

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BENEFITS OF OPEN SPACE

Wider Benefits of Open Space

Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing safe outdoor areas that are available to all ages of the local population to mix and socialise • social cohesion - potential to engender a sense of community ownership and pride • providing opportunities for community events, voluntary activities and charitable fund raising • providing opportunities to improve health and take part in a wide range of outdoor sports and activities.
Recreational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing easily accessible recreation areas as an alternative to other more chargeable leisure pursuits • offers wide range of leisure opportunities from informal leisure and play to formal events, activities and games. • open spaces, particularly parks, are the first areas where children come into contact with the natural world • play opportunities are a vital factor in the development of children.
Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing motor car dependence to access specific facilities • providing habitats for wildlife as an aid to local biodiversity • helping to stabilise urban temperatures and humidity • providing opportunities for the recycling of organic materials • providing opportunities to reduce transport use through the provision of local facilities.
Educational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • valuable educational role in promoting an understanding of nature and the opportunity to learn about the environment • open spaces can be used to demonstrate virtues of sustainable development and health awareness.
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding value to surrounding property, both commercial and residential, thus increasing local tax revenues • contribution to urban regeneration and renewal projects • contributing to attracting visitors and tourism, including using the parks as venues for major events • encouraging employment and inward investment • complementing new development with a landscape that enhances its value.

APPENDIX B
HOUSEHOLD SURVEY



The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Parks and Open Space Survey



Definitions of Open Space – These different typologies are contained within the PPG17, a piece of government legislation recently brought in that addresses the effective planning for open space, sport and recreation, accounting for the various needs of the local community.

Parks and gardens - These range from large country parks to urban parks and small memorial formal gardens. The grounds of publicly accessible country houses are also included.

Natural areas - Woods, nature reserves and unmanaged greenspaces such as scrubland. Pocket parks are also included.

Amenity areas - These are small or large greenspaces often found amongst housing estates (eg village greens)

Play areas for children - These are equipped play areas for children (eg swings, slides and climbing frames)

Teenage facilities - These range from youth shelters, to skate parks and multi-use-games-areas

Outdoor sports facilities - Grass pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts and golf courses

Allotments - Public or private open spaces dedicated to growing produce and gardening

Civic spaces – Hard paved areas used for a variety of purposes

Cemeteries and churchyards - Open and closed burial grounds and cemeteries

Green corridors – Typical examples include the Grand Union Canal and disused railway lines.

SECTION ONE - QUANTITY

Q1 Please tick below whether you feel there is ENOUGH OR NOT ENOUGH provision for each type of open space within the Borough and if possible, explain briefly the reason for your answer (eg not enough in your area/ quality is poor/ inaccessible).

	<i>More than enough</i>	<i>About right</i>	<i>Nearly enough</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>No opinion</i>
Parks and gardens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Natural areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Amenity areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Play areas for children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Teenage facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Outdoor sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Allotments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				
Civic spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>	<hr/>				

Cemeteries and churchyards

Reason for answer _____

Green corridors

Reason for answer _____

Travel time

Q2 Please write the **TIME** you would expect to travel, and the type of transport you would expect to use, when travelling to open spaces in the Borough (please state one time and travel mode for each open space type only):

	Walk	Cycle	Public transport	Car
Parks and gardens	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Natural areas	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Amenity areas	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Play areas for children	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Teenage facilities	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Outdoor sports facilities	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Allotments	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Civic spaces	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Cemeteries and churchyards	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins
Green corridors	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins	___ mins

Usage

Q3 How **OFTEN** do you use each of the following types of open space? (please tick one option only for each type of open space)

	More than once a month	Less than once a month	Don't use
Parks and gardens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amenity areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Play areas for children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teenage facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outdoor sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Allotments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Civic spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cemeteries and churchyards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Green corridors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q4 Do you or any member of your household rent an allotment in Windsor and Maidenhead Borough?

Yes (please proceed to Q6)..... No

Q5 If **NO**, would you be interested in renting an allotment within Windsor and Maidenhead Borough?

Yes..... No

If YES please indicate why you do not currently rent an allotment _____

Quality

Q6 How would you rate the quality of the following types of open space in the Borough? (If you are unsure please leave blank)

	Good	Average	Poor
Parks and gardens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Natural areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amenity areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Play areas for children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teenage facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outdoor sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Allotments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Civic spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cemeteries and churchyards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Green corridors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION TWO - SPECIFIC TO THE TYPE OF OPEN SPACE YOU MOST FREQUENTLY USE

Q7a Please indicate which open space TYPE you use MOST FREQUENTLY in the Borough? (PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE)

Parks and/or gardens *Teenage facilities* *Cemeteries and churchyards*
Natural areas *Outdoor sports facilities* *Green corridors*.....
Amenity areas *Allotments*
Play areas for children *Civic spaces*.....

Q7b Please indicate whether you use any of the following open spaces regularly OUTSIDE of the Borough?

Parks and/or gardens *Teenage facilities* *Cemeteries and churchyards*
Natural areas *Outdoor sports facilities* *Green corridors*.....
Amenity areas *Allotments*
Play areas for children *Civic spaces*.....

Q7c If you use open spaces outside of the Borough regularly then please explain why you do not use such spaces inside the Borough (eg site outside the Borough is closer or similar space inside the Borough is of a poorer quality):

Type most frequently used

Q8 Please name the SITE you use MOST FREQUENTLY and where it is located (include as complete an address as possible)

Site Name _____

Location _____

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SHOULD BE RELATED TO THE OPEN SPACE TYPE YOU MOST FREQUENTLY USE AS INDICATED IN QUESTION 7a

Travel

Q9 How do you normally TRAVEL there? (please tick one box only)

Walk..... *Public transport*..... *Car*..... *Cycle*..... *Other*.....

Q10 How LONG does it take you to reach this type of open space? (please tick one box only)

Less than 5 minutes..... *Between 10-15 minutes*..... *Between 20-25 minutes*
Between 5-10 minutes..... *Between 15-20 minutes*..... *Over 25 minutes*.....

Aspirations

Q11 If you were describing your ideal features within this type of open space, what would be the TOP FEATURES you think should be provided? (please only tick up to FIVE)

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Well kept grass..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Level surface/ good drainage..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Nature features (eg wildlife) <input type="checkbox"/> | Good access to site..... <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Clean/litter free <input type="checkbox"/> | Events (eg music) <input type="checkbox"/> | Pond/lake/water features <input type="checkbox"/> | On site security (eg warden/CCTV) <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Flowers/trees and shrubs <input type="checkbox"/> | Toilets <input type="checkbox"/> | Dog walking facilities (dog bins, enclosed areas, places to tie the dog etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> | Information boards/signage..... <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Changing facilities <input type="checkbox"/> | Café..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Dog free area <input type="checkbox"/> | Dog mess bins <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Car parking facilities <input type="checkbox"/> | Seating <input type="checkbox"/> | Litter bins..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Footpaths <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cycle parking facilities... <input type="checkbox"/> | Picnic area <input type="checkbox"/> | Facilities for children and young people..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Community activities (eg fairs, markets)..... <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Environmental educational programmes..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Sports facilities..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (please specify) <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Q12 Which of the following factors would make you feel SAFER using open space? (please tick one or more)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| Adequate lighting..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Staff-on-site (eg park rangers) <input type="checkbox"/> | Overlooked by housing <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Clear route to open space..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Reputation of area/space <input type="checkbox"/> | Other users <input type="checkbox"/> |
| CCTV <input type="checkbox"/> | Clear boundaries <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Other (please specify) <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

Quality

Q13 Please indicate whether you experience any of the following PROBLEMS at the open space type you visit most frequently as indicated in Q7a by rating the seriousness of the problem in the boxes below:

	Significant problem	Minor problem	No problem
Vandalism and graffiti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Safety and age of equipment (play areas, seating)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Litter problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mis-use of site (eg anti-social behaviour)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dog fouling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14 Please rate the following quality factors for the type of open space in the Borough you visit most frequently as stated in Q7a:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	Not applicable
Play equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General maintenance and management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Boundaries (railings, hedges etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Toilets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Car parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycle parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provision of bins for litter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seats/benches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pathways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information and signage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planted and grassed areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Green flag or other awards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ranger service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dog related facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability access and features	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION THREE - OUTDOOR SPORTS

Q15 Please tick below whether you feel there is ENOUGH OR NOT ENOUGH provision for each type of outdoor sport facility in the Borough and if possible, explain briefly the reason for your answer.

	<i>More than enough</i>	<i>About right</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>No opinion</i>
Grass pitches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>				
Synthetic turf pitches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>				
Tennis courts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>				
Bowling greens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>				
Golf courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Reason for answer</i>				

Q16 Please write the TIME you would expect to travel below the type of transport you would expect to use when travelling to outdoor sports facilities in the Borough (please state one time and travel mode for each open space type only):

	<i>Walk</i>	<i>Cycle</i>	<i>Public transport</i>	<i>Car</i>
Grass pitches	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins
Synthetic turf pitches	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins
Tennis courts	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins
Bowling greens	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins
Golf courses	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins	__ mins

General

Q17 If you have any other COMMENTS that you would like to make regarding parks and open spaces in the Borough, please write them in the box below. If you would be interested in being part of a friends or group for a park please indicate which one?

SECTION FOUR - SOME DETAILS ABOUT YOU

Q18 Are you:
Male..... *Female*.....

Q19 How old are you?
16 or under..... *40-49*..... *75-84*
17-25..... *50-59*..... *Over 85*.....
26-39..... *60-74*..... *Do not wish to answer*.....

Q20 Which of the following best describes your ethnic origin?

White (British, Irish, any other white background - please specify).....

Black or Black British (African Caribbean, any other Black background- please specify).....

Dual or Multiple Heritage (white and Asian, White and Black African, White and Black Caribbean, any other dual/multiple heritage background- please specify).....

Asian or Asian British (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, any other Asian background) please specify.....

Chinese or other ethnic group (Chinese, any other ethnic background) please specify

Do not wish to answer.....

Q21 Are there any children in your household under 16 years?

Yes..... No

Q22 We operate within the framework of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA), which defines Disability as: 'A physical or mental impairment which has substantial and long term adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out normal day to day activities'. Do you consider yourself to be disabled as defined by the Disability Discrimination Act?

Yes..... No

The completion of the details below are optional

Name:

Address:

Telephone/Email:.....

Thank you for completing this questionnaire, please return it in the prepaid envelope provided, by Monday 28th January 2008

APPENDIX C
SCHOOL SURVEY



Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

This is ***your*** opportunity to tell us what ***you*** think of open spaces in your area and how they can be improved for you, your friends, and the people of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

What do we mean by 'Open Space'?

Parks, play areas, skate parks, Multi-Use Games Areas (where you can play basketball or football), sports pitches and courts, public grassy areas in housing estates, and very large paved areas in towns such as civic spaces

Instructions

- 1) Please read each question carefully and click the box to the answer or answers that apply to you
- 2) Please make sure you continue to the end of the questionnaire and press "**submit**" once you have finished all your answers
- 3) It should not take more than 10 minutes to complete

Q1 Which school do you go to?

Q2 Which school year are you currently in:

Year 11	<input type="checkbox"/>	Year 9	<input type="checkbox"/>	Year 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	Year 5	<input type="checkbox"/>
Year 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	Year 8	<input type="checkbox"/>	Year 6	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Q3 Are you a...

Boy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Girl	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	------	--------------------------

Q4 Which of the following is your favourite thing to do in your free time? (please only tick one)

Indoor things (for example playing games, watching TV)

Reading

Playing sport

Walking (includes walking the dog)

Playing or hanging out with friends outside

Cycling

Playing or hanging out with friends inside

Skateboarding/ BMX/ roller blading

Shopping

Other (please write in the box):

Q5 Is there a specific place (eg shelter, park) near your house or school where you can play or hang out with your friends?

Yes

Don't know

No

Q6 Have you been to any of the following types of places near your home in the last year?

Parks

Outdoor sports facilities (like sports pitches, basketball courts or tennis courts)

Woodland or nature reserve

Youth shelters or teenscene facilities

Grassy areas in a housing development, or a village green

Allotments

Play areas

Cemeteries or churchyard

Youth shelters or teenscene facilities

None

Other

Q7 What are your main reasons for not using open spaces (tick as many as apply)?

I don't have enough time

Buses don't go at the right times

They're not very good

I do not feel safe there

It's a difficult route to get there

I can't get there by bus

I'm not interested

I don't like the people there

There aren't things there I want to use or do

They're too close to a busy road/railway

They're too far from my home

I play at home in my garden

I'm not allowed

I use other parks/open spaces that are outside of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

It costs too much to get there

Getting there is not safe

Other (please write in the box)

Q8 What is the name of your favourite local outdoor open space:

please write the name of the road and the village or town it is in:

Section 1 - Questions 9 to 17 apply to the outdoor open space you use most often

Q9 What is the name of the outdoor open space you go to most often if it is different from question 8.

please write the name of the road and the village or town it is in:

Q10 What type of open space is it?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Parks</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Woodland or overgrown nature reserve</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Grassy areas in a housing development, or a village green</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Play areas</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Multi-use games area</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Other (please specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><i>Teenage facility eg youth shelter or skate park</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Outdoor sports facilities (like playing pitches, basketball courts or tennis courts)</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Allotments</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Cemeteries or churchyards</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Other</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|---|--|

Q11 How often do you visit the site?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <i>More than once a week</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>More than once a month</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>More than once a year</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Once a week</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Once a month</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Once a year</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q12 How do you normally get there?

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Walk</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Skate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Car</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Cycle</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Bus</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Other</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
- Other (please specify)*

Q13 How would you prefer to get there?

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Walk</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Skate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Car</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Cycle</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Bus</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Other</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
- Other (please specify)*

Q14 How long does it take you to get there?

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <i>0 to 5 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>10 to 15 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>More than 20 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>5 to 10 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>15 to 20 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Q15 What are your top TWO reasons for using this place?

To use the playground/play equipment



It's just somewhere to go



To play for a team on the outdoor sports pitches/courts



It's the only place I can go



To play on sports pitches/courts with friends



To walk the dog



For a kickabout/play



It has a visitors centre



To meet friends



To take part in nature conservation / wildlife



Environmental education to take part in



Other (Please specify)

Q16 What are the top TWO things you like MOST about this place?

It's close to my home



It's free to use



The play equipment



I can use it in the evening because it is well lit



It's a good place to meet friends



It's good for playing sport



Other, please specify

Q17 What are the TWO things you like LEAST about this place?

It is too far away from my home



There's not enough space for playing sport



The play facilities are boring



It's too dirty (eg with litter, graffiti or glass)



It is the only place I can go



Dog muck



It is closed in the evening



Parents won't let me go there



It is too close to people's houses



I feel unsafe there



It costs too much



Other (please specify)

Section 2 - Questions 18 to 24 are about all open spaces in your local area

Q18 **Are there any open spaces where you feel unsafe?**

Yes

No

please say which ones:

Please write the name of the road and the village/town it is in:

What is it that makes you feel unsafe?

- Q19 What would make you feel safer?**
- | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Lighting</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Houses nearby</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Travelling there with adults</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Cameras/CCTV</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Organised activities on-site</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Other</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Staff on-site</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Travelling there with friends</i> | <input type="radio"/> | | |

- Q20 What do you think about the amount of open spaces near you?**
- | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Good</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>OK</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Bad</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Don't know</i> | <input type="radio"/> |

- Q21 Do you like the open spaces near you?**
- | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| <i>Yes</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>No</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
|------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|

- Q22 If you could make ONE improvement to an existing open space or have ONE new place to go what would it be?**
- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>More interesting things to play on</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Skate park</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Indoor non-sports place (eg somewhere to hang out with friends)</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>BMX park</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Multi-use games area / Kickabout area</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Organised activities</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Outdoor sports (eg tennis, football)</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Shelters</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Indoor sports (eg badminton)</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>Nature areas</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Other, please specify</i> | | <i>Park warden</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
-

- Q23 How long would you be willing to take getting to this new place?**
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>0 to 5 minutes</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>15 to 20 minutes</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>5 to 10 minutes</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <i>More than 20 minutes</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>10 to 15 minutes</i> | <input type="radio"/> | | |

- Q24 Outside of school time, have you been to any of the following sports locations locally in the last year?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Tennis courts</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Football pitches</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Artificial turf pitch</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Rugby pitches</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Outside netball courts</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Outside basketball courts</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Hockey pitches</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Bowling green</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Other (please state below)</i> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Other:</i> | |
-

- Q25 If you have any other comments on open spaces or sports facilities you use, or on improvements to sports and recreation facilities you would like to see locally please write them in the box below:**
-

Q26 What is your postcode? If you don't know just write the name of the road and town/village you live on

Q27 We operate within the framework of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA), which defines Disability as: 'A physical or mental impairment which has substantial and long term adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out normal day to day activities'. Do you consider yourself to be disabled as defined by the Disability Discrimination Act?

Yes

Don't know

No

Q28 What is your ethnic origin?

White British

White Irish

Black African

Black Caribbean

White and Asian, White and Black African

White and Black Caribbean

Asian Bangladeshi

Asian Indian

Asian Pakistani

Chinese

Do not wish to answer

Any other ethnic background (please specify)

Thanks for your time - now back to school work!

APPENDIX D
EXTERNAL CONSULTEES



Windsor and Maidenhead EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Definitions of Open Space – These different typologies are contained within the PPG17, a piece of government legislation recently brought in that addresses the effective planning for open space, sport and recreation, accounting for the various needs of the local community. In filling in the survey below please consider all typologies, specifically those used by your organisation.

Parks and gardens - These range from large country parks to urban parks and small memorial formal gardens. The grounds of publicly accessible country houses are also included.

Natural areas - Woods, nature reserves and unmanaged greenspaces such as scrubland. Pocket parks are also included.

Amenity areas - These are small or large greenspaces often found amongst housing estates (eg village greens)

Play areas for children - These are equipped play areas for children (eg swings, slides and climbing frames)

Teenage facilities - These range from youth shelters, to skate parks and multi-use-games-areas

Outdoor sports facilities - Grass pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts and golf courses

Allotments - Public or private open spaces dedicated to growing produce and gardening

Civic spaces – Hard paved areas used for a variety of purposes

Cemeteries and churchyards - Open and closed burial grounds and cemeteries

Green corridors – Typical examples include the Grand Union Canal and disused railway lines.

Ownership & Management of Sites

Q1) Does your organisation own or manage any sites within the Borough?

If YES, please provide details in the box below

Yes..... No

Name of Site	Address

Q2) What type of open space does your organisation use most frequently?

- | | |
|---|---|
| Parks and Gardens..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Outdoor sport facilities..... <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Natural Areas <input type="checkbox"/> | Allotments <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Amenity Areas <input type="checkbox"/> | Civic spaces <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Play areas for children) <input type="checkbox"/> | Cemeteries and churchyards <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Teenage facilities..... <input type="checkbox"/> | Green Corridors <input type="checkbox"/> |

Does this open space meet the needs of your organisation? if NO please specify reasons below

Yes No.....

Programmes / Funding

Q3) Are there any programmes / initiatives being undertaken within the area by your organisation that may affect the quantity, quality or accessibility of open space sites? If YES, please provide details in the box below

Yes..... No

Q4) Are there any funding opportunities within your organisation that the Council may link into to improve specific open space sites? If YES, please provide details in the box below

Yes..... No

Open Space Assessments

Q5) The following questions are addressing the overall provision of open space in the Borough. Please provide details of any specific sites/areas in the box below each question:

How would you rate the overall **QUANTITY** of open space in your area? Please provide details below

Very good Poor
Good Very poor
Average

How would you rate the overall **QUALITY** of open space in your area? Please provide details below

Very good Poor
Good Very poor
Average

How would you rate the overall **ACCESSIBILITY** of open space in your area? Please provide details below

Very good

Poor

Good

Very poor

Average

How would you rate the overall **LEVEL OF USAGE** of open space in your area? Please provide details below

Very good

Poor

Good

Very poor

Average

Q6) Please provide any key strengths and weaknesses of open space provision within the Borough?

Strengths	Weaknesses

Q7) Please provide any details of areas/specific sites of good or bad practise

- National

- Regional

- Local / more specific

Set Standards / Parameters

Q8) Are there any provision standards set by your organisation that may influence any local standards that may be adopted by the council?

If YES, please provide details in the box below

Yes..... No

Information

Q9) Are there any key strategies/documentation that you feel we need to be aware of with regards to our open space assessment in Council?

If YES, please provide details in the box below

Yes..... No

Future

Q10) Are you aware of any plans / developments within the immediate future or long term future regarding improving, enhancing or increasing the number of open space sites within the district of Council?

If YES, please provide details in the box below

Yes..... No

Please return surveys to the FREEPOST address by Wednesday 23rd February 2008.

Initial	First	Last	Position	Organisation	Address 1	Address2	Address 3	Address 4	Postcode
Mr	Matt	Jackson	Head of Policy, Planning & Wildlife	Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	The Lodge	Armstrong Road	Littlemore	Oxford	OX4 4XT
Mr	Peter	Thorn	Principal	Berkshire College of Agriculture	Hall Place	Burchetts Green		Maidenhead	SL6 6QR
Mr	John	Waterton	Head of Planning	Bracknell Forest Borough Council	Time Square	Market Street		Bracknell	RG12 1JD
Mr	G.W.	Copas		Copas Farms	Hedsor Park Farm	Heathfield Road	Taplow	Berkshire	SL6 0HX
	P	Everett		Crown Estate Office (The)	Windsor Great Park			Windsor	SL4 2HT
Mr	Ian	Davie	Planning Liaison Officer	Environment Agency	South East Office	Swift House	Frimley Business Park	Camberley	GU16 5SQ
			Farm Conservation Adviser	Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG)	Unit 11	Blenheim Office Park	Long Hanborough	Witney	OX29 8LN
Ms	Jane	Hull	Framework Development Officer	Forestry Commission	Berks Bucks and Oxon Area	Upper Icknied Way	Aston Clinton	Aylesbury	HP22 5NF
Mr	Mike	Stubbs		National Trust (The)	Thames and Solent Regional	Hughenden Manor		High Wycombe	HP17 8BS
Mr	Graham	Deans	Area Manager	National Trust (The)	Hughenden Manor			High Wycombe	HP14 4LA
Ms	Sam	King		Natural England	Block A	Government Offices	Coley Park	Reading, Berks	RG1 6DT
Ms	Julie	Delcroix	Countryside Planning Advisor	Natural England	Sterling House	7 Ashford Road	Maidstone	Kent	ME14 5BJ
Mr	Steve	Gilbert	South East Regional Office	Royal Society for Protection for Birds (RSPB)	2nd Floor, Frederick House	42 Frederick Place	Brighton	East Sussex	BN1 4EA
Mr	R.	Etheridge	Head of Planning	Runnymede Borough Council	Civic Offices	Station Road		Addlestone	KT15 2AH
			Head of Planning	Slough Borough Council	Town Hall	Bath Road		Slough	SL1 3UQ
			Head of Planning	South Bucks District Council	Capswood	Oxford Road		Denham	UB9 4LH
Mr	John	Brooks	Assistant Head of Planning	Spelthorne Borough Council	Planning Policy & Implement	Council Offices	Knowle Green	Staines	TW18 1XB
Mr	John	Feetam	Senior Planning Manager	Sport England	51a Church Street	Caversham		Reading	RG4 8AX
			Head of Planning	Surrey Heath Borough Council	Surrey Heath House	Knoll Road	Camberley	Surrey	GU15 3HD
Miss	Georgie	Cook		Thames Water	Clearwater Court	Ground Floor East	Vastern Road	Reading	RG1 8DB
Mr	Simon	Thorne		Thames Water Utilities	Asset Investment	Maple Lodge STW	Denham Way	Rickmansworth	WD3 9SQ
Land Use	Michael	Stubbs	Land Use Adviser	National Trust (The)	Hughenden Manor	High Wycombe		High Wycombe	HP14 4LA
Mr	Jim	Dunning	Principal Development Plans Off	Wokingham Borough Council	Shute End			Wokingham	RG40 1WR
Ms	Diane	Mills	Regional Policy Officer	Woodland Trust (The)	13 Redston Road			London	N8 7HL
			Head of Planning	Wycombe District Council	Queen Victoria Road			High Wycombe	HP11 1BB
				Legoland	C/O Hepher Dixon	23 Furzton Lake	Shirwell Crescent	Milton Keynes	MK4 1GA
Mr	John	Bowles		Eton College	C/O NAI Fuller Peiser	Whittington House	19-30 Alfred Place	London	WC1E 7EA
				Beaumont College	Priest Hill			Old Windsor	SL4 2JN
Mr	N.	Adzic		Imperial College	C/O Gerald Eve	7 Vere Street		London	W1G 0JB
				Civil Service College	Larch Avenue			Ascot	SL5 0QE
				Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre	c/o The Museum of Oxford	Fletchers House	Park Street	Woodstock, Oxo	OX20 1SN

COMPLETED AND RETURNED

APPENDIX E
PARISH COUNCIL SURVEY



OPEN SPACE STUDY

Questionnaire

PARISH:

COMPLETED BY:

POSITION:

**TO BE COMPLETED AND RETURNED IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED BY
NO LATER THAN TUESDAY 25th MARCH**

GENERAL ANALYSIS – OPEN SPACE

Site No.	Name of site	Type of open space (please tick)									Owned by	Managed by	Details of specific facilities available	Level of use (please tick)				Quality (please tick)				Accessibility (please tick)																			
		Parks and Gardens	Natural and Semi Natural Green Spaces	Green Corridors	Amenity Greenspace	Provision for Children	Provision for Young People	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Allotments	Cemeteries & Churchyards				High / Significant	Often	Low / Insignificant	No usage	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor														
1																																									
2																																									
3																																									
4																																									
5																																									
6																																									
7																																									
8																																									
9																																									

QUANTITY ASSESSMENT

Please read:

(A1) We would like you to provide an overall **QUANTITY** assessment of public open spaces and outdoor recreation facilities **within your Parish area**, covering all provision whether under the ownership of the Parish/Town Council or other organisations. This will help us to gain a good understanding of the profile of current provision through highlighting types of open space/facilities that are perceived to be well provided as well as perceived deficiencies. We appreciate that this may be difficult in some circumstances, but as this is to provide a broad overview, please make an informed judgement where necessary and provide any specific details to support and explain the reasons for your choice.

TYPE OF OPEN SPACE	PLEASE TICK (✓) AS APPROPRIATE				REASONS FOR ANSWER (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF COMMENTS ON THE REASON FOR YOUR ANSWER)
	MORE THAN WE NEED	ABOUT RIGHT	LESS THAN WE NEED	N/A	
PARKS AND GARDENS					
NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACES					
GREEN CORRIDORS					
AMENITY GREENSPACE					
PROVISION FOR CHILDREN					
PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE					
OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES (INCLUDING ANCILLARY FACILITIES EG CHANGING ROOMS, PAVILIONS)					
ALLOTMENTS					
CEMETERIES AND CHURCHYARDS					

NEW DEVELOPMENTS:

Please give details of any new developments or improvements to current facilities being proposed by the Parish/Town Council or other organisations in your area, indicating whether these plans are underway, soon to be progressed or are longer-term aspirations. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Does your organisation own or control any natural or semi natural green space which is not currently available to the public but that you consider may be suitable for recreation purposes?

Yes..... No.....

If YES, please provide details in the box below:

SUPPLEMENTARY 'QUANTITY' QUESTIONS

Please answer the following specific questions to provide further details on **allotments and cemeteries/churchyards**.

- (A2) Please provide further details, as accurately as possible, on the number of ALLOTMENT plots at each site within your Parish, how many are occupied and whether waiting lists are in existence?

Site Name	Number of Allotment Plots	Number of Plots Occupied	Waiting List?

- (A3) Please provide further details, as accurately as possible, on the CEMETERIES AND CHURCHYARDS within your Parish?

Site Name	Estimated year in which burial space will be full

QUALITY ASSESSMENT – OPEN SPACE

Please read:

(B1) We would like you to provide an overall **QUALITY** assessment of open spaces **within your Parish area**, covering all provision whether under the ownership of the Parish/Town Council or other organisations. This will help us identify the key quality issues within your Parish. We appreciate that there may be site specific issues in some cases but would ask you to provide a general overview at this stage.

Please answer the questions on ‘quality’ of open spaces within your area.

Category	Please tick (✓) as appropriate					
	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	N/A
Cleanliness and maintenance						
Maintenance and management						
Absence of Litter						
Provision of bins for rubbish/litter						
Absence of dog fouling						
Noise						
Absence of vandalism and graffiti						
Overall cleanliness & maintenance						
Security and safety						
Lighting						
Equipment (eg in play areas or recreation and sport provision such as goal posts or nets)						
Boundaries (including hedges, fencing and gates)						
Overall security and safety						
Vegetation						
Planted areas (including trees)						
Grass areas						
Ancillary accommodation						
Toilets						
Changing rooms						
Parking (related to open spaces)						
Pathways (within the open space sites)						
Information & signage						
Other						
National awards (eg green flag)						
Overall						
Overall Quality Rating of open space within your Parish area						

Please answer the following questions to provide further comments on the **QUALITY** of open space and indoor recreation facility sites **within your Parish area**.

(B2) Are you aware of any concerns or complaints from residents about the 'QUALITY' of open space in your Parish?

Yes

No

If yes, please give brief details below:

(B3) Are you aware of suggested improvements identified by local residents who are keen to see enhancements in the 'QUALITY' of open spaces within your Parish?

Open space

Yes

No

If yes, please give brief details below:

(B4) Would you consider any open space sites in your Parish to be examples of GOOD PRACTICE (ie sites that are well-designed, well-used and maintained to a high standard) or BAD PRACTICE (ie sites that are in disrepair and/or in need of significant improvement) in terms of the 'QUALITY'? Please give details.

	Name of Site	Reasons
GOOD PRACTICE		
BAD PRACTICE		

(B5) Please write any further comments relating to the 'QUALITY' of open space sites or indoor recreation facilities within your Parish area. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary:

ACCESSIBILITY ASSESSMENT – OPEN SPACE

Please read:

(C1a) We would like you to provide an overall **ACCESSIBILITY** assessment of open spaces **within your Parish area**, covering all provision whether under the ownership of the Parish/Town Council or other organisations. By accessibility we mean “*can those who wish to use the various types of open space get to them when they wish to do so?*” This definition includes a range of factors such as transport to a site, movement across a site, visibility and awareness, information/signage and cost.

Please answer the following questions on ‘accessibility’ of open space within your area.

Category		Please tick (✓) where appropriate					N/A
		Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	
GENERAL							
Entrance to the sites <i>(ie are the entrances to open space sites easily seen, easily accessible etc)</i>							
Availability of sites <i>(ie sites are open to local residents at popular times or are there specific closing times for instance locking of gates to a park)</i>							
Value to user (if charged) <i>(ie are most open space sites free for use or are there charges that deter usage by the local resident population)</i>							
DISTANCES AND CATCHMENT AREAS							
Public Transport	Provision <i>(please rate the provision of public transport to open spaces sites – if none then rate as very poor)</i>						
	Distance from population <i>(ie do the majority of people in your Parish live within easy reach of open space by public transport)</i>						
Cycling	Provision <i>(please rate the provision of cycleways to open spaces sites within your area)</i>						
	Distance from population <i>(ie do the majority of people in your Parish live within easy reach of open space by cycling)</i>						
Walking	Distance from population <i>(ie do the majority of people in your Parish live within easy walking distance of open space)</i>						
SIGNAGE & PROMOTION							
Signage <i>(ie is the signage to the open spaces appropriate where required, clear to see and easy to follow)</i>							
Information and/or promotion of the sites <i>(ie is the information and promotion, where provided, appropriate, clear to see and easy to read? Does it encourage positive usage?)</i>							
OVERALL							
Overall Accessibility Rating of open spaces in your Parish area							

(C2) How far do you think one should be expected to travel to each type of open space/sports facility? Please indicate the maximum **TIME you would expect to travel and by what **MODE OF TRANSPORT**.**

Fill in as many boxes as you wish but please answer at least once for each type of open space/facility.

Type of Open Space	Place a time in minutes within the box relating to the type of transport.			
	Walk	Cycle	Bus	Car
	Travel Time (minutes)			
<i>Example Open Space</i>	20			5
Parks and Gardens				
Natural and Semi-natural Greenspaces				
Green Corridors				
Amenity Greenspace				
Provision for Children				
Provision for Young People				
Outdoor Sports Facilities				
Allotments				
Cemeteries and Churchyards				

(C3) Are you aware of any concerns or complaints from residents about the 'ACCESSIBILITY' of open space sites in your Parish?

Yes

No

If yes, please give brief details below:

(C4) Are you aware of suggested improvements identified by local residents who are keen to see enhanced 'ACCESSIBILITY' to open spaces within your Parish?

Yes

No

If yes, please give brief details below:

(C5) Would you consider any open space sites in your Parish to be examples of GOOD PRACTICE or BAD PRACTICE in terms of the 'ACCESSIBILITY'? Please give details.

