

# **APPENDIX A**

## **BENEFITS OF OPEN SPACE**



## **Wider Benefits of Open Space**

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

## **APPENDIX B**

### **HOUSEHOLD SURVEY COVERLETTER**

**What do you think of parks, play areas, sport and recreational land and other open spaces in Telford and Wrekin?**  
**(Have your say and be in with the chance to win some prizes!)**

Dear Resident,

We very much **hope you can spare 10-15 minutes to complete the attached survey**. The study will investigate whether the current level of open space provision is sufficient in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility to meet the needs of Telford and Wrekin residents now and in the future. The findings of this study will be used to influence decisions on where money in the future will be spent in your local open spaces, sport and recreation facilities. It is therefore imperative we receive as many responses as possible from both rural and urban locations. Your household is one of 5000 randomly selected in order to provide us with an insight into residents' opinions on open space within Telford and Wrekin. Even if you don't use open spaces we are keen to hear your views. All the answers you give will be treated as confidential.

When completing the survey please answer the questions in relation to the open spaces within your area.

**The questionnaire is quick and easy to answer.** Please try to answer as many questions as possible by placing a tick in the boxes or write your answer in the space provided. Please return your questionnaire even if you are unable to answer all of the questions, as any information you provide will be of great use to us.

**Who should complete the survey?**

You will notice that the survey has not been addressed to any particular individual in your household. This is because we would like to hear the views of the widest possible range of people – so anyone can answer the questionnaire. If you have any questions or need any help completing the questionnaire please phone Steven Sinclair at PMP on 0161 2355576. Alternatively, you can email your views to:

[TWopenspace@pmpconsult.com](mailto:TWopenspace@pmpconsult.com)

Please return your completed questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope provided by **15/06/07**. For your chance to win the following prize please fill in the slip below and enclose along with survey.

- £50 VOUCHER TO SPEND AT JJB SPORTS

Many thanks for your help with this important survey.

Yours sincerely

**Steven Sinclair**  
**Research Consultant**  
**PMP**

Enc.

---

**FOR YOUR CHANCE TO WIN A PRIZE,**

Please complete (and enclose with your completed questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope):

**Name:** .....

**Address:** .....

**Telephone Number:** .....

## DEFINITIONS OF OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITIES

**Cemeteries and Churchyards** - open and closed burial grounds and cemeteries

[illegible]

**Q3** Please write the **TIME** you would be willing to travel and the type of transport you would use when travelling to open spaces (please state one time and travel mode for each open space type only e.g. if you expect to walk to a play area for children and take 10 minutes to get there, please write 10 in the Walk column):

	Walk	Cycle	Bus	Car	Trams /Trains
Parks and Gardens	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Natural areas	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Amenity areas	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Play areas for children	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Facilities for young people and teenagers	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Allotments	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Civic Spaces	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**Q4** How **OFTEN** do you use each of the following types of open space, sport and recreation facilities? (Please tick one option only for each type)

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Rarely	Don't use
Parks and Gardens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Green Corridors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amenity areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Play areas for children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilities for young people / teenagers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outdoor sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indoor facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Allotments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Churchyards and cemeteries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Civic spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q5** Is there anything which prevents you from visiting the above types of open space, sport and recreation facilities more frequently or at all? Please tick as many as you feel are relevant and provide further reasons where appropriate:

Too far away	<input type="checkbox"/>	Physical barriers (busy roads, railway / tram lines or waterways)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality of facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Cost	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of access by public transport	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other							

**Q6** Please explain your responses to Q5 and state the type of open space, sport and recreation facility you are referring to.

**Q7** Do you feel safe when using open space, sport or recreation facilities in your local area?

Yes (please go to Q9) ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐

**Q8** If you answered no to Q7, please indicate whether any of the following would make you feel safer or provide an alternative idea?

Adequate lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff on site (e.g. park rangers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Clearly visible entrance and exists	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clear, visible overlooked route to open soace, sport / recreation facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reputation of area / space	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other users	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCTV	<input type="checkbox"/>	Clear visibility into and out of open space / facility	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Overlooked by housing	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Other

## SECTION TWO - INDOOR AND OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES

**Q9** Please tick below whether you feel there is ENOUGH OR NOT ENOUGH provision for each type of outdoor sport facility in your local area.

	More than enough	About right	Nearly enough	Not enough	No opinion
Grass Pitches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Synthetic Turf Pitches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tennis courts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bowling greens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Golf courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Athletics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide further justification for your answers if you feel this is necessary

**Q10** Please write the TIME you would be willing to travel against the type of transport you would use for each outdoor sports facility.

	Walk	Cycle	Bus	Tram / Train	Car
Grass pitches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Synthetic Turf Pitches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tennis Courts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bowling Greens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Golf Courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Athletics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q11** Please tick below whether you feel there is ENOUGH or NOT ENOUGH provision for each type of indoor facility in your local area and if possible, explain briefly the reason for your answer

	More than enough	About right	Nearly enough	Not enough	No opinion
Swimming Pools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sports Halls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indoor Bowls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indoor Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide further justification for your answers if you feel this is necessary

**Q12** Please write the TIME you would expect to travel and the type of transport you would expect to use when travelling to indoor sport facilities (please state one time and travel mode for each facility type only)

	Walk	Cycle	Bus	Tram / Train	Car
Swimming Pools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sports Halls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indoor Bowls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indoor Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## SECTION THREE - THE OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITY YOU USE MOST FREQUENTLY

**Q13** Please name the site you use **MOST FREQUENTLY** and where it is located. If the site does not have a name (such as for informal open spaces) please provide the relevant street name.

Site Name (where applicable)..

Location

**Q14** What **TYPE** of open space, sport or recreation facility is this site?

- |                                                   |                                                                         |                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Parks and Gardens</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Play areas for children</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                 | <i>Cemeteries and churchyards</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Natural areas</i> <input type="checkbox"/>     | <i>Facilities for young people / teenagers</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Civic spaces</i> <input type="checkbox"/>               |
| <i>Green corridors</i> <input type="checkbox"/>   | <i>Outdoor sports facilities</i> <input type="checkbox"/>               | <i>Indoor sports facilities</i> <input type="checkbox"/>   |
| <i>Amenity areas</i> <input type="checkbox"/>     | <i>Allotments</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                              |                                                            |

**Q15** What do you particularly like about this open space, sport or recreation site?

**Q16** If you were describing the ideal characteristics of this site, which of the following would be included? Please tick as many as appropriate and provide further suggestions in the box provided as necessary:

- |                                                                  |                                                                              |                                                               |                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Well kept grass</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                  | <i>Level surface/ good drainage</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                 | <i>Well laid out</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                 | <i>Good access to site</i> <input type="checkbox"/>               |
| <i>Clean / litter free</i> <input type="checkbox"/>              | <i>welcoming staff</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                              | <i>Nature features (eg wildlife)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>On site security (eg warden/CCTV)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Flowers/trees and shrubs</i> <input type="checkbox"/>         | <i>Toilets</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                                      | <i>Secluded</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                      | <i>Information boards</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                |
| <i>Good quality changing facilities</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Play equipment / facilities for young people</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Dog bins</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                      | <i>Maintenance of equipment</i> <input type="checkbox"/>          |
| <i>Parking facilities</i> <input type="checkbox"/>               | <i>Seating</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                                      | <i>Litter bins</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                   |                                                                   |
| <i>Footpaths</i> <input type="checkbox"/>                        |                                                                              | <i>Range of facilities</i> <input type="checkbox"/>           |                                                                   |
| <i>Other</i>                                                     |                                                                              |                                                               |                                                                   |

