MATTER 5
Specific Housing Needs and Generic Housing Policies

Issue 1 – Housing Mix (Policy HP2)

1.1 Does the requirement for developments to provide for a mix of housing in accordance with the SHMA provide sufficient clarity?

1.1.1 Yes it does.

1.1.2 The NPPF\(^1\) advises that local planning authorities should seek to deliver a wide choice of homes, creating sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. They should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required.

1.1.3 The Local Plan covers the period up to 2031. The policy is intended to ensure that a wide choice of homes is delivered over the plan period. The policy is not prescriptive in order to provide flexibility and ensure that it relates to the most up to date evidence.

1.1.4 The 2014 SHMA\(^2\) included analysis as to the likely size of housing to be required across all tenures. For Wyre this is presented at Figure 7.23. The analysis is presented in tabular form for the scenarios which form both ends of the OAN range with an ‘average’ set of proportions presented in the final row. This confirms that a mix of different sizes of housing will be required based on the projected changing population and household profile of the borough.

1.1.5 The 2014 SHMA, also presents details with regards to the size and type of affordable housing at Figure 9.18. The Addendum 3 report\(^3\) presents an updated analysis of the need for affordable housing by size at Table 6.8. This confirms a significant need for smaller affordable properties as well as a more modest need for larger family sized affordable dwellings.

1.2 Is the requirement for developments to provide 20% of housing for older people and with restricted mobility justified?

1.2.1 Yes it is.

1.2.2 The government has recognised that society is ageing and is committed to addressing the needs of older people in the UK. The NPPF makes specific reference to the needs of older people and people with disabilities in paragraphs 50 and 159 of the NNPF. It is important that the Local Plan

---

\(^{1}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED013, para. 50

\(^{2}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED085

\(^{3}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED088
makes provision for housing for older people to enable them to live independently at home for as long as possible.

1.2.3 The 2014 Fylde Coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)\textsuperscript{4} identified that growth in the older population is a significant driver of population change in the Fylde Coast and in Wyre itself\textsuperscript{5}.

1.2.4 As noted in the 2014 SHMA at paragraph 5.16, the dominance of the over 40 age group in Wyre at the 2011 Census indicated an ageing population. The migration pattern in Wyre (SHMA paragraph 5.17) shows a higher level of net in-migration in older age groups, and particularly the 60-64 bracket. A significant net outmigration of 15-19 year olds without a subsequent inflow of 20-24 age group suggested that students moving away do not return to Wyre.

1.2.5 The SHMA\textsuperscript{6} specifically looks at the housing requirements of older people in chapter 10.

1.2.6 Figure 10.1 in the 2014 SHMA (page 165 and partially reproduced below to show the Wyre information), shows the significant growth in the older population anticipated in the period to 2030. Wyre is expected to account for 40% of the growth in this age group on the Fylde Coast (over 25,000 people).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population at mid year</th>
<th>Change 2011 - 2030</th>
<th>%Change 2011 - 2030</th>
<th>% of total Wyre change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>18,064</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>108.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>9,315</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>101.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Older Persons</td>
<td>30,962</td>
<td>10,450</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>312.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>107,692</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.7 The SHMA Addendum 1 report\textsuperscript{7} which was prepared following publication of the 2012-based sub-national population projections (SNPP) in 2014, continued to confirm using the updated demographic projections that the older population of Wyre would significantly grow in the period 2012 – 2037. A strong growth in the older population across the borough was also a feature of the updated demographic modelling which informed the Addendum 3 report\textsuperscript{8} which took full account of the latest 2014-based SNPP and sub-national household projections (SNHP).

1.2.8 The 2014 SHMA confirmed that the projections of housing need presented excluded the institutional population (with this conforming to the methodology applied by the DCLG in the preparation of the official household projections)\textsuperscript{9}.

---

\textsuperscript{4} Submission Document Library Reference ED085
\textsuperscript{5} Submission Document Library Reference ED085, Figure 10.1.
\textsuperscript{6} Submission Document Library Reference ED085
\textsuperscript{7} Submission Document Library Reference ED086
\textsuperscript{8} Submission Document Library Reference ED088, Figure 4.4
\textsuperscript{9} Submission Document Library Reference ED085, Paragraph 10.11
The specific requirements of an increasing number of older people (aged over 75) assumed to live in institutional housing are therefore separate and additional to the concluded OAN within the SHMA and subsequent Addendum’s. This will represent a further additional need for housing to accommodate older persons.

1.2.9 The Viability Study\(^{10}\) assessed the viability of the policy and considered two options in relation to –

a) Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings - in line with Building Regulations Requirement M4 (2) and;

b) Wheelchair-accessible Dwellings - in line with Building Regulations Requirement M4 (3A)

The Study concluded (paragraph 7.16) that it does not have a significant impact on viability. Where development is viable these standards can generally be supported. The non-prescriptive nature of policy HP2 provides flexibility to take account of viability issues on a case by case basis.

1.2.10 It is important that the Local Plan addresses the needs of older people and people with restricted mobility and makes provision for housing which is sustainable and can support people to remain independent in their home as they grow older. The requirement for a 20% provision is considered reasonable.

1.3 Does the wording of Policy HP2 allow for sufficient flexibility taking into account viability considerations and differing needs across the District?

1.3.1 Yes it does.

1.3.2 Policy HP2 is not prescriptive as to how the requirement is met, allowing flexibility in the design of developments and the actual dwellings. The Viability Study\(^{11}\) includes specific testing of the cost per dwelling for specific elderly adaptations relating to 20% of the homes which does not show a significant impact on overall viability if any at all. The Local Plan includes flexibility through Policy SP6 to consider site specific viability issues.

Issue 2 – Affordable Housing (Policies HP3 and HP7)

2.1 Are the requirements for the levels of affordable housing within Policy HP3 justified?

2.1.1 Yes they are.

2.1.2 The SHMA Addendum 3 Report\(^{12}\) updates the evidence in relation to affordable housing needs (chapter 6). The Report indicates an annual need for 134 affordable homes in Wyre over the next five years (2017 – 2022). Beyond this five year period, an estimated 189 affordable homes will be needed annually.

\(^{10}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED003

\(^{11}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED003

\(^{12}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED088
2.1.3 The requirements in policy HP3 are justified in view of the scale of affordable housing need in the Borough.

