

1. INTRODUCTION	2
PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE 17.....	2
TYPOLOGY OF SPACES	2
RELEVANT POLICIES AND STRATEGIES	5
2. IDENTIFYING LOCAL NEEDS	11
EXISTING POLICIES AND STANDARDS	11
SPORT RECREATION AND LEISURE SURVEY	13
QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION FROM CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE	17
QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION	18
GROUP'S SURVEY	22
3. AUDITING LOCAL PROVISION	34
OPEN SPACE AUDIT.....	34
OPEN SPACE AUDIT UPDATE	35
BUILT FACILITIES AUDIT.....	37
AREA PROFILES	39
4. SETTING AND APPLYING STANDARDS.....	64
TOOLS USED FOR OPEN SPACE AND BUILT FACILITIES ANALYSIS ...	65
TOOLS USED FOR BUILT FACILITY ANALYSIS	65
5. QUALITY STANDARDS	67
6. OPEN SPACE QUANTITY STANDARDS.....	68
PARKS AND GARDENS	68
NATURAL GREENSPACE	73
GREEN CORRIDORS.....	76
SPORTS FACILITIES.....	77
AMENITY GREENSPACE.....	79
PLAY AREAS AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S AREAS.....	82
ALLOTMENTS	86
CEMETERIES AND CHURCH YARDS	89
CIVIC SPACE.....	90
7. BUILT FACILITY QUANTITY STANDARDS	91
HEALTH AND FITNESS SUITES	91
INDOOR BOWLS	95
INDOOR TENNIS	100
SPORTS HALLS	104
SWIMMING POOLS.....	111
SYNTHETIC TURF PITCHES	119
ICE RINKS	123
COMMUNITY CENTRES AND VILLAGE HALLS	125
8. BUILT FACILITIES QUALITY	129
9. EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT	130
10. PROVISION IN RURAL VILLAGES	131

1. INTRODUCTION

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE 17

1.1. Planning Policy Guidance 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (PPG17) was published in 2002. It highlights the role that open space and sport provision can play in people's quality of life and in delivering wider government objectives such as:

- supporting an urban renaissance;
- supporting a rural renewal;
- promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion;
- health and well being; and
- promoting more sustainable development.

1.2. PPG17 asserts that robust assessments of local need and existing provision are necessary to effectively plan for open space, sport and recreation. Information from assessments of need and existing provision should then be used to set local standards for quantity, quality and accessibility.

1.3. Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion Guide to PPG17 (PPG17 Guidance) suggests a five step process for the assessment of open space, sport and recreation facilities;

- 1) Identifying local needs
- 2) Auditing Local Provision
- 3) Setting Provision Standards
- 4) Applying Provision Standards
- 5) Drafting Policies

TYPOLOGY OF SPACES

1.4. The table below outlines the typology of open space defined by PPG17, this table has been taken from the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees Open Space Audit (2005), which forms part of our audit of local provision.

Type	Definition	Primary Purpose
Parks and Gardens	Urban parks, formal gardens and country parks.	Informal recreation Community events
Natural Greenspace	Woodland, scrub, grassland, wetland etc. with note-able wildlife value.	Wildlife conservation Biodiversity Environmental education
Green Corridors	Spaces whose primary function is as a corridor (e.g. wildlife corridor,	Corridor for travel (eg. walking, cycling, horse-riding) or wildlife.

	cycle ways, paths, rights of way). Other types of space may form parts of Green Corridors but have different primary functions therefore would be designated with different typologies.	Opportunities for wildlife migration (e.g. hedgerows or stream corridors). Linear usage
Sports Facilities	Open space specifically geared towards sport and formal recreation e.g. football pitches, athletics fields and playing fields. May be private/public owned. Includes school playing fields.	Participation in specific sports e.g. football, golf, and athletics. Training for sports Watching sports
Amenity Greenspace	Spaces whose primary function is the provision of amenity (e.g. visual enhancement or informal recreation) to local residents, workers or passers by. Predominantly found in residential areas but may be located in e.g. commercial areas to serve staff/visitors	Casual activities close to home or work Visual enhancement of local area
Play areas	All formal playgrounds. Even those within other open spaces	Play
Allotments	Allotment gardens – recognised areas where people can grow their own produce.	Non-commercial growing of vegetables and fruit. Does not include private gardens.
Cemeteries and Churchyards	All cemeteries, churchyards and other burial grounds whether still used as graveyards or not.	Burial of dead Quiet contemplation Wildlife conservation Biodiversity
Civic spaces	Town squares, market squares. Hard surfaced spaces for pedestrians, around civic buildings and town centres.	Markets Settings for civic buildings Community/town events

1.5. The typology for built sports facilities has been based on a suggested typology from PPG17 and from Sport England's Active Place Power online database. It includes Health and Fitness Suites, Indoor Bowls Centres, Indoor

Tennis Centres, Sports Halls, Swimming Pools, Synthetic Turf Pitches, Ice Rinks and Community Centres and Village Halls. The typology is explained further in the Built Facilities Audit section of this document (see page 35).

RELEVANT POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

1.6. This PPG17 assessment will provide an evidence base for a number of documents, policies and strategies. These include

- Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping Supplementary Planning Document (SPD);
- Core Strategy Development Plan Document
- Environment Development Plan Document (DPD);
- Stockton-on-Tees Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Sport and Active Leisure Strategy;

1.7. A number of other existing strategies and policies will provide the wider context for the assessment and are also outlined below.

Open Space, Recreation and Landscape SPD

1.8. As part of the Local development Framework (LDF) this SPD will provide guidance to open space and recreation policies that will be contained within the Environment DPD. It will contain the standards that result from this assessment and outline the way that they will be used to determine planning obligations that are required for new development. Guidance on landscape is also included to ensure that new development contains high quality open space.

Core Strategy DPD

1.9. The Core Strategy is the overarching document of the Local Development Framework and as such is being prepared first. It sets out, in broad terms, the pattern of development and growth in the Borough over the next 15 years, and how this will be achieved. This document sets out the key planning policy for the Borough based on its unique feature and characteristics and taking account of other strategies and programmes which affect the area.

Environment DPD

1.10. The Environment DPD is a high level document in the LDF, which will house planning policy relating to the built and natural environment such as open space, nature conservation sites, green wedges and the historic environment. The DPD requires a robust evidence base including the PPG17 assessment.

Stockton-on-Tees Green Infrastructure Strategy

1.11. The Stockton-on-Tees Green Infrastructure Strategy aims to deliver the vision of the Tees Valley Green Infrastructure Strategy in Stockton-on-Tees. The multi functional nature of green infrastructure will be used to provide benefits to local residents and the local environment based on both local needs and green infrastructure principles. The strategy will provide a long-term vision for green infrastructure in the Borough and encourage partnership working.

- Key functions and benefits of green infrastructure include:

- Travel and transport;
- Recreation;
- Settings and image;
- Learning;
- Natural and built heritage;
- Working landscapes; and
- Ecosystem services.

Sport and Active Leisure Strategy

1.12. Stockton's Strategy for Sport & Active Leisure seeks to ensure the effective planning and coordination of a range of opportunities for participation in sport and active leisure to meet the needs and aspirations of the boroughs residents, and to support the objectives of the Council and its strategic partners.

1.13. The vision of the strategy is:

'To positively contribute to the Health, Educational Attainment and Economy of Stockton through raising the levels of participation in sport & active leisure within the community. We will achieve this by offering a quality sport and leisure environment that is equally accessible to all which encourages the achievement of personal goals.'

1.14. The three strategic aims, which underpin the vision, are as follows:

- Through strong and cohesive partnerships we will develop opportunities for all sectors of the community to participate in sport & active leisure, at whatever level they choose;
- To develop robust structures (physical and organisational), in which to develop sustainable and high quality sport/ active leisure opportunities;
- To inspire a generation to participate in sport and physical activity through the delivery of high profile initiatives that promote and realise the many benefits that sport can provide.

Local Plan 1997

1.15. Relevant policies from the Local Plan have been saved by the Secretary of State, as part of the transitional arrangements from the local plan to the LDF system. Open space and recreation policy is currently part of this body of saved policies which will be replaced by policy in the Core Strategy or Environment DPD once adopted.

Shaping Our Future: A Sustainable Community Strategy for the Borough of Stockton –on-Tees 2008-2021

1.16. This strategy outlines how public agencies will use resources and work with the public and voluntary sector to improve the Borough's ability to meet the needs of existing and future residents.

1.17. The strategy is based around a number of core improvement themes:

- Economic Regeneration and Transport;

- Environment and Housing;
- Safer Communities;
- Children and Young People; and
- Healthier Communities and Adults.

‘Play Matters’ Stockton –on-Tees Children’s Trust Board Play Strategy 2007-2012

1.18. Developed in response to the 2004 children’s play review “Getting Serious About Play” this strategy is linked to the five Every Child Matters Outcomes particularly ‘Be Healthy’. Widespread public consultation including adults and children from 4-19 years informed the development of the strategy which aims to improve opportunities for play throughout the Borough and links the importance of play to wider objectives.

1.19. Key objectives are:

- To develop and promote high standards of play provision across the Borough;
- To increase the range, distribution and quality of child led play activities across the Borough;
- Provide a range of appropriately risk managed play environments, which physically challenge and stimulate the minds of children and young people;
- Promote free inclusive and accessible play opportunities for all children and young people, whatever their age ability and circumstances;
- To empower children and young people to contribute as equal partners in the development monitoring and review of play provision.

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Play Area Strategy 2007 – 2010

1.20. This strategy aims to provide a framework for the future development and management of equipped play areas in the Borough in order to ensure the effective targeting of resources, to inform planning policy and the use of Planning Obligations and to encourage cooperation between stakeholders.

1.21. The Strategy also outlines the benefits of appropriate play provision and its contribution to wider social and environmental agendas such as anti social behaviour, inequality, exclusion and environmental quality.

1.22. Existing play areas have been categorised into a heirachy of Destination, Neighbourhood and Doorstep sites. These designations reflect relative levels of use and relative size of catchment areas therefore indicating the required resource levels for different sites.

1.23. The strategic objectives are:

- Equity- Provide high quality diverse play equipment across the Borough that are convenient to access from people’s homes;

- Community Safety- Create play areas where children and parents feel safe, eliminate unacceptable levels of risk and reduces anti social behaviour through good design and other measures;
- Environmental Quality – Provide attractive play areas in well-maintained environments;
- Social Inclusion and Accessibility – Provide convenient and safe pedestrian access to facilities, improve access for disabled people and people from disadvantaged sections of the community. Provide convenient and safe car parking, public transport and cycle access to larger play sites with wider catchment areas.

Stockton-on-Tees Climate Change Action Plan 2007 – 2012

- 1.24. This plan acknowledges concerns about climate change and aims to cut emission from the Stockton-on-Tees Borough area through more efficient energy use, renewable energy, waste management, sustainable transport and green procurement. The target is to reduce green house gas emissions by 8.75% below the 2000 level by 2012. Other aims are to raise awareness and involve communities, to provide a framework to adapt to the impacts of climate change and to demonstrate the social, economic and environmental benefits of taking climate change actions.
- 1.25. Objective 7 and 8 of the Plan, set out below, are the issues that are most relevant to this SPD.
- Objective 7: Promote cycling as an attractive alternative to the private car for journeys made within the Borough;
 - Objective 8: Green infrastructure managed and developed functioning as a carbon sink and contributing towards sustainable lifestyles.

Cemeteries 5 Year Improvement Plan

- 1.26. This plan seeks to improve the quality of cemeteries and closed churchyards, limiting the health and safety risks to users. It identifies the relevant condition of cemeteries on a number of different aspects such as:
- Walls and boundaries;
 - Ground stability and drainage works;
 - Roads and footpath works;
 - Chapels and buildings;
 - Street furniture;
 - Expansion and development; and
 - Horticultural Aesthetics work and trees.
- 1.27. The plan then outlines a process of continual monitoring and repair, excluding Memorials for which funding will be sought from elsewhere.

Stockton-on-Tees Local Transport Plan 2006 to 2011: Cycling Strategy

- 1.28. Set against the five themes of the Central Government/ Local Government Association's Shared Priority for Transport; congestion, accessibility, road safety,

air quality and other quality of life, the strategy's aim is to achieve "more people cycling, more often, and more safely". Relevant objectives are:

- To develop a seamless hierarchy of cycle routes, allowing cyclists to access all parts of the Borough;
- To develop and implement a robust planning and design process to deliver cycle-friendly infrastructure as an integral part of the Borough's transport network;
- To provide a safe and efficient well maintained cycling network;
- To provide more and better cycle facilities to remove theft as a barrier to cycling as a transport mode choice;
- To provide for the needs of cyclists at all stages of the land use planning and development control processes.

Tees Valley Green Infrastructure Strategy

- 1.29. Green Infrastructure is a network of multi functional green and blue spaces. This approach to open spaces acknowledges the many benefits that open space provides including those to health, environment, biodiversity, local economies and local identity.
- 1.30. The Tees Valley Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies the strategic green infrastructure network across the Tees Valley in relation to existing green infrastructure and highlights priorities and actions at the sub-regional level. It outlines the following vision.
- 1.31. To develop by 2021 a network of green corridors and green spaces in the Tees Valley that:
- Enhance the quality of place and environment for existing and future communities and potential investors;
 - Provide an enhanced environment for new development and regeneration projects, which produces high quality design and renews the housing market;
 - Creates and extends opportunities for access, recreation and enhancement of biodiversity.

Tees Valley Biodiversity Action Plan

- 1.32. The Tees Valley Biodiversity Action Plan is a living document that highlights the sub-regional priority bird and mammal species, and habitats. The plan encourages partnership working between National Government Agencies, Local Authorities and Non Government Organisations.

Tees Valley Sport Sub-Regional Facilities Strategy (draft) and A Regional Facilities Strategy for Sport England North East (draft)

- 1.33. A Sport England Facilities Strategy has been produced at both the regional and sub-regional level. These strategies determine the adequacy of existing

facilities compared to regional and sub-regional need and identify strategic issues and opportunities at the regional and sub-regional level. The built facilities section of this PPG17 assessment will sit beneath these strategies and take the assessment of the adequacy of built sports facilities down to the Local Authority Level.

The North East of England Plan: Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021

1.34. The RSS outlines the long term strategy for spatial development in the north east Local Development Frameworks produced at the Local Authority Level must be in general conformity of this strategy. The RSS and LDF make up the statutory Development Plan outlined in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The SPD conforms to the policy in the RSS, as it supports Green Infrastructure and high quality development and redevelopment.

North East Strategy for the Environment 2008

1.35. This strategy, produced by the North East Environment Forum, is designed to ensure that “an understanding that social and economic activity must be undertaken within environmental limits in line with the fundamental principles of sustainability”. There are four main themes through which objectives are highlighted:

- Sustainable communities – how environmental and cultural assets contribute towards better places to live and work;
- Resource management – Making best use of our resources;
- Environmental Infrastructure – safeguarding key natural, physical and cultural assets realising their potential;
- Towards Delivery – Action to meet the region’s environmental objectives whilst also delivering social and economic benefits;

Planning Obligations Circular 05/2005

1.36. The circular provides updated guidance on the governments approach to planning obligations. The guidance states how planning obligations must be:

- relevant to planning;
- necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the proposed development;
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and
- reasonable in all other respects.

1.37. Standards outlined through this assessment will be used to request planning obligations in line with the above tests.

2. IDENTIFYING LOCAL NEEDS

- 2.1. To identify local needs it is important to assess the current context in which open space is provided in the Borough including current policies and advice from those using the policies in the Development Services Section and the Countryside and Greenspace section.
- 2.2. It is also important to understand the needs and aspirations around open space, sport and recreation facilities, of people living in the Borough. This has been achieved through the Sport, Recreation and Leisure Survey which was a large scale survey intended to identify the views of a representative sample of the Borough. Some quantitative analysis has been undertaken with people who may have particular needs around open space, sport and recreation facilities.
- 2.3. In order to identify specialist knowledge about open space, sport and recreation facilities questionnaires were sent out to groups with a particular interest in open space for example due to a sport they undertake or a type of facility they need to use. The questionnaire contained both open and multiple choice questions.

EXISTING POLICIES AND STANDARDS

Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan 1997

- 2.4. The following are policies from the Local Plan, which relate to open space and have been saved by the secretary of state for the transition from the Local Plan to the LDF system. These policies will be used until they are replaced by a suitable document in the LDF such as the Core Strategy or the Environment DPD.

EN 15

Development will not be permitted on Urban Open Space unless :

- i) it would enhance the sporting, recreational, or nature conservation value of the land and the space would still retain its character; or*
- iii) the development of a small area of open space would result in the enhancement of the remainder to the overall benefit of the local community.*

REC1

Development that would result in the permanent loss of playing space will not be permitted unless:

- i) sport and recreation facilities can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site, or*
- ii) alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is made available , or*
- iii) the land is not required to satisfy known local needs.*

HO11

New residential development should be designed and laid out to:

ii) incorporate open space for both formal and informal use;

2.5. The justification for the above policy states that

“For larger developments the council will use the National Playing Fields Association standard of 2.46ha per 1000 population as a guideline to assess the requirement for outdoor playing space, such as football pitches, until it develops its own standard based on a local survey.”

Supplementary Planning Document 6: Planning Obligations 2008

2.6. The recently adopted Planning Obligations SPD states that the requirements for open space on new development will be assessed on a case-by-case basis using the formula below until local standards are derived.

“For every 0.1ha of land within the planning application boundary, the Council would seek a contribution of £3500 plus maintenance contributions.”

Limitations of the existing approach

2.7. Discussion with colleagues in Development Services and Countryside and Greenspace, have highlighted a number of limitations with the existing approach. The current lack of evidence base makes it hard to prove what is acceptable to ask for as a Planning Obligation contribution. For example, what is relevant to planning, necessary to allow the proposal go ahead, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respects. This makes negotiations with developers difficult.

2.8. A lack of certainty about the contributions that are likely to be achieved makes it difficult to coordinate and pool contributions for offsite provision. On a number of occasions planning obligation contributions have almost been returned to developers because they could not be spent in the right time frame in a way that was related to the development. An increased certainty about the ability to achieve planning obligation contributions may enable more use for securing matched funding for open space and sport. A greater time frame in which to be able to keep contributions, beyond the five years that is often currently used, would facilitate the pooling of contributions considerably.

2.9. Other issues with the current approach are that on site provision is harder to secure, as off site contributions have been preferred by developers. The provision of open space based on the area of the development does not reflect the density of the development and therefore the population that the open space is to serve. Also, we have currently not been requesting contributions to built sports facilities.

SPORT RECREATION AND LEISURE SURVEY

- 2.10. The Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey was undertaken in early 2008, by a social research company NWA Research. A representative sample of 2700 residents of the Borough were interviewed on a face-to-face basis about their views on open space, sport and recreation provision. The sample was representative both spatially and in terms of demographic characteristics.
- 2.11. A copy of the survey was also available online so that those with an interest in the assessment were able to take part even if they were not selected as part of the sample. This self-selected sample analysed separately from the main sample so it remained representative of the Borough. The online questionnaire achieved 239 responses.
- 2.12. The survey aimed to understand the leisure activities people undertake, the spaces and facilities they use, what they think of the quantity and quality of these facilities and also people's aspirations for improvements to existing provision. Open space built sports facilities and other cultural and community facilities were included.