**Q17** How do you normally **TRAVEL** to this site? (please tick one box only)

- |                                      |                                              |                                       |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Walk</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Bus</i> <input type="checkbox"/>          | <i>Cycle</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Car</i> <input type="checkbox"/>  | <i>Tram / Train</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |                                       |

**Q18** How **LONG** does it take you to reach this site?(please tick one box only)

- |                                                      |                                                       |                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Less than 5 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/>  | <i>Between 10-15 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Between 20-30 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Between 5-10 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Between 15-20 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Over 30 minutes</i> <input type="checkbox"/>       |

**Q19** Please indicate whether you consider any of the following to be a problem at the site you visit most frequently:

- |                                                   | Significant Problem      | Minor Problem            | No problem               |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Vandalism and graffiti                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Safety and age of equipment (play areas, seating) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Poor maintenance                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Litter problems                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Misuse of site (e.g. unruly behaviour)            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dog Fouling                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Other; please explain</i>                      |                          |                          |                          |



## SECTION FOUR - FINAL THOUGHTS

Q20

If you have any other COMMENTS that you would like to make regarding open space, sport and recreation facilities in Telford and Wrekin, please write them below.

## SECTION FIVE - SOME DETAILS ABOUT YOU

Q21

Are you;

Male

☐

Female

☐

Q22

How old are you?

Under 16

☐

25-39

☐

60-75

☐

16-24

☐

40-59

☐

75+

☐

Q23

Which of the following best describes your ethnic origin?

White British

☐

Black Other

☐

Mixed White and Black  
Caribbean

☐

White Irish

☐

Asian British

☐

Mixed White and Black African

☐

White Other

☐

Asian Pakistani

☐

Mixed White and Asian

☐

Black British

☐

Asian Indian

☐

Mixed Other

☐

Black African

☐

Asian Bangladesh

☐

Chinese

☐

Black Caribbean

☐

Asian Other

☐

Other (please specify)

Q24

Are there any children in the household under 16 years?

Yes

☐

No

☐

Q25

Does a long standing health problem or disability mean you have substantial difficulties doing day to day activities (including problems associated with old age)

Yes

☐

No

☐

Q26

Please provide your post code.

PMP Consultancy is registered under the Data Protection Act 1998 with the Notification Department of the Information Commission.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire, please return it in a pre-paid envelope provided by  
**Friday 15th June**

**APPENDIX C**

**SITE ASSESSMENT SCORES**

SiteID	SiteName	OpenSpaceType	AnalysisArea	Quality Percentage
64	Sandiford Crescent Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	Newport	73
74	Meadow View Road Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	Newport	70
156	Ringers Lane Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	Rural	58
187	Wrekin Road Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	North West	77
326	Millstream Way Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	North West	66
499	Randlay Avenue Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	Central	66
551	Stirchley Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	Central	82
566	Brookside Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	Central	62
592	Woodside Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	South	72
594	West View Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	South	56
634	Sutton Hill Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	South	72
939	Stanmore Drive Allotments	Allotments and Community Gardens	North East	72
15	The Nurseries AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	53
16	Plantation Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	50
33	Deer Park Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	66
34	Masons Place AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	50
48	Newport Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	70
61	Broomfield Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	54
62	Longford Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	60
63	Ford Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	50
66	Adams Crescent AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	86
70	Hawkotone Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	66
77	Ashworth Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Newport	58
77	Ashworth Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	58
90	High Ercall Primary School AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	93
103	Rodington House AGS (River Roden)	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	56
107	Glovers Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	64
109	Constable Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	78
109	Constable Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	78
110	Harrington Heath AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	74
111	Oakfield Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	70
112	Stile Rise AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	70
121	Humber Way Tennis Courts AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	62
122	Humber Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	82
128	Humber Lane AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	64
145	MOD Donnington AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	48
168	Sunniside AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	32
170	Walton Hall	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	34
172	Quarry View AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	30
174	Forge Farm AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	50
176	Marlebrook Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	34
183	Union Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	70
185	The Mount Borough of Telford & The Wrekin	Amenity Greenspace	North West	60
189	Rothwaite AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	64
193	Millfield AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	70
199	John Broad Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	50
201	Watling St Community Centre AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	48
207	Harvey Crescent AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	72
208	Manor Rise AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	64
235	The Common AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	52
241	Donnington Wood C of E Primary School AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	80
245	Furnace Lane AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	78
288	Apley Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	52
299	The Old Shawburch P.H. AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	58
303	Athol Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	58
315	Hereford Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	86
316	York Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	76
324	Hadley Castle AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	90
331	Leegomery Pools	Amenity Greenspace	North West	80
338	Teagues Crescent AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	67
347	Greenlea Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	62
366	Rockall Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	52
369	Wellswood Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	50
387	Chockleys Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	72
404	Copper Beech Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	48
412	Wombbridge Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	80
415	Hollyhurst Road (North) AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	66
433	University of Wolverhampton Telford Campus AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	50
437	Teece Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	66
446	Brunel Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	58
450	Prince Edward Crescent AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	48
468	Downmead AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	68
482	Alma Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	52
503	Speedwell Ridge AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	84
505	Randlay Avenue Village Green	Amenity Greenspace	Central	66
517	Doseley Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	62
544	Culmington AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	78
557	Majestic Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	56
561	Eleanors Close AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	80
573	Burford AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	72
591	Withybrook AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	70
642	Mercia Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	46
665	Martingale Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	82

666	Glendale AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	98
666	Glendale AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	98
686	Hollies Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	50
696	Deer Park Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	54
698	Severn Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	74
909	Admaston Green	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	66
925	Ludford Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	72
928	Briarwood AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	62
958	Hollyhurst Road (South) AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	42
959	Capewell Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	52
1000	Glade Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1001	Whiteway Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Rural	
1002	Barnes Wallice Drive AGS1	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1003	Barnes Wallice Drive AGS2	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1004	Leegomery shops AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1005	Barnes Wallis Drive (adjacent) AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1007	Peregrine Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1011	Union Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1012	Hurlebrook Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1013	Haybridge Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1014	Victoria Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1017	The Incline AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1018	Shrubbery Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1019	Bank Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1020	Wombridge Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1021	Maple Close AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1022	Newfield Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1023	Hadley Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1025	Juniper Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1026	Lamburnam Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1027	Stafford Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1028	Buttery Grove AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1029	Bradley Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1031	Johnstone Close AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1032	Fireclay Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1033	The Timbers AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1034	Albion Street AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1036	Castle Farm Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1037	Chancery Park	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1038	Highgrove Meadows AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1039	Chilcombe Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1040	Grove Street AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North East	
1043	Old Park AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1044	Third Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1046	Cordean Meadow AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1047	Tom Morgan Close AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1048	Milners Lane AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1049	Powis Place 1 AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1050	Powis Place 2 AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1053	Drayton Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1054	Chiltern Gardens AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1055	Dunsheath AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1056	Dalelands AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1057	Deercote AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1058	Daywell AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1059	Dallamoor AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1060	Dale Acre Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1061	Doddington AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1062	Draycott AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1063	Grange Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1064	Chumcote AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1065	Owen close AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1067	Connomara Meadow AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1068	Clydesdale Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1071	Pageant Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1072	Severn Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1073	Majestic Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1074	Viscount Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1075	Lambeth Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1076	St James Crescent	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1077	Briarwood AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1078	Bembridge AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1079	Burnside AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1080	Brookside Avenue AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1081	Blakemore AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1082	Bishopdale AGS	Amenity Greenspace	Central	
1084	Stanier Drive AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1085	Wilwood AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1086	Warrens Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1087	Wealdstone AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1088	Woodrows AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1089	Willowfield AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1091	Waverley AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1092	Russell road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1093	Upper Road AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	