2.2 *Do the requirements of Policy HP3 relating to viability (Section 3) and financial contributions (Section 4) provide sufficient flexibility?*

2.2.1 Yes they do.

2.2.2 The provisions in sections 3 and 4 allow for viability matters to be considered on a case by case basis under policy SP6.

2.3 *Should Policy HP7 be modified to allow a proportion of market housing (para 54 of the NPPF refers)?*

2.3.1 No it should not.

2.3.2 As stated in the response to preliminary matters in paragraph 48\(^{13}\), it would be inappropriate because the inclusion of a provision for market housing in the policy could increase expectations of its acceptability and consequently drive land values up in itself causing a development to be unviable. Any viability issues should be considered under Policy SP6 on a case by case basis.

2.4 *Does Policy HP7 need to be more specific in terms of ‘need’ and ‘locality’?*

2.4.1 Yes it does.

2.4.2 As indicated in the response to preliminary matters\(^ {14}\) the Council proposes a modification to introduce a new paragraph 7.8.2 and footnote.

### Issue 3 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (Policy HP8 and Site SA6)

3.1 *Does the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) robustly assess the need for residential and transit sites in the District?*

3.1.1 Yes it does.

3.1.2 The Site Allocations Background Paper Annex B GTAA Technical Note\(^ {15}\) summarises the conduct and outcomes of the 2014 GTAA\(^ {16}\) and 2016 GTAA Update\(^ {17}\).

3.1.3 The current need for pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople is set out within the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Update 2016. Both the 2014 and 2016

\(^{13}\) Examination Document Library Reference EL1.001b  
\(^{14}\) Examination Document Library Reference EL1.001b, paragraph 48  
\(^{15}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED012d  
\(^{16}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED078  
\(^{17}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED079
Assessments were undertaken by ORS on behalf of the three Fylde Coast Authorities (Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre). It is the Council’s opinion that they represent a robust evidence base to be used for the calculation of need.

3.1.4 The 2016 GTAA was carried out in accordance with the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (the PPTS) (2015)\(^{18}\). Although the 2014 and 2016 assessments utilised similar methodologies, the 2016 Assessment methodology reflects the primary change made by the PPTS in the definition of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople for planning purposes.

3.1.5 Whilst requiring local authorities to complete a GTAA, the PPTS does not provide a methodology for the assessment of current and future pitch and plot needs. The 2016 GTAA sought to understand the accommodation needs of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population that meet the planning definition through desk-based research to identify all authorised and unauthorised pitches and plots in the study area and interviews with members of the travelling community living on all known sites/yards.

3.1.6 All pitches and plots were visited by experienced ORS interviewers who are accredited under the Interviewer Quality Control Scheme (IQCS) and the Market Research Society (MRS) Code of Conduct. The interviewers attempted to conduct semi-structured interviews with residents to determine their current demographic characteristics; their current or future accommodation needs; whether there is any over-crowding or the presence of concealed or doubled-up households or single adults; and their travelling characteristics.

3.1.7 Both assessments engaged with Gypsies and Travellers living in brick and mortar accommodation. In both assessments a Lancashire County Council community development worker with personal professional knowledge of the subject communities was engaged to identify members of the target population living in bricks and mortar accommodation who were willing to be interviewed.

3.1.8 The outcomes of the interviews were used to assess whether the occupants met the planning definition within the PPTS in that they stated that household members:

- Travel for work purposes and stay away from their usual place of residence when doing so; or
- Have ceased to travel temporarily due to education, ill health or old age.

3.1.9 It is not now a requirement for a GTAA to include a formal assessment of need for households that do not meet the current planning definition. However for completeness the 2016 Assessment included an estimate of current and future accommodation need for those Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who were not able to be interviewed but who may meet the planning definition (unknown households).

\(^{18}\)Examination Document Library Reference ED017
3.1.10 The approach currently used by ORS was considered in April 2016 and July 2017 by the Planning Inspector for the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy who concluded that the GTAA provides a robust and credible evidence base. The findings were accepted. The overall approach used by ORS was also considered and supported by the Inspector at a Local Plan Examination in Maldon, Essex, in June 2017.

3.1.11 It is acknowledged in the 2014 and 2016 GTAAs that in some cases the target population either refused to take part in the study or were not available despite multiple site visits. This has a particular impact on any assessment of travelling characteristics as a result of the change in definition as the 2016 assessment emphasised the need to establish whether or not each household could evidence a travelling lifestyle.

3.1.12 For Wyre, the 2016 assessment identified a zero need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and a need for 19 plots for Travelling Showpeople, increased to 20 plots on the receipt of new information as explained in the Technical Note on page 4.

3.1.13 It is considered that the studies undertaken have been completed using a robust methodology, involving a genuine process of engagement designed to robustly identify the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

3.2 Are the criteria within Policy HP8 consistent with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)?

3.2.1 Yes, they are.

3.2.2 The PPTS\(^\text{19}\) at paragraph’s 11 and 24 allows the establishment of development management criteria-based policy. Policy HP8 (as proposed to be modified) contains two specific criteria (2b and 2c) that seek to ensure that the amenity of the future site occupiers and that of users in the vicinity of the development is protected. This is consistent with the PPTS para. 4 (part k), para. 10 (part e), and para. 13 (part e).

3.2.3 The Council recognise, however, that an additional criteria requiring traveller developments to be well planned and landscaped to minimise impact on the local area will strengthen Policy HP8 in line with the approach of the PPTS to the protection of amenity and the local environment (references above) and PPTS para. 26, which, amongst other matters, addresses itself to the issue of landscaping and environmental impact.

3.2.4 Criterion 2d in Policy HP8 provides for housing needs to be considered in the planning balance in cases of applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showperson accommodation on land identified in the Local Plan for another purpose. This is in line with the overall aim of the PPTS to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers (PPTS, para. 3) and that of meeting needs. It is the Council’s view that other matters raised by the PPTS that are material in

\(^{19}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED017
this context, such as the need to avoid areas of flood risk and protection of the countryside, are addressed by specific policies of the emerging Local Plan.

3.3 *Is the allocation SA6 justified?*

3.3.1 Yes it is.

3.3.2 As referred to in the response to question 3.1 above, the GTAA\(^{20}\) shows a need for 20 plots for Travelling Showpeople. The Site Allocations Background Paper\(^{21}\) (pages 30 to 32) provides the background to the allocation of SA6, documenting an extensive site search process. It explains that the site search process did not yield a suitable allocation for Travelling Showpeople apart from SA6. Site SA6 is capable of accommodating the identified need. The site is in the ownership of the part-owner of the Kepple Lane Travelling Showperson’s yard who has confirmed support for the allocation of SA6.

