotswold District was recognised and the need to maximise the opportunities provided by these natural resources, such as the River Thames was highlighted.

12.39 Green corridors help create a sustainable network of open spaces and provide linkages between settlements in the Cotswold District, which is particularly important in light of the rural nature of the District. This is also illustrated in Sections 4 – 11 of this report, with many recommendations highlighting the role of linkages and suggesting the need to improve existing linkages, rather than provide new facilities.

12.40 In consideration of the contribution that green corridors can make to wider strategic policy, as well as the high value placed on green corridors by local residents, the Local Development Framework (LDF) should seek to protect existing corridors and support enhancements to the overall network. It should ensure that the impact of development on existing green routes is considered.

GC 4 Seek to protect green corridors through policy in the Local Development Framework.

New provision

12.41 Local consultation identified the need for increased provision of green corridors in the Cotswold District. A lack of cycle paths was emphasised by residents at drop in sessions, in Parish Council workshops, in the household survey and at the Citizens workshop. The need for more bridleways was also identified in consultation with Gloucestershire County Council.

12.42 Although there is perceived to be a good network of routes in the north of the District, Gloucestershire County Council indicated that the network is patchy in other parts of the district and needs to be joined up.

12.43 The provision of new routes will contribute to the achievement of the PROWIP and will also facilitate links to, between and within open space, sport and recreation facilities. As previously identified the development of the Cotswold Canals is a major project in the District. In addition to this the River Thames and number of disused railways lines also provide significant opportunities to enhance the green corridor network in the District and the provision of accessible routes along these resources should be prioritised. Other areas identified throughout this report as being particular priorities for access improvements include;

- East of Cirencester - St Michael’s Park and Abbey Grounds
- Stratton - Cirencester Park and Abbey Grounds
- Tetbury - Westonbirt Arboretum
- Bourton-on-the-Water - Sherbourne Park and Eyford Park
**GC 5**
Ensure that policy within the Local Development Framework supports and promotes the creation of new accessible green corridors suitable for walking, cycling and horse riding.

**GC 6**
Seek to emphasise and promote the role of the River Thames, Cotswold Canals and disused railway lines in the District and build on the natural resources these corridors offer to improve opportunities for recreation as well as biodiversity.

12.44 In addition to providing new routes, to ensure the development of a green infrastructure network it will be important that access issues are considered as part of new developments and planning applications. The Council should seek to work with relevant departments to ensure that this is taken into consideration. In some instances, it may be more appropriate for new developments to contribute towards the improvement of access routes between and within settlements and open spaces rather than to provide new or improve the quality of existing open spaces.

**Disposal and redesignation**

12.45 There are no recommendations for the disposal or redesignation of green corridors in the District.

**Increasing access**

12.46 Increasing access to green corridors will promote physical activity and encourage sustainable travel in the District. Attendees at the LDF Working Group workshop indicated that access to open spaces via green corridors is good and that more should be done to encourage further usage of these types of facility.

12.47 Consultation undertaken as part of the PROWIP identified the need for more permissive routes, improved surfaces and closer working with land owners and representatives. A lack of access to private land was a key theme of consultation.

**GC 7**
Cotswold District Council / Gloucestershire County Council and Parish Councils should work with local landowners to increase public access across private land.

12.48 It is also important to ensure that green corridors are accessible to all sectors of the population through the improvement of surfaces, reduction of physical barriers and increased access to private land. Increasing disabled access to green corridors will also be important. This is a key aim for Gloucestershire County Council and the County Council is focused on improving surfaces and removing stiles to increase disabled access. Access for different sectors of the population was highlighted as an issue across many types of open space in Cotswold District.

**GC 8**
Work with providers to enhance access to green corridors in the District by ensuring that surfaces are even and that there are no physical barriers limiting access to some sectors of the population.
Green corridors are a particular attraction for visitors to the District. Promotion of the opportunities available is therefore essential in maximising the usage of these resources and ensuring the ongoing contribution of tourism to the local economy. Gloucestershire County Council promotes the PROW network through leaflets and on the Council website and further information is provided by Cotswold District Council. The Council should continue to promote green corridors to both residents and potential visitors to maximise usage.

**GC 9**

Continue to promote the opportunities provided by green corridors in the District and raise awareness amongst local residents as well as tourists to the area.

**Summary**

12.50 Green corridors provide opportunities close to peoples’ homes for informal recreation, particularly walking and cycling, as part of every day activities, for example, travel to work or shops. Therefore the development of a linked green corridor network will help to improve the health and well being of the local community. In this way, green corridors can be integral to the achievement of targets for increased active recreation.

12.51 There are a large number of green corridors in the District and these are a key attraction for visitors to the Cotswolds. Consultation emphasised the value of green corridors and the regularity of use of these routes highlights their overall value to residents. The need to maximise the opportunities provided by these natural resources, such as the River Thames, was highlighted and in particular the need to increase the number of cycle routes and bridleways was identified. The role that green corridors can play in improving access to other types of open space has been emphasised in Sections 4 – 12 of this report.

12.52 In addition to addressing gaps in the existing network, future improvement should also encompass qualitative improvements to existing corridors. The quality of existing corridors was perceived to be good, however, the need for improved surfaces and general maintenance was emphasised. Furthermore, the need to remove barriers such as stiles, which restrict access for disabled residents was raised.

12.53 While green corridors are well used, there are opportunities to further promote these routes and capitalise on the role that they can play in improving levels of physical activity, promoting sustainable travel and contributing to the tourism economy.

12.54 The key priorities for the future delivery of green corridors should therefore include:

- ensuring the protection and development of the network through planning policy. Policy should give consideration to improvements to access routes and linkages as part of new development;
- facilitating the development of new green corridors as part of the planning process, and actively addressing the need to provide additional routes. This should include the creation of green corridors along disused railway lines as well as within and between settlements;
- all providers working together to drive a programme of qualitative improvements including enhanced maintenance of footpaths, improvements to the perception of safety and increased signage as well as appropriate gateways;
- ensuring that corridors are managed sympathetically taking into account their role in both the provision of habitats and in the sustainable movement of people;
• working in tandem with key partners to help maximise the use of green corridors and Public Rights of Way; and
• promoting the opportunities available to increase usage of green corridors for both residents and tourists.
13. Summary and Planning Implementation

Background

13.1 This study of open space, sport and recreation facilities has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the latest Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) and its Companion Guide.

13.2 This section sets a vision and objectives for the future provision of open space, considers the wider benefits of open spaces and identifies the impact and implications of the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities on key aims and objectives of Cotswold District and its partners.

13.3 This section also highlights the key priorities arising from the study and the implications of these from a planning perspective. The recommendations set out in this report do not constitute formal policies, but provide an evidence base to inform future decision making and policy formulation across Cotswold District.

Vision and objectives

13.4 Consultation throughout this study highlights the importance of open space in Cotswold District in defining the character of the local area for both residents and visitors. The natural countryside and associated green corridors are one of the main reasons why thousands of tourists visit the area each year. In addition to the abundance of natural open space, consultation demonstrates that local space within the towns and villages is also important to residents from a recreational and social inclusion perspective as well as for the wider environmental benefits that open spaces offer.

13.5 It is therefore essential that a clear vision for open space, sport and recreation is developed to guide the proactive planning of these facilities across the District and ensure that all partners are working to achieve a common goal. Partnership working and community involvement will be essential if ongoing improvements are to be delivered, particularly given the variety of owners and providers of open space, sport and recreation facilities in the District.

13.6 The vision for open space, sport and recreation facilities across Cotswold District is therefore:

“to create an accessible, attractive, safe, secure and sustainable network of open space and sport and recreation facilities that protects and enhances biodiversity, improves choice, access and quality of life and engenders pride and involvement in the local community”.

13.7 This vision can be achieved by:

- maintaining and enhancing the quality of open spaces;
- ensuring that the quantity of open space is sufficient to meet current and future needs;
- maximising access to and functionality of existing open spaces; and
promoting, encouraging and facilitating community involvement and supporting other key delivery partners.