1103	Sunnymead AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1104	Summerhill AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1105	Southfield AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1106	Reynards Coppice AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
1110	Bank Way AGS	Amenity Greenspace	North West	
1111	Sandcroft AGS	Amenity Greenspace	South	
2	St Luke's Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	88
6	All Hallows Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	80
12	Tibberton Methodist Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	68
14	All Saints Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	80
21	Edgmond Methodist Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	72
22	Shrewbury Road CC	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	
39	St Michaels Parish Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	70
40	Rive Lane Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	68
43	St Mary Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	76
44	Parish Church of St Peter	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	80
46	Edgmond Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	80
50	Talbot Chapel Longford	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	54
56	St Nicholas Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Newport	100
75	Newport General Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Newport	98
79	St Andrews Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	72
86	St Michael and All Angels Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	60
91	The Parish Church of St Chad	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	76
98	Rodington Heath Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	84
104	St George's Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	70
105	St Bartholomew's Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	74
115	St Catherine's Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	88
118	St Lawrence Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	76
129	Donnington Way Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	80
138	St Micheal's Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	74
139	Lilleshall Churchyard	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	86
150	St Peter's Church, Wrockwardine	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	63
153	Wrockwardine Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	70
166	St Lawrence Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	80
167	Little Wenlock Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	56
181	Wellington Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	90
190	Christ Church Wellington	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	70
215	St John The Evangelist Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	84
232	St Matthew Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	62
263	Garden of Rest	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	84
264	St Mary's Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	68
272	Oakengates Parish Church - Holy Trinity	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	62
309	St Georges Parish Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	52
317	Telford Crematorium	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	76
325	Hadley Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	66
343	Holy Trinity Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	64
359	Wrockwardine Wood Methodist Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	60
371	St Peters Church Priors Lea	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North East	62
373	All Saints Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	90
394	Elim Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	58
396	Hadley Methodist Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	78
400	Holy Trinity Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	70
411	Wombridge Road Parish Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	76
440	Baptist Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Central	52
481	St Leonards Church Mainslee	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Central	74
527	Holy Trinity Church Dawley	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Central	74
535	St James Church, Stirchley	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Central	76
605	Catholic Church of St Mary	Cemeteries and Churchyards	South	82
626	St Michael's Parish Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	South	72
646	St Lukes Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Central	56
651	St Luke Church of Ironbridge	Cemeteries and Churchyards	South	60
653	Castle Green Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	South	78
654	The Parish Church of the Holy Trinity	Cemeteries and Churchyards	South	76
903	St John the Baptist Church	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Rural	70
957	Wombridge Cemetery	Cemeteries and Churchyards	North West	80
278	Oakengates Shopping Centre	Civic Spaces	North West	82
334	Leegomery Local Centre	Civic Spaces	North West	67
339	Priorslee Avenue CS	Civic Spaces	North East	60
395	Hadley Local Centre CS	Civic Spaces	North West	73
457	Telford Square	Civic Spaces	Central	60
461	Telford Park CS	Civic Spaces	Central	46
465	M & S Square	Civic Spaces	Central	98
466	Central Square	Civic Spaces	Central	82
467	Leonmasters Way Walkthrough	Civic Spaces	Central	62
470	Hollinswood Local Centre	Civic Spaces	Central	54
490	High Street Local Centre	Civic Spaces	Central	68
506	Randlay Avenue Local Centre	Civic Spaces	Central	42
540	Stirchley Local Centre	Civic Spaces	Central	64
572	Brookside Local Centre	Civic Spaces	Central	62
607	Madeley Shopping Centre	Civic Spaces	South	
632	Sutton Hill Local Centre	Civic Spaces	South	54
650	Ironbridge Civic Space	Civic Spaces	South	88
685	Wellington Town Centre	Civic Spaces	North West	76
703	Shawbirch Local Centre	Civic Spaces	North West	76
4	Sambrook NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	40

5	Puleston Common	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
13	Area Adjacent to Tibberton Primary School Field	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	32
35	Norbroom Park NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Newport	54
36	Beechfields Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Newport	42
51	Wrekin View Farm NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Newport	
51	Wrekin View Farm NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
80	Baddely's Wells NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Newport	50
80	Baddely's Wells NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	50
82	Ercall Mill Bridge NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
85	Shewsbury Road	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	36
93	Limekiln Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	36
94	Mirelake Farm NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	36
95	Hillside NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	64
108	Leeses Close NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	69
108	Leeses Close NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	69
113	Glade Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	80
116	Village Farm NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	54
123	Humber Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	54
123	Humber Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	54
127	Parsons Barracks NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
142	Copperfield Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	26
143	Marshbrook Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	68
144	Saltwells Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	64
147	Abbeywood NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
173	Field Adjacent to Waters Upton Village Hall	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	37
180	Bowring Recreation Ground	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	52
197	Limekiln Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	30
210	Arleston Lane	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	36
214	Limekiln Wood	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
217	The Wrekin	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
219	Loamhole Dingle	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
219	Loamhole Dingle	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
219	Loamhole Dingle	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
220	Holbrook Copice	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
220	Holbrook Copice	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
226	Granville Nature Reserve	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	70
230	Columbine Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	38
231	Church Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	34
234	Goodyear Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	38
247	Donnigton Wood NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
248	Wrockwardine Wood Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	70
249	Daisy Bank Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
253	Oakengates NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
262	Shepherds Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	46
265	Shrubbery Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	52
266	Sunnyside Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	44
273	Wesley Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	46
281	Station Fields NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	44
282	Greyhound Hill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	44
285	St Pauls Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	38
290	Heatherdale NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	58
301	Newlands Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	54
302	Snedshill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	70
304	Station Hill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	74
305	Willows Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	38
310	Derwent Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	78
319	Cedar Close NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	48
321	The Rock NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	66
322	The Coppice	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	76
323	Colliers Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	44
330	Berberis Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	72
335	Leegomery Local Centre NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	56
358	Oakengates Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	54
360	Lodge Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	60
365	Fifth Avenue NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	52
370	Hollinswood Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	38
386	Whitchurch Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	44
405	Copper Beach Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	46
421	The Rookery NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	40
426	Shifnal Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	72
427	University of Wolverhampton Telford Campus NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	74
435	Wesley Brook	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	56
452	Park Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	40
458	Town Park NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	90
480	Mount Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	58
513	Ketley Lightmoor Railway (North) NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	38
518	Doseley Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	30
521	Ketley Lightmoor Railway (South)	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	38
525	Manor Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	57
526	Southall Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	46
529	Trinity Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	48
532	Stirchley Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	67
542	Stirchley Dingle	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	36
552	Castle Pools	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	69
562	Aqueduct Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	70