Activities and interests

- 2.13. The survey showed that the most popular activity is walking and enjoying the outdoors and nature with 60.9% saying that they consider it one of their favourite leisure activities. Other favourite activities include watching films, shopping and visiting pubs and restaurants. Sporting or fitness activities are a preference for 35.4% and 17.2% enjoy cycling.
- 2.14. People were asked if they belong to any clubs relating to their favourite leisure activities 25.6% of the sample belong to a club, team or association. Sport and fitness clubs are the most popular, 16.4% of people say they are a member.
- 2.15. When asked if there are any activities people would like to undertake or undertake more often 25.4% said that they would. "General sporting activities" was the most popular answer followed by "various/ like to be generally more active" and "gym/ fitness activities".

Existing spaces and facilities

- 2.16. In total 61.7% of the sample would like to see more of some type of open space or facility nearer to their home. People were asked what type of open spaces or facilities they would like to see more of near to their home. "Parks and gardens/nature areas" was the space that most people would like to see more of, with 28.1% of the sample mentioning it. This is followed by informal greenspace also known as amenity greenspace at 11.9 %.
- 2.17. The sports facilities that most people would like to see more of near to their homes are swimming pools with 15.4% mentioning them, this is very closely

followed by outdoor sports facilities at 14.9%. Sports pitches were the most popular outdoor sports facility mentioned was “sports pitches / playing fields”.

- 2.18. The cultural or community facility that most people would like to see more of nearer to their home was indoor community facilities such as community centres and village halls 7.1% of the sample mentioned them. This was closely followed by “theatres or other venues for live performance” at 6.9%.
- 2.19. People were asked about the type of spaces they use and the reasons for not using the spaces they do not use. The most used type of open space was “parks and gardens/ nature areas” with 69.7% of the sample saying they used them. This was followed by accessible countryside at 52.8%.
- 2.20. The space where the highest number of people do not use a space for reasons other than personal reasons or a lack of interest, was accessible countryside where 9 % do not use the space for reasons other than personal reasons. In this case the biggest reason for non-use is “too far away/ difficult to get to”. Riverside walks is another example of this 8.3% do not use this facility for reasons other than personal reasons, the biggest reason for non-use is “too far away/ difficult to get to”.
- 2.21. The most used sports facility is swimming pools with 42.2% of people saying they use them. This is followed by 26.6% of people saying they use indoor sports facilities. The sports facility with the highest number of people who do not use the facility for reasons other than personal reasons is ice rinks. The ice rink is not used for reasons other than personal reasons by 10.5% of people, the main non-personal reason is that the facility is “too far away/ difficult to get to”. Gyms are the facility that follows ice rinks in this category, 8.6% do not use them for reasons other than personal reasons the biggest reason for non-use is that they are too expensive.
- 2.22. The most used cultural or community facility is libraries, with 43% of the sample saying they use them. This is followed by theatres and other performance venues, which are used by 37% of the people surveyed. The two cultural and community facilities with the highest proportion of people who do not use facilities for reasons other than personal reasons are theatres and museums and galleries. The biggest non-personal reason for non-use in both cases is that they are “too far away/ difficult to get to”.

Outdoor Spaces

- 2.23. Of the sample 81.5% said they use an outdoor space for leisure. The most used space is Preston Park with which 15% of the sample said they use most often, this is closely followed by Ropner Park at 13.4%. Amenity greenspace is third with 12.6% of the sample saying it is the space they use most often.
- 2.24. Of people who use outdoor space 38.6% travel less than a mile to access their most used space and 66% of people travel under 2 miles. Of people who use outdoor space 51% walk to the site they use most often. The most popular

use of people's most used outdoor space is walking (56.8%) and enjoying the outdoors and nature(51%).

- 2.25. Most of the sample rated their most used space as very good (43.6%) or good (36.7%). Of those who rated their most used space as poor or very poor improved cleanliness, appearance and maintenance and "improved security /reduce anti social behaviour" were the most popular improvements suggested.

Sports and Fitness Facilities

- 2.26. The sample were asked if they use sports or fitness facilities 58.5% said that they do. Splash Leisure Centre is the most popular facility with 12.5% of the sample saying that it is their most used facility closely followed by Billingham Forum Leisure Complex with 12.3% saying it is their most used facility.
- 2.27. Respondents were asked how far they travel to their most used facility 22% said they travel under a mile, 29.8% said they travel one to two miles meaning that over half of the sample travel less than two miles to their most used facility. However the most popular answer was between two and five miles at 31.2%. The most popular form of transport to access this facility is by car (66.5%) followed by on foot at (22%).
- 2.28. The most popular activity undertaken at people's most used facility was swimming at 54% followed by gym or individual fitness activity at 32.4% and fitness classes at 10.8%. Most people rated their most used facility as very good (44.5%) or good (36.1%). Of those who rated it as poor or very poor improved cleanliness, appearance and maintenance (42%) and more or better facilities such as toilets, seating and changing rooms (28.4%) are the most popular improvements requested.

Community and Cultural Facilities

- 2.29. The survey asked people about the facility they use most often to pursue non-sporting leisure interests. Of the sample 66.5% said they use community or cultural facilities. The most popular most used facility is the library at 26.6% followed by the theatre or other venue for live performances which 17.1% cited as their most used facility. In terms of travel distance 36.6% said they travel less than a mile to their most used facility, 27.9% said they travel one to two miles. The car is the most popular form of transport (53.2%) followed by walking (38.5%).
- 2.30. The most popular activity undertaken at the most used community or cultural facility is browsing or viewing exhibits (20.5%) followed by local groups and associations (17%). The most popular activity undertaken in libraries is borrowing books (96.1%) followed by using reference books (13.6%). The most popular performances viewed at theatres are drama (53.5%) and comedy (43.1%).
- 2.31. Of the those who use community or cultural facilities 49% rate their most used facility as very good, followed by 37.3% who rated it as good. Of those who rated the facility as poor or very poor the most popular improvement requested was 'other' with 40.6%. 'Other' comments included more live music, more varied performances and more affordable prices.

Children and Young People

- 2.32. People were asked if they had children under 16 in the household. The 37.6% who did, were asked about the way in which sports and leisure facilities in the area could be improved to better meet the needs of children. More facilities for five to eleven year olds (37.1%) was the most popular improvement requested, closely followed by more facilities for 12 to 16 year olds (36.3%) and more facilities for under five year olds (32.9). More organised activities (32.8%) and more open space for ball games (27.6%) were also popular.
- 2.33. Of the people who thought that improvements to existing facilities were important 20.2% highlighted improved security and reduction in anti-social behaviour as an area for improvement closely followed by 19.1% who felt that a greater range of activities available.

Online Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey

- 2.34. In addition to the main Sport, Recreation and Leisure Survey, residents of the borough who were not selected as part of the representative sample were also able to complete the survey. The survey was made available online and paper copies were left in libraries, community centres and visitor centres. Groups who responded to the Groups Questionnaire were asked to inform their members about this survey. 239 people responded to this part of the questionnaire. There were more women and more people aged 45-64 in this self-selected sample than the one that was representative of the Borough.
- 2.35. More of this sample belong to groups around their interests, 46.4 percent rather than 25.3 percent in the wider survey, which is to be expected due to the way the survey was publicised. More people in this sample would like to see more facilities near to their home in most cases, with accessible countryside and theatres being the spaces and facilities with the highest increase compared to the representative sample. This group were also much more likely to think there needed to be more facilities in the Borough as a whole compared the main sample who mainly were concerned with facilities near their home.
- 2.36. As should be expected due to the nature of the sample, higher levels of use for all facilities and spaces were expressed, reasons for non – use in this sample were less likely to be personal due to lack of interest or ill health and were more likely to relate to issues concerning the facility or space such as expense, lack of information or anti-social behaviour.
- 2.37. In general this sample is less likely to rate their most used facilities and spaces as very good and more likely to rate them as poor, although this was still relatively low. They are also more likely to travel further to access their most used spaces and facilities. More members in this sample were likely to have children in the household and only 3.3% thought that no improvements for facilities for children and young people were necessary.

QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION FROM CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

- 2.38. A number of quantitative studies have been undertaken to investigate children and young people's views about open space and recreation facilities. It is important to include these as the Sport, Recreation and Leisure survey was designed to access the views of people over 16. The following information is from a Youth Viewpoint Questionnaire distributed to 10-18 year olds on the panel in 2005.
- 2.39. The most popular reasons for young people to visit parks are for walking (33%), play facilities (31%) and events (31%). They thought the biggest problems with urban parks are safety (53%) and "looking scruffy" (49%). In order to make people use parks more the young people surveyed thought that clean toilets were most important (68%) followed by feeling safer (62%) and better play equipment (56%).
- 2.40. The Ezeelive questionnaire 2005 also demonstrates the views of young people towards open space and recreation provision. Just over half of the people asked think there are enough youth clubs, two thirds of young people think there are enough sports facilities and just over half think there are enough places to chill out with friends. Just over a half say there are enough youth clubs but almost a half said that more youth clubs where they live is one of the top things they would change. Almost two thirds of young people would like access to more arts and cultural activities. Affordability is clearly an issue for young people as three quarters of those surveyed would like more affordable things to do.
- 2.41. During Stockton Children's Trust consultation day in 2008 young people told us that their most popular activities are hanging around with friends (23%) and sport of fitness activities (16%). The places they told that they told us were hardest to get to are leisure centres (19%) and the countryside (16%). When asked for areas near where they live where they feel unsafe parks were mentioned often as were other public places such as parades of shops.

QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION

2.42. In order to supplement the statistical information from the Sport, Recreation and Leisure Survey some qualitative work was undertaken to understand people's needs around open space, sport and recreation facilities. This was undertaken through focus groups and attendance at meetings of groups who may have particular needs surrounding their use of open space, sport and recreation facilities. This information will also be used in order to identify visions for different types of spaces to encourage the form of their future development.

Children and Young People

2.43. To understand the needs of children and young people a Youth Assembly meeting was attended as was an Urdu class held at the International Family Centre and a Sure Start drop in session. Children and young people from the BME community who were attending an Urdu class provided information about the views of children and young people. Most of the children and young people live in the Parkfield area of Stockton. Young people in the 11-14 age group said they enjoy sport and fitness activities, including football, cricket, swimming and gymnastics, and socialising in community centres and parks. The need for more open space for these activities was highlighted.

2.44. A need for independence was identified, as the young people would like to have places they were able to go without parents or older siblings. Spaces near their homes are valued but often seen as unsafe and it was mentioned that it is important that parks are safe without dog litter and evidence of drug use. Community centres were highlighted as an important resource to have activities closer to home but it was mentioned that they need to be bigger.

2.45. Suggested improvements in order to make it easier to access facilities included opening schools at weekends, more play equipment in parks, facilities that are close by, and more organised activities. Festivals were viewed positively but there was a desire for something more permanent, it was acknowledged that you have to go further away and outside of Stockton for larger more unusual facilities such as Nature World.

2.46. In the 8-11 age group many views are similar to those above particularly the need to have locally based facilities and organised activities and a desire for more unusual facilities in parks such as a maze, mini fairs, young people's gyms and roller skating. Once again community centres were highlighted as important with suggested improvements including a canteen, table tennis and pool and a relaxation room. This age group showed an interest in less active organised activities, which wasn't as evident in the older group, such as arts and crafts, dancing, face painting and sewing. This age group also said they enjoy using the library.

2.47. A key issue for young people at the Youth Assembly meeting was the ability to travel to facilities and open spaces in terms of their access to public transport

and its running times. Another issue is the cost of using facilities an example provided was the cost of using the Tees Barrage.

- 2.48. Security was highlighted as important with discussion of the suitability of CCTV with Park Keepers also suggested as an alternative. In terms of improvement to existing facilities lots of traditional park elements were suggested such as sports areas and places to relax. However, there was also a request for challenging play equipment for young people such as zip lines and assault courses. The improvements at John White Head Park were suggested as an example of a play facility, which caters for a wider age range.
- 2.49. The young people also mentioned that the availability of facilities and open space such as sports pitches varied depending on where you live, with Fairfield and Ingleby Barwick mentioned as places with lower levels of sports facilities. An issue suggested for improvement was the need for more places indoors where young people can hang out, more specifically “more places for 16-18 year olds for non-alcohol related chilling”.
- 2.50. The Play it Your Way Billingham consultation undertaken in 2007 was designed to understand the views of young people not usually involved in mainstream consultation processes. This identified that football is a key activity for both genders, music is also a key interest. Friends were the biggest reason for young people being encouraged to join clubs and activities.
- 2.51. Getting into trouble was associated with a buzz and excitement, particularly for boys aged 16-18. However, the majority of young people interviewed thought that positive activities are the best way of stopping young people drinking too much. And, the majority of young people interviewed would like steps to be taken to improve how safe they feel in their area particularly more policing with a strong emphasis on community policing
- 2.52. An understanding of the needs of very young children were accessed through a drop in session at a Sure Start centre. Most of the people accessing the centre live near Ropner Park and there was a strong consensus that this was a very good facility for young children. The points mentioned were that it is free to use, in good condition, closed at night to stop anti social behaviour and has a variety of facilities such as the play area with equipment for young children, the café and being able to feed the ducks.
- 2.53. The need to have facilities close by when walking with small children was highlighted, and the sure start centre was seen as a positive facility and likened to a community centre. People at the centre who had experience of Yarm and Ingleby Barwick felt there was a lack of facilities for young children and the development of Romano Park was seen as an important improvement.

Older People

- 2.54. Attendance at the Over 50s Assembly and Retired Members Association provided an opportunity to identify the needs of older people around open space and recreation facilities. The cost of using facilities and hiring meeting places was considered a key problem for older people. Transport was also identified as a

difficulty, particularly the inability to access facilities and activities on an evening. A central meeting place for older people with good bus access and low hourly rates was identified as a solution to these problems.

- 2.55. A lack of information was highlighted as a problem as people expressed that they were unable to find out about activities for older people and concessions available. Better toilet facilities were identified as an important issue for older people as they are only available in shops and pubs and it limits the amount of time that can be spent in a park. People at the meetings believed that there is a lack of activities for older people that are based on entertainment rather than education and it is important for older people to have something to do on an evening as currently lots of evening entertainment is focused on younger people.
- 2.56. The importance of “cut throughs” in residential areas for older people was highlighted to avoid having to walk long distances. Safety issues were understood but it was believed that this should be dealt with in other ways rather than closing routes that they find important.

People with disabilities

- 2.57. In order to understand the needs of people with disabilities, a meeting was arranged with members of the Disability Advisory Group, and a session with Special Needs Activities with Parent Support was attended as was a meeting with social workers who work with people with profound and multiple disabilities.
- 2.58. There were some common themes that emerged when talking to members of these groups. A key issues is the lack of facilities and activities which are accessible to people with disabilities or special needs. It was felt that the legal requirement for disabled access does not always fully meet people’s needs and that it is important to have some facilities that go further than just what is legally required. This was felt to be particularly important due to changes in the way services are delivered through Direct Payments meaning people will increasingly have to access facilities independently. Also, activities are often only short term and could benefit from being extended.
- 2.59. Toilets are a key example of difficult access as it is difficult to be certain of the accessibility of toilets even in accessible buildings, use of the National Accessible Scheme currently used by the tourism industry was suggested as a way of making public buildings more accessible. It was highlighted that nowhere in the local area has toilets with a hoist.
- 2.60. Having trained staff was also felt to be a key way of helping people access facilities so that people could be confident that there would be help in an emergency. Providing ‘safe’ people for vulnerable people to access if necessary. Flexible staff, that understand people’s needs could enable people to access facilities more independently.
- 2.61. Transport was also described as a key difficulty in accessing facilities, parking can be difficult to access public places such as high streets, accessible buses and taxis are not always available. Information is also another key issue, this included not only a lack of information about activities and facilities that are

available to people with a disability or special needs but also in a format that is accessible.

- 2.62. The importance of design and well maintained surfaces was mentioned and it was suggested that people with disabilities could be involved in the design of new spaces and facilities. It was also mentioned that there is a lack of disability sport in the area and lack of activities that people with and without disabilities can take part in together.
- 2.63. Positive examples included the library services, which operate housebound services and the book bus. Examples of sporting venues that provide audio commentaries to blind and partially sighted people were given, and it was suggested that the Riverside Festival, which was considered as a very positive event, could be improved by more provision for disabled people.

Black and Minority Ethnic Groups

- 2.64. A number of people from the Black and Minority Ethnic Communities have been accessed when investigating the views of other groups, for example, through the Urdu class consultation and through speaking to women at the Sure Start centre. Many of the views expressed have been included within other sections of this analysis. However, additional points include that Sure Start centres are considered to be good facilities as they are like community centres but have interpreters for people who do not speak English, increasing inclusion.
- 2.65. A Health Trainer from the BME community highlighted the issue of getting transport to facilities outside of the centre of Stockton. This was an issue for some BME women who need to use sports facilities in a female only environment, including having only female staff in activity areas. It was highlighted that the design of facilities such as Splash were problematic as they were very open and people using them are visible to people outside the facility. The design of Splash is unhelpful in this situation as it is located nearest to the area of Stockton where a large proportion of BME communities live.

GROUP'S SURVEY

2.66. Specialist questionnaires were sent out to various groups that have an interest in open space, sport or recreation provision. The aim was to capture the specialist knowledge of these groups about their subject areas. The groups survey also offered an opportunity to get qualitative data from people who are engaged in the use of facilities. 71 questionnaires were returned in total but the groups who returned these questionnaires represent over 3000 members. This is likely to be an under estimate as it does not include the number of people represented by parish councils and residents associations and those accessing support services.

Groups with an Interest in a Particular Area

2.67. Area based questionnaires were returned by 17 residents associations, parish councils and others. The groups identified spaces that they felt had both improved and deteriorated since the Open Space audit was completed, this information has been used to inform the Open Space Audit update. Many of the questionnaires were returned by parish councils in village areas, although there were also returns from residents groups in urban areas.

2.68. The groups were asked what issues, if any, prevented people in their area from using indoor recreation facilities. None of the groups felt that there were no real restrictions to the use of indoor facilities in their area and comments were generally around a lack of accessible facilities.

- 13 groups felt that poor public transport was a key issue
- 10 groups felt that a lack of choice of activities was a key issue
- 8 groups felt that poor facilities was a key issue
- 7 groups felt that the location of facilities was a key issue
- 7 groups felt that lack of information about activities was a key issue
- 6 groups felt that expense was a key barrier to use
- 1 group felt that opening hours was a key issue

2.69. The groups were asked what issues, if any, restrict residents from using outdoor leisure and recreation facilities. One group felt that there were no real restrictions to the use of outdoor facilities, comments were generally about a lack of available facilities.

- 12 groups felt that poor public transport was a key issue
- 9 groups felt that the location of outdoor facilities was a key issue
- 8 groups felt that poor facilities was a key issue
- 6 groups felt that lack of maintenance was a key issue
- 2 groups felt that safety was a key issue

2.70. The groups were asked to provide comments about indoor community facilities in their area. Two groups were satisfied with their indoor community facilities and one group was positive about them. Five groups felt that there needed to be more facilities and five groups felt that existing facilities needed to be improved. The remaining four groups did not comment.