3.4 *What is the current position with the planning application for the SA6 site?*

3.4.1 The Council has received a planning application (reference: 17/01176) for a “change of use of land to travelling showpeople accommodation site and erection of storage and amenity building” on the site shown as SA6 land at Conway, West of the A6, Garstang. The application proposes 18 serviced plots, three family plots and three transit plot, plus facilities for storage, servicing and repair. The bungalow known as Conway will remain. At present the application is being considered by the Council and will be considered by the Wyre Council Planning Committee on 2 May 2018 (recommended for approval).

---

**Issue 4 – Generic Housing Policies**

4.1 *Are the requirements of Policy HP9 (Green Infrastructure in new residential developments) deliverable and clear to the decision maker (the Council has indicated that it will be giving further consideration to the wording of the policy)?*

4.1.1 As proposed to be modified, Policy HP9 is deliverable and clear to the decision maker. The Council is also proposing modification to the text in section 7.10.

4.1.2 In summary, the proposed modifications: –

   a) Seek to ensure that Green Infrastructure provision through the policy should be meaningful. The proposed policy therefore allows for individual typology requirements to be grossed up to create a total requirement for green infrastructure, with the nature of provision to be determined on a site-by-site basis as already allowed for in the draft policy.

---

\(^{20}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED078 & ED079
\(^{21}\) Submission Document Library Reference ED012a
b) Clarify that the policy applies to developments of 11 dwellings or more in accordance with the government’s planning practice guidance “Planning Obligations”\textsuperscript{22}

c) Introduce a specific standard for playing pitches to provide clarity and certainty. It is accepted that the Wyre Playing Pitch Strategy\textsuperscript{23} does not provide sufficient clarity in terms of required provision. The Council is proposing the adoption of the playing pitch standard of 1.20/1,000 population and accessibility standard of 1,200m set by Fields in Trust (Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard – England (undated) (see Appendix A). This standard is within the range of standards used by comparator authorities as established by the Green Infrastructure Strategy\textsuperscript{24}.

d) Clarify that some GI typologies will not apply in the calculation of the total GI requirement for certain types of developments (for example sheltered housing schemes would not normally be required to allow for the provision of children’s play space).

e) Provide clarity on the prioritisation of on-site provision but allowing for off-site provision and commuted sums (for the improvement of quality and accessibility on nearby sites) where appropriate.

f) Clarify that the deliberate sub-division of sites such that each falls below the 11 dwelling threshold will not be acceptable.

4.1.3 It is considered that the proposed modifications provide additional clarity in the wording of the policy and its operation whilst allowing sufficient flexibility to take into account site and development circumstances and allow for the most appropriate form of GI provision. It is considered that the modifications provide a clear and deliverable policy.

\textsuperscript{22} Submission Document Library Reference ED014
\textsuperscript{23} Submission Document Library Reference ED069d
\textsuperscript{24} Submission Document Library Reference ED069a, Appendix 2
Appendix A - Fields in Trust (Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard – England (see separate document)
Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard

England
Foreword

‘At first glance the similarities between toddlers playing in the local park and professional athletes competing at the highest level seem tenuous but they both share one basic requirement: a need for outdoor recreational space.

Parks, playgrounds and playing fields play a vital role in building healthy neighbourhoods contributing to the physical, mental and emotional well-being of local people. Without access to these spaces the quality of life and well-being of residents is reduced.

Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard emphasises the need for a range of both formal and informal outdoor spaces to meet our recreational needs and the practical tools to guarantee sufficient space is available.

Outdoor recreational spaces are the foundation stone for an active, healthy nation. Fields in Trust’s expert advice ensures provision of these spaces is part of the fabric of our communities.’

The Rt Hon The Lord Coe CH KBE

Introduction

‘Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play’ is a one-stop shop for the practitioner – local planning authorities, developers, planners and urban designers, landscape architects and parish and town councils – in the planning and design of outdoor sport, play and informal open space.

‘Since the 1930s, Fields in Trust has provided guidance on the provision of outdoor space for sport, play and recreation that is both respected and valued across the sector. This new publication recognises the need for people to have access to a wide range of outdoor spaces for recreational purposes and the intrinsic value these important spaces bring to the health and well-being of our communities.’

HRH The Duke of Cambridge
President, Fields in Trust

‘I welcome this updated guide which councils and neighbourhood planning groups may find helpful when they consider planning for open space’.

The Rt Hon Greg Clark MP
Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Fields in Trust

Fields in Trust is the operating name of the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA), and has been protecting outdoor space for sport and recreation since 1925. Its mission is to safeguard and improve protected space for future generations.

Fields in Trust currently safeguards over 2,500 sites, a total of 28,000 acres of land (11,331ha.) including playgrounds, playing fields, and formal and informal parkland across the UK.

Examples of Fields in Trust’s protection work include the King George V Fields, the Queen Elizabeth II Fields and Centenary Fields.

Open Space Guidance

As part of its protection work, Fields in Trust has offered guidance for practitioners on open space provision and design known as the Six Acre Standard (6AS) since the 1930s and most recently updated to Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play (PDOSP) in 2008.

The benchmark standards within PDOSP remain a useful guidance tool. However, there is need for review, given the substantial changes in the political, planning and social landscapes since 2008 including:

- reforms to national planning policy and guidance and the introduction of Neighbourhood Planning and CIL; and
- a growing trend towards a preference for individual participatory sport.

Sustainability

Updated guidance for open space and play provision resonates with national planning policy, in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the promotion of its economic, social and environmental roles and the seeking of positive improvements in the quality of the environment, and people's quality of life. In promoting healthy communities, access to high quality open spaces can make an important contribution to health and wellbeing. Such open spaces should not be built on unless any loss is appropriately replaced or outweighed by new provision.