	Name of Site	Reasons
GOOD PRACTICE		
BAD PRACTICE		

(C6) Please provide any further comments relating to the 'ACCESSIBILITY' of open space in your Parish area:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

If you would like to provide any supporting information or highlight any other points relating to open space or indoor recreation, please write them in the box below:

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS IMPORTANT QUESTIONNAIRE ON OPEN SPACE PROVISION

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND ANY SUPPORTING INFORMATION TO THE FREEPOST ADDRESS BY NO LATER THAN TUESDAY 25th MARCH

APPENDIX F

SITE LIST

ANALYSIS AREA 1

Id	Name	Area_ha	TPOLOGY_FINAL	
265	Reitlinger Open Space	0.201748	1	
266	Guards Club Park and Island	0.458986	1	
264	Bridge Gardens	0.575494	1	
266	Guards Club Park and Island	0.851525	1	
279	Raymill Island	1.63947	1	
272	Riverside Gardens	1.69149	1	
239	Grenfell Park	2.47815	1	
329	Boyn Grove Park	3.10147	1	
241	Kidwells Park	3.71062	1	
235	Desborough Park	4.3379	1	
258	Braywick Park	5.27956	1	
		24.326413		11
313	Pinkeys Green NSN	0.384804	2	
319	Maidenhead Thicket NSN E	0.622446	2	
316	Maidenhead Thicket NSN B	1.74834	2	
315	Maidenhead Thicket NSN A	1.98005	2	
234	The Gullet	2.13147	2	
317	Maidenhead Thicket NSN C	5.43637	2	
317	Maidenhead Thicket NSN C	6.53925	2	
317	Maidenhead Thicket NSN C	8.56318	2	
260	Braywick Park NSN	12.7694	2	
315	Maidenhead Thicket NSN A	33.7591	2	
319	Maidenhead Thicket NSN E	49.5115	2	
319	Maidenhead Thicket NSN E	54.1441	2	
		177.59001		12
295	Harrow Lane AGS	0.0292889	4	
295	Harrow Lane AGS	0.0328527	4	
287	Aldebury Road AGS	0.0734754	4	
295	Harrow Lane AGS	0.0901864	4	
326	St Marks Cresecent AGS	0.112814	4	
334	Fair Acre Amenity Space	0.121787	4	
263	Green Lane AGS	0.132369	4	
251	Raymond Road Open Space	0.139102	4	
263	Green Lane AGS	0.157445	4	
294	Gardner Road AGS	0.1683	4	
335	Altwood Road/Great Hill Crescent Amenity Area	0.194017	4	
248	Maudsley Memorial Gardens	0.196411	4	
314	Pinkeys Green AGS	0.227926	4	
297	Switchback Road AGS	0.235145	4	
310	Lancaster Road Amenity Area	0.307787	4	
287	Aldebury Road AGS	0.311765	4	
300	Shifford Crescent Amenity Area	0.375261	4	
314	Pinkeys Green AGS	0.384414	4	
311	Dorchester Close Amenity Area	0.386325	4	
314	Pinkeys Green AGS	0.401852	4	
293	Moffy Hill	0.415747	4	
269	Cherwell Close AGS	0.550017	4	
314	Pinkeys Green AGS	1.24564	4	
283	North Town Moor (Nat Trust)	3.98007	4	
267	Maidenhead Moor AGS	6.45013	4	
229	Ross Road Open Space	0.340863	4	
		17.0609904		25

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYOLOGY_FINAL	
473	Raymill Island Play Area	0.00141025	5	
230	Ross Road Open Space Play Area	0.00685398	5	
299	Switchback Road Play Area	0.00706056	5	
330	Boyn Grove Play Area	0.00955248	5	
252	Raymond Road Play Area	0.0186344	5	
249	Magnet Leisure Centre Play Area	0.0226329	5	
244	Kidwells Park Play Area	0.0395219	5	
237	Desborough Park Play Area	0.0485557	5	
256	Braywick Park Club Play Area	0.0488545	5	
273	Riverside gardens Play Area	0.0496652	5	
270	Cherwell Close Play Area	0.0711251	5	
305	Oaken Grove Play Area	0.0932474	5	
240	Grenfell Park Play Area	0.102525	5	
		0.51963937		13
243	Kidwells Park Skate Area	0.0952571	6	
308	Oaken Grove MUGA	0.111089	6	
236	Desborough Park MUGA + YP OSF	0.139787	6	
236	Desborough Park MUGA + YP OSF	0.224435	6	
		0.5705681		4
247	Maidenhead Bowls Club	0.140747	7	
324	Holyport CE school	0.165485	7	
304	Oaken Grove Bowls	0.194052	7	
324	Holyport CE school	0.21064	7	
262	Oldfield Primary school	0.29247	7	
274	Riverside Gardens Crazygolf	0.312325	7	
242	Kidwells Tennis Courts	0.324244	7	
276	Clares Court School	0.433267	7	
231	Iarchfield primary school	0.61687	7	
328	Maidenhead Tennis Club	0.63548	7	
245	Furze Platt school OSF	0.761391	7	
288	Highfield school	0.821734	7	
286	West Mead Football Pitch	0.823428	7	
246	Maidenhead FC	0.827931	7	
333	All Saints CE Primary school	0.891323	7	
296	Furze Platt Infant school	0.973674	7	
289	Laggan Fields Open Space	1.06439	7	
312	Pinkeys Green Cricket	1.20218	7	
290	Ellington Primary school	1.31003	7	
296	Furze Platt Infant school	1.35899	7	
309	Alwyn Infant school	1.83738	7	
324	Holyport CE school	2.34942	7	
285	North Maidenhead Football Club	3.24345	7	
331	Boyne Hill Cricket Club	3.34301	7	
284	Noth Maidenhead Cricket Ground	4.11415	7	
232	Desborough school	4.13306	7	
332	altwood school OSF	5.84518	7	
303	Oaken Grove Park	8.06574	7	
302	furze platt school	9.41638	7	
255	Braywick Park	27.1941	7	
207	Maidenhead Golf Course	53.7446	7	
		136.647121		82.5902 31

Id	Name	Area_ha	TPOLOGY_FINAL	
238	Croft Allotments	0.222552	8	
233	Griffin Close Allotments	0.336818	8	
268	Blackamoor Lane Allotments	0.464062	8	
307	Courthouse Road Allotments	1.20279	8	
261	Green Lane Allotment	1.3479	8	
325	St Marks Cresecent Allotments	1.37754	8	
292	Sandringham Road Allotments	1.82964	8	
		6.781302		7
250	St Luckers Church	0.41756	9	
254	All Saints Church	0.534911	9	
259	Braywick Cemetery	3.27718	9	
327	Courthouse Road Cemetery	3.52431	9	
		7.753961		4

ANALYSIS AREA 2

Id	Name	Area_ha	TPOLOGY_FINAL	
41	Duke Street Communal Garden	0.371926	1	
47	Bachelors Acre open space	0.671139	1	
40	Bath Island Pleasure Ground	0.84695	1	
83	Imperial Park	1.14827	1	
101	Osgood Park	1.7696	1	
154	Clewer Park	3.18529	1	
		7.993175		
104	Keepers Farm Close South	0.0536638	2	
103	Keepers Farm Close North	0.0806406	2	
145	Ruddles NSN Area	0.139013	2	
107	Wolf Lane NSN	0.284362	2	
109	Graffton Drive NSN	0.293373	2	
105	Castle Farm Spinney	0.293802	2	
163	Bell Lane Open Space	0.360338	2	
51	Trinity Wildlife Area	0.389478	2	
100	Park Corner North AGS	0.57802	2	
108	Hemwood Dell NSN	1.07161	2	
39	Thames NSN Island	1.73163	2	
119	Kenneally NSN	3.89321	2	
32	Eton Wick NSN	6.39741	2	
124	Sutherland Grange	9.72577	2	
67	The Long Walk	15.4625	2	
77	Windsor Great Park	130.617	2	16
		171.37182		
458	Barry Avenue AGS	0.0118978	4	
458	Barry Avenue AGS	0.0151129	4	
458	Barry Avenue AGS	0.0274613	4	
458	Barry Avenue AGS	0.0438495	4	
60	Sinclair Road	0.0506496	4	
82	Princess Avenue AGS 3	0.0522479	4	
63	Boltan A	0.0707837	4	
112	Basford Way Woodland AGS	0.0854462	4	
81	Princess Avenue AGS 2	0.0923086	4	
94	Perrycroft/ ridings	0.093871	4	
93	Bartlett Green	0.0966135	4	
131	Loring Road AGS	0.0981847	4	
458	Barry Avenue AGS	0.11	4	
80	Princess Avenue	0.11235	4	
125	WHitely Amenity Area	0.115404	4	
88	Clewer Public Open Space	0.132137	4	
116	The Limes	0.140091	4	
140	Ruddles Way Amenity Area	0.141541	4	
123	Sydney Road	0.159244	4	
149	Clarence Road Gardens	0.173458	4	
133	St Georges Close AGS	0.179225	4	
134	Losfield road AGS	0.20001	4	
471	Vansittart Road AGS	0.204289	4	
58	Bulkeley Avenue AGS	0.21158	4	
136	Knights close AGS	0.212486	4	
464	Westbury AGS	0.218866	4	
79	Peel Close AGS	0.237821	4	
92	Stuart WY AGS	0.248279	4	
92	Stuart WY AGS	0.273778	4	
62	Nightingale Walk AGS	0.293177	4	
132	Dedworth drive/ Stuartway AGS	0.29906	4	
96	Greenacre AGS	0.342085	4	
146	Guards Road AGS	0.445995	4	
65	Osborne Road AGS	0.472155	4	
125	WHitely Amenity Area	0.488241	4	
122	Liddell Place	0.515088	4	
44	Barry Avenue AGS2	0.737093	4	
160	Stockdales Road AGS	0.842848	4	
126	Sawyers Close	1.74472	4	
125	WHitely Amenity Area	1.93193	4	
55	Vansittart Road Recreation Ground AGS	2.46122	4	
42	Barry Avenue AGS	2.72434	4	
		17.1069377		42

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYPOLOGY_FINAL	
59	Bulkeley Ave, Play Area	0.00319495	5	
66	Osborne Road Play Area	0.0063357	5	
106	Wolf Lane Play Area	0.00993062	5	
118	Kenneally Play Area	0.0220395	5	
98	Keeler Close Play Area	0.0244971	5	
127	Sawyers Close play area	0.0287616	5	
474	Park Corner Play Area	0.0312298	5	
46	Bachelors Acre Play area	0.0337837	5	
61	Nightingale Walk Play Area	0.0357323	5	
137	Knights Close Play Area	0.0372196	5	
442	Eton Recreational Ground Play Area	0.03854	5	
443	Home Park Play Area	0.045934	5	
129	Dedworth Manor Play Area	0.0461653	5	
89	Clewer Manor play area	0.0548289	5	
114	Filmer Road Play Area	0.0566899	5	
158	Eton Wick Play Area	0.0568045	5	
53	Vansittart Road Playground	0.0801323	5	
113	Bruce Walk Play Area	0.0816633	5	
161	Stockdales Play Area	0.0938597	5	
465	Imperial Park Play area	0.0981171	5	
120	The Guards Road Play Area	0.102789	5	
144	Clewer recreation ground P/A	0.149375	5	
		1.13762387	22	22
64	Osborne Road	0.00181584	6	
102	Foster Avenue MUGA	0.0139168	6	
99	Keeler Close Teenscene	0.027063	6	
143	Clewer Recreation Ground MUGA	0.039202	6	
162	Stockdales MUGA/TEEN	0.0420079	6	
117	Kenneally MUGA	0.0540293	6	
130	Dedworth Manor MUGA	0.0641914	6	
466	Imperial Park MUGA	0.0795164	6	
54	Vansittart Recreation Ground skate park	0.10748	6	
		0.42922264	9	
73	Princess Margaret Royal Free School play area 2	0.0165898	7	
472	Eton Wick Basketball Court	0.0174747	7	
72	Princess Margaret Royal Free School play area 1	0.0321301	7	
151	The Windsor Lawn Tennis Club	0.12373	7	
456	The Goswells Bowling Green	0.131971	7	
151	The Windsor Lawn Tennis Club	0.156308	7	
457	The Goswells Tennis Courts	0.174607	7	
70	Trevelyan Middle School OSF	0.263184	7	
95	Park Corner School (Spencer Denny Centre) AGS Sout	0.351474	7	
139	Homer First school OSF	0.693306	7	
90	Clewer Green School/Hatch Lane OSF	0.700827	7	
75	St Leonards Road Football Ground	0.901051	7	
68	The Brigidine School Playing Areas	0.965798	7	
35	Eton School STP's	1.35707	7	
26	Eton Football Fields	1.39616	7	
152	St Edwards Royal Free school	1.85805	7	
29	Eton School/Common Lane Swimming Pool	1.87238	7	
22	Eton Athletics Track	1.95543	7	
87	windsor girls school	1.95831	7	
34	Willow Place (School) playing fields	2.49664	7	
52	Windsor Boys school	2.56184	7	
84	Oakfield First School	2.83498	7	
71	Princess Margaret Royal Free School playing fields	2.85144	7	
25	Eton Rugby Ground	3.03925	7	
27	Eton AGS	3.07394	7	
150	Windsor Girls School OSF	3.31433	7	
28	Eton Football Fields 2	3.32708	7	
156	Eton Wick football and social club.	3.36109	7	
36	South Meadow Lane (NORTH)	4.55166	7	
142	Clewer Recreation Ground	4.92834	7	
128	Dedworth Manor OSF	4.96093	7	
24	Eton Playing Fields 2	6.49902	7	
135	Dedworth Middle School	6.62824	7	
37	South Meadow Lane (south)	7.92206	7	
38	Meadow Lane South	8.1965	7	
76	Windsor GRT Park Sports Ground	8.57725	7	
30	Eton School/Common Lane Golf Course	9.27638	7	
23	Eton Playing Fields	28.1244	7	
1	Home Park OSF	29.8823	7	
		161.333521		152.0571 39

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYPOLOGY_FINAL
31	Eton Wick Road Allotments 1	0.205537	8
56	Vansittart Road Allotments	0.333018	8
33	Eton Wick Allotments 2	0.627638	8
69	Wood Close Allotments	1.43073	8
91	Bellview Close Allotments	2.49775	8
159	Eton Wick Allotments.	3.03934	8
153	Maidenhead Road Allotments B	3.38059	8
74	St Leonards Road Allotments	4.86045	8
141	Maidenhead Allotments	5.74266	8
		22.117713	9
45	Windsor Parish Church	0.125932	9
157	St Johns Church	0.383337	9
155	Clewer Parish Church	0.829603	9
78	St Leonards Cemetary	4.49068	9
		5.829552	4

ANALYSIS AREA 3

Id	Name	Area_ha	TPOLOGY_FINAL	
340	Walgrove Gardens	0.221104	1	
340	Walgrove Gardens	0.401142	1	
		0.622246		
191	Stroud Farm Road NSN	1.30288	2	
210	Ockwells Park Nature Reserve NSN	9.89991	2	
280	Suttonroad NSN (NAT TRUST)	7.41219	2	
280	Suttonroad NSN (NAT TRUST)	20.8459	2	
318	Maidenhead Thicket NSN D	15.9712	2	
319	Maidenhead Thicket NSN E	3.11514	2	
319	Maidenhead Thicket NSN E	3.5168	2	
319	Maidenhead Thicket NSN E	27.818	2	
337	Waltham Grove Open Space	2.36763	2	
347	Chosely Road NSN	0.619817	2	12
352	Maidenhead Thicket NSN F	0.417378	2	
352	Maidenhead Thicket NSN F	23.3411	2	
353	Maidenhead Thicket NSN	117.673	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.00414795	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.0112252	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.0303086	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.0420882	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.0513952	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.0706333	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.0889081	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.144715	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.270405	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.351379	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.871837	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	0.981176	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	1.71494	2	
359	Biusham NSN (NT)	2.36084	2	
364	Winter Hill NT	5.68872	2	
367	Cockmarch NSN (N.T.)	9.51818	2	
367	Cockmarch NSN (N.T.)	46.2212	2	
454	Knowl Hill Common	2.53703	2	
454	Knowl Hill Common	0.357995	2	
		305.618069		

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYPOLGY_FINAL
187	Holyport Green	0.00794377	4
187	Holyport Green	0.0130969	4
363	Dean Lane AGS	0.0230828	4
363	Dean Lane AGS	0.027817	4
187	Holyport Green	0.0284336	4
362	Church Road AGS	0.0310683	4
187	Holyport Green	0.0326417	4
187	Holyport Green	0.0343036	4
187	Holyport Green	0.0348146	4
187	Holyport Green	0.0396745	4
362	Church Road AGS	0.0490005	4
323	Barley Mead AGS B	0.0576801	4
187	Holyport Green	0.107218	4
219	Wessex Way AGS	0.10955	4
215	Stratford Gardens	0.130737	4
196	Priors Way AGS	0.133132	4
321	Barley Mead AGS A	0.133304	4
187	Holyport Green	0.134423	4
222	Brill Close AGS	0.136354	4
187	Holyport Green	0.143659	4
187	Holyport Green	0.144231	4
341	Walgrove Gardens AGS B	0.150212	4
214	Cox Green Road AGS	0.171442	4
187	Holyport Green	0.173338	4
199	Hanover Mead AGS B	0.182392	4
183	Springfield AGS	0.195183	4
225	Heywood Avenue AGS	0.211152	4
187	Holyport Green	0.217721	4
362	Church Road AGS	0.229097	4
363	Dean Lane AGS	0.230321	4
374	Cookham Moor (NT)	0.263127	4
362	Church Road AGS	0.325282	4
213	Brill Green	0.399688	4
374	Cookham Moor (NT)	0.426556	4
211	Thurley Way AGS	0.435082	4
374	Cookham Moor (NT)	0.443863	4
186	Cadogan Close AGS	0.509234	4
363	Dean Lane AGS	0.511413	4
187	Holyport Green	0.616102	4
202	Bray Green	0.681527	4
187	Holyport Green	0.740076	4
220	Heynes Green	0.744236	4
374	Cookham Moor (NT)	0.746914	4
226	Phipps Close AGS	0.756953	4
212	Treesmill Drive AGS	0.95324	4
374	Cookham Moor (NT)	1.31166	4
362	Church Road AGS	1.31885	4
187	Holyport Green	1.32159	4
375	Bell Rope Meadow	1.45766	4
378	Westbrook AGS	1.89472	4
192	Aysgarth Park	2.04814	4
377	Odney Common (JL Partnership)	3.31666	4
		24.5355964	

52

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYOLOGY_FINAL		
195	Asgarth Park Play Area	0.00727617	5		
322	Barley Mean Play Area	0.0224753	5		
204	Jubilee Fields Play Area	0.0356085	5		
190	Holyport War Memorial Play Area	0.0372228	5		
221	Heynes Green Play Area	0.0389417	5		
228	Phipps Close Play Area	0.0454808	5		
218	Wessex Way Play Area	0.0471172	5		
342	Walgrove Gardens Play Area	0.0610416	5		
356	Green Lane PA	0.0817686	5		
369	Alfred Major Play Area	0.0833457	5		
184	Springfield play area	0.0866346	5		
208	Ockwells Park Play Area	0.13778	5		
349	Shepherds Close Play Area	0.205231	5		
		0.88992397	13		
451	Choseley Road Teenscene	0.00643287	6		
227	Phipps Close MUGA	0.0600758	6		
217	Wessex Way MUGA	0.0676836	6		
370	Alfred Major Basketball Area	0.0731277	6		
		0.20731997	4		
320	Bowls Club	0.133327	7		
338	White Waltham Primary school OSF	0.22945	7		
189	Holyport War memorial Rec Ground	0.442771	7		
224	Woodlands Primary school	0.593545	7		
368	cookham rise primary school	0.598087	7		
185	holypport c of e primary school	0.645615	7		
360	Cookham Dean CE school	0.7591	7		
357	Bisham CE Primary school	0.832297	7		
390	Waltham St lawrence OSF	1.04008	7		
188	Holyport Cricket Club	1.07533	7		
354	Bisham, Abbey National Sports Centre	1.107	7		
384	Bray Cricket Rugby Club	1.1814	7		
216	Wessex Nursery	1.2504	7		
348	Hurley Rec Ground	1.34731	7		
193	Gays Lane Field	1.42818	7		
392	Shurlock Row Cricket Ground	1.48151	7		
365	Cookham Cricket Club	1.48266	7		
351	Hurley Cricket Gound	1.49218	7		
339	White Waltham Cricket Club	1.52956	7		
201	Bray Cricket Club	1.6312	7		
203	Jubilee Fields OSF	1.71206	7		
345	Littlewick Green - remove central area on GIS	3.21372	7		
209	Ockwells Park OSF	6.72167	7		
371	Alfred Manor Rec Ground	7.10001	7		
223	cox green school	9.76145	7		
354	Bisham, Abbey National Sports Centre	10.2173	7		
386	Birds Hill Golf Centre	35.4795	7		
350	Temple Gold Course	56.6688	7		
373	Winter Hill Golf Course	63.589	7		
		214.744512		59.00721	29
372	Alfred Major Allotments	0.429204	8		
194	Gays Lane Allotments	0.434216	8		
197	Hanover Mead Allotments.	0.844817	8		
336	Breadcroft Road Allotments	0.956528	8		
366	Alleyns Lane Allotment	0.993733	8		
380	Cookham Road Allotments	1.20885	8		
		4.867348		6	

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYPOLOGY_FINAL
453	Knowl Hill Cemetery	0.175087	9
391	Parish Church	0.260831	9
453	Knowl Hill Cemetery	0.301014	9
450	Memorial Garden	0.409303	9
361	Church Road Church	0.578052	9
200	St Michaels Church	0.64319	9
376	Bell Rope Church	0.757378	9
182	HolyPort Parish Cemetry	0.766661	9
301	Long Lane Cemetry	0.884858	9
147	Oakley Green Cemetery	2.58755	9
		7.363924	

10

ANALYSIS AREA 4

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYPOLOGY_FINAL	
10	Datchet Village Green	0.0540231	1	
413	Nell Gwynn Memorial Garden	0.0966527	1	
433	Broomhall Rec Ground	2.76854	1	
		2.9192158		
18	WILLOW FIELDS	7.55971	2	
20	Major Farm Raod	0.891398	2	
77	Windsor Great Park	6.44798	2	
169	Arthur Jacob Nature Reserve	4.09022	2	
170	Poyle Poplars Woodland	3.09108	2	
171	Old Mill Place NSN	0.688953	2	
173	Douglas Lane NSN	1.03412	2	
412	Tom Greenes Field	2.73271	2	
421	Allens Field NSN	12.344	2	12
426	South Ascot NSN	6.04486	2	
427	Blythwood Open Space	1.15812	2	
439	Broomhall Rec Woodland	0.601528	2	
440	South Ascot Rec NSN	5.10393	2	
418	Allens Field Rec Ground	3.02587	2	
		54.814479		
401	Cornwall Road Open Space	0.00348802	4	
401	Cornwall Road Open Space	0.0514861	4	
165	Horton Village Green	0.0556088	4	
178	Waylands AGS A	0.184786	4	
400	Kingsbaury Brive AGS	0.194268	4	
460	Horton Manor AGS	0.2286	4	
425	Lyndhurst Road AGS	0.260799	4	
11	HORTON ROAD AGS	0.345919	4	
401	Cornwall Road Open Space	0.360948	4	
166	Horton Rec Ground	0.450491	4	
179	Waylands AGS B	0.510171	4	
393	Day Centre Green Space	0.804982	4	
389	Prince Consorts AGS	1.37058	4	
13	GREEN LANE AGS	1.48253	4	
389	Prince Consorts AGS	3.0013	4	
		9.30595692		15
167	Horton Play Area	0.0221746	5	
172	Wraysbury Play Area	0.0251603	5	
428	Blythwood Play Area	0.0319818	5	
423	South Ascot Play Area	0.0517229	5	
16	Datchet Recreation Ground play area	0.0606461	5	
410	Victory Field Play Area	0.0698691	5	
441	Windsor Park Village Play Area	0.0766725	5	
435	Broomhall Rec Play Area	0.0875344	5	
180	Waylands Play Area	0.126973	5	
175	The Green Play Area	0.181353	5	
397	Old Windsor Rec Ground Play Area	0.188408	5	
408	Cheapside Rec Play Ground	0.214774	5	
		1.1372697	12	
411	Victory Road MUGA	0.00371046	6	
17	GREEN LANE MUGA	0.0218522	6	
424	South Ascot Teen Area	0.0223932	6	
176	Wraysbury Rec Ground Kickabout	0.0408812	6	
398	Old Windsor Rec Ground MUGA	0.0980345	6	
15	GREEN LANE PLAY GROUND	0.142006	6	
434	Broomhall Rec MUGA	0.204023	6	
		0.53290056	7	

Id	Name	Area_ha	TYPOLOGY_FINAL		
463	Wraysbury Bowling Green	0.0468826	7		
402	Kings Court First school OSF	0.0727228	7		
404	st peter c of e school	0.112808	7		
438	Broomhall Rec. Tennis Courts	0.1561	7		
462	Wraysbury Lawn Tennis Club	0.159828	7		
388	Prince Consorts Bowls	0.184082	7		
12	St Marys School Playing Field	0.422371	7		
402	Kings Court First school OSF	0.434344	7		
419	South Grange Nursery OSF	0.521449	7		
404	st peter c of e school	0.619941	7		
416	Charters School OSF	0.626884	7		
177	Wraysbury Rec Ground OSF	1.10489	7		
8	Deepfield Cricket Ground	1.25031	7		
174	Wraysbury Green	1.69958	7		
422	South Ascot Recreation Ground	1.71148	7		
415	Highclere Preschool school	1.92371	7		
414	Ascot Race Course Cricket	2.18474	7		
409	Victory Fields Rec Ground	2.24743	7		
6	Pajaro Valley High School	3.08479	7		
396	Old Windsor Recreation Ground	4.56207	7		
437	charters road school OSF2	5.56861	7		
4	Slough Rugby Club	5.93969	7		
14	GREEN LANE PLAYING FIELDS	7.52288	7		
436	Charters school OSF	17.5793	7		
2	Datchet Golf Course	18.2509	7		
387	Prince Consorts Drive Rec Ground	21.7885	7		
		99.78		81.52539	26
420	Allens Way Allotments	0.592627	8		
432	Church Road Allotments	1.00907	8		
394	Church Road Allotments	2.19448	8		
3	Datchet Allotments	3.35187	8		
		7.148047		4	
429	Kiln Lane Cemetery	0.261699	9		
395	Church Road Cemetery	0.501801	9		
181	St Andrews Church	0.557914	9		
168	St Michaels Church and Cemetery	0.632538	9		
431	Trinity Crescent Church	0.704886	9		
19	Ditton Road Cemetery	0.745566	9		
		3.404404		6	

APPENDIX G
SITE ASSESSMENT

QUALITY SCORING ASSESSMENT

Site ID:

Date of Visit:

Site Name:

Specific Facilities

Site Address:

Type of Open Space:

1	Parks and Gardens	5	Play areas for children	9	Civic Spaces
2	Natural and semi natural areas	6	Outdoor Sports Facilities	10	Outdoor teenager facilities
3	Green Corridors	7	Allotments		
4	Amenity Greenspace	8	Cemeteries and Churchyards		

PMP Audit Codes:

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	Weighting	Assessor's Comments
-----------	------	---------	------	-----------	-----------	---------------------

Cleanliness and Maintenance								
Includes: Vandalism and Graffiti Equipment	Litter problems Maintenance	Dog Fouling	Noise	5	4	3	2	1

x3

Security and Safety							
Includes: Lighting	Equipment	Boundaries (e.g. fencing)	5	4	3	2	1

x2

Vegetation						
Includes: Planted areas	Grass areas	5	4	3	2	1

x2

Ancillary Accommodation								
Includes: Toilets	Parking	Provision of bins for rubbish/litter Pathways (within the open space sites)	Seats / Benches	5	4	3	2	1

x2

Enriched Play Environment					
Includes: Criteria for enriched play environment	5	4	3	2	1

x2

SITE ACCESS SCORING ASSESSMENT

Site ID:

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

Weighting

Assessor's Comments

General						
Includes: Entrance to site Disabled Access	Roads, paths and cycleway access	5	4	3	2	1

x3

Transport						
Includes: Accessible by public transport Accessible by walking	Accessible by cycleways	5	4	3	2	1

x2

Information & Signage					
Is the information & signage to the open space appropriate where required and is it clear?	5	4	3	2	1

x1

WIDER BENEFITS SCORING ASSESSMENT

Site ID:

Wider Benefits

Assessor's Comments

Structural and landscape benefits	Yes	No
Ecological benefits	Yes	No
Education benefits	Yes	No
Social inclusion and health benefits	Yes	No
Cultural and heritage benefits	Yes	No
Amenity benefits and a "sense of place"	Yes	No
Economic benefits	Yes	No

QUALITY SCORING ASSESSMENT (Definitions)

		Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Average (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)
Cleanliness and Maintenance	Vandalism and Graffiti	No evidence of vandalism or graffiti	Limited evidence of vandalism or graffiti	Some evidence of vandalism or graffiti but doesn't really detract from the cleanliness or attraction of the area	Increasing evidence of vandalism and graffiti which would probably deter some users	Clear evidence of vandalism and graffiti which would probably deter any usage of the open space site
	Litter problems	No evidence of litter	Limited evidence of litter	Some evidence of litter but doesn't really detract from the cleanliness or attraction of the area	Increasing evidence of litter which would probably deter some users	Clear evidence of litter which would probably deter any usage of the open space site
	Dog Fouling	No evidence of dog fouling; specific dog fouling wastage bins provided where appropriate	Limited evidence of dog fouling	Some evidence of dog fouling but doesn't really detract from the cleanliness or attraction of the area	Increasing evidence of dog fouling which would probably deter some users; no specific bins provided in appropriate areas	Clear evidence of dog fouling which would probably deter any usage of the open space site
	Noise	Very quiet and peaceful site; no intrusion by any noise	Limited intrusion by noise; i.e. site located away from roads, railways, works sites etc	Little intrusion by noise (e.g. busy road, railway nearby) but wouldn't really deter usage of the site	Noise intrusion apparent; may have some affect on potential usage	Noise intrusion clearly apparent by a number of sources and would probably deter some usage
	Equipment (e.g. condition and maintenance of equipment in play areas or recreation provision)	Equipment in excellent condition and provides an attraction for users;	Equipment in good condition	Equipment in reasonable condition; some potential improvements but not a necessity at this stage	Some equipment in poor condition and obvious that improvements could be made	Majority of equipment in poor condition and in a state of disrepair; no signs of the issue being addressed
	Smells (unattractive)	No unattractive smells	Limited unattractive smells	Little unattractive smells or some smells that would be a one-off; shouldn't deter any usage	Some unattractive more permanent smells; may deter some users	Clearly apparent unattractive permanent smells; would deter some potential users
	Maintenance and Management	Clean and tidy; well-maintained site that is inviting to users; possibly an example of good practice	Clean and tidy site; good maintenance	Reasonably clean and tidy site; some potential improvements	Some questions regarding the cleanliness of the site; some obvious improvements could be made	Poor cleanliness; clear evidence of a lack of maintenance
Security and Safety	Lighting	Appropriate lighting that promotes the safety of the open space; well-maintained	Appropriate lighting; well-maintained	Some lighting; some general improvements could be made	Limited lighting; or appropriate lighting in poor condition	Limited lighting in poor condition; or no lighting in places required
	Equipment (e.g. protection of equipment and appropriate flooring and surfaces)	Equipment in excellent condition; excellent surfaces provided throughout the site; appropriate fencing of site to protect equipment and/or ensure safety of users	Equipment in good condition; appropriate and suitable surfaces provided throughout the majority of the site; sufficient measures provided to protect equipment and/or ensure safety of users	Equipment in reasonable condition; appropriate surfaces provided but some potential improvements; some measures provided to protect equipment and/or ensure safety of users	Equipment in poor condition; some questions regarding safety of use; appropriate surfaces provided but in poor condition or some clear concerns regarding surfaces; limited measures to protect equipment of users	Equipment in very poor condition; clear questions regarding safety of use; inappropriate surfaces; no measures to protect equipment of users
	Boundaries (including hedges, fencing and gates)	Clearly defined and well-maintained to a high standard	Clearly defined and maintained to a reasonable standard	Mostly clearly defined but possibly improvements to be made to the standard and condition.	Poorly defined and some questions regarding the standard and condition.	Poorly defined and in a state of disrepair.
Vegetation	Planted areas	Numerous planting, with appropriate mix of plants, installed and maintained to a very high standard; no weeds	Numerous planting, with appropriate mix of plants, installed and maintained to a reasonable standard; very few weeds	Appropriate range of vegetation and plants but with some patchy maintenance	Limited range of vegetation and plants but reasonable maintenance	Limited range of vegetation and plants; poor maintenance with some areas clearly suffering
	Grass areas	Full grass cover throughout; cleanly cut and in excellent colour and condition	Full grass cover throughout and cleanly cut; few weeds but generally in good condition	Grass cover throughout but with some thin patches or excessive growth in some areas; some bald areas and a few weeds; but generally in good condition	General grass cover but some significant areas thins, saturated and/or poorly maintained; cut infrequently with obvious clippings still in existence	General grass cover but with some serious wear and tear and/or limited grass cover in many areas; little or no serious attempt to correct the problem
Ancillary Accommodation	Toilets	Provided where appropriate; easy to access; signed and well-maintained	Provided where appropriate; easy to access; some minor improvements could be made (e.g. cleanliness)	Provided where appropriate; reasonable access; generally not very well maintained;	Insufficient toilets provided; or those provided are in poor condition and likely to be generally avoided by open space users; uninviting	No toilets in a place that should be provided; or some provided but in a state of disrepair that are unlikely to be used
	Parking (related to open spaces)	On-site parking provided; adequate number; clean and in good condition; well signposted	On-site or appropriate off-site parking provided; adequate number; generally clean but some improvements could be made;	Appropriate off-site parking provided; some limit in terms of spaces; generally clean	No on-site and limited off-site parking provided; or adequate number of spaces but in poor condition	Parking provision limited and in poor condition
	Provision of bins for rubbish/litter	Numerous bins provided and in good condition; in right locations and clearly labeled for appropriate purpose	Numerous bins provided and in average condition; clearly visible and in appropriate locations	Adequate number provided and in average condition; some signs of overuse/ damage etc	Insufficient number provided but in average/good condition; or appropriate number but with significant signs of damage or limited maintenance	Insufficient number provided and in poor condition;
	Seats / Benches	Numerous for the size of site and in good condition	Numerous for the size of site and in average condition	Adequate number for the size of site and in good condition	Insufficient number but in good condition; or adequate number but in poor condition	Insufficient number and in poor condition
	Pathways (within the open space sites)	Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges well defined; surfaces clean, debris and weed free and in excellent condition;	Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges well defined; little debris and/or weeds but overall in good condition; good disabled access in most areas	Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges reasonably well defined; some debris and/or weeds but doesn't detract too much from overall appearance; disabled access in some areas	Suitable materials but some faults; some difficulty with defined edges; debris and/or weeds detract slightly from appearance; some difficulties with disabled access	Inappropriate materials and/or significant faults; edges not clearly defined; significant debris and/or weeds; limited disabled access or very restricted

SITE ACCESS SCORING ASSESSMENT (Definitions)

		Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Average (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)
General	Entrance to the sites (i.e. are the entrances to sites easily seen, easily accessible etc)	Easy to find, with a welcoming sign; appropriate size, clean and inviting and easily accessible for all users including less able bodied people.	Clear entrance and well-maintained, appropriate size and clean.	Fairly obvious entrance that is maintained to a reasonable level and which is clean and accessible to most potential users	Apparent as an entrance but no clear signage; not as well-maintained as it could be; some users may have difficulty with access	Poor or limited entrance; no signage; difficulty with access and not maintained appropriately
	Roads, pathways, cycleways and/or accesses	Suitable materials, level for safe use and in excellent condition; cycle stands provided and separate clearly marked routes for cycles, pedestrians and other traffic etc	Suitable materials and overall in good condition; some cycle stands provided where appropriate and easy and safe access within the site for cycles, pedestrians and other traffic etc	Suitable materials; reasonable access for pedestrians and cycles etc but no real separate defined areas where appropriate	Some potential improvements to some surfaces; some difficulty with general access within the site	Inappropriate surfaces and/or significant faults; limited restrictions of access for pedestrians and cycles; usage would be clearly affected
	Disabled Access	Good disabled access throughout; specific facilities and pathways provided	Good disabled access in most areas	Disabled access in some areas; some improvements could be made	Some difficulties with disabled access	Limited disabled access or very restricted
Transport	Accessible by public transport	Excellent public transport links provided where appropriate; bus stop located at the site and/or train station in very close proximity	Good public transport links; bus stop located nearby; and/or train station within reasonable walking distance	Reasonable public transport links but would not be first choice of accessible transport; bus stop located within reasonable walking distance;	Limited public transport links; bus stop located a significant walking distance away (more than 10-15minutes);	No public transport links within any reasonable walking distance of the site
	Accessible by cycleways	Clear separated cycle routes to and within the site; cycle stands provided in appropriate places	Some cycle routes to and/or within the site; local roads quiet and safe for cyclists; cycle stands provided in some places	Easy access for cyclists although no specific routes provided; local roads fairly quiet and safe; cycle stands provided or suitable areas to lock cycles are evident	Limited access for cyclists; not really encouraged by design and/or location of site; no cycle stands provided but some areas to lock cycles	No real access for cyclists; not really encouraged by design and/or location of site; access via busy dangerous roads; no cycle stands provided and/or no clearly evident areas to lock cycles
	Accessible by walking	Clearly defined pathways / walkways to and within the open space site; pedestrian crossings provided where appropriate	Pathways / walkways provided to and within the open space site; some crossing of roads required without assistance but no real safety issues regarding access for pedestrians	Some pathways / walkways provided to and/or within the open space site; some crossing of roads required without assistance; some potential for improvements	Limited pathways / walkways provided to and/or within the open space site or pathways provided not clearly defined; some safety issues regarding access for pedestrians	No clear pathways / walkways provided to and/or within the open space site; significant safety issues regarding access for pedestrians
Information & Signage	Information & Signage (i.e. is the signage to the open spaces appropriate where required and clear to see and easy to follow)	Site clearly signposted outside the site; signage in good condition; signage within site easy to follow and understand; information clearly displayed in various formats (e.g. noticeboards, leaflets etc);	Site is signposted with signage in good condition; some signage within the site; information mostly clear and displayed in appropriate format; signage in relatively good condition	Signage provided within or outside the site; some improvements could be made; condition of signage reasonable	Site not signposted and/or signage that is provided in poor condition and uninviting; limited information displayed;	No information displayed in appropriate areas; no signage / No information displayed in appropriate areas; no signage;

WIDER BENEFITS SCORING ASSESSMENT (Definitions)

		Yes	No	Definition	Factors
Wider Benefits	Structural and landscape benefits	Yes	No	The landscape framework of open spaces can contribute to the study of environmental quality. Well-located, high quality greenspaces help to define the identity and character of an area, and separate it from other areas nearby.	buffer between roads and houses greenbelt land edge of settlement forming local landscape
	Ecological benefits	Yes	No	Greenspaces support local biodiversity and some provide habitats for local wildlife and may exhibit some geological features. Some may help to alleviate the extremes of urban climates such as noise and water pollution.	designations - e.g. SSSI's, LNR's diverse and rich habitats site includes rivers, ponds, lakes that encourage local wildlife habitats local biodiversity studies
	Education benefits	Yes	No	Seen as 'outdoor classrooms' ; some greenspaces offer educational opportunities in science, history, ecological and environmental activities.	nature walks interpretational material provided opportunities for volunteers in practical conservation outdoor educational facilities
	Social inclusion and health benefits	Yes	No	Greenspaces , including sport and recreation facilities can promote some civic pride, community ownership and a sense of belonging; they are also one of the very few publicly accessible facilities equally available to everyone irrespective of personal circumstances	range of age groups use by community groups organised community activities social, cultural or community facilities specific walking/jogging trails and/or sports facilities central location to be accessed by majority
	Cultural and heritage benefits	Yes	No	Some greenspaces have a historical value and some provided a setting listed buildings; also can be high profile symbols of towns and cities	historic buildings historic gardens symbol of the area conservation area monuments and/or memorials
	Amenity benefits and a "sense of place"	Yes	No	The network of greenspaces can contribute to the visual amenity of an urban landscape and make them a more attractive place to live, work and play. They can be appreciated both visually and passively - not just through the active use of facilities provided.	helps to create specific neighbourhood provides important landmark clearly visible from most areas softens urban texture
	Economic benefits	Yes	No	greenspaces can promote economic development and regeneration; can also help to enhance property values	local tourist site income from sports facilities enhancing or devaluing housing within estates potential hosting of major events offers employment opportunities regeneration

QUALITY SCORING ASSESSMENT (Definitions)

		Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Average (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)
Cleanliness and Maintenance	Vandalism and Graffiti	No evidence of vandalism or graffiti	Limited evidence of vandalism or graffiti	Some evidence of vandalism or graffiti but doesn't really detract from the cleanliness or attraction of the area	Increasing evidence of vandalism and graffiti which would probably deter some users	Clear evidence of vandalism and graffiti which would probably deter any usage of the open space site
	Litter problems	No evidence of litter	Limited evidence of litter	Some evidence of litter but doesn't really detract from the cleanliness or attraction of the area	Increasing evidence of litter which would probably deter some users	Clear evidence of litter which would probably deter any usage of the open space site
	Dog Fouling	No evidence of dog fouling; specific dog fouling wastage bins provided where appropriate	Limited evidence of dog fouling	Some evidence of dog fouling but doesn't really detract from the cleanliness or attraction of the area	Increasing evidence of dog fouling which would probably deter some users; no specific bins provided in appropriate areas	Clear evidence of dog fouling which would probably deter any usage of the open space site
	Noise	Very quiet and peaceful site; no intrusion by any noise	Limited intrusion by noise; i.e. site located away from roads, railways, works sites etc	Little intrusion by noise (e.g. busy road, railway nearby) but wouldn't really deter usage of the site	Noise intrusion apparent; may have some affect on potential usage	Noise intrusion clearly apparent by a number of sources and would probably deter some usage
	Equipment (e.g. condition and maintenance of equipment in play areas or recreation provision)	Equipment in excellent condition and provides an attraction for users;	Equipment in good condition	Equipment in reasonable condition; some potential improvements but not a necessity at this stage	Some equipment in poor condition and obvious that improvements could be made	Majority of equipment in poor condition and in a state of disrepair; no signs of the issue being addressed
	Smells (unattractive)	No unattractive smells	Limited unattractive smells	Little unattractive smells or some smells that would be a one-off; shouldn't deter any usage	Some unattractive more permanent smells; may deter some users	Clearly apparent unattractive permanent smells; would deter some potential users
	Maintenance and Management	Clean and tidy; well-maintained site that is inviting to users; possibly an example of good practice	Clean and tidy site; good maintenance	Reasonably clean and tidy site; some potential improvements	Some questions regarding the cleanliness of the site; some obvious improvements could be made	Poor cleanliness; clear evidence of a lack of maintenance
Security and Safety	Lighting	Appropriate lighting that promotes the safety of the open space; well-maintained	Appropriate lighting; well-maintained	Some lighting; some general improvements could be made	Limited lighting; or appropriate lighting in poor condition	Limited lighting in poor condition; or no lighting in places required
	Equipment (e.g. protection of equipment and appropriate flooring and surfaces)	Equipment in excellent condition; excellent surfaces provided throughout the site; appropriate fencing of site to protect equipment and/or ensure safety of users	Equipment in good condition; appropriate and suitable surfaces provided throughout the majority of the site; sufficient measures provided to protect equipment and/or ensure safety of users	Equipment in reasonable condition; appropriate surfaces provided but some potential improvements; some measures provided to protect equipment and/or ensure safety of users	Equipment in poor condition; some questions regarding safety of use; appropriate surfaces provided but in poor condition or some clear concerns regarding surfaces; limited measures to protect equipment of users	Equipment in very poor condition; clear questions regarding safety of use; inappropriate surfaces; no measures to protect equipment of users
	Boundaries (including hedges, fencing and gates)	Clearly defined and well-maintained to a high standard	Clearly defined and maintained to a reasonable standard	Mostly clearly defined but possibly improvements to be made to the standard and condition.	Poorly defined and some questions regarding the standard and condition.	Poorly defined and in a state of disrepair.
Vegetation	Planted areas	Numerous planting, with appropriate mix of plants, installed and maintained to a very high standard; no weeds	Numerous planting, with appropriate mix of plants, installed and maintained to a reasonable standard; very few weeds	Appropriate range of vegetation and plants but with some patchy maintenance	Limited range of vegetation and plants but reasonable maintenance	Limited range of vegetation and plants; poor maintenance with some areas clearly suffering
	Grass areas	Full grass cover throughout; cleanly cut and in excellent colour and condition	Full grass cover throughout and cleanly cut; few weeds but generally in good condition	Grass cover throughout but with some thin patches or excessive growth in some areas; some bald areas and a few weeds; but generally in good condition	General grass cover but some significant areas thins, saturated and/or poorly maintained; cut infrequently with obvious clippings still in existence	General grass cover but with some serious wear and tear and/or limited grass cover in many areas; little or no serious attempt to correct the problem
Ancillary Accommodation	Toilets	Provided where appropriate; easy to access; signed and well-maintained	Provided where appropriate; easy to access; some minor improvements could be made (e.g. cleanliness)	Provided where appropriate; reasonable access; generally not very well maintained;	Insufficient toilets provided; or those provided are in poor condition and likely to be generally avoided by open space users; uninviting	No toilets in a place that should be provided; or some provided but in a state of disrepair that are unlikely to be used
	Parking (related to open spaces)	On-site parking provided; adequate number; clean and in good condition; well signposted	On-site or appropriate off-site parking provided; adequate number; generally clean but some improvements could be made;	Appropriate off-site parking provided; some limit in terms of spaces; generally clean	No on-site and limited off-site parking provided; or adequate number of spaces but in poor condition	Parking provision limited and in poor condition
	Provision of bins for rubbish/litter	Numerous bins provided and in good condition; in right locations and clearly labeled for appropriate purpose	Numerous bins provided and in average condition; clearly visible and in appropriate locations	Adequate number provided and in average condition; some signs of overuse/ damage etc	Insufficient number provided but in average/good condition; or appropriate number but with significant signs of damage or limited maintenance	Insufficient number provided and in poor condition;
	Seats / Benches	Numerous for the size of site and in good condition	Numerous for the size of site and in average condition	Adequate number for the size of site and in good condition	Insufficient number but in good condition; or adequate number but in poor condition	Insufficient number and in poor condition
	Pathways (within the open space sites)	Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges well defined; surfaces clean, debris and weed free and in excellent condition;	Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges well defined; little debris and/or weeds but overall in good condition; good disabled access in most areas	Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges reasonably well defined; some debris and/or weeds but doesn't detract too much from overall appearance; disabled access in some areas	Suitable materials but some faults; some difficulty with defined edges; debris and/or weeds detract slightly from appearance; some difficulties with disabled access	Inappropriate materials and/or significant faults; edges not clearly defined; significant debris and/or weeds; limited disabled access or very restricted

SITE ACCESS SCORING ASSESSMENT (Definitions)

		Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Average (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)
General	Entrance to the sites (i.e. are the entrances to sites easily seen, easily accessible etc)	Easy to find, with a welcoming sign; appropriate size, clean and inviting and easily accessible for all users including less able bodied people.	Clear entrance and well-maintained, appropriate size and clean.	Fairly obvious entrance that is maintained to a reasonable level and which is clean and accessible to most potential users	Apparent as an entrance but no clear signage; not as well-maintained as it could be; some users may have difficulty with access	Poor or limited entrance; no signage; difficulty with access and not maintained appropriately
	Roads, pathways, cycleways and/or accesses	Suitable materials, level for safe use and in excellent condition; cycle stands provided and separate clearly marked routes for cycles, pedestrians and other traffic etc	Suitable materials and overall in good condition; some cycle stands provided where appropriate and easy and safe access within the site for cycles, pedestrians and other traffic etc	Suitable materials; reasonable access for pedestrians and cycles etc but no real separate defined areas where appropriate	Some potential improvements to some surfaces; some difficulty with general access within the site	Inappropriate surfaces and/or significant faults; limited restrictions of access for pedestrians and cycles; usage would be clearly affected
	Disabled Access	Good disabled access throughout; specific facilities and pathways provided	Good disabled access in most areas	Disabled access in some areas; some improvements could be made	Some difficulties with disabled access	Limited disabled access or very restricted
Transport	Accessible by public transport	Excellent public transport links provided where appropriate; bus stop located at the site and/or train station in very close proximity	Good public transport links; bus stop located nearby; and/or train station within reasonable walking distance	Reasonable public transport links but would not be first choice of accessible transport; bus stop located within reasonable walking distance;	Limited public transport links; bus stop located a significant walking distance away (more than 10-15minutes);	No public transport links within any reasonable walking distance of the site
	Accessible by cycleways	Clear separated cycle routes to and within the site; cycle stands provided in appropriate places	Some cycle routes to and/or within the site; local roads quiet and safe for cyclists; cycle stands provided in some places	Easy access for cyclists although no specific routes provided; local roads fairly quiet and safe; cycle stands provided or suitable areas to lock cycles are evident	Limited access for cyclists; not really encouraged by design and/or location of site; no cycle stands provided but some areas to lock cycles	No real access for cyclists; not really encouraged by design and/or location of site; access via busy dangerous roads; no cycle stands provided and/or no clearly evident areas to lock cycles
	Accessible by walking	Clearly defined pathways / walkways to and within the open space site; pedestrian crossings provided where appropriate	Pathways / walkways provided to and within the open space site; some crossing of roads required without assistance but no real safety issues regarding access for pedestrians	Some pathways / walkways provided to and/or within the open space site; some crossing of roads required without assistance; some potential for improvements	Limited pathways / walkways provided to and/or within the open space site or pathways provided not clearly defined; some safety issues regarding access for pedestrians	No clear pathways / walkways provided to and/or within the open space site; significant safety issues regarding access for pedestrians
Information & Signage	Information & Signage (i.e. is the signage to the open spaces appropriate where required and clear to see and easy to follow)	Site clearly signposted outside the site; signage in good condition; signage within site easy to follow and understand; information clearly displayed in various formats (e.g. noticeboards, leaflets etc);	Site is signposted with signage in good condition; some signage within the site; information mostly clear and displayed in appropriate format; signage in relatively good condition	Signage provided within or outside the site; some improvements could be made; condition of signage reasonable	Site not signposted and/or signage that is provided in poor condition and uninviting; limited information displayed;	No information displayed in appropriate areas; no signage / No information displayed in appropriate areas; no signage;

WIDER BENEFITS SCORING ASSESSMENT (Definitions)

		Yes	No	Definition	Factors
Wider Benefits	Structural and landscape benefits	Yes	No	The landscape framework of open spaces can contribute to the study of environmental quality. Well-located, high quality greenspaces help to define the identity and character of an area, and separate it from other areas nearby.	buffer between roads and houses greenbelt land edge of settlement forming local landscape
	Ecological benefits	Yes	No	Greenspaces support local biodiversity and some provide habitats for local wildlife and may exhibit some geological features. Some may help to alleviate the extremes of urban climates such as noise and water pollution.	designations - e.g. SSSI's, LNR's diverse and rich habitats site includes rivers, ponds, lakes that encourage local wildlife habitats local biodiversity studies
	Education benefits	Yes	No	Seen as 'outdoor classrooms' ; some greenspaces offer educational opportunities in science, history, ecological and environmental activities.	nature walks interpretational material provided opportunities for volunteers in practical conservation outdoor educational facilities
	Social inclusion and health benefits	Yes	No	Greenspaces , including sport and recreation facilities can promote some civic pride, community ownership and a sense of belonging; they are also one of the very few publicly accessible facilities equally available to everyone irrespective of personal circumstances	range of age groups use by community groups organised community activities social, cultural or community facilities specific walking/jogging trails and/or sports facilities central location to be accessed by majority
	Cultural and heritage benefits	Yes	No	Some greenspaces have a historical value and some provided a setting listed buildings; also can be high profile symbols of towns and cities	historic buildings historic gardens symbol of the area conservation area monuments and/or memorials
	Amenity benefits and a "sense of place"	Yes	No	The network of greenspaces can contribute to the visual amenity of an urban landscape and make them a more attractive place to live, work and play. They can be appreciated both visually and passively - not just through the active use of facilities provided.	helps to create specific neighbourhood provides important landmark clearly visible from most areas softens urban texture
	Economic benefits	Yes	No	greenspaces can promote economic development and regeneration; can also help to enhance property values	local tourist site income from sports facilities enhancing or devaluing housing within estates potential hosting of major events offers employment opportunities regeneration

APPENDIX H
STRATEGIC REVIEW

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Regional Planning Guidance Note 9 (December 2000)</p>	<p>This document provides the Strategic Planning guidance for the South East region of England.</p> <p>RPG9 will be superseded by the South East Plan during late 2008 when the South East Plan is adopted autumn / winter 2008.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>South East Plan: (Proposed Modifications) August 2008</p>	<p>This document, once adopted, will provide the Strategic Planning guidance for the South East region of England. The document is in draft version at present and was submitted to the Government in March 2006. The Examination In Public took place between November 2006 and March 2007. The Inspectors Report was published during August 2007. Proposed changes were published during July 2008 and these are open to public consultation until 24 October 2008. The South East Plan will, at the time of writing, be adopted late 2008. Once adopted this document will supersede RPG9.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>South East Plan: Section D10 Tourism and related sports and recreation</p>	<p>Policy S1 (Supporting Healthy Communities): the Planning system can develop and shape healthy sustainable communities by providing good access to these facilities; by promoting mixed and cohesive communities through focussing on access to housing for socially excluded groups, and by encouraging healthier forms of transport (ie incorporating cycle lanes, footpaths in planned developments).</p> <p>Policy S5 (Cultural and sporting activity): participation in sport, recreation and cultural activity should be encouraged (with relevant policies in place to encourage participation by disadvantaged/socially excluded persons/groups). An up to date strategy including an audit of current supply against estimated demand/growth should be the basis of cultural and sporting activity provision, and facilities accessible by a number of modes should have joint service provisions in place.</p>	<p>Both Policy S1 and S5 set the regional context for the encouragement of healthy communities through the promotion of recreation and sporting activity.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Berkshire Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 Adopted (July 2005)</p>	<p>This document provides the Strategic framework for Berkshire. It guides, controls development in the Borough. This document has been adopted for development control purposes by RBWM. These policies all provide guidance at the strategic county wide level. Detailed policy/guidance is contained within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>Structure Plan Chapter: Spatial Strategy & Development Principles</p>	<p>DP3 (Green Belt): The policy sets out the broad extent of the Green Belt and briefly sets out the forms of development that would be acceptable within it. Planning permission will be given only in very special circumstances such as agriculture and forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries, etc providing it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purpose of including land within it. More detail is provided by the Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Boundaries of the Green Belt and of the settlements have been identified in local plans. Green Belt boundary changes will only be made in exceptional circumstances through local plan reviews.</p>	<p>Policy DP3 emphasises the importance of the Green Belt and indicates that proposals for development would only be granted planning permission provided that they meet certain (limited) criteria. One of these criteria related to essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation.</p> <p>This is a very important consideration for RBWM as 83% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt. Given the location of the Borough to London and major transport infrastructure there is intense pressure for development.</p>
<p>Structure Plan Chapter: Shopping & Leisure</p>	<p>S1 (Major retail and leisure development in town centres): The sequential approach in identifying suitable sites should be adopted, the scale and nature of development will be consistent with the role of the centre, and proposals must demonstrate that they will (on their own or cumulatively) not adversely affect the vitality and viability of other town centres nor result in unacceptable increases in the numbers of car borne shopping or leisure trips or in their average length of stay. Where appropriate developments will be expected to contribute towards improved access and choice of transport to the centre.</p>	<p>Policy S1 stipulates that major leisure developments in town centre areas would be required to contribute towards improved access and transport choices to the centre through developer contributions.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>S3 (Leisure Development outside major town centres) Development will only be permitted outside the centres where the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need has been demonstrated, • Sequential approach has been followed in site selection, • Development will (solely or cumulatively) not adversely affect the vitality and viability of other town centres, nor cause any significant adverse impacts on the environment or upon the amenity of nearby residents. <p>Any changes in travel patterns over the catchments area would be in accordance with the Transport Strategy in Policy T1 and the development of the Strategic Transport Network</p> <p>S4 (Other sport, recreation, Tourism and Leisure uses) Proposals for these non key town centre uses should be in a location appropriate to their use, and of a scale and form appropriate to their current and future accessibility and level of infrastructure, services and employment. The sequential approach should be followed and proposals for uses in rural locations must be in accordance with other policies regarding development in the countryside. Potential effects of increased visitors on landscape, wildlife, habitats etc will be considered.</p>	<p>Policy S3 refers to the criteria that developers proposing leisure development located outside of the major town centres would be required to meet.</p> <p>Policy S4 provides strategic level guidance on the location of sport and recreation facilities not covered by policies S1 and S3.</p>
<p>RBWM Community Strategy 2007 - 2013</p>	<p>A strategic priority of the Community Strategy is to improve the appearance of the Borough by improving parks, combating litter and vandalism and attaining “green flag” quality assurance status for parks by improving the landscape and design of public open spaces through tree and bulb planting. It also seeks to promote sustainable lifestyles and protect the environment by improving access to the countryside through public rights of way.</p>	<p>Two key themes of the Community Strategy are to improve the quality of parks and also to improve the health of the Borough’s population by encouraging both sport and recreational activity.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>The Strategy also seeks to promote sustainable and prosperous communities and recognises that a healthy workforce can assist with this through participation in sports and recreational activities etc. Strengths in this area are that the Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • actively safeguards and enhances public rights of way • Consults and works with interested parties to achieve the provision of a well maintained and signed network of public rights of way • Ensure that the public rights of way network is properly maintained and well publicised and landowners are assisted to understand their responsibilities and rights. <p>One area for development is seen as improving the access to the countryside through public rights of way.</p>	
<p>RBWM Local Plan (incorporating Alterations) Adopted June 2003</p>	<p>This document provides the detailed framework for guiding, controlling and bringing forward development in the Borough at the local level. This document has been adopted for development control purposes by RBWM.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Local Plan Chapter: Environment:</p>	<p>Policy GB1 (Green Belt): This policy set out the purposes of the Green Belt and the limited uses considered appropriate within these locations. These purposes are defined in PPG2 and include agriculture, forestry, certain types of residential development, and essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses, which preserve the openness, and purpose of including land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Objectives for the use of land in the Green Belt include the provision of opportunities for access for outside sport and to the open countryside. Construction of new buildings for essential facilities genuinely required is appropriate development providing it preserves the openness of the greenbelt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.</p>	<p>Policy GB1 provides guidance, at the local level, for development located within the Green Belt. It reflects the stipulations set out by the Structure Plan which themselves reflect the national guidance set out by PPG2 (Green Belts).</p> <p>It emphasises the importance of limiting the impact of any development proposal on the openness of the Green Belt. For example new sporting facilities located in a rural location could need parking facilities, changing facilities, stadium facilities etc. All of these forms of additional development which will impact on the purposes of including the land in the Green Belt in the first place.</p>
<p>Local Plan Chapter: Leisure</p>	<p>Policy R1 (Protection of urban open spaces): Proposals that would result in the loss of existing areas of important urban land (shown of the Local Plan proposals map) will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can best be retained and enhanced through a redevelopment of a portion of the site.</p> <p>R2 (Identify opportunities to overcome deficiencies in open space) This stipulates that the Borough Council will work together with Parish Councils to identify opportunities to overcome deficiencies in open space. This may be through enhancement or upgrading of existing facilities, improving access to existing facilities or encouraging the dual use of school facilities.</p>	<p>Policy R1 seeks to retain open land in urban areas which meets the recreational needs of the community. Some may not have public access but do contribute to the environmental quality will also be protected by this policy. For example: allotments, private playing fields, detached school playing fields and cemeteries and other privately owned amenity space.</p> <p>Policy R2 identifies the commitment to work with Parish Council's to identify new open space in areas of deficiency.</p>

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>R3 (New Housing Developments will be required to include public open space). The policy sets out that the minimum standard for open space provision for new housing developments is 4.3 HA per 1000 population.</p> <p>R4 (New Housing Developments will be required to allocate a minimum provision of public open space on site): Open space provision for new housing developments should be contained in one area and not spread throughout the development site. A capitalised maintenance payment will be sought by the Council for future site management.</p> <p>R5 (Provision for play areas in new family house developments): Sites larger than 0.4ha or 15 units will require the provision of a Local Area for Play (LAP). Sites larger than 0.8ha or 50 units in addition to LAP will also require a Local Equipped Area for Play LEAP.</p> <p>R6 (Public open space on identified housing sites): The following areas will be sought for public open space as part of identified housing sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Altwood Crest House, Cannon Lane, Maidenhead (0.4ha) 2. King Edward VII Hospital, St Leonards Road, Windsor (0.2ha) 3. Little Lowbrook Farm, Cox Green (1.0ha) 4. Land to rear of Alma Road/Clarence Road, Windsor (0.4ha) 5. Kennel Green Nursery, Burleigh Road, North Ascot (1.0ha) 6. Land to rear of Sutherlands Chase, North Ascot (1.0ha) [this area includes the area of Wildlife Heritage Site to be retained] 	<p>Policies R3, R4 and R5 set out specifically the open space/equipped play area requirements for the Borough.</p> <p>Policy R6 identifies those areas that will be sought for public open space as part of identified housing sites.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>R7 (Formal sports and leisure facilities): Development which results in loss of a built sport or leisure facility available to the public will not be permitted unless a similar size replacement is provided or a smaller facility of greater recreational value is retained on site.</p> <p>R8 (New developments for recreation use) Development will be permitted for public or private recreation use except where it would result in significant environmental or highway problems or where it would conflict with other policies.</p> <p>R9 (Partnership ventures): Through partnership an improved range of opportunities for participation in outdoor, indoor and water based recreation activities will be provided. The development of new and improved facilities on schools sites in partnership with schools and other agencies and improved access to these will also be encouraged.</p> <p>R10 (Disabled access): Access and facilities for disabled people will be required for all new recreation facilities.</p> <p>R11 Recreation facilities in major commercial redevelopment schemes) Where appropriate, formal sports facilities will be sought as part of a scheme for the redevelopment of all or part of an identified employment/commercial area. If facilities cannot be provided on site then a contribution will be sought by means of a planning obligation to RBWM to provide new facilities.</p>	<p>Policy R7 provides protection for the existing level of sports and leisure facilities within the Borough.</p> <p>Policies R8, R9, R10, R11 and R13 all seek to either improve access to sports / recreation facilities or promote additions to the supply of these facilities.</p>

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>R12 (Golf courses): Planning permission to develop public/private golf facilities will be permitted provided certain criteria are met. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not result in unacceptable concentration of golf course facilities • The proposal does not involve the loss of existing features or excessive alteration of ground • The proposal does not introduce features conflicting with the character of area • If appropriate existing buildings on site should be re-used, however new buildings would be considered. <p>The Council will require maintenance of existing public rights of way across golf course land and seek the introduction of new rights of way where opportunities exist to improve links within the local public right of way network.</p> <p>R13 (Other specialist recreation facilities) Use of land or water for specialised or organised activities will be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate access and parking is provided • It will not harm character, agriculture etc of countryside • It will not adversely affect amenities and safety of local residents/other users of countryside <p>R14 (Rights of way and countryside recreation) The Council will safeguard and enhance the public rights of way network and recreational cycle routes, particularly by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supporting the Countryside Commission in its efforts to establish Thames Path National Trail, and seek to prevent any 	<p>Policy R12 deals with proposals for new golf courses and sets out the criteria under which they are likely to be acceptable.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>encroachment of the route by development</p> <p>2. Support establishment of the Green Way Recreational Route between Cookham and Bray through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signposting and promoting the use of the Green Way • Making the route accessible to all including the disabled and elderly • Resist proposals which would affect enjoyment of route • Encourage improved access and landscape enhancement to areas adjoining the route <p>3. Support development of circular walks</p> <p>R15 (The Thames): Promote the retention and enhancement of recreational value of riverside paths including The Thames Path National Trail by providing adequate car parks and cycle parking facilities and improved pedestrian access</p>	<p>Policies R14 and R15 both look at linear recreation facilities in the form of public footpaths and riverside trails. These are of particular importance for the study in regard of promoting the linkages between the other types of open space.</p>
<p>Local Plan Chapter: Transportation & Movement</p>	<p>Policy T7 (cycling): Special provisions will be made for cyclists to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide safe cycle routes, lanes etc • Achieve the network of desirable cycle routes • Provide convenient and secure facilities particularly in town centres • Improve cycle links to public transport facilities • Ensure new development make provision where appropriate- for cyclists • Consider cyclists needs to design and improvement of roads • Strengthen links with Thames Valley Long Distance Cycle Route 	<p>Policy T7 promotes the provision of cycle ways within the Borough. The study will look at the linkages between sport and recreation facilities and this policy could help to provide additional linkages.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Local Plan chapter: Area based policies and proposals</p>	<p>MTC 3 (Maidenhead Town Centre Leisure facilities)</p> <p>The loss of existing leisure facilities will be resisted and additional provision encouraged, within and adjoining the town centre in order to enhance its role as a focus for recreational, entertainment, social and cultural activities.</p>	<p>Policy MTC3 looks to promote (amongst other things) leisure facilities within and adjoining Maidenhead town centre. The explanatory text to the policy indicates that areas to the north of Saint-Cloud Way and around Bridge Street are considered to be particularly appropriate for this.</p>
<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance Document (SPG): Interpretation of policies R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6 (Public Open Space Provision). Adopted February 2003 (incorporating amendments May 2004 & February 2005)</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPG is to assist in the interpretation of the public open space policies of the RBWM Local Plan (July 1999). It provides no new policies of its own, but provides a greater level of detail for understanding the open space policies already contained in the Local Plan, concentrating on Policy R3. The guidance is area specific to provide greater certainty to residents and developers about requirements throughout the Borough.</p> <p>A general standard of 4.3 ha of open space per 1,000 population has been adopted by the council, which is considered a reasonable amount to accommodate the spread of recreational demands of the local population. The 4.3 ha should comprise the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal sports provision 1.8ha / 1000 population (pitches, courts, greens, tracks) • Informal open spaces 2.5ha / 1000 population (passive recreation) <p>Total 4.3ha / 1000 population.</p> <p>In addition to the quantitative standard the Council has also adopted an accessibility standard of 400m and is based on the standards set by the National Playing Field Association.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose and main points.</p> <p>The SPD provides a greater degree of detail to enable developers to understand the requirements for open space provision throughout the Borough.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>RBWM Playing Pitch Strategy (March 2007)</p>	<p>There are 238 playing pitches in RBWM. The strategy assesses the provision of playing pitches (i.e. the playing surface, safety margins etc) and not playing fields or open spaces (i.e. grass or other areas not used for sport) within the borough including those not (currently) available for community use. The assessment is primarily concerned with voluntary participation by adults and young people in competitive association football, cricket, rugby union and hockey.</p> <p>The study reveals an undersupply of facilities in relation to demand. Recommends all pitch sites to be afforded protection within the LDF. Pitch sites should not be developed unless it can be proved through the application of both the playing pitch methodology and PPG17 that it is surplus to requirements and not providing an important local amenity.</p> <p>The document also recommends identifying opportunities to increase the number of community use agreements at school sites and a more efficient and effective use of recreational facilities and open spaces.</p> <p>52% of pitches are secured for community use although if school pitches are included that are currently used but there is not formal agreement then this increases to 73%.</p> <p>The supply of pitches is above the national average for football 1:1,509 (average 1:1,840), cricket 1:2,551 (average 1:4,243), and rugby union 1:2,976 (average 1:8,968).</p>	<p>Recommendation for analysis areas include:</p> <p>Maidenhead: only 33.5% of pitches in the area secured for community use – shortfall of 18.6 pitches (specific demand for adult rugby and cricket pitches and all forms of junior pitches)</p> <p>Windsor and Eton: shortfall of junior grass pitches. Oversupply of STPs – focus on improving quality of current grass pitches</p> <p>Northern wards: Slight oversupply of adult pitches which should meet the demand for junior pitches. Aim to increase percentage of non-community agreed sites.</p> <p>Southern wards: main undersupply of junior football and adult rugby union. Oversupply of STPs which should be used more.</p> <p>Overall undersupply of 27.4 pitches across the borough – the main recommendation was increasing community access and agreement to use school pitches. 1.18ha per 1,000 population of playing pitches is recommended.</p> <p>The projections for 2011 identify an oversupply of 9.3 adult football pitches, 7.1</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
		<p>adult rugby pitches, and 11.3 hockey pitches There will be an undersupply of 25.7 junior football pitches, 31.1 mini-soccer pitches, 14.5 cricket pitches, and 10.4 junior rugby pitches across the borough.</p> <p>Across all types of facilities Windsor in 2011 Windsor will have an oversupply of 2.5 pitches, and all other areas an undersupply (northern wards 7.3 pitches, Maidenhead 24.9 pitches, southern wards 24.2 pitches).</p>
<p>Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD – Developers Guide (December 2005)</p>	<p>The SPD has been produced to provide advice to developers on how contributions, in relation to their development, will be sought for facilities and infrastructure. Including recreation and leisure matters.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>RBWM Play Strategy 2007-10</p>	<p>The document highlights the need for children to be physically active, ideally for at least 60 minutes per day, in an environment that provides the opportunity to experience risk taking in play, without unacceptable danger. The experience should allow the individual to develop their problem-solving, social, language, planning, construction, creativity, co-ordination, and negotiation skills (without an adult necessarily present).</p> <p>The National Childcare Strategy is promoting an initiative to open school premises up during out-of-school hours so the facilities, including play items can be used.</p> <p>Through the Council's Play Policy attempts are being made to actively</p>	<p>Important to identify what improvements envisaged within the Play Strategy have actually been realized. A Play Partnership was set up to oversee the Action Plan. Key elements of this plan included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing a Play Ranger by January 2008 to champion, co-ordinate and lead on the play strategy (£80k) • Improve play provision in identified localities by June 2008 (£60k) • Improve the play areas at Desborough Park by April 2008

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>involve and consult with a range of community groups.</p> <p>The RBWM Local Plan 1991-2006 stipulates a standard of 4.3ha per 1,000 population, to include 2.5ha of informal open spaces (which include equipped and unequipped children’s play spaces). The plan endorses the Fields in standard aiming to provide all residents with a play facility within 400m of their homes.</p> <p>Between 1996-2006 the Royal Borough has gained three open spaces, four open spaces and play areas, eighteen teenscenes, three play areas and teenscenes, and seven play areas. Within the same period one open space, one play area and teenscene and one separate play area has been lost.</p> <p>The areas that are prioritised for improved play space are Old Windsor, Eton Wick, Sunninghill and Ascot, and Bray.</p>	<p>(£100k from S106)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a MUGA in Imperial Park by December 2007 (£150k from S106) • Installation of floodlights at Vansittart Skate Park by January 2008 (£25k YOF grant by SK8) • Sessional community play rangers by July 2007 (£42k) • Play ranger/officer to develop the school sports partnership to allow for ‘free play’ by September 2008 (£35K) <p>While play areas need to offer a range of equipment and diversity of activity the number of play sites and their accessibility should also be explored, especially in the rural wards.</p> <p>A review of this strategy will be required in light of the PPG17 findings.</p>

APPENDIX H
STRATEGIC REVIEW

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Regional Planning Guidance Note 9 (December 2000)</p>	<p>This document provides the Strategic Planning guidance for the South East region of England.</p> <p>RPG9 will be superseded by the South East Plan during late 2008 when the South East Plan is adopted autumn / winter 2008.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>South East Plan: (Proposed Modifications) August 2008</p>	<p>This document, once adopted, will provide the Strategic Planning guidance for the South East region of England. The document is in draft version at present and was submitted to the Government in March 2006. The Examination In Public took place between November 2006 and March 2007. The Inspectors Report was published during August 2007. Proposed changes were published during July 2008 and these are open to public consultation until 24 October 2008. The South East Plan will, at the time of writing, be adopted late 2008. Once adopted this document will supersede RPG9.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>South East Plan: Section D10 Tourism and related sports and recreation</p>	<p>Policy S1 (Supporting Healthy Communities): the Planning system can develop and shape healthy sustainable communities by providing good access to these facilities; by promoting mixed and cohesive communities through focussing on access to housing for socially excluded groups, and by encouraging healthier forms of transport (ie incorporating cycle lanes, footpaths in planned developments).</p> <p>Policy S5 (Cultural and sporting activity): participation in sport, recreation and cultural activity should be encouraged (with relevant policies in place to encourage participation by disadvantaged/socially excluded persons/groups). An up to date strategy including an audit of current supply against estimated demand/growth should be the basis of cultural and sporting activity provision, and facilities accessible by a number of modes should have joint service provisions in place.</p>	<p>Both Policy S1 and S5 set the regional context for the encouragement of healthy communities through the promotion of recreation and sporting activity.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Berkshire Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 Adopted (July 2005)</p>	<p>This document provides the Strategic framework for Berkshire. It guides, controls development in the Borough. This document has been adopted for development control purposes by RBWM. These policies all provide guidance at the strategic county wide level. Detailed policy/guidance is contained within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>Structure Plan Chapter: Spatial Strategy & Development Principles</p>	<p>DP3 (Green Belt): The policy sets out the broad extent of the Green Belt and briefly sets out the forms of development that would be acceptable within it. Planning permission will be given only in very special circumstances such as agriculture and forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries, etc providing it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purpose of including land within it. More detail is provided by the Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Boundaries of the Green Belt and of the settlements have been identified in local plans. Green Belt boundary changes will only be made in exceptional circumstances through local plan reviews.</p>	<p>Policy DP3 emphasises the importance of the Green Belt and indicates that proposals for development would only be granted planning permission provided that they meet certain (limited) criteria. One of these criteria related to essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation.</p> <p>This is a very important consideration for RBWM as 83% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt. Given the location of the Borough to London and major transport infrastructure there is intense pressure for development.</p>
<p>Structure Plan Chapter: Shopping & Leisure</p>	<p>S1 (Major retail and leisure development in town centres): The sequential approach in identifying suitable sites should be adopted, the scale and nature of development will be consistent with the role of the centre, and proposals must demonstrate that they will (on their own or cumulatively) not adversely affect the vitality and viability of other town centres nor result in unacceptable increases in the numbers of car borne shopping or leisure trips or in their average length of stay. Where appropriate developments will be expected to contribute towards improved access and choice of transport to the centre.</p>	<p>Policy S1 stipulates that major leisure developments in town centre areas would be required to contribute towards improved access and transport choices to the centre through developer contributions.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>S3 (Leisure Development outside major town centres) Development will only be permitted outside the centres where the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need has been demonstrated, • Sequential approach has been followed in site selection, • Development will (solely or cumulatively) not adversely affect the vitality and viability of other town centres, nor cause any significant adverse impacts on the environment or upon the amenity of nearby residents. <p>Any changes in travel patterns over the catchments area would be in accordance with the Transport Strategy in Policy T1 and the development of the Strategic Transport Network</p> <p>S4 (Other sport, recreation, Tourism and Leisure uses) Proposals for these non key town centre uses should be in a location appropriate to their use, and of a scale and form appropriate to their current and future accessibility and level of infrastructure, services and employment. The sequential approach should be followed and proposals for uses in rural locations must be in accordance with other policies regarding development in the countryside. Potential effects of increased visitors on landscape, wildlife, habitats etc will be considered.</p>	<p>Policy S3 refers to the criteria that developers proposing leisure development located outside of the major town centres would be required to meet.</p> <p>Policy S4 provides strategic level guidance on the location of sport and recreation facilities not covered by policies S1 and S3.</p>
<p>RBWM Community Strategy 2007 - 2013</p>	<p>A strategic priority of the Community Strategy is to improve the appearance of the Borough by improving parks, combating litter and vandalism and attaining “green flag” quality assurance status for parks by improving the landscape and design of public open spaces through tree and bulb planting. It also seeks to promote sustainable lifestyles and protect the environment by improving access to the countryside through public rights of way.</p>	<p>Two key themes of the Community Strategy are to improve the quality of parks and also to improve the health of the Borough’s population by encouraging both sport and recreational activity.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>The Strategy also seeks to promote sustainable and prosperous communities and recognises that a healthy workforce can assist with this through participation in sports and recreational activities etc. Strengths in this area are that the Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • actively safeguards and enhances public rights of way • Consults and works with interested parties to achieve the provision of a well maintained and signed network of public rights of way • Ensure that the public rights of way network is properly maintained and well publicised and landowners are assisted to understand their responsibilities and rights. <p>One area for development is seen as improving the access to the countryside through public rights of way.</p>	
<p>RBWM Local Plan (incorporating Alterations) Adopted June 2003</p>	<p>This document provides the detailed framework for guiding, controlling and bringing forward development in the Borough at the local level. This document has been adopted for development control purposes by RBWM.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Local Plan Chapter: Environment:</p>	<p>Policy GB1 (Green Belt): This policy set out the purposes of the Green Belt and the limited uses considered appropriate within these locations. These purposes are defined in PPG2 and include agriculture, forestry, certain types of residential development, and essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses, which preserve the openness, and purpose of including land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Objectives for the use of land in the Green Belt include the provision of opportunities for access for outside sport and to the open countryside. Construction of new buildings for essential facilities genuinely required is appropriate development providing it preserves the openness of the greenbelt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.</p>	<p>Policy GB1 provides guidance, at the local level, for development located within the Green Belt. It reflects the stipulations set out by the Structure Plan which themselves reflect the national guidance set out by PPG2 (Green Belts).</p> <p>It emphasises the importance of limiting the impact of any development proposal on the openness of the Green Belt. For example new sporting facilities located in a rural location could need parking facilities, changing facilities, stadium facilities etc. All of these forms of additional development which will impact on the purposes of including the land in the Green Belt in the first place.</p>
<p>Local Plan Chapter: Leisure</p>	<p>Policy R1 (Protection of urban open spaces): Proposals that would result in the loss of existing areas of important urban land (shown of the Local Plan proposals map) will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can best be retained and enhanced through a redevelopment of a portion of the site.</p> <p>R2 (Identify opportunities to overcome deficiencies in open space) This stipulates that the Borough Council will work together with Parish Councils to identify opportunities to overcome deficiencies in open space. This may be through enhancement or upgrading of existing facilities, improving access to existing facilities or encouraging the dual use of school facilities.</p>	<p>Policy R1 seeks to retain open land in urban areas which meets the recreational needs of the community. Some may not have public access but do contribute to the environmental quality will also be protected by this policy. For example: allotments, private playing fields, detached school playing fields and cemeteries and other privately owned amenity space.</p> <p>Policy R2 identifies the commitment to work with Parish Council's to identify new open space in areas of deficiency.</p>

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>R3 (New Housing Developments will be required to include public open space). The policy sets out that the minimum standard for open space provision for new housing developments is 4.3 HA per 1000 population.</p> <p>R4 (New Housing Developments will be required to allocate a minimum provision of public open space on site): Open space provision for new housing developments should be contained in one area and not spread throughout the development site. A capitalised maintenance payment will be sought by the Council for future site management.</p> <p>R5 (Provision for play areas in new family house developments): Sites larger than 0.4ha or 15 units will require the provision of a Local Area for Play (LAP). Sites larger than 0.8ha or 50 units in addition to LAP will also require a Local Equipped Area for Play LEAP.</p> <p>R6 (Public open space on identified housing sites): The following areas will be sought for public open space as part of identified housing sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Altwood Crest House, Cannon Lane, Maidenhead (0.4ha) 2. King Edward VII Hospital, St Leonards Road, Windsor (0.2ha) 3. Little Lowbrook Farm, Cox Green (1.0ha) 4. Land to rear of Alma Road/Clarence Road, Windsor (0.4ha) 5. Kennel Green Nursery, Burleigh Road, North Ascot (1.0ha) 6. Land to rear of Sutherlands Chase, North Ascot (1.0ha) [this area includes the area of Wildlife Heritage Site to be retained] 	<p>Policies R3, R4 and R5 set out specifically the open space/equipped play area requirements for the Borough.</p> <p>Policy R6 identifies those areas that will be sought for public open space as part of identified housing sites.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>R7 (Formal sports and leisure facilities): Development which results in loss of a built sport or leisure facility available to the public will not be permitted unless a similar size replacement is provided or a smaller facility of greater recreational value is retained on site.</p> <p>R8 (New developments for recreation use) Development will be permitted for public or private recreation use except where it would result in significant environmental or highway problems or where it would conflict with other policies.</p> <p>R9 (Partnership ventures): Through partnership an improved range of opportunities for participation in outdoor, indoor and water based recreation activities will be provided. The development of new and improved facilities on schools sites in partnership with schools and other agencies and improved access to these will also be encouraged.</p> <p>R10 (Disabled access): Access and facilities for disabled people will be required for all new recreation facilities.</p> <p>R11 Recreation facilities in major commercial redevelopment schemes) Where appropriate, formal sports facilities will be sought as part of a scheme for the redevelopment of all or part of an identified employment/commercial area. If facilities cannot be provided on site then a contribution will be sought by means of a planning obligation to RBWM to provide new facilities.</p>	<p>Policy R7 provides protection for the existing level of sports and leisure facilities within the Borough.</p> <p>Policies R8, R9, R10, R11 and R13 all seek to either improve access to sports / recreation facilities or promote additions to the supply of these facilities.</p>