- 2.71. The groups were asked what they felt there needed to be more of or there was a demand for in the area. eight responses, the majority, were about the need for more facilities mainly for sports, including both indoor and outdoor facilities. Requests for improved activities and services were also popular, particularly around arts and crafts and adult education classes. Better walking networks and bigger projects like Ropner Park and a large concert hall were also mentioned.
- 2.72. Groups were asked about the particular needs of their communities for recreation and leisure facilities. The most popular response was the need to improve existing facilities. This was followed by the need for facilities or activities for young people, and the need for more facilities generally. More activities and services were mentioned particularly in an outreach capacity in rural areas such as ICT and adult education. Improved walking networks were also mentioned particularly as a way of people in rural areas accessing the countryside.
- 2.73. The groups felt that the best way to meet the needs they expressed were to provide more facilities mainly through increased access to existing facilities such as on school sites. Increased resources were also a main concern. Support and outreach services were also mentioned. Other comments included the need for better use of existing spaces, better parking and footpaths and concerns about areas that are generally deficient in facilities.

Sports Teams

- 2.74. In total 17 sports organisation replied to the survey with a variety of sport interests such as cricket, bowling, football, netball, rugby, bowling, golf and others. The groups that responded represent almost 2000 members made up of approximately 464 adult males, 297 adult females, 756 junior males and 230 junior females.
- 11 groups cater for school children
 - 10 groups cater for young people
 - 9 groups cater for adults
 - 6 groups cater for over 50s
 - 5 groups cater for families
 - 4 groups cater for people with disabilities
 - 3 groups cater for parents with young children
 - 3 groups cater for all of the above
- 2.75. There was an even split between groups that met weekly, of these groups all members tended to meet at once, and groups that met daily of which meetings tend to be more casual with different combinations of members meeting. There is also a seasonal element to some of the team's meetings.
- 2.76. The teams were asked about the way their members travelled to meetings
- 16 teams said a significant number of their team drive to meetings
 - 7 teams said a significant number of their team walk
 - 5 teams said a significant number of their team cycle

- 4 teams said a significant number of their team use public transport

2.77. Teams were also asked how far their members travel to meetings

- 5 of the teams had members who travelled between 1 and 5 miles
- 4 teams had members that travelled under a mile and up to 5 miles
- 4 teams had members that travelled over a mile up to 15 miles
- 2 teams had members who travelled as little as a mile and over 15 miles these teams were more specialist
- 1 team had members that travelled under a mile and up to 15 miles

2.78. This seems to demonstrate that although most team's members do not travel further than five miles to attend meetings people will travel much further. Seven teams have members that travel from outside the Borough three teams had approximately five percent of members from outside the Borough, one team had ten percent, two teams had 20% and one team was based outside the Borough with 76% of its members from other areas.

2.79. The table below demonstrates the ratings given by the teams for their main venue. It appears that teams are generally pleased with their venues based on these criteria although there are areas for improvement.


Sports Team's Rating of Their Main Venue

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	No opinion / don't know
Location	0	0	1	7	9	0
Signposting	1	6	4	4	2	0
Accessibility by public transport	0	1	5	6	3	2
Accessibility by walking or cycling networks	0	0	3	9	3	2
Accessibility within the site or venue for all users—inc those with disabilities	1	1	3	8	4	0
Car-parking	2	0	5	6	4	0
Quality of facility	1	1	3	5	6	0
Range of facilities	1	2	1	9	3	1
Opening times	0	0	2	7	8	0
Value for money	1	1	0	5	10	0
Overall	1	0	3	6	7	0
Does it meet your needs as a group?	2	1	2	5	6	1

2.80. When asked how their venue could be improve to better suit the team's needs nine teams suggested changes to the venue itself including improvements to the sports area and improvements to other features of the venue, such as car parking and refreshment areas. two teams reported a need to solve difficulties with other users of their venue. Other suggestions were for more facilities, more access to schools, improved equipment and improvement to the area surrounding facility.

2.81. Teams were asked to rate the overall provision of sports facilities in the Borough, the result was generally positive as demonstrated below with most


thinking that provision was fair or good. It does however, show room for improvement.



2.82. Groups were asked if there was any thing they would like to do but currently are unable to due to the facilities available, 12 teams responded. five of these teams felt that they needed to improve or expand their facilities. Three teams felt they needed to expand their meetings or range of activities. Two teams felt they needed more facilities and one team was already happy with their venue.

2.83. When asked what they would like to see more of in terms of facilities or what they thought there was a demand for in the Borough 12 teams responded. New facilities suggested include a skate park, roller rink and dedicated badminton facilities. Most suggestions where for more facilities such as swimming pools, bowling rinks and pitches. More access to existing facilities was also mentioned.

2.84. Teams where asked about the type of facility development they would like to see in the future: As demonstrated below, there is a clear preference from the teams for increased access to school sites and the development of specialist provision.



2.85. When asked if the teams had any plans to expand 13 teams responded positively. Four of these teams outlined that they would like to increase their membership either of existing teams of by expanding opportunities for

participation to new age groups or ability groups for example. Five of the teams expressed a desire which would require an improvement of facilities for example floodlighting to extend participation time, the ability to store equipment and better car parking and showering facilities.

2.86. The teams were asked about the key issues that they currently face

- 10 teams outlined a lack of resources for equipment / facility improvements
- 8 teams mentioned that suitable facilities were not available
- 6 teams felt unable to recruit junior members
- 6 teams feel they are lacking enough volunteers to run the club
- 3 teams felt the lack of quality coaching personnel is a key issue
- 3 teams felt that recruiting adult members was a key issue

2.87. Additional comments included a need for help with funding, improved links with schools to recruit members, the need for all weather facilities and the need for more access to facilities to make the most of existing coaching staff.

Community Groups

2.88. Community groups such as faith groups, management committees of community facilities, support groups and social groups returned 22 questionnaires. The groups represent approximately 768 members and many more in the case of groups that offer a support role. This is made up of 214 adult males, 326 adult females, 110 junior males and 118 junior females. Most of the groups meet weekly as full groups but there were those who met more frequently on a casual basis and less frequently in the case of management committees.

2.89. The groups were asked who they cater for

- 13 groups said they cater for all
- 6 groups said they cater for adults
- 4 groups cater for those aged 50 and above
- 3 groups said they cater for people with disabilities
- 2 groups said they cater for young people
- 1 group said they cater for school children
- 1 group said they cater for parents with young children

2.90. Groups were asked about the travel arrangements of their members

- 19 groups said a significant number of their members travelled by car
- 13 said a significant number of their members walked
- 5 groups said a significant number of their members used public transport
- 1 group said a significant number of their members cycled

2.91. In addition to travel modes groups were also asked about the pattern of distances that their members travelled to attend, it demonstrated that most of the groups had members that did not travel over five miles to attend.

- 5 groups that their members travelled less than a mile

- 5 groups that their members travelled less than a mile and up to 5 miles
- 5 groups said that their members travelled between 1 and 5 miles
- 4 groups said that their members travelled over 5 miles and up to 15 miles
- 1 group said their members travelled between 1 and 5 miles and over 15 miles
- 1 group said their members travel less than a mile and between 5 and 15 miles
- 1 group said their members travelled over a mile and up to 15 miles

2.92. The table below demonstrates the ratings that the community groups gave to their meeting venue. The response is positive particularly for how the venue meets the group's needs, overall and value for money.

Community Group's Rating of Their Main Venue


	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	No opinion / don't know
Location	0	0	3	9	10	0
Signposting	2	6	4	7	2	1
Accessibility by public transport	1	5	4	6	5	1
Accessibility by walking or cycling networks	0	4	6	7	5	0
Accessibility within the venue for all users – inc those with disabilities	0	1	4	10	7	0
Car-parking	2	1	5	7	7	0
Quality of facility	0	1	3	11	7	0
Range of facilities	0	1	4	9	8	0
Opening times	0	1	2	7	9	3
Value for money	0	0	1	6	13	2
Overall	0	0	1	11	10	0
Does it meet your needs as a group?	0	0	3	5	14	0

2.93. The groups were asked how the venue could be improved to meet their needs better. 16 groups responded ten of which wanted to improve their facilities particularly in relation to refurbishment and parking provision, the need for improved equipment was also highlighted. Improved access was mentioned in relation to transport and signposting.

2.94. The groups were asked if there was anything they would like to be able to do but currently are unable to, because of existing facilities. Eight groups responded some felt that they would like to offer new opportunities such as new youth facilities, outdoor areas, games rooms or kitchens. Other felt they needed further resources to be able to extend the opportunities already offered.

2.95. When asked what they would like to see more of, or what there was a demand for in the Borough nine groups responded. The response was varied but included improved public transport, crèches, meeting rooms and a concert hall.

2.96. The groups were asked about the key issues they currently face. As demonstrated below a lack of resources and a lack of volunteers to help run the group were the most popular issue. Additional comments seemed to suggest that these issues were often related, for example a lack of resources resulted in an inability to provide information to recruit members.



Groups with an Interest in the Environment, Greenspaces and Outdoor Recreation

2.97. Nine groups with an interest in the environment, greenspace and outdoor recreation were surveyed. They have a variety of roles such as conservation and involving the community with greenspaces, or have an interest in a particular greenspace. The groups represented approximately 516 members of which; 405 are adult males, 104 adult females and seven junior members. Most of the groups said they meet quarterly and some monthly.

- 5 groups said they cater for adults
- 4 groups said they cater for over 50s
- 2 groups said they cater for all
- 1 group said they cater for people with disabilities

- 1 group said they cater for parents with young children
- 1 group said they cater for families
- 1 group said they cater for young people

2.98. The groups were asked about the travel arrangements to their meeting venue or site if this differed, most travel appears to be by car.

- 8 groups said a significant number of their members travelled by car to meetings of their site
- 3 groups said a significant number of their members walked to their meetings or their site
- 2 groups said a significant number of their members travelled on public transport to their meetings or their site.

2.99. Information was also provided about the distances travelled to their venue or their site, as demonstrated below the majority of people do not travel more than five miles to their meeting or site.

- 3 groups said members travel 1 to 5 miles
- 2 groups said that members travel 5 to 15 miles
- 1 group said members travel less than a mile
- 1 group said members travel from under a mile up to 5 miles
- 1 group said that members travel between 1 and 15 miles

2.100. Six groups plan to extend their role in the future mainly through the expansion of membership and activities undertaken and by an extension of remit, for example, budget holding.

2.101. Groups were asked if there is anything they would like to do but are currently unable to, six groups responded to the question. The main aspirations were to improve outdoor spaces in order to offer wider opportunities for people to use them, particularly children. Another group felt they would like to take more control of decision-making.

2.102. Six of the groups had an interest in a particular, park, area of countryside or greenspace. The groups were asked to rate this greenspace, some groups rated more than one space. Additional comments relate to problems with litter and antisocial behaviour, the need for resources to improve management and the opportunity offered by improvements.

Environmental Group's Rating of Their Main Venue

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	No opinion / don't know
Signposting and on-site information	1	1	4	4	3	0
Other information / publicity (e.g. information on Council's website)	2	2	3	3	3	0
Accessibility by public transport	2	1	2	4	0	4
Accessibility by walking or cycling networks	0	0	1	6	5	1
Accessibility within the site/area for all users– inc those with disabilities	0	0	7	5	0	1
Car-parking	2	0	2	4	5	0
Management and cleanliness of the site/area	0	0	2	5	6	0
Range of facilities	1	1	3	4	4	0
Overall quality	0	1	1	7	4	0
How do you think it meets the needs of local people and/or visitors?	1	0	1	7	4	0

2.103. When asked what improvements are needed to make this site better meet the needs of the group and other users, the main theme was around small improvements such as seating, bins and information boards making a big difference. More involvement with the community and education were also mentioned as were the need to improve access other than by car, by improving public transport and walking and cycling networks.

2.104. The groups were asked to highlight issues of particular importance, those mentioned relate to the conservation of the natural and historic environment, local greenspace, light pollution, access for people with disabilities and access by public transport. The groups were asked to expand upon this by outlining the main assets and opportunities, which relate to these issues. The wealth of green spaces in the Borough including ancient woodland and Local Nature Reserves where the most popular of the Borough's assets, its network of countryside organisations were also mentioned. Opportunities highlighted by the groups mainly relate to forms of management for example managing spaces including verges in a way that enhances wildlife habitats. Other examples include traffic management, improved public transport, and energy savings through reduced street lighting.

2.105. Additional comments were welcomed, many of these were positive about the improvements that have taken place, but there are concerns about the loss of greenspaces and countryside areas, and about the correct management of existing spaces. The need for increased resources and security was also highlighted as was some of the group's willingness to be involved in management of spaces in the future or in a more involved way than at present

Allotment groups Survey.

2.106. Six questionnaires were returned from allotment management groups across the Borough. Their questionnaires demonstrated that the groups undertake a number of activities in addition to working on plots and looking after chickens and pigeons, including barbecues, shows, a shop, a charity fair and maintenance of a local flower bed.

2.107. The groups were asked about the people they cater for as members

- 6 groups cater for adults
- 5 groups cater for people over 50
- 3 groups cater for people with disabilities
- 3 groups cater for parents with young children
- 3 groups cater for families
- 3 groups cater for young people
- 3 groups cater for school children

2.108. The groups were asked about their members' travel arrangements to their allotment site. No one said that their members travelled more than five miles to their site, five groups said their members travelled one to five miles and one group said their members travelled under a mile. There are also a variety of transport modes used:

- 6 groups said a significant number of their members walk to the site
- 5 groups said a significant number of their members cycle to the site
- 5 groups said a significant number of their members use public transport to reach the site
- 5 groups said a significant number of their members use a car to visit their site

2.109. Groups were asked to rate their allotment site and the number of groups rating each feature as very poor through to very good is outlined below.

Allotment Group's Rating of Their Site

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	No opinion / don't know
Signposting and on-site information	2	0	2	1	0	none
Other information / publicity (e.g. information on Council's website)	1	3	1	1	0	0
Accessibility by public transport	0	0	4	1	2	0
Accessibility by walking or cycling networks	0	0	2	2	2	0
Accessibility within the site/area for all users– inc those with disabilities	0	0	2	1	2	0
Car-parking	1	1	2	2	0	0
Management and cleanliness of the site/area	0	0	1	2	3	0
Range of facilities	0	1	1	2	1	0
Overall quality	1		1	2	3	0
How do you think it meets the needs of local people and/or visitors?	0	1	1	2	2	0

- 2.110. In addition to the above rating the groups were asked about the improvements that they felt were necessary for their sites. The most popular improvements were toilets and fencing but parking, running water, drainage and police presence were also mentioned.
- 2.111. When asked to rate the provision of allotments in the Borough overall the response was positive but left room for improvement, three groups reported them as average and three groups reported them as good.
- 2.112. The groups were asked if there was anything they wanted to do but were unable to due to their current facilities, three groups said no, but one group would like to be able to have meetings on site. The groups felt that there was a demand for toilets on site and more allotment provision in the south of the Borough, particularly in Ingleby Barwick.
- 2.113. When asked if the groups had any plans to expand half of those surveyed said they did not but the other three groups said that they welcome new members or that they would expand but there was not the land available to allow this. The groups were also asked what the main issues facing their organisation or allotment site were, the most popular answer was vandalism, litter and other similar issues. Lack of resources for improvements and lack of volunteers to run the organisation also featured.

2.114. Other comments offered by the groups indicated the level of demand on waiting lists, which has led some allotments to split their plots to accommodate more members, concern about the loss of existing allotments was also raised as was the current use of allotments by adult education and local schools.

3. AUDITING LOCAL PROVISION

- 3.1. The second step of the assessment is to determine the level of existing provision. It is important to identify the amount of existing space, the quality and value of existing space and how it is distributed.

OPEN SPACE AUDIT

- 3.2. Existing provision was originally assessed by the Open Space Audit, completed in 2005, over 1000 spaces are included. The pilot for this study was originally undertaken in Billingham in 2003. The audit has both a quantitative and qualitative element. The assessment was undertaken using the following information sources

- Aerial and ground photography;
- Ordnance Survey Maps;
- Field Survey; and
- Background Reports.

- 3.3. For inclusion in the audit, Urban Open Space was defined as:

“Open land within 500m of urban areas, which has the potential to provide recreational, environmental, social or economic benefits to communities, regardless of access or ownership. Such land shall not include land within the curtilage of private dwellings or private farmland.”

- 3.4. Land with an area smaller than 200 square metres was excluded unless it had particular amenity value an assessment to identify those spaces under 200 square metres was included in the audit. Highway verges were also excluded. The audit was intended to provide a baseline about the quantity and quality of open space in the Borough. The audit provides information about open space at a particular point in time.

- 3.5. The quantity of space has been assessed using GIS. Each space was surveyed using a standard form, which assessed a number of characteristics around issues such as biodiversity, facilities and landscaping. Using this information spaces were given a score for quality. To ensure that spaces were not penalised unfairly for not having characteristics that are not suitable for their type, scores were based on different characteristics for different types of space. For example, a natural green space would not be penalised for not having a marked pitch, which would be unsuitable for its primary purpose. Primary purpose has been outlined previously (p.4). An online consultation was then undertaken in which residents were able to rate the spaces that they use.

OPEN SPACE AUDIT UPDATE

- 3.6. In order to reflect changes that have taken place to open space in the Borough it is important to update the audit regularly and an update of the audit was undertaken in 2008. Information from a number of sources was used to update the audit and ensure consistency.

Original Survey Sheets

- 3.7. Due to the inappropriate representation of toilets, bins and seating in the qualitative assessment of the spaces, the survey sheets from the Open Space Audit were used to change the way this information was represented to that when originally surveyed.

Geographical Information Systems (GIS)

- 3.8. Planning application sites are entered onto GIS and these were used with the Audit information to identify open spaces in the Audit where a planning application had taken place. Planning applications were then investigated to identify changes to the quantity or quality of open space. Ordnance Survey information was also used to highlight areas of change.

Play Area Strategy and Informal Sports Information

- 3.9. The Play Area Strategy and mapped informal sports, or young people's areas, information was used to ensure that play areas and young people's areas are included in the audit.

Playing Pitch Audit (Care for Your Area 2007) and Sports England's Active Places Power

- 3.10. To ensure that sports facilities were defined consistently the playing pitch audit and Active Power Places were used to identify sports facilities. Spaces identified as sports facilities in the audit which do not appear in the playing pitch audit or on active power places were included if there was evidence of a marked pitch identified by aerial photographs or a site visit.

Officer Local Knowledge

- 3.11. The local knowledge of officers in the Countryside and Greenspace Section was used to identify issues that may have caused changes to open space or areas of the Audit that could be improved.

Survey of New Development

- 3.12. Since the original audit new development has occurred which contains new areas of open space, particularly in Ingleby Barwick. Open space on new development was surveyed and added to the audit.

Major Improvements

- 3.13. Major programmes of improvement that have taken place since the original audit was conducted such as the improvements at Ropner Park and improvements to the play area at John Whitehead Park. Information about major improvements has been used to identify spaces that have changed in quality.

Land in Industrial Estates

- 3.14. It was noted that there was some inconsistency in the inclusion of land in industrial estates. Most industrial estates only had land that has some significance included, however, in one case all land was included, this land was excluded during the update to maintain consistency with the other industrial estates and because it was deemed to not meet the definition of urban open space of providing benefits to communities.

BUILT FACILITIES AUDIT

3.15. The table below identifies the facilities included in the built facilities audit, and the unit of measurement. This has been derived using a suggested typology from PPG17 and information held on Sport England's Active Places Power online database.