Open space also plays an important role in meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding through integrating Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) and providing opportunities for conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

A review of current national planning policy and guidance related to open space provision can be found here.
Policy context

National Policy – England

i. National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. It forms the key national policy document and is a material consideration in planning decisions.

ii. National Planning Practice Guidance

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides additional guidance to the NPPF, including in relation to open space, sports and recreation, in the form of an online resource.

iii. The Localism Act – Neighbourhood Planning Orders

The Localism Act paved the way for planning powers to be passed down to local communities through the production of Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Plans are to be prepared by community groups, guided by Local Planning Authorities, and plan for a range of land uses, including outdoor sports and recreation uses.

iv. Planning Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a method of collecting funds from development to pay for necessary delivery and maintenance of infrastructure. Local authorities have the freedom to set their own priorities for what the money should be spent on. A portion of the CIL funds (up to 25%) will be payable to local communities with Neighbourhood Plans in place, for the purpose of localised spending on priority projects. CIL funds are capable of being used to fund local sport and recreation facilities.

v. Other Material Orders/Legislation

- Metropolitan Open Land designation (in London).
- Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation (PPG 17): although no longer current guidance, the content is still of practical value, along with The Companion Guide to PPG 17 (Assessing Needs and Opportunities).
- Disposal or change of use of playing field and school land (2015).

Green Flag Awards
Managed by Keep Britain Tidy and Keep Wales Tidy, these awards reward the best green spaces in the country. Green Flag recognises the importance of Fields in Trust permanent safeguarding of open spaces in its processes.
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Fields in Trust Policy Framework

Good planning and design is central to the philosophy and objectives of Fields in Trust and adds value to the overall quality of an area, helping to create a sense of place and space as well as contributing to the health and wellbeing of residents.

The Fields in Trust policy framework seeks the protection, provision and improvement of outdoor spaces for sport and play as part of the provision of sustainable communities.

Policies are kept under review to ensure that they remain relevant and proportionate. Current land-use policies include:

**Policy 1 – Promoting Healthy Communities**
As its core principle Fields in Trust protects the legacy of high quality outdoor spaces to facilitate opportunities for sport, play and recreation.

**Policy 2 – Protection of Open Space**
Fields in Trust seeks to contractually protect individual outdoor spaces for sport, play and recreation in perpetuity via deed of dedication. Fields in Trust does not look to own or manage sites but to work with all recreational landowners to secure the future of their local spaces for recreation.

**Policy 3 – Safeguarding of Facilities**
Fields in Trust objects to the loss of existing open space for sport play and recreation unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. The development of community playing fields and school playing fields should be refused unless replacement facilities of equal quality and quantity can be provided to serve the same catchment area to meet the need of both new and existing communities.

**Policy 4 – Town and Village Greens**
Whilst noting that recreational use of land may meet the criteria for registration of land as a town and village green, Fields in Trust prefers that such space be protected by deeds of dedication to ensure that an appropriate balance is struck between protection and flexibility to improve the space.

**Policy 5 – Green Belt Development**
Fields in Trust supports the provision of playing fields and other appropriate recreational facilities in the Green Belt consistent with policy for Green Belt development.

**Policy 6 – Sustainable Development**
Fields in Trust supports sustainability benefits arising from outdoor spaces including energy use and generation, carbon reduction, conservation of natural resources such as air, water, soil and biodiversity, sustainable consumption and production.

**Policy 7 – Telecommunications**
Fields in Trust does not normally support telecommunications apparatus and structures on playing fields if they conflict with the primary purpose of the land. Any such cases will be considered on individual merit.

**Policy 8 – Planning and Design**
Fields in Trust attaches great importance to the planning and design of facilities for communities. Good planning will achieve the provision of open spaces (formal and informal). Designated spaces (LAPs, LEAPs, NEAPs and MUGAs) should be provided on all developments in line with the guidance set out in this document.

**Policy 9 – Planning Agreements**
Fields in Trust seeks to secure the provision and protection of spaces for outdoor sport, play and recreation through planning conditions or obligations.

**Policy 10 – National Planning Policies**
Fields in Trust seeks to support national guidance and policies geared towards the protection of outdoor space for sport, play and recreation.
Fields in Trust guidelines: guidance for the practitioner

Fields in Trust’s benchmark standards, or local guidance derived from them, were widely used by local authorities for many years and they were referred to by other bodies, including Sport England who used to refer to them for benchmarking purposes. 75% of LPAs in a survey commissioned by Fields in Trust in 2014 use the PDOSP or guidance that promotes equivalent levels of provision demonstrating the continuing relevance of Fields in Trust’s Benchmark Guidelines.

The 2015 guidance backed up by research retains the same headline rates of provision, but draws out new recommendations for accessibility, the application of standards and the minimum dimensions of formal outdoor space. The standards also no longer differentiate between urban and rural areas.

Using this current guidance will help to ensure that the provision of outdoor sport, play and informal open space is of a sufficient size to enable effective use; is located in an accessible location and in close proximity to dwellings; and of a quality to maintain longevity and to encourage its continued use. It is recommended that Equipped/Designated Play Spaces be promoted in the form of:

* Local Areas for Play (LAPs) aimed at very young children;
* Locally Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) aimed at children who can go out to play independently; and
* Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs) aimed at older children.

These can be complemented by other facilities including Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and skateboard parks etc.

Open spaces can also provide dual use for Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), delivering recreational benefits by using attenuation and storage areas for play and/or sports areas.

Table 1 sets out Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines for a range of open space and equipped play areas. These benchmarks reflect the findings of the survey of local standards for open space applied by local planning authorities.

Quantity guidelines should not be interpreted as maximum levels of provision, and it is recommended that these are adjusted to take account of local circumstances.

Accessibility guidelines are provided as walking distance from dwellings. Indicative walking distances can be determined from the accessibility guidelines as set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Walk Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250m</td>
<td>2–3 minutes’ walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400m</td>
<td>5 minutes’ walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800m</td>
<td>10 minutes’ walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>15 minutes’ walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600m</td>
<td>20 minutes’ walk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be recognised that when applying these benchmarks, local features and obstacles to pedestrian and cycle movement should be taken into account. In doing so, accessible and sustainable play and sport facilities will be maximised.

High quality green spaces go a long way to encouraging people to use facilities positively and actively. Fields in Trust favours the use of durable equipment to reduce the burden and cost of maintaining open spaces, and recommend that management and maintenance regimes be put in place to ensure repair and replacement can be facilitated over time as necessary to maintain the standard of quality.