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>R12 (Golf courses): Planning permission to develop public/private golf facilities will be permitted provided certain criteria are met. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not result in unacceptable concentration of golf course facilities • The proposal does not involve the loss of existing features or excessive alteration of ground • The proposal does not introduce features conflicting with the character of area • If appropriate existing buildings on site should be re-used, however new buildings would be considered. <p>The Council will require maintenance of existing public rights of way across golf course land and seek the introduction of new rights of way where opportunities exist to improve links within the local public right of way network.</p> <p>R13 (Other specialist recreation facilities) Use of land or water for specialised or organised activities will be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate access and parking is provided • It will not harm character, agriculture etc of countryside • It will not adversely affect amenities and safety of local residents/other users of countryside <p>R14 (Rights of way and countryside recreation) The Council will safeguard and enhance the public rights of way network and recreational cycle routes, particularly by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supporting the Countryside Commission in its efforts to establish Thames Path National Trail, and seek to prevent any 	<p>Policy R12 deals with proposals for new golf courses and sets out the criteria under which they are likely to be acceptable.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>encroachment of the route by development</p> <p>2. Support establishment of the Green Way Recreational Route between Cookham and Bray through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signposting and promoting the use of the Green Way • Making the route accessible to all including the disabled and elderly • Resist proposals which would affect enjoyment of route • Encourage improved access and landscape enhancement to areas adjoining the route <p>3. Support development of circular walks</p> <p>R15 (The Thames): Promote the retention and enhancement of recreational value of riverside paths including The Thames Path National Trail by providing adequate car parks and cycle parking facilities and improved pedestrian access</p>	<p>Policies R14 and R15 both look at linear recreation facilities in the form of public footpaths and riverside trails. These are of particular importance for the study in regard of promoting the linkages between the other types of open space.</p>
<p>Local Plan Chapter: Transportation & Movement</p>	<p>Policy T7 (cycling): Special provisions will be made for cyclists to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide safe cycle routes, lanes etc • Achieve the network of desirable cycle routes • Provide convenient and secure facilities particularly in town centres • Improve cycle links to public transport facilities • Ensure new development make provision where appropriate- for cyclists • Consider cyclists needs to design and improvement of roads • Strengthen links with Thames Valley Long Distance Cycle Route 	<p>Policy T7 promotes the provision of cycle ways within the Borough. The study will look at the linkages between sport and recreation facilities and this policy could help to provide additional linkages.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>Local Plan chapter: Area based policies and proposals</p>	<p>MTC 3 (Maidenhead Town Centre Leisure facilities)</p> <p>The loss of existing leisure facilities will be resisted and additional provision encouraged, within and adjoining the town centre in order to enhance its role as a focus for recreational, entertainment, social and cultural activities.</p>	<p>Policy MTC3 looks to promote (amongst other things) leisure facilities within and adjoining Maidenhead town centre. The explanatory text to the policy indicates that areas to the north of Saint-Cloud Way and around Bridge Street are considered to be particularly appropriate for this.</p>
<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance Document (SPG): Interpretation of policies R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6 (Public Open Space Provision). Adopted February 2003 (incorporating amendments May 2004 & February 2005)</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPG is to assist in the interpretation of the public open space policies of the RBWM Local Plan (July 1999). It provides no new policies of its own, but provides a greater level of detail for understanding the open space policies already contained in the Local Plan, concentrating on Policy R3. The guidance is area specific to provide greater certainty to residents and developers about requirements throughout the Borough.</p> <p>A general standard of 4.3 ha of open space per 1,000 population has been adopted by the council, which is considered a reasonable amount to accommodate the spread of recreational demands of the local population. The 4.3 ha should comprise the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal sports provision 1.8ha / 1000 population (pitches, courts, greens, tracks) • Informal open spaces 2.5ha / 1000 population (passive recreation) <p>Total 4.3ha / 1000 population.</p> <p>In addition to the quantitative standard the Council has also adopted an accessibility standard of 400m and is based on the standards set by the National Playing Field Association.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose and main points.</p> <p>The SPD provides a greater degree of detail to enable developers to understand the requirements for open space provision throughout the Borough.</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
<p>RBWM Playing Pitch Strategy (March 2007)</p>	<p>There are 238 playing pitches in RBWM. The strategy assesses the provision of playing pitches (i.e. the playing surface, safety margins etc) and not playing fields or open spaces (i.e. grass or other areas not used for sport) within the borough including those not (currently) available for community use. The assessment is primarily concerned with voluntary participation by adults and young people in competitive association football, cricket, rugby union and hockey.</p> <p>The study reveals an undersupply of facilities in relation to demand. Recommends all pitch sites to be afforded protection within the LDF. Pitch sites should not be developed unless it can be proved through the application of both the playing pitch methodology and PPG17 that it is surplus to requirements and not providing an important local amenity.</p> <p>The document also recommends identifying opportunities to increase the number of community use agreements at school sites and a more efficient and effective use of recreational facilities and open spaces.</p> <p>52% of pitches are secured for community use although if school pitches are included that are currently used but there is not formal agreement then this increases to 73%.</p> <p>The supply of pitches is above the national average for football 1:1,509 (average 1:1,840), cricket 1:2,551 (average 1:4,243), and rugby union 1:2,976 (average 1:8,968).</p>	<p>Recommendation for analysis areas include:</p> <p>Maidenhead: only 33.5% of pitches in the area secured for community use – shortfall of 18.6 pitches (specific demand for adult rugby and cricket pitches and all forms of junior pitches)</p> <p>Windsor and Eton: shortfall of junior grass pitches. Oversupply of STPs – focus on improving quality of current grass pitches</p> <p>Northern wards: Slight oversupply of adult pitches which should meet the demand for junior pitches. Aim to increase percentage of non-community agreed sites.</p> <p>Southern wards: main undersupply of junior football and adult rugby union. Oversupply of STPs which should be used more.</p> <p>Overall undersupply of 27.4 pitches across the borough – the main recommendation was increasing community access and agreement to use school pitches. 1.18ha per 1,000 population of playing pitches is recommended.</p> <p>The projections for 2011 identify an oversupply of 9.3 adult football pitches, 7.1</p>

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
		<p>adult rugby pitches, and 11.3 hockey pitches There will be an undersupply of 25.7 junior football pitches, 31.1 mini-soccer pitches, 14.5 cricket pitches, and 10.4 junior rugby pitches across the borough.</p> <p>Across all types of facilities Windsor in 2011 Windsor will have an oversupply of 2.5 pitches, and all other areas an undersupply (northern wards 7.3 pitches, Maidenhead 24.9 pitches, southern wards 24.2 pitches).</p>
<p>Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD – Developers Guide (December 2005)</p>	<p>The SPD has been produced to provide advice to developers on how contributions, in relation to their development, will be sought for facilities and infrastructure. Including recreation and leisure matters.</p>	<p>Overview of documents purpose</p>
<p>RBWM Play Strategy 2007-10</p>	<p>The document highlights the need for children to be physically active, ideally for at least 60 minutes per day, in an environment that provides the opportunity to experience risk taking in play, without unacceptable danger. The experience should allow the individual to develop their problem-solving, social, language, planning, construction, creativity, co-ordination, and negotiation skills (without an adult necessarily present).</p> <p>The National Childcare Strategy is promoting an initiative to open school premises up during out-of-school hours so the facilities, including play items can be used.</p> <p>Through the Council's Play Policy attempts are being made to actively</p>	<p>Important to identify what improvements envisaged within the Play Strategy have actually been realized. A Play Partnership was set up to oversee the Action Plan. Key elements of this plan included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing a Play Ranger by January 2008 to champion, co-ordinate and lead on the play strategy (£80k) • Improve play provision in identified localities by June 2008 (£60k) • Improve the play areas at Desborough Park by April 2008

APPENDIX H – STRATEGIC REVIEW

Document Reviewed	Summary	Links to open space & green infrastructure study
	<p>involve and consult with a range of community groups.</p> <p>The RBWM Local Plan 1991-2006 stipulates a standard of 4.3ha per 1,000 population, to include 2.5ha of informal open spaces (which include equipped and unequipped children’s play spaces). The plan endorses the Fields in standard aiming to provide all residents with a play facility within 400m of their homes.</p> <p>Between 1996-2006 the Royal Borough has gained three open spaces, four open spaces and play areas, eighteen teenscenes, three play areas and teenscenes, and seven play areas. Within the same period one open space, one play area and teenscene and one separate play area has been lost.</p> <p>The areas that are prioritised for improved play space are Old Windsor, Eton Wick, Sunninghill and Ascot, and Bray.</p>	<p>(£100k from S106)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a MUGA in Imperial Park by December 2007 (£150k from S106) • Installation of floodlights at Vansittart Skate Park by January 2008 (£25k YOF grant by SK8) • Sessional community play rangers by July 2007 (£42k) • Play ranger/officer to develop the school sports partnership to allow for ‘free play’ by September 2008 (£35K) <p>While play areas need to offer a range of equipment and diversity of activity the number of play sites and their accessibility should also be explored, especially in the rural wards.</p> <p>A review of this strategy will be required in light of the PPG17 findings.</p>

APPENDIX I

QUANTITY STANDARD WORKSHEET

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council - Setting Quantity Standards

Field	Comment
National Standards	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. National Playing Fields Association for playing pitches
Current Provision (per 1,000 population)	This is the current provision in hectares per 1,000 population within the Local Authority area
Existing Local Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards
Benchmarking	These are figures detailing actual provision and local standards set by PMP within other green space and open space projects and provide another comparison benchmark when setting local standards for other Local Authorities. This is provided as a separate sheet. York, Brighton and Telford and Wrekin have been selected as according to the Office of National Statistic's 'Nearest Neighbour' these local authorities have a high statistical similarity to Windsor and Maidenhead (based on demographics, population splits, socio-economic status, geographical area, retail and residential composition etc.). Surrey Heath, Elmbridge, and Epsom and Ewell have been included as they are located geographically close to the RBWM.
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Some statistical information that will come from the household questionnaire and needs to be applied and reported per analysis area to provide some detailed local analysis.
Consultation Comments (Quantity)	A summary of reasons behind peoples choices of whether they feel there provision is about right or not enough in some areas. PPG 17 indicates that where local provision is regarded as inadequate it is important to establish why this is the case. The feeling of deficiency can sometimes be due to qualitative issues of existing open space sites rather than actual quantity issues. Any other qualitative consultation / information that has been extracted on local needs in terms of quantity of provision e.g. from neighbourhood drop-in sessions and local strategic documents
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local standard for discussion and approval by the client - standard should be in hectares per 1,000 population
PMP Justification	PMP reasoning and justification for the local standard that has been recommended
CLIENT APPROVAL	Client to approve local standard before analysis undertaken - any changes in standards at a later date during the project will impact on re-doing calculations, analysis and report - the standards drive the analysis

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR PARKS AND GARDENS		
National Standards	No National Standards	
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.27 ha per 1,000 population	
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Berkshire Structure Plan 2001-1016:</p> <p>DP3 states essential facilities for outdoor sports and recreation would be granted planning permission to be built on the green belt if certain criteria were met.</p> <p>S4 states that any developments should consider how the increased visitor numbers will affect the landscape, wildlife, habitats etc.</p> <p>RBWM Community Strategy 2007-13</p> <p>The policy emphasises the use of public rights of way to access the countryside. The Borough is actively promoting a network of paths to enable access to the main open spaces of the local authority.</p> <p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy R1 - The loss of existing areas of important urban land will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can be best retained and enhanced through a redevelopment scheme.</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999)</p> <p>An overall open space provision target of 4.3ha per 1,000 population has been adopted by the Council. Of this 2.5ha per 1,000 population of informal open space should be provided.</p>	
BENCHMARKING	York – 46% about right/32% not enough (0.18 to 0.18ha/1,000)	Telford and Wrekin – 44% about right/35% not enough (0.06 to 0.07ha/1,000)
	Brighton – 59% about right/18% not enough (1.65 to 1.65ha/1,000)	

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	Spelthorne: currently 0.04 - no standard set	Elmbridge: 61% about right/19% not enough (1.17 to 1.17ha/1,000)	Epsom and Ewell: 75% about right/ 10% not enough (0.35 to 0.35ha/1,000)																																				
<p>Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="654 284 1662 529"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>4.9%</td> <td>60.5%</td> <td>15.8%</td> <td>16.0%</td> <td>2.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>1.8%</td> <td>60.1%</td> <td>20.2%</td> <td>16.0%</td> <td>1.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>9.8%</td> <td>59.4%</td> <td>15.8%</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>1.0%</td> <td>54.8%</td> <td>15.4%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>6.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td>67.0%</td> <td>9.7%</td> <td>13.6%</td> <td>1.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="654 598 2038 730">61% of respondents to the household survey stated that the quantity of parks and gardens in the Borough is about right. However, a significant proportion of respondents (16%) also felt there was not enough provision. When added to the proportion of those that feel there is nearly enough provision (16%), this represents a split in the opinions of residents.</p> <p data-bbox="654 769 2038 970">Across the individual analysis areas, the common perception is that the provision of parks and gardens is about right, with the majority of respondents indicating this in all four analysis areas. The highest level of satisfaction can be found in the Southern wards, where 67% of respondents felt that provision was about right. The lowest levels of satisfaction are located in the Northern wards, where 22% believed there was not enough provision and a further 15% identified a slight shortfall. Within all wards more respondents identified a shortfall than an over supply of parks and gardens.</p> <p data-bbox="654 1008 2038 1104">General comments identified the lack of parks that offered proper, tarmac cycleways. Proper paths are needed at Broomhall Park and Virginia Water. Additional free parking areas are required that are within close proximity of major parks in the Borough.</p>				More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	4.9%	60.5%	15.8%	16.0%	2.8%	Maidenhead	1.8%	60.1%	20.2%	16.0%	1.8%	Windsor and Eton	9.8%	59.4%	15.8%	13.5%	1.5%	Northern Wards	1.0%	54.8%	15.4%	22.1%	6.7%	Southern Wards	7.8%	67.0%	9.7%	13.6%	1.9%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																		
Overall	4.9%	60.5%	15.8%	16.0%	2.8%																																		
Maidenhead	1.8%	60.1%	20.2%	16.0%	1.8%																																		
Windsor and Eton	9.8%	59.4%	15.8%	13.5%	1.5%																																		
Northern Wards	1.0%	54.8%	15.4%	22.1%	6.7%																																		
Southern Wards	7.8%	67.0%	9.7%	13.6%	1.9%																																		
<p>Consultation (other)</p>	<p data-bbox="654 1114 963 1141"><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p data-bbox="654 1177 2038 1311">The Council are in the process of trying to locate a five hectare site north of Maidenhead that will accommodate a park and sports facilities. It was felt by several officers that the S106 contribution funds were ring-fenced in terms of primarily focusing on qualitative improvements in the area of development and that there was limited flexibility to allow for larger scale new provision.</p>																																						

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

Several officers identified the need to build in more flexibility into the S106 contribution system, ideally by simplifying the list while still identifying key priority sites. While there is a desire to provide 4.3ha of overall open space per 1,000 population there is the aspiration that this should be surpassed. However, there is a concern that quantitative deficiencies are not being addressed as the Council is currently not likely to buy land and prefer to make qualitative developments to increase a site's capacity. These improvements have become reliant on S106 money as there is limited capital from the maintenance and repair budget. There are attempts being made internally to bulk up/group S106 contributions and decrease the number of small pots (usually consisting of £10-15,000). By keeping contributions focused on localised developments it is easier to justify at the planning stage, although this means that certain areas are ignored. There is also concern as to the policing of how these funds are spent in parishes, as there is limited consultation with residents and money is notoriously wasted. Currently S106 spending is limited by the work capacity of the Council's architects.

One of the key flaws in the Borough's core strategy was that no greenbelt review was carried out. It is now assumed that part of this area to the north of Maidenhead will need to be developed and open space will be required in line with the residential builds and the agenda to revitalise the town and capitalise upon the new Crossrail extension.

External Consultations

Many of the consultees were national or regional bodies who were capable and willing to comment on strategic and policy issues relating to provision. Some valuable documents were provided, including PPG17 studies from surrounding local authorities, and strategic open space documents from bodies such as the National Trust and the Forestry Commission.

Views were less clear about the quantity of parks and gardens provided in Windsor and Maidenhead, although those that expressed a view thought that provision was adequate, particularly in the light of large quantities of natural green space available to residents in the locality.

Parish Councils

This is a difficult typology for parish councils to comment on, as parks and gardens are not generally provided at a parish level. Most provide this function only in the form of recreation grounds with general provision for play and sport. However, there was a view that people were not far from either Windsor or Maidenhead in terms of journey time, and had ample opportunity to access the facilities in the two towns should they wish to use the more formal facilities available in the two centres.

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	Parish	Comment
	Sunningdale	About right
	Wraysbury	About right
	Bisham	N/A
	Sunningdale & Ascot	About right
	White Waltham	About right
	Horton	N/A
	Cookham	Less than we need (only have Bellrope Meadow)
	Eton	Less than we need (very little formal area)
	Old Windsor	About right
	Datchet	About right
	Bray	About right
	<u>Drop-In Consultations</u>	
	Drop-in sessions were held in the centres of Windsor and Maidenhead, and in two outlying villages in the Borough.	
	Most people felt that the amount of open space in the form of parks and gardens in Borough was about right. As a category, this is of significance in the towns of Windsor and Maidenhead, and, as with most local authorities, of less significance in outlying country areas. These do not tend to be as relevant in the countryside areas, where people considered that there was ample countryside to act as a recreational facility (see later comments relating to Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace (NSN)).	
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	Maintain provision – 0.27 ha per 1,000	
PMP Justification	<p>Parks are perceived to be particularly important to local residents. Although there is some dissatisfaction, there is a greater level of satisfaction regarding the provision of parks than there is for most other types of open space. Variations in the level of satisfaction suggest that there may be some locational deficiencies in the distribution of parks and gardens.</p> <p>When benchmarked against other similar local authorities (Appendix D), the Borough has a significant supply of parks and gardens which is supported by NSN sites that have park features. The standard set ensures that all current sites are protected and the focus shifts to ensuring residents have the best possible</p>	

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>access to these existing sites.</p> <p>Windsor Great Park has been omitted from the quantitative calculations due to its NSN features and ecological benefits it provides the area. However, it is perceived by many residents as a park and used regularly. As it is an extremely large strategic site serving the needs of residents across the Windsor and Eton analysis area and the Southern wards it is unrealistic to consider the quantitative supply of the park typology exclusively in these analysis areas.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the important role of the urban parks in the Maidenhead analysis area and it is vital that a high quality of provision is ensured if these sites are to justify being protected. When addressing the undersupply of parks in the Northern wards it is important to consider how the features of NSN and amenity green space (AGS) areas can replicate many park features. If certain sites such as the Maidenhead Thicket can be designed and maintained so that they offer the same levels of access and similar features to parks then satisfaction in the Northern wards should improve.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL			
National Standards	<p>Natural England Standard recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an accessible natural green space less than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home • statutory Local Nature Reserves at a minimum level of one hectare per thousand population • at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home; one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; and one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home. <p>Natural England Accessible Natural Green Space Standard recommends 1 ha of LNR per 1,000 population.</p> <p>Rethinking Open Space Report - Average of all LA applicable standards = 2 ha per 1,000 population - areas that promote biodiversity and nature conservation.</p>		
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	5.31 ha per 1,000 population		
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy R1 - the loss of existing areas of important urban land will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can be best retained and enhanced through a redevelopment scheme.</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999)</p> <p>An overall open space provision target of 4.3ha per 1,000 population has been adopted by the Council. Of this 2.5ha per 1,000 population of informal open space should be provided.</p>		
BENCHMARKING	<p>York – 44% about right/28% not enough (1.78 to 1.79ha/1,000)</p>	<p>Brighton – 51% about right/41% not enough (1.12 to 1.12ha/1,000)</p>	<p>Telford and Wrekin – 44% about right/33% not enough (6 to 6ha (urban) and 15.3 to 15.3ha/1,000 (rural))</p>
	<p>Spelthorne: 2.16 to 2.16ha/1000</p>	<p>Elmbridge: 60% about right/19% not enough (9.86 to 11.54ha/1,000)</p>	<p>Epsom and Ewell: 63% about right/17% not enough (11.54 to 11.54ha/1,000)</p>
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>Based on the findings of the household survey, 62% of respondents feel the provision of NSN is adequate/ more than adequate and 34% feel there is nearly enough/ not enough provision, highlighting a split in opinion. The most common response (52%) is that provision is about right.</p>		

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
Overall	10.0%	52.0%	11.8%	22.3%	3.8%
Maidenhead	5.6%	51.6%	13.0%	24.8%	5.0%
Windsor and Eton	13.2%	50.4%	10.9%	23.3%	2.3%
Northern Wards	11.5%	46.2%	13.5%	24.0%	4.8%
Southern Wards	11.9%	61.4%	9.9%	13.9%	3.0%

Looking across the individual analysis areas it is evident that the highest level of satisfaction can be found in the Southern wards, where 73% of residents feel provision is about right/more than enough. The lowest levels of satisfaction can be found in Maidenhead and the Northern wards, where 38% of respondents in both analysis areas feel provision is insufficient. This highlights a mixed satisfaction level between the rural and urban analysis area. While rural areas will generally contain higher quantities of NSN areas there may be issues with regard quality or accessibility that are influencing residents' perceptions.

Within Windsor and Eton the highest number of respondents (13%) indicates that there are more than enough NSN areas. While 23% suggest there is a significant shortfall. Further investigation into accessibility gaps is required and whether access via footpaths and cycleway networks is negatively influencing the perception of certain groups of residents within this analysis area.

Respondents acknowledged safety concerns as the main barrier to using this type of open space rather than a lack of provision.

Internal Consultations

Consultations identified the need to protect existing NSN areas and ensure public access is provided wherever possible, especially around the Crown Estate and Burnham Beeches. It was also mentioned that churches in rural areas are providing successful wildlife habitats that should be maintained and protected.

External Consultations

Consultees who responded tended to be from bodies representing the provision of green space at a national or regional level, and professed little direct knowledge of quantity standards relating to NSN space in Windsor and Maidenhead. One body, the Farming and Wildlife Action Group (FWAG) felt that issues were more important in relation to the management of the service, and offered to manage this category on

Consultation (other)

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>behalf of the Council. In general, however, the view was taken that provision was adequate.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Parish Councils were of the opinion that there was adequate provision of NSN greenspace. Within the Borough, and were more concerned about the quantity of some other types of open space provision.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 384 2045 807"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sunningdale</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wraysbury</td> <td>About right (local reservoirs cover large area for sailing)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisham</td> <td>About right (appropriate for small parish)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td>About right (parish manages and maintains significant amount of green spaces)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Waltham</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horton</td> <td>About right (good green space and village walks)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cookham</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eton</td> <td>More than we need (green belt, flood plain)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Windsor</td> <td>N/A (not under PC control)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Datchet</td> <td>N/A (not under control of PC)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bray</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>There were few issues in terms of quantity, particularly as residents had access to two major assets: a large quantity of accessible countryside, and the riverside along the Thames river. The drop-in sessions were comprised of about equal numbers of residents living within the Borough, and visitors living elsewhere. Both groups were comfortable with the amount of provision in this category.</p>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	About right	Wraysbury	About right (local reservoirs cover large area for sailing)	Bisham	About right (appropriate for small parish)	Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (parish manages and maintains significant amount of green spaces)	White Waltham	About right	Horton	About right (good green space and village walks)	Cookham	About right	Eton	More than we need (green belt, flood plain)	Old Windsor	N/A (not under PC control)	Datchet	N/A (not under control of PC)	Bray	About right
Parish	Comment																								
Sunningdale	About right																								
Wraysbury	About right (local reservoirs cover large area for sailing)																								
Bisham	About right (appropriate for small parish)																								
Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (parish manages and maintains significant amount of green spaces)																								
White Waltham	About right																								
Horton	About right (good green space and village walks)																								
Cookham	About right																								
Eton	More than we need (green belt, flood plain)																								
Old Windsor	N/A (not under PC control)																								
Datchet	N/A (not under control of PC)																								
Bray	About right																								
<p>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>Slight Increase – 5.4 ha per 1,000 population</p>																								
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>The value placed on NSN open space is clear, both in terms of the recreational resource these spaces offer and the role that natural areas play in biodiversity and conservation. While the household survey reveals a marginal split in opinion between those who perceive there to be insufficient natural areas and those who are satisfied with current levels of provision, all other consultations emphasised the protection of existing provision and increasing accessibility to sites through better networking of footpaths and cycle ways. It is therefore suggested that the local standard is increased from 5.29 to 5.4 hectares per 1,000 population. Much of this will be to mitigate a planned growth in population to the north of Maidenhead and ensuring</p>																								

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>sites in the Northern wards are clearly accessible. The green nature of the Borough has meant several extremely large NSN open spaces exist across the Borough. While sites such as Windsor Great Park and the Maidenhead Thicket serve predominantly as NSN areas it is vital that a balance is ensured between the conservation of biodiversity and public accessibility to these strategic sites.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR AMENITY GREEN SPACE			
National Standards	<p>Rethinking Open Space Report - average of all LA applicable standards = 2 ha per 1,000 population - areas that provide informal recreation and visual amenity or land provided for environmental or safety reasons.</p> <p>NPFA (now FIT) - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas.</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that is not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments.</p> <p>LAPs - aged 4-6 ; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p>		
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.54ha per 1,000 population		
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy R1 - The loss of existing areas of important urban land will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can be best retained and enhanced through a redevelopment scheme.</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999)</p> <p>An overall open space provision target of 4.3ha per 1,000 population has been adopted by the Council. Of this 2.5ha per 1,000 population of informal open space should be provided.</p>		
BENCHMARKING	York – 39% about right/29% not enough (1.05 to 1.07ha/1,000)	Brighton – 33% about right/33% not enough (0.56 to 0.58ha/1,000)	Telford and Wrekin – 31% about right/32% not enough (1.17 to 1.17ha/1,000)
	Spelthorne: 1.46 to 1.46ha/1000	Elmbridge: 46% about right/21% not enough (1.81 to 1.81ha/1,000)	Epsom and Ewell: 38% about right/22% not enough (2.09 to 2ha/1,000)
Consultation (too much / about right / not	Based on the findings of the household survey, there is a split opinion regarding the provision of amenity green space (AGS), with 44% of respondents stating there is some form of undersupply and 42% indicating		

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

<p>enough)</p>	<p>provision is about right. It can be seen that a greater proportion of residents feel that there is a insufficient supply compared to those who feel that it is about right. There are also very few respondents who feel that there is an oversupply of AGS.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="667 240 1704 491"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>42.1%</td> <td>17.6%</td> <td>26.2%</td> <td>12.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>40.1%</td> <td>20.4%</td> <td>24.2%</td> <td>13.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>43.3%</td> <td>15.7%</td> <td>32.3%</td> <td>7.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>2.0%</td> <td>38.4%</td> <td>20.2%</td> <td>24.2%</td> <td>15.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>3.1%</td> <td>45.9%</td> <td>13.3%</td> <td>24.5%</td> <td>13.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>When examining the individual analysis areas, results mirror those found within the overall findings. Windsor and Eton had the highest levels of dissatisfaction and the lowest number of respondents who stated any kind of oversupply. In comparison to other typologies, a large proportion of residents in the Borough have no opinion regarding the amount of AGS. The number of residents with no opinion is particularly high within the Northern wards.</p>		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	1.9%	42.1%	17.6%	26.2%	12.2%	Maidenhead	1.9%	40.1%	20.4%	24.2%	13.4%	Windsor and Eton	0.8%	43.3%	15.7%	32.3%	7.9%	Northern Wards	2.0%	38.4%	20.2%	24.2%	15.2%	Southern Wards	3.1%	45.9%	13.3%	24.5%	13.3%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																
Overall	1.9%	42.1%	17.6%	26.2%	12.2%																																
Maidenhead	1.9%	40.1%	20.4%	24.2%	13.4%																																
Windsor and Eton	0.8%	43.3%	15.7%	32.3%	7.9%																																
Northern Wards	2.0%	38.4%	20.2%	24.2%	15.2%																																
Southern Wards	3.1%	45.9%	13.3%	24.5%	13.3%																																
<p>Consultation (other)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Consultations identified that areas such as the Cookham Road residential estate and Aldebury Road estates in north Maidenhead were undersupplied in terms of open space. There also needs to be additional provision of publically accessible land around the North Town Moor and west of Maidenhead around Highway Avenue and Highway Road, again areas with high residential density. The Town Moor development is part of the Maidenhead masterplan and will use £160k of existing S106 money and a possible further £250k from additional housing developments in the area.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>There was a greater awareness of the provision of Parks and Gardens and NSN green space than there was of AGS. No views were expressed to indicate that there was a shortfall in provision in this category.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>The only significant comments in relation to this category were from Bray Parish Council, where there was a perception that the provision of AGS was low in the parish. The Parish Council has a long term plan to provide additional AGS in Fifield and Oakley Green, as and when land becomes available. Most parish</p>																																				

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>council's though felt provision to be about right.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 213 2045 639"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 213 958 248">Parish</th> <th data-bbox="958 213 2045 248">Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 248 958 284">Sunningdale</td> <td data-bbox="958 248 2045 284">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 284 958 319">Wraysbury</td> <td data-bbox="958 284 2045 319">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 319 958 354">Bisham</td> <td data-bbox="958 319 2045 354">About right (sufficient for residents' use)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 354 958 389">Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td data-bbox="958 354 2045 389">About right (located within or near residential areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 389 958 424">White Waltham</td> <td data-bbox="958 389 2045 424">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 424 958 459">Horton</td> <td data-bbox="958 424 2045 459">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 459 958 494">Cookham</td> <td data-bbox="958 459 2045 494">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 494 958 529">Eton</td> <td data-bbox="958 494 2045 529">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 529 958 564">Old Windsor</td> <td data-bbox="958 529 2045 564">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 564 958 600">Datchet</td> <td data-bbox="958 564 2045 600">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 600 958 635">Bray</td> <td data-bbox="958 600 2045 635">Less than we need</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>AGS was viewed as important by both residents and visitors to the Borough, although of more relevance to local residents. There was a perception that provision was about right, but there were concerns about the potential loss of such space as built development occurred in the Borough.</p>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	About right	Wraysbury	About right	Bisham	About right (sufficient for residents' use)	Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (located within or near residential areas	White Waltham	About right	Horton	N/A	Cookham	About right	Eton	About right	Old Windsor	About right	Datchet	About right	Bray	Less than we need
Parish	Comment																								
Sunningdale	About right																								
Wraysbury	About right																								
Bisham	About right (sufficient for residents' use)																								
Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (located within or near residential areas																								
White Waltham	About right																								
Horton	N/A																								
Cookham	About right																								
Eton	About right																								
Old Windsor	About right																								
Datchet	About right																								
Bray	Less than we need																								
<p>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>Slight Increase – 0.59ha per 1,000 population</p>																								
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>While AGS is valued, there is a split in opinion regarding the adequacy of the current level of provision. The majority of residents in all analysis areas expect the Southern wards indicated a shortfall of AGS. Analysis indicates that there may be locational deficiencies in provision. Local access is particularly important to residents and young children, and many residents highlighted that a lack of very local provision is a key determinant of their perception of the overall quantity. New housing developments are also not perceived as providing adequate new open space to address the increase in population. Many residents highlighted the importance of the protection of AGS and expressed concerns about the loss of spaces to development. The findings from the consultations indicated a balance between meeting the current requirements in specific localities with an increase in provision and ensuring that the quality of sites are maintained and specific sites are improved. The imminent housing developments are seen as an opportunity to increase the overall quantitative standard across the borough. Due to this a slight increase in provision has been deemed most appropriate.</p>																								

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION OF PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN	
National Standards	<p>NPFA (now FIT) - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (i.e. 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas.</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>1) LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity green space</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.45 facilities per 1,000 population
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy R5 – New development sites that exceed 0.4ha or 15 units are required to provide a Local Area for Play (LAP). Developments larger than 0.8ha or 50 units are required to provide a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP).</p> <p>Play Strategy 2007-10</p> <p>The RBWM Local Plan 1991-2006 stipulates a standard of 4.3ha per 1,000 population, to include 2.5ha of informal open spaces (which include equipped and unequipped children's play spaces). The plan endorses the NFPA standard aiming to provide all residents with a play facility within 400m of their homes.</p> <p>Between 1996-2006 the Borough has gained three open spaces, four open spaces and play areas, 18 teenscenes, three play areas and teenscenes, and seven play areas. Within the same period one open space, one play area and teenscene and one separate play area has been lost.</p> <p>Key quantitative elements in the Action Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing a Play Ranger by January 2008 to champion, co-ordinate and lead on the play strategy

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a MUGA in Imperial Park by December 2007 • Installation of floodlights at Vansittart Skate Park by January 2008 <p>The areas that are prioritised for improved play space are Old Windsor, Eton Wick, Sunninghill and Ascot, and Bray.</p>																																							
BENCHMARKING	York – 31% about right/38% not enough (0.04 to 0.07ha/1,000)	Brighton – 30% about right/32% not enough (0.04 to 0.06ha/1,000)	Telford and Wrekin – 28% about right/46% not enough (0.092 to 0.095ha/1,000)																																					
	Spelthorne: 0.038 to 0.038ha/1000	Elmbridge: 31% about right/35% not enough (0.03 to 0.03ha/1,000)	Epsom and Ewell: 25% about right/ 39% not enough (0.03 to 0.35ha/1,000)																																					
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>In total, 41% of respondents feel there is nearly enough/not enough provision for children and 43% indicate provision is about right/more than enough. The high percentage (23%) that perceive provision as not enough suggests that there is a perception that children's provision is Windsor and Maidenhead is insufficient. Interestingly the proportion of respondents illustrating that there are more than enough play facilities is high compared to other typologies, especially in the Southern wards. This may be skewed by the respondent profile to the household survey, who do not frequently use these play facilities.</p>																																							
	<table border="1" data-bbox="651 762 1615 1010"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>40.2%</td> <td>18.4%</td> <td>23.0%</td> <td>15.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>44.0%</td> <td>18.9%</td> <td>16.4%</td> <td>19.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>2.3%</td> <td>40.6%</td> <td>18.0%</td> <td>26.6%</td> <td>12.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>31.1%</td> <td>22.3%</td> <td>29.1%</td> <td>15.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>8.8%</td> <td>44.1%</td> <td>13.7%</td> <td>22.5%</td> <td>10.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Within the Southern wards (53%) and Maidenhead (45%) a higher proportion (from those that have stated an opinion) of residents perceive that the supply of children's facilities meets current demand compared to those that perceive a shortfall exists. The analysis area regarded as having the most significant shortfall is the Northern wards (51% perceive supply is inadequate to meet demand).</p> <p>General comments from the household survey support the view of children's provision being insufficient. It was stated that there needs to be more provision for the under threes with better disabled access to play areas. It was suggested that the north of Maidenhead is poorly served by play facilities, especially Moor</p>						More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	3.2%	40.2%	18.4%	23.0%	15.2%	Maidenhead	1.3%	44.0%	18.9%	16.4%	19.5%	Windsor and Eton	2.3%	40.6%	18.0%	26.6%	12.5%	Northern Wards	1.9%	31.1%	22.3%	29.1%	15.5%	Southern Wards	8.8%	44.1%	13.7%	22.5%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																			
Overall	3.2%	40.2%	18.4%	23.0%	15.2%																																			
Maidenhead	1.3%	44.0%	18.9%	16.4%	19.5%																																			
Windsor and Eton	2.3%	40.6%	18.0%	26.6%	12.5%																																			
Northern Wards	1.9%	31.1%	22.3%	29.1%	15.5%																																			
Southern Wards	8.8%	44.1%	13.7%	22.5%	10.8%																																			

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>Park and Laggan Park. There is also a demand for a wider range of interesting and modern equipment that encourages varied activities and movement. It was suggested that Savill Garden, Windsor would benefit from such a feature.</p>																								
<p>Consultation (other)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Five new multi-use games areas (MUGAs) have been constructed (at Desborough Park, Oaklands Park, Osgood Park, Keeler Park, and Imperial Park) across the Borough. The MUGAs have been built over the last 12 months, are all fenced and provide a facility for football and basketball, and are used by sports centres for coaching during the holidays (mon-fri, 11-4pm). The community safety budget is used to supervise these new sites. The Council is also currently tendering for five new play areas, including an older children’s facility at Braywick Park, with an overall value of approximately £250k.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>External consultees had no knowledge of children’s play provision in the Borough on which to base an opinion.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Opinions varied in relation to this category. In Bray, there is a long-term plan to build a children’s play area in the Fifield and Oakley Green wards of the Parish on the basis that provision is low. By contrast, new facilities have recently been provided for children in the Old Windsor Parish area.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 927 2045 1347"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sunningdale</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wraysbury</td> <td>About right (children’s play equipment is “varied”)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisham</td> <td>About right (enclosed safe playground and ample space for play in orchard)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td>About right (major improvement programme since 2001)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Waltham</td> <td>More than we need (only available in Woodlands Park village)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horton</td> <td>About right (update 2 years ago)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cookham</td> <td>Less than we need (more play and sporting areas for school children needed)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eton</td> <td>About right (Recent town council provision)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Windsor</td> <td>About right (play area to east of parish usable)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Datchet</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bray</td> <td>Less than we need</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	About right	Wraysbury	About right (children’s play equipment is “varied”)	Bisham	About right (enclosed safe playground and ample space for play in orchard)	Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (major improvement programme since 2001)	White Waltham	More than we need (only available in Woodlands Park village)	Horton	About right (update 2 years ago)	Cookham	Less than we need (more play and sporting areas for school children needed)	Eton	About right (Recent town council provision)	Old Windsor	About right (play area to east of parish usable)	Datchet	About right	Bray	Less than we need
	Parish	Comment																							
Sunningdale	About right																								
Wraysbury	About right (children’s play equipment is “varied”)																								
Bisham	About right (enclosed safe playground and ample space for play in orchard)																								
Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (major improvement programme since 2001)																								
White Waltham	More than we need (only available in Woodlands Park village)																								
Horton	About right (update 2 years ago)																								
Cookham	Less than we need (more play and sporting areas for school children needed)																								
Eton	About right (Recent town council provision)																								
Old Windsor	About right (play area to east of parish usable)																								
Datchet	About right																								
Bray	Less than we need																								

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p><u>School Survey</u></p> <p>44% of respondents suggested that the provision of open space is adequate. 37% identified it as good, 13% as poor and 7% did not provide an opinion. 72% of students indicated that they liked the open spaces in their locality. In terms of new and future provision 25% suggested more interesting play items are required, 17% that indoor non-sports place is required, 13% suggested a BMX track and 11% that more outdoor sport facilities are needed.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>There was a perception that the level of provision in this category, particularly amongst residents as opposed to visitors, may be on the low side. This seemed to be particularly relevant for the provision of very local facilities for toddlers and young children.</p>
<p>‘PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>Maintain - 0.45 facilities per 1,000 population</p>
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>It has been suggested across the various consultation methods that the main deficiency in provision exists mainly in north Maidenhead. The average level of provision borough-wide is 0.45 per facilities per 1,000 population and this is deemed a suitable supply. The Council’s Play Strategy adopts the recommendations of the National Childcare Strategy and suggests that schools premises should be made available out-of-school hours. It is important that the provision of new facilities for children is balanced with the need to improve the quality of existing provision. This is particularly important given that the key complaint from children regarding existing provision was that facilities are not sufficiently innovative or exciting. Residents from the household survey indicated that more facilities for under threes were necessary.</p> <p>The standard set implies that the overall level of provision borough-wide will remain the same and the focus should be on quality improvements. The focus will be on ensuring that areas with lower levels of provision, which are below the standard are focussed upon. This will either be through the development of new facilities (facilitated through S106 contributions) or relocating sites from areas in the borough where accessibility and quality standards are already met and current sites are surplus to requirements. Accessibility standards will be accounted for and subsequent new provision will be delivered where it is most needed. In setting a standard in terms of facility numbers we are ensuring that access to at least one site for all residents is a key aim.</p>