563	Tweeddale NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
564	Malory Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	50
576	Holmer Lake NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	60
577	Rough Park Way	Natural and semi natural green space	South	70
582	Ironbridge Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	66
597	Court Street NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	46
614	Tweeddale Woods	Natural and semi natural green space	South	66
615	Coalport Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	46
618	Meadowpit Mound	Natural and semi natural green space	South	78
621	Lloyds Coppice	Natural and semi natural green space	South	50
622	Orchard Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	38
635	Sutton Hill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	44
638	Sutton Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	54
640	Chapel Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	38
641	Severn Valley Way	Natural and semi natural green space	South	50
652	Hodgebower NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	44
655	Oil House Coppice	Natural and semi natural green space	South	70
659	Pool Hill	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	50
661	Heath Hill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	44
668	Station Road	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	40
669	Overdale NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	44
676	Riddings Close NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	50
678	Parkers Pool NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	50
684	Ketley Hill	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	42
701	Dothill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	72
701	Dothill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	72
702	Donnerville Gardens NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	50
702	Donnerville Gardens NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	50
706	Apley Pool NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	54
916	Fallow Deer Lawn NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Newport	32
930	Nedge Hill Picnic Site	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	30
932	Malvern Crescent NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	46
978	Halesfield 21 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	56
1006	Peregrine Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1008	Hortonwood 40 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1009	Hortonwood 50 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1009	Hortonwood 50 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
1010	Golf Links Lane NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1015	Arleston Avenue NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1016	Ketley Business Park NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1024	Wombridge Way Pool	Natural and semi natural green space	North West	
1030	Dalebrook Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
1035	Carlton Drive NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
1041	Whitechapel Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	North East	
1042	Stafford Park NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
1045	Dawley Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Rural	
1051	Bank Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
1052	Doseley Road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
1066	Horsehay Pool NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
1069	Jiggers Roundabout NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
1070	Stocking Farm NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	Central	
1083	Cherry Tree Hill NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1090	Waverley NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1094	Legges Way NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1095	Halesfield 1 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1096	Halesfield 20 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1097	Halesfield 16 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1098	Bridge Road 1 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1099	Bridge Road 2 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1100	Bridge Road 3 NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1101	Lloyds Head NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1102	Bridgnorth NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1107	Church road NSN	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1108	Coal Port High Street West	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
1109	Coal Port High Street East	Natural and semi natural green space	South	
7	Heath Court Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	66
11	Tibberton Sports Pavilion	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	86
17	Harper Adams University College	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	76
18	Harper Adams University College OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	94
20	Edgmond Village Pavilion Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	88
29	Newport Salop Rugby Union Football Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	60
31	Norbroom Park OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	54
45	High Street OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	49
57	Adams' Grammar School OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	68
68	Newport Girls High School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	
69	High St Tennis Courts	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	80
71	Burton Borough School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	74
76	Audley Avenue OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	68
83	Ercall Magna Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	100
84	High Ercall Tennis Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	92
87	Higher Ercall Village Hall OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	71
96	Llleshall Cricket Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	72
101	Rodington Village Hall OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	72
117	St Lawrence C.E. Primary School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	80
120	Humber Way OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	62

124	Williams Road OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	
125	Hill Road OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	60
131	Wellington Road OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	52
135	Saltwells Drive OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	58
146	Muxton Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	77
149	British Sugar Cricket Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	90
152	South View Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	66
157	Ringers Lane Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	54
160	St Peter's C.E. Primary School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	74
162	Wellington Cricket Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	88
164	Little Wenlock Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	70
178	Bowring Recreation Ground	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	100
182	The Sir John Bayley Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	92
191	New College Telford	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	66
192	New College Telford	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	35
195	Old School Field. Rear integrated with childrens	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	54
196	Ercall Wood Technology College OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	63
202	Telford College of Arts and Technology OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	72
223	Dale End Riverside Park - The Meadow	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	48
227	School Road OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	56
233	St Matthews C.E. Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	77
237	Donnington Wood Infant School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	68
240	Donnington Wood C of E Junior School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	49
243	The Coddon Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	82
267	School Grove OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	72
268	Hartshill OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	
269	Hartshill Park OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	72
275	Ketley Grange Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	66
280	Maddocks Sports and Social Club Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	80
284	Apley Wood Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	74
286	Blessed Robert Johnson Catholic College Playing Fi	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	68
287	Blessed Robert Johnson Catholic College Tennis Cou	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	69
289	Grainger Drive PlayingFields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	68
298	The Old Shawburch P.H. Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	48
306	St Georges C of E Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	74
314	St Georges Public Recreation Ground	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	84
336	Teagues Crescent OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	64
337	Teagues Bridge Primary School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	86
340	Trench Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	94
341	Wrockwardine Wood C of E Junior School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	70
342	The Sutherland School Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	74
346	Trench Community Association Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	50
349	Oakengates Leisure Centre OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	92
351	Wrockwardine Wood Infant School and Nursery	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	74
364	Queenswood Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	69
384	Wrekin College OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	94
385	Wrekin College OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	92
390	Hadley Learning Community Small Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	68
393	Milbrook Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	74
399	Hadley United Services Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	76
401	Hadley Playing Fields (Hadley Learning Community)	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	74
402	Hadley Learning Community Bowling Green	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	100
416	Wrockwardine Wood Arts College Multi Use Games Are	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	73
430	Priorslee Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	77
431	University of Wolverhampton Telford Campus OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	60
432	Ricoh Sports Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	80
434	Teece Drive Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	70
441	Thomas Telford School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	74
442	Alma Fields Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	54
443	Langley Junior School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	74
463	Telford Park Arena	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	78
477	Hollingswood Junioe, Infant and Nursery School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	70
479	Matlock Avenue Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	38
484	Dawley Green Way OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	
486	Ladygrove Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	70
491	Dawley Park OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	68
493	Quarry Place OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	58
494	The Duncow Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	76
496	Telford Hornets R.U.F.C.	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	60
511	Randlay Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	78
515	Finger Road Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	58
516	Mount Gilbert School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	58
520	Grizedale Drive OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	64
523	The Phoenix School Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	62
533	Southall School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	68
534	Stirchley Road/Stirchley Lane Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	46
536	Stirchley Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	72
546	3 Oaks Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	70
556	Aqueduct Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	72
568	Windmill Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	87
575	Holmerlake Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	68
584	Woodlands Primary School and Nursery Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	68