Definitions can be found here for the open space and equipped/designated play area typologies.
### Table 1: Fields in Trust recommended benchmark guidelines – formal outdoor space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space typology</th>
<th>QUANTITY GUIDELINE (hectares per 1,000 population)</th>
<th>WALKING GUIDELINE (walking distance: metres from dwellings)</th>
<th>QUALITY GUIDELINE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing pitches</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>* Quality appropriate to the intended level of performance, designed to appropriate technical standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All outdoor sports</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>* Located where they are of most value to the community to be served.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped/designated play areas</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>LAPs – 100m, LEAPs – 400m, NEAPs – 1,000m</td>
<td>* Sufficiently diverse recreational use for the whole community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>700m</td>
<td>* Appropriately landscaped.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Quantity guidelines should not be interpreted as either a maximum or minimum level of provision; rather they are benchmark standards that can be adjusted to take account of local circumstances.

2 Technical standards produced by Sport England, national governing sporting bodies or professional or trade organisations, such as the Institute of Groundsmanship and the Sports and Play Construction Association, can prove helpful.
The guidelines are recommended to relate to residential and mixed-use developments involving non-specialist residential use (i.e. the standards should be reviewed where there are high levels of student housing, or sheltered accommodation) using average household sizes for the relevant local planning authority.

Table 2 sets out recommended benchmark guidelines for the provision of equipped/designated play space. These should be provided on site in accordance with the minimum sizes set out at Table 4. A financial contribution (i.e. through S106 or CIL) towards improvement of an existing equipped/designated play space may be sought in lieu of on-site provision for larger scale play spaces, or where existing play space lies within the walking distance guideline of a proposed development (see Table 2).

Table 3: Fields in Trust Recommended Benchmark Guidelines – Informal Outdoor Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Typology</th>
<th>QUANTITY GUIDELINE(^2) (hectares per 1,000 population)</th>
<th>WALKING GUIDELINE (walking distance: metres from dwellings)</th>
<th>QUALITY GUIDELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>710m</td>
<td>* Parks to be of Green Flag status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>480m</td>
<td>* Appropriately landscaped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi-Natural</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>720m</td>
<td>* Positive management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Provision of footpaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Designed so as to be free of the fear of harm or crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Recommended Application of Quantity Benchmark Guidelines – Equipped/Designated Play Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Development</th>
<th>Local Area for Play (LAP)</th>
<th>Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)</th>
<th>Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–10 dwellings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–200 dwellings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201–500 dwellings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501+ dwellings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fields in Trust survey of local standards identified the use of local standards for informal outdoor spaces such as Parks and Gardens and the broad use of national standards for space such as Natural England’s ‘Nature Nearby’ Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance. Fields in Trust considers that these spaces can play a valuable role in complementing formal outdoor space provision consistent with its objectives, and provide opportunities for play and recreation. Table 3 sets out benchmark guidelines for informal outdoor space.

\(^2\) Quantity guidelines are provided as minimum guidelines and should not be interpreted as maximum levels of provision, and it is recommended that they are adjusted to take account of local circumstances.
How to apply this guidance

Fields in Trust’s benchmarks form a suitable basis for informing planning policies at district or neighbourhood level, and to inform planning decisions on individual proposals.

Quantity

The quantity guidelines can be applied across all urban and rural settings. Account should be taken of the intensity of use of a particular facility: it may be appropriate to relax the quantity guidelines where facilities support a high intensity of usage (e.g. MUGAs, Synthetic Turf Pitches supported by floodlighting).

Accessibility

Accessibility thresholds should be measured as distances actually walked rather than ‘as the crow flies’ (see also the indicative walking times on page 5). Significant obstacles or impediments to local access such as main roads should be avoided in accessing open spaces. Open Space and play facilities should be located and be accessible from bus stops, pedestrian and cycle routes to promote sustainable travel. Other larger scale strategic facilities such as swimming pools or golf courses will have broader catchments – these lie beyond the scope of this guidance.

Quality

The quality guidelines should be applied to encourage people to use facilities which are safe, secure and fit for purpose.

Spatial Requirements

Recommended Minimum Sizes

The recommended minimum spatial requirements for the more popular outdoor sports and games are set out in Table 4. These requirements allow for safety margins and the movement of pitches from season to season. Unless stated otherwise, the areas given are those for senior use. The information is provided only as a guide. The margins around pitches should allow for maintenance operations to be carried out. Further guidance on the dimensions of each type of facility can be found in many other publications, including those of the Sports and Play Construction Association and Sport England.

Buffer Zones

A suitable relationship can be created by using the minimum buffer zones for specific facilities. These off-set distances ensure that facilities do not enable users to overlook neighbouring properties, reducing the possibility of conflict between local residents and those at play.
## Table 4: Recommended minimum sizes – formal outdoor space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space typology</th>
<th>Minimum sizes</th>
<th>Minumum dimensions</th>
<th>Buffer zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playing pitches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association football</td>
<td>Adult soccer</td>
<td>0.74ha</td>
<td>106 x 70 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14ha</td>
<td>43 x 33 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25ha</td>
<td>60 x 42 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>0.70ha</td>
<td>100 x 70 metres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Mini Hockey</td>
<td>0.31ha</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11ha</td>
<td>65 x 48 metres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05ha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>0.66ha</td>
<td>100 x 60 metres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Senior recreational 12 pitch</td>
<td>1.43ha</td>
<td>111.56 x 128.04 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other outdoor (non-pitch) sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>6 lane track</td>
<td>1.51ha</td>
<td>172.03 x 87.64 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>1 recreational court</td>
<td>0.06ha</td>
<td>34.75 x 17.07 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 recreational courts</td>
<td>0.11ha</td>
<td>34.75 x 31.70 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For each adjacent court</td>
<td>0.05ha</td>
<td>34.75 x 14.63 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling greens</td>
<td>Flat green</td>
<td>0.12ha</td>
<td>34.4 x 34.4 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crown green</td>
<td>0.08ha</td>
<td>27.4 x 27.4 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipped/designated play areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>0.01ha</td>
<td>10 x 10 metres</td>
<td>5m minumum separation between activity zone and the boundary of dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(minimum activity zone of 100sqm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>0.04ha</td>
<td>20 x 20 metres</td>
<td>20m minumum separation between activity zone and the habitable room façade of dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(minimum activity zone of 400sqm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAP</td>
<td>0.1ha</td>
<td>31.6 x 31.6 metres</td>
<td>30m minumum separation between activity zone and the boundary of dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(minimum activity zone of 1,000sqm comprising an area for play equipment and structures &amp; a hard surfaced area of at least 465sqm (the minimum needed to play five-a-side football))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>0.1ha</td>
<td>40 x 20 metres</td>
<td>30m minumum separation between activity zone and the boundary of dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexe A: Glossary