Type	Definition	Unit for measurement
Health and Fitness Suites	Contain health and fitness equipment for individual fitness activity.	Measured in the numbers of stations included in the suite
Indoor Bowls Centres	Permanent indoor facilities which contain a permanent bowls green area.	Measured in rinks
Indoor Tennis Centres	Dedicated covered or indoor tennis courts not multi use halls etc,	Measured in courts
Sports Halls	Main halls are multi-sports halls where a range of activities are carried out, at least one hall on site should be the size on one badminton court. Activity halls are also included they are halls which share a site with a main hall and are smaller than a badminton court, or are on their own site larger than a badminton court but not marked for sports.	Sports halls are measured in both badminton courts and square metres.
Swimming Pools	Swimming pools include main pools which are over 15 metres in length and are generally rectangular, training pools which may be under 15 metres in length or the smaller pool on one site. Open air pools are also included.	Measured in lanes and square meters.
Synthetic Turf Pitches	Synthetic alternative to grass pitches for all weather use, pitches should be a minimum of	Measured in pitches

	75metres times 45 metres and flood lit.	
Ice Rinks	Permanent ice rinks.	Measured in square metres.
Community Centres and Village Halls	Included community centres owned by the SBC Community Development and Youth Services. Also includes village halls identified in the Tees Valley Rural Community Council Village Hall Audit (2005).	Measured in capacity, the number of people the facility holds.

3.16. Both private and public sports facilities have been included in the Built Audit as have facilities in schools, as all facilities provide potential benefits. This is the approach suggested by Sport England. Private facilities provide a legitimate part of the sports facility market in a diverse Borough like Stockton and provide choice to residents. Public facilities also have a cost for use and some sectors of the private sports facility market have a similar cost to public facilities.

3.17. The inclusion of community centres and village halls is slightly different to that of the sports facilities. Only those facilities associated with SBC Community Development, those in the portfolio of SBC Children Education and Social Care and those identified in the Tees Valley Rural Community Council Village Hall Audit (2005) are included. The village hall audit was undertaken as part of the Tees Valley Village Halls and Rural Community Buildings Project. There is a need for strict boundaries for the inclusion of community centres and village halls due to the variety of buildings that can be used for community purposes and the difficulty of identifying them all.

3.18. Quality has been assessed through the audit in a number of ways. For built sports facilities run by Tees Active an ISPAL Customer Service Audit Report undertaken in 2007 has been used as to outline the quality of facilities. For private and school facilities the date when the facility was built and last refurbished indicates the quality and attractiveness of the facility, an approach taken by Sport England.

3.19. For community centres and village halls a quality assessment was undertaken using a standard form that identifies the quality of facilities such as toilets, entrances and internal equipment. This assessment was undertaken in person, over the phone or in cooperation with colleagues in Community Development and Youth Services who have regular access to these facilities. The nature of this assessment was determined by access issues associated with built facilities which are not relevant to open spaces.

AREA PROFILES

- 3.20. The following profiles outline the quantity and quality of spaces in different areas of the Borough. For some types of space the total open space and accessible open space has been highlighted. The open space audit has included all spaces that meet its definition regardless of access and ownership because of the amenity and biodiversity benefits that can be provided even without access. For this reason spaces that were “Restricted (only accessible to a small group of people e.g. operational site)” have been excluded from the area of accessible space.
- 3.21. Allotments, Cemeteries and Churchyards and Civic Space have not been separated by accessibility, as both civic space and cemeteries and church yards do not have any instances of inaccessibility. Allotments have an unusual form of access so no difference has been made.
- 3.22. The type of space where the largest proportion of space is sports facilities this is largely because golf courses, which tend to be by far the largest facilities in an area have been classed as inaccessible. Although people can access them by arrangement they are usually opportunity led and it is unlikely that we would expect to increase them through planning obligations contributions. Due to the massive size of golf courses compared to the small number of people who use them it is felt that they are an exceptional case and would skew the amount of provision compared to population. Golf courses have therefore been excluded from the calculations that are used to set standards.
- 3.23. The quality total has been broken down to show the distribution of spaces that have different quality scores. The percentage of spaces with a poor, satisfactory, good, and excellent score are demonstrated. A poor score relates to spaces scoring between zero and 25 percent, satisfactory 26 to 50 percent, good 51 to 75 percent and excellent 76 to 100 percent.
- 3.24. A percentage score is used to demonstrate quality rather than an actual score as different types of space are scored for a different number of characteristics. The differing nature of the spaces means that different characteristics represent quality for different spaces, for example a marked sports pitch would be inappropriate in a natural greenspace. Using a percentage score allows comparison across different types of spaces.
- 3.25. The population figures used have been provided by the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (JSU). Ward estimates have been produced based on Office of National Statistics Lower Super Output Areas for 2007 which were released at the end of November 2008. The JSU figures were produced at the beginning of December 2008. These figures contain the age breakdown of people in the Borough. Most of the areas used in the Open Space Audit relate to the wards however this is not the case in Stockton East and Stockton West where Parkfield and Oxbridge has been split. In this case the population of that ward in each side of Stockton has been estimated using the ward population and identifying the

number of households in each area through GIS and the Gazetteer. This was not an issue for the Built Facilities Audit.

- 3.26. In the case of rural villages their population has been estimated using the figure of 2.4 people per dwelling as the average suggested by the JSU for the current number of people per house. In cases where rural villages are in the wards which also contain urban areas, the population of the village has been taken away from the population which makes up that urban area and the villages stand alone. For example, Kirkleavington's population has been taken away from that of Yarm and both areas have been assessed separately.
- 3.27. Information about levels of use has been taken from the Sport, Recreation and Leisure Survey. Information on car ownership is based on census data at ward level. To identify car ownership at the town level an average of the wards included in that town has been undertaken to provide an indication. In cases where this average may mask a wide variation in car ownership in the town, this has been highlighted.

Stockton-on-Tees Borough

Population –190,250

Percentage of the population:

- aged 0-15 years =19.67%
- retirement age 17.69%
- working age (16-retirement) =62.63%
- do not own a car = 30%
- use outdoor areas for leisure =81.5%
- use sports and fitness facilities =58.5%
- use community and cultural facilities =66.5%

3.28. The total population of Stockton-on-Tees Borough is 190,250. 19.67% of this population are children aged up to 15 years, 17.69% are of retirement age, currently 65 for males and 60 for females and 62.63% of working age, aged 16 to retirement. Of the whole population of the Borough 30% do not own a car. Levels of car ownership will be investigated in the other area profiles however at ward level non- car ownership varies between 68% in Stockton Town Centre Wards and three percent in Ingleby Barwick West. In rural areas car ownership is higher than the general Borough level with 13% and 10 percent non-car ownership in Northern Parishes Ward and Western Parishes Ward respectively.

3.29. The results of the Sport, Recreation and Leisure Survey demonstrate that in the Borough as a whole 81.5% use outdoor areas for leisure, 58.5% use sports and fitness facilities and 66.5% use community and cultural facilities.

3.30. The total amount of open space in the Borough is 1890.1ha of which 1503.3ha is considered accessible. The largest proportion of this space is made up by sports facilities and natural greenspaces. The lowest proportion of the space is made up by civic space, allotments and cemeteries and church yards.

3.31. Sports facilities, green corridors and natural greenspace have the largest proportion of inaccessible space. Almost all of the parks and gardens in the Borough are accessible, the level of accessible amenity greenspace is also very high.

Quantity of Spaces in Stockton-on-Tees Borough

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	1890.1ha	1503.3ha
Parks and Gardens	106.1ha	106.1ha
Natural Greens Spaces	510.8ha	463.8ha
Green Corridors	288.5ha	236ha
Sports Facilities	603.5ha	335.1ha
Amenity Green Space	276.5ha	263.6ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	2091 people per play unit.	
Allotments	42.9ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	50.5ha	
Civic Space	5.6ha	

3.32. Most of the space in the Borough is of good quality and 6 percent is excellent. About a third is satisfactory and only one percent is poor. Play areas and young people's areas and Civic space have the highest proportion of excellent space with allotments the only type of space not to have any space scoring excellent for quality.

3.33. Most types of spaces have a significant majority of spaces with a quality rating of good, it is only natural greenspace and allotments where this is not the case. Both of these types of spaces have a higher percentage of spaces with satisfactory quality. The highest proportion of poor spaces is found within the natural greenspace category. Allotments and cemeteries have a relatively higher amount of space in this category at four percent, however it should be noted that for those types of space with less sites four percent may only relate to very few sites.

Quality of Spaces in Stockton-on-Tees Borough

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	1%	30%	63%	6%
Parks and Gardens	0	35%	59%	6%
Natural Greenspace	7%	43%	45%	4%
Green Corridors	2%	32%	60%	7%
Sports Facilities	1%	32%	59%	9%
Amenity Greenspace	1%	26%	70%	4%
Play areas/young people's areas	0	17%	64%	19%
Allotments	4%	65%	31%	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	4%	8%	85%	4%
Civic Space	0	13%	75%	13%

3.34. The Borough has a total of 1227 health and fitness stations, and 100 badminton courts of sports halls in main halls and six smaller activity halls. There are 42 lanes of swimming pools in main pools and seven training pools. six synthetic turf pitches are available in the Borough as are an ice rink, an indoor tennis centre with seven courts and two indoor bowls centres containing a total of 8 rinks. There are 43 community centres and village halls in the Borough with the total capacity to hold 6263 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Stockton-on-Tees Borough

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	1172 stations
Indoor Bowls	8 rinks
Indoor Tennis	6 courts
Sports Halls	100 badminton courts
Activity Halls	5 halls
Swimming Pool	42 lanes
Training Pool	7 pools
Synthetic Turf Pitch	6 pitches
Ice Rink	1456 m2
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity for 6263 people

Billingham

Population –36,670

Percentage of the population:

- aged 0-15 years =19.12%
- retirement age 18.93%
- working age (16-retirement) =61.96%
- do not own a car = 30%
- use outdoor areas for leisure =78.3%
- use sports and fitness facilities =62.9%
- use community and cultural facilities =70.6%

3.35. The current population of Billingham is 36,670 people. This is made up of 19.12% children, 18.93% retirement age and 61.96% working age. This is very similar to the demographic make up of the Borough as a whole but with a slightly lower proportion of children, higher proportion of retired people and a lower proportion of working age people. The level of car ownership is the same as that in the Borough as a whole. However, this average of the wards in Billingham does not demonstrate the level of variation by area with 12% and 16% non car ownership in Billingham North and Billingham West wards with 44% in both the Central and East Ward. The ward best represented by the average is Billingham South with 35%.

3.36. At 78.3% the percentage of people who use outdoor areas for leisure is lower than that in the Borough as a whole at 81.5%. However, the percentage of people using sports and fitness facilities at 62.9% is higher than the Borough level of 58.5%, as is the proportion of people using community and cultural facilities at 70.6% compared to the Borough level of 66.5%.

3.37. There is a total of 457.5ha in Billingham with 400.3ha of that space considered accessible. Almost half of this space is natural greenspace largely due to the location of Cowpen Bewley Nature Reserve and Billingham Beck Country Park. Sports facilities are the least accessible of spaces due to the relatively large area of the golf course.

Quantity of Spaces in Billingham

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	457.6ha	400.3ha
Parks and Gardens	14.7ha	14.7ha
Natural Greens Spaces	218.6ha	212.1ha
Green Corridors	22.3ha	22.3ha
Sports Facilities	142.4ha	87.8ha
Amenity Green Space	40.6ha	40.1ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	1930 people per play unit.	
Allotments	11.6ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	5.7ha	
Civic Space	1.1ha	

3.38. The overall quality of spaces in Billingham is lower than that in the Borough as a whole, as 52 percent of spaces score only poor or satisfactory compared to 31 percent at the Borough level. The lower quality of spaces is continued throughout the different types of spaces in Billingham. Only parks and gardens, play and young people's facilities and civic space have less space scoring only poor or satisfactory than at the Borough level. The percent of spaces scoring excellent is lower in Billingham than the Borough as a whole for all types of space.

Quality of spaces in Billingham

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	2	50	47	1
Parks and Gardens	0	25	75	0
Natural Greenspace	7	59	34	0
Green Corridors	0	24	71	5
Sports Facilities	3	50	43	3
Amenity Greenspace	0	57	43	0
Play areas/young people's areas	0	9	82	9
Allotments	10	80	10	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0	25	75	0
Civic Space	0	0	100	0

3.39. A variety of Billingham's facilities are housed at the Forum Leisure Complex including the ice rink, indoor bowling and a main pool, training pool, sports hall activity hall and health and fitness suite. Billingham has 25 badminton courts worth of sports halls, three activity halls, two synthetic turf pitches and 285 health and fitness stations. There are eight community centres in the Borough with the total capacity to hold 1052 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Billingham

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	285 stations
Indoor Bowls	2 rinks
Indoor Tennis	0 courts
Sports Halls	25 badminton courts
Activity Halls	3 halls
Swimming Pool	10 lanes
Training Pool	1 pool
Synthetic Turf Pitch	2 pitches
Ice Rink	1456m ²
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity for 1052 people

Thornaby

Population –23,175

Percentage of the population:

- aged 0-15 years =19.16%
- retirement age 18.12%
- working age (16-retirement) =62.68%
- do not own a car = 40%
- use outdoor areas for leisure =78.1%
- use sports and fitness facilities =51.4%
- use community and cultural facilities =57.5%

3.40. Thornaby's population currently amounts to 23,175. 19.16% of this population are children, 18.12% are retired and 62.68% are of working age. This is very similar to the total Borough population with very slightly less children very slightly more retired people and almost exactly the same proportion of working age people. The level of people in Thornaby who do not own a car, 40%, is higher than the Borough level by 10%. However, both Village Ward and Stainsby Hill Ward are more similar to the Borough level than the average suggests with 34% and 36% respectively. The level in Mandale and Victoria Ward is 50%.

3.41. The percentage of people who use outdoor areas for leisure is 78.1%, the percentage of people using sports and fitness facilities is 51.4% and the percentage using community and cultural facilities is 57.5%. This is lower in all cases than the wider Borough levels which are 81.5%, 58.5% and 66.5% respectively.

3.42. There is a total of 277.8ha in Thornaby of which 217ha are accessible. All 17.7 ha of parks and gardens are accessible, the level of accessibility of amenity space is also very high. Sports facilities are the least accessible of spaces due to the relatively large area of the golf course. As usual civic space, allotments and cemeteries and church yards were the spaces with the lowest areas.

Quantity of Spaces in Thornaby

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	277.8ha	217ha
Parks and Gardens	17.7ha	17.7ha
Natural Greens Spaces	67.4ha	63.6ha
Green Corridors	47.5ha	38.6ha
Sports Facilities	81.5ha	34.5ha
Amenity Green Space	34.6ha	33.8ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	1545 people per play unit	
Allotments	10.1ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	17.3ha	
Civic Space	0.5ha	

3.43. The quality of space in Thornaby is very similar to the level of quality of overall space to the whole Borough. The level of quality of amenity space and natural greenspace in Thornaby is also very similar to quality of amenity space in the

whole Borough. Green corridors, allotments and cemeteries and churchyards have a lower quality in Thornaby than in the Borough as a whole with parks and gardens only slightly worse. The quality of sports facilities and civic space is higher in Thornaby than it is in the Borough as a whole. The amount of excellent spaces, in all cases except sports facilities, is lower in Thornaby than the whole Borough level.

Quality of Spaces in Thornaby

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	2	29	62	7
Parks and Gardens	0	50	50	0
Natural Greenspace	9	45	45	0
Green Corridors	8	75	17	0
Sports Facilities	0	11	72	17
Amenity Greenspace	0	23	70	6
Play areas/young people's areas	0	0	100	0
Allotments	0	100	0	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	33	0	67	0
Civic Space	0	0	100	0

3.44. Thornaby has 254 health and fitness stations and 17 badminton courts worth of main sports hall eight of which are housed at Thornaby Pavillion. The largest indoor bowls facility in the Borough is also in Thornaby with six rinks. There are eight lanes of swimming pools. There are three community centres in Thornaby with the total capacity to hold 450 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Thornaby

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	254 stations
Indoor Bowls	6 rinks
Indoor Tennis	0 courts
Sports Halls	17 badminton courts
Activity Halls	0 halls
Swimming Pool	8 lanes
Training Pool	1 pool
Synthetic Turf Pitch	1 pitch
Ice Rink	0
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity for 450 people

Ingleby Barwick

Population –19,645

Percentage of the population:

- **aged 0-15 years =26.05%**
- **retirement age 6.9%**
- **working age (16-retirement) =67.03%**
- **do not own a car = 4%**
- **use outdoor areas for leisure =87.8%**
- **use sports and fitness facilities =68.7%**
- **use community and cultural facilities =75%**

3.45. Ingleby Barwick currently has a population of 19,645 people. 26.05% of that population are children this is considerably higher than the Borough level at 19.67%. The proportion of children at the Borough level has been skewed slightly by the high proportion of children in Ingleby Barwick as the proportion of children in all other towns is slightly lower than the Borough level. The proportion of people of working age people, 67.03%, is also higher than that at the wider Borough level of 62.63%. Perhaps the most striking variation is the proportion of retired people in Ingleby Barwick, which at 6.9% is less than half the proportion of retired people in the Borough as a whole which is 17.69%. The low proportion of retired people in Ingleby Barwick has skewed the proportion of retired people in the Borough as a whole, as all other towns have a higher proportion of retired people than the Borough level.

3.46. The proportion of people who do not own a car is the lowest in the Borough at four percent. In Ingleby Barwick 87.8% say they use outdoor areas for leisure, 68.7% say they use sports and fitness facilities and 75% say they use community and cultural facilities. This is a higher level of use for all facilities that that at the Borough level which is 81.5%, 58.5% and 66.5% respectively.

3.47. There is a total of 230.6ha of open space in Ingleby Barwick 154.9ha of which is accessible, green corridors make up the largest proportion of this space, at over half of the total space. Ingleby Barwick has fewer of the types of space in the PPG17 typology with no space allocated to allotments cemeteries and churchyards, civic space and parks and gardens. However, in the case of parks and gardens this is soon to change with the development of Romano Park. As usual sports facilities has the lowest level of accessible space due to the proportion of the space that is made up by the golf course. Natural greenspace and amenity greenspace has a high level of accessibility.

3.48. Ingleby Barwick has the highest number of people per play unit of all the Borough's town however, the development of Romano Park will considerably improve this situation. The Park will include a destination play area which amounts to five play units and a multi ball court which amounts to three play units of young people's provision. This increases the number of play units in Ingleby Barwick to 12 resulting in 1637 people per play unit. This is a higher level of provision than that of the Borough as a whole.

Quantity of Space in Ingleby Barwick

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	230.6ha	154.9ha
Parks and Gardens	0	0
Natural Greens Spaces	27.5ha	25.8ha
Green Corridors	147ha	105.8ha
Sports Facilities	42ha	10ha
Amenity Green Space	14ha	13.2ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	4911 people per play unit	
Allotments	0	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0	
Civic Space	0	

3.49. The quality of space in Ingleby Barwick is generally better than the quality of space in the Borough as a whole. There is a higher proportion of spaces in the excellent category and a lower proportion of spaces in the poor category in nearly all cases. Green corridors, sports facilities, amenity greenspace, and play facilities are generally of a higher quality than those in the whole Borough, the type of space with a generally lower quality score in Ingleby Barwick than the rest of the Borough is natural greenspace.