585	William Reynolds Junior and Infant School Playing	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	64
593	Madeley Cricket Club Ground	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	76
596	Castlefields Way Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	48
598	Court Street Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	56
600	Madeley Court Sports Centre	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	92
601	St Mary's Catholic Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	70
610	Hills Lane Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	46
611	Haughton School and John Randall Primary School Pl	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	74
616	Abraham Darby Specialist School for Performing Art	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	66
617	Abraham Darby Specialist School for Performing Art	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	68
624	Madeley Infant School/ John Fletcher Junior School	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	72
629	Sir Alexander Fleming Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	74
637	Sutton Way Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	South	70
644	Daddlebrook Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	40
660	The White Horse Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	68
663	Glendale Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	64
674	Overdale Playing Field OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	54
677	Sinclair Sports and Social Club Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	40
681	Meadows Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	80
682	Ketley Playing Field OSF	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	44
683	Rayburn Sports Ground	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	50
689	St Patricks Catholic Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	74
691	Wrekin View Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	74
699	Dothill Infant and Junior Schools Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	70
705	Maxell Factory Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	52
913	Newport Cricket Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	100
914	Newport Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	100
915	Shukers Close Playing Fields (Nova United Football	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Newport	48
921	Edgmond Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	90
922	Harper Adams University College Tennis Courts	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	76
933	Llleshall Tennis Courts	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	76
934	Llleshall Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Rural	74
937	School Lane Tennis Courts/Games Area	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	44
938	Donnington Wood Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	86
944	St Georges Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	82
945	St Georges Sports and Social Club Cricket Ground	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	80
946	Charlton School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	
947	Hadley Learning Community Games Area 1	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	80
948	Hadley Learning Community Multi Games Area	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	89
949	Hadley Learning Community Games Area 2	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	73
954	Newdale Community Campus	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	80
955	Sinclair Sports and Social Club Bowling Green	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	78
963	Crescent Road Playing Fields	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North West	66
964	West Croft Walk	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	32
966	Redhill Primary School Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	74
968	The Sutherland School Multi-use Games Area	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	67
969	Wrockwardine Wood Bowling Club	Outdoor Sports Facilities	North East	74
972	Draycott Playing Field	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Central	34
24	Chetwynd Park Deer Park (Newport Showground)	Parks and Gardens	Rural	
52	Victoria Park	Parks and Gardens	Newport	58
224	Dale End Riverside Park	Parks and Gardens	South	92
271	Hartshill Park	Parks and Gardens	North West	64
459	Town Park North	Parks and Gardens	Central	100
498	Town Park South	Parks and Gardens	Central	82
970	Dawley Park	Parks and Gardens	Central	88
19	Edgmond Village Pavilion Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	70
27	St Michael & All Angels Church	Play Areas for Children	Rural	68
28	Newport Showground Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Newport	86
30	Norbroom Park Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Newport	67
42	Manor Place CYP	Play Areas for Children	Rural	60
47	St Peter's C.E. (controlled) Primary School Playin	Play Areas for Children	Rural	80
54	Water Lane CYP	Play Areas for Children	Newport	64
60	Broomfield Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	Newport	62
65	Boughey Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	Newport	40
67	Wrekin Avenue CYP	Play Areas for Children	Newport	64
72	Daniels Cross Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Newport	74
73	Barnmeadow Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	Newport	52
78	Ashworth Way CYP	Play Areas for Children	Newport	78
81	Marlebrook Way Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	90
97	Llleshall Primary School Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	84
100	Rodington Village Hall Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	68
132	Wellington Road Play Ground	Play Areas for Children	North East	58
133	Sutherland Gate Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	72
134	Saltwells Drive CYP	Play Areas for Children	North East	72
148	Meadow Drive Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	60
158	Burnell Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	Rural	64
165	Little Wenlock Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	92
169	Sunnyside CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	46
179	Child Bowring Recreation Ground/CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	62
194	Millfields Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	77
200	John Broad Avenue CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	60
205	Harvey Crescent Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	50
225	Dale End Riverside Park Play Area	Play Areas for Children	South	60
236	Barn Close Play Areas	Play Areas for Children	North East	64

238	Donnington Wood C of E Primary School Games Area -	Play Areas for Children	North East	80
239	Donnington Wood C of E Primary School Adventure PI	Play Areas for Children	North East	80
270	Hartshill Park Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	60
297	The Old Shawburch P.H. Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	68
300	Newlands Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	80
307	Freestone Avenue Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	68
308	Gower Youth Centre Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	34
311	Hollyoak Grange CYP	Play Areas for Children	North East	67
313	St Georges Sports and Social Club Childrens Play A	Play Areas for Children	North East	60
320	The Rock Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	48
328	Whimbrel Close CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	60
329	Millstream Way Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	70
332	Leegomery Local Centre Paly Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	62
344	Trench Community Association Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	46
348	Greenlea Road Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	54
362	Queenswood Primary School Games Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	80
363	Queenswood Primary School Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	73
367	First Avenue CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	68
372	Parklands Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	70
374	Victoria Avenue CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	60
379	Union Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	74
388	Hurleybrook Way Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	56
391	Hadley Learning Community CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	73
392	Hadley Learning Community Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	98
403	Copper Beech Road Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	38
410	Wombidge Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	60
413	Capewell Road Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	60
418	Fireclay Drive Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	73
436	Teece Drive Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	74
438	Milners Lane CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
447	Brunel Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	52
451	Prince Edward Crescent Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	40
460	Telford Park CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	92
471	Downemead CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
472	Dallamoor CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	40
473	Dudmaston CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
474	Doddington CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	52
485	Ladygrove Primary School Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	80
487	Purbeck Dale CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	68
492	Dawley Park Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	84
495	Lancaster Avenue CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	73
497	Wonderland Adventure Playground	Play Areas for Children	Central	92
501	Dodmoor Grange CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	70
504	Brands Farm Way CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	68
508	Randlay Avenue Village Green Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
512	Boulton Grange CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	62
514	Portley Rd Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
530	Pageant Drive Play Area 1	Play Areas for Children	Central	46
531	Pageant Drive Play Area 2	Play Areas for Children	Central	54
537	Beckbury Drive CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	72
545	Culmington Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	93
548	Combrook CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	52
549	Chesterton Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
553	Hafren Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	24
554	Pageant Drive Play Area 3	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
555	Pageant Drive Play Area 4	Play Areas for Children	Central	60
569	Beaconsfield Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	64
574	Bembridge CYP	Play Areas for Children	Central	44
579	Park Lane Play Area	Play Areas for Children	South	89
586	William Reynolds Junior School	Play Areas for Children	South	69
587	Ironbridge Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	68
589	The Saplings	Play Areas for Children	South	64
590	Waverley CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	72
602	Tweedale Crescent CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	52
604	Coronation Crescent CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	60
608	Prince Street CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	74
609	Hills Lane CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	44
623	Upper Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	58
625	John Fletcher Junior School Games Area	Play Areas for Children	South	69
627	Smallwood Play Area	Play Areas for Children	South	68
628	Southfield CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	60
630	Sir Alexander Fleming Primary School Games Area	Play Areas for Children	South	69
633	Local Centre Play Area	Play Areas for Children	South	72
636	Sutton Way CYP	Play Areas for Children	South	68
656	Cherry Tree Hill Play Area	Play Areas for Children	South	50
657	AB Craines Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	58
658	Pool Side Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	68
662	Glendale Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	56
664	Princes End Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	52
672	Overdale Playing Field Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	40
680	Meadows Primary School Adeventure Playground	Play Areas for Children	North West	87
695	Deer Park Road CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	62
700	Dothill Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	51

708	Primmer Road Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	58
901	Higher Ercall Village Hall Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	60
904	The Meadows Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	60
905	Humber Way Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	98
906	Squirrel Heath Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Rural	78
912	Watling Street Community Centre CYP	Play Areas for Children	North West	66
927	Brindley Ford Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	68
936	School Lane Younger Childrens Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	56
940	Frome Way Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	80
941	Kenway Drive Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	80
942	Onny Grove Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	80
943	Keepers Crescent Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	84
950	Hadley Learning Community Phase 1 and 2 Play Areas	Play Areas for Children	North West	89
962	Hollies Road Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North West	76
965	Hereford Drive Children's Play Area	Play Areas for Children	North East	80
971	Dawley C of E Primary School Adventure Playground	Play Areas for Children	Central	80
973	Daddlebrook Play Area	Play Areas for Children	Central	48
975	Tibberton C.E. Primary School CYP	Play Areas for Children	Rural	86
32	Norbrook Park BMX Track	Teenagers and Young People	Newport	44
228	School Lane Senior Childrens Play Area	Teenagers and Young People	North East	60
327	Leegomery BMX Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	50
368	Wellswood Avenue BMX Track	Teenagers and Young People	North West	40
519	The Web Youth Club Multi Use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	56
541	Stirchley Cycle Trails Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	44
543	Stirchley Skate Park	Teenagers and Young People	Central	71
567	Brindley Ford Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	70
570	Brookside Skate Park	Teenagers and Young People	Central	76
583	Park Lane Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	South	89
612	Haughton School Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	South	69
643	Berberis Road CYP	Teenagers and Young People	North West	47
645	Daddlebrook Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	22
673	Overdale Palying Field Multi-use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	76
679	Meadows Primary School Multi-Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	76
900	Marlebrook Way Young Persons kick about area	Teenagers and Young People	Rural	90
902	Higher Ercall Village Hall Young People Play Area	Teenagers and Young People	Rural	63
907	Admaston Cycle Track for BMX	Teenagers and Young People	Rural	76
908	Admaston Multi Use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Rural	96
910	Millfields Young Peoples Play Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	80
911	Harvey Crescent Teenagers Play Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	96
918	Beechfields Way Teenagers Play Area	Teenagers and Young People	Newport	80
920	Edmond Village Pavilion Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Rural	86
923	Stirchley Multi Use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	71
924	Randlay Ave. Village Green Multi Use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	87
929	Brookside Multi Use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	51
935	Wellington Road Multi Use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	North East	51
951	Millstream Way Multi-use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	67
952	Leegomery Skate Park	Teenagers and Young People	North West	67
956	Wombidge Wheels BMX Trails Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	58
960	Hollies Road Multi-use Games Arena	Teenagers and Young People	North West	62
961	Hollies Road BMX Area	Teenagers and Young People	North West	50
967	Brunel Road Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	Central	42
976	Sutton Hill Local Centre Skateboard Park	Teenagers and Young People	South	76
977	Sutton Hill Local Centre Multi-use Games Area	Teenagers and Young People	South	76
999	Hills Lane BMX Track	Teenagers and Young People	South	44