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
National Standards	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (i.e. 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas.</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments.</p> <p>LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.17 facilities per 1,000 population
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Play Strategy 2007-10</p> <p>The RBWM Local Plan 1991-2006 stipulates a standard of 4.3ha per 1,000 population, to include 2.5ha of informal open spaces (which include equipped and unequipped children's play spaces). The plan endorses the NFPA standard aiming to provide all residents with a play facility within 400m of their homes.</p> <p>Between 1996-2006 the Borough has gained three open spaces, four open spaces and play areas, eighteen teenscenes, three play areas and teenscenes, and seven play areas. Within the same period one open space, one play area and teenscene and one separate play area has been lost.</p> <p>Key quantitative elements in the Action Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing a Play Ranger by January 2008 to champion, co-ordinate and lead on the play strategy • Provide a MUGA in Imperial Park by December 2007 • Installation of floodlights at Vansittart Skate Park by January 2008 <p>The areas that are prioritised for improved play space are Old Windsor, Eton Wick, Sunninghill and Ascot, and Bray.</p>

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

BENCHMARKING	York – 12% about right/59% not enough (0.092 to 0.095ha/1,000)	Brighton – 10% about right/60% not enough (0.04 to 0.06ha/1,000)	Telford and Wrekin – 9% about right/65% not enough (0.025 to 0.04ha/1,000)																																							
	Spelthorne: 0.038 to 0.038ha/1000	Elmbridge: 31% about right/35% not enough (0.03 to 0.03ha/1,000)	Epsom and Ewell: 25% about right/ 39% not enough (0.03 to 0.35ha/1,000)																																							
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>Responses from the household survey indicate the majority of residents (62%) feel the provision of open space for teenagers is insufficient. Only 12% of respondents stated provision was about right/more than enough, supporting the perception of insufficient provision in the Borough. This echoes the perceptions surrounding the provision for children and young people, and it is within these two typologies where the greatest concerns lie.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>1.5%</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>9.5%</td> <td>52.7%</td> <td>25.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>11.5%</td> <td>12.7%</td> <td>51.6%</td> <td>22.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>9.6%</td> <td>11.2%</td> <td>52.0%</td> <td>27.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>2.0%</td> <td>9.0%</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>57.0%</td> <td>27.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>3.1%</td> <td>12.4%</td> <td>7.2%</td> <td>50.5%</td> <td>26.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	1.5%	10.6%	9.5%	52.7%	25.7%	Maidenhead	1.3%	11.5%	12.7%	51.6%	22.9%	Windsor and Eton	0.0%	9.6%	11.2%	52.0%	27.2%	Northern Wards	2.0%	9.0%	5.0%	57.0%	27.0%	Southern Wards	3.1%	12.4%	7.2%	50.5%	26.8%
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																				
Overall	1.5%	10.6%	9.5%	52.7%	25.7%																																					
Maidenhead	1.3%	11.5%	12.7%	51.6%	22.9%																																					
Windsor and Eton	0.0%	9.6%	11.2%	52.0%	27.2%																																					
Northern Wards	2.0%	9.0%	5.0%	57.0%	27.0%																																					
Southern Wards	3.1%	12.4%	7.2%	50.5%	26.8%																																					
	<p>Analysis of perceptions across different geographical areas of the Borough indicates that feelings are consistent. The highest level of satisfaction can be found in the Southern wards, where 16% of residents indicated provision was about right/more than enough. In all areas, over 58% of residents (including those with no opinion) were dissatisfied, indicating that there is an overwhelming perception of insufficient provision.</p> <p>General comments support the perception of insufficient provision and particular reference was made to a lack of volleyball and basketball courts and more varied equipment and supervised activities available (such as climbing walls or assault courses). This suggests there is recognition that a variety of facilities should be provided to meet the needs of young people, not just equipped play facilities.</p>																																									
Consultation (other)	<p>Internal Consultations</p> <p>Five new MUGAs have been built across the Borough in the last 12months to accompany the two skate parks in Windsor and Maidenhead. This is seen by officers as very positive although there is still the need to provide a large scale central facility that offers a number of activities. The Thames Valley play area currently provides suitable equipment for disabled residents.</p>																																									

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>External consultees had no knowledge of facilities for young people in the Borough on which to base an opinion.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Opinions varied in relation to this category. In Bray, there is a long-term plan to build a youth shelter in the Fifield and Oakley Green wards of the Parish on the basis that provision is low. By contrast, new facilities have recently been provided in the Old Windsor Parish area.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sunningdale</td> <td>Less than we need (highlighted in consultation)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wraysbury</td> <td>About right (Wraysbury Green has outdoor sports provision)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisham</td> <td>About right (in close proximity to Bisham Abbey and Marlow)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td>Less than we need (improvements made, but demand is higher)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Waltham</td> <td>No answer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horton</td> <td>Less than we need (but funds and space unavailable)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cookham</td> <td>Less than we need (more needed for youths)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eton</td> <td>Less than we need (recent town council provision)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Windsor</td> <td>About right (new teen area created)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Datchet</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bray</td> <td>Less than we need</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	Less than we need (highlighted in consultation)	Wraysbury	About right (Wraysbury Green has outdoor sports provision)	Bisham	About right (in close proximity to Bisham Abbey and Marlow)	Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (improvements made, but demand is higher)	White Waltham	No answer	Horton	Less than we need (but funds and space unavailable)	Cookham	Less than we need (more needed for youths)	Eton	Less than we need (recent town council provision)	Old Windsor	About right (new teen area created)	Datchet	About right	Bray	Less than we need
	Parish	Comment																							
	Sunningdale	Less than we need (highlighted in consultation)																							
	Wraysbury	About right (Wraysbury Green has outdoor sports provision)																							
	Bisham	About right (in close proximity to Bisham Abbey and Marlow)																							
	Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (improvements made, but demand is higher)																							
	White Waltham	No answer																							
	Horton	Less than we need (but funds and space unavailable)																							
	Cookham	Less than we need (more needed for youths)																							
	Eton	Less than we need (recent town council provision)																							
Old Windsor	About right (new teen area created)																								
Datchet	About right																								
Bray	Less than we need																								
	<p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>There was a perception that the level of provision in this category, particularly amongst residents as opposed to visitors, may be on the low side. This seemed to be relevant for the provision of facilities for young people, and particularly youths in the Borough.</p>																								
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	Increase to 0.23 facilities per 1,000 population (currently provision at 75% of this target) - 8 new facilities																								
PMP Justification	There is an overriding need for more facilities for young people across the Borough. A standard significantly above the existing level of provision is therefore recommended. The location of facilities was																								

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

perceived to be particularly important to encourage young people to use facilities. The preference for facilities located in close proximity to residential areas places a greater demand on the quantity of facilities required. While quantity was the key concern emerging through consultation, the quality of facilities, and design of these sites was also frequently mentioned, particularly by young people themselves. In addition to setting a standard that recognises the need for increased provision across the borough, it is important to ensure that the quality of facilities is also considered and that the need for more varied activities besides traditional play is considered.

The recommended standard will result in the need for the creation of an additional 8.22 (8) sites over the projected period (2016). This is also reflective of the findings of the Play Strategy. It was felt my council officers that current provision was at around 60-75% of the current demand, this is reflected by the aspirational standard.

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
National Standards	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 4 acres (i.e. 1.62 per 1,000 population) for outdoor sport - includes pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens, tennis courts training areas and croquet lawns.</p> <p>'NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments.</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	2.81ha per 1,000 population (excluding golf courses)
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy R1 - The loss of existing areas of important urban land will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can be best retained and enhanced through a redevelopment scheme</p> <p>Policy R7 - Development which results in loss of a built sport or leisure facility available to the public will not be permitted unless a similar size replacement is provided or a smaller facility of greater recreational value is retained on site</p> <p>Policy R8 - Development will be permitted for public or private recreation use except where it would result in significant environmental or highway problems or where it would conflict with other policies</p> <p>Policy R9 - Through partnership an improved range of opportunities for participation in outdoor, indoor and water based recreation activities will be provided. The development of new and improved facilities on schools sites with better public access will be encouraged</p> <p>Policy R10 - Access and facilities for disabled people will be required for all new recreation facilities</p> <p>Policy R11 - Where appropriate, formal sports facilities will be sought as part of a scheme for the redevelopment of all or part of an identified employment/commercial area. If facilities cannot be provided on site then a contribution will be sought by means of a planning obligation to RBWM to provide new facilities</p> <p>Policy R13 – The use of land or water for activities will be permitted as long as adequate parking is</p>

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>provided, the landscape is not damaged, and the local community is not negatively affected</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999)</p> <p>An overall open space provision target of 4.3ha per 1,000 population has been adopted by the Council. Of this 1.8ha per 1,000 population of formal sports provision (pitches, courts, greens, tracks) should be provided.</p> <p>RBWM Playing Pitch Strategy</p> <p>There are 238 playing pitches in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. There is currently an undersupply of pitches across the Borough. It recommends that all pitches should be protected within the LDF. Pitches should only be developed if they are proved through the Playing Pitch Strategy and PPG17 methodology that they do not provide a valuable local amenity.</p> <p>The Strategy promotes the increase in availability of school pitches for community use.</p>																																									
BENCHMARKING	York – 1.91 to 1.92ha/1,000	Brighton – 0.27 to 0.29ha/1,000	Telford and Wrekin – 1.8 to 1.8ha/1,000																																							
	Spelthorne: 2.37 to 2.37ha/1,000	Elmbridge: 39% about right/30% not enough (3.27 to 3.27ha/1,000 exc. golf courses)	Epsom and Ewell: 38% about right/22% not enough (2.75 to 3ha/1,000 exc. golf courses)																																							
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>36.7%</td> <td>19.2%</td> <td>29.8%</td> <td>12.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>39.4%</td> <td>20.6%</td> <td>27.7%</td> <td>11.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>1.6%</td> <td>34.9%</td> <td>18.6%</td> <td>32.6%</td> <td>12.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>2.9%</td> <td>31.1%</td> <td>14.6%</td> <td>35.0%</td> <td>16.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>4.0%</td> <td>41.0%</td> <td>21.0%</td> <td>25.0%</td> <td>9.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	2.2%	36.7%	19.2%	29.8%	12.0%	Maidenhead	1.3%	39.4%	20.6%	27.7%	11.0%	Windsor and Eton	1.6%	34.9%	18.6%	32.6%	12.4%	Northern Wards	2.9%	31.1%	14.6%	35.0%	16.5%	Southern Wards	4.0%	41.0%	21.0%	25.0%	9.0%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																					
Overall	2.2%	36.7%	19.2%	29.8%	12.0%																																					
Maidenhead	1.3%	39.4%	20.6%	27.7%	11.0%																																					
Windsor and Eton	1.6%	34.9%	18.6%	32.6%	12.4%																																					
Northern Wards	2.9%	31.1%	14.6%	35.0%	16.5%																																					
Southern Wards	4.0%	41.0%	21.0%	25.0%	9.0%																																					

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>Grass Pitches: 4.1% more than enough 46.6% about right 19.3% not enough 30.0% no opinion</p>	<p>Synthetic Turf Pitches: 1.2% more than enough 21.4% about right 27.1% not enough 50.2% no opinion</p>	<p>Tennis Courts: 2.8% more than enough 34.7% about right 34.9% not enough 27.6% no opinion</p>
	<p>Bowling Greens: 3.9% more than enough 28.7% about right 15.4% not enough 52.0% no opinion</p>	<p>Golf Courses: 16.7% more than enough 31.7% about right 13.4% not enough 38.2% no opinion</p>	
<p>Consultation (other)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>The main concern sighted by officers was the lack of junior pitches in the Borough. While several of the schools such as Windsor Girls School allow community use of their pitches there needs to be a more dual use sites. This would counterbalance the inflexibility of the current S106 contribution system in providing new sites. Efforts are also being made to provide adult pitches outside of towns and converting urban pitches for junior use due to travel constraints. Imperial Park offers junior pitches although there is concern over the high demand for junior pitches (rugby and football) in Maidenhead and lack of provision. There is a shift in demand in terms of adult pitches (less demand at weekends) with a growing interest in 5-a side competitions and the subsequent need for all-weather STPs.</p> <p>Plans are in place to build an STP at Windsor Leisure Centre. An £800k redevelopment of the pavilion at Braywick Park has also been proposed. The Council are currently in the process of looking for a five hectare site north of Maidenhead that will accommodate a park with two pitches and necessary infrastructure. Braywick Park is regarded as one of the leading facilities in the Borough and provides a floodlit STP, athletic track, and several rugby pitches, all deemed as being of good quality and regularly used. Plans are in place to install another two STPs (5-a side for around £200k) in the summer of 2008. Holyport Manor School is to be relocated onto the playing fields at Cox Green Comprehensive School; the redevelopment will provide two STPs, subject to planning, and a small community sports facility. This development has a two year time constraint on it.</p> <p>S106 funds are available for the purchase of formal pitches north of Maidenhead although the opening up of the green belt means that none of the land is now viable for sports provision due to the potential of residential planning permission being granted. The Borough has around £6,000 per acre available for sport</p>		

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

pitches although it is envisaged sites with residential planning permission will be valued at up to £5million per acre. It was acknowledged that a more flexible approach is required to using S106 contributions and there may be the possibility of looking for sport sites further north once residential plans have been finalised.

Currently the S106 contribution process excludes certain open space development/land purchase categories depending on the type of dwelling/commercial development being built. For example the build of OAP dwellings currently excludes the need for category one (formal land purchase) or three (informal land purchase) contributions. A review of the process could identify these type of dwellings as eligible to contribute towards relevant outdoor (bowls, tennis) or indoor sport facilities. In the case of OAP dwellings only 83% of potential contributions are being sought. There is the suggestion that this process lacks flexibility and should actually be more project focused, thus assisting in the acquisition of additional outdoor sport sites.

There has been no pitch built recently due to the lag time of around six years, although there is now significant funding available and the council are actively pursuing site selection. In addition to north Maidenhead there is also the option of developing a site to the south of Ascot. It was conceded though that money does remain latent for too long.

External Consultations

External consultees did not have enough knowledge of this category to express an opinion in relation to the quantity of supply in general, although it should be noted that an adjoining planning authority felt that the level of provision for football was relatively low.

Parish Councils

Parish Councils felt that provision of facilities in this category was veering towards “less than we need” within their parishes. This may also have been the case with the Wraysbury response, which could be an error in completion.

Parish	Comment
Sunningdale	Less than we need
Wraysbury	About right (all facilities provided)
Bisham	N/A
Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (but subject to funding availability)

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	White Waltham	More than we need (no proper football/rugby and only 1 cricket pitch)	
	Horton	N/A	
	Cookham	Less than we need (new tennis courts and changing needed)	
	Eton	Less than we need (existing facilities basic)	
	Old Windsor	About right (2 soccer pitches available)	
	Datchet	About right	
	Bray	About right	
	<p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>There were no major issues relating to the quantity of provision within this category. Most felt that it was “about right” within the Borough.</p>		
	<p>Grass Pitches: Individual analysis areas indicate the provision of grass pitches is about right. The greatest dissatisfaction can be found in the northern wards, where 24% of residents feel there is not enough provision.</p>	<p>Synthetic Turf Pitches: Results from the individual analysis areas highlight the perception that there is not enough provision across all analysis areas. The highest satisfaction can be found in Windsor and Eton, where 24% of residents feel provision is about right.</p>	<p>Tennis Courts: The majority of residents across each individual analysis area indicate there is not enough provision of tennis courts in all analysis areas except the southern wards where 72% of those residents with an opinion sight an undersupply. Over 26% of respondents in each analysis area, except the southern wards (17%), have no opinion, suggesting a lack of interest in this type of facility.</p>

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>Bowling Greens: Within the analysis areas there is split opinion regarding the provision of open space, with all of the analysis areas stating provision is about right with the exception of the southern wards where more residents sight a shortfall. However, in each analysis area there is a significant proportion of respondents (over 42%) that have no interest in the sport or its facilities.</p>	<p>Golf Courses: Across the individual analysis areas, residents feel the provision of golf courses is about right, with the exception of the southern wards where 47% of those residents with an opinion believe a significant oversupply exists and only 15% sighting an undersupply</p>	
<p>PMP Recommendation (per 1000 population)</p>	<p>Increase Grass pictures – 2.92ha per 1,000 (excluding golf courses)</p>		

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

PMP Justification	<p>Outdoor sports facilities are demand-led and the outdoor sports facility (OSF) typology encompasses a wide variety of different facilities including athletics tracks, pitches, golf courses and bowling greens. In order to understand the demand for OSF in a greater level of detail it is essential to consider each type of sports facility separately. Golf courses have been excluded from this quantity setting as it is deemed that their size would skew results and that they are usually commercial ventures that are demand-led.</p> <p>The variation in responses indicates that there may be a disparity in the distribution of facilities across the Borough although overall, there is dissatisfaction in the quantity of all types of facility with the exception of golf courses. This indicates that an increase in quantity across all facilities is required and is in line with the recent Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS). All potential school pitches have already been included in this calculation as in line with the PPS the Council is attempting to increase the number dual use of sites across the Borough.</p> <p>The PPS identified that across all types of sports pitches that in 2011 Windsor will have an oversupply of 2.5 pitches and all other areas an undersupply (Northern wards 7.3 pitches, Maidenhead 24.9 pitches, Southern wards 24.2 pitches). The recommendation of the study was to encourage community use of all school sites. This study assumes that all school sites are publically accessible. A standard set at 2.92ha per 1,000 population would require sports facilities equating to the size of 11 football pitches (Appendix I) in addition to all school sites.</p> <p>Consultations with council officers identified a significant shortfall in junior pitch provision. Efforts are currently being made to provide adult pitches outside of towns and converting urban pitches for junior use due to travel constraints. There is a shift in demand in terms of adult pitches (less demand at weekends) with a growing interest in 5-a side competitions and the subsequent need for all-weather STPs. Given that junior pitches are smaller in size than adult pitches, it can be considered that while the layout of pitches may change, the required quantity of provision should remain at similar levels to the existing quantity. S106 funds are available for the purchase of formal pitches north of Maidenhead although the opening up of the green belt means that none of the land is now viable for sports provision due to the potential of residential planning permission being granted.</p> <p>Setting the standard slightly above the current level of provision will identify local deficiencies and assist the council in meeting a growing demand for outdoor sports facilities.</p>
--------------------------	---

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR ALLOTMENTS						
National Standards	National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners - 20 allotment plots per 1,000 households (i.e. 20 allotments plots per 2,200 people (2.2 people per house) or 1 allotment plot per 200 people. With an average allotment plot of 250 sq/m this equates to 0.125 ha per 1,000 population 1970 Thorpe Report suggested 0.2 ha per 1,000 population					
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.31ha per 1,000					
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003) Policy R1 - The loss of existing areas of important urban land will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can be best retained and enhanced through a redevelopment scheme					
BENCHMARKING	York – 36% about right/18% not enough (0.28 to 0.28ha/1,000)	Brighton – 59% about right/18% not enough (0.24 to 0.25ha/1,000)		Telford and Wrekin – 22% about right/35% not enough (0.06 to 0.07ha/1,000)		
	Spelthorne: 0.125ha/1,000	Elmbridge: 38% about right/11% not enough (0.32 to 0.32ha/1,000)		Epsom and Ewell: 28% about right/9% not enough (0.22 to 0.16ha/1,000)		
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Results from the household survey show 46% of respondents with an opinion feel the provision of allotments in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is insufficient. This suggests a shortfall in provision. The results suggest a slight shortfall as 33% of residents indicated that supply was either about right or more than enough. There is a significantly high proportion of residents with no opinion although this is replicated in other local authorities.					
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	4.5%	28.1%	10.9%	17.2%	39.2%
	Maidenhead	3.9%	24.0%	10.4%	18.2%	43.5%
	Windsor and Eton	7.8%	40.3%	15.5%	14.0%	22.5%
	Northern Wards	2.9%	18.6%	4.9%	20.6%	52.9%
	Southern Wards	3.0%	28,3%	12.1%	16.2%	40.4%

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>The highest level of dissatisfaction was in Windsor and Eton, where 30% of residents felt that the level of provision was nearly enough/not enough.</p> <p>The greatest satisfaction levels with this typology is also found in Windsor and Eton, where 40% of respondents indicated provision was about right. As there is also a significant number of residents indicating an undersupply it is clear that those with allotments are satisfied and do not perceive that further provision is necessary, despite there being an indication that there is an unmet demand existing within this analysis area. With a relatively high number of residents indicating that there are too many allotments suggests that vacant allotments may exist and the current organisational structure in Windsor and Eton is not locating or managing site users and potential users suitably.</p> <p>A high level of respondents with no opinion was portrayed in each analysis area. This may be due to allotments experiencing the lowest level of use out of all typologies, with 86% of respondents claiming they do not use this type of open space.</p> <p>The shortfall in provision identified by findings from the household survey were supported by general comments made by respondents, with a number of people stating allotments were too far away and more provision was needed, especially if they could be linked to other open space such as parks. It is important that sites have good accessibility and are secure as residents suggested that it was often intimidating to use isolated sites.</p>
<p>Consultation (other)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Officers identified a recent trend with a growing popularity of allotments and a waiting list in excess of 400 (three years) in Maidenhead alone. Windsor allotments (run by well by an association) are currently at around 80% capacity and several sites are bringing previously redundant land back into use. Rural allotments are run by the parishes and are mostly full. It is unlikely that any additional open space will be designated as allotments due to the individual nature of site use.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>External consultees had insufficient knowledge of this category to express an opinion about the quantity of supply in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p>

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>Whilst acknowledging that provision generally met need, there was an anxiety that there were waiting lists for plots which were quite high in some cases, and that allotment provision needed to be well guarded. N/A probably means that parishes do not have any provision, and this may indicate a need for more plots.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 280 2040 738"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 280 934 316">Parish</th> <th data-bbox="934 280 2040 316">Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 316 934 351">Sunningdale</td> <td data-bbox="934 316 2040 351">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 351 934 386">Wraysbury</td> <td data-bbox="934 351 2040 386">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 386 934 421">Bisham</td> <td data-bbox="934 386 2040 421">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 421 934 491">Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td data-bbox="934 421 2040 491">Less than we need (waiting list – only 7 plots in Cheapside)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 491 934 526">White Waltham</td> <td data-bbox="934 491 2040 526">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 526 934 561">Horton</td> <td data-bbox="934 526 2040 561">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 561 934 596">Cookham</td> <td data-bbox="934 561 2040 596">About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 596 934 632">Eton</td> <td data-bbox="934 596 2040 632">Less than we need (currently fashionable)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 632 934 667">Old Windsor</td> <td data-bbox="934 632 2040 667">About right (90% occupancy)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 667 934 702">Datchet</td> <td data-bbox="934 667 2040 702">N/A (none held, but adequate provision for residents in adjoining Slough site)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 702 934 738">Bray</td> <td data-bbox="934 702 2040 738">About right</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="651 775 949 805"><u>Drop-In Consolutions</u></p> <p data-bbox="651 842 1946 943">There was a great deal of sympathy for the need to make adequate provision within the Borough. Heightened awareness about the need for healthy food sourced locally meant that people felt that, if anything, greater provision should be made in the Borough.</p>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	About right	Wraysbury	N/A	Bisham	N/A	Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (waiting list – only 7 plots in Cheapside)	White Waltham	About right	Horton	N/A	Cookham	About right	Eton	Less than we need (currently fashionable)	Old Windsor	About right (90% occupancy)	Datchet	N/A (none held, but adequate provision for residents in adjoining Slough site)	Bray	About right
Parish	Comment																								
Sunningdale	About right																								
Wraysbury	N/A																								
Bisham	N/A																								
Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (waiting list – only 7 plots in Cheapside)																								
White Waltham	About right																								
Horton	N/A																								
Cookham	About right																								
Eton	Less than we need (currently fashionable)																								
Old Windsor	About right (90% occupancy)																								
Datchet	N/A (none held, but adequate provision for residents in adjoining Slough site)																								
Bray	About right																								
<p>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>Slight Increase (Maidenhead) – 0.325ha per 1,000</p>																								
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>The clear message from consultation findings is that there is an overall perception that the quantity of allotments particularly in Maidenhead insufficient (currently 0.31ha per 1000 population). This is also supported by the presence of waiting lists at sites across the Borough. It is therefore suggested that a standard above the existing level of provision is set.</p> <p>This standard would ensure that deficiencies in the quantity of allotments and access to allotments can be addressed across the Borough. Setting a standard at this level would equate to the requirement for an additional 100 allotment plots in the projected population period up until 2016. This would go some way to offsetting the existing and future unmet demand.</p>																								

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR CIVIC SPACES																																					
National Standards	No National Standard																																				
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	Only one site in the Borough																																				
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	No standards set																																				
BENCHMARKING	No standards set																																				
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>In total, 35% of respondents feel provision of civic spaces is about right and 26% feel there is nearly/not enough. This highlights a divide in the opinion of the provision of civic spaces.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>35.2%</td> <td>10.3%</td> <td>15.2%</td> <td>35.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>5.3%</td> <td>34.9%</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>17.1%</td> <td>32.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>4.0%</td> <td>44.4%</td> <td>10.5%</td> <td>17.7%</td> <td>23.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>27.7%</td> <td>9.6%</td> <td>6.4%</td> <td>53.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>32.3%</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>17.2%</td> <td>34.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Findings from the individual analysis demonstrate a consensus across all analysis areas that of those residents with an interest/opinion that the majority perceived the supply to be about right or more than enough. The highest level of dissatisfaction can be found in the rural southern wards, where 29% of residents indicate provision is about nearly/not enough. A large proportion of residents in the northern wards had no opinion with regard civic spaces, suggesting a lack of supply or a lack of awareness and promotion of the current sites. General comments highlighted a need for more civic spaces that had better transport links; however this was not a significant amount.</p>		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	4.3%	35.2%	10.3%	15.2%	35.0%	Maidenhead	5.3%	34.9%	9.9%	17.1%	32.9%	Windsor and Eton	4.0%	44.4%	10.5%	17.7%	23.4%	Northern Wards	3.2%	27.7%	9.6%	6.4%	53.2%	Southern Wards	4.3%	32.3%	11.8%	17.2%	34.4%
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																															
Overall	4.3%	35.2%	10.3%	15.2%	35.0%																																
Maidenhead	5.3%	34.9%	9.9%	17.1%	32.9%																																
Windsor and Eton	4.0%	44.4%	10.5%	17.7%	23.4%																																
Northern Wards	3.2%	27.7%	9.6%	6.4%	53.2%																																
Southern Wards	4.3%	32.3%	11.8%	17.2%	34.4%																																
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	<p>PPG17 recommends that due to the specific location of civic spaces, there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set.</p>																																				

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR CEMETERIES																																					
National Standards	No national standard																																				
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.18ha per 1,000 population																																				
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003) Policy R1 - The loss of existing areas of important urban land will not be permitted unless they are replaced by a similar site or can be best retained and enhanced through a redevelopment scheme																																				
BENCHMARKING	Supply ranges from 0.09ha/1,000 (Stevenage) to 0.56 ha/1,000 (Maidstone)																																				
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>Results from the household survey show 45% of respondents feel the provision of churches and cemeteries is about right. However, a significant proportion of respondents (32%) have no opinion with regard this typology. It is important that in rural areas where less public open space is accessible that churches and cemeteries provide an area for amenity use.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>5.1%</td> <td>45.0%</td> <td>8.6%</td> <td>9.8%</td> <td>31.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>6.4%</td> <td>47.4%</td> <td>5.8%</td> <td>10.3%</td> <td>30.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>3.9%</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>14.8%</td> <td>11.7%</td> <td>32.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>3.9%</td> <td>47.1%</td> <td>5.9%</td> <td>4.9%</td> <td>38.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>6.0%</td> <td>49.0%</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>12.0%</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The individual analysis areas portray similar results and the highest level of satisfaction can be found in the Southern wards where 55% of residents state the provision of churches and cemeteries is about right/more than enough. The lowest level of satisfaction is highlighted in the Northern wards, where 26% of residents indicate there in nearly enough/not enough provision of this typology. Resident's main concerns were vandalism, graffiti and miss-use of sites.</p>		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	5.1%	45.0%	8.6%	9.8%	31.5%	Maidenhead	6.4%	47.4%	5.8%	10.3%	30.1%	Windsor and Eton	3.9%	37.5%	14.8%	11.7%	32.0%	Northern Wards	3.9%	47.1%	5.9%	4.9%	38.2%	Southern Wards	6.0%	49.0%	8.0%	12.0%	25.0%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																
Overall	5.1%	45.0%	8.6%	9.8%	31.5%																																
Maidenhead	6.4%	47.4%	5.8%	10.3%	30.1%																																
Windsor and Eton	3.9%	37.5%	14.8%	11.7%	32.0%																																
Northern Wards	3.9%	47.1%	5.9%	4.9%	38.2%																																
Southern Wards	6.0%	49.0%	8.0%	12.0%	25.0%																																
Consultation (other)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Consultations identified the need to protect churches and their grounds, especially in rural areas where the sites not only provide necessary amenity space for residents but also natural habitats for wildlife.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p>																																				

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	<p>External consultees simply did not have enough knowledge to comment on the quantity of provision in this category.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Most PC's felt that provision was about right, although it should be noted that in Old Windsor, for instance, there are only 6 plots left in the old graveyard, but that a new cemetery had been opened with sufficient provision in 1978.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 451 2047 874"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sunningdale</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wraysbury</td> <td>About right (10 years left)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisham</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td>About right (50 years availability)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Waltham</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horton</td> <td>About right (space available, but not under control of PC)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cookham</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eton</td> <td>Less than we need</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Windsor</td> <td>About right (new cemetery opened in 1978)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Datchet</td> <td>Less than we need (little space left in Datchet Cemetery)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bray</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Drop-In Consolutions</u></p> <p>Drop in consultations revealed that people felt unable to comment based on a lack of knowledge of the quantity of provision in this category.</p>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	About right	Wraysbury	About right (10 years left)	Bisham	About right	Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (50 years availability)	White Waltham	N/A	Horton	About right (space available, but not under control of PC)	Cookham	About right	Eton	Less than we need	Old Windsor	About right (new cemetery opened in 1978)	Datchet	Less than we need (little space left in Datchet Cemetery)	Bray	About right
Parish	Comment																								
Sunningdale	About right																								
Wraysbury	About right (10 years left)																								
Bisham	About right																								
Sunningdale & Ascot	About right (50 years availability)																								
White Waltham	N/A																								
Horton	About right (space available, but not under control of PC)																								
Cookham	About right																								
Eton	Less than we need																								
Old Windsor	About right (new cemetery opened in 1978)																								
Datchet	Less than we need (little space left in Datchet Cemetery)																								
Bray	About right																								
<p>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>PPG17 states that 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.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set.</p>																								

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR GREEN CORRIDORS																																					
National Standards	No standards set																																				
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	N/a																																				
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy R14 - The Council will support the Countryside Commission in its efforts to establish Thames Path National Trail, and seek to prevent any encroachment of the route by development</p> <p>Policy R15 - Promote the retention and enhancement of recreational value of riverside paths including The Thames Path National Trail by providing adequate car parks and cycle parking facilities and improved pedestrian access</p>																																				
BENCHMARKING	No standards set																																				
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>Results from the household survey show 27% of respondents feel the provision of green corridors is about right. However, a significant proportion of respondents (29%) feel there are not enough green corridors.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>27.4%</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>28.5%</td> <td>28.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maidenhead</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>19.5%</td> <td>31.2%</td> <td>26.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windsor and Eton</td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>28.9%</td> <td>14.0%</td> <td>25.6%</td> <td>28.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Wards</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>29.4%</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td>30.4%</td> <td>29.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southern Wards</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>30.9%</td> <td>6.4%</td> <td>25.5%</td> <td>34.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The individual analysis areas portray similar results and the highest level of satisfaction can be found in the southern wards where 34% of residents state the provision of green corridors is about right/more than enough. The lowest level of satisfaction is highlighted in Maidenhead, where 51% of residents indicate there in nearly enough/not enough provision of this typology. The main barrier to using green corridors was safety concerns with regard poor lighting. General comments highlighted the need for more specifically designated cycleways and paths across and to open spaces. These paths need to have adequate drainage and ensure that they are maintained regularly.</p>		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	1.7%	27.4%	13.5%	28.5%	28.9%	Maidenhead	1.3%	22.1%	19.5%	31.2%	26.0%	Windsor and Eton	2.5%	28.9%	14.0%	25.6%	28.9%	Northern Wards	0.0%	29.4%	10.8%	30.4%	29.4%	Southern Wards	3.2%	30.9%	6.4%	25.5%	34.0%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																
Overall	1.7%	27.4%	13.5%	28.5%	28.9%																																
Maidenhead	1.3%	22.1%	19.5%	31.2%	26.0%																																
Windsor and Eton	2.5%	28.9%	14.0%	25.6%	28.9%																																
Northern Wards	0.0%	29.4%	10.8%	30.4%	29.4%																																
Southern Wards	3.2%	30.9%	6.4%	25.5%	34.0%																																

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

Consultation (other)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>There are currently no plans for a green network although work is underway to establish a greenway between Cookham, Maidenhead, Bray, and Holyport with leaflets due to be published. The improvement of York Stream is sighted as a political priority.</p> <p>There are poor networks and links between outside space and there is quite a lot of conflict between park users and cyclists. There needs to be safe, designated cycleways across parks and between Windsor and Maidenhead. Desborough Park is the only site to have a specific cycleway.</p> <p>It is important to link the Crown Estate with National Trust, Thames and RBWM sites. It is vital that the town centres of Windsor and Maidenhead do not become divorced from the Thames.</p>																	
	<p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>External consultees felt in the main unable to express an opinion owing to a lack of knowledge in this category. However, FWAG felt that there was a good opportunity to arrange wayleave agreements with local landowners in order to create rural countryside greenways available to the public.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>This was a somewhat confusing category for parish councils. It is understood that the development of plans for green corridors is in its infancy in the Borough, and that further work needs to be done to link open space in rural areas.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Parish</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sunningdale</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wraysbury</td> <td>About right (long footpath at Hythe End)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisham</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sunningdale & Ascot</td> <td>Less than we need (environmental improvements necessary)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Waltham</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horton</td> <td>About right (change of planning policy needed to preserve existing provision)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cookham</td> <td>About right</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eton</td> <td>About right (already exist alongside natural features)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Parish	Comment	Sunningdale	N/A	Wraysbury	About right (long footpath at Hythe End)	Bisham	About right	Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (environmental improvements necessary)	White Waltham	N/A	Horton	About right (change of planning policy needed to preserve existing provision)	Cookham	About right	Eton
Parish	Comment																	
Sunningdale	N/A																	
Wraysbury	About right (long footpath at Hythe End)																	
Bisham	About right																	
Sunningdale & Ascot	Less than we need (environmental improvements necessary)																	
White Waltham	N/A																	
Horton	About right (change of planning policy needed to preserve existing provision)																	
Cookham	About right																	
Eton	About right (already exist alongside natural features)																	

APPENDIX I – QUANTITY STANDARDS WORKSHEET

	Old Windsor	N/A
	Datchet	N/A
	Bray	About right
	<u>Drop-In Consolutions</u>	
	Whilst consultees were in favour of the development of greenways in the Borough, there was a low level of knowledge of any that are currently available.	
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	PPG17 states that 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. Key issues with regard enabling better access to a network of open spaces and public rights of way will be addressed by the Green Infrastructure Study.	
	It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set.	