**The wider context**

13.8 There is now national recognition of the continuing importance of open spaces.

13.9 The Government strategy *World Class Places* (May 2009) sets out the Government’s vision that all places are planned, designed and developed to provide everyone, including future generations, with a decent quality of life and fair chances. It sees green infrastructure as a core ingredient of this vision. This message and vision is consistent with a number of other cross-Government initiatives. The consultation draft (*Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment*), which brings together policy on the protection of open spaces from a range of other Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Statements (PPS 9: Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, PPS 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas and PPG20: Coastal Planning) further serves to highlight the importance of the natural environment and the role that the conservation and effective planning of this environment can have on the achievement of wider aims and objectives. The *Green Spaces, Better Places Report* (DTLR Task Force May 2002) highlighted that parks and open spaces:

- contribute significantly to social inclusion because they are free and accessible to all;
- can become a centre of community spirit;
- contribute to child development through providing scope for outdoor, energetic and imaginative play;
- offer numerous educational opportunities; and
- provide a range of health, environmental and economic benefits.

13.10 The wider benefits of open space are well documented and are set out in Figure 13.1 overleaf.
Effective Provision of Open Space, Sport and Recreation facilities

- Improving health and levels of physical activity through the provision of recreational opportunities
- Defining local landscape character and providing context for built development and infrastructure
- Achieving an interface between rural and urban environments
- Emphasising and maximising the presence of natural features
- Preserving the historic character of the environment
- Facilitating community empowerment
- Promoting and protecting biodiversity and habitat creation
- Attracting tourists and visitors to the area
- Mitigating climate change and flood risk
- Creating community cohesion
13.11 At the local level, the role that open spaces play in the achievement of wider corporate objectives is recognised, both within overarching documents such as the Sustainable Community Strategy, Local Area Agreement and Cotswold District Council Corporate Strategy, as well as within more specific documents such as the Play Strategy.

13.12 Table 13.1 summarises the role of open space in the achievement of the priorities of key regional and local strategies. The key objectives of each of the documents are summarised in Section 3.

**Table 13.1 - The role of open space in the achievement of local and regional priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives for the future delivery of open space</th>
<th>Strategic Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the quality of open spaces across Cotswold District</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the quantity of open space is sufficient to meet local needs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise access and functionality of existing open spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote, encourage and facilitate community involvement and partnership Working</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Better Place to be - Culture in the South West of England

Biodiversity Action Plan for Gloucestershire

Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Strategy

Cotswold District Sustainable Community Strategy (2008 – 2012)


**Framework for action**

13.13 This PPG17 study and the key priorities highlighted should be used as a supporting evidence base for Local Development Documents and the policies within them. The key findings from the local consultation and audit of provision should inform the Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Documents (DPDs) as well as the General Policies DPD and any further documents relating to open space, sport and recreation provision.
13.14 Development Plan Documents (DPDs), open space designations and allocations should include general policies on open space, sport and recreation facilities that are supported by the findings of this study and other relevant documents.

13.15 DPDs should also consider the principles and use of planning obligations. For example, matters to be covered by planning obligations and factors to take into account when considering the scale and form of contributions. This will be particularly important in the planned Development Management DPD, which will take into account the protection of open space and the collection of developer contributions.

13.16 Planning obligations can be in kind or in the form of financial contributions. Policies on the types of payment, including pooling and maintenance payments, should be set out and developers should be able to predict as accurately as possible the likely contributions they will be asked to pay. Many local authorities now include a S106 contributions calculator on their website ensuring that the system is transparent to all developers.

13.17 More detailed policies applying the principles set out in the Development Plan Document, for example, specific localities and likely quantum of contributions ought to then be included in Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

13.18 This study therefore provides a starting point for future proactive and reactive action to open space, sport and recreation facilities. It draws together the key issues highlighted in each of the typology specific sections. The framework for action includes the following:

- General overarching issues / principles
- Key priorities for each type of open space
- Priorities by settlement

**Overarching issues - priorities arising during the study**

13.19 Several issues relating generally to open spaces across the District were highlighted during the course of consultation. An improvement in access to existing open space was a particularly high priority in many of the consultations. In order to maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of open space across the District, the following issues, common to all types of open space should be considered as part of a future delivery strategy, in both the Local Development Framework and other more specific strategies:

- there is a need to ensure that open spaces and sport and recreation facilities are designed and managed in such a way that is sustainable and that facilitates ongoing and continuous improvement. This is particularly important in some of the more rural Parishes, where a higher number of facilities are required to provide localised access for residents;
- effectively provided open spaces and sports facilities are viewed as a key opportunity to integrate people from different communities and of different ages. It was suggested that facilities should be accessible to all groups and designed to integrate rather than segregate;
- a strategy to maximise the use of resources in order to provide more and improved facilities in some of the rural settlements is essential. School facilities provide an important opportunity to improve the quantity of facilities in the area and ensure that residents have localised access to facilities. Ongoing engagement with the county council will therefore be essential and guidance on securing community use agreements is provided in the Sport England document Win Win Scenario (http://www.sportengland.org/support__advice/building_schools_and_sport.aspx). There are also a high amount of private facilities in the district, which provide limited or no
access for local residents. Negotiating access to some of these facilities would significantly improve access to localised open space for residents of and visitors to the District;

- there are many examples of good practice and it will be essential to create a culture of knowledge sharing and partnership working to ensure that such facilities and spaces can be replicated and that interested parties can learn from the experience of others. A coordinated approach to the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities by all providers, including the District Council, County Council, Parish Councils and voluntary and private groups will maximise the effectiveness of the open space, sport and recreation facility network. In particular, voluntary sector groups are able to access different types of external funding and there are many opportunities for bodies such as Friends Groups and allotment associations to invest their time and effort improving open spaces. Creation of, and empowerment of such voluntary groups would improve the ongoing sustainability of parks and open spaces;

- the rural nature of the District means that many residents are required to travel long distances to public open space and sports facilities. Access to facilities was the key issue across all consultations. Effective public transport and a comprehensive network of transport routes are therefore instrumental in the delivery of an effective network of open spaces although it is recognised that this is challenging in such a rural area. As well as providing appropriate public transport routes, consideration should also be given to the provision of sustainable greenways, such as footpaths and cycleways. Cost issues were also raised as a barrier to access by some parties and it is essential to ensure that facilities are accessible to all; and

- there will be significant growth in the population of the district over the Local Development Framework period. It will be essential to ensure that the impact of this growth is taken into account when planning open space, sport and recreation provision. As well as taking into account the views of residents, it is important to ensure that facilities meet the needs of tourists to the area

### PLAN 1

Seek to ensure that both planning policy and future proactive green space planning considers the key issues outlined above.

### Typology specific and settlement specific issues - priorities arising in the study

13.20 The priorities and issues outlined in this report are a result of the application of a series of local standards. These standards were set following an extensive programme of consultation and the key issues arising from consultation feed directly into the standards that have been set.

13.21 For each typology, the following standards were set:

- Quantity – amount of provision that can be expected per 1,000 population
- Quality – the key qualitative aspects expected for each type of open space
- Accessibility – the distance that residents expect to travel to reach different types of open space

13.22 These standards provide a guide as to the appropriate amount of open space required in each settlement. As well as facilitating a proactive approach to improving the overall provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in line with local needs, these standards can be used to determine the additional demand that new developments will generate. This will be returned to later in this section.
Table 13.2 summarises the local standards that have been set as part of this study. The suggested minimum sizes for each type of open space are also outlined. This will help with decision making on whether on site provision is required. Where the population of a new development is insufficient to reach the minimum size, based on the local standards, provision will be required off site. Minimum size criteria have been derived from analysis of Best Practice and CABE Space and Greater London Authority (GLA) guidance. All types of open space should be accessible at a cost that it is considered affordable to residents.