**APPENDIX D**

**SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

## TELFORD AND WREKIN BOROUGH COUNCIL GENERAL DETAILS

**Site ID:** 
**Date of Visit:**

**Site Name:**

**Site Address:**

**Boundary of Site Check:** ☐ Changed? - (✓) or (x)

**Other Sites within the site?** ☐ No ☐ Yes  
 (e.g. play area in a park)

- complete other site assessment and draw on map and label with new site ID

**Specific Facilities:**

### Type of Open Space (please circle):

1	City parks	4	Green Corridors
2	Local Parks	5	Amenity Greenspace
3	Natural and semi natural areas	6	Children

Map No	
7	Young People/teenagers
8	Outdoor Sports Facilities
9	Allotments
10	Cemteries and Churchyards
11	Civic Spaces

### 'Typology Changed:

(✓) or (x)

☐

## QUALITY SCORING ASSESSMENT

Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	not applicable
-----------	------	---------	------	-----------	----------------

Weighting
-----------

Assessor's Comments
---------------------

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

x3
----

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

x2
----

Vegetation									
Includes: Planted areas Grass areas	5	4	3	2	1	N/A			

x3
----

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

x2
----

SITE ACCESS SCORING ASSESSMENT

	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	not applicable	Weighting	Assessor's Comments		
General										
Includes:	Entrance to site	Roads, paths and cycleway access	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	x3	
	Disabled Access									
Transport										
Includes:	Accessible by public transport	Accessible by cycleways	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	x2	
	Accessible by walking									
Information & Signage										
Is the information & signage to the open space appropriate where required and is it clear?	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	x1			

WIDER BENEFITS SCORING ASSESSMENT

Wider Benefits			Assessor's Comments							
Structural and landscape benefits	Yes	No								
Ecological benefits	Yes	No								
Education benefits	Yes	No								
Social inclusion and health benefits	Yes	No								
Cultural and heritage benefits	Yes	No								
Amenity benefits and a "sense of place"	Yes	No								
Economic benefits	Yes	No								

## **APPENDIX E**

### **QUANTITY STANDARD WORKSHEET**

Telford and Wrekin Borough Council - Setting Quantity Standards

Quantity Calculations	Category	Populations	Parks and Gardens		Nat & Semi Nat Open Space - Urban (in hectares)	Nat & Semi Nat Open Space - Rural (in hectares)	Amenity Green Space	Provision for Children (hectares)		Provision for Young People (hectares)	Allotments (in hectares)	Outdoor Sports Facilities (in hectares)
	Total Provision - Existing Open Space (ha)											
	Telford North West	45,961	0.89		229.81		75.3	3		1.44	3	79.69
	Telford North East	33,630	0		182.31		34.62	2.23		0.31	0.47	59.11
	Telford Central	43,145	3.05		302.19		61.7	5.14		1.52	2.18	66.08
	Telford South	22,124	4.56		205.02		14.69	2.1		0.46	2.92	45.8
	Newport	11,924	1.46		22.08		2.6	1.35		0.19	0.97	27.05
	Rural	14,946				229.63	13.71	2.04		0.52	1.06	31.79
	OVERALL	171,730	9.96		941.41	229.63	202.62	15.86		4.44	10.6	309.52
	Existing Open Space (ha per 1000 Population)											
	Telford North West	45,961	0.0194		5.0001		1.6383	0.0653		0.0313	0.07	1.73
	Telford North East	33,630	0.0000		5.4211		1.0294	0.0663		0.0092	0.01	1.76
	Telford Central	43,145	0.0707		7.0041		1.4301	0.1191		0.0352	0.05	1.53
	Telford South	22,124	0.2061		9.2669		0.6640	0.0949		0.0208	0.13	2.07
	Newport	11,924	0.1224		1.8517		0.2180	0.1132		0.0159	0.08	2.27
	Rural	14,946			0.0000	15.3640	0.9173	0.1365		0.0348	0.07	2.13
	OVERALL	171,730	0.0635		6.0045		1.1799	0.0924		0.0259	0.06	1.80
	Future Open Space (ha per 1000 Population) 2016											
	Telford North West	48,739	0.0183		4.7151		1.5450	0.06		0.0295	0.06	1.64
	Telford North East	35,661	0.0000		5.1123		0.9708	0.06		0.0087	0.01	1.66
	Telford Central	45,755	0.0667		6.6045		1.3485	0.11		0.0332	0.05	1.44
	Telford South	23,439	0.1945		8.7470		0.6267	0.09		0.0196	0.12	1.95
	Newport	12,648	0.1154		1.7457		0.2056	0.11		0.0150	0.08	2.14
	Rural	15,855			0.0000	14.4831	0.8647	0.13		0.0328	0.07	2.01
	OVERALL	182,097	0.0547		5.1698		1.1127	0.09		0.0244	0.06	1.70
	Consultation (%)											
	RECOMMENDED PROVISION STANDARD		0.07		6.00	15.30	1.17	0.095		0.04	0.07	1.8
	Balance											
	Telford North West	45,961	-2.33		-45.96		21.53	-1.37		-0.40	-0.22	-3.04
	Telford North East	33,630	-2.35		-19.47		-4.73	-0.96		-1.04	-1.88	-1.42
	Telford Central	43,145	0.03		43.32		11.22	1.04		-0.21	-0.84	-11.58
	Telford South	22,124	3.01		72.28		-11.20	0.00		-0.42	1.37	5.98
	Newport	11,924	0.63		-49.46		-11.35	0.22		-0.29	0.14	5.59
	Rural	14,946				0.96	-3.78	0.62		-0.08	0.01	4.89
	OVERALL	171,730	-2.06				1.70	-0.45		-2.43	-1.42	0.41
	Future Balance 2016											
	Telford North West	48,739	-2.52		-62.62		18.28	-1.63		-0.51	-0.41	-8.04
	Telford North East	35,662	-2.50		-31.66		-7.10	-1.16		-1.12	-2.03	-5.08
	Telford Central	45,756	-0.15		27.66		8.17	0.79		-0.31	-1.02	-16.28
	Telford South	23,440	2.92		64.39		-12.73	-0.13		-0.48	1.28	3.61
	Newport	12,648	0.57		-53.81		-12.20	0.15		-0.32	0.08	4.28
	Rural	15,855				-12.95	-4.84	0.53		-0.11	-0.05	3.25
	OVERALL	182,100	-2.79		-151.17		-10.43	-1.44		-2.84	-2.15	-18.25