**6AS**
Six Acre Standard (2001)

**Accessibility**
Convenient, inclusive and safe accessibility to outdoor facilities, particularly for children and the less mobile

**Amenity greenspace**
Informal recreation spaces, communal green spaces in and around housing, and village greens

**CIL**
Community Infrastructure Levy

**Designated play areas**
Designated areas for children and young people containing a range of facilities and an environment that has been designed to provide focused opportunities for outdoor play comprising casual or informal playing space within housing areas. These play areas comprise LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs

**General Residential Use**
Residential use within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order but excluding specialist forms of housing such as housing aimed at specialist groups (e.g. sheltered housing, student accommodation etc.) or housing not permanently occupied such as holiday homes

**LAP**
Local Area for Play (and informal recreation)

**LEAP**
Local Equipped Area for Play (and informal recreation)

**LPA**
Local Planning Authority

**MUGA**
Multi Use Games Area

**Multi-functionality**
Green space performs both important recreational activity space and important environmental functions, such as moderating surface water run-off, air pollution and wind speeds, as well as providing wildlife habitats to aid biodiversity

**Natural and semi-natural greenspaces**
Woodland, scrub, grassland, wetlands, open and running water, and open access land

**NEAP**
Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (and informal recreation, and provision for children and young people)

**Non-specialist residential use**
Dwellinghouse occupied by a single person or by people regarded as forming a single household, not including residential accommodation where care is provided, purpose-built student accommodation or holiday homes

**NPFA**
National Playing Fields Association

**NPPF**
National Planning Policy Framework

**NPPG**
National Planning Policy Guidance

**Other outdoor provision**
Other outdoor provision comprises MUGAS, skateboard parks and other outdoor provision

**Other outdoor sports**
Courts and greens comprising natural or artificial surfaces, including tennis courts, bowling greens, athletics tracks and other outdoor sports areas

**Parks and Gardens**
Formal green spaces including urban parks, country parks, forest parks, and formal gardens

**PDOSP**
Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play (2008)

**Primary purpose**
Different types of open space and play facilities will have a primary purpose which is accorded priority at certain times (e.g. sports pitches when matches are being played) or indeed at all times (e.g. children’s playgrounds and bowling greens)

**Protected space**
Outdoor sport, play and informal open space

**Quality**
The needs, expectations and experiences of users, and the design, management and maintenance of facilities

**Quantity**
A measure of the amount of open space provision which is necessary to meet the needs of the local (and in some cases the regional) catchment
Introduction

1. Fields in Trust undertook a review of recommendations on standards for outdoor play, sport and recreation within Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play (formerly known as the Six Acre Standard). This work was undertaken on a phased basis: a Phase 1 desk top pilot study of 30 local planning authorities undertaken by Pegasus Group (July 2014) and a Phase 2 survey undertaken on behalf of Fields in Trust by David Lock Associates (DLA).

2. The Phase 2 survey comprised an online survey of local planning authorities, supplemented by further desktop research drawing on the Phase 1 study and other sources.

Quantitative Survey of Local Authorities

3. All local planning authorities throughout England and Wales were sent an online questionnaire relating to the practical use of standards for space for outdoor sport and play. A total of 107 English and 12 Welsh authorities responded to the survey. The Phase 2 report analyses the 119 responses from local planning authorities in England and Wales only. This represents a response rate for England and Wales of 33%.

4. A total of 81% of respondents express quantity standards for open space as ‘hectares per 1,000 population’.

5. In relation to local standards for open space being met in planning decision-taking, and based on a scoring system with 1 being ‘seldom’ and 10 being ‘always’, 64% indicated a score between 7 and 10. This indicates a relatively high degree of compliance with open space standards in planning decision making.

Playing Pitches

6. 52% of respondents were able to provide data about their current standards for the provision of playing pitches on a hectares per 1,000 population basis. The median level of provision was 1.21 hectares per 1,000 population which is comparable with the recommendation of 1.20 hectares per 1,000 population in ‘Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play’ (2008). In 20 instances, the local planning authority standard for playing pitches employed is lower than the Fields in Trust benchmark recommendation.

7. The median accessibility standard from respondents was 1,200m from dwellings, which matches the Fields in Trust benchmark.

Other Outdoor Sports

8. 25% of respondents were able to provide data about their current standards for the provision for other outdoor sports, expressed as hectares per 1,000 population. Other outdoor sports (excluding pitches) included provision of bowling greens, tennis courts, athletic tracks and Gaelic football. Taken with the standards for Playing Pitches for the relevant authorities, the combined total exceeds the benchmark of 1.60 hectares per 1,000 population for All Outdoor Sport in ‘Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play’ (2008).

Designated Play Areas

9. 49% of respondents were able to provide data about their current designated equipped spaces for play, expressed as hectares per 1,000 population. The median level of provision was 0.25 hectares per 1,000 population. This is equal to the Fields in Trust benchmark standard for Designated Playing Space.

10. The median accessibility standard was 100m for LAPs, 400m for LEAPs, and 1,000m for NEAPs when considered individually. Accessibility standards were also more commonly expressed in terms of walking time, rather than distance.
Other Outdoor Provision

11. 13% of respondents were able to provide data about their current provision for other outdoor provision, expressed as hectares per 1,000 population. Other outdoor provision comprised provision of natural and semi-natural green space, Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs), and wheeled sport (BMX track or Skate Park). A small number of respondents noted that ‘other outdoor’ provision was included as part of their requirements for open space for children and young people.

Parks and Amenity Green Space

12. 22% of the total number of respondents were able to provide data about parks and amenity green space as an overall standard, expressed as hectares per 1,000 population. For parks and amenity green space, where provided as an overall standard, the median level of provision sought was 1.0 hectare per 1,000 population.
13. For Parks on their own, 21% of respondents provided data which identified the median level of provision sought to be 0.8 hectares per 1,000 population.
14. For Amenity Green Space on its own, 21% of respondents provided data which identified the median level of provision sought to be 0.55 hectares per 1,000 population.