**Table 13.2 - Recommended local standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of open space</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Suggested Minimum Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal parks</td>
<td>0.48 hectares per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>480m catchment (10 minute walk) in Cirencester and the Market Towns (Category B1 and B2 Settlements)</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free, vegetation e.g. flowers and trees, well kept grass. Desirable – toilets, footpaths, seating, level surface, dog bins and parking facilities.</td>
<td>0.4 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country parks</td>
<td>No standard set – sites to be protected.</td>
<td>30 minute drive time (public transport).</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free, appropriate and level footpaths, nature features and dog and litter bins. Desirable – toilets, well kept grass, parking and appropriate signage.</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and semi natural open space</td>
<td>2 hectares per 1,000 population <strong>for new developments.</strong> Existing provision to be protected.</td>
<td>480m catchment (10 minute walk).</td>
<td>Essential – cleanliness and maintenance, footpaths and natural features. Desirable – trees and shrubs, dog walking area, parking facilities, information and signage and dog bins.</td>
<td>0.05 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity green space</td>
<td>0.23 hectares per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>240m catchment (5 minute walk).</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free,</td>
<td>0.1 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of open space</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Suggested Minimum Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>0.075ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>480m catchment (10 minute walk).</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free, well kept grass, facilities for the young that meet Safety and Play value guidelines and litter and dog bins. Desirable – seating, clear and defined boundaries creating a dog free area, involvement of local children in the design and management and maintenance of facilities.</td>
<td>0.04 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for young people</td>
<td>0.040 ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>480m catchment (10 minute walk).</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free, well kept grass, facilities for the young that meet Safety and Play value guidelines, litter and dog bins and seating and shelter. Desirable – level surfaces and clearly defined footpaths, clear and defined boundaries creating a dog free area, lighting</td>
<td>0.04 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of open space</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Suggested Minimum Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.76 hectares per 1,000 population</td>
<td>480m catchment (10 minute walk) Cirencester and Market Towns. 10 minute drive time Small Towns and Small Local Service Centres.</td>
<td>and involvement of local young people in the design and management and maintenance of facilities.</td>
<td>0.76 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>3.28 hectares per 1000 population</td>
<td>15 minute drive - athletics tracks. 20 minute drive - golf courses. 10 minute drive - synthetic turf pitches, bowling greens and tennis courts. 480m catchment (10 minute walk) - grass pitches.</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free, good site access, parking facilities and appropriately maintained to NGB standards. Desirable - appropriate specification for key users (designed in accordance with NGB guidance), changing facilities, toilets and accessible parking.</td>
<td>0.28 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>Essential – clean and litter free, accessible footpaths, nature features and level</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of open space</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Suggested Minimum Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards</td>
<td>For cemeteries, 1.81 hectares of burial space will be required up to 2026. This may be dispersed across the authority in order to provide local burials and is likely to take the form of extensions to existing sites</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>Essential – parking, well kept grass, clean and litter free and parking. Desirable – toilets, seating, litter bins and dog walking areas.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Sports Halls – 0.26 courts per 1000 population Swimming Pools – 9.17m² per 1000 population Health and Fitness – no standard set Indoor Bowls – no standard set</td>
<td>Sports Halls – 15 minute drivetime Swimming Pools – 20 minute drivetime Health and Fitness – 10 minute drivetime</td>
<td>Essential – clean, appropriate maintenance of facilities, costs that are accessible to residents, range of activities, design and specification in line with National Governing Body requirements Desirable – secure parking, welcoming staff, clear booking procedures and reached by accessible routes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.24 Table 13.3 summarises the key issues and priorities for each type of open space and highlights the potential implications for the Local Development Framework documents. As highlighted, these key issues and priorities arise from the application of local standards.
### Table 13.3 - Key issues and priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Key Issues and Priorities</th>
<th>Implications for LDF Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and gardens</td>
<td>Formal parks are a highly valued type of open space in Cotswold District. This type of open space is frequently used by residents and is considered to be particularly important facilities for families. There are a variety of formal parks within Cotswold District. Sites range from those with a range of facilities, such as sports facilities and a play area, that serve a predominantly recreational function to those parks which provide landscaping and aesthetic values, providing users with an area for relaxation and informal recreation. The benefits of parks are wide reaching and these sites are as valuable for the habitats they offer as the recreational opportunities that they provide. The quality of formal parks was perceived positively throughout consultation, with this type of open space rated highly in comparison to other types of open space in the District. Site assessment findings support the consultation perceptions, with the condition of formal parks rated as good or very good. Westonbirt Arboretum was specifically identified as an excellent quality site. The achievement of green flag awards is set as a key priority for the district moving forwards as attaining such recognition can increase the profile of the park and positively impact on the number of visitors to the site. Formal parks are predominantly located in the east of the District. All residents in the rural settlements have access to a formal park within the recommended 30 minute drive time. Reflecting this, application of the quantity standard reveals that there is currently only a minor shortfall of provision. However, future population increases indicate that pressure on existing provision will increase, resulting in an expected shortfall of 3.67 hectares by 2026. Increased provision will therefore be required in order to accommodate future population growth. Key areas of deficiency are evident in East Cirencester, the centre of Tetbury, west of Bourton-on-the-Water and East of Moreton-in-Marsh. Consider including parks within a policy on open space. Such a policy should recognise the environmental and recreational benefits of parks and protect these sites from development. In addition to protecting existing open space, new parks may be required in the areas of identified deficiency (East Cirencester, the centre of Tetbury, west of Bourton-on-the-Water and east of Moreton-in-Marsh) and sites should be allocated for this purpose. In addition, the Local Development Framework should facilitate contributions towards improvements to the quality of parks as well as to the provision of new parks. Guidance on the key quality criteria that should be taken into account in the creation of new parks and improvement of existing parks should be clearly set out, as well as the quantity and accessibility standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Typology

#### Natural and semi natural open space and country parks

- **Key Issues and Priorities**
  - Natural and semi natural open space and country parks are popular types of open space in the District. Natural and semi natural open space is the most frequently used typology and country parks are the third most frequently used.
  - The need to protect country parks and natural open space from development was a key theme throughout consultation. While recreational opportunities should be encouraged at natural and semi natural open space and country parks, this should be balanced with conserving and promoting biodiversity.
  - Part of Cotswold District is designated as an AONB and there is an abundance of natural and semi natural open space in the District. The provision of natural and semi natural open space contributes significantly to the character of the District.
  - Application of the accessibility standard has revealed that natural and semi natural open space is predominantly located outside of settlement boundaries. Local access to natural open space for residents within settlements, particularly the more urban settlements, is therefore limited. Key areas of deficiency are evident in Cirencester, Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh, Bourton-on-the-Water, Chipping Campden and Stow-on-the-Wold. Opportunities to increase the provision of natural and semi natural open space in these settlements should be seized, particularly in the event of population growth.
  - Opportunities to increase the provision of natural and semi natural open space are limited within some settlements, particularly within the more urban