**APPENDIX F**

**TELFORD QUANTITY STANDARDS**

## Telford and Wrekin Council - Setting Quantity Standards

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

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR PARKS AND GARDENS</b>	
<b>National Standards</b>	No National Standards
<b>Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)</b>	<b>0.06 hectares per 1,000 population</b>
<b>Existing Local Standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 1995 –2008:</b></p> <p>S8.15 states that the District’s open space is land that is not allocated for build development. It is the Council’s aim to establish a framework to protect all open space and to utilise it to make best use of the opportunities it provides.</p> <p>Policy OL1 – The policy states that the council will encourage the protection, enhancement and effective management of open land.</p> <p>Policy OL2 – The council will not permit development that is likely to have any adverse effects on sites of national importance.</p> <p>Policy OL4 – The policy protects the Green Network resource of Telford and only permits development in exceptional circumstances, where the development contributes to the aims of the Green Network and where environmental and community benefits are an integral part of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Submission October 2006:</b></p> <p>CS11 - attempts to protect all areas of open space regardless of their quality. Development on open space will only be permitted if community and environmental benefits are provided and that the land does not contribute to the open space standards of the local population.</p> <p><b>Telford Urban Capacity Study August 2005:</b></p> <p>The local standards contained within this report should be used to ensure a plan led approach to open space, sport and recreation contributions from urban capacity development sites. This will ensure that urban capacity sites provide the right amount and type of open space (or alternatively improvements to existing sites in the locality) as best suited to local circumstance.</p> <p><b>Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin Joint Structure Plan 2005 – 2011:</b></p> <p>Policy P20 - states that Local Plans shall ensure that open space located in built up areas are assessed against the need for development. Further more where Local Planning Authorities identify a shortage of open space Local Plans shall contain policies to protect these areas and new provision of open space should link to other areas to provide a network of open space.</p>

	<b>Heart and Soul – Telford and Wrekin Cultural Strategy 2001 – 2006:</b>  The strategy emphasises that urban parks, free and open to everyone, for example, can contribute to increased social interaction by providing a sense of place and helping to define local communities.					
<b>BENCHMARKING</b>	<b>Telford – 44% about right</b>		North Shropshire – 53% about right		Shrewsbury – 59% about right	
	Ryedale – 60% about right		Wychavon – 70% about right		York – 60% about right (City), 46% about right (Local)	
<b>Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)</b>		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	Telford North West	3.4%	41.6%	20.1%	34.2%	0.7%
	Telford North East	3.1%	50%	16.7%	27.1%	3.1%
	Telford Central	4.4%	45.6%	16.2%	33.1%	0.7%
	Telford South	4%	39.4%	11.8%	40.8%	4%
	Newport	0%	31.6%	21%	44.8%	2.6%
	Rural	4.4%	52.2%	4.3%	34.8%	4.3%
	44% of respondents to the household survey stated that the quantity of parks and gardens in Telford and Wrekin is about right. However, a significant proportion of respondents (34.5%) also felt there was not enough provision. When added to the proportion of those that feel there is nearly enough provision (16%), this represents a split in the opinions of residents.					
	Across the individual analysis areas, the common perception is that the provision of parks and gardens is about right, with the majority of respondents indicating this in four of the six analysis areas. The highest level of satisfaction can be found in Telford North East where 50% of residents felt that provision was about right. The lowest levels of satisfaction are located in Telford South and Newport, where the majority of respondents in each area felt there were not enough parks and gardens. When also considering the views of those residents who felt there were only nearly enough, it can be seen that over 50% of residents in the Newport and Telford North West areas are dissatisfied.					
General comments identified safety concerns as the main prevention for residents wanting to use this typology. In particular respondents expressed concerns about gangs of youths congregating in parks and partaking in anti-social behaviour, with specific reference made to St George’s park. A number of references were also made about Telford Town Park being too far away and car parking being too expensive. This suggests that residents feel there is a lack of locally accessible provision and that residents would value access to local parks.						

<p><b>Consultation Comments (quantity)</b></p>	<p>Residents at drop in sessions emphasised the value of parks and gardens, stating the need for protection of these sites and increased provision of this typology in alignment with future population growth. Specific reference was made to Woodside, with residents identifying the need for more local parks and gardens in this area. Concerns were also raised regarding Granville Park and the sale of land on the park boundary. Local residents feel as though this may impinge on the park and affect its open feel.</p> <p>The value of parks and gardens was further reinforced by respondents to the IT Young People and Children's surveys, showing that parks and gardens were their favourite type of open space with 27% (Young People) and 41% (Children) respectively.</p> <p>In terms of the quantity, 36% of young people stated that there are enough, but not the right type of parks within Telford and Wrekin, as opposed to 24% of young people who stated that there are not enough parks.</p> <p>Responses from the Parish Council questionnaires highlighted areas of deficiency within Church Aston, Rodington, and Lawley and Overdale. Dawley Park is well used, with the Town Park deemed to be an important facility serving the parish. Moreover, these facilities are integral open spaces for leisure and recreational activities both formal and informal.</p>
<p><b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b></p>	<p><b>0.07ha per 1000 population</b></p>
<p><b>PMP Justification</b></p>	<p>Parks are perceived to be particularly important to local residents. Although there is some dissatisfaction, there is a greater level of satisfaction regarding the provision of parks than there is some other types of open space.</p> <p>Variations in the level of satisfaction suggest that there may be some locational deficiencies in the distribution of parks and gardens.</p> <p>A standard set marginally above the existing level of provision enables any locational deficiencies to be met but does not place significant requirements for new park provision.</p> <p>Telford Town Park has been omitted from the quantitative calculations due to its size and tendency to skew the figures. As it is an extremely large strategic site serving the needs of residents across the borough it is unrealistic for this level of provision to be replicated across the borough. Consideration has been given to the role that Telford Town Park serves and the impact of this site on the demand for further provision will be considered during the application of the recommended local standards. Bearing this in mind, Chetwynd Park has also been omitted from the Rural Analysis Area due to the size of the site (66.75ha) and it's potential to miss represent the level of provision borough wide.</p>

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL	
National Standards	<p>English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an accessible natural greenspace less than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home;</li> <li>• statutory Local Nature Reserves at a minimum level of one hectare per thousand population; [ ]</li> <li>• at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home; one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; and one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home.</li> </ul> <p>Rethinking Open Space Report - Average of all LA applicable standards = 2 ha per 1,000 population - areas that promote biodiversity and nature conservation</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	6 hectares per 1,000 population (Urban), 15.3 hectares per 1,000 population (Rural)
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p><b>Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 1995 –2008:</b></p> <p>S8.23 emphasises the importance of countryside and states that it cannot be replaced; therefore these areas should be protected from unnecessary built development.</p> <p>Policy OL4 protects the Green Network resource of Telford and only permits development in exceptional circumstances, where the development contributes to the aims of the Green Network and where environmental and community benefits are an integral part of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Shropshire Biodiversity Action Plan</b></p> <p>The goal of the plan is, <i>“By working in partnership, conserve and enhance biological diversity in Shropshire and contribute to the conservation of biodiversity in the UK through all appropriate mechanisms.”</i></p> <p>The objectives of the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maintain and enhance the populations and natural ranges of species and the quality and extent of wildlife habitats and ecosystems in Shropshire</li> <li>• To conserve internationally, nationally and regionally important and locally distinctive species, habitats and ecosystems and enhance their conservation status</li> <li>• To promote awareness, understanding and support for biodiversity conservation throughout Shropshire</li> </ul>