Other Open Space Standards

15. 42% of respondents were able to provide data about other standards for open space applied within their local authority area. ‘Others’ included an overall catch-all standard, allotments, community gardens, and urban farms, and natural and semi-natural greenspace.
16. The median overall standard of provision for ‘others’ was 1.59 hectares per 1,000 population.
17. The median level of provision for allotments, community gardens and urban farms was 0.3 hectares per 1,000 population.
18. For natural and semi-natural green space, the local standard of provision was 1.78 hectares per 1,000 population.

Quality

19. 59% of English and Welsh authorities identified that they had specific requirements regarding the quality of new open space provision. Of those respondents who specified their quality requirements, 18% apply a local assessment of quality (the most commonly used quality assessment by respondents). 10% apply the Green Flag standard to assess the quality of parks. 8% of respondents apply the Fields in Trust standards. 2% of authorities apply the Sport England standards in assessing the quality of sports pitches.

Appeals

20. A shortlist of 19 appeal decisions were reviewed relating to the disposal and reuse of open space, the replacement of open space or new provision. The decisions were specific to the particular circumstances of each case and no clear pattern regarding the use of Fields in Trust standards was apparent. However, a number of cases did make reference to Fields in Trust standards and used these as part of the decision-making process.

Conclusion and Recommendations

21. The survey work demonstrated clearly that the previous recommendations of ‘Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play’ (2008) remain very relevant in the context of current provision in England and Wales. As provided by the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance, there is a need for local assessment but the use of Fields in Trust recommendations as quantitative Benchmark Standards carry general value. As illustrated from the survey results, there are variations both below and above the Fields in Trust Benchmark standards.
Planning Policy in England

1. An overview of the influential planning policy relevant to the provision of outdoor space for sport, recreation and play focuses on that within England. This reflects the local planning authorities surveyed as part of the 2015 Survey for those countries where the response rate was sufficient to provide a representative sample of local planning authorities.

Localism Act

2. The Localism Act was given Royal Assent in 2011, paving the way for planning powers to be passed down to local communities through the production of Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood planning legislation came into effect in April 2012. Neighbourhood Plans are to be prepared by community groups, guided by Local Planning Authorities, and plan for a range of land uses, including outdoor sports and recreation uses. As such there is a need to respond to Neighbourhood Planning within the revised Benchmark Guidelines.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

3. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a method of collecting funds from development to pay for necessary delivery and maintenance of infrastructure. It came into force in April 2010 through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The latest amendments are set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2015 which came into force in April 2015. Most new development which creates net additional floor space of 100 square metres or more, or creates a new dwelling, is potentially liable for the levy. Local authorities have the freedom to set their own priorities for what the money should be spent on.

4. A portion of the CIL funds (up to 25%) will be payable to local communities with Neighbourhood Plans in place, for the purpose of localised spending on priority projects. CIL funds are capable of being used to fund local sport and recreation facilities. The regulations set out controls to ensure the use of the levy and planning obligations does not overlap.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5. The National Planning Policy Framework was published in March 2012. It forms the key national policy document and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The previous guidance ‘Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play’ (PDOSP) predates the NPPF and the Benchmark Guidelines in the revised guidance reflect the relevant requirements of the NPPF, and the revocation of Planning Policy Guidance 17: Sport and Recreation on which the PDOSP was based.

6. The NPPF advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development and identifies the three dimensions of sustainable development as economic, social and environmental. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation are highlighted as an important aspect of healthy communities.

7. One of the core planning principles set out under NPPF paragraph 17 seeks to “secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings”.

8. NPPF paragraph 73 states that “access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision”.

9. Benchmark Guidelines at the national level must therefore continue to be capable of adjusting to local circumstances.

10. The NPPF also promotes the protection of existing open space (paragraph 74) which is a key aspect of Fields in Trusts’ operations as a national charity that safeguards recreational spaces. Paragraph 81 promotes the use of Green Belt land for beneficial outdoor sport and recreation opportunities, where it preserves the openness of the Green Belt (paragraph 89), or in London ‘Metropolitan Open Land’, which is afforded the same level of protection as the Green Belt.

11. Paragraph 69 relates to community involvement in planning decisions, including through Neighbourhood Planning, and states that:

“The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities...To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning.”

12. Paragraph 175 relates to CIL and states that:

“Where practical, Community Infrastructure Levy charges should be worked up and tested alongside the Local Plan. The Community Infrastructure Levy should support and incentivise new development, particularly by placing control over a meaningful proportion of the funds raised with the neighbourhoods where development takes place.”

---

4 See paragraph 13 of the NPPF, DCLG (March 2012)
13. Land can be designated as ‘Local Green Space’ in Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans, which provides special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF sets out the requirements for designation and comprise:

- “where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and
- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”

14. Local Green Space designation exemplifies the importance to local communities of recreational space which is in close proximity to local people.

15. The NPPF states at paragraph 171 that:

“Local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population (such as for sports, recreation and places of worship)...and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being.”

16. Physical activity is fundamental to the overall health and wellbeing of the population, and therefore the provision of open space for sport, play and recreation is instrumental to this.

17. **National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)** provides additional guidance to the NPPF in the form of a web-based resource which is updated on a regular basis to incorporate changes in planning legislation and policy. The NPPG provides guidance on a wide range of topics, including in relation to open space, sports and recreation.

18. As the online NPPG is periodically updated, and to avoid referencing out-of-date guidance, a written summary of guidance is not provided in this document. Up-to-date PG guidance can be found at: [http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/](http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/)

19. The following topic areas may be of particular relevance:

- ii. Community Infrastructure Levy
- iii. Health and wellbeing
- iv. Natural environment
- v. Open space, sports and recreational facilities, public rights of way and Local Green Space
Annexe D: Other ways to use this guidance

1. Beyond the Six Acre Standard: Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play provides a fresh expression of Fields in Trust benchmark policies for sports and play provision. This annexe sets out further advice on how the guidance can be employed.

How Fields in Trust can help
- Guidance.
- The benchmark and the ways to meet it.
- Research of equivalent cases.
- Implementation: legal and ownership mechanisms to protect land over the long term.

Alternative and multi-use ways of providing sport and recreation within planned developments

2. In certain locations it may be appropriate to consider the sharing of facilities or the provision of multi-use facilities.

3. The dual use of facilities covers all situations in which the community is granted authorised access to school facilities for outdoor sport and recreation irrespective of the detailed financial arrangements or original intentions which guided the planning and provision of the facilities.