- **Implications for LDF Policy**
  - Consideration should be given to including natural and semi natural open spaces and country parks within an overall policy on the protection of open spaces. This policy should extend to natural open spaces of recreational value as well as those with specific designations such as SSSI, LNR, SINC.
  - The Local Development Framework should facilitate improvements to the quality of natural and semi natural open spaces and country parks as well as new spaces where these are required.
  - Consideration should be given to requiring contributions these types of open space as part of the Local Development Framework.
  - Consideration should also be given to promoting the improvement of existing, and creation of new, linkages between residential areas and existing open spaces within the Local Development Framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Key Issues and Priorities</th>
<th>Implications for LDF Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>settlements, and the incorporation of natural open space within formal parks or other types of open space may be required to alleviate deficiencies and ensure that natural open space is accessible for both wildlife and humans. In these parts, increasing access to natural and semi natural open space and country parks through the development of the green infrastructure network (footpaths and cycle routes) within and between settlements and public transport routes will be the key means of improving the provision of natural and semi natural space for residents. Providing private access to existing private sites will also help address the identified deficiencies. Particular deficiencies exist in Stow on the Wold, Andoversford, Blockley, Kemble, Kempsford, Mickleton and Down Ampney. The creation of pocket parks (linked with parks above) may rectify many of these deficiencies.</td>
<td>The Local Development Framework should incorporate policies that protect sites where usage is particularly high and/or the site is the only green space within a catchment area from development. Loss of amenity should only be permitted where the site is surplus to requirements and not required for any other use as open space and the disposal of the site will enable the improvement of other spaces in the district. The Local Development Framework should facilitate contributions towards improvements to the quality of amenity green spaces as well as new spaces where these are required. The Local Development Framework should also seek to promote the creation of linkages between amenity spaces and other open spaces and between and within settlements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity green space</td>
<td>The value of amenity green space was recognised during consultation. This type of open space is used regularly by local residents and is perceived to offer local access to informal recreational opportunities. The provision of amenity green space in settlements where there is a lack of other types of informal open space is particularly important. Application of the quantity and accessibility standards indicates that there is a shortfall of amenity green space within the District. Key areas of deficiency are located in Cirencester, Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water, Northleach and Chipping Campden. There is also scope to provide new amenity space in Mickleton, Kempsford, Avening and Down Ampney, potentially through the creation of pocket parks. There is also an identified need to provide amenity green space as part of new developments. While most amenity green space is valuable, there are some sites serving overlapping catchments in Cirencester, Tetbury and Moreton-in-Marsh. Improvement to the quality and functionality of amenity green spaces across the District is also necessary. Site visits highlighted a series of issues and indicate that the provision of basic equipment such as bins and benches is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Issues and Priorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implications for LDF Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for children and young people</td>
<td>Children’s play areas and facilities for young people were key themes to emerge from local consultation. The need to increase the amount of facilities, particularly for young people, was highlighted in addition to enhancing the quality of existing provision. It was also emphasised that facilities should be fit for purpose and challenging, and exciting. The <em>Cotswold Play Strategy</em> outlines a commitment to increasing provision for children and young people in the District and enhancing the quality of existing facilities. The strategy also indicates that it is important to ensure that play opportunities are accessible for all children and young people aged 8 – 14 in Cotswold District. Quantitative analysis indicates that the current provision of facilities for children and young people falls below the recommended quantity standards, indicating that there is a need to increase provision, particularly with regards to facilities for young people. Accessibility mapping reveals that children’s play areas and facilities for young people are generally well distributed across the District and predominantly serve unique catchments. However, key areas of deficiency are evident in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider both the provision for children and facilities for young people as separate entities within Local Development Framework policy. Provision for children and young people should be required in addition to amenity green space (i.e. it is not interchangeable). The Local Development Framework should take on board the standards recommended and should seek to promote a strategic approach to play provision, requiring either new facilities for both children and/or young people depending on local need and aspirations or qualitative improvements to existing facilities. An accessibility led approach should be used to guide decision making (i.e where a development is within the catchment of an existing facility, contributions will be required towards qualitative improvements rather than new provision). The provision of new facilities where these are required should be encouraged. It may be appropriate to allocate some sites in areas where deficiencies have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for children, in Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water, Tetbury, Blockley, Kemble, Avening, Moreton-in-Marsh and Chipping Campden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for young people in Cirencester, Stratton, Bourton-on-the-Water, Moreton-in-Marsh, Northleach, Tetbury, Lechlade, Blockley and Kempsford. In smaller settlements, use the mobile skatepark managed by Cotswold District Council to meet short term demand, particularly in Andoversford, Avening, Down Ampney and Mickleton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A series of qualitative improvements are also identified. These focus largely on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Key Issues and Priorities</th>
<th>Implications for LDF Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Local consultation indicates that the current provision of allotments is insufficient to meet demand. Waiting lists are evident at a number of sites in the District and there is high unmet demand for allotments, highlighted by the fact that 40% of respondents to the household survey that do not currently use allotments would be interested in renting a plot. Reflecting this, application of the quantity standard indicates that the current provision of allotments is below the minimum standard and that future population growth will further increase pressure on existing provision. Ensuring that the capacity of allotments is sufficient to accommodate future population growth will therefore be important and it should also be ensured that new developments contribute towards the provision of allotments. Accessibility mapping reveals that there is a good distribution of allotments in the District, which means that nearly all residents have access to a site within the recommended accessibility catchments. Latent demand has however been identified in towns and villages across the district, with several Parishes indicating that they are actively seeking new allotment land, and waiting lists evident at several sites. Priorities for new provision include west Cirencester, Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water, Fairford, Lechlade, South Cerney, Andoversford and Down Ampney.</td>
<td>Consider including a policy within the Local Development Framework that protects allotments from development. In addition to protecting existing sites, new allotments are required to meet current and future demand. Consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of sites for allotment provision or alternatively should include a policy permitting the conversion of appropriate sites for allotment use as well as protecting existing sites. Allocate sites in west Cirencester, Tetbury, Bourton-on-the-Water, Fairford, Lechlade, Northleach and South Cerney, Andoversford and Down Ampney. Ensure that policy includes a requirement towards allotments from new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards</td>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards can be significant providers of open space, particularly in rural areas. In towns they can represent a relatively minor resource in terms of the land required, but are important for nature conservation and also offer recreational opportunities for residents. Given the nature of cemeteries and churchyards, local standards for the cleanliness and maintenance of existing sites.</td>
<td>The LDF should facilitate the delivery of additional cemeteries and should project need across the LDF period. Demand should be monitored, particularly for localised burial space as well as larger centrally located cemeteries and churchyards. New provision is not likely to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accessibility have not been set. Despite this, it remains important to consider the future delivery of cemeteries and churchyards anticipating future demand as well as assessing the current level of provision.

The essential and desirable features set out in the quality standards should guide the future development and improvement of cemeteries and churchyards across the District. Site visits indicate that the quality of existing cemeteries and churchyards is high and there is currently a very positive perception of provision. Sympathetic management will however be essential to ensure that recreational use is balanced with biodiversity.

In some instances, cemeteries and churchyards are the only type of open space within a village, making them a particularly valuable element of the rural green space network. Enhancements to accessibility and quality should be prioritised in these areas.

**Typology** | **Key Issues and Priorities** | **Implications for LDF Policy**
--- | --- | ---
Green corridors | Green corridors provide opportunities close to peoples’ homes for informal recreation, particularly walking and cycling, as part of every day activities, for example, travel to work or shops. Therefore the development of a linked green corridor network will improve the health and well being of the local community. In this way, green corridors can be integral to the achievement of targets for increased active recreation.

There are a large number of green corridors in the District and these are a key attraction for visitors to Cotswold District. Consultation emphasised the value of green corridors and the need to maximise the opportunities provided by these natural resources, such as the River Thames, was highlighted. In particular the need to increase the number of cycle routes and bridleways was identified.

In addition to addressing gaps in the existing network, future improvement should also encompass qualitative improvements to existing corridors. The quality of existing corridors was perceived to be good, however, the need for improved surfaces and general maintenance was emphasised. Furthermore, be required over the LDF period, however, pressure on smaller sites was identified and if there is an acceptance that local burial space will be provided, then new provision will be required to meet this demand. As a minimum, it will be necessary to consider the need for new provision towards the end of the planning period to ensure that provision is sufficient beyond the year 2030.

Consider the inclusion of a policy promoting the development of a green network within the Local Development Framework. This should link with policies promoting sustainable transport principles. Existing corridors should be protected and policy should promote the provision of new corridors. Opportunities may include existing disused railway lines and river routes.