Quantity of space in Ingleby Barwick

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	1	21	54	24
Natural Greenspace	0	75	13	13
Green Corridors	0	18	68	14
Sports Facilities	0	13	63	25
Amenity Greenspace	4	12	58	27
Play areas/young people's areas	0	0	25	75

3.50. In total there are 90 stations of health and fitness suite in Ingleby Barwick there is also four badminton courts of sports hall located at the secondary school and one training pool. There is on one community centre in the Ingleby Barwick with the capacity to hold 180 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Ingleby Barwick

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	90 stations
Indoor Bowls	0
Indoor Tennis	0 courts
Sports Halls	4 Badminton Courts
Activity Halls	0 halls
Swimming Pool	0 lanes
Training Pool	1 pool
Synthetic Turf Pitch	0
Ice Rink	0m2
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity to hold 180 people

Eaglescliffe

Population –10,735

Percentage of the population:

- aged 0-15 years =19.05%
- retirement age 19.61%
- working age (16-retirement) =61.39%
- do not own a car = 14%
- use outdoor areas for leisure =84.8%
- use sports and fitness facilities =65.7%
- use community and cultural facilities =81%

3.51. Currently 10,735 people live in Eaglescliffe, 19.05% of this population are children, this is similar to but slightly lower than the level in the Borough as a whole, which is 19.67%. The population of retirement age people in Eaglescliffe is at 19.61%. This is higher than the total Borough level which is 17.69%. The working age population is at 61.39% which is similar to but lower than the Borough level which is 62.63%. The proportion of people who do not own a car in Eaglescliffe is 14%. This is less than half the proportion of people in the Borough as a whole who do not own a car.

3.52. In Eaglescliffe 84.8% of people use outdoor spaces for leisure, 65.7% of people use sports and fitness facilities and 81% use community and cultural facilities. This is higher for all types of facilities than the total Borough levels which are 81.5%, 58.5% and 66.5% respectively. Use of community and cultural facilities in Eaglescliffe is high second only to Yarm at 81.3%.

3.53. There is a total of 131.8ha of open space in Eaglescliffe 89.3ha of which is accessible. A large proportion, almost half, of the total space is made up of sports facilities. All of the parks and gardens, green corridors and amenity greenspace in Eaglescliffe are accessible. In Eaglescliffe there is no civic space. Cemeteries and churchyards and green corridors are the spaces with the lowest areas. Eaglescliffe has the lowest number of people per play unit of all the Borough's towns.

Quantity of space in Eaglescliffe

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	131.8ha	89.3ha
Parks and Gardens	11.6ha	11.6ha
Natural Greens Spaces	20.2ha	18.2ha
Green Corridors	4.9ha	4.9ha
Sports Facilities	60.6ha	22.9ha
Amenity Green Space	25.2ha	25.2ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	1193 people per play unit	
Allotments	7.8ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0.7ha	
Civic Space	0	

The quality of open space in Eaglescliffe is better than the Borough as a whole largely due to 84% of the spaces in Eaglescliffe being rated as good. This distribution is highlighted by the percentage of spaces scored as poor being lower than the wider Borough level except for natural greenspace. There is also a lower proportion of spaces categorised as excellent in Eaglescliffe than the Borough as a whole apart from amenity greenspace and play and young people's areas. All types of space have a higher level of quality than the whole Borough due to the high proportion of spaces which are good, even with lower levels of excellent spaces the proportion of spaces scored good or excellent is higher and the proportion of spaces scoring poor or satisfactory lower than the wider Borough.

Quality of space in Eaglescliffe

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	1	9	84	6
Parks and Gardens	0	0	100	0
Natural Greenspace	9	27	64	0
Green Corridors	0	0	100	0
Sports Facilities	0	17	83	0
Amenity Greenspace	0	8	88	5
Play areas/young people's areas	0	0	50	50
Allotments	0	0	100	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0	0	100	0

3.54. In Eaglescliffe there are 41 health and fitness stations and 9 badminton courts of sports hall, largely housed on two schools sites, Egglecliffe School and Teeside Preparatory High School. There is also one training pool and one synthetic turf pitch. Eaglescliffe has one community centre and two village halls with the total capacity to hold 530 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Eaglescliffe

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	41 stations
Indoor Bowls	0 rinks
Indoor Tennis	0 courts
Sports Halls	9 badminton courts
Activity Halls	0
Swimming Pool	0 lanes
Training Pool	1 pool
Synthetic Turf Pitch	1pitch
Ice Rink	0m2
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity to hold 530 people

Yarm

Population –9,025

Percentage of the population:

- aged 0-15 years =19.05%
- retirement age 19.61%
- working age (16-retirement) =61.39%
- do not own a car = 13%
- use outdoor areas for leisure =89.7%
- use sports and fitness facilities =69.2%
- use community and cultural facilities =81.3%

3.55. The population of Yarm is currently 9,025, 19.05% of the population are children which is similar to but slightly lower than the wider Borough percentage of 19.67%. The population are of retirement age in Yarm is 19.61% which is higher than the wider Borough level of 17.69% and 61.39% are of working age which is similar to but very slightly lower than the Borough level of 62.63%. Non-car ownership in Yarm is at 13 % which is less than half the proportion of the wider Borough population who do not own a car.

3.56. In Yarm 89.7% of people say that they use outdoor areas for leisure, 69.2% say they use sports and fitness facilities and 81.3% say they use community and cultural facilities. The proportion of people who say they use these facilities is higher for all types of facilities in Yarm than in the Borough as a whole, which is 81.5%, 58.5% and 66.5% respectively. Yarm has the highest proportion of people who say they use all types of facilities in the Borough.

3.57. There is a total of 65.8ha in Yarm 56.5ha of which is accessible. The largest proportion of this space is made up of sports facilities closely followed by amenity greenspace. All sports facilities and amenity greenspace are categorised as accessible. Parks and gardens is the lowest area of space, the only area included is Atlas Wynd garden, followed by cemeteries and churchyards and civic space.

Quantity of space in Yarm

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	65.8ha	56.5ha
Parks and Gardens	182m2	0
Natural Greens Spaces	13.5ha	6ha
Green Corridors	6.4ha	4.7ha
Sports Facilities	21.1ha	21.1ha
Amenity Green Space	18ha	18ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	3008 people per play unit	
Allotments	3.7ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	1.2ha	
Civic Space	1.6ha	

3.58. The overall quality of space in Yarm is higher than that in the whole Borough. There is a majority of spaces scoring good for quality and there is also a relatively

high proportion of spaces in the excellent category. Sports facilities, amenity greenspace, allotments, cemeteries and churchyards and civic space all have a better quality distribution than the same spaces in the whole Borough. This is also true of parks and gardens but it should be remembered that in Yarm this category relates to one site with a small area. The quality distribution of green corridors is similar to that at the whole Borough level. The quality of play and young people's areas are lower than the Borough level as is the quality of natural greenspace. However, natural greenspace quality has an unusual distribution in Yarm with a third excellent, which is high, but no space categorised as good meaning that a third of spaces are satisfactory and a third of spaces are poor.

Quality of space in Yarm

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	2	14	71	14
Parks and Gardens	0	0	100	0
Natural Greenspace	33	33	0	33
Green Corridors	0	38	50	13
Sports Facilities	0	0	71	29
Amenity Greenspace	0	7	83	10
Play areas/young people's areas	0	33	67	0
Allotments	0	50	50	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0	0	100	0
Civic Space	0	0	0	100

3.59. In Yarm there are 90 health and fitness stations and eight badminton courts of sports halls the majority of which are contained on the Conyers School site. There is also one swimming pool and one synthetic turf pitch. Yarm has two community centres and a village hall with the total capacity to hold 310 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Yarm

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	90 stations
Indoor Bowls	0 rinks
Indoor Tennis	0 courts
Sports Halls	8 badminton courts
Activity Halls	0 halls
Swimming Pool	1 pool
Training Pool	0 pool
Synthetic Turf Pitch	1 pitch
Ice Rink	0m2
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity to hold 310 people

Stockton

- 3.60. For the purpose of the Built Facilities assessment Stockton has been assessed in its entirety due to the more concentrated nature of built facilities it is expected that people will travel further to access them therefore the separation of Stockton into East and West as occurs with the Open Space assessment is not necessary.
- 3.61. For the purposes of the Open Space assessment Stockton is separated into Stockton East and Stockton West this separation was part of the original open space audit. PPG17 Guidance suggests that the assessment should be based on identifiable neighbourhoods rather than political or administrative boundaries but that reference should be given to physical boundaries such as rivers and railway lines. The original separation of Stockton into east and west for the analysis of open space reflects this, as the boundary between the two areas is the railway line.

Population –82,805

Percentage of the population:

- **aged 0-15 years =19.07%**
- **retirement age 19.13%**
- **working age (16-retirement) =61.77%**
- **do not own a car = 34%**
- **use outdoor areas for leisure =81%**
- **use sports and fitness facilities =56.1%**
- **use community and cultural facilities =64.2%**

- 3.62. The total population of Stockton is 82,805, 19.07% of this population is made up of children, this is similar to but slightly smaller than the proportion of children in the Borough as a whole which is 19.67%. The proportion of people of retirement age in Stockton is 19.13% which is slightly higher than the proportion in the Borough as a whole which is 17.69%. The working age population of Stockton is at 61.77% which is very similar to but slightly lower than the Borough level which is 62.63%.
- 3.63. In Stockton 34% of the population do not own a car which is higher than the level of the Borough as a whole at 30%. In this case the average of 34% non car ownership for Stockton hides the wide variation in non car ownership in Stockton which is as high as 68% in Stockton Town Centre and as low as 13 % in Hartburn.
- 3.64. In Stockton 81% say they use outdoor areas for leisure which is very similar to 81.5% at the Borough level, 56.1% say they use sports and fitness facilities which is lower than the Borough level of 58.5%. In Stockton 64.2% say that they use community and cultural facilities which is lower than the Borough level of 66.5%.
- 3.65. Stockton has 467 health and fitness stations, 37 badminton courts of sports halls and three activity halls. Stockton is the location of the indoor tennis centre which contains seven courts and is part of the David Lloyd Club. There are 24 lanes of swimming pools in main pools and three training pools. There is also one

synthetic turf pitch at the Norton Teeside Sports Complex. Facilities at Stockton Sports Centre have not been included as they close at Christmas 2008. As it is not yet complete the Splash extension has not been included. However, the implications of the closure of Stockton Sports and the opening of the Splash extension are discussed further on in this document (p.108.). There are 16 community centres in Stockton with the capacity to hold a total of 2920 people.

Quantity of Built Facilities in Stockton

Built Sports Facilities	Total
Health and Fitness Suites	412 stations
Indoor Bowls	0 rinks
Indoor Tennis	6 courts
Sports Halls	37 badminton courts
Activity Halls	2 halls
Swimming Pool	24 lanes
Training Pool	3 pools
Synthetic Turf Pitch	1 pitch
Ice Rink	0m2
Community Centres and Village Halls	Capacity to hold 2920 people

Stockton East

Population=31,505

Percentage of the Population:

- **aged 0-15 years =18.35%**
- **retirement age =18.02%**
- **working age (16-retirement) =63.59%**

3.66. The population of Stockton East as defined in the Open Space Audit, is 31,505. In Stockton East 18.35% of the population are children, which is lower than the proportion in the Borough as a whole which is 19.67%. In Stockton East 18.02% of the population are of retirement age which is higher than the Borough level, which is 17.69%. In Stockton East 63.59% are of working age, this is slightly higher than the wider Borough proportion of 62.63%.

3.67. There is a total of 236.5ha of open space in Stockton East 227.6ha of which is accessible. The types of space that make up the largest proportion of this area are sports facilities and natural greenspace. All of the parks and gardens, natural greenspace, green corridors and sports facilities are accessible. The types of space with the smallest area are allotments, civic space and cemeteries and church yards.

Quantity of space in Stockton East

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	236.5ha	227.6ha
Parks and Gardens	19.2ha	19.2ha
Natural Greens Spaces	61.6ha	61.6ha
Green Corridors	23ha	23ha
Sports Facilities	65ha	65ha
Amenity Green Space	57.8ha	50.3ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	2423 people per play unit	
Allotments	1.6ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	5.7ha	
Civic Space	1.7ha	

3.68. Overall the quality of space in Stockton East is very similar to that of the Borough overall, in particular the proportion of excellent spaces is the same. The quality of civic space, amenity greenspace and natural greenspace is higher than that in the Borough as a whole, this is particularly true of the proportion of natural greenspace rated as excellent. The quality of parks and gardens, allotments and play and young people's areas are worse than the that at the Borough level as are cemeteries and churchyards and sports facilities but only slightly. In the case of sports facilities this is due to the higher proportion of satisfactory spaces. The quality of green corridors is very similar to that in the rest of the Borough.

Quality of space in Stockton East

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	0	23	71	6
Parks and Gardens	0	100	0	0
Natural Greenspace	0	30	50	20
Green Corridors	0	33	67	0
Sports Facilities	0	45	45	9
Amenity Greenspace	0	5	89	5
Play areas/young people's areas	0	43	57	0
Allotments	0	100	0	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0	25	75	0
Civic Space	0	0	100	0

Stockton West

Population=51,300

Percentage of the population:

- aged 0-15 years =19.51%
- retirement age =19.81%
- working age (16-retirement)= 60.66%

3.69. The population of Stockton West as defined by The Open Space Audit is currently 51,300. The proportion of children in Stockton West is 19.51% this is similar to but very slightly lower than the Borough proportion which is 19.67%. The proportion of retirement age people in Stockton West is higher than the wider Borough level of 17.69% at 19.81%. 60.66% of the population of Stockton West is of working age, this is lower than the proportion at the Borough level which is 62.63%.

3.70. There is a total of 362.5ha of open space in Stockton West, 292.5ha of which is accessible. A large proportion of this total is made up of sports facilities and amenity greenspace. Green corridors and parks and gardens are fully accessible. The smallest proportion of space is made up by civic space, allotments and cemeteries and church yards.

Quantity of space in Stockton West

Type of space	All Space	Accessible Space
Total Open Space	362.5ha	292.5ha
Parks and Gardens	42.7ha	42.7ha
Natural Greens Spaces	64.2ha	38.7ha
Green Corridors	34.3ha	34.3ha
Sports Facilities	123.6ha	88.5ha
Amenity Green Space	72.2ha	68.9ha
Play areas and Young People's Areas	2332 people per play unit	
Allotments	6.1ha	
Cemeteries and Church Yards	17.8ha	
Civic Space	0.6ha	

3.71. The overall quality of open space in Stockton West is very similar to that in the Borough as a whole. Parks and gardens, green corridors, amenity greenspace, allotments and cemeteries and church yards in Stockton West all have better quality than that of the whole Borough. Natural greenspace, sports facilities, play and young people's areas and civic spaces all have worse quality distribution than the same spaces in the Borough as a whole.

Quality of space in Stockton West

	Percent of spaces scoring 0-25%	Percent of spaces scoring 26-50%	Percent of spaces scoring 51-75%	Percent of spaces scoring 75-100%
All Space	1	27	69	3
Parks and Gardens	0	20	60	20
Natural Greenspace	13	69	19	0
Green Corridors	0	29	62	10
Sports Facilities	0	35	61	3
Amenity Greenspace	1	22	76	1
Play areas/young people's areas	0	25	58	17
Allotments	0	60	40	0
Cemeteries and Church Yards	0	0	100	0
Civic Space	0	33	67	0

4. SETTING AND APPLYING STANDARDS

- 4.1. PPG17 asserts that adequate planning for open spaces requires an understanding of the quantity and quality of open space. Setting standards for open space and built facility provision is a way of outlining a level of acceptable provision, which can be used to identify deficiencies and surplus of open space in the Borough. To achieve this a standard should be set for the quantity, quality and proximity of open space. Quantity and proximity relate to planning for the quantity of open space and quality relates to improving quality.
- 4.2. The standards set through this assessment are based on the level of provision, which is already in existence at the Borough level. Due to this the standard set should be seen as a minimum standard, in instances where this standards is not met the level of provision should be increased. This means that where open space is above the standard it should not be seen as a surplus of open space, which is then available for development.
- 4.3. The PPG17 Guidance, on redevelopment of existing open space, stresses that before open space is considered suitable for development is should be considered to remedy open space deficiencies in the area. For example natural greenspace could be changed into allotments in an area will high levels of natural greenspace but a deficiency in allotments. As no area in the Borough meets the minimum standard for all types of space this means that open space is not suitable for development.
- 4.4. The PPG17 Guidance explains that it is not necessary to set all types of standards for all types of open space, as demonstrated below. Both civic spaces and green corridors are opportunity led and it is not necessary to set quantity and proximity standards to relate them to population. A quality standard can be set for all types of space as it is reasonable to improve the quality of any type of space.

Space Type	Quantity	Quality	Proximity
Parks and Gardens	✓	✓	✓
Natural Greenspace	✓	✓	✓
Green Corridors	X	✓	X
Sports Facilities	✓	✓	✓
Amenity Greenspace	✓	✓	✓
Play areas and young people's areas	✓	✓	✓
Allotments	✓	✓	✓
Cemeteries and Church Yards	✓	✓	✓
Civic Space	X	✓	X

TOOLS USED FOR OPEN SPACE AND BUILT FACILITIES ANALYSIS

Capacity Ratio

- 4.5. The capacity ratio is a way of comparing existing provision to population. It provides an estimate for the number of a unit of facilities, for example square meters in the case of pools, against the population in an area, in this case per 1000 population. This provides an indication of the facilities compared to the population and can be compared to a national and regional level as calculated by Sport England or to existing national standards. The limitations of this approach are that the only spatial element is the area in which you compare facilities to population, so the potential to travel to facilities outside of that area is ignored.

Proximity Analysis Integrated Transport Network (ITN)

- 4.6. Distances for the proximity standards were determined using ITN on our Geographical Information Systems (GIS). An ITN analysis was used to determine proximity standards for both open space and built facilities. ITN contains a detailed road network, which can be used to identify the number of households that are within different distances of open space or sports facilities. Through the use of a road network this approach takes account of barriers to movement such as rivers and railway lines. However, the network does not contain footpaths and cycleways that do not follow roads, this data, with this level of detail, is not yet available for ITN analysis.
- 4.7. The distances used for the analysis are based on those used in Natural England's ANGST Standard and those from other local authorities' analysis. The standard has been set at the distance that a majority of at least 60% (or almost 60%) of households are within that distance.
- 4.8. In the case of built sports facilities, which people may be happy to travel longer distances to, facilities which may be attractive outside the Borough Boundary have been included in the analysis to simulate resident's ability to travel to facilities outside of the Borough.

TOOLS USED FOR BUILT FACILITY ANALYSIS

- 4.9. A number of tools are available to assess the adequacy of the existing provision of built sports facilities. These tools offer particular insight into different elements of the adequacy of facilities. However, these tools do have limitations, which it is important to be aware of during use. Limitations can be mitigated by the use of a number of tools to provide a wider picture of the adequacy of facilities. The tools used have largely been accessed on Sport England's Active Places Power Online Database.

Sports Facilities calculator

- 4.10. The sports facilities calculator is a tool for assessing the demand likely to be generated for a facility by a particular population. This tool is available for sports

halls, swimming pools and indoor bowls. The demand generated is based on a population with the same characteristics as Stockton Borough. A limitation of this tool is that it does not have a spatial element, calculations are based on an isolated population ignoring the wider context.

Facility Catchment Tool

- 4.11. The facility catchment tool introduces a spatial element to the analysis and facilitates the investigation of the potential to travel to facilities rather than just compare the amount of facilities in particular bounded areas. It highlights areas with poor access in terms of travel distances and demonstrates that facilities in one town can provide for residents in another due to short travel times. The population level for this tool is based on the 2001 census. This tool acknowledges the ability to travel to facilities outside of the Borough.