APPENDIX J
QUANTITY STANDARDS

The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council - Setting Quantity Standards

Category	Populations	Parks and Gardens	Nat & Semi Nat Open Space	Amenity Green Space	Provision for Children (hectares)	Provision for Children	Provision for Young People (hectares)	Provision for Young People	Allotments (in hectares)	Outdoor Sports Facilities (jn hectares)	Outdoor Sports Facilities (jn hectares) - EXCLUDING GOLF COURSES
Total Provision - Existing Open Space (ha)						Number		Number			
Maidenhead	42,850	24.33	177.59	17.06	0.52	13	0.57	3	6.78	136.68	82.59
Windsor and Eton	33,304	7.99	171.37	17.11	1.14	22	0.43	9	22.12	161.33	152.06
Northern Wards	31,597	0.62	305.62	24.54	0.89	13	0.21	4	4.87	214.74	59.01
Southern Wards	25,890	2.92	54.81	12.92	1.14	12	0.53	7	7.15	99.78	81.52
OVERALL	133,641	35.86	709.39	71.63	3.69	60.00	1.74	23.00	40.92	612.53	375.18
Existing Open Space (ha per 1000 Population)											
Maidenhead	42,850	0.57	4.14	0.40	0.01	0.30	0.013	0.07	0.16	3.19	1.93
Windsor and Eton	33,304	0.24	5.15	0.51	0.03	0.66	0.013	0.27	0.66	4.84	4.57
Northern Wards	31,597	0.02	9.67	0.78	0.03	0.41	0.007	0.13	0.15	6.80	1.87
Southern Wards	25,890	0.11	2.12	0.50	0.04	0.46	0.020	0.27	0.28	3.85	3.15
OVERALL	133,641	0.27	5.31	0.54	0.03	0.45	0.013	0.17	0.31	4.58	2.81
Future Open Space (ha per 1000 Population) 2026											
Maidenhead	48,677	0.50	3.65	0.35	0.01	0.27	0.012	0.06	0.14	2.81	1.70
Windsor and Eton	37,075	0.22	4.62	0.46	0.03	0.59	0.012	0.24	0.60	4.35	4.10
Northern Wards	28,808	0.02	10.61	0.85	0.03	0.45	0.007	0.14	0.17	7.45	2.05
Southern Wards	33,092	0.09	1.66	0.39	0.03	0.36	0.016	0.21	0.22	3.02	2.46
OVERALL	147,652	0.24	4.80	0.49	0.02	0.41	0.012	0.16	0.28	4.15	2.54
Consultation (%)											
RECOMMENDED PROVISION STANDARD per 1,000		0.27	5.40	0.59	0.028	0.45	0.017	0.23	0.325	4.64	2.92
Balance		maintain	increase	increase		maintain		currently 60-75% of required	small increase	increase grass pitches	increase grass pitches
Maidenhead	42,850	12.83	-53.80	-8.22	-0.66	-6.24	-0.17	-6.83	-7.15	-62.14	-42.53
Windsor and Eton	33,304	-0.95	-8.47	-2.54	0.22	7.05	-0.15	1.36	11.30	6.80	54.81
Northern Wards	31,597	-7.86	135.00	5.90	0.02	-1.19	-0.34	-3.25	-5.40	68.13	-33.25
Southern Wards	25,890	-4.03	-85.00	-2.36	0.43	0.38	0.08	1.06	-1.26	-20.35	5.92
OVERALL	133,641	0.00	-12.27	-7.22	0.00	0.00	-0.58	-7.67	-2.51	-7.56	-15.05
Future Balance 2026											
Maidenhead	48,677	11.27	-85.27	-11.66	-0.82	-8.85	-0.28	-8.17	-9.04	-89.18	-59.55
Windsor and Eton	37,075	-1.96	-28.84	-4.76	0.12	5.35	-0.21	0.49	10.07	-10.70	43.80
Northern Wards	28,808	-7.11	150.06	7.54	0.09	0.07	-0.29	-2.61	-4.49	81.07	-25.11
Southern Wards	33,092	-5.96	-123.89	-6.60	0.23	-2.86	-0.04	-0.59	-3.60	-53.77	-15.11
OVERALL	147,652	-3.76	-87.93	-15.48	-0.39	-6.29	-0.82	-10.88	-7.07	-72.58	-55.96

Quantity Calculations

APPENDIX K

QUANTITY STANDARDS BENCHMARKING

PMP Definitions - Process by Typology

PPG 17 Typology	STEP 3 - SETTING STANDARDS				STEP 4 - APPLYING STANDARDS		
	Quantity Standard (yes/no)	Quantity Standard (ha/number)	Accessibility Standard - catchment (yes/no)	Quality Standard (yes/no)	Apply Quantity for Surplus / Deficiencies	Quantity Standard Analysis (LA area/analysis area)	Apply Accessibility Standard - catchment (yes/no)
Parks and Gardens	✓	ha	✓	✓	✓	LA area/Analysis Area	✓
Natural and Semi Natural	✓	ha	✓	✓	✓	Analysis Area	✓
Green Corridors	X <small>(see PPG17 Annex - Typologies / there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard and instead planning policies should promote the use of green corridors)</small>	not applicable	✓	✓	not applicable	not applicable	X
Amenity Greenspace	✓	ha	✓	✓	✓	Analysis Area	✓
Provision for Children and Young People	✓ <small>(possible need for separate standards for children's play and teenage provision)</small>	ha and number	✓	✓	✓	Analysis Area	✓
Outdoor Sports Facilities	✓ <small>(refer to Playing Pitch Strategy / Sport and Rec Facility Strategy for specific facilities)</small>	ha	✓	✓	X <small>(standard set for broad planning need only) / (application for surplus would be meaningless)</small>	not applicable	✓
Allotments and Community Gardens	✓	ha	✓	✓	✓	Analysis Area	✓
Cemeteries and Churchyards	X <small>(see PPG17 Annex - Typologies / PPG 17 process is not appropriate but any data on local death rates, if available, may be used to set some form of local standard)</small>	not applicable	X	✓	not applicable	not applicable	X
Civic Spaces	X <small>(see PPG17 Annex - Typologies - not suitable for local standards - they are normally provided on an opportunistic and urban design-led basis)</small>	not applicable	X	✓	not applicable	not applicable	X
Accessible countryside in urban fringe areas	Not Applicable						

Setting Accessibility Standards

Typology	National Standards and/or Benchmarks	LA Name
Parks & Gardens	No national standards	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell
Natural & Semi-Natural	<p>Natural England (English Nature) Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGS) recommends at least 2 ha of accessible natural greenspace per 1,000 people based on no-one living more than: 300m from nearest natural greenspace / 2km from a site of 20ha / 5km from a site of 100ha / 10km from a site of 500ha</p> <p>The Woodland Trust proposes the following accessibility standards for England:</p> <p>Accessible woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.18% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m • 55.18% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km <p>Inaccessible woodland (if opened to public)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra 26.08% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m • Extra 26.74% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km <p>The following provision is required to meet standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59.44% of population require new woodland for access to 2ha+ within 500m (minimum additional provision of 164 hectares) • 2.31% of population require new woodland for access to 20ha+ within 4km (minimum additional provision of 20 hectares) 	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell
Amenity Greenspace	No national standards	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell
Provision for Children	<p>FIT: (1) LAPs - aged 4-6 ; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace (2) LEAPs - aged min 5 ; min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell
Young People	<p>(1) LAPs - aged 4-6 ; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace (2) LEAPs - aged min 5 ; min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell
Outdoor Sports Facilities	<p>New assessments by the Audit Commission as part of Comprehensive Performance Assessment assess the percentage of the population within either a 20 minute drive (rural) or 20 minute walk to at least three facilities which have met a national standard from swimming pool, sports hall, health and fitness suite, STP, golf course and grass pitch.</p>	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell
Allotments	No national standards	York
		Brighton
		Telford and Wrekin
		Spelthorne
		Elmbridge
		Epsom and Ewell

Setting Quality Standards

Typology	National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)		LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD
		LA Name	Local Standard Set	
Parks & Gardens	No national standards	York	A welcoming, clean and litter free site providing a one-stop community facility which is safe and accessible to all and has a range of facilities and other types of open space within it. City Parks should be attractive, well designed and maintained, providing well-kept grass, flowers and trees, adequate lighting and other appropriate safety features, as well as suitable ancillary accommodation (including seating, toilets, litter bins and play facilities). Sites should promote the conservation of wildlife and the built heritage and provide links to the surrounding green infrastructure	Essential features: Clean and well maintained Flowers/trees and shrubs Well kept grass Achieve Green Flag standards Desirable features: Nature/biodiversity/conservation features Parking on-site
		Brighton	Parks and gardens should be well maintained and offer a variety of plants, shrubs and flowers across the City Ancillary accommodation should include seating, dog bins, cycle parking, litter bins, and clear signage. The Council aims to continue enabling access to toilets at key sites, with access to refreshments, picnic and shaded seating areas at larger sites. Sites should be secure and safe with adequate lighting and, where appropriate, have a staff presence to improve security and management. Where applicable, historic buildings should be kept in good order and other buildings kept safe.	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: Flowers/trees, footpaths, good access Desirable: Well kept grass, clean/litter free, litter bins	
		Spelthorne	"Urban parks and gardens should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. They should also be clean and tidy, well maintained, inviting, safe and secure with appropriate, high quality facilities and infrastructure"	
		Elmbridge	"A welcoming, well-maintained site that is clean, and litter, vandalism and graffiti are kept to a minimum. It should provide a wide range of leisure and recreational opportunities, varied and well-kept vegetation and natural features, where suitable appropriate lighting and ancillary accommodation."	
		Epsom and Ewell	A clean and litter free site providing varied and well-kept vegetation and nature features and appropriate ancillary accommodation, including benches, toilets, litter bins and well signed to and within the site.	
Natural & Semi-Natural	Natural England (English Nature) Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGS) recommends at least 2 ha of accessible natural greenspace per 1,000 people based on no-one living more than: 300m from nearest natural greenspace / 2km from a site of 20ha / 5	York	"A clean and litter free site with clear and obvious pathways that provide opportunities to link other open spaces together and where appropriate link to the outlying countryside. Sites should encourage wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental awareness and contain appropriate natural features. Litterbins, dog bins, benches and picnic areas should be provided where possible and there should be a clear focus on balancing recreational and wildlife needs, whilst ensuring public access. Community involvement through management, maintenance and promotion of these sites should be maximised." Care where nature conservation is actively promoted, although other uses may also take place. Habitats and species of biodiversity value should be present. Links to other areas of nature conservation value via a green network is desirable. Management, including maintenance and ensuring accessibility, should be tailored to benefit biodiversity. An aspirational target is for information and signage to be made available to improve the public's awareness and understanding of nature conservation. Sites should be clean and litter free. Sites should be open to all, and compliant with DDA accessibility guidance wherever possible and appropriate.	Essential features: Clean and litter free Nature/conservation/biodiversity Delineated footpaths Good site access (disabled)
		Brighton	Essential: Nature features, footpaths, flower/trees Desirable: Good access, clean/litter free, dog bins	
		Telford and Wrekin	Natural and semi-natural green spaces should be free from vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout design should follow 'safer by design' principles with appropriate facilities provided in the least obtrusive manner. Sites should be maintained to protect any nature conservation/interest"	
		Spelthorne	"A spacious and clean site with clear pathways, minimal litter, and natural features and varied vegetation which encourages wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Where appropriate, sites should provide a key cultural and educational resource for the community. Sites should be maintained to protect any nature conservation interest"	
		Elmbridge	"A clean, litter free open space with natural features (including flowers, trees, shrubs and water features) which encourages wildlife and nature conservation, biodiversity and environmental education."	
		Epsom and Ewell	"A clean and well-maintained green space site that is accessible to all. Sites should have appropriate ancillary facilities (dog and litter bins etc), pathways and landscaping in the right places providing a safe secure site with a spacious outlook that enhances the appearance of the local environment and provides a safe area for young people to meet. Larger sites should be suitable for informal play opportunities and should be enhanced to encourage the site to become a community focus, while smaller sites should at the least provide an important visual amenity function." Amenity green spaces should meet the casual recreational needs of the immediate community. A creative approach to provision should be sought, with an emphasis on provision of varied opportunities. On larger sites, informal play opportunities should be considered, as well as providing a variety of planting and landscaping. Sites should be clean, secure and safe with adequate lighting and CCTV where appropriate, with a suitable maintenance regime.	
Amenity Greenspace	No national standards	York	Essential: Seating, well kept grass, clean/litter free Footpaths, flowers/trees, litter bins Desirable:	Essential features: Clean and well maintained Suitable soft landscaping Designed to enhance passive security Desirable features: Dog mess bins
		Brighton	"Amenity green space should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. The layout and design should follow 'safer by design' principles and sites should be clean and well maintained with clearly defined boundaries, high quality facilities appropriate to their use and appropriate planting"	
		Telford and Wrekin	"A safe, clean and well-maintained green space site with minimal litter, well-kept grass and vegetation. The site should be easily accessible and large enough to accommodate informal play. Sites should have appropriate ancillary accommodation (benches, litter bins etc) and landscaping that enhances the appearance of the local environment."	
		Spelthorne	"A safe, clean, litter-free and well-maintained greenspace with well-kept grass, flowers and shrubs. It should include clear, flat footpaths and should be large enough to encourage informal play. Where appropriate the site should have appropriate ancillary accommodation."	
		Elmbridge	"A well designed clean site of sufficient size to provide a mix of well-maintained and imaginative formal equipment and an enriched play environment in a safe and convenient location. Equipped play spaces should be fun and exciting and should have clear boundaries with dog free areas and include appropriate ancillary accommodation such as seating, litter bins and toilets in the locality of larger sites. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety and safeguard residential amenity of neighbouring land users. The site should also be accessible to all"	
		Epsom and Ewell	On sites where equipment is provided, there should be a range of different types of well-maintained pieces of equipment in a safe, secure setting. The planning, layout and design of the site should follow industry best practice, drawing on guidance from the NPFA, RoSPA, Play England and others. It is an aspiration that main sites feature seating, shaded areas, litter bins and have access to toilets and refreshments. The play area should also be free from dogs. Sites should be well-maintained and easily accessible on foot and by cycle, and follow Disability Discrimination Act guidance.	
Provision for Children	FIT: (1) LAPs - aged 4-6 : 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) : min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace (2) LEAPs - aged min 5 : min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)	York	Essential: good play equipment, litter bins, clean/litter free Desirable: well kept grass, good access, equipment maintenance	Essential Features: Clean, safe and well maintained at all times Apply Fields in Trust (FIT) standards Desirable features: Maximise range of play opportunities Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating Development of the play ranger service Suitable soft landscaping
		Brighton	"Facilities for children and young people should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. The layout and design should follow 'safer by design' principles and sites should be well maintained, appropriately planted and equipped to provide range of activities to suit varied interests and age groups."	
		Telford and Wrekin	"A site providing an appropriate mix of well-maintained formal equipment/facilities and an enriched play environment to encourage informal recreation by children and young people. The sites should be in a safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes clean and dog free areas with minimal litter and vandalism where possible. Ancillary facilities such as shelters and seating should be provided where appropriate"	
		Spelthorne	"A clean and litter free play area in safe and secure locations which includes facilities for young people of a wide variety of ages. The area should be kept dog-free."	
		Elmbridge		
		Epsom and Ewell		
	FIT: (2) LEAPs - aged min 5 : min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)			

Typology	National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)		LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD
		LA Name	Local Standard Set	
Provision for Young People	FIT: (1) LAPs - aged 4-6 : 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace (2) LEAPs - aged min 5 : min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)	York	"A well designed high quality site that provides a meeting place for young people, encompassing the needs of all users with varied formal and informal equipment/space. The site should be located in a safe environment that is accessible to all, without compromising neighbouring land users. The focus should be on providing a well-maintained, clean and litter free area with appropriate lighting and shelter, promoting a sense of community ownership. Facilities should be developed through extensive consultation with the local community at all stages of the process"	<p>Essential Features: Clean, safe and well maintained at all times Apply Fields in Trust (FIT) standards Provision of seats User consultation for all new provision</p> <p>Desirable features: Maximise range of opportunities Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets Development of the play ranger service</p>
		Brighton	"On sites where equipment is provided, there should be a range of different types of well-maintained pieces of equipment in a safe, secure setting. The planning, layout and design of the site should follow industry best practice, drawing on guidance from the NPFA, RoSPA, Play England and others. It is an aspiration that main sites feature seating, shaded areas, litter bins and have access to toilets and refreshments. The play area should also be free from dogs. Sites should be well-maintained and easily accessible on foot and by cycle, and follow Disability Discrimination Act guidance."	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: good play equipment, litter bins, clean/litter free Desirable: well kept grass, good access, equipment maintenance	
		Spelthorne	"Facilities for children and young people should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. The layout and design should follow 'safer by design' principles and sites should be well maintained, appropriately planted and equipped to provide a range of activities to suit varied interests and age groups."	
		Elmbridge	"A site providing an appropriate mix of well-maintained formal equipment/facilities and an enriched play environment to encourage informal recreation by children and young people. The sites should be in a safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes clean and dog free areas with minimal litter and vandalism where possible. Ancillary facilities such as shelters and seating should be provided where appropriate."	
		Epsom and Ewell	"A clean and litter free play area in safe and secure locations which includes facilities for young people of a wide variety of ages. The area should be kept dog-free."	
Outdoor Sports Facilities	New assessments by the Audit Commission as part of Comprehensive Performance Assessment assesses the percentage of the population within either a 20 minute drive (rural) or 20 minute walk to at least three facilities which have met a national standard from	York	"A well-planned, clean and litter free sports facility that sits in harmony with its surroundings. The site should be well maintained to an appropriate match play standard, with good grass coverage and well-drained quality surfaces. Appropriate ancillary facilities should be provided at sites with consideration given to providing toilets, changing rooms, car parking, and meeting places. The site should be managed appropriately ensuring community safety and provide a local amenity that is close to people's homes, encouraging residents to participate in physical activity"	<p>Essential features: Apply relevant NGB specifications Clean/litter free and well maintained Level surface/good drainage Changing facilities Car parking Toilets</p>
		Brighton	Clean, litter-free sports facilities should be provided with appropriate, well-drained, well-maintained surfaces. Ancillary accommodation should include toilets, changing facilities, dog and litter bins and appropriate amenity and sports lighting. All sites should meet the minimum specifications of the appropriate National Governing Body of sport and meet Disability Discrimination Act guidance.	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: well kept grass, toilets, good access Desirable: Clean/litter free, parking facilities, changing facilities	
		Spelthorne	free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. The layout and design should follow 'safer by design' principles. Sites should be	
		Elmbridge	All outdoor sports facilities should be well kept, where dog fouling, vandalism and litter are kept to a minimum, with level and well-drained good quality surfaces. Where appropriate, sites should provide parking facilities and well-drained surfaces and appropriate good quality ancillary accommodation including toilets and car parking. On site security should be provided where	
		Epsom and Ewell	Essential: well kept grass, toilets, good access Desirable: Clean/litter free, parking facilities, changing facilities	
Allotments	No national standards	York	"A well-kept, well managed and secure site that encourages sustainable development, bio-diversity, healthy living and education with appropriate ancillary facilities (eg provision of water and toilets) to meet local needs, clearly marked pathways and good quality soils. The site should be spacious providing appropriate access for all and should be promoted to ensure local community awareness"	<p>Essential Features: Clean/litter free and well maintained Safe and secure</p> <p>Desirable features: Toilets Sustainable practices including the use of water</p>
		Brighton	Allotments should feature appropriate facilities including a well maintained water supply, good quality soil, car parking/access and secure fencing. The Council aspires to meet national guidance on the provision of toilets, dip tanks and storage space, and enable the provision of an allotment holders' or members' office and organic recycling by individual plot holders, as well as provide good disability access on key sites across the city.	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: toilets, security, good access Desirable: footpaths, clean/litter free, maintenance	
		Spelthorne	"Allotments should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti-social behaviour. Where appropriate, access pathways and signage should be clearly provided and well maintained."	
		Elmbridge	"A clean and well-kept site with minimal litter and which encourages bio-diversity and sustainable, healthy living. The site should have appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs and clearly marked pathways to and across the site. Management of local sites should continue to involve the local community."	
		Epsom and Ewell	"A well-kept, clean and litter free site with good quality soils that encourages sustainable development, biodiversity and education objectives. It should have good site access and water supply, with appropriate ancillary facilities such as seating, parking and toilets if possible."	
Cemeteries / Churchyards	No national standards	York	"A clean and well-maintained site providing long-term burial capacity, an area of quiet contemplation and a sanctuary for wildlife. Sites should have clear pathways, varied vegetation and landscaping and provide appropriate ancillary accommodation (eg facilities for flowers litter bins and seating.) Access to sites should be enhanced by parking facilities and by public transport routes where possible, particularly in urban areas"	<p>Essential Features: Well kept grass Clean/litter free Flowers/trees</p> <p>Desirable features: Toilets Nature/conservation/biodiversity Achieve Green Flag standards (cemeteries)</p>
		Brighton	Sites should provide areas of quiet contemplation with the opportunity to enhance biodiversity by formulating a conservation management plan. Cemeteries should be well kept, with a variety of planting and trees to avoid monotony and attention given to the inspection, care and maintenance of all memorials including historic monuments. Ancillary facilities should include even and well-maintained paths and seating, in compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act, together with water taps and litter bins	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: Seating, footpaths, clean/litter free Desirable: Well kept grass, flowers/trees, litter bins	
		Spelthorne	"Cemeteries and churchyards should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. Where appropriate, access pathways and signage should be clearly provided and well maintained."	
		Elmbridge	"A well-maintained, clean site with seating areas, clear pathways and varied vegetation and landscaping. It should provide a sanctuary for wildlife in areas devoid of greenspace and encompasses bio-diversity and meet the requirements of the Council's Charter for the Bereaved."	
		Epsom and Ewell	"A well maintained, clean and litter free site with toilets, flowers, trees and shrubs with vegetation and landscaping that encompasses bio-diversity. They should ideally have clear footpaths, seating, dog free areas and parking"	
Green Corridors	No national standards	York	"A clean and well-maintained site providing long-term burial capacity, an area of quiet contemplation and a sanctuary for wildlife. Sites should have clear pathways, varied vegetation and landscaping and provide appropriate ancillary accommodation (eg facilities for flowers litter bins and seating.) Access to sites should be enhanced by parking facilities and by public transport routes where possible, particularly in urban areas"	<p>Essential Features: Footpaths Clean/litter free Nature/conservation/biodiversity Designed to enhance passive security Sympathetic signage/way markings</p> <p>Desirable Features: Routes suitable for shared use (pedestrian/cyclists)</p>
		Brighton	No Standard Set	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: Flowers/trees, nature features, footpaths Desirable: Good access, clean/litter free	
		Spelthorne	"Green corridors should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, litter and anti social behaviour. The layout and design should follow 'safer by design' principles. They should provide links between green spaces and from residential areas to green spaces."	
		Elmbridge	"Clean, well-maintained, safe and secure corridors with clear, level and well-drained pathways where appropriate, which are enclosed and reinforced by natural vegetation and well signposted. Green corridors should provide links which effectively connect major open spaces and provide ancillary facilities in appropriate places."	
		Epsom and Ewell	"A clean, litter free, level and well-drained pathway which links major open spaces. It should include flowers, trees, shrubs and well kept grass."	
Civic Spaces	No national standards	York	No Standard Set	<p>Essential Features: Clean/litter free and well maintained Planted areas</p>
		Brighton	No Standard Set	
		Telford and Wrekin	Essential: Information boards, good access, parking facilities Desirable: Clean/litter free, seating, flowers/trees	
		Spelthorne	No Standard Set	
		Elmbridge	No Standard Set	
		Epsom and Ewell	No Standard Set	

Setting Quantity Standards

Typology	National Standards	Other Local Authorities Actuals and Standards		PMP Recommendation	LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD
		LA Name	Local standard (ha per 1,000 pop)		
Parks & Gardens	No national standards	York	0.18 to 0.18	MAINTAIN	MAINTAIN
		Brighton	1.65 to 1.65		
		Telford and Wrekin	0.06 to 0.07		
		Spelthorne	currently 0.04 - no standard set		
		Elmbridge	1.17 to 1.17		
		Epsom and Ewell	0.35 to 0.35		
Natural & Semi-Natural	<p>Natural England Standard recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an accessible natural greenspace less than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home statutory Local Nature Reserves at a minimum level of one hectare per thousand population at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home; one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; and one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home. <p>Natural England Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard recommends 1 ha of LNR per 1,000 population</p> <p>Rethinking Open Space Report - Average of all LA applicable standards = 2 ha per 1,000 population - areas that promote biodiversity and nature conservation</p> <p>The Woodland Trust proposes the following accessibility standards for England:</p> <p>Accessible woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15.18% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m 55.18% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km Inaccessible woodland (if opened to public) Extra 20.05% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m Extra 26.74% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km <p>The following provisions are required to meet standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59.44% of population require new woodland for access to 2ha+ within 500m (minimum additional provision of 54 hectares) 2.31% of population require new woodland for access to 20ha+ within 4km (minimum additional provision of 20 hectares) 	York	1.78 to 1.79	MAINTAIN	SLIGHT INCREASE
		Brighton	1.12 to 1.12		
		Telford and Wrekin	15.3 to 15.3		
		Spelthorne	2.16 to 2.16		
		Elmbridge	11.54 to 11.54		
		Epsom and Ewell	12.23 to 11		
Amenity Greenspace	<p>Rethinking Open Space Report - Average of all LA applicable standards = 2 ha per 1,000 population - areas that provide informal recreation and visual amenity or land provided for environmental or safety reasons</p> <p>NPPA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for childrens playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>NPPA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPPA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>LAPs - aged 4-6 ; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>FIT - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for childrens playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>FIT - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the FIT standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>(1) LAPs - aged 4-6 ; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5 ; min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>	York	1.05 to 1.07	INCREASE (urban)	SLIGHT INCREASE
		Brighton	0.56 to 0.58		
		Telford and Wrekin	1.17 to 1.17		
		Spelthorne	1.46 to 1.46		
		Elmbridge	1.81 to 1.81		
		Epsom and Ewell	2.09 to 2		
Provision for Children & Young People	<p>FIT - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for childrens playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>FIT - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the FIT standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>(1) LAPs - aged 4-6 ; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line) ; min area size 100msq ; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5 ; min area size 400msq ; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>	York	0.04 to 0.07	<p>INCREASE (Epsom 0.34 to 0.35 sites per 1,000 / Kettering 0.41 to 0.45 (children) and 0.02 to 0.25 (YP) sites per 1,000</p>	<p>CHILDREN: MAINTAIN</p> <p>YOUNG PEOPLE: INCREASE to 0.24 facilities per 1,000 population (currently provision at 75% of this target) - 8 new facilities</p>
		Brighton	0.04 to 0.06		
		Telford and Wrekin	0.092 to 0.095		
		Spelthorne	0.038 to 0.038		
		Elmbridge	0.03 to 0.03		
		Epsom and Ewell	0.03 to 0.35		
Outdoor Sports Facilities	<p>FIT - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 4 acres (ie 1.62 per 1,000 population) for outdoor sport - includes pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens, tennis courts training areas and croquet lawns</p> <p>FIT - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPPA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p>	York	1.91 to 1.92	INCREASE (grass pitches - tie in with PPS recommendations)	INCREASE grass pitches
		Brighton	0.27 to 0.29		
		Telford and Wrekin	1.8 to 1.8		
		Spelthorne	2.37 to 2.37		
		Elmbridge	3.27 to 3.27		
		Epsom and Ewell	2.75 to 3		
Allotments	<p>National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners - 20 allotment plots per 1,000 households (ie 20 allotments plots per 2,200 people (2.2 people per house) or 1 allotment plot per 200 people.</p> <p>1969 Thorpe Report suggested 0.2 ha per 1,000 population</p>	York	0.28 to 0.28	MAINTAIN (ensuring 100% capacity and qualitative)	SLIGHT INCREASE (Maidenhead)
		Brighton	0.24 to 0.25		
		Telford and Wrekin	0.06 to 0.07		
		Spelthorne	0.125		
		Elmbridge	0.32 to 0.32		
		Epsom and Ewell	0.22 to 0.16		

APPENDIX L
QUALITY STANDARDS

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Setting Quality Standards / Vision – Windsor and Maidenhead

Field	Comment
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. Green Flag criteria for parks produced by the Civic Trust
Existing Local Quality Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards
Benchmarking against other authorities for satisfaction of quality	Essential and desirable features of other authorities relating to the quality of their open space. York, Brighton and Telford & Wrekin have been selected for benchmarking purposes as based on the Office of National Statistic's 'Nearest Neighbour' these local authorities have a high statistical similarity to Windsor and Maidenhead (taking in to account demographics, population splits, socio-economic status, geographical area, retail and residential composition etc.)
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations)	Results from the household survey with regards to users of each typology in relation to their aspirations and needs and existing quality experiences
Consultation (other)	Results from all the consultations undertaken with regards the quality issues for each typology
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local quality standard for discussion and approval by the client

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Setting the Local Quality Standards – Explanation and Justification of the recommended approach

For each typology, the recommended quality standards have been derived directly from local consultations, where residents were asked to consider their opinions on the quality of sites in their local area and also to highlight the key features of a good quality site for each typology.

For each typology, these key features have been divided into those that are essential, and those that are desirable. National standards for provision and good practice examples from the rest of the country have also been taken into account as part of these recommendations.

These lists therefore set out the quality vision (as required by PPG17) which should be applied to all new sites and should inform the enhancement of existing sites.

For each typology, two lists are therefore provided. An example is set out below:

Essential	Desirable
Clean and litter free	Toilets
Provision of seats	A range of equipment
Provision of bins	An information board
Even footpaths	

In order to relate the recommended quality vision to the site assessments, those priorities derived from consultation have been used to inform the percentage scores achieved during site assessments. For each type of open space, those elements that have emerged as being of particular priority to local residents during consultation are given a greater weighting in the site assessments. This weighting ensures that those areas considered to be of higher relative importance have a greater influence on the overall score achieved.

The key aspirations of local residents with regards the quality of open spaces have therefore been categorised into the four overarching categories considered within the site assessments, specifically:

- Cleanliness and maintenance
- Vegetation
- Ancillary accommodation
- Security and safety.

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

These classifications are set out below:

Cleanliness and maintenance	Vegetation	Ancillary accommodation	Security and safety
Well kept grass	Flowers/Trees	Changing facilities	Good Site Access
Clean and litter free	Level Surface	Car Parking Facilities	On-site Security
Dog free area	Nature Features	Cycle Parking	Information Boards
Litter Bins	Water Features	Environ Education Programs	
Dog mess bins		Events	
		Toilets	
		Cafe	
		Seating	
		Picnic Area	
		Dog Walking Facilities	
		Facilities for the young	
		Sports	
		Footpaths	
		Community activities	

For each typology, the number of responses received indicating that each of the above features is considered important in addition to other comments made during consultations and national standards have been used to determine the relative importance of each of the four key areas.

Given that for each typology, respondents were able to select as many key features as they felt appropriate, the proportion of respondents prioritising each area is determined by calculating the total number of responses that could have been received and measuring this against the number of responses that were received.

The following example sets out the calculations using the above methodology, on the assumption that there were 100 respondents to the survey (who could all have ticked every box if they felt this was appropriate).

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Site assessment classification	Number of features contributing to this area	Total Number of Possible Responses
Cleanliness and maintenance	6	600
Vegetation	3	300
Ancillary accommodation	8	800
Security and safety	3	300

The response rate for each of the four key areas is therefore derived by calculating the questions ticked as a percentage of the total number of responses that could have been received. A fictitious example, building on the previous example, is set out below:

Site assessment classification	Number of features contributing to this area	Total Number of Possible Responses	Responses Received	Percentage
Cleanliness and maintenance	6	600	400	66%
Vegetation	3	300	25	8%
Ancillary accommodation	8	800	400	50%
Security and safety	3	300	280	93%

The percentage response rates above (informed by other consultations) can then be used to determine the relative importance of each component of quality. Using the example above, it can be seen that for this typology, security and safety are most important, cleanliness and maintenance is second and ancillary accommodation and vegetation are less important.

This relative importance will be reflected in the overall score of the site assessment through a weighting system whereby:

- The score for the most valued element will be multiplied by four
- The score for the second most valued aspect will be multiplied by three
- The score for the third most valued aspect will be multiplied by two
- The score for the fourth element will be multiplied by one.

For each typology, all sites can therefore be measured against each other in order to determine which sites best meet public need.

This approach means that in line with PPG17, both the quality vision and the site assessment scores are directly correlated with the findings of the local consultation. The justification behind all of these standards is that they are directly reflective of local needs and the degree to which sites achieve the required standard can be measured using the findings of the site assessments.

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Parishes

The parish questionnaire did not structure quality by using the typology, but by using the classifications as detailed above. Responses by parish are set out in the table below.

Category: Cleanliness and Maintenance

Includes:

Maintenance and management

Absence of litter

Provision of bins

Absence of dog fouling

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	All categories very good apart from noise, which was marked as good
Wraysbury	Very good/good	Very good apart from bins provision/dog fouling (good) & noise/vandalism (poor)
Bisham	Good	All categories good except maintenance & management (very good)
Sunninghill and Ascot	Good/average	Maintenance/noise/cleanliness good; litter/bins/vandalism average; dog fouling poor
White Waltham	Average	Apart from maintenance (good) & dog fouling (poor)
Horton	Good/average	Maintenance/litter/bins/cleanliness good; rest average
Cookham	Good	Maintenance/noise/cleanliness very good; bins/dog fouling good; litter/vandalism poor
Eton	Average	Vandalism good; litter/bins poor
Bray	Good/average	Maintenance very good; bins/dogs/cleanliness good; vandalism poor; rest average
Old Windsor	Very good	Noise good (aircraft)
Datchet	Very good	Maintenance good

No major problems overall.

Dog fouling is an issue in some areas

Isolated problems with littering

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Category: Security and Safety

Includes:

Lighting
Equipment
Boundaries
Overall security/safety

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	All categories very good apart from lighting, which was marked as average
Wraysbury	Good/very good	Lighting/boundaries good; equipment very good
Bisham	Good	Boundaries & overall security good; other N/A
Sunninghill and Ascot	Average	Except for equipment (good)
White Waltham	Good	Except for equipment (good)
Horton	Good/average	Boundaries/security good; others average
Cookham	Very good	Apart from lighting (average)
Eton	Good	But lighting poor
Bray	Very good	Lighting good
Old Windsor	Very good	Lighting average
Datchet	Very good	Lighting good

No major problems
Lighting was consistently less well marked than other areas

Category: Vegetation

Includes:

Planted areas
Grass areas

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	Both planted areas and grass areas
Wraysbury	Very good	
Bisham	Very good	
Sunninghill and Ascot	Good	

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

White Waltham	Good	
Horton	Good	
Cookham	Very good/good	Grass very good
Eton	Average	
Bray	Very good/good	Grass very good
Old Windsor	Very good/good	Grass very good
Datchet	Very good	

No problems in this area identified

Category: Ancillary Accommodation

Includes:

Toilets
 Changing rooms
 Parking
 Pathways
 Information/signage

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	Pathways/information & signage good; parking/toilets average; changing rooms N/A
Wraysbury	Good/very good	Parking/pathways/information good; toilets/changing rooms very good
Bisham	Good	Pathways & information good; parking average
Sunninghill and Ascot	Average	Apart from signage (good)
White Waltham	Average	Apart from pathways (good)
Horton	N/A	Apart from information (average)
Cookham	Average	Pathways/information good; changing rooms average; parking poor; toilets very poor
Eton	Poor	Pathways average; toilets N/A
Bray	Good	Pathways very good; toilets/information average
Old Windsor	Very good	Information average
Datchet	Good	Information average

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Generally good
 The provision of quality information and signage is an issue
 Parking and toilet provision only average in some areas

Category: National Awards

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	N/A	
Wraysbury	N/A	
Bisham	N/A	
Sunninghill and Ascot	N/A	
White Waltham	N/A	
Horton	N/A	
Cookham	N/A	
Eton	N/A	
Bray	N/A	
Old Windsor	N/A	
Datchet	Very good	Heavy involvement in Britain in Bloom

There was a low response to this category, perhaps flagging up a need for take-up of standards such as Green Pennant/Green Flag

Overall Quality Rating

Category: Overall Quality Rating	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	More for teenagers; better toilets; & refreshment facilities suggested as improvements
Wraysbury	Good	No quality concerns or suggestions
Bisham	Very good	Improvements include playground equipment and additional seating
Sunninghill and Ascot	Good	Need for more young people's provision/improved sense of security/soccer equipment/tennis court resurfacing

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

White Waltham	Good	No concerns or suggestions
Horton	Good	Teen provision required
Cookham	Very good	CCTV at Alfred Major
Eton	Average	No concerns or suggestions
Bray	Good	No concerns or suggestions
Old Windsor	Very good	Better lighting
Datchet	Very good	No concerns or suggestions

The need for young people's provision was suggested by a number of parishes
Other suggestions were more parochial

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PARKS AND GARDENS			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	RBWM Community Strategy 2007-13 One of the key aims of the Community Strategy is to improve the quality of the parks by reducing litter and vandalism and achieving Green Flag status by improving the landscape and design of public open spaces		
Benchmarking	York: 46% good/44% average	Brighton: 69% good/27% average	Telford and Wrekin: 36% good/34% average
	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i></p> <p><i>Clean and litter free with well kept grass, a variety of flowers, trees and shrubs. Ancillary facilities will include toilets and dog-poop scheme</i></p>		
Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated parks and gardens as their most frequently used open space – 42%)	<p>The household survey reveals that the highest rated aspirations with regards parks and gardens in the Borough are: clean and litter free (74%), flowers/trees and shrubs (43%), well kept grass (40%), toilets (40%), nature features (38%) and parking (33%).</p> <p>Regarding the quality of parks and gardens, miss-use of site (21%) and dog fouling (19%) were considered the most common significant problems. Dog fouling (34%) and litter problems (33%) were viewed as the most common minor problems. Safety/age of equipment and poor maintenance were stated as no problem by of respondents (48% and 43% respectively).</p>		
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Results from the household survey show a split in opinion regarding the quality of parks and gardens. 64% of respondents feel the quality of this typology is good and 34% feel the quality is average. Only 2% of respondents feel that the quality of park and garden provision is poor. This is a relatively high score compared to other local authorities e.g. York: 46% good/ 44% average; Brighton: 69% good/ 27% average and Telford and Wrekin: 36% good/ 34% average.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas results are consistent with the borough-wide findings, with the exception of analysis area 3 (the northern wards), with only 47% of respondents from this area identifying parks as good and with 49% of respondents suggesting this open space is average and 3% that it is poor. The highest level of satisfaction is portrayed in the rural southern wards, where 78% of residents feel the quality of parks and gardens is good.</p>		

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p>General comments regarding the quality of parks and gardens revolved around a lack of parking (particularly in Maidenhead), litter problems and the need for more bins, particularly to tackle dog fouling. It was also felt that not enough policing and enforcement of rules were carried out when it came to dog fouling and vandalism and graffiti in parks. Specific issues that were raised included damage caused by quad bikes at Ockwells Park and lack of maintenance and litter problems at Alexandra Gardens and Laggan Field. Graffiti was seen as a major problem at Punt Hill Park, which could be improved through better lighting. It was suggested that toilets need to be more available at most parks. Further to this, additional seating areas are required at Clewer Park.</p>
<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead manage 53 parks and open spaces. One of the main concerns highlighted was that of anti-social behaviour. Consultation with internal officers identified specific issues regarding parks in the Borough. Oakland Grove Park has a lack of parking facilities (not adequate for the number of football teams that use the venue), and the tennis courts which are leased from the Council for a peppercorn rent by Maidenhead Tennis Club are regularly vandalised. There is also a degree of intimidation due to the parks proximity to the neighbouring housing estate. Punt Hill is a popular park although has limited parking available. The facilities at Dedworth Manor Open Space are not fully utilised. Home Park is a well used site offering a variety of activities including large scale events and a number of sports. The new Imperial Park, Windsor has been developed through S106 funding and provides a £90k play area, two junior pitches and parking for 42 cars.</p> <p>The main aim of the Council is to achieve Green Flag status for six parks over the next two years (the parks are Desborough, Oaken Grove, Braywick, Kidwells, Clewer Memorial Park, and Home Park). In addition to planted areas and improving maintenance there will also be a marketing focus with additional information distributed regarding the parks in the Borough and a new suite of signs to increase public awareness. A recent survey conducted by the Council identified 75% of residents being satisfied with park provision within the Borough. The aim is to increase this to 79% (by using part of the £3million of S106 money) in order to achieve LEA funding. The plan is to spend £34k per annum on the parks in areas of deprivation in order to achieve the Green Flag status. A proposal for the development of Town Moor is out for tender to make the land more suitable for formal sports.</p> <p>The investment programme for parks is currently based on SPG guidance with no capital programme in place. The focus is on soft landscaping and play area provision. There has been improvements in reducing graffiti and vandalism over the last three years although quality standards are still low in outlying/rural areas.</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>Although knowledge of parks and gardens within the Borough was limited with external consultees there was a general view that standards in relation to this typology were quite high.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>There may be some misunderstanding amongst the parishes as to what constitutes a park and garden site. However, it was generally felt that standards were adequate to good in this category.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>There was a feeling that standards had generally improved over the last few years to a level which is quite high. People felt in particular that parks and gardens were generally clean and had low levels of litter, a marked improvement on the situation five years ago.</p>																									
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 758 2045 935"> <thead> <tr> <th>Essential</th> <th>Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Clean and well maintained</td> <td>Nature/biodiversity/conservation features</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flowers/ trees and shrubs</td> <td>Parking on-site</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Well kept grass</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Achieve Green Flag standards</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to parks, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 1070 2045 1279"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component of quality</th> <th>Proportion of possible total responses received</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>12%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>33%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>31%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>16%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Desirable	Clean and well maintained	Nature/biodiversity/conservation features	Flowers/ trees and shrubs	Parking on-site	Well kept grass		Achieve Green Flag standards		Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	12%	1	Cleanliness and maintenance	33%	4	Vegetation	31%	3	Ancillary accommodation	16%	2
Essential	Desirable																									
Clean and well maintained	Nature/biodiversity/conservation features																									
Flowers/ trees and shrubs	Parking on-site																									
Well kept grass																										
Achieve Green Flag standards																										
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting																								
Security and Safety	12%	1																								
Cleanliness and maintenance	33%	4																								
Vegetation	31%	3																								
Ancillary accommodation	16%	2																								