Ensure that policy permits contributions towards the improvement of green corridors in lieu of on site provision of other types of open space where green corridors would be of greater benefit to the community, for example in areas already well served by other types of open space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Key Issues and Priorities</th>
<th>Implications for LDF Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports</td>
<td>the need to remove barriers such as stiles that restrict access for disabled residents was highlighted. While green corridors are well used, there are opportunities to further promote these routes and capitalise on the role that they can play in improving levels of physical activity, promoting sustainable travel and contributing to the tourism economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities are a wide ranging category of open space which includes both natural and artificial surfaces for sport and recreation, specifically playing pitches; athletics tracks; bowling greens; and tennis courts. In addition to these facilities, water sports and cycling and walking are also popular in Cotswold District. Local standards have been set for outdoor sports facilities in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility. The quantity standard should be used for broad planning need only - to determine the likely impact of new development. Whilst the key issues with regards to each type of facility are considered at an overview level, the demand-led nature of outdoor sports facilities means that specific studies (such as a playing pitch strategy) should be undertaken in order to explore shortfalls and surpluses in more detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The key issues arising from analysis of the current provision and consultation with regards to outdoor sports facilities are as follows:</td>
<td>Consider the inclusion of a policy protecting outdoor sports facilities. This policy should ensure that detailed assessments of demand are required prior to the disposal of any site. For pitches, the criteria set out in Sport England Planning guidance should be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tennis Courts – The majority of residents have access to a tennis court within the recommended catchment, however, there is a lack of public access to facilities, with many courts being located on school sites. Dissatisfaction is evident with the amount of tennis courts, and agreements to access facilities on school sites should be prioritised, particularly in Tetbury. Cost was not raised as an issue during consultations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bowling Greens – The current quantity of bowling greens is sufficient to meet demand and the quality of existing provision is good. However,</td>
<td>Consideration should also be given to the inclusion of policy that promotes improvements to existing sites, for example by ensuring policy permits provision of changing facilities etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the implementation of policies that require contributions towards either the creation of new / improvement of existing outdoor sports facilities as part of new development. This should draw on the recommended standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek to ensure that policy supports and facilitates negotiation of community use agreement at school sites and also supports the development of new outdoor sports facilities including an athletics training facility (Cirencester) and other facilities where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Key Issues and Priorities</td>
<td>Implications for LDF Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessibility deficiencies are evident in the centre of the District. While there is no evidence to suggest that additional bowling greens are required, taster sessions should be run in larger settlements without greens (Bourton-on-the-Water and Northleach) in order to establish demand. The characteristics of the population suggest that the propensity of residents to participate in sports such as bowls is high;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Synthetic Turf Pitches</strong> – The quantity of STPs is generally sufficient to meet demand although there are some areas where residents are outside of the catchment for appropriate facilities and some reports of difficulties accessing facilities for training. In the short term, focus should be placed on enhancing the quality of existing STPs, particularly as some are nearing the end of their lifespan, through the implementation of sinking funds. Longer term, and as population grows, new provision will be required. The location of existing facilities suggests that Tetbury would be the optimum location for new provision;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Athletics Tracks</strong> – There is no dedicated athletics track in the District. Consultation indicates that there is demand for such a facility, particularly in Cirencester where there is an existing successful club that struggles to find appropriate facilities. Consideration should be given to the provision of a four lane practice track in the District, located within Cirencester;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Golf Courses</strong> – The amount of golf courses is adequate to meet demand and nearly all residents have access to a site within or in close proximity to the District. The quality of existing provision is also high and focus should therefore be placed on increasing access to existing facilities and ensuring that these sites are accessible to all sectors of the population, in terms of both transport routes and the costs associated with using such facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grass Pitches</strong> – The current provision of grass pitches is generally perceived to be adequate, although football clubs identify unmet demand. A series of quality improvements are required to existing sites and to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Key Issues and Priorities</td>
<td>Implications for LDF Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must meet unmet demand, it will be necessary to improve access to school facilities. A full playing pitch strategy in line with Towards a Level Playing Field should be carried out in order to refine these issues; and</td>
<td>Consider including policy which protects against the loss of indoor sports facilities and that facilitates improvements to existing sites, for example by ensuring policy permits provision of associated changing facilities etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water sports – water sports are particularly popular in Cotswold District and there are a variety of opportunities for residents and visitors. Further promotion of these opportunities, as well as facilitating the ongoing development and improvement of such venues would ensure that the role of these sports in the district continues. A lack of access to the Cotswolds Water Park arose as a key issue throughout consultations and improving access to this site is a key priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports facilities</td>
<td>Analysis of the current supply and demand of indoor sports facilities in Cotswold District concludes that there are sufficient facilities to meet current and future demand in quantitative terms. No additional demand was highlighted for any type of facility. Around three quarters (73%) of residents in Cotswold District are satisfied with local sports provision (Source: Active People Survey) which is in line with the national average. The key area of dissatisfaction raised during consultation related to access and to the limited opening hours of some facilities in the district. Residents in the North of the District were much less satisfied (particularly at drop in sessions) than residents in the south. Key issues raised that should be addressed in order to increase participation and use at leisure centres include:</td>
<td>Consider incorporating policy that requires contributions towards indoor sports facilities as part of new development. The Sport England facility calculator should be used to determine the impact of new development. Design guidance (as well as the quality features outlined in this report) should be used to ensure that any new facilities provided / refurbishments of existing facilities are of the required quality. While it is unlikely that population growth will be sufficient to warrant new provision, contributions may be required towards the improvement of existing facilities which will be impacted by new residents in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensuring that investment strategies are in place for future repairs and maintenance requirements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure that the pricing structure is attractive to all sections of the community and maintaining concessionary rates for appropriate groups (consultations demonstrate that price is not a key issue at the current)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Key Issues and Priorities</td>
<td>Implications for LDF Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure that facilities on school sites provide access to the community out of school hours – this is particularly important in the North of the District;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensuring that the programming at facilities are complementary to one another; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensuring that the most is made of village/community halls for delivery of physical activities, especially in more rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This PPG17 assessment highlights a series of general recommendations by typology, and also considers issue by settlement. The general recommendations by typology are summarised below.

**Parks**

- Continue to develop and enhance the quality of existing formal parks in the District. Drive a structured programme of improvements with clearly defined outputs to create an overall network of sustainable parks. This should include the production of parks management plans and should focus on ensuring that all parks contain the facilities required by the local standard. Consultation indicates that the quality of existing provision is currently good, and maintaining a high level of provision will be essential if these sites are to remain valuable resources.

- Strive to achieve a Green Flag award at a minimum of one of the parks in the District. This will link to the preparation of a management plan and will help to attract visitors to the sites.

- Work with providers of open space in the District such as Town and Parish Councils to initiate the creation of friends groups at all parks. Once groups are established, provide ongoing advice and support.

- Work with providers of open space in the District to incorporate sustainable management techniques to promote biodiversity and create a healthy ecosystem at parks in the District.

- In light of the importance of formal parks, ensure that Local Development Framework policy protects existing sites from residential development. The loss of a park should only be permitted where it can be proven that there is no demand for the facility, or that improvements to another site will be of greater value to residents in the immediate catchment of the park to be lost.

- Ensure that Local Development Framework policy requires new housing developments to contribute towards (or provide on site where they are large enough to be reasonably expected to do so) the provision of new, or enhancement of existing, formal parks where possible and appropriate. Where the supply of formal parks in the surrounding area is sufficient, policy should ensure that contributions are required for qualitative improvements.

- Provide small local pocket parks if a friends group can be created, or proactive approaches to Parish Councils for the provision of a small park are made.

- Seek to improve access to existing formal parks through the development of safe and effective pedestrian and cycle routes linking key settlements with parks and gardens. Ensure that where possible, formal parks are located on public transport routes.

- Seek to improve access for disabled users to formal parks in the District by evaluating and overcoming existing barriers to use, drawing on the site assessments as a starting point.

- Negotiate with landowners to maintain and increase access to private parks and gardens within Cotswold District.
**Natural and semi natural open space**

- Work with providers and landowners to maintain and enhance the quality of country parks and natural and semi natural open space in Cotswold District. This could include applications for grant funding / use of S106 monies to drive a structured programme of improvements with clearly defined outputs, with particular focus on ensuring sites are clean, tidy and well maintained and have the appropriate basic infrastructure in place e.g. bins, car parking etc. Policy in the Local Development Framework should support the improvement of the quality of natural open spaces.

- Sympathetic management techniques should be practiced at sites of importance for nature conservation and biodiversity. Consideration should also be given to prohibiting public access to sites that are particularly sensitive in terms of the habitats that they offer to ensure their long term sustainability. The priorities of the biodiversity action plan should be used to inform these decisions.

- Continue to promote the country parks and larger strategic natural open spaces both to residents within the District and further afield (through the internet for example) to raise awareness of potential visitors to the area.

- In light of the importance of natural and semi natural open space in the District, ensure that Local Development Framework policy protects all sites. Natural open space should only be lost to development if it can be proven that the site has no recreational or conservation value and that the benefits of development would outweigh the impact of the loss of the site. These exception criteria should be set out in policy.

- In light of the importance of country parks in the District all sites should be protected through policies in the Local Development Framework.

**Amenity green space**

- Seek to enhance the quality of amenity green spaces in the District using the quality standard as a guide to inform the key features that should be present at each site. Priorities for improvement should be those where specific issues have been identified, or those which provide the only informal recreation opportunity in the area.

- Planning policy should protect valuable amenity green spaces from development. Valuable amenity green spaces include those which serve unique catchments and those which are frequently used. Provision in Northleach, Down Ampney and Kemble is particularly important as they are the only spaces within the settlement.

- Consideration of the disposal of an amenity green space proven surplus to requirements should only be given if the site is not required for alternative use as another type of open space. Policy should ensure that appropriate criteria for decision-making are set.