4. Provided that community safety and school security issues, including insurance, can be satisfied it is recommended that school playing space is made available to the local community out of school hours and during holiday periods. Hard surfaced or synthetic pitches and courts have the ability to sustain intensive use and may usefully provide opportunities for community use when not in use by the school and changing facilities are available.

5. The ability of natural grass pitches to sustain additional community use outside school hours will depend on a number of factors, including weather conditions, the drainage characteristics of the site, and the frequencies of sports being played. To avoid difficulties for the school and a potential decline in the quality of facilities, there must be a clear understanding of any necessary physical alterations to the premises and proper management of the dual use.

6. Many groups besides local authorities provide opportunities for children’s play. The shared use of a play area may be offered to the community as part of a Section 106 agreement related to a planning application, for use by different groups of children.

7. There is also the potential for the active recreational use of features such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) in major developments which can be used as linear play areas.

Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines and Local Plans

8. The results of the Phase 2 survey demonstrate that the Fields in Trust benchmarks remain very relevant in the context of current provision in England and Wales. The Fields in Trust benchmarks provide a starting point for determining local standards of provision, accessibility and quality.

Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines and Neighbourhood Plans

9. Neighbourhood Plans are prepared by neighbourhood planning groups (often Town or Parish Councils), guided by Local Planning Authorities, and plan for a range of land uses, including outdoor sports and recreation uses. Fields in Trust Benchmarks can be used in identifying an appropriate level of outdoor sport and play provision.

Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines and CIL

10. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allows local planning authorities in England and Wales to raise funds from developers to fund a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. A portion of CIL funds will be payable to local communities close to the development location with Neighbourhood Plans in place for the purpose of localised spending on priority projects. These funds are capable of being used to fund local sport and recreation facilities, and local planning authorities and local communities should consider how these funds can be apportioned for the provision or improvements to such uses. Most new development which creates net additional floor space of 100 square metres or more, or creates a new dwelling, is potentially liable for the levy. CIL therefore presents a potential resource to allow smaller scale development to make an effective contribution to outdoor sport and play provision.

Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines and Local Green Space

11. Land can be designated as ‘Local Green Space’ in Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans, which provides special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities. Fields In Trust Benchmark guidelines can assist in defining the role of such spaces in meeting open space needs within the local community.

Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines and Planning Applications

12. Planning applications must satisfy local policy requirements which include open space provision. Benchmark Guidelines and spatial requirements can be used to form the basis for determining locally derived standards based on need, accessibility and quality.
13. In the determination of appeal decisions where the disposal and reuse of open space, the replacement of open space or new provision is a material consideration, Fields in Trust Benchmark Guidelines can provide an appropriate method of assessment, providing a robust basis for decision-takers to assess the provision of open space.

14. In promoting the safeguarding of open spaces, Fields in Trust benchmarks can be utilised to ensure an appropriate provision for outdoor sport and play is provided for, when considering the disposal of or alternative use for existing open spaces.
## Annexe E: Useful resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields in Trust</th>
<th><a href="http://www.fieldsintrust.org">www.fieldsintrust.org</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sportengland.org">www.sportengland.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Play Construction Association</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sapca.org.uk">www.sapca.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Groundsmanship</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iog.org">www.iog.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cimspa.co.uk">www.cimspa.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Association</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thefa.com">www.thefa.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk">www.footballfoundation.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Council for Physical Recreation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccpr.org.uk">www.ccpr.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Sports and Play Associations</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sportsandplay.com">www.sportsandplay.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play England</td>
<td><a href="http://www.playengland.org.uk">www.playengland.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Places</td>
<td><a href="http://www.activeplaces.com">www.activeplaces.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Play Industries</td>
<td><a href="http://www.api-play.org">www.api-play.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Playground Inspectors International</td>
<td><a href="http://www.playinspectors.com">www.playinspectors.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoSPA Play Safety</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rospa.com/playsafety">www.rospa.com/playsafety</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playlink</td>
<td><a href="http://www.playlink.org.uk">www.playlink.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Useful publications

- 'A plain English guide to the Localism Act'  
  Department for Communities and Local Government (2011)
- 'Design for Play: A Guide to creating successful play spaces'  
  Play England (2008)
- 'Localism Act 2011' The Stationery Office Limited
- 'National Planning Policy Framework'  
  Department for Communities and Local Government (2012)
- 'National Planning Practice Guidance'  
  Department for Communities and Local Government
- 'Plain English guide to the Planning System'  
  Department for Communities and Local Government (2015)
- 'The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010'  
  The Stationery Office Limited
- 'The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013'  
  The Stationery Office Limited
- 'The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2015'  
  The Stationery Office Limited
- 'The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012'  
  The Stationery Office Limited
- 'The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended'  
  The Stationery Office Limited
- 'Town and Country Planning Act 1990'  
  The Stationery Office Limited
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Paul Garber is a qualified town planner with 48 years experience in development and construction. Prior to his retirement he was Group Planning Director of George Wimpey/Taylor Wimpey and a Director of GW/TW Strategic Land. His experience extends to master planning major developments throughout the UK, experience as an expert at over 600 inquiries and providing advice to Government Agencies on design and the built environment. He was also a member of the Planning Committee of the HBF (Homebuilders Federation).

Outside his professional role he has had an extensive involvement in playing fields in the UK initially as a Trustee and Officer of the Surrey Playing Fields Association since 1978 and as a FIT Trustee since 2001. Paul also Chairs FIT’s Land and Planning Committee. He was President of British Gymnastics and Vice President of European Gymnast (UEG). His other involvements in sport have included being Regional Chairman of the former Sports Council, Director of Sports Aid and a member of the Commonwealth Games Council for England. He has previously been a Team Manager for Team GB at Olympic Games.

Tim Smith is a solicitor and partner at the city law firm Berwin Leighton Paisner. He has also been a Trustee of FIT since 2010. Tim is an acknowledged expert in Planning law with over 20 years’ experience. He has been voted as one of the top ten planning solicitors nationally for the last eleven years. He has also been a member of the Law Society’s Planning & Environment Committee since 2009. Tim has a wide-ranging practice acting for both private and public sector clients on all aspects of Planning law.

Tim is co-author of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment’s “Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment” and editor of the College of Estate Management’s course-work module on Highways Law. He has also lectured extensively on the subject of Planning Law for organisations including the County Playing Fields Association, TRICS, the RTPI, the Law Society Local Government Group, the UK Green Building Council.