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Natural England highlights the need to conserve and protect the natural environment and promotes local community involvement and consultation. They also have a commitment to work with Local Authorities in developing Local Area Agreements (LAA) for improved community infrastructure to enhance access to high quality natural environments.</p>		
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	No local standard		
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	York: 43% good/44% average	Brighton: 50% good/27% average	Telford and Wrekin: 53% very good and good/ 46% average and poor
	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i></p> <p><i>A spacious site that encourages wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education and awareness and also informal recreation where appropriate.</i></p>		
Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated natural and semi-natural sites as their most frequently used open space – 31%)	<p>Highest rated aspirations: Clean and litter free (66%), nature features (58%) and footpaths (39%).</p> <p>When asked about the quality of natural and semi-natural sites, 19% of residents indicated that they experience significant litter problems and 18% also felt that dog fouling was very problematic. Other areas of concern were vandalism and graffiti, and the miss-use of the site with 41% and 35% respectively deeming these issues wither significant or at least a minor issue.</p>		
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Natural and semi-natural open space is the most regularly used typology within Windsor and Maidenhead, with 68% of residents visiting sites more than once a month and only 6% (the lowest out of all typologies) never visiting this type of open space provision.</p> <p>Findings from the household survey indicate that there is an overall perception that the quality of natural and semi-natural areas is good (68%), 27% indicated that the quality is average and only 5% stated the quality is poor. Across the individual analysis areas similar results are evident, with the lowest level of satisfaction in Windsor and Eton, where 7% of residents feel the quality of natural and semi-natural open space is average/poor. A commonly cited problem experienced by users of this typology was litter. The highest levels of satisfaction were in the southern wards with 78% of respondents indicating natural and semi natural areas are of good quality. The quality items that most residents cited as most satisfactory were</p>		

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p>parking and planted/grassed areas. The items that were deemed least satisfactory and should be addressed were toilets, provision of litter bins, seats and benches, cycle parking and dog related facilities (at least 15% of all respondents who use this typology most frequently indicated these items were unsatisfactory or very unsatisfactory).</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Consultations revealed that Braywick Nature Centre offers good parking, is well kept and in a good locations (and well signposted). There are benefits that derive from natural and semi natural sites and there are currently six successful designated nature reserves across the Borough (five of which are managed by the Council). The importance of maintaining the 15 hectares of natural area at Braywick is a priority.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>In so far as external consultees had any knowledge of this category of open space in the Borough, it was felt that standards were quite high. The National Trust felt that the standards of the three areas of common that they maintain in the Borough were quite high.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Parish councils felt that standards of quality were adequate for this typology.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consulations</u></p> <p>Few people seemed to be aware of the existence of Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space, other than a general perception of countryside areas accessible to the public being in reasonable condition.</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Clean and litter free	
	Nature/Conservation/Biodiversity features	
	Delineated footpaths	
	Good site access (disabled)	
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to natural and semi natural areas, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
Security and Safety	10.5%	2
Cleanliness and maintenance	24%	3
Vegetation	35%	4
Ancillary accommodation	10.1%	1
<p><i>Analysis suggests the improvement in quality of natural and semi-natural open space is considered to be more important than increasing its provision.</i></p>		

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION AMENITY GREEN SPACE		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management	
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	No standard	
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	York: 26% good/59% average	Brighton: 26% good/58% average
	Telford and Wrekin: 24% good/42% average	
	<i>PMP Quality Vision:</i> <i>An individual greens pace site that enhances the appearance of the local environment conveniently located close to housing that is easily accessible and is of reasonable size to accommodate informal play.</i>	
Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated amenity green space sites as their most frequently used open space – 1.4%)	<p>Amenity green space is one of the least frequently used typologies in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and 35% of respondents to the household survey indicated that they never use this type of open space. The highest rated aspirations of those who use amenity spaces were clean and litter free (100%), and flowers and trees planted (43%).</p> <p>The most significant problems were dog fouling, miss-use of sites and litter problems. Vandalism and graffiti was not seen as significant although 43% of respondents identified it as a minor problem.</p>	
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Consultation indicated that the quality of amenity areas is perceived to be good by 32%, average by 56%, and 13% as poor.</p> <p>The lowest levels of satisfaction were in Maidenhead and the northern wards, with 14% of respondents in both analysis areas citing amenity areas to be of poor quality. The highest levels of satisfaction are in analysis area 4, the southern wards, with 48% of respondents indicating that they are satisfied with the quality of amenity space in their locality.</p> <p>The quality items that most residents cited as most satisfactory were seats and benches and pathways. The items that were deemed least satisfactory and should subsequently be addressed were lighting, general maintenance and management, planted and grassed areas, and a ranger/monitoring service.</p>	
Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>It was suggested by officers that the Council may be adopting an easy option with their play strategy by</p>	

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

locating play areas and MUGAs on all open spaces. It is important to keep some areas informal and natural.

External Consultations

It would be unwise to infer too much from the perceptions of external consultees, who did not know the Borough well enough to comment about smaller open spaces within the Borough boundary.

Parish Councils

The quality of grounds maintenance was generally perceived as high. However, there were some comments which need addressing in relation to the quality of provision. The issue of vandalism and graffiti was cited as a problem, with some more minor concerns about litter. Signage was considered to be only at best average, thus not presenting a welcome to visitors.

Drop-In Consultations

People were generally satisfied with quality standards, although there are still some concerns about litter, graffiti and vandalism, notwithstanding the fact that there seems to have been an improvement in this area in the last five years.

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:	
	Essential	Desirable
	Clean and well maintained	Dog mess bins
	Suitable soft landscaping	
	Flowers/ trees and shrubs	
	Designed to enhance passive security	
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to amenity green spaces, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>	
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
Security and Safety	5%	1
Cleanliness and maintenance	34%	4
Vegetation	32%	3
Ancillary accommodation	6%	2

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>Criteria set out by the Fields in Trust in relation to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, a varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers.</p> <p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA are also relevant to play areas and include Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management</p> <p>CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti-social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment, and highlights that there is a better solution: invest in place making and improving public spaces to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space’s study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings.’ <i>CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces</i></p>		
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>Play Strategy 2007-10</p> <p>The document highlights the need for children to be physically active, ideally for at least 60 minutes per day, in an environment that provides the opportunity to experience risk taking in play, without unacceptable danger. The experience should allow the individual to develop their problem-solving, social, language, planning, construction, creativity, co-ordination, and negotiation skills (without an adult necessarily present).</p> <p>Specific qualitative improvements outlined in the Action Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appointing a Play Ranger by January 2008 to champion, co-ordinate and lead on the play strategy • improve play provision in identified localities 		
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	York: 25% good/46% average	Brighton: 37% good/45% average	Telford and Wrekin: 35% average/ 26% poor

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i></p> <p><i>A clean and litter free, well kept area with varied equipment for a range of age groups.</i></p>
<p>Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated play areas for children sites as their most frequently used open space – 15%)</p>	<p>15% of respondents to the household survey use play areas for children most frequently of all typologies. However, it is important to note that the level of use of children’s play areas demonstrated through the household survey may not be representative of the actual level of use due to the age of the majority of respondents. Only a small percentage of people under the age of 16 completed the household survey, therefore it is particularly important to consider all other consultation.</p> <p>Of those people stating they do use children’s play areas more frequently than any other type of open space, their highest rated aspirations are clean and litter free (79%), suitable facilities for young people (62%) and toilets on site (51%).</p> <p>Of those respondents who gave an opinion regarding the quality of children’s open space, safety and age of equipment, poor maintenance, and litter problems were viewed by most respondents as no problem. However, vandalism and graffiti (26%) and dog fouling (18%) were believed to be a significant problem experienced by users of this typology.</p>
<p>Consultation Household Survey - other</p>	<p>44% of respondents to the household survey identified the quality of children’s open space as both good and average. Across the individual analysis areas the majority of respondents regard the quality of children’s open space as average or good. The highest levels of discontent were in the rural northern analysis area (16% unsatisfied) and the highest level of satisfaction was in the southern wards analysis area (59% satisfied). This suggests that the quality of provision facilities across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is varying.</p> <p>Respondents indicated high levels of satisfaction with regard to play equipment, general maintenance and management, boundary definition, provision of bins for litter, pathways, and planted and grassed areas. Areas where respondents were least satisfied included the provision of toilets and seats and benches. Comments suggested that better equipment was required at Desborough; that there needs to be better general provision for disabled users and that further provision is required at Moor Park and Laggan Park.</p>
<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Several new play areas have been introduced across Windsor and Maidenhead over the last two years, including a site at Punt Hill that has attracted a large number of users. The facilities at Desborough Park have had limited investment and have subsequently deteriorated in quality (includes the changing rooms).</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

There is an over reliance on small but frequently used play areas and the Council need to provide larger sites that offer a wide range of facilities.

External Consultations

Consultees not informed enough to provide an opinion

Parish Councils

Quality standards were felt to be a little below those for most other open spaces, although they are still perceived to be good.

School Survey

The majority of respondents indicated that the favourite activity to do with their free time was 'hanging outdoor with friends' (36%) and 'playing sport' (24%). 75% of respondents identified a specific place near their home that they could meet or play.

The main reasons for not using open spaces were 'they're not very good quality' (15%), 'things aren't there that I want to use or do' (10%), and 'I'm not interested' (10%). Play areas were the third most frequented typology (5%), behind parks (50%), and outdoor sport facilities (9%). 45% of respondents indicated that they visited their most popular site more than once an week and 27% visited the site once a week. The main reasons for using this site were 'to meet friends' (30%), for a kick about/play (19%), and 'it's just somewhere to go' (19%). The features deemed most desirable at these sites were 'its close to my house' (31%), 'it's a good place to meet friends' (25%) and 'it's free to use' (19%). The least desirable features of these sites were 'dog muck' (21%), 'the play facilities are boring' (18%), and 'it's too dirty' (15%).

52% of respondents suggested that they feel unsafe at certain open spaces. Key sites that were identified as being unsafe were in south Datchet and north towards Slough. It was the nature of people that congregate at these sites that was the main cause of concern so there is a need for greater on site supervision. It was suggested that safety could be improved by 'travelling to sites with friends' (23%), cameras/CCTVs (22%) and better lighting (22%).

Most popular sports facilities visited outside of school are football pitches (25%), tennis courts (19%), outside basketball courts (12%) and rugby pitches (8%).

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p>Most popular sites were Datchet Recreation Ground, Upton Court Park, and Windsor Home Park. A large number of respondents identified their favourite sites being outside of the borough boundaries in Colnbrook, Langley and Slough (Maplin Park).</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>Quality standards were viewed as adequate; although it was felt that play equipment could be a little more imaginative. There seem to be some perceived problems relating to litter, vandalism and graffiti.</p>														
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 520 2045 730"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 520 1350 555">Essential</th> <th data-bbox="1350 520 2045 555">Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 555 1350 624">Apply Fields in Trust (FIT) standards</td> <td data-bbox="1350 555 2045 624">Maximise range of play opportunities for children, disabled users etc</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 624 1350 659">Clean and well maintained</td> <td data-bbox="1350 624 2045 659">Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 659 1350 694"></td> <td data-bbox="1350 659 2045 694">Development of the play ranger service</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 694 1350 730"></td> <td data-bbox="1350 694 2045 730">Suitable soft landscaping</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Desirable	Apply Fields in Trust (FIT) standards	Maximise range of play opportunities for children, disabled users etc	Clean and well maintained	Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating		Development of the play ranger service		Suitable soft landscaping				
	Essential	Desirable													
	Apply Fields in Trust (FIT) standards	Maximise range of play opportunities for children, disabled users etc													
Clean and well maintained	Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating														
	Development of the play ranger service														
	Suitable soft landscaping														
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to play areas for children, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 866 2045 1077"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 866 1115 935">Component of quality</th> <th data-bbox="1115 866 1579 935">Proportion of possible total responses received</th> <th data-bbox="1579 866 2045 935">Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 935 1115 970">Security and Safety</td> <td data-bbox="1115 935 1579 970">5%</td> <td data-bbox="1579 935 2045 970">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 970 1115 1005">Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td data-bbox="1115 970 1579 1005">32%</td> <td data-bbox="1579 970 2045 1005">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 1005 1115 1040">Vegetation</td> <td data-bbox="1115 1005 1579 1040">15%</td> <td data-bbox="1579 1005 2045 1040">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 1040 1115 1077">Ancillary accommodation</td> <td data-bbox="1115 1040 1579 1077">18%</td> <td data-bbox="1579 1040 2045 1077">3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Analysis highlights the need for innovative and imaginative provision of facilities for children. Community involvement from children in the provision of play facilities was also considered to be particularly important.</i></p>	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	5%	1	Cleanliness and maintenance	32%	4	Vegetation	15%	2	Ancillary accommodation	18%	3
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting													
Security and Safety	5%	1													
Cleanliness and maintenance	32%	4													
Vegetation	15%	2													
Ancillary accommodation	18%	3													

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

**WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION
PROVISION FOR TEENAGERS AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

**National Standards and/or
Benchmarks**

Fields in Trust guidance relating to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers.

GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.

CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti-social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment. Investment: invest in place making and improving public spaces should be used to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space's study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings.' *CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces*

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

<p>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</p>	<p>Play Strategy 2007-10</p> <p>The document highlights the need for children to be physically active, ideally for at least 60 minutes per day, in an environment that provides the opportunity to experience risk taking in play, without unacceptable danger. The experience should allow the individual to develop their problem-solving, social, language, planning, construction, creativity, co-ordination, and negotiation skills (without an adult necessarily present).</p> <p>Specific qualitative improvements outlined in the Action Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appointing a Play Ranger by January 2008 to champion, co-ordinate and lead on the play strategy • improve play provision in identified localities by June • improve the play areas at Desborough Park by April 2008 • installation of floodlights at Vansittart Skate Park by January 2008 • sessional community play rangers by July 2007. 		
<p>Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction</p>	<p>York: 64% poor</p>	<p>Brighton: 52% poor</p>	<p>Telford and Wrekin: 39% poor</p>
<p>Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated teenage facilities as their most frequently used open space – 0.4%)</p>	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i> <i>A clean and litter free, well kept area with varied equipment for all ages including a shelter or 'hang out' area for teenagers.</i></p> <p>A small minority of respondents to the household survey use teenage facilities most frequently of all typologies. However, it is important to note that the level of use demonstrated through the household survey may not be representative of the actual level of use due to the age of the majority of respondents (86% of respondents stated that they do not use teenage facilities). Only a small percentage of people under the age of 16 completed the household survey, therefore it is important to consider all other consultations across the Borough.</p>		
<p>Consultation Household Survey - other</p>	<p>Overall, the quality of teenage facilities is rated average/ poor by 89% of respondents; however the majority of respondents (52%) indicate that the quality of provision for teenagers is poor.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas, the modal response regarding the quality of teenage facilities was</p>		

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p>poor. Residents in Maidenhead portrayed the most dissatisfaction, with 56% of respondents stating the quality of facilities as poor. General comments echoed the perception of teenage open space as being of poor quality and there was a general perception of a lack of policing around teenage facilities, especially in areas such as Cookham. Other general comments identified Punt Hill as susceptible to vandalism and better lighting being required. The variety of provision was also deemed to be poor. The analysis area with the highest level of satisfaction was Windsor and Eton (17% citing provision as good).</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Alexander Gardens has a privately owned skate park which has become a successful and well used facility. Another new skate park by Vansittart Road has recently been built and there are plans to install floodlighting. The facility is supervised and has CCTV in place. The site was provided by a working group and is locked at night to protect the equipment. New investment in Kidwells Park has provided a new skate park, children's play area and netball/football/and tennis facilities within a multi use area. The new teenscenes in Windsor and Maidenhead, including the skate parks are seen as limited and there needs to be a larger, centralised facility to cater for residents aged 13-19.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>No informed judgement possible.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Parish councils felt provision to be good in this category, although not as good as for most other open spaces, which were considered to be very good in many cases.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>There was a general feeling that better provision should be made for this age category, but that nevertheless, there were some problems of vandalism and graffiti.</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Essential</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Clean, safe and well maintained at all times</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Apply FIT standards</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provision of seats</td> </tr> <tr> <td>User consultation for all new provision</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Clean, safe and well maintained at all times	Apply FIT standards	Provision of seats	User consultation for all new provision	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Maximise range of play opportunities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Development of the play ranger service</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desirable	Maximise range of play opportunities	Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating	Development of the play ranger service						
Essential																	
Clean, safe and well maintained at all times																	
Apply FIT standards																	
Provision of seats																	
User consultation for all new provision																	
Desirable																	
Maximise range of play opportunities																	
Provision of ancillary facilities eg toilets, seating																	
Development of the play ranger service																	
	<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to facilities for young people, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component of quality</th> <th>Proportion of possible total responses received</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>50%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>13%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>14%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	0%	1	Cleanliness and maintenance	50%	4	Vegetation	13%	2	Ancillary accommodation	14%	3
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting															
Security and Safety	0%	1															
Cleanliness and maintenance	50%	4															
Vegetation	13%	2															
Ancillary accommodation	14%	3															
	<p><i>Analysis highlights the need for innovative and imaginative provision of facilities for teenagers. Community involvement from teenagers in the provision of facilities was also considered to be particularly important.</i></p>																

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Fields in Trust – quality of provision could include gradients, ancillary accommodation, planting and community safety.</p>	
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>RBWM Community Strategy 2007-13</p> <p>The Borough are actively promoting a healthy workforce by encouraging the promotion of participation in sports and recreational activities – the main focus of this is by ensuring good access to sites.</p> <p>Berkshire Structure Plan 2001-1016:</p> <p>S1 states that developments should contribute towards improving access to leisure facilities by promoting the use of footpaths and cycle ways.</p> <p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy GB1 – In regard to the green belt, PPG2 allows for the development of essential outdoor sport and recreational facilities, which preserve the openness of the area – necessary infrastructure required to support an outdoor sports facility may have an adverse effect on the green belt and cause to proposal to be unviable.</p> <p>RBWM Playing Pitch Strategy</p> <p>There is currently an undersupply of pitches across the Borough. It recommends that all pitches should be protected within the LDF. Pitches should only be developed if they are proved through the Playing Pitch Strategy and PPG17 methodology that they do not provide a valuable local amenity</p> <p>The Policy promotes the increase in availability of school pitches for community use.</p>	
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	York: 23% good/50% average	Telford and Wrekin: 23% good/39% average
	Brighton: 23% good/55% average	

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i></p> <p><i>A comprehensively well planned sports facility site that will provide an effective use for the community, with good quality surfaces and appropriate ancillary accommodation including changing accommodation and car parking.</i></p>
<p>Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated outdoor sports facility sites as their most frequently used open space – 4%)</p>	<p>Of those people indicating that they use this open space most frequently the highest rated aspirations were: car parking facilities (70%), clean and litter free (65%), toilets (55%) and good sports facilities (50%). This highlights the importance of the ancillary accommodation as well as the quality of the actual facility.</p> <p>A significant proportion of residents have experienced minor problems in relation to vandalism and graffiti (50%), and litter problems (45%). In contrast, miss-use of the site, poor maintenance and dog fouling were not considered problematic. The general consensus is that few significant problems exist with outdoor sport facilities in the Borough.</p>
<p>Consultation Household Survey - other</p>	<p>Responses from the household survey show mixed opinions concerning the quality of outdoor sports facilities. 50% of respondents rate their quality as average, 19% poor and 30% good. This may be reflective of varying quality around the borough.</p> <p>The individual analysis areas provide similar results with most of respondents in all areas considering the quality of outdoor sports facilities to be average. The highest levels of dissatisfaction were in the northern wards (28% indicating poor quality) and the southern wards (21% indicating poor quality), demonstrating that there is a perception that needs to be addressed in the rural analysis areas.</p> <p>General comments identified that a demand exists for sport pitches in Dedworth, a need to address flooding of pitches around the Thames Basin, and the need for designated off-road mountain biking areas to cater for the Windsor Great Park Off Road Mountain Bike Group.</p>
<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Boyn Hill Cricket is sighted as being a high quality facility. It is proposed that investment in the running track at Braywick is required. The athletic facilities at Eton (established in partnership with Slough Council) are very good although would benefit from greater public exposure as they have the capacity for more users. Windsor Boys School has a full size synthetic turf pitch (STP) and good multi-use outdoor space including the cricket pitch and rowing facilities. The tennis courts and bowls green at Alexander Gardens are in need of additional investment.</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

The sport pitches at Home Park are currently overused although it is important to maintain their formal sport focus.

External Consultations

Little knowledge of these facilities on which to make a judgement.

Parish Councils

These were considered good in terms of quality rather than very good.

Drop-In Consolations

Standards were felt to be adequate rather than good. There seems to be a problem with sports pitch surfaces being somewhat uneven in places, and possibly compacted from overuse.

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Apply relevant NGB specifications	
	Clean/ litter free and well maintained	
	Level surface/ good drainage	
	Changing facilities	
	Car Parking	
	Toilets	
	<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to outdoor sports facilities, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>	
	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received
	Security and Safety	17%
	Cleanliness and maintenance	28%
	Vegetation	18%
	Ancillary accommodation	20%

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION ALLOTMENTS			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	No existing local quality standards.		
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	York: 42% good/45% average	Brighton: 26% good/55% average	Telford and Wrekin: 23% good/42% average
	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i></p> <p><i>A site that encourages sustainable development, bio-diversity and healthy living objectives with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs including individual allotment sheds and clearly marked pathways and allotment plots.</i></p>		
Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated allotment sites as their most frequently used open space – 2%)	<p>Only 2% of respondents to the household survey stated they use allotments most frequently of all open space in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. 86% of respondents also indicated they do not use an allotment.</p> <p>Of those residents who do use an allotment, many people commented on how they enjoy the tranquillity of the site and the social element of working on an allotment, but believe some small sites can be intimidating and if new sites are built they should be located more conveniently (possibly as additions to current parks and gardens).</p> <p>Residents who currently use an allotment indicated that clean and litter free sites and availability of toilets were of particular importance to them.</p>		
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>The majority of respondents (53%) consider the quality of allotments to be average. 39% regard their quality as good and 9% poor.</p> <p>The individual analysis areas mirror the borough-wide results and the greatest dissatisfaction is located in the northern wards, where 19% of residents state the quality of allotments is poor. The highest levels of</p>		

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

	satisfaction are in Windsor and Eton where 53% of respondents identify the quality of their allotments as good.
Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>The allotments run by associations and parishes are generally well maintained. There is still the opportunity to better coordinate the supply of sites and address the large waiting lists in Maidenhead.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>Consultees did not have enough information to make an informed judgement.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Standards were felt to be good. This may reflect the fact that allotment holders frequently have to wait for a plot to become available, so that those who do own a plot tend to be keen to keep them in good condition.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>Given the limited nature of usage, people were generally unaware as to whether allotment sites maintained good standards of quality.</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>																
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Essential</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Clean/ litter free and well maintained</td> <td>Toilets</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Safe and secure</td> <td>Sustainable practices including the use of water</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Desirable	Clean/ litter free and well maintained	Toilets	Safe and secure	Sustainable practices including the use of water										
Essential	Desirable																
Clean/ litter free and well maintained	Toilets																
Safe and secure	Sustainable practices including the use of water																
	<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to allotments, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>																
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Component of quality</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Proportion of possible total responses received</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>15%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>27%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>25%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>7%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	15%	2	Cleanliness and maintenance	27%	4	Vegetation	25%	3	Ancillary accommodation	7%	1
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting															
Security and Safety	15%	2															
Cleanliness and maintenance	27%	4															
Vegetation	25%	3															
Ancillary accommodation	7%	1															

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION CIVIC SPACES	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	NONE
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	No existing local quality standards.
Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated civic spaces as their most frequently used open space – 0.2%)	<p>Of those respondents who stated they use civic spaces most frequently, their highest rated aspirations are clean/ litter free areas with high quality planted areas.</p> <p>Significant problems experienced by users were litter problems, vandalism and graffiti, poor maintenance, miss-use of the site and dog fouling</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Consultation from the household survey indicates the majority of respondents (61%) view civic spaces to be of average quality. However, 23% rate this typology as good quality and 16% poor quality.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas results are consistent and the area with the highest level of satisfaction is in Windsor and Eton, where 32% of respondents feel the quality of civic spaces is good. The lowest level of satisfaction is in analysis area 4 with 18% rating this typology as poor.</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Civic spaces are considered to be adequate.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>No evidence forthcoming in this category.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>No specific details provided by parish councils.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>Most people professing an opinion were positive about the quality of Civic Space in Windsor and</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	Maidenhead, and felt that standards were high.	
	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:	
	Essential	Desirable
	Clean/litter free and well maintained	Well cut grass
	Planted areas	
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to civic spaces, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>	
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
Security and Safety	0%	1
Cleanliness and maintenance	40%	4
Vegetation	25%	3
Ancillary accommodation	14%	2

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION CHURCHYARDS AND CEMETERIES	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	NONE
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	NONE
Benchmarking	<i>PMP Quality Vision: A well-maintained, clean site with long-term burial capacity, provision of seating areas and varied vegetation that provides a sanctuary for wildlife in areas devoid of greenspace and one that encompasses bio-diversity.</i>
Consultation (Household Survey –	The highest rated aspirations of those people who use churchyards and cemeteries most frequently are: well kept grass, clean and litter free, flowers and trees, and car parking facilities.

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

<p>aspirations of those that rated indoor sports facilities as their most frequently used open space – 2%)</p>	<p>Factors considered problematic by users of this typology are vandalism and graffiti and miss-use of sites. Maintenance of the site was perceived as positive by the majority of respondents.</p>
<p>Consultation Household Survey - other</p>	<p>58% of respondents rate the quality of cemeteries and churchyards to be of average quality. However, a significant amount of respondents also rate their quality to be good (39%). Only 3% of respondents perceived church and cemeteries to be of poor quality.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas similar results are portrayed, with the majority of residents in each analysis area stating the quality of cemeteries and churchyards is average. The highest level of discontent was in Windsor and Eton (3.6% perceive sites as poor) although this is relatively low.</p> <p>Specific references were made to the accessibility of toilets at sites and ensuring they were unlocked when the site is open.</p>
<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Cemeteries and churchyards are generally well maintained and offer a variety of amenity uses to the community, and their use should be promoted, especially in rural parishes.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>No information available.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Standards were very good in this category, with no major quality problems.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consultations</u></p> <p>As might be expected, knowledge relating to the quality of churchyards and cemeteries was limited, but what knowledge there was indicated that standards were high in the Borough.</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Essential</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Flowers/ trees and shrubs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clean/ litter free and well maintained</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Well kept grass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Flowers/ trees and shrubs	Clean/ litter free and well maintained	Well kept grass	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Parking</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desirable	Parking									
Essential																	
Flowers/ trees and shrubs																	
Clean/ litter free and well maintained																	
Well kept grass																	
Desirable																	
Parking																	
	<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to cemeteries and churchyards, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Component of quality</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Proportion of possible total responses received</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>10%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>26%</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>30%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>11%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	10%	1	Cleanliness and maintenance	26%	3	Vegetation	30%	4	Ancillary accommodation	11%	2
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting															
Security and Safety	10%	1															
Cleanliness and maintenance	26%	3															
Vegetation	30%	4															
Ancillary accommodation	11%	2															

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD– SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION GREEN CORRIDORS	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Countryside Agency (now a key partner in Natural England)- what the user should expect to find is i) a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation; ii) ground not soft enough to allow a horse or cycle to sink into it; iii) a path on unvegetated natural surfaces.</p> <p>Natural England, the Countryside Agency and the British Heart Foundation advocate providing a network of local health walks to promote the 'Walking the Way to Health Initiative', something that can easily be enhanced through the provision of quality green corridors and natural linkages with other open spaces.</p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	No existing local quality standards.
Benchmarking	<p><i>PMP Quality Vision:</i></p> <p><i>A quiet, safe and secure, well-signposted route that provides appropriate travelling surfaces and varied vegetation that links major open spaces together.</i></p>
Consultation (Household Survey – aspirations of those that rated green corridors as their most frequently used open space – 2%)	<p>Of those respondents who stated they use green corridors most frequently, their highest rated aspirations are: clean and litter free (58%), natural features (50%) and good site access (42%).</p> <p>The most significant problems experienced by users of these sites were poor maintenance (17%), litter problems (17%) and dog fouling (17%). Litter problems (67%) and vandalism and graffiti (58%) were seen as by most people as minor problems. The category with most people sighting no 'problem' was with safety and age of equipment.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Overall, 48% of respondents to the household survey stated that the quality of green corridors in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is average, with 34% regarding their quality as good and 18% as poor.</p> <p>Similar results are shown in all individual analysis areas; the highest level of dissatisfied respondents is in analysis area 3, with 19% stating that green corridor quality is poor.</p> <p>Within the general comments, residents expressed safety concerns as the main barrier to using this type of</p>

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)	<p>open space with the lack of additional lighting being the main issue.</p> <p><u>Internal Consultations</u> There are reported issues with the miss-use of tow paths around Eton Bridge with visitors from outside the area bringing BBQs and bins not being used suitably. Several of the new signs in the area have been vandalised. It has been proposed that a specific BBQ area is required that have sufficient policing.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u> There was a low level of awareness about the state of Green Corridors in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u> There is little evidence of the provision of Green Corridors at a parish level.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consulations</u> Most people acknowledged the need for Green Corridors, but were unaware of their presence.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX L – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:	
	Essential	Desirable
	Footpaths	Routes suitable for shared use (pedestrians/cyclists)
	Clean/ litter free	
	Nature/ conservation/biodiversity features	
	Designed to enhance passive security	
	Sympathetic signage/ way marking	
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to green corridors, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>	
	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received
Security and Safety	16%	2
Cleanliness and maintenance	20%	3
Vegetation	29%	4
Ancillary accommodation	7%	1

APPENDIX M

ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Setting Accessibility Standards – Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council

Field	Comment
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. Natural England make recommendations of access for 'Natural Greenspace'
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards
Other Local Authorities Standards (set by PMP)	These are figures detailing other local standards set by PMP within other green space and open space projects and provide another comparison benchmark when setting local standards for other Local Authorities. York, Brighton and Telford and Wrekin have been selected as according to the Office of National Statistic's 'Nearest Neighbour' these local authorities have a high statistical similarity to Windsor and Maidenhead (based on demographics, population splits, socio-economic status, geographical area, retail and residential composition etc.). Surrey Heath, Elmbridge, and Epsom and Ewell have been included as they are located geographically close to the RBWM.
Consultation (Household Survey - establish 75% threshold catchments)	Some statistical information that will come from the household questionnaire - need to take the 75% level as recommended by PPG 17 Companion Guide (ie from a list of responses - what is the time 75% are willing to travel)
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local standard for discussion and approval by the client - standard should be in time and/or distance
PMP Justification	PMP reasoning and justification for the local standard that has been recommended
CLIENT APPROVAL	Client to approve local standard before analysis undertaken - any changes in standards at a later date during the project will impact on re-doing calculations, analysis and report - the standards drive the analysis
LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD	Final Local Standard agreed and approved that will be stated in the report and used for analysis purposes - standard should be in time and/or distance

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Accessibility standards – assumptions

Walking	All areas	average of 3mph
---------	-----------	-----------------

Conversion (walking)

Time (mins)	Miles	metres	Factor Reduction	metres (straight line to be mapped)
5	0.25	400	40%	240
10	0.5	800	40%	480
15	0.75	1200	40%	720
20	1	1600	40%	960
25	1.25	2000	40%	1200
30	1.5	2400	40%	1440

Assumption

National Guidelines reduce actual distances into straight line distances by a 40% reduction. This is to allow for the fact that routes to open spaces are not straight-line distances but more complex. The 40% reduction is based on robust research by the NPFA in numerous areas using a representative sample of pedestrian routes.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Parishes

Accessibility standards were assessed in two ways:

1. Accessibility assessment
2. Travel times in minutes dependant upon mode

The accessibility assessment for all parishes is reproduced below. Travel times were by typology, and are therefore included in each category for all parishes.

Accessibility Assessment

Category: General

Includes:

Entrance to all sites
Availability of sites
Value to user

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	
Wraysbury	Very good	
Bisham	Very good	
Sunninghill and Ascot	Average	But value to user good
White Waltham	Very good/good	Availability very good
Horton	Good	
Cookham	Very good	But entrances average
Eton	Average	
Bray	Very good/good	Opening times very good
Old Windsor	No response	
Datchet	No response	

No problems here, although the issue of value relating to an “if charged” criterion probably does not apply, therefore value is high as open spaces are free at the point of use in the parishes.

Category: Distances and Catchment Areas

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Includes:

- Provision (public transport)
- Distance from population (public transport)
- Provision (cycleways)
- Distance from population (cycling)
- Distance from population (walking)

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	All categories very good
Wraysbury	Good	But provision of public transport and cycleways average
Bisham	N/A	Apart from walking distance classed as “good”
Sunninghill and Ascot	Average	Distance for cycling/walking good; provision of public transport/cycleways poor
White Waltham	Average	Distance for cycling/walking good; distance from public transport poor; provision of public transport poor
Horton	Average	But provision of public transport/cycleways very poor
Cookham	Good	Distance of public transport/cycling very good; provision of public transport poor; provision of cycleways very poor
Eton	Good	But Distance from public transport average; and provision very poor
Bray	Good	
Old Windsor	No comment	
Datchet	No Comment	

Issues relate to the provision of public transport and cycleways.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Category: Signage and Promotion

Includes:

Signage
Information

Parish	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	
Wraysbury	Good	
Bisham	Good	
Sunninghill and Ascot	Good	
White Waltham	Good	
Horton	Good	
Cookham	Very good/average	Information average
Eton	Average/poor	Information poor
Bray	Good	
Old Windsor	No comment	
Datchet	No comment	

No major problems in this area identified

Overall Accessibility Rating

Category: Overall Quality Rating	Average Score	Comments
Sunningdale	Very good	
Wraysbury	Good	Public transport links to National Trust park at Ankerwyke poor
Bisham	Good	
Sunninghill and Ascot	Average	
White Waltham	Good	
Horton	Good	
Cookham	Very good	
Eton	Average	
Bray	Good	
Old Windsor	No comments	
Datchet	No comments	

No overriding concerns – seems to mirror earlier results on accessibility.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS PARKS AND GARDENS			
Definition	Includes urban parks, formal gardens and country parks. Parks usually contain a variety of facilities, and may have one of more of the other types of open space within them. Their primary purpose is informal recreation.		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	No national standards		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999)</p> <p>In accordance with the National Playing Field Association an accessibility standard of 400m has been set as the maximum distance any resident should have to walk in order to access a form of open space</p> <p>RBWM Local Plan (Adopted 2003)</p> <p>Policy T7 – Addresses the need to provide a network of desirable cycle routes throughout the Borough to allow easy access between open spaces</p>		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	York: 20 minute walk time	Brighton: 15 minutes walk time	Telford and Wrekin: 15 minute walk time (Urban), 20 minute drive time (Rural)
	Spelthorne: 5 minute walk time	Elmbridge: 10 minute walk time	Epsom and Ewell: 14 minutes walk

Household Consultation

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS

42% of respondents to the household survey use parks and gardens more frequently than any other typology in Windsor and Maidenhead. Of these respondents, a majority (52%) walk to this type of open space, with 36% indicating they travel by car.

When asked how far they currently travel to use parks and gardens, travel times were split between three responses, between 5 and 10 minutes (36%), between 11 and 15 minutes (27%) and less than 5 minutes (22%).

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - METHOD OF TRAVEL

Results from the household survey indicate 71% of respondents expect to walk to parks and gardens and 25% favour driving. Across the individual analysis areas similar results are portrayed, with the majority of respondents in all areas stating walking as the preferred method of travel. However, in the rural northern analysis area a significantly higher proportion of residents (37%) indicate a preference to travel by car to access this type of open space. This indicates that there is an acceptance by residents in this rural area that parks may not be located in close proximity to their homes.

For those respondents who prefer to walk to parks and gardens a journey time of 5 – 10 minutes is expected (61%). When travelling by car, the majority of respondents (61%) also expected the journey to take 5 –10 minutes. Results across the analysis areas are consistent with the borough wide results. The two rural analysis areas have the highest proportion of resident users that walk to a park who expect a journey time of over 16 minutes (27% northern and 23% southern), suggesting poorer accessibility to parks and gardens within the rural areas of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

Borough wide results show that the 75th percentile of respondents are willing to travel for 15 minutes by foot to access this typology, with the modal response being 10 minutes. This 75th percentile figure is consistent across all of the analysis areas, with the exception of the rural northern wards (analysis area 3), where 20 minutes was recorded, indicating that respondents expect to have to walk further to reach parks and gardens.