Personal share

- 4.12. The Personal Share identifies the potential share of facilities per person when the ability to travel to facilities is incorporated. Demand is also integrated and the personal share depends heavily on the population and the size of the facilities within travelling distance. This is currently the most powerful tool available on Active Places Power, however, it is only available for swimming pools sports halls and indoor bowls. The personal share value should be used mainly to compare rather than as a meaningful value in itself. The personal share is identified by ward.

Corresponding Local Authorities

- 4.13. In order to be able to compare local authorities the Office of National Statistics has identified local authorities which have similar characteristics. Census information is used to identify similarities between authorities around the following issues: demographic structure, household composition, housing, socio-economic character, employment and industry sector.
- 4.14. The authorities which are most similar to Stockton-on-Tees are Doncaster, Rotherham, Redcar and Cleveland and Darlington. In cases where there are no national or regional figures for comparison and there are no recognised standards, a comparison will be made with these authorities to put Stockton-on-Tees figures into a wider context. This is particularly the case with travel time analysis.

Facilities Planning Model

- 4.15. The facilities planning model is the most powerful tool used during this assessment. It estimates the demand generated by the population and then compares it to supply, factoring in the size, location and age of facilities. Less attractive facilities that are for example very small or only accessible to a small number of people are excluded from this analysis. This tool is currently not available on the Active Places Power website. Analysis using this tool was undertaken by Sport England North East, for sports halls and swimming pools.

5. QUALITY STANDARDS

5.1. PPG17 states that

“social justice demands that authorities should aim to bring all the open spaces or sport and recreation facilities in their area up to as consistent a standards or quality as possible; and Best Value demands that they should progressively raise it.”

5.2. With this in mind the approach to quality standards should aim to ensure as much potential to improve sites as possible. Due to this a “plus one” approach will be adopted. Using the designation of sites as either poor, scoring 0-25%, satisfactory, scoring 26-50%, good, scoring 51 to 75% and excellent scoring 75% and over, a “plus one” approach means improving sites so that they can step up to the next quality standard. For example a poor site should be improved to a satisfactory or good site with excellent as the ultimate aim.

5.3. Those sites scoring poor or satisfactory should be the priority with poor sites as an absolute priority. However, sites which are already rated good or excellent should not be excluded from possible improvement.

6. OPEN SPACE QUANTITY STANDARDS

PARKS AND GARDENS

- 6.1. In the Borough as a whole there are 0.55 ha of parks and gardens per 1000 people. However, across the Borough there is variation in the provision of parks and gardens with some areas having more provision than the Borough level of provision and some areas having less.

Quantity of Parks and Gardens Per 1000 People


Town	Area per 1000 people	People who thought there should be more*
Borough	0.55ha	28
Ingleby Barwick	0ha	61
Yarm	0ha	25
Billingham	0.4ha	18
Stockton East	0.61ha	30
Thornaby	0.77ha	34
Stockton West	0.83ha	25
Eaglescliffe	1.1ha	16

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

- 6.2. Although PPG17 asserts that it is important to set local standards based on local evidence, previous national standards can provide a guideline of acceptable provision the National Playing Field Association, set aside 0.4 ha per 1000 people for parks and amenity spaces. This suggests that the level of provision in the Borough for parks and gardens is high and should be maintained. The high number of people in the Borough who think there needs to be more parks justifies setting a higher standard than the national one.
- 6.3. To understand the quantity of provision it is important to understand not only the amount of provision but also its proximity. A space may not fall within the boundary of a town but may still be close enough for the residents of a town to use. This is particularly true of large facilities that should have a large catchment area.
- 6.4. The table below demonstrates that the majority of people live within two kilometres of a park or formal garden. This is a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard for all parks and gardens. The map on the following page identifies the areas of the Borough which are included in the proximity standard.

Number of Households Within Different Distances of Parks

Parks and Gardens	600m	1km	2km	Total
Number of households	8567	20895	47545	82288
Percentage of households	10%	25%	58%	100%




6.5. Larger more strategic parks, which have been highlighted by the Countryside and Greenspace section as Ropner Park, Preston Park and John Whitehead Park, are larger, more equipped facilities, which have a larger catchment area than parks in general. Due to this a separate analysis has been completed for these parks. As shown below the majority of households are located within five kilometres of a strategic park, which is a suitable level at which to set this standard. The map on the following page demonstrates this analysis.

Number of Households within Different Distances of Strategic Parks

Strategic Parks	2km	5km	Total
Number of Households	17268	66090	82288
Percentage of households	21%	80%	100%

Standard

**There should be 0.55ha of parks and gardens per 1000 people.
People should live within two kilometres of a Park and within five kilometres of a strategic park.**



NATURAL GREENSPACE

- 6.6. In the Borough as a whole there is a total of 2.44ha of natural greenspace per 1000 people. The amount of natural greenspace per 1000 people varies widely across the Borough. It is at its highest in Billingham with 5.78ha per 1000 people, this is largely due to Cowpen Bewley Nature Reserve and Billingham Beck Country Park.

Quantity of Natural Greenspace Per 1000 People

Town	Area per 1000 people	People who thought there should be more*
Borough	2.44ha	28
Yarm	0.66ha	25
Stockton West	0.75ha	25
Ingleby Barwick	1.31ha	61
Eaglescliffe	1.69ha	16
Stockton East	1.96ha	30
Thornaby	2.74ha	34
Billingham	5.78ha	18

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

- 6.7. Natural England have set a standard for natural greenspace called the ANGST standard, which outlines that there should be two hectares of natural greenspace per 1000 people. The level of provision in the Borough clearly exceeds this. However, as most of the towns in the Borough have a level below the ANGST standard it seems that the high level of provision in Billingham is significantly increasing the level of provision in the Borough overall.
- 6.8. The high level of provision in Billingham has been opportunity led due to the existing green infrastructure rather than due to the demands of the local population alone. Due to this, a level of provision at the Borough level, which includes the high level of provision in Billingham, is not typical of the Borough. As the Borough level of provision is not suitable in this case the ANGST standard two hectares per 1000 people is more appropriate. Most of the towns in the Borough have a level of provision below this standard with the exception of Thornaby and Billingham. However, the high number of people who think there should be more natural greenspace in the Borough, highlighted by our survey, suggests that the ANGST standard is suitable.
- 6.9. It is important that the quantity of provision is not understood only in terms of the amount of provision in an area, a large amount of provision may exist outside of a town's boundary and the population may be able to travel to it easily. To represent this a proximity standard is also important.
- 6.10. The table below demonstrates the number and percentage of households within different distances of natural greenspace by road. Nine percent of the Borough's households are within 300m of a natural greenspace, 29% of the Borough's households are within 600m of a natural greenspace, 76% of the Borough's holds are within 1km of a natural greenspace and 96% of the


Borough's households are within two kilometres of a natural greenspace. A large majority of the households in the Borough are within one kilometre of a natural greenspace, this is an appropriate level at which to set the proximity standard. The map on the following page identifies the areas in the Borough which are within the proximity standard for natural greenspace.

Households Within Different Distances of Natural Greenspace

Natural greenspace	300m	600m	1km	2km	Total
Number of households	7796	23638	62411	78870	82288
Percentage of households	9%	29%	76%	96%	100%

Standard

There should be two hectares of natural greenspace per 1000 people. People should live no further than one kilometre from a natural greenspace.



GREEN CORRIDORS

- 6.11. PPG17 highlights the need to enhance and protect green corridors, through planning policy, to encourage sustainable travel and improve biodiversity. However it suggests that it is not sensible to set a quantity standard including amount or proximity, for green corridors, which should be demand led, based on connecting residential areas to services. The need to take opportunities to establish linear routes is also acknowledged.
- 6.12. The table below demonstrates that in the Borough overall there is 1.24ha of green corridors per 1000 people. This varies across the Borough and is at its highest level in Ingleby Barwick at 5.39ha per 1000 people.

Area of Green Corridors Per 1000 People

Town	Area per 1000 people
Borough	1.24
Eaglescliffe	0.45
Yarm	0.52
Billingham	0.6
Stockton West	0.67
Stockton East	0.73
Thornaby	1.65
Ingleby Barwick	5.39

SPORTS FACILITIES

6.13. The level of existing sports facility provision in the Borough is 1.76ha per 1000 people. This varies across the Borough with some areas not meeting the Borough level of and some exceeding it. The highest level of provision is in Billingham.

Quantity of Sports Facilities Per 1000 People

Town	Area per 1000 people	People who thought there should be more*
Borough	1.76	15
Ingleby Barwick	0.51	29
Thornaby	1.49	13
Stockton West	1.73	17
Stockton East	2.06	10
Eaglescliffe	2.13	6
Yarm	2.34	33
Billingham	2.4	9

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

6.14. The table below outlines the number of households within different distances of sports facilities by road. As it demonstrates, the vast majority of households are located within one kilometre of outdoor sports facilities. Almost all households in the Borough are within four kilometres of an outdoor sports facility. The analysis below determines that one kilometre is a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard. The map on the following page identifies the areas of the Borough where households are not within the one kilometre standard.


Households Within Different Distances of Sports Facilities

Sports Facilities	1km	2km	3km	4km	Total
Number of households	74758	80787	81592	82163	82288
Percentage of households	91%	98%	99%	100%	100%

Standard

Quantity: 1.76ha of sports facility per 1000 people.

Proximity: within one kilometre of an outdoor sports facility



AMENITY GREENSPACE

- 6.15. The amount of existing amenity greenspace in the Borough is 1.39ha per 1000 people. This varies across the Borough with some areas below this level and other's above this level. Eaglescliffe has the most amenity greenspace compared to its population.

Quantity of Amenity Greenspace Per 1000 People

Town	Area per 1000 people	People who thought there should be more*
Borough	1.39	12
Ingleby Barwick	0.67	28
Billingham	1.09	6
Stockton West	1.34	11
Thornaby	1.46	14
Stockton East	1.6	11
Yarm	2	19
Eaglescliffe	2.35	8

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

- 6.16. It is important to set local standards as stated in PPG17 but national standards can provide an example of satisfactory provision the national playing field association set the level of provision for both parks and amenity space at 0.4ha per 1000 people. However it should be noted that the space typology used for the national playing fields association is not identical to that used in the Open Space Audit. The level of existing provision in the Borough exceeds the level set in the national standard however, our survey shows that people still think there needs to be more amenity greenspace. Due to this the existing level of provision should be maintained.
- 6.17. It is important to understand the quantity of provision not just in terms of the amount but also in terms of its proximity to people's homes. It is possible that spaces outside of a town's boundary are close to those within that town. It is also possible that an area within a town with a high amount of provision may also be located a long distance from that provision. It is important that proximity is also considered to fully understand quantity.
- 6.18. The table below demonstrates the number and percentage of households in the Borough that are different distances from amenity greenspace by road. 63% of households in the Borough are within 300m of an amenity greenspace, 90% of households are within 600m of an amenity greenspace and 98% of households in the Borough are within one kilometre of an amenity greenspace. The vast majority of households in the Borough are within 600m of an amenity greenspace. Although a majority of 60% of households are within 300m of amenity greenspace a standard of this distance would exclude the possibility of pooling contributions from a number of developments, for use offsite.

Households Within Different Distances of Amenity Greenspace


Amenity Greenspace	300m	600m	1km	2km	Total
Number of households	51543	73986	80910	81697	82288
Percentage of households	63%	90%	98%	99%	100%

6.19. The map on the following page identifies which areas of the Borough are within the 600m proximity standard for amenity Greenspace.

Standards

There should be 1.39ha of amenity space per 1000 people.

People should not live more than 600m from an amenity greenspace.



PLAY AREAS AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S AREAS

6.20. A play unit has been defined in order to adequately measure the level of play provision in the Borough. The number of play areas or the area a play facility covers does not adequately demonstrate the amount of equipment or the age ranges provided for. The provision of play facilities outlined in the Play Area Strategy has been used to more fully represent the level of existing play provision. A doorstep play area as outlined in the Strategy amounts to one play unit. Due to the size of provision and age ranges covered a neighbourhood play area is three play units and due to the size, age ranges and ancillary features a destination site relates to five play units.

6.21. The amount of provision at the Borough level is 2091 people per play unit, this varies between its highest at Ingleby Barwick with 4911 people per play unit and its lowest in Eaglescliffe with 1193 people per play unit.

Population Per Play Unit for Play and Young People's Areas

Town	People per play unit.	People with children in the household who think play facilities need to be improved.*
Borough	2091	88
Billingham	1930	90
Thornaby	1545	93
Ingleby Barwick	4911	93
Eaglescliffe	1193	77
Yarm	3008	93
Stockton East	2423	86
Stockton West	2332	87

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

6.22. There is some consensus between council officers and national government that play facility provision is low both in Stockton-on-Tees and more widely across the country. Due to this setting the standard based on existing provision has a risk of setting a low standard that perpetuates a low level of facilities.

6.23. In the case of play facilities national standards cannot be used as an indicator as the format of provision advocated by National Playing Fields association is not followed in the Borough. It is felt that all areas in the Borough should be identified as deficient and to this end a standard of 1000 people per play unit has been set. This standard identifies all areas as deficient and provides a sensible figure for calculation. In the near future investment in play facilities will take place through the Play Builder Programme. The standard of 1000 people per play unit will act as a temporary standard until provision is improved through this programme and existing provision is at an adequate level at which to set a standard.

6.24. The standard set includes provision for both play areas and young people's areas. Young people's areas relate to provision such as Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs), kick walls, basket ball and the BMX track. The idea of play units has

been used to identify the level of existing provision for young people in a comparable way.

- 6.25. The table below demonstrates the variation in the level of provision of play facilities and of young people’s areas in different towns. The categories are not completely separate as children can play on young people’s facilities and some play facilities have equipment that is designed for up to age 14, however it is still a useful distinction.
- 6.26. In the Borough as a whole there is a higher level of play provision than young people’s provision and the level of satisfaction associated with the level of provision does not seem to be related entirely to the amount of existing provision. The variation in different types of provision varies greatly with Eaglescliffe and Ingleby Barwick not having dedicated young people’s provision although this will change in the case of Ingleby Barwick with the development of Romano Park. The level of play provision for younger children is very low in Stockton East with 10,502 people per play area.
- 6.27. The information below can be used to provide details of the age range of existing provision, which can lead to improvements that fill gaps in deficiency based on age. A standard for both young people’s provision and play provision is not necessary due to the variations in type, particularly of young people’s provision, that at this level of detail may become misleading.

Population Per Play Unit Separately for Play Areas and Young People’s Areas

Area	1000 people per play area	Needs more play areas*	1000 people per young people’s area	Needs more young people’s areas*
Borough	3523	8.9%	5142	9.4%
Billingham	3056	4.9%	5239	5%
Thornaby	3311	10.6%	2897	11.7%
Ingleby Barwick	4911	13.7%	No young people’s areas	10.9%
Eaglescliffe	1193	0	No young people’s areas	1%
Yarm	4513	19.6%	9025	20.6%
Stockton East	10502	9.8%	3151	10.2%
Stockton West	4664	9.8%	4664	10.2%

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

- 6.28. It is important to understand not only the amount but also the location of play areas and young people’s areas. The table below indicates that the majority of households in the Borough are located within one kilometre of a play area and young people’s area, this is a suitable level at which to set the standard.

Households Within Different Distances of Play and Young People's Areas


Play areas and Young people's areas	300m	600m	1km	2km	Total
Number of households	9203	27135	51938	78562	82288
Percentage of households	11%	33%	63%	95%	100%

6.29. The map on the following page demonstrates the areas of the Borough which are included within the one kilometre play areas and young people's areas standard.

Standards

There should be one play unit of play areas or young people's areas per 1000 people.

People should live within kilometre of a play area or young people's area.



ALLOTMENTS

6.30. Overall there is 0.23ha per 1000 people of allotments per 1000 people in the Borough as a whole. This varies across the Borough with some areas below this amount and others above it, with Eaglescliffe at the highest level compared to its population.

Quantity of Allotments Per 1000 People

Town	Area per 1000 people	People who thought there should be more*
Borough	0.23	6
Ingleby Barwick	0	8
Stockton East	0.05	5
Stockton West	0.12	7
Billingham	0.31	3
Yarm	0.41	10
Thornaby	0.44	7
Eaglescliffe	0.72	5

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

6.31. The National Society of Allotments and Leisure Gardeners suggest a standard of 0.125ha per 1000 people. There is currently a higher level of provision than this in the Borough, however a number of people in our survey suggest that there needs to be more than current levels of provision and a recent Allotment Review (Care for your Area 2008) suggest that the current level of provision does not meet the current level of demand with waiting lists in all areas, some as long as five years. Due to this, a standard needs to be set which defines all provision in the Borough as below the standard. The standard should be set at 0.8ha per 1000 people to achieve this.

6.32. It is important that the amount of space is not seen as a full representation of the quantity of space in an area. Allotments that are located outside the boundary of a town may still be close enough for residents to travel to. An assessment of the proximity of allotments is important to fully understand quantity.

6.33. The table below demonstrates the number and percentage of households in the Borough that are located within different distances of allotments by road. Four percent of the Borough's households are located within 300m of an allotment, 13% are within 600m, 36% are within one kilometre, 68% are within two kilometres and 97% are within five kilometres. The majority of households are within two kilometres of an allotment, however with the current level of high demand a proximity standard of this length may not maximise opportunities to provide new allotment provision.

6.34. A longer proximity standard set at five kilometres will increase the opportunity to pool contributions from different developments for allotment provision. This approach is also supported by the allotments groups survey in which a majority of groups said that their members travel between one and five miles to reach their

allotment site. The map on the following page shows the areas of the Borough which are included in the proximity standard of five kilometres.


Households With Different Distances of Allotments

Allotments	300m	600m	1km	2km	5km	Total
Number of households	3529	11086	23849	56053	79441	82288
Percentage of households	4%	13%	29%	68%	97%	100%

Standard

Quantity: 0.8ha of allotment land per 1000 people.

Proximity: within 5 kilometres of an allotment



CEMETERIES AND CHURCH YARDS

- 6.35. Cemeteries are unusual in that they have a finite capacity and cannot go on being used indefinitely like other types of open space. A provision standard for cemeteries should be based on the needs of the population rather than on area alone and the Guidance suggests that a standard should be based on population and proportionate deaths that result in burial. Church Yards rely on the existence of a church so a provision standard is not suitable for them.
- 6.36. The death rate is currently one percent of which 28.8% result in burials. With a current population figure of 190,250 approximately 548 burials per year would be expected. This approximately amounts to three burials a year per 1000 people. If the expected lifetime of a house is 60 years then a development is likely to result in the need for 180 burial plots per 1000 people.
- 6.37. It is important to ensure that cemeteries are of good quality and are in close proximity for people to be able to visit them. The table below demonstrates the number and percentage of the Borough's households that are located within different distances of cemeteries and church yards by actual road routes. The analysis below shows that four percent of the households in the Borough are located within 300m of a cemetery or church yard, 15% are within 600m, 34% are within one kilometre, 70% are within two kilometres and 100% are within five kilometres. The majority of households are within 2km two kilometres of a cemetery or church yard, however as it is not suitable to provide cemeteries on site in a new development so the opportunities for offsite contributions to cemeteries needs to be maximised. Due to this a proximity standard of five kilometres would be more suitable in order to increase the opportunity to pool contributions off site.

Households Within Different Distances of Cemeteries and Church Yards

Cemeteries and Chuchyards	300m	600m	1km	2km	5km	Total
Number of households	3501	12106	27647	57697	82005	82288
Percentage of households	4%	15%	34%	70%	100%	100%

Standard

Quantity : 180 burial plots per 1000 people.