- Ensure that policy requires contributions towards amenity green space as part of new development as appropriate. Promote an accessibility led approach to determine levels of provision required as part of new development (i.e ensure that space is provided where residents are outside of the catchment of an existing amenity green space) and use the quantity standards to determine the amount of contribution that will be required.
Provision for children and young people

- Where the opportunity to upgrade a play facility is identified, seek to provide challenging and exciting play facilities that encourage children to explore their boundaries and balance risk and safety. This may include the creation of natural play areas which link with the surrounding environment as well as equipped play facilities.

- Providers of facilities for children and young people should seek to consult with children and young people in the local community and engage these groups in the design and management of new sites and refurbishment of existing sites.

- Work with providers to enhance the quality of children’s play areas in the District, using the findings of the site visits as a starting point. Focus should be placed on ensuring sites are well maintained and contain appropriate play and ancillary facilities. Avening Parish Council indicated that investment in play facilities is their top priority.

- Work with providers to enhance the quality of facilities for young people in the District. Focus should be placed on ensuring sites are well maintained and contain appropriate street furniture (e.g. lighting, bins and benches).

- Seek to protect valuable facilities for children and young people serving unique catchments through the LDF, using the standards as a basis for decision making. Facilities should only be lost to development where it can be proven (and supported through local consultation at the time of the decision) that there is no demand for a facility or that improvements to another site in the immediate catchment of the original site will be of greater value to residents. A lack of use of the existing site should not be taken to indicate that there is no demand, particularly if the local standards suggest that the facilities are required.

- Ensure that policy requires contributions towards facilities for both children and young people as part of new development as appropriate. Promote an accessibility led approach (i.e. prioritise the application of accessibility standards over the quantity standards) to the determination of levels of provision required as part of new development.

- Facilitate access to play areas and facilities for young people by providing safe footpaths and cycle routes between large residential neighbourhoods, play facilities and other green spaces.

- Encourage the development of facilities on sites that are easily accessible by public transport.

- Work with schools to increase community access to school play facilities in the District.

Allotments

- Seek to enhance the quality of allotments in the District based upon the findings of site assessments.

- As well as improving the function of allotments from a user perspective, work with providers to ensure that the management, maintenance and future planning of these sites takes into account their role in nature conservation and biodiversity.

- Include a policy within the Local Development Framework that protects allotments from development. Loss of allotments should only be permitted where it can be proven that the site is surplus to requirements and is unlikely to be needed in future years to accommodate population growth.
• Work with providers to implement appropriate policies to promote usage of allotment sites by a wide variety of residents including:
  - providing half plots as opposed to full plots to ensure that sites can accommodate a higher number of residents;
  - ensuring that residents only have one allotment plot at any one time; and
  - promoting appropriate use of allotments.
• Ensure that policy within the Local Development Framework requires contributions towards allotments as part of new development. The local standard should be used to evaluate the impact of the new development.
• Improve access to allotments in Cotswold District through the development of additional footpaths and cycle routes. Ensure that sites contain appropriate facilities such as car parking and cycle storage.
• Prioritise access improvements to all allotments in the district to ensure that they are accessible to all sectors of the population. Site visits reveal that only one site is currently accessible to disabled residents.
• Work with providers to increase awareness of allotments in Cotswold District.

Outdoor sports facilities

• The Council should seek to support and coordinate all partners and providers of outdoor sports facilities in order to promote a joined up approach to facility provision.
• Protect all outdoor sports facilities from development unless criteria set out in Sport England policy are met. This should be carried out through the incorporation of appropriate policies in the LDF.
• Seek to increase access to outdoor sports facilities within Cotswold District by:
  o Maximising the amount of outdoor sports facilities that are located on the public transport network.
  o Improving access to outdoor sports facilities by cyclepath and safe pedestrian routes. Appropriate facilities (such as cycle storage racks) should also be provided at key sites.
• Seek to negotiate formal community use agreements of outdoor sports facilities at all schools in the District. Use the Sport England Guidance Win Win as a starting point for discussions and strategic planning.
• Prioritise schools in areas where there are no community facilities, or where specific deficiencies are identified that can be rectified by opening up a school site. Sir William Romney School (Tetbury) should be considered the main priority.
• Seek opportunities to provide tennis courts in Stow-on-the-Wold.
• Work with providers to enhance the quality of tennis courts to meet Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) standards. Prioritise improvements at Chipping Campden School and King George V Playing Fields;
• provide support to bowls clubs to promote the opportunities that are available and to increase the number of members at each club.

• Assess demand for bowling greens within Bourton-on-the-Water and Northleach by running taster sessions in the first instance. Should demand be sufficient provide bowling greens in these settlements.

• Seek to maintain the quality of bowling greens to meet national governing body standards. Focus particularly on improvements to access at:
  - Chipping Campden Bowling Green
  - Cirencester Lawn Bowls Club
  - Cotswold Water Park Bowling Green
  - Weston Sub-Edge Bowling Club

• Provide a new Synthetic Turf Pitch (STP) at a school site as the population grows. Investigate opportunities to locate this facility in Tetbury.

• Support providers in the establishment of a sinking fund to ensure that ongoing refurbishments of facilities can take place.

• Provide a four lane practice athletics track in Cirencester.

• Where possible, ensure that all golf courses are located on public transport routes.

• Work with providers of golf courses to ensure that the pricing structure facilitates affordable access for local residents and consider interventions such as ‘Back to Golf’ (taster sessions to reintroduce people to the sport) to improve participation.

• Work with providers of golf courses in the District to ensure the continued provision of high quality facilities.

• Undertake a playing pitch strategy in line with Towards a Level Playing Field, to provide a robust assessment of the adequacy of grass pitch provision in the District.

• Support providers (through planning and guidance) to enhance the quality of pitch provision across the district.

• Seek to increase access to Cotswold Water Park through the development of the Green Infrastructure Network and public transport routes. Work to achieve connectivity between the network of pathways, bridleways and cycleways in the Water Park and the remainder of the district.

• Continue to promote water sports activities and venues in the District by updating the Cotswold Leisure Directory and providing further information on the Council website.

• Continue to promote cycling and walking in the District through the production of maps and information, as well as by supporting the provision of a connected network of pedestrian and cycle routes.

*Cemeteries and churchyards*
- Support improvements to the quality of cemeteries and churchyards across the District. Improvements to St. Catharine’s R.C. Cemetery and War memorial (Chipping Campden) are of particular priority.

- Stakeholders should recognise and promote the nature conservation value of cemeteries and churchyards and develop a greater awareness of ecological management and maintenance of cemeteries and churchyards.

- The Council should keep under review the opportunities for the reuse, expansion or acquisition of suitable land to ensure the continued and sustainable provision of local cemeteries. The LDF should facilitate the provision of additional burial spaces in areas where new localised provision is required/desired.

- Seek to increase access to cemeteries and churchyards through the development of sustainable transport routes (e.g. footpaths).

- Seek to increase disabled access to cemeteries and churchyards in the District.

**Green corridors**

- Continue to work in partnership and key stakeholders to develop the PROW and green corridor network in the Cotswolds. Given the success that has been achieved through community engagement with other types of open space, consider the creation of friends groups on key green corridors.

- Seek to maintain and enhance the quality of green corridors in the District in line with the quality standard.

- Ensure that maintenance regimes at green corridors are sympathetic to the wider role of these sites in terms of biodiversity and habitat creation.

- Seek to protect green corridors through policy in the Local Development Framework.

- Ensure that policy facilitates the creation of new accessible green corridors suitable for walking, cycling and horse riding.

- Seek to emphasise and promote the role of the River Thames, Cotswold Canals and disused railway lines in the District and build on the natural resources these corridors offer to improve opportunities for recreation as well as biodiversity.

- Work with landowners to increase public access across private land.

- Enhance access to green corridors in the District by ensuring that surfaces are even and that there are no physical barriers limiting access to some sectors of the population.

13.26 Recommendations specific to each settlement are summarised in Table 13.4. Where a settlement is deficient in quantitative terms in a type of open space, it does not necessarily mean that new provision is required to meet current demand, as provision should be accessibility led – ie all residents should be within the appropriate catchment of a facility.