For those who prefer to travel by car, the 75th percentile of respondents would be willing to travel for up to 15 minutes to access a park or garden in Windsor and Maidenhead, with the modal response rate being 10 minutes. Within the individual analysis areas differing results are evident. Respondents in both urban analysis areas, Maidenhead (area 1) and Windsor and Eton (area 2) have a relatively high propensity to travel further by car (75th percentile of 15 minutes and 20 minutes respectively) compared to analysis area 3, the northern wards (10 minutes) and analysis area 4, the southern wards (10 minutes).

There were 41 respondents who stated that parks and gardens is their most frequented typology and who currently access the sites by car but would actually expect to walk to the sites. Of these respondents 32% were from analysis area 1, Maidenhead, 24% from analysis area 2, Windsor and Eton, 24% from analysis area 3, the northern wards, and 20% from analysis area 4, the southern parishes.

<p>Other Consultations</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>The consultation with officers highlighted that several parks are poorly located. It was felt that both Kidwells Park and Grenfell Park in Maidenhead had limited access due to dual carriageways and railway lines and that there insufficient open space networks to link these sites with the town centre.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>There was a general view, insofar as external consultees felt that they had sufficient knowledge to comment, that accessibility to Parks and Gardens was good in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Provision was considered to be about right in this category, although there was some confusion as to what a park or garden meant in the context of a parish. Most spaces are amenity green spaces or recreation grounds, with access to the two towns cited as appropriate to reach a park or garden.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>Most people felt that access to parks and gardens was good, particularly those living in the towns of Windsor and Maidenhead.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>10 minutes walk (urban) 10 minutes drive (rural)</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

PMP Justification	<p>Consultation illustrates an emphasis in favour of walking to local parks and gardens both in terms of current travel patterns and aspirations of local residents.</p> <p>The standard for urban areas is set at 10 minutes drive time to local parks and gardens, based on the 75% threshold of those respondents from the rural analysis of the Borough wide (as advocated in the PPG17 companion guide). While this still leaves gaps in provision across the borough it is important that open space opportunities are exploited where natural and semi natural and amenity green space can offer park features, especially in the rural north and south .</p> <p>Given that parks tend to be larger more strategic facilities offering a range of activities it would not be realistic to expect this type of facility within a shorter walking time and also within each village, therefore, a drive time of 10 minutes has been set for the rural areas, in light of the findings from the household survey. The 75% threshold for all those that prefer to drive across all analysis areas is 15 minutes. The standard is therefore aspirational and should realistically be achieved.</p> <p>Setting separate accessibility standards is reflective of the fact the current quantity of provision is deemed to be satisfactory. All those within the urban areas of Maidenhead and Windsor and Eton should be able to access a park within a 10 minute walk time. This is reflective of consultation findings and the 75th threshold. It is suggested that the Council should be pursuing improvements to the accessibility of the urban for rural residents (such as public transport networks or cycleways etc), offering an approach that facilitates the usage of these areas and increases their value to all residents.</p> <p>Setting a standard at this level will enable the Council to identify areas that do not have sufficient access to sites and explore the opportunities of investing in other typologies to provide park-style facilities. The standards will also be representative of resident's propensity for travel to this typology and ensure that any relocation of current sites enhance the value of this open space.</p>
--------------------------	---

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD COUNCIL– SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL OPEN SPACE	
Definition	Includes publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (e.g. downlands, commons, meadows), wetlands and wastelands.
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>Natural England’s Natural Green space Standard (ANGSt) recommends at least 2 ha of accessible natural green space per 1,000 people based on no-one living more than: 300m from nearest natural green space / 2km from a site of 20ha / 5km from a site of 100ha / 10km from a site of 500ha. Woodland Trust Access Standards recommend that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size and that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people’s homes</p> <p>Natural England have a commitment to champion preventative health solutions in the natural environment and have adopted an objective of providing accessible natural space within 300 metres (or 5 minutes walk) of every home in England for exercise, relaxation and wellbeing. http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/pdf/campaigns/Health_card.pdf</p> <p>The Woodland Trust proposes the following accessibility standards for England:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Accessible woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.18% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m • 55.18% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Inaccessible woodland (if opened to public)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra 26.08% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m • Extra 26.74% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

<p>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</p>	<p>No existing local accessibility standards.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust identifies the Borough as offering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.89% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m • 60.15% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km Inaccessible woodland (if opened to public) • Extra 34.67% of the population with access to 2ha+ wood within 500m • Extra 37.54% of the population with access to 20ha+ wood within 4km <p>The following provision is required to meet standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59.44% of population require new woodland for access to 2ha+ within 500m (minimum additional provision of 164 hectares) • 2.31% of population require new woodland for access to 20ha+ within 4km (minimum additional provision of 20 hectares) 		
<p>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</p>	<p>York: 15 minute walk time</p>	<p>Brighton: 15 minutes walk time</p>	<p>Telford and Wrekin: 10 minute walk time</p>
	<p>Spelthorne: 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>Elmbridge: 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>Epsom and Ewell: 19 minutes walk</p>

	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u></p> <p>Natural and semi-natural open space is the second most popular typology in the Royal Borough of Maidenhead and Windsor, with 31% of residents stating they use it more frequently than any other open space. Within this group of regular natural and semi natural open space users, walking is the most common mode of travel used to access sites (55%). Using the car is second with 34%. Travel times of current users were evenly distributed over three timeframes; 0-5 minutes (32%), 5-10 minutes (28%), and 10-15 minutes (25%).</p>
<p>Household Consultation</p>	<p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u></p> <p>Similar to the patterns exhibited by regular users, 66% of respondents expect to walk and 26% expect to travel by car to natural and semi-natural open space.</p> <p>Of those who would expect to walk to a natural and semi natural open space, 56% would be willing to travel between 5-10 minutes. Of those respondents who would prefer to drive, 61% expect a journey to take between 5 and 10 minutes. All of these figures are consistent across all of the analysis areas.</p> <p>It can be calculated that the 75th percentile of the total population would be willing to travel 15 minutes on foot to this type of open space (The modal response is a 10 minute walk time). Analysis of the four individual analysis areas shows identical results in terms of the 75% threshold and the modal response for walking. In terms of the 75th percentile for accessing the sites by car the time is 15 minutes for all areas except analysis area 4, the southern wards, which is 10 minutes.</p> <p>There were 51 respondents who stated that natural and semi natural is their most frequented typology and who currently access the sites by car but would actually expect to walk to the sites. Of these respondents 31% were from analysis area 1, Maidenhead, 18% from analysis area 2, Windsor and Eton, 27% from analysis area 3, the northern wards, and 11% from analysis area 4, the southern parishes. This identifies Maidenhead as the analysis area where people are most amenable to change from accessing natural and semi natural areas by car to walking and further strategies should identify ways of facilitating this.</p>

<p>Other Consultations</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>It was deemed by officers as being vital that nature reserves were promoted although it is important that the biodiversity is protected. Access to other natural and semi-natural areas is poor in certain rural areas and requires further strategic planning of the public rights of way.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>There was a general feeling that the residents of Windsor and Maidenhead had ready access to Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space. There were some comments indicating that linkages could be improved in rural areas (see Greenway comments)</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Provision was felt to be about right, with access by car and on foot to large tracts of accessible Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space. It should be noted that there was little mention of accessible links by bicycle in rural areas.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>Comments were flavoured by the fact that people felt that there was a great deal of accessible countryside available around the Borough, which made the need for absolute accessibility standards in this category less urgent.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>15 minutes walk time</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

PMP Justification

When identifying preferred methods of transport, local consultation highlights the split in opinion regarding whether natural and semi natural sites should be accessed by walking or driving (26% of respondents would travel by car, whilst 66% of people stated that they would walk). To a certain extent, this will relate to the varying size and function of spaces within each locality.

An assessment of the 75% threshold level Borough wide suggests that residents are willing to walk up to 15 minutes to a natural and semi natural open space. The modal response time was 10 minutes and although current usage patterns show 25% of residents currently travel between 10-15 minutes to access natural and semi natural sites.

A drive time standard would produce a significantly larger distance threshold than a walk time standard. PPG17 states that higher thresholds may be appropriate if there is no realistic possibility of sufficient new provision to allow lower thresholds to be achievable, but can result in levels of provision that are too low and may not meet some local needs. In the context of the local consultation findings regarding the quantity of provision (22% think that there is not enough as opposed to only 10% who think there is more than enough) and given the importance of facilitating everyday contact with nature, a standard based on a walk time is recommended as this will help to deliver a greater number of localised natural and semi natural spaces.

Of the respondents who identified natural and semi natural sites as their most frequented, 31% were from analysis area 1, Maidenhead, 18% from analysis area 2, Windsor and Eton, 27% from analysis area 3, the northern wards, and 11% from analysis area 4, the southern parishes. This identifies Maidenhead as the analysis area where people are most amenable to change from accessing natural and semi natural areas by car to walking and further strategies should identify ways of facilitating this.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS AMENITY GREEN SPACE			
Definition	Most commonly but not exclusively found in housing areas. Includes informal recreation green spaces and village greens.		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	No national standards		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	No existing local accessibility standards.		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	York: 5 minute walk time	Brighton: 10 minutes walk time	Telford and Wrekin: 10 minute walk time
	Spelthorne: 5 minute walk time	Elmbridge: 10 minute walk time	Epsom and Ewell: 9 minutes walk

<p>Household Consultation</p>	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u> A small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (1.4%), it is therefore difficult to produce sound analysis on current usage patterns based on the sample size provided, a more detailed analysis is given below in terms of expected mode of transport and travel time in relation to all respondents. Analysis of the regularity of use of amenity spaces indicates that amenity spaces are less frequently used than other typologies, with many having a wider landscape value rather than recreational use.</p> <p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u> When accessing amenity areas the majority of people would prefer to walk (72%), with 75% of these respondents stating a journey should take no longer than 10 minutes. The figures relating to preferred travel patterns and length of journey are similar in all areas.</p> <p>Using the borough wide results, it can be calculated that the 75th percentile of the total population would travel 10 minutes on foot to amenity areas, with the most common travel time stated is 10 minutes walk-time. Analysis of the individual areas highlights the most common travel time (modal) by foot is 5 minutes in all areas except the southern wards (10 minutes), and Maidenhead residents are willing to travel the furthest on foot (75th percentile) for up to 15 minutes to access an amenity green space. For those residents who prefer to travel by car, borough wide results show 75% are prepared to travel for 10 minutes. However, across the individual analysis areas residents located in the northern wards (analysis area 3) are willing to travel the furthest by car for up to 15 minutes (75th percentile).</p> <p>There were 5 respondents who stated amenity green space is their most frequented typology and who currently access the sites by car but would actually expect to walk to the sites. Of these respondents 60% were from analysis area 1, Maidenhead. This identifies Maidenhead as the analysis area where people are most amenable to change from accessing amenity green space areas by car to walking and further strategies should identify ways of facilitating this.</p>
<p>Other Consultations</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u> Officers agreed that the Borough-wide target of providing all residents with access to informal open space within 400m of their house should be supported. Again ensuring safe access to these sites will be dependent on a complete network of paths and cycleways.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u> External consultees had insufficient knowledge of open space at this level in the Borough to make an informed comment.</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

	<p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>It was generally felt that accessibility to those spaces provided was adequate, with a walking time of a few minutes possible from within any village to its local open space. It should be noted that comments from Bray indicate that more space is needed, which would improve accessibility, in the Fifield and Oakley Green wards.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>There were some concerns that accessibility may be compromised by continued development, particularly if planning conditions were not imposed on these developments to ensure that Amenity spaces were available within a few minutes walk of home. People were not prepared to walk long distances to reach this type of open space, but appreciated its value.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>10 minutes walk time with an aspiration of achieving 5 minutes</p>
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>Given the large emphasis on walking rather than driving in terms of the expectations of respondents it is recommended that a walking standard is set. The expressed desire for local amenity green space throughout consultations supports the recommendation that a standard based on walking is most appropriate.</p> <p>At a Borough wide level, the 75% threshold from the household survey of 10 minutes walk, which is the same as the modal response (10 minutes). A standard based on the 75% threshold level of a 10-minute walk time has been agreed, this has to be rationalised against the local nature of amenity green spaces and the aspiration of residents for these local open spaces through consultation. In the absence of other forms of open space, sport and recreation provision within close proximity of residents, the value of localised amenity green spaces is particularly important. This was particularly apparent during consultation with children and young people as great emphasis was placed on the importance of the provision of local open spaces. While identifying 10-minutes walk as a realistic standard borough-wide it was agreed that in certain localities a 5-minute walk time should be an aspiration.</p> <p>An accessibility catchment of 10-minutes is similar to that of parks and will ensure all residents have local access to some type of open space, facilitating delivery of increased participation in informal sport and physical activity. The importance of local provision to break up the urban landscape should also not be underestimated.</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN			
Definition	<p>Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children below aged 12. While it is recognised that a wide variety of opportunities for children exist (including play schemes and open spaces not specifically designed for this purpose), as per PPG17, this typology considers only those spaces specifically designed as equipped play facilities. Within this study, play provision for children includes only equipped play areas (ie. LEAPS and NEAPS) which are designed for children.</p>		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>Fields in Trust LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p> <p>NEAPs aged min 8; min area size 1000msq; should be located 1,000 metres or 15 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (600 metres in a straight line)</p>		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	<p>Play Strategy 2007-10</p> <p>The National Childcare Strategy is promoting an initiative to open school premises up during out-of-school hours so the facilities, including play items can be used.</p> <p>The RBWM Local Plan 1991-2006 stipulates a standard of 4.3ha per 1,000 population, to include 2.5ha of informal open spaces (which include equipped and unequipped children’s play spaces). The plan endorses the NFPA standard aiming to provide all residents with a play facility within 400m of their homes.</p> <p>Between 1996-2006 the Royal Borough has gained three open spaces, four open spaces and play areas, eighteen teenscenes, three play areas and teenscenes, and seven play areas. Within the same period one open space, one play area and teenscene and one separate play area has been lost.</p> <p>The Action Plan identified the need for a Play ranger/officer to develop the school sports partnership to allow for ‘free play’ by September 2008</p>		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	York: 10 minute walk time	Brighton: 15 minutes walk time	Telford and Wrekin: 10 minute walk time
	Spelthorne: 5 minute walk time	Elmbridge: 10 minute walk time	Epsom and Ewell: 14 minutes walk

	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u></p> <p>A relatively small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (15%); this may be due to the fact that it is very specific to its function. When accessing this type of open space 65% of these respondents stated walking was their current method of travel.</p> <p>In terms of length of journey, results showed an most people travelled 5-10 minutes (54%) and under 5 minutes (22%), thus displaying a that the majority of people who have identified play areas as their most frequented typology are not travelling further than 10 minutes. This may be influenced by the location of existing facilities and the function of this typology, which primarily is targeting a younger age group who may have a lower propensity for travelling for longer periods of time to reach sites.</p>
<p>Household Consultation</p>	<p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u></p> <p>Similar to the patterns exhibited by regular users, responses from the household survey regarding preferred methods of travel to this type of open space highlighted that 86% of residents expected to walk. Of those that expect to walk 75% of people believed the journey should take 5-10 minutes.</p> <p>Consideration of travel expectations across the analysis areas shows varied figures – the highest proportion of respondents who expect to walk to play areas was in Windsor and Eton where 93% of respondents stated walking was their preferred method of travel with 71% of these people suggesting a typical journey should take between 5-10 minutes. Maidenhead also has a high level of people expecting to walk to sites. The northern rural wards (analysis area 3) have the lowest proportion of people expecting to walk to play areas 69%. Accessibility issues to this typology within analysis area 3 should be investigated further in a green infrastructure study to ensure adequate safe routes are provided.</p> <p>Using the borough wide results, it can be calculated that the 75th percentile of the total population would expect to travel 10 minutes on foot to children’s play and the most common travel time is 10 minutes walk time, indicating that there is a significant number of residents that believe the walk time should be no more than 10 minutes. The 75th percentile is an expected walk time of 10 minutes for all analysis areas with the exception of the northern wards who expect to travel 15 minutes. The perceptions of residents from this analysis area regarding walking need to feed into a green infrastructure study. By linking these findings with the open space audit it will be possible to recognise whether the perception is due to a shortfall in sites or poor accessibility and lack of resident awareness of locations. The 75th percentile figure for those that expect to walk to play areas and indicated that it was their most frequented type of open space is 10 minutes (modal figure is also 10 minutes) for analysis area 3 and 10 minutes (modal figure of 5 minutes) on a borough-wide level, with only 20% (analysis area 3) and 8%</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

(borough-wide) of respondents indicating an expected time of over 10 minutes. This is a more realistic indicator as to an aspirational benchmark, particularly for this typology where the user group can be relatively defined.

There were 20 respondents who stated that play areas is their most frequented typology and who currently access the sites by car but would actually expect to walk to the sites. Of these respondents 40% were from analysis area 1, Maidenhead, 10% from analysis area 2, Windsor and Eton, 35% from analysis area 3, the northern wards, and 15% from analysis area 4, the southern parishes. This identifies Maidenhead as the analysis area where people are most amenable to change from accessing play areas by car to walking and further strategies should identify ways of facilitating this.

	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>There is now target group consultation with residents before any play area is built. The aim of the Council is to ensure all residents are within 400metres of informal space which preferably has a children’s play area and within 800metres of a site with a teenscene.</p>
<p>Other Consultations</p>	<p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>Consultees had insufficient knowledge to comment on this category.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Accessibility was generally quite good, although there are plans to build new facilities at Fifield and Oakley Green to meet people’s ability to walk to such facilities.</p> <p><u>School Survey</u></p> <p>The main access issues were to the south and east edges of Datchet where respondents were indicating there was not direct usable open space that was suitable for meeting friends. 59% of respondents indicated that they would walk to their most frequented open space, 19% would take the car, and 13% cycle. When asked what method of transportation they would actually prefer to use in order to reach the site 44% suggested walking, 25% cycling and 19% walk. The significant feature from this data is that there are restrictions to people cycling to sites; maybe this ought to be addressed in the green infrastructure study. It takes most respondents under five minutes to reach their most frequented site (47%). 28% take five to 10 minutes, and 13% 10 to 15.</p> <p>If a new site was introduced into the locality most respondents indicated that they would wish to travel 5 to 10 minutes (35%). 31% of respondents suggested travel time should be under five minutes and 26% suggesting 10 to 15 minutes.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>There was some concern that the design of facilities for younger children, and particularly toddlers, needs consideration. Most people would wish to walk to these sites, especially those with toddlers, whose range of travel is limited. There were concerns about loss of accessibility to those living in new developments are these are constructed.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>10 minute walk time</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

PMP Justification	<p>The majority of respondents to the household questionnaire indicate that they would expect to walk to a children's play facility (86%). Furthermore, the distances parents are willing to let their children travel unaccompanied from their homes to play facilities has reduced as concerns over safety have grown. Facilities should therefore be in close proximity to the home. However, PPG17 suggests that distance thresholds should be reflective of the maximum distance that typical users can reasonably be expected to travel. The 75% threshold level for children using the responses from the household survey was a 10 minute (480 metre) walk time for all analysis areas with the exception of the northern wards (15 minutes). Furthermore the modal response was a 5 minute walk time (consistent across all of the analysis areas except the northern wards which was 10 minutes). This implies that while a 10 minute standard is consistent with PPG17 criteria the long term aspiration should be to provide provision within 5 minutes of residents' homes.</p> <p>Setting the standard in accordance with the 75% threshold level is advocated in PPG17. Moreover, a larger accessibility catchment provides greater flexibility in terms of striking a balance between qualitative and quantitative improvements in provision. Where a five minute catchment would place a greater requirement on new provision, local consultation also revealed the importance of high quality sites and not just new facilities. The Council should continually seek to promote measures designed to improve accessibility, such as better public transport or cycling routes.</p> <p>A standard of 10 minutes (480 metre) walk time therefore meets user expectations and provides a realistic target for implementation. Furthermore, this local standard encompasses all types of provision for children, including the larger, more strategic sites that people could be expected to travel further to visit. The provision of local facilities meets with the aspirations of children and ensures that the use of these play facilities is maximized. It is important to consider the provision of play facilities in the context of amenity green spaces and other typologies providing more informal play opportunities for children.</p>
--------------------------	--

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
Definition	<p>Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving young people aged 12 and above. While it is recognised that a wide variety of opportunities for young people exist (including youth clubs and open spaces not specifically designed for this purpose, as per PPG17, this typology considers only those spaces specifically designed for use by young people eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teenage shelters • skateboard Parks • BMX tracks • Multi Use Games Areas.
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p><u>Fields in Trust</u> LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p> <p>NEAPs aged min 8; min area size 1000msq; should be located 1,000 metres or 15 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (600 metres in a straight line)</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

<p>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</p>	<p>Play Strategy 2007-10</p> <p>The National Childcare Strategy is promoting an initiative to open school premises up during out-of-school hours so the facilities, including play items can be used.</p> <p>The RBWM Local Plan 1991-2006 stipulates a standard of 4.3ha per 1,000 population, to include 2.5ha of informal open spaces (which include equipped and unequipped children’s play spaces). The plan endorses the NFPA standard aiming to provide all residents with a play facility within 400m of their homes.</p> <p>Between 1996-2006 the Royal Borough has gained three open spaces, four open spaces and play areas, eighteen teenscenes, three play areas and teenscenes, and seven play areas. Within the same period one open space, one play area and teenscene and one separate play area has been lost.</p> <p>The Action Plan identified the need for a Play ranger/officer to develop the school sports partnership to allow for ‘free play’ by September 2008</p>		
<p>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</p>	<p>York: 15 minute walk time</p>	<p>Brighton: 15 minutes walk time</p>	<p>Telford and Wrekin: 10 minute walk time</p>
	<p>Spelthorne: 5 minute walk time</p>	<p>Elmbridge: 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>Epsom and Ewell: 14 minutes walk</p>

Household Consultation

CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS

The use of this type of open space is very specific to its function and the availability of the data collected on current usage through the household survey makes it difficult to assess given the small number of responses that indicated it was their most frequented typology (0.4%). The statistically robust evidence base generated by the household survey enables detailed analysis and interpretation of the expectations and aspirations of local residents.

PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL

70% of respondents stated that walking would be the preferred option when travelling to this type of open space. Of those respondents who would expect to walk to teenager facilities, the most commonly held expectation is that this journey should take 5-10 minutes (62%). When looking across the analysis areas, the figures relating to preferred travel patterns and length of journey are have a degree of variation. In the two analysis areas of Maidenhead and the northern wards only 64% of respondents would expect to walk to this typology with 19% and 28% respectively electing to use the car and in the northern wards. In Windsor and Eton (80%) and the southern wards (74%) a high proportion of respondents expect to walk to teenage facilities. The most common expected travel time across all analysis areas to walk to the sites is 5-10 minutes.

The findings of the household survey suggest that across Windsor and Maidenhead 75th percentile of the total population would travel 15 minutes on foot to access teenage facilities, however the modal response was slightly lower, calculated as a 10-minute walk time. The breakdown of individual areas shows comparable results in Windsor and Eton and the northern wards; however the 75% threshold was lower in the southern wards (10 minutes) and higher in Maidenhead (20 minutes). It will be important to assess the accessibility of teen facilities in Maidenhead to evaluate this higher expectancy figure.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Other Consultations	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>The aim of the Council is to ensure all residents are within 400metres of informal space which preferably has a children’s play area and within 800metres of a site with a teenscene. It was a concern of officers that MUGAs were too readily being installed on informal land without any proper consultation with residents, especially in rural areas. It is proposed that larger, more centralised facilities will be more effective if suitable access routes can be provided.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>Consultees had insufficient knowledge to comment on this category.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>There was some concern at a local level. New facilities have been provided in Old Windsor, and there is planned provision in two wards in Bray, which will improve accessibility.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>There was a view expressed by a number of residents that more accessible facilities for teenagers may have the effect of reducing levels of vandalism and graffiti in the Borough.</p>
PMP Recommendation	10 minute walk time

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

PMP Justification	<p>70% of people stated that walking is the preferred method of travel to a young person's facility; therefore it is recommended that a walk time standard be adopted. A secondary point is that young people do not always have access to a motorised vehicle and consequently a walk time enables access for all ages and users. Provision of localised facilities meets the needs of young people as identified within internet survey. Location was a particularly important determinant of the level of use of a site.</p> <p>While the 75% threshold level is 15 minutes, the modal response rate is 10 minutes. Given that the overriding issue emerging from consultations was a shortfall of provision for children and young people and the need for local facilities, it is recommended that the standard is set at 10 minutes in line with the modal response.</p> <p>In applying the local standards, consideration should be made for other open spaces that are used by young people, such as amenity green spaces, parks and outdoor sport facilities. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Play Strategy sets out the key features that will be provided as part of the provision of facilities for young people and it should be ensured that new facilities developed are of sufficient quality and appropriate for the young people they are designed for.</p>
--------------------------	---

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES			
Definition	<p>Natural or artificial surfaces either publicly or privately owned used for sport and recreation. Includes school playing fields. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outdoor sports pitches • tennis and bowls • golf courses • athletics • playing fields (including school playing fields) • water sports. 		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>No national standards, although the Comprehensive Performance Assessment highlights “% of the population within 20 minutes of a range of 3 different sports facility types, one of which much be quality assured” as one of their key performance indicators. Sport England’s December 2006 Choice and Opportunity Scores reveal the current figure as 31.68%, which is marginally below the national average of 32%. The surrounding local authorities are Wokingham (31%), Wycombe (28%), South Bucks (16%), Slough (36%), Runnymede (6%), Spelthorne (39%) and Surrey Heath (25%).</p>		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	<p>No existing local accessibility standards.</p>		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	<p>York: 15-minute walk (720m) to local outdoor sports (grass pitches, tennis and bowling greens) 20-minute drive (8km) to synthetic turf pitches and golf courses</p>	<p>Brighton: 20 minutes walk time</p>	<p>Telford and Wrekin: 15 minute walk time (grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens), 20 minute drive time (synthetic turf pitches, golf course and athletics track)</p>
	<p>Spelthorne: 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>Elmbridge: 15 minute walk time</p>	<p>Epsom and Ewell: 15-19 minutes walk</p>

<p>Household Consultation</p>	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u> A relatively small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (4.1%). Of these frequent users 75% travel by car and only 10% walk to access these facilities. With regards to travel times, 75% of respondents stated a journey of under 10 minutes.</p> <p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u> Responses from the household survey regarding the preferred travel method for the different types of open space highlighted the variation between types of facilities. Results for all areas included:</p> <p>Grass Pitches – Walk (54%), Car (39%) Synthetic Turf Pitches – Walk (34%), Car (55%) Tennis Courts – Walk (47%), Car (43%) Bowling Greens – Walk (31%), Car (58%) Golf Courses – Walk (21%), Car (76%)</p> <p>This highlights how there are differing preferences in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead regarding the five types of outdoor sport facilities. More people expect to drive to access synthetic, bowling greens and golf courses, whereas more people prefer to walk to grass pitches and tennis courts. However, in terms of journey times the majority of respondents expected a journey to take 5 – 10 minutes by foot, bike or car to access each of the five facilities although most people expect the travel time to be 10-15 minutes by public transport.</p> <p>Looking across the analysis areas, the travel expectations followed a similar pattern to the results given at a borough level, with only a few exceptions. In Maidenhead, the most respondents (48%) stated they would walk to grass pitches and take the car to tennis courts (48%) and in the northern wards most people take the car to tennis courts (64%).</p> <p>For the three types of provision for which there was an overall preference for driving the 75% threshold level was a 15-minute drive time for synthetic turf pitches and bowling greens and a 20-minute drive time for golf courses.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

For grass pitches and tennis courts the 75th percentile of residents are prepared to walk for 15 minutes to access these facilities, with a modal response of 10 minutes. Respondents in analysis area 2 (Windsor and Eton) and analysis 3 (northern wards) consistently expected their travel times for walking to be higher than the other analysis areas for synthetic turf pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens and golf courses. Further investigation should identify if this perception emanates from poor accessibility routes to these sites

There were 12 respondents who stated that outdoor sport facilities is their most frequented typology and who currently access the sites by car but would actually expect to walk to the sites. Of these respondents 17% were from analysis area 1, Maidenhead, 17% from analysis area 2, Windsor and Eton, 33% from analysis area 3, the northern wards, and 33% from analysis area 4, the southern parishes. This identifies the two northern and southern wards as the analysis areas where people are most amenable to change from accessing natural and semi natural areas by car to walking and further strategies should identify ways of facilitating this.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Other Consultations	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Officers sighted the dual use of more school sites should be promoted to increase availability of pitches. The new STP provision at Braywick and Windsor should increase the number of pitches although there is still the need to provide more junior pitches in urban areas that are easily accessible by young people without the need to drive.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>An external consultee felt that the supply of football pitches could be greater, which would have the effect of improving accessibility for Borough residents. Most felt that they had insufficient local knowledge to comment on levels of accessibility.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Outdoor sports facilities were felt to be “about right” in terms of provision. PC’s felt that it was appropriate for users to drive to facilities if there was insufficient supply at village level.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>The general view was that most outdoor recreational facilities of this nature were readily accessible to residents.</p>
PMP Recommendation	15 minutes walk time (grass pitches, tennis courts - based on the use of school sites) and 15 minutes drive time (STPs, golf courses, bowls greens)

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

PMP Justification

There are several factors to consider in setting a standard for outdoor sports facilities. In particular, the range of facilities that lie within this typology makes it difficult to set a meaningful standard that can be applied across the board as per PPG17 requirements. For example, residents have significantly different expectations for synthetic turf pitches (to which they are willing to travel further) than they do for grass pitches (where there is a presumption of more localised provision).

Given the findings from the local consultation, it is suggested that two standards are set, one for grass pitches and tennis courts and a separate standard for synthetic turf pitches, bowling greens and golf courses. This reflects local expectations regarding driving and walking to outdoor sport facilities. The 75% threshold level for those who expect to walk to grass pitches and tennis courts is 15 minutes (720 metres). As a consequence a 15 minute (720 metre) walk time to these “local” outdoor sports facilities is considered an appropriate standard. It will ensure quantitative improvements whilst also focusing on improving the quality of existing provision. Furthermore, this 15 minute level is supported across most analysis areas. This is in line with incorporating sustainable transport choices, to account for the wide mix of facilities types within the standard to meet all expectations.

Respondents in analysis area 2 (Windsor and Eton) and analysis 3 (northern wards) consistently expected their travel times for walking to be higher than the other analysis areas for synthetic turf pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens and golf courses. Further investigation should identify if this perception emanates from poor accessibility routes to these sites.

The 75% threshold level for those who expect to drive to synthetic turf pitches and bowling greens was 15 minutes, with a 20-minute drive time for golf courses. Given the more specialist nature of these facilities (and the vast area that golf courses cover), alongside the fact they are usually built in strategic locations to incorporate local demand, a 15-minute drive time standard is recommended.

The formal use of school facilities by the community after school hours will be particularly important if the recommended standards are to be delivered. Should community use of school sites not be increased, new provision and a higher quantity standard will be required.

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS ALLOTMENTS			
Definitions	Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. May also include urban farms. This typology does not include private gardens.		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	No national standards		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	No existing local accessibility standards.		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	York: 15 minute walk time	Brighton: 15 minutes walk time	Telford and Wrekin: 15 minute walk time
	Spelthorne: No standard set	Elmbridge: 10 minute walk time	Epsom and Ewell: 20-24 minutes walk

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Household Consultation	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u> A relatively small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (1.9%). Of these frequent users 33% travel by car and only 44% walk to access allotments. With regards to travel times, 78% of respondents stated a journey of under 5 minutes.</p> <p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u> Respondents to the household survey stated that walking (69%) would be the most popular travel method when visiting allotments, with 25% preferring to travel by car. Across both travel methods, the expected travel times are similar, with 63% of walkers and 83% of those who would travel by car suggesting a typical journey should take 5 – 10 minutes. Results from the individual analysis areas support the overall results, with analysis area 4, the southern wards having the highest level of respondents preferring to walk (82%) and analysis area 3, the northern wards having the highest level of respondents preferring to drive (32%).</p> <p>Using the borough wide results, it can be calculated that the 75th percentile of the total population would travel 15 minutes on foot and 10 minutes by car to allotments. Individual travel times for each area remained constant with the exception of northern wards with a 12 minute walk time and Maidenhead with a 5 minute drive time.</p>
Other Consultations	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u> Allotment management has been outsourced fully in Windsor. Other allotments run by the council are managed by the cemetery officer and an administrating member of staff. There is no capital spend from the Council but various arrangements are in place with public groups.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u> There was insufficient knowledge of provision within the Borough for external consultees to comment on accessibility.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u> Whilst accepting that levels of usage were quite high, which sometimes resulted in people having to</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

	<p>travel outside of their immediate area to access an allotment, walking times of 10 – 15 minutes were appropriate and achievable in most parishes.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>Most people felt that provision was “about right” but that levels should not be reduced, which would reduce accessibility to an unacceptable degree.</p>
PMP Recommendation	15 minute walk time
PMP Justification	<p>The provision of allotments is very much a demand led typology and this should be reflected in the application of the accessibility and quantity standards. As such any deficiencies that are highlighted through the application of the study should be assessed further to indicate if there is genuine demand in that area.</p> <p>However, as a guide, a standard has been set at 15 minutes (720 metre) walk time. Although a challenging standard, this reflects the findings of the household survey as 46% of respondents (with an opinion) stated there are not enough allotments. Residents responding to the household survey also indicated that they would expect to walk to allotments and a walk time has therefore been used in line with living a healthy lifestyle and targets to reduce the reliance on private transport. Given the 75% threshold level is for a 15 minute (720 metre) walk, setting a standard at this level is in accordance with the PPG17 Companion Guide. Individual travel times for each area remained constant with the exception of northern wards with a 12 minute walk time. By setting the standard at a 15 minute walk time; this will encompass the expectations of most users and potential users of this type of open space.</p>

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS CIVIC SPACES			
Definitions	Hard surfaced areas usually located within Town or city centres.		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	No national standards		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	No existing local accessibility standards.		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	York: There is no realistic requirement to set catchments	Brighton: rough planning policy and implementation	Telford and Wrekin: 15 minute walk time and (urban) and 15 minute

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

	for such an open space typology as they cannot be easily influenced through planning policy and implementation and are very much opportunity-led rather than demand-led.		drive time (rural)
--	--	--	--------------------

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Consultation	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u> Findings from the household surveys show that a minimal amount of respondents (0.2%) use civic spaces more than any other typology. It is therefore difficult to produce sound analysis on current usage patterns based on the sample size provided; a more detailed analysis is given below in terms of expected mode of transport and travel time.</p> <p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u> 59% of respondents stated that walking would be the preferred option when travelling to this type of open space. Travelling by car was second with 33%. Of those respondents who would expect to walk, 47% expect the journey to take between 5 - 10 minutes. To drive to this typology respondents expect a journey to also take 5 - 10 minutes (74%).</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas similar results are provided, with the exception of the northern wards analysis area, where 50% of residents indicated travelling by car as the preferred mode of travel (only 42% prefer to walk) suggesting residents have to travel significantly further to access a civic space in the northern wards and possibly a shortage of supply. In Windsor and Eton respondents indicated the highest expectation to walk for over 10 minutes to civic spaces (56%).</p> <p>The findings of the household survey suggest that across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 75% of the total population would travel up to 20 minutes by foot to access civic spaces (with a modal response of 10 minutes). Maidenhead and Windsor and Eton mirror the borough wide response, however in the northern wards and southern wards residents expect the journey to be shorter (75th percentile indicating 15 minutes).</p> <p>When travelling by car, 75% of residents in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead are prepared to travel for 10 minutes to access this type of open space. Identical results are found in Maidenhead and the northern wards, however in Windsor and Eton (15 minutes) and the southern ward (20 minutes) residents are willing to travel for longer.</p>
Other Consultations	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u></p> <p>Accessibility of civic spaces is believed to be adequate</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

	<p><u>External Consultations</u></p> <p>There was insufficient knowledge for external consultees to comment on this category.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>Residents and visitors alike felt that the civic spaces in Windsor and Maidenhead would be adequately accessed in line with the PMP recommendation for this category</p>
PMP Recommendation	No standard to be set

WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS CHURCHES AND CEMETERIES			
Definitions	Hard surfaced areas located usually located within Town or city centres.		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	No national standards		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	No existing local accessibility standards.		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)	<p>York: There is no realistic requirement to set catchments for such an open space typology as they cannot be easily influenced through planning policy and implementation and are very much opportunity-led rather than demand-led.</p>	<p>Brighton: rough planning policy and implementation</p>	<p>Telford and Wrekin: 15 minute walk time and (urban) and 15 minute drive time (rural)</p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

<p>Consultation</p>	<p><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u> Findings from the household surveys show that a minimal amount of respondents (2%) use churches and cemeteries more than any other typology. It is therefore difficult to produce sound analysis on current usage patterns based on the sample size provided; a more detailed analysis is given below in terms of expected mode of transport and travel time.</p> <p><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u> 58% of respondents stated that walking would be the preferred option when travelling to this type of open space. Travelling by car was second with 39%. Of those respondents who would expect to walk, 51% expect the journey to take under 10 minutes. To drive to this typology respondents expect a journey to take 5 - 10 minutes (73%).</p> <p>The highest number of respondents that prefer to walk to churches and cemeteries is from analysis area 4, the southern wards (77%) and the lowest in analysis area 1, Maidenhead (44%) The highest expected time to reach this type of open space by foot (over 10 minutes) is in Windsor and Eton (60%) and Maidenhead (59%) and the lowest number of respondents expecting to walk over 10 minutes are from the southern wards (32%). While the southern wards has the highest number of respondents expecting to walk despite it taking the longest time, further investigation should identify whether this is due to higher levels of accessibility with respect to footpath networks.</p> <p>The findings of the household survey suggest that across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 75% of the total population would travel at least 20 minutes by foot to access churches and cemeteries (with a modal response of 10 minutes).</p> <p>When travelling by car, 75% of residents in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead are prepared to travel for 15 minutes to access this type of open space (with a modal response of 10 minutes).</p>
<p>Other Consultations</p>	<p><u>Internal Consultations</u> Accessibility is deemed to be adequate.</p> <p><u>External Consultations</u></p>

APPENDIX M – ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

	<p>External consultees had insufficient information to comment.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils</u></p> <p>Most parishes felt that a few minutes walk time was acceptable for this type of facility.</p> <p><u>Drop-In Consolations</u></p> <p>There was no trend which deviated from a recommendation of approximately 15 minutes walk time in urban areas or 15 minutes drive time in rural areas</p>
PMP Recommendation	No standard to be set