Proximity: within five kilometres of a cemetery or church yard

CIVIC SPACE

6.38. Civic space is usually opportunistic and urban design led it is not suitable to set a quantity standard in terms of amount and proximity. The table below demonstrates the amount of existing civic space in the Borough and where it is located. There is currently 292.32m² of civic space per person in the Borough as a whole. There are areas in the Borough that have levels of provision both above and below the Borough level with Yarm having the largest amount of civic space compared to its population.

Quantity of Civic Space Per 1000 People

Town	Area per 1000 people
Borough	292.32m ²
Eaglescliffe	0
Ingleby Barwick	0
Stockton West	124.33m ²
Thornaby	220.19m ²
Billingham	315.08m ²
Stockton East	540.83m ²
Yarm	1721.77m ²

7. BUILT FACILITY QUANTITY STANDARDS

HEALTH AND FITNESS SUITES

Capacity Ratio-Facilities per 1000 People

- 7.1. The total level of health and fitness suit provision in the Borough exceeds both the national and the north east level. However this is not the case in all towns and Ingleby Barwick and Eaglescliffe do not meet the national level, meaning that other towns in the Borough are well above it.

England: 5.64

North East Region: 6.23

Stockton-on-Tees Borough: 6.16

Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more: 8%

Quantity of Health and Fitness Suites Per 1000 People

Area	Capacity Ratio	People who think there should be more Health and Fitness Suites (%)*
Billingham	7.77	5
Thornaby	10.96	4
Ingleby Barwick	4.58	12
Eaglescliffe	3.82	8
Yarm	9.97	20
Stockton	4.98	8

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

- 7.2. Our needs assessment shows that 25% of the population use gyms and that nine percent would like to use gyms but currently do not. The most prevalent reason for non-use was expense, followed by “too far away from home/ difficult for me to get to”. Residents in Ingleby Barwick and Yarm were most likely to think that there needed to be more facilities closer to home. In Ingleby Barwick this may reflect a lower level of provision. However Yarm has the one of the highest levels of provision in the Borough. The views expressed may be due to a lack of access to these facilities as a third of the provision in Yarm is attached to Yarm School and is for private use only.

Travel Distances

- 7.3. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries, analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas. Areas in the Borough which have high levels of provision may adequately provide for residents who are not in the same town but are still within reasonable travelling distance.

7.4. The table below demonstrates the number of households in the Borough within different distances of health and fitness suites, it demonstrates that the vast majority of people in the Borough live within two kilometres of a health and fitness suite this is a suitable level at which to set the standard for health and fitness provision. The map on the following page demonstrates the areas of the Borough which are within two kilometres of a health and fitness suite.

Households Within Different Distances of Health and Fitness Suites

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km
Number of households	25125	65049	77735	80397	81123	81676
Percentage of households	31%	79%	94%	98%	99%	99%


7.5. Sport England’s Active Power Places enables an analysis of the location of facilities, which can be replicated in other local authorities to benchmark the level of proximity to facilities in the Borough. To place the Borough’s travel times to health and fitness suites in a wider context, the table below outlines the travel times to health and fitness suites in the Borough’s corresponding local authorities. As illustrated by the table, Stockton-on-Tees Borough compares well to these authorities, both by car and on foot. This demonstrates that the current level of provision is at a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard.

Health and Fitness Suites Access by car.

	0-10 minutes	10.1 –20 minutes	20.1 – 30 minutes	30.1-45 minutes	45.1-60 minutes
Stockton-on-Tees	99%	1%	0	0	0
Doncaster	95%	5%	0	0	0
Rotherham	97%	3%	0	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	97%	3%	0	0	0
Darlington	92%	8%	0	0	0

Health and Fitness Suites Access by Walking


Local Authority	0-10 minutes	10.1 –20 minutes	20.1 – 30 minutes	30.1-45 minutes	45.1-60 minutes
Stockton-on-Tees	33%	47%	16%	4%	0
Doncaster	34%	40%	13%	9%	3%
Rotherham	26%	36%	18%	15%	5%
Redcar and Cleveland	39%	40%	9%	10%	2%
Darlington	22%	27%	25%	24%	3%



Standards-Supply and Demand

7.6. The level of provision of health and fitness in the Borough is good and reasonably accessible, however it is important that this level is maintained in the future. The Recreation and Leisure Survey demonstrates that the general public still feel that there needs to be more provision in the Borough demonstrating that existing provision should be maintained even though it is above the regional and national level.

7.7. As the table below demonstrates there are areas that both exceed and standard and do not meet the standard. It is therefore important to only understand these figures with reference to proximity analysis. Areas should only be seen as deficient in provision if they have low provision and also if those areas within the accessibility standard are also deficient or low in quantity.



Standards

Quantity: 6.45 stations per 1000 people

Accessibility: within two kilometres

INDOOR BOWLS

Capacity Ratio- Facilities Per 1000 People

7.8. The Borough's level of provision is equal to the national level but below that of the regional level, provision is concentrated, particularly in Thornaby.

England: 0.04

North East Region: 0.06

Stockton-on-Tees Borough: 0.042


Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more: 1%

Quantity of Indoor Bowls Centres Per 1000 People

Area	Capacity Ratio	People who think there should be more Indoor Bowls Facilities(%)*
Billingham	0.055	2
Thornaby	0.256	0
Ingleby Barwick	0	0
Eaglescliffe	0	0
Yarm	0	7
Stockton	0	0.5

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

Personal Share of Facilities



Symbol	Range	Ward Count
--------	-------	------------

	0.36 - 0.438	(4)
	0.439 - 0.516	(9)
	0.517 - 0.594	(8)
	0.595 - 0.672	(4)
	0.673 - 0.75	(1)

- England ratio: 0.6
- North East Region ratio: 0.87
- Stockton Borough Ratio: 0.51

7.9. The Personal share analysis demonstrates that 21 wards have a lower personal share than the national personal share and no wards have a personal share equal to that at the Regional level. However, our survey indicates that only one percent of the sample thought that there needed to be more indoor bowls facilities in the Borough. This seems to indicate that the demand is currently being met by existing provision meaning that existing provision levels would be an adequate level at which to set the quantity standard.

Sport England Sports Facilities Calculator

7.10. The table below demonstrates the level of provision required to satisfy demand from populations that have the same age and gender make up as Stockton Borough. This seems to indicate that total Stockton provision is low and that the concentration of indoor Bowls facilities is problematic with Thornaby having six rinks to serve a population that only requires 1.38 rinks. However, Sport Recreation and Leisure survey indicates that only one percent of residents through that there should be more indoor bowls provision which seems to indicate that current provision is adequate.

Sport England Facilities Calculator Demand Compared to Existing Provision of Indoor Bowls

Area	Existing total provision	Demand outlined by Sport England facilities calculator (rinks)
Borough	8	11.05
Billingham	2	2.11
Thornaby	6	1.38
Ingleby Barwick	0	1.14
Eaglescliffe	0	0.62
Yarm	0	0.50
Stockton	0	4.87

7.11. The Sport England Facilities Calculator results should be viewed with caution as this demand calculation does not have a spatial element and ignores the possibility of people travelling beyond their town to access facilities.

Facility Catchment-Travel Distances

7.12. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries. Analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas.

The table below demonstrates that although provision is quite concentrated in nature the majority of households in the Borough are located within five kilometres of an indoor bowls centre. This is a suitable distance at which to set the proximity standard. The map on the following page identifies the areas in the Borough which are covered by the proximity standard.


Households Within Different Distances of Indoor Bowls Centres

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km	Total
Number of households	5135	16555	26241	35400	48902	60321	82288
Percentage of households	6%	20%	32%	43%	59%	73%	100%

7.13. Using Active Places Power it is possible to compare proximity to indoor bowls provision in Stockton-on-Tees to that in other areas. The table below indicates that access to indoor bowls by car compares well to the Borough's corresponding authorities. This demonstrates that the current level of provision is at a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard.


Indoor Bowls Access by Car

Local Authority	0-10 minutes	10.1 –20 minutes	20.1 – 30 minutes	30.1-45 minutes	45.1-60 minutes
Stockton-on-Tees	55%	45%	0	0	0
Doncaster	17%	56%	28%	0	0
Rotherham	5%	55%	45%	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	75%	25%	0	0	0
Darlington	71%	29%	0	0	0



Standard-Supply and Demand

7.14. Although our level of provision is below that of the regional level it is equal to that of the national level. It is also concentrated, so the distance which people have to travel to facilities becomes more important. However, the results of the Recreation and Leisure Survey indicate that the existing level of provision is a suitable level at which to set our provision standard.



Standard

Quantity: 0.04 rinks per 1000 people
Proximity: within five kilometres

INDOOR TENNIS

Capacity Ratio-

7.15. The capacity ratio for indoor tennis facilities in the Borough is above that of both the national and regional level. Facilities are concentrated in Stockton which has a very high capacity ratio. It should be noted that this provision is located at a private facility with relatively high membership costs.

England: 0.03

North East Region: 0.02

Stockton-on-Tees Borough:0.03

Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more: 2%

Quantity of Indoor Tennis Centres Per 1000 People

Area	Capacity Ratio	People who think there should be more Indoor Tennis Facilities(%)*
Billingham	0	2
Thornaby	0	1
Ingleby Barwick	0	3
Eaglescliffe	0	1
Yarm	0	9
Stockton	0.07	1

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

7.16. 27% of our sample said they use indoor sports facilities which includes indoor tennis, indoor bowls, sports halls and ten pin bowling and 11% of the sample felt there needed to be more of these facilities. Two percent of this need was attributed to indoor tennis. Eight percent of the sample expressed that they would like to use indoor sports facilities but didn't for a number of reasons, the most prevalent reasons were "too far away from home/difficult to get to" and too expensive.


Facility Catchment-Travel Distances

7.17. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries. Analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas.

7.18. The table below indicates that although the nature of tennis provision is relatively concentrated that a majority of households in the Borough are located within six kilometres of an indoor tennis centre. This is a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard. The map on the following page identifies the areas of the Borough which are covered by the proximity standard.

Households Within Different Distances of the Indoor Tennis Centre

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km	Total
Number of households	135	1596	9416	21608	34167	49792	82288
Percentage of households	<1%	2%	11%	26%	42%	61%	100%



7.19. Active Places Power enables a comparison to be made between the proximity to population of indoor tennis centres in Stockton-on-Tees and in its corresponding authorities. The table below demonstrates that proximity to indoor tennis centres in the Borough is much higher than that in its corresponding authorities, meaning that the existing proximity of provision in the Borough is at a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard.

Indoor Tennis Access by Car

Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	33%	66%	1%	0	0
Doncaster	0	2%	21%	67%	11%
Rotherham	0	20%	67%	14%	0
Redcar and Cleveland	15%	66%	15%	4%	0
Darlington	0	17%	80%	3%	0

Standards- Supply and Demand

7.20. The level of provision for indoor tennis centres in the Borough is good exceeding both the national and regional level, however it should be remembered that this facility is a private facility with a higher than average membership fee and will not be easily accessible to everyone. The standard should be set at the national level.

Quantity: 0.03 courts per 1000 people

Proximity: within six kilometres

SPORTS HALLS

Capacity Ratio-Facilities Per 1000 People

7.21. The figures below demonstrate that the level of sports hall provision in the Borough is above that of the national level and below that of the regional level.

England: 77.93

North East Region: 103.06

Stockton-on-Tees Borough: 92.22

Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more: 6%

Quantity of Sports Halls per 1000 Population

Area	Capacity Ratio	People who think there should be more Sports Halls (%)*
Billingham	137.25	2
Thornaby	114.30	3
Ingleby Barwick	30.24	23
Eaglescliffe	116.81	1
Yarm	132.96	16
Stockton	82.30	4

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

7.22. An investigation of the distribution of facilities at the town level demonstrates that all of the towns in the Borough exceed the National level of provision apart from Ingleby Barwick. The regional level is exceeded in Billingham, Thornaby and Yarm. Overall six percent of people felt that there needed to be more sports halls nearer to their home. This is much higher in Ingleby Barwick where there is a very low level of provision and conversely in Yarm which has the highest level of provision in the Borough. There is a high level of people who say they use indoor sports facilities in Yarm.

7.23. It should be acknowledged that the level of provision in Stockton is currently in a state of transition Stockton Sports Centre closed at Christmas 2008 and has not been included in current capacity ratio of 82.30. The capacity ratio of Stockton previous to this closure has been 93.36. The construction of an extension to Splash, which currently has planning permission, will take this ratio back up to 89.60.

Sport England Sports Facilities Calculator


Sport England Facilities Calculator Demand compared to Existing Provision of Sports Halls

Area	Existing provision	Demand outlined by Sport England facilities calculator (courts)
Borough	100	53.65
Billingham	25	10.25
Thornaby	17	6.71
Ingleby Barwick	4	5.55
Eaglescliffe	9	3
Yarm	8	2.45
Stockton	37	23.29






7.24. The table above demonstrates the provision of sports halls that the Sport England Sports Facilities Calculator would expect a population with the same profile as the Borough's to require. Every town in the Borough exceeds this level apart from Ingleby Barwick.

Personal Share of Facilities

7.25. The personal share of sports halls for the Borough is 1.8 and therefore above the national level at 1.13 and the North East Region level at 1.75. none of the wards in the Borough have a personal share below the national level and more than 11 wards are above the North East region level. The analysis indicates that the level of provision for sports halls in the Borough is generally good, particularly in terms of personal share. This demonstrates that existing provision is at a suitable level at which to set the quantity standard.



Map 11: Personal Share of Sports Halls

	Range	Ward Count
	1.52 - 1.746	(11)
	1.747 - 1.972	(4)
	1.973 - 2.198	(6)
	2.199 - 2.424	(3)
	2.425 - 2.65	(2)


Facility Catchment- Travel Distance

7.26. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries. Analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas.

7.27. The table below shows that the vast majority of households in the Borough are located within two kilometres of a sports hall. This is a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard based on the proximity of existing facilities. The map on the following page identifies areas of the Borough within the proximity standard.

Households Within Different Distances of Sports Halls

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km	Total
Number of households	38544	72537	79017	80415	81099	81708	82288
Percentage of households	47%	88%	96%	98%	99%	99%	100%



7.28. Active Places Power enables comparisons between the analysis of proximity of population to facilities in the Borough, to that of its corresponding authorities. The tables below show that Stockton-on-Tees compares well to other local authorities both for an analysis by car and on foot. This means that the existing level of provision is at a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard.

Sports Halls Access by Car

Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	99%	1%	0	0	0
Doncaster	99%	1%	0	0	0
Rotherham	100%	0	0	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	93%	7%	0	0	0
Darlington	99%	1%	0	0	0

Sports Hall Access by Walking

Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	51%	35%	10%	3%	0
Doncaster	44%	34%	10%	9%	2%
Rotherham	43%	39%	9%	5%	4%
Redcar and Cleveland	39%	35%	15%	6%	5%
Darlington	47%	45%	4%	3%	1%

Facilities Planning Model

7.29. Stockton has 30 halls across 17 sites. 12 of the sports halls sites are education sites, four are leisure/community centres and one site is a private sector facility. Satisfied demand for hallspace in Stockton stands at 94.4%. This is a high figure compared to both the national average 90.2% and the regional average 91.1%. Indeed Stockton has the highest level of satisfied demand for hallspace in the region. Personal share of hallspace in Stockton relative to demand stands at 1.04, which is 16% above the national average (although not quite as high as the regional figure).


7.30. Unsurprisingly unmet demand in Stockton does not add up to much. Unmet demand as visits is only 484 vpppwpp (in the context of an overall demand of 8697vpppwpp. In physical terms unmet demand equates to three badminton courts (ie. Less than four court hall. The key to addressing unmet demand across the Borough certainly does not lie with building additional hallspace – rather it is

more to do with improving the quality of the existing stock and improving access to existing facilities.

- 7.31. One contrary note, however, relates to the supply demand relationship with neighbouring authorities. Stockton is a significant net exporter of demand to neighbouring authorities – this equates to 24% of the demand. This is a net figure however and nearly 40% of satisfied demand for hallspace is satisfied outside of Stockton. By contrast near neighbour Middlesbrough is a net importer of demand, with over 36% of satisfied demand in that area being imported. This means that the high levels of satisfied demand in Stockton is not wholly down to Stockton's sports halls. Indeed high levels of satisfied demand masks the fact that there are still issues to be faced in Stockton in respect of hall provision.
- 7.32. The measure of how well sports halls are utilised shows that utilised capacity in Stockton only stands for 40% (the figure at which hall capacity is being fully utilised is 80%). This figure is the lowest of the Tees Valley authorities and is lower than both the regional average (49.9%) and the national average (66.6%). Stock that is not being utilised properly has the same revenue costs as a facility that is running at capacity.
- 7.33. To understand why this occurs it is necessary to look at the characteristics of Stockton's hall stock. First of all it is important to note that the capacity of Stockton's hall stock is weighted down because of its age by 48.2% (higher than the national and regional averages at 33.3% and 34.6% respectively). This is quite a noticeable issue for Stockton's major hall capacity centres; Billingham Forum, Stockton Sports Centre and Thornaby Pavilion – all these leisure centres score poorly on the attractiveness rating and have their capacity supply downgraded as a result.
- 7.34. One further issue to note from Stockton's hall stock is that there is a very high representation of sports halls in the education sector. The national level FPM data applies a slight weighting to education site sports halls where they are managed by that educational establishment. The model assumes that schools and colleges do not manage and proactively promote their sports halls as much as dedicated local authority or leisure trust staff.
- 7.35. Returning to Stockton's hall stock – a high proportion are managed by the educational sector and are in poor condition. This means their contribution to supply is discounted twice. It should be noted that all halls below three courts are excluded from FPM analysis, unless they are ancillary to halls which exceed this threshold.

Standards-supply and Demand

- 7.36. The level of provision for sports halls in the Borough is good as are their proximity, however six percent of our survey indicated that they felt there needed to be more. This indicate that the level should be maintained rather than seen as an over supply. The level of 92m² of sports hall per 1000 people is the Borough level of provision which should be maintained.



Standards

Quantity: 92 m2 of sports hall per 1000 people

Proximity: within two kilometres

SWIMMING POOLS

Capacity Ratio-Facilities Per 1000 People

- 7.37. The figures demonstrates that the capacity ratio for swimming pools in Stockton-on-Tees Borough at 16.74 which is slightly above the regional level and below the national level.

England: 18.77

North East Region: 16.64

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Total: 16.47

Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more: 15%

Quantity of Swimming Pools Per 1000 People

Area	Capacity Ratio	People who think there should be more Swimming Pools (%)*
Billingham	20.26	6
Thornaby	28.87	10
Ingleby Barwick	5.70	35
Eaglescliffe	9.13	24
Yarm	22.16	51
Stockton	15.84	12

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

- 7.38. The distribution of facilities outlined in the table demonstrates a wide variation of provision across the Borough. This is to be expected as swimming pools by their nature are a concentrated facility. Variation by area is also reflected in the results of the survey with a wide variation in the level of people that think that there is a need for swimming facilities. Overall our survey indicated that people thought there was more of a need for swimming pools than any other facility at 15%. However this facility is also the one that the highest number of our sample said they use at 42% and therefore have an interest in.