13.27 Table 13.4 includes the application of quantity standards only for those typologies for which it is appropriate to look at local provision. Specific recommendations for outdoor sports facilities and indoor sports facilities, which are strategic facilities, are included but should be treated as an indication only. The application of the quantity standard for outdoor sports, as outlined in Section 8, is for broad planning need only. As set out in Section 5, the local standard for natural and semi...
natural open space should be applied to new provision only and no surpluses or deficiencies have therefore been stated.

13.28 Where no specific location for provision is identified, the new site should be located centrally to maximise the number of residents within the catchment of the facility.
Table 13.4 - Key issues by settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Current Provision</th>
<th>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Issues to be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>New allotment required - demand identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>Most residents are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td>New provision required - A pocket park would rectify this deficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park, improve links to Dowdeswell Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.87 36.65</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. Seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park - small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11 0.07</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Consider use of mobile skatepark, new facilities should be provided longer term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52 0.7</td>
<td>Residents mostly within catchments</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andoversford</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avening</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>No demand identified at current time. New allotment required if sufficient residents demonstrate clear interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>Most residents are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td>New provision required – A pocket park would rectify this deficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Good access to natural open space</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. Seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park – small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified, Parish Council indicate investment in facilities for children and young people is their key priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Consider use of mobile skatepark, new facilities should be provided longer term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>Residents mostly within catchments</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockley</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>No demand identified at current time. New allotment required if sufficient residents demonstrate clear interest. Quality improvements required to existing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Good access to existing provision</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park, improve links to Burton Wood and Norcome Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity – above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. Seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park – small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>1 facility identified in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Provide a new facility due to identified demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-4.09</td>
<td>Residents within catchments</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourton-on-the-Water</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>Most residents within catchment</td>
<td>New allotment required – demand identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Residents in the north of the town are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td>New provision required in the north of the town – if this was provided as a park amenity space will not be required. 1 site identified as being in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Residents in the north west are currently outside of the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>Provide new natural space within the north west of the town and improve access to Bourton Gravel Pits and Temple Ham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>Residents in the West outside of catchment</td>
<td>Provide a new park in the West of the town. In the short term, improve access routes to Sherbourne Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td><em>Provision for Children</em> 0.25 0.00</td>
<td>Residents in south outside of catchment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New facility needed, potentially at Bourton Playing Fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Provision for Young People</em> 0.00 -0.13</td>
<td>Residents in North outside of catchment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a facility to the north of the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Outdoor Sports Facilities</em> 16.54 5.73</td>
<td>Residents within catchments except for bowling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of demand for bowling required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chipping Campden</em> Allotments 0.85 -0.90</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No demand identified at current time. New allotment required if</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sufficient residents demonstrate clear interest. Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvements required to existing site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Amenity Green Space</em> 0.39 -0.14</td>
<td>Residents in the north of the town are outside of the catchment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for an amenity space. New provision required to the north of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the town. A pocket park would rectify this deficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Natural Open Space</em> 37.74 N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to existing natural space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park in the east of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the town. Improve access to existing sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Parks</em> 0 -0.92</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. Seek to engage with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small sites designed and managed by the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Provision for Children</em> 0.44 0.27</td>
<td>Most residents outside of catchment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New provision needed, or negotiate access to existing school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>site (St James School).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>Residents within catchment of youth centre only</td>
<td>Provide a new facility if clear demand becomes evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Residents within catchments</td>
<td>Improvements required to quality of tennis and bowling facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>Most residents within catchment, deficiencies in the west</td>
<td>New allotments required – demand identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Residents in the east and in Stratton are outside of the catchment of amenity space</td>
<td>New provision required in the east of the town – if this was provided as a park amenity space will not be required. 4 sites identified as being in need of improvement. Some sites potentially surplus to requirement due to overlapping catchments, these are illustrated in Figure 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Some residents in the east and west outside of recommended catchment area</td>
<td>Provide natural and semi natural open space in Abbey Grounds and Cirencester Park. Incorporate natural space within any new park in the east of the town. Improve pedestrian routes to existing parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>Residents in the East and in Stratton outside of catchment</td>
<td>Provide a new park in the east of Cirencester. Improve pedestrian routes between East Cirencester, St Michaels Park and Abbey Grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility. Residents to the east and in Stratton unable to access a site.</td>
<td>New facility should be provided, potentially in Cirencester Park, and in South Stratton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity – above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide new facilities to the north, east and in Stratton Existing facilities highlighted as priorities for improvement. Abbey Grounds and St Michaels Park are potential locations for these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>Residents in North, east and Stratton outside of catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deficiency of athletics track – 4 lane track required. Improvement to quality of bowling greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>79.43</td>
<td>-16.45</td>
<td>Residents within catchments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down Ampney</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td>New allotment required – demand identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>Most residents are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td></td>
<td>New provision required – A pocket park would rectify this deficiency. The existing site is of particular importance as it is the only site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park, improve links to The Folley and Down Ampney Pits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. Seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park – small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider use of mobile skatepark, new facilities should be provided longer term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Quantity – above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Residents within catchments</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairford</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment, limited local provision</td>
<td>New allotment required – demand identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Good access to existing provision</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>Good access to natural open space</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. The recommended standard does not require the provision of formal parks in the settlement. If demand for local provision arises however as the settlement grows, seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket parks= – small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>Consultation reveals quality of facilities to be poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Residents within catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity – above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>Residents within catchments</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemble</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>Good access to existing provision</td>
<td>No issues identified, the existing site is important as it is the only site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. The recommended standard does not require the provision of formal parks in the settlement. If demand for local provision arises however as the settlement grows, seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park – small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsford</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>No demand identified at current time. New allotment required if sufficient residents demonstrate clear interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most residents are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td>New provision required – A pocket park would rectify this deficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park, improved links to Cotswold Water Park will also be of particular benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. The recommended standard does not require the provision of formal parks in the settlement. If demand for local provision arises however as the settlement grows, seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park – small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Provide a new facility due to identified demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Issues to be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>0.23, -3.91</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment, no local provision</td>
<td>New allotment required – demand identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>1.53, 0.84</td>
<td>Good access to existing provision</td>
<td>3 sites identified as in need of improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>29.40, N/a</td>
<td>Good access to natural open space</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0, -1.19</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. The recommended standard does not require the provision of formal parks in the settlement. If demand for local provision arises however as the settlement grows, seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park – small sites designed and managed by the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.23, 0.01</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>New provision required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>-4.90</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>Most residents are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td>New provision required – A pocket park would rectify this deficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park, improve links to Bakershill and Old Coppice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. The recommended standard does not require the provision of formal parks in the settlement. If demand for local provision arises however as the settlement grows, seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park - small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Consider use of mobile skatepark, new facilities should be provided longer term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreton-in-Marsh</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>Most residents within catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Lack of access to amenity space in the east of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaps in access to the west and east of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Residents in East outside of catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility. Deficiency to the east of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>Residents to the east outside of catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northleach</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>4.09 - 7.49</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
<td>No issues to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.34 - 1.03</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
<td>No demand identified at current time. New allotment required if sufficient residents demonstrate clear interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.27 - 0.14</td>
<td>Residents in the north of the town are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
<td>1 site identified as in need of improvement. New provision required to the north of the town. A pocket park would rectify this deficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Good access to natural open space</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>153.20 - 152.48</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
<td>Focus should be placed on improving access to nearby parks by improved pedestrian routes and cycleways. The recommended standard does not require the provision of formal parks in the settlement. If demand for local provision arises however as the settlement grows, seek to engage with the local community to promote the creation of a pocket park - small sites designed and managed by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.12 - 0.02</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>1 facility identified as being in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Support proposals to provide a MUGA at Westwoods Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>Residents outside of catchment for bowling green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddington</td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>Most residents are outside of the catchment for an amenity space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Good access to natural open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cerney</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>Good access to existing provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Good access to natural open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>All residents in catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow-on-the-Wold</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>-5.09</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>Residents in catchment of youth centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>All residents within catchment except lack of access to public tennis courts</td>
<td>Requirement for public tennis provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>Most residents within catchment, limited local provision</td>
<td>New allotment required – demand identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>Good access to existing sites</td>
<td>Good access but largely small sites with limited function. Some sites potentially surplus to requirement due to overlapping catchments (Figure 6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Poor access to existing natural open space</td>
<td>Facilitate new natural and semi natural open space, perhaps within a new park located in the centre of the town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>Residents outside of the catchment of a park</td>
<td>Provide a new park in the centre of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>1 facility identified as being in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>Residents in north and centre outside of catchment</td>
<td>New provision required (to be located in the north or centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>All residents within catchment except for STP and lack of local access to public tennis courts</td>
<td>Potential to provide STP and public tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Current Provision</td>
<td>Quantity - above or below minimum standard (hectares)</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>All residents within drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good access to existing provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Limited access to natural open space</td>
<td>Provide new natural open space or a pocket park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All residents within appropriate drivetime catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Most residents within the catchment of a facility</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>All residents outside of catchment</td>
<td>Consider use of mobile skatepark, new facilities should be provided longer term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>All residents within catchment</td>
<td>No issues identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development control decisions

13.29 The standards set in this assessment of open space, sport and recreation facilities can be used as a basis for development control decisions both in terms of whether specific open space, sport and recreation provision is surplus to requirements and also in relation to the contributions that are required from new developments.