Sport England Sports Facilities Calculator

- 7.39. The table below outlines the demand for facilities as outlined by Sport England's Sports Facilities Calculator. The Sports Facilities Calculator identifies the level of demand that is likely to be created by a population with similar characteristics to the population of Stockton-on-Tees Borough. This demand analysis indicates that the overall level of provision in the Borough exceeds that necessary for water space.

Sport England Facilities Calculator Demand Compared to Existing Provision of Swimming Pools

Area	Existing total provision	Demand outlined by Sport England facilities calculator (m2)
Borough	3134	1936.23
Billingham	743	369.89
Thornaby	669	242.06
Ingleby Barwick	112	200.43
Eaglescliffe	98	108.28
Yarm	200	88.48
Stockton	1312	833.91

7.40. When this is broken down to town level, demand is exceeded in Billingham, Thornaby, Stockton and Yarm. Ingleby Barwick and Eaglescliffe do not meet the demand as outlined by the Calculator. However, the Sports Facilities Calculator does not have a spatial element meaning that facilities that may be close by but not within the town may not be taken into account when comparing supply to demand. For example the areas that have a supply of facilities which outstrips demand, may provide facilities for other areas with a lower supply of swimming pools.

Facilities Catchment-Travel Distance

7.41. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries. Analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas.

7.42. The table below demonstrates that for all swimming pools the majority of people are within two kilometres of a swimming pool, this is a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard for swimming pools.


Households Within Different Distances of Swimming Pools

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km	Total
Number of households	21721	59430	76819	79867	80646	81163	82288
Percentage of households	26%	72%	93%	97%	98%	98.51	100%

7.43. The map on the following page demonstrates the areas in the Borough which are within two kilometres of a swimming pool. It should be noted that the areas covered in Eaglescliffe and Ingleby Barwick are within two kilometres of a training pool rather than a main pool.

7.44. The analysis of proximity on Active Places Power allows comparison between authorities. When compared to its corresponding authorities the proximity to swimming facilities in Stockton-on-Tees compares very well for both by car and

on foot. Due to this the existing proximity of facilities is at a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard.



Not to Scale

© Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council 100023297 2009

Swimming Pools Access by Car


Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	99%	1%	0	0	0
Doncaster	88%	12%	0	0	0
Rotherham	95%	5%	0	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	93%	7%	0	0	0
Darlington	94%	6%	0	0	0

Swimming Pools Access by Walking






Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	27%	45%	22%	4%	1%
Doncaster	17%	33%	25%	19%	7%
Rotherham	20%	35%	22%	18%	6%
Redcar and Cleveland	10%	20%	22%	36%	12%
Darlington	29%	48%	18%	1%	4%

Personal Share

7.45. The table and map below indicates the personal share of swimming pools in Stockton Borough. At 1.79 the Borough's personal share is above the regional level at 1.71 but below the national personal share at 1.90. Six wards are below the Borough personal share but most meet or exceed it. Almost ten wards meet or exceed the national personal share.



Map 15: Personal Share of Swimming Pools

Symbol	Range	Ward Count
	1.2 - 1.416	(2)
	1.417 - 1.632	(4)
	1.633 - 1.848	(10)
	1.849 - 2.064	(7)
	2.065 - 2.28	(3)


Facilities Planning Model

- 7.46. Stockton has 11 pools across eight sites. two of the sites are in the commercial sector (David Lloyd, Health Academy and Total Fitness) three are leisure centres (Billingham Forum, Splash and Thornaby), with the remaining two sites being schools (Billingham Campus School and Our Lady/St Bede)
- 7.47. The local pool stock is able to satisfy 93% of demand for swimming. This compares to a regional figure of 88.1% and national figure of 91.9%. Stockton residents personal share of waterspace (sq.m. of water per 000 relative to demand in local area) is marginally lower than the national average but (at four percent) not significantly so.
- 7.48. Because satisfied demand is not at 100% there is, of course, some unmet demand. As visits this equates to 765 vpppppp. Expressed in physical terms the unmet demand equates to 135 sq.m of water. It is not suggested however that the degree of unmet demand means that additional waterspace is needed.

- 7.49. First FPM analyses how well pool capacity is used across the stock. [The optimal figure here is 70%]. On average only 59.4% of Stockton's pool capacity was being utilised. This is slightly better than both the regional average (56%) and the national figure (57.6%).
- 7.50. There is however quite a wide variation in capacity utilisation across Stockton's pools. The pools at David Lloyd, Splash and Total Fitness could be considered full at peak times (ie. Over 70%) (Splash particularly so), while at the other end of the scale Our Lady/St Bede and Billingham Forum (at 30.1% and 34.2% respectively) are the pools with the lowest utilised capacity.
- 7.51. This is 'age weighted' FPM analysis in that the attractiveness of pools (and therefore their capacity) declines by age. Unless pools are substantially refurbished, the older they are, the less capacity they are considered to offer. It is no coincidence that the two pools in Stockton that have the lowest utilised capacity are the two pools which have the lowest attractiveness rating (Our Lady/St Bede is 36%, while Billingham Forum is 45% - Splash in contrast is 99%.
- 7.52. The overall adequacy of Stockton's pool stock means that it is a net importer of swimming demand from its neighbour. Maps prepared at sub-regional level show the spatial distribution of unmet demand (at 2kmsq.) It is highest between Middlesbrough and Stockton, and between Stockton and Billingham.
- 7.53. It should be noted that the Facilities Planning Model at the national level includes pools that are longer than 20m and over 160 sq.m. for tanks and over 200 sq.m. for leisure pools. Where ancillary pools (learner pools etc) that fall below this threshold are situated adjacent to pools that meet the size / area parameter, it is also included. Private sector pools are included in the national level analysis, provided they meet the size / area parameters. Data is from Feb 2008, and is weighted by age.

Standards-Supply and Demand

- 7.54. The analysis shows that the Borough is below the national and regional level of provision but exceeds the Regional personal share which factors in the location of facilities. The overall level of provision is also above that recommended by the Sports Facilities Calculator. The standard is set at the Borough level.



Standards

16.5m² swimming pool per 1000 people
Proximity: within two kilometres

SYNTHETIC TURF PITCHES

Capacity Ratio-Facilities Per 1000 People

7.55. The figures below demonstrate that the level of provision of synthetic turf pitches is equal to both the national and regional level. 21% of our survey said they use outdoor sports provision and 11% of our survey said they thought there needed to be more sports pitches nearer to their home. It should be remembered that although this figure does not relate only to synthetic pitches, that synthetic pitches can provide pitch provision in place of grass pitches where potential pitch area is low.

7.56. Although general pitch provision in the Borough meets national and regional levels there are variations by town as demonstrated below. It is important to investigate the potential to travel to existing provision outside of the defined towns.

England: 0.03

North East Region: 0.03

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Total: 0.032

Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more sports pitches: 11%

Quantity of Synthetic Turf Pitches Per 100 People

Area	Capacity Ratio	People who think there should be more Sports Pitches/Playing Fields (%)*
Billingham	0.055	6
Thornaby	0.043	9
Ingleby Barwick	0	9
Eaglescliffe	0.093	5
Yarm	0.111	21
Stockton	0.012	11


*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

Facilities Catchment-Travel Distances

7.57. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries. Analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas. The table below indicates that the vast majority of households in the Borough are within four kilometres of a synthetic turf pitch. This is a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard for synthetic turf pitches. The map on the following page identifies the areas, which are located within the proximity standard.

Households Within Different Distances of Synthetic Turf Pitches

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km	Total
Number of households	8846	30594	44048	56050	69898	78908	82288
Percentage of households	11%	37%	54%	68%	85%	96%	100%




7.58. Active Places Power allows an analysis of proximity that can be compared to other authorities. The tables below show that when compared with its corresponding authorities access to synthetic turf pitches by car in Stockton-on-Tees is good. This means that the existing level of provision is at a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard.

Synthetic Turf Pitch Access by Car

Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	81%	19%	0	0	0
Doncaster	47%	52%	1%	0	0
Rotherham	56%	44%	0	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	61%	32%	7%	0	0
Darlington	94%	6%	0	0	0

Standards-Supply and Demand



7.59. Supply standards should be set at 0.032 to maintain the Borough, national and regional level of provision.

Standards

Quantity: 0.032 pitches per 1000 people

Proximity: within four kilometres

ICE RINKS

Capacity Ratio- Facilities per 1000 people

7.60. The figures below demonstrate the high level of provision in the Borough compared to both the national and regional level, this demonstrates the concentrated nature of ice rink provision, expressed even more clearly by the high level of provision in Billingham.

England: 1.09

North East Region: 1.17

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Total: 7.653

Percentage of people in the Borough who thought there should be more: 7%

Quantity of Ice Rinks Per 1000 People

Area	Capacity Ratio Total	People who think there should be more Ice Rinks(%)*
Billingham	39.705	2
Thornaby	0	11
Ingleby Barwick	0	11
Eaglescliffe	0	7
Yarm	0	13
Stockton	0	7

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

Facility Catchment – Travel Distances

7.61. It is very important not to understand quantity of provision as just that located within town boundaries. Analysing the ability to travel to facilities in other towns gives a more realistic picture of the quantity of facilities available to residents in different areas.

7.62. The table below demonstrates that a majority of the households in the Borough are located with eight kilometres of the Ice Rink. However due to the regional or sub-regional significance of the ice rink it is suitable to set a standard for the ice rink which includes any households within the Borough.

Households Within Different Distances of the Ice Rink

Distance	1km	2km	3km	4km	5km	6km	7km	8km	Total
Number of households	3018	8697	15846	21441	26376	33431	41507	51705	82288
Percentage of households	4%	11%	19%	26%	32%	41%	50%	63%	100%

7.63. Active Places Power allows an analysis of a facility's proximity to population that can be compared to other authorities. When compared to its corresponding authorities, as demonstrated by the table below, the Borough has a very good level of proximity to population for ice rinks. This demonstrates that the current provision of the Borough is at a suitable level at which to set a proximity standard

for ice rinks. The map at page 121 demonstrates the areas of the Borough that are covered by the proximity standard for ice rinks.

Ice Rinks Access by Car

Local Authority	0-10 minutes (% pop.)	10.1 –20 minutes (% pop.)	20.1 – 30 minutes (% pop.)	30.1-45 minutes (% pop.)	45.1-60 minutes (% pop.)
Stockton-on-Tees	34%	62%	4%	0	0
Doncaster	15%	42%	39%	5%	0
Rotherham	8%	67%	25%	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	0%	5%	68%	26%	1%
Darlington	0	1%	64%	35%	0

Standards – supply and demand

7.64. The information above demonstrates that Stockton-on-Tees Borough has a very high level of provision for ice rinks and that the ice rinks is accessible for its residents. 12 % of our survey said they use ice rinks and seven percent of people thought that there needed to be more ice rinks in the Borough. The relatively high level of people who said there should be more ice rinks in the Borough, relevant to the number of users, may be a reflection of expectations raised by existing provision rather than a lack of facilities. The standard will be set at the existing level of provision in the Borough.

7.65. The standard does not demonstrate a need to change the level of provision in the Borough. Rather, for the purposes of requesting contributions from new development it is more appropriate to seek a contribution at the regional level to reflect that the ice rink is a regional or sub-regional level facility rather than to suggest that the Borough should increase ice provision.

Standards

Quantity: 7.65m² ice per 1000 population

Proximity: within the Borough

COMMUNITY CENTRES AND VILLAGE HALLS

Capacity Ratio – Facilities per 1000 people

7.66. In the Borough as a whole there is community centre and village hall capacity for nearly 33 people for every 1000 people in the Borough. The highest level of provision in the Borough is in Eaglescliffe with a capacity of over 49 per 1000 people. Capacity is at its lowest in Ingleby Barwick with a capacity of just over nine per 1000 people. In the Borough as a whole there are 7% think there should be more community facilities 17.1% people use them only 6% would like to use them but currently do not.

Quantity of Community Centres and Village Halls Per 1000 People

Area	Capacity Ratio Total (Capacity per 1000)	People who think there should be more community buildings (%)*
Stockton-on-Tees Borough	32.92	7
Billingham	28.69	2
Thornaby	19.42	6
Ingleby Barwick	9.16	13
Eaglescliffe	49.37	6
Yarm	34.35	13
Stockton	35.26	8

*information from the Sport Recreation and Leisure Survey.

7.67. The table below demonstrates that the provision of village halls is particularly high in rural villages, this perhaps reflects that the village hall is often the only facility available to rural village whose residents will expect to travel further to other facilities. The capacity ratio of rural villages in general is 122.78 hall capacity per 1000 people compared to the total Borough level of 32.92 hall/community centre capacity per 1000 people.

Table to Demonstrate the Provision of Village Halls in Rural Villages

Village	Village Hall Capacity	Village Halls compared to population (capacity per 1000)	People who think there need to be more village halls. (%)
Thorpe Thewles	90	250	7%
Wynyard	0	0	5%
Stillington	124	127.18	0
Whitton	0	0	n/a*
Carlton	80	142.86	9%
Redmarshall	0	0	0
Elton	0	0	8%
Long Newton	200	273.96	0
Aislaby	0	0	n/a*
Kirklevington	225	231.96	15%
Hilton	35	175.68	0
Maltby	60	218.18	n/a*
Total villages	814	122.78	4%


*people from these villages where not surveyed as part of the Sport, Recreation and Leisure Survey.

Facility Catchment – Travel Distances

7.68. The table below demonstrates that the majority of households in the Borough are within 2 kilometres of a community centre or a village hall. This is a suitable level at which to set the proximity standard.


Households Within Different Distances of Community Centres and Village Halls

Distance	300m	600m	1km	2km	5km	Total
Number of households	8873	24099	47089	77992	82049	82288
Percentage of households	11%	30%	57%	95%	100%	100%



Standards- Supply and Demand

7.69. The Borough level of provision for community centres and village halls is a capacity of 33 per 1000 people, the standards will be set at this level and is demonstrated in the graph below. The proximity standard will also be set at the Borough level of provision.



Standards

Quantity: Capacity of 33 per 1000 people.

Proximity: within two kilometres

8. BUILT FACILITIES QUALITY

- 8.1. The Ispal Assessment which provided information to our built facilities audit for the Tees Active Facilities offers important information surrounding the quality of these facilities. The quality of school and private facilities has been highlighted by the age and last refurbishment date of the facility.
- 8.2. Ispal highlights that the Tees Active provision in the Borough is generally of very good quality with the Splash facility in central Stockton ranked as twelfth of the facilities it assessed. The older facilities in Thornaby are also ranked highly at 104 for the Pavillion, which includes a sports hall and indoor bowls facility and 133 for the pool. Although still relatively highly ranked overall at 306, the quality of Billingham Forum is considerably below that of any other Tees Active Facility. This facility provides a large element of the Borough's water space, an ice rink which could be said to be of sub regional importance and is strategically important for provision in the north of the Borough.
- 8.3. Due to this Billingham Forum should be a priority for improvement, followed by the facilities in Thornaby and then Stockton. However, it is important to remember that all facilities should be open to improvement particularly where improvements could increase access and capacity of the facility. Improvements can increase the attractiveness and use of facilities increasing their efficiency.
- 8.4. Sports halls in schools in the Borough represent an older age profile which will affect their attractiveness however, the Building Schools for the Future programme should improve this.
- 8.5. The built facilities audit shows a wide variation in the quality of facilities with scores from 40% to 100%. Using the same approach as quality for the open space audit where 0-25% scores are poor, 26-50% scores are satisfactory, 51-75% scores are good and 76-100% scores are excellent, the majority of community centre and village halls score good followed by excellent and then satisfactory. There are no poor community centres and village halls.
- 8.6. All village halls score good or excellent, however, there is a wider variation in community centres with both the highest and lowest scores relate to community centres. Although the majority of community centres score good or excellent all satisfactory scores are for community centres.

9. EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

- 9.1. The online version of the Sport, Recreation and Leisure survey provided an opportunity to identify the use of facilities by people who work in the Borough but do not live in the Borough, this was identified using postcode. The results of this survey demonstrate that for many of the open spaces and indoor sports facilities named in the survey the same proportion of workers and people living in the Borough name them as their most used site.
- 9.2. For example 4.7% of people living in the Borough in this section of the survey use John Whitehead Park most often compared to four percent of people who work in the Borough. Of those living in the Borough in this section of the survey 19.9% use Preston Park most often compared to 20% who only work in the Borough. This is similarly the case with Billingham Forum Leisure complex with 22.3% of those living in the Borough using it most often compared to 20% of those who only work here. These examples are used because they provide named examples so we can be sure of the comparison, but it appears to be a common theme. The findings clearly demonstrate that employment uses do create a similar demand for open space and facilities. This suggests that the open space and sport facility requirements of workers are similar to those of residents.
- 9.3. This evidence would suggest that the standards determined should be used for provision in both residential and employment developments. However, it can be assumed that only built facilities and some types of open space would be used by workers, these include, parks, amenity space and outdoor sports facilities.

10. PROVISION IN RURAL VILLAGES

10.1. The table below outlines the quantity of open space in rural villages compared to their populations. Villages outlined here are those originally surveyed separately in the Open Space Audit, other villages such as Wolviston and Cowpen Bewley have been included in wider urban areas. The same variety of open space should not be expected in rural areas due to the low populations that are usually served and that provision in towns is often required to make up for a lack of openness and greenery that is not an issue in rural areas.

10.2. As the table demonstrates the provision in rural areas shows a different pattern to that of the Borough's urban areas. The villages tend to have less variety in the types of spaces provided but in some cases the type of space provided is in much greater quantities than would be expected in urban areas when compared to population. An example of this is the very high level of provision of natural greenspace in Thorpe Thewles, which is many times that of the Borough level. However, this should not be seen as an over provision as this is due to the nature of the space and of the lower populations in rural areas.

Quantity of Open Space in Rural Villages Per 1000 Population

Village	Natural Greenspace (ha per 1000 people)	Green Corridors (ha per 1000 people)	Outdoor Sports (ha per 1000 people)	Amenity Greenspace (ha per 1000 people)	Play areas (people per unit)	Allotments (ha per 1000 people)
Thorpe Thewles	21.21ha	7.8ha	0	16.41ha	0	0
Wynyard	0	0	0	1.1ha	0	0
Stillington	16.56	0	2.14ha	1.76ha	488 people	2.09ha
Whitton	133.68	0	0	6.6ha	0	0
Carlton	0	0	0	2.73ha	560 people	0
Redmarshall	0	0	0	0.63ha	0	0
Elton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Newton	2.32	0	2.37ha	2.25ha	730 people	0
Aislaby	12.9	0	0	0	0	0
Kirklevington	0	0	0.68ha	0.21ha	970 people	0
Hilton	0	0	2.14ha	0.31ha	370 people	0
Maltby	0	0	0	0.64ha	0	0
Borough	2.44	1.24ha	1.76	1.39ha	2091 people	0
Standard	2ha	N/A	1.76	1.39ha	1000 people	0

- 10.3. There are no parks in the rural villages, however Wynyard Woodland Park and play area are located relatively close to Thorpe Thewles. Graveyards are a type of space that is prevalent in rural villages and are included in Thorpe Thewles, Stillington, Elton, Long Newton, Kirkleavington and Hilton. Where play provision is present in rural villages the quantity of provision is consistently high with far less people per play unit than both the standards or the Borough level.
- 10.4. Due to the varied nature of provision in rural areas, the Borough wide standard for open space should be applied to rural villages rather than having separate provision standards.
- 10.5. In all cases the rural villages do not have indoor sport facilities and people will typically have to travel further to this type of facility. This means that a village hall is often the only indoor facility available in rural areas and as such is particularly important.