13.30 The standards can also be used to inform decision making with regards settlement Action Plans and future planning policies.

13.31 The processes that should be applied are set out in brief below and overleaf. It is important that each situation is considered and evaluated individually and that a flexible approach is taken.

Determining the value of existing open spaces

13.32 Local standards have been set for:

- Quantity - how much of each type of open space is expected (per 1000 population)
- Accessibility - how far residents should expect to travel to reach each type of open space
- Quality – what quality of open space should be provided

13.33 In order to determine the value of a site, these standards should be applied individually and then together. These steps should be evaluated both including and excluding the site in question in order to determine the overall value of the site to the local community and consequently, the acceptability of the proposed development. The key phases in this application are detailed below.

Applying standards individually

Quantity standards

13.34 Quantity standards can be applied to any area where the population is known for example wards, Parishes, Super Output areas. For the area in question, the current provision per 1000 population should be compared with the expected provision (measured by the local standard) to determine whether there is a shortfall or surplus. Areas falling below the minimum standard are considered to be deficient. Table 13.4 provides an indication of the surpluses and deficiencies for each type of open space at a Parish level in the District, providing an assessment of the adequacy of provision within the main settlements.

13.35 For detailed site-specific queries, application of the quantity standard should be calculated in small areas (e.g. Super output areas) where possible to give a localised understanding of the quantity of open space. The most accurate means of calculating requirements / surpluses and deficiencies is to use a GIS system to calculate the catchment area of that particular open space e.g. for parks, 600 metres.

13.36 For all analysis, an accessibility led approach should be taken – this means that the accessibility standard is more important and if residents are outside of the catchment of an existing space, then new provision is still required, even if the quantity standard is exceeded. Conversely, if
provision falls below minimum standards, but is located within reach of all residents, new provision will not be a priority.

**Accessibility standards**

13.37 Accessibility standards are applied using the GIS system. They enable the identification of areas where residents are outside of the catchment for existing provision. Areas which are outside of the recommended catchment for the type of open space in question can be considered deficient.

13.38 It is also important to consider the impact of natural barriers to access e.g. main roads and railway lines. For example, where the catchment of a park crosses a railway line, in reality the railway line is likely to reduce access to the site for residents on the other side.

**Quality standards**

13.39 The quality standard sets out a series of criteria which each site should achieve (based on the findings of site assessments and consultations). Sites not achieving this require improvement.

**Applying the standards together**

13.40 Following the application of the standards individually, it is important to consider the interrelationship between the standards in order to evaluate the impact of removing the site. Some of the scenarios that may arise include:

- if there are quantity shortfalls but no gaps in accessibility, it is likely that the area is served by small sites. These may not have the capacity to serve residents, however the good access means that new provision is unlikely to be a priority. Longer term, new / redesigned provision may be required and in all instances, the existing site may be valuable, despite the fact it is not serving a unique catchment. A unique catchment is defined as the only site in the area to meet the needs of residents. Qualitative improvements to the site would maximise the capacity of the site to meet the needs of residents;

- in the event of quantitative shortfalls and gaps in accessibility when the site is removed, it is likely that the site is valuable as a green space;

- in areas where provision exceeds the quantity standards, if residents also have access to other nearby sites, qualitative improvements to nearby sites may be of higher priority than the retention of the existing green space; and

- in areas where the minimum quantity standard is met but removal of the site means that residents do not have access to the appropriate types of open space, the site should be retained as green space.

13.41 Figure 13.2 summarises some of the scenarios that may arise.
13.42 When considering site specific issues it is therefore important to consider:

- Once the current situation has been established, what happens if that site is removed?
- What happens if new facilities are to be provided?
- As well as considering the role that the site currently plays in terms of its existing function, it is also necessary (in line with PPG17 guidance) to identify if the site is required to fulfil any other functions.

**Using local standards to determine what new space is required as part of a new development**

13.43 Local standards can also be used to determine what open space is required as part of a new development.

13.44 This type of analysis will still require an understanding of the current provision in the area through the application of the standards. It is however necessary to also determine the additional impact of the development in order to identify the requirements for new provision.

13.45 In order to obtain the appropriate balance of open space in new developments, it is essential to retain a flexible approach to provision. In some areas, enhancing access routes to existing open spaces will be of greater priority than the provision of new spaces. Where new provision cannot be realistically provided on site, it may be appropriate to enhance access routes and / or the quality of existing provision. This is particularly the case where the new development is located in close proximity to a facility of strategic significance.

13.46 Qualitative improvements in particular can enhance the overall value capacity of a site.
Determining the additional impact of development

13.47 Application of the local quantity standards will determine the amount of additional demand that will be generated by the new development.

13.48 For example, a development providing 1000 new residents will generate demand for 2 hectares of parks if the local standard is 2 hectares per 1000 population.

13.49 New provision (and on site provision) will not always be required. Decision making will require local interpretation of the existing open spaces and the priorities for on site provision.

13.50 Circumstances to consider may include:

- **The need for additional provision**

  - Additional provision will be needed when the total amount of provision within the appropriate distance threshold of the site is or will be below the amount required in the area following the development, based on the quantity and accessibility standards.

  - The decision as to whether on-site provision or a contribution towards off site provision will be more appropriate, should be based primarily on whether the total quantity of each form of new provision required as a result of the proposed development is above the minimum acceptable size in the adopted provision standards. If it is, the new provision should normally be on-site, if not; the developer should be required to contribute towards off-site provision. For example, if the minimum acceptable size is 2 hectares for natural open space, and a standard of 2 hectares per 1000 population has been set, only developments generating 1000 additional residents or more would be required to provide on site natural and semi natural open space.

- **The need for enhancement of existing provision**

  - Not every proposed development will require additional provision. If the amount and quality of provision within the appropriate distance threshold of the proposed development site will match or exceed the adopted provision standards when the development is complete, there is no need for either additional provision or the enhancement of any existing provision. If either or both of these pre-conditions are not met, however, the authority will be justified in requiring the developer either to make on-site provision or contribute to the provision or enhancement of off site provision.

- **Contributions to the enhancement of existing provision**

  - The need for the enhancement of existing provision arises when there will be sufficient provision in terms of quantity within the distance threshold of the development site after the development, but some elements of the provision fail to meet the adopted quality standards.

13.51 In order to ensure that the developer contributions system is clear and transparent, policy should:

- set out which type of dwellings will be required to contribute towards open space provision;

- outline the local standards that have been set and the types of open space for which contributions are required; and

- detail the adopted minimum sizes for each type of open space for which there is a requirement for contributions.
13.52 Minimum size criteria should be used to determine when provision will be required on site and where it will be more appropriate to contribute towards qualitative / access improvements to existing provision. Suggested minimum size criteria were provided in Table 13.2.

**Summary**

13.53 The open space, sport and recreation study provides an important part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework, guiding the formulation and implementation of planning policies. This relates to both the protection and enhancement of existing open space and the framework for developing planning obligations.

13.54 The study provides the tools in which the value of an open space can be assessed on a site-by-site basis, as and when a development proposal is submitted for an existing piece of open space.

13.55 The study also facilitates proactive planning of open space, sport and recreation facilities across the District and will provide the foundations for the proactive delivery of open space, sport and recreation provision in Cotswold District.