	<p>there is enough provision with those that perceive there to be not enough indicates that in three of the areas, over 50% of residents have indicated that the level of provision is insufficient.</p> <p>Respondents acknowledged safety concerns as the main barrier to using this type of open space rather than a lack of provision.</p>
<b>Consultation Comments (quantity)</b>	<p>Drop in session attendees reflected the need to protect natural and semi-natural areas, recognising them as a key part of Telford and Wrekin. Residents highlighted the importance of these spaces because of the number of possible uses of this typology and their contribution to making Telford and Wrekin a 'green' area. Specific reference was made to housing pressures being placed upon the natural and semi-natural areas in Prior Lea. This emphasis on the protection of natural open spaces indicates the importance of biodiversity and conservation to residents of Telford and Wrekin.</p> <p>Responses from the Parish Council questionnaires suggest a satisfaction with the level of natural and semi natural open spaces, however this has been followed up with a need to designate and protect this land from future housing developments. Lawley and Overdale parish council have expressed a concern over the quantity of this typology, stating that the majority of natural and semi natural open spaces are being developed as part of the Lawley Sustainable Urban Extension.</p>
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	<p><b>6.0ha per 1000 population – Urban Standard</b></p> <p><b>15.3ha per 1000 population – Rural Standard</b></p>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>The value placed on natural and semi natural open space is clear, both in terms of the recreational resource these spaces offer and also in light of the role that natural areas play in biodiversity and conservation. While there is a split in opinion in responses to the household survey between those who perceive there to be insufficient natural areas and those who are satisfied with current provision, the focus of all other consultations was an emphasis on the protection of existing provision from development rather than the creation of new spaces.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the local standard is set at the existing level of provision (to protect existing provision), and that emphasis is placed on improving the quality of existing sites from both a recreational and conservation perspective.</p> <p>The green nature of Telford and Wrekin has meant several extremely large natural and semi natural open spaces are found across the borough. These vast expanses have been excluded from the calculations because the inclusion of these sites will set an artificially high quantity standard across the borough, which would be both unachievable and generate unrealistic expectations.</p> <p>The urban and rural areas show substantial differences in terms of level of provision and the density of populations, it is therefore recommended that different standards be set in order to maintain the current levels of provision across the borough. This is justifiable in light of the different characteristics of the rural and urban environments.</p>



TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR AMENITY GREEN SPACE						
National Standards	The NPFA Six acre standard includes some elements of amenity green space.					
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	1.17 hectares per 1,000 population					
Existing Local Standards and strategic context						
BENCHMARKING	Telford – 32% not enough	North Shropshire – 39% about right	Shrewsbury – 39% about right			
	Ryedale – 40% not enough	Wychavon – 39% about right	York – 39% about right			
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Based on the findings of the household survey, there is a split opinion regarding the provision of amenity green space, with 32.3% of respondents stating there is not enough and 31.3% indicating provision is about right. When the number of residents who have indicated that there is nearly enough provision in addition to those who feel there is not enough, it can be seen that a greater proportion of residents feel that there is insufficient compared to those who feel that it is about right.					
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	3.4%	31.3%	22.2%	32.3%	10.8%
	Telford North West	5.9%	30.1%	20.6%	32.4%	11%
	Telford North East	1.1%	27.5%	29.7%	34%	7.7%
	Telford Central	2.3%	33.9%	22%	33.1%	33.7%
	Telford South	2.9%	35.3%	19.1%	36.8%	5.9%
	Newport	2.8%	25%	19.4%	30.6%	22.2%
	Rural	4.7%	34.9%	18.6%	20.9%	20.9%
		When examining the individual analysis areas, results mirror those found within the overall findings, with the exception of Newport where dissatisfaction is particularly high. In comparison to other typologies, a large proportion of residents in Telford and Wrekin have no opinion regarding the amount of amenity green space. The number of residents with no opinion is particularly high within Telford Central, Newport and the rural area.				
Consultation Comments (quantity)	At the drop in sessions there was a general consensus that the amount of amenity green space is more than adequate and that future resources should be focused on the preservation and maintenance of these open spaces in order to retain the ‘green feel’ of the neighbourhoods. However, residents living in Doddington suggested a need for more local open spaces, with a slight resentment towards having to travel to the Town Park. Residents highlighted the importance of these spaces because of their contribution to making Telford and Wrekin a ‘green’ area and specific comments centred on the need to strike a balance between the quality and quantity of the amenity green spaces. The majority of comments related to quality issues rather than a lack of spaces or poor access					

	<p>to these facilities.</p> <p>In terms of the IT Young People survey, 35% of respondents stated that there are enough informal grass areas (falling within the amenity green space typology) and 60% of respondents to the children's survey stated that there is a lot of grass areas. The survey illustrates the value of these spaces – which are often the most localised form of recreational open space available to residents. Amenity green spaces were particularly popular with the younger children (up to 11 years old) – possibly due to limited potential there is to travel. They were generally thought of as good places to meet friends.</p> <p>Similar to the findings from the household survey, the Parish Council questionnaire suggests a split in opinion regarding the quantity of amenity green space, Areas well served include Hollinswood and Randlay, The Gorge and Madeley, whereas Church Aston, Rodington and Newport all comment on the depleting amount of amenity green space surrounding residential developments.</p>
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	<b>1.17ha per 1000 population</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>While amenity green space is valued, there is a split in opinion regarding the adequacy of the current level of provision.</p> <p>Early analysis indicates that there may be locational deficiencies in provision. Local access to facilities is particularly important to residents and young children, and many residents highlighted that a lack of very local provision is a key determinant of their perception of the overall quantity.</p> <p>Many residents highlighted the importance of the protection of amenity green space and expressed concerns about the loss of spaces to development. In terms of quality, while residents' value amenity spaces, many highlighted a preference for sites containing a variety of facilities.</p> <p>While the findings of the household survey suggest that there are quantitative deficiencies, other consultations highlighted that quality was more important. Coupled with a preference for sites containing a range of facilities (and the difficulties with maintaining large quantities of small pieces of land), it is suggested that a standard be set at the current level of provision. This will bring out locational deficiencies and enable a focus to be placed on qualitative improvements.</p>

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS</b> <b>PROVISION OF PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN</b>	
<b>National Standards</b>	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (i.e. 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that may not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>1) LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>
<b>Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)</b>	<b>0.092 hectares per 1,000 population</b>
<b>Existing Local Standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Telford and Wrekin Children and Young People's Plan 2005 – 2010:</b></p> <p>The vision for children and young people is to: "...Work together with children, young people, families and their communities to build a safe, prosperous and bright future for all the children &amp; young people in Telford &amp; Wrekin".</p> <p>The plan focuses on five aims: promoting health and early years, staying safe, enjoying and achieving, making a positive contribution and achieving economic wellbeing.</p> <p><b>Telford and Wrekin Local Play Strategy 2007 – 2017:</b></p> <p>The Council "is committed to enhancing the quality and <u>quantity</u> of current and future free play provision and equipped play and youth facilities across the Borough".</p> <p><b>Open Green Spaces</b> - The Council will actively encourage the right of children's informal play particularly in the landscape of open green spaces.</p> <p>Protection of existing play/youth facilities - Where play spaces are proposed to be lost through development, a suitable replacement facility or feature (to the satisfaction of the Council) of equal or greater quality and accessibility is required to be provided, unless highlighted in the Implementation Plan as to be surplus to requirement.</p> <p>The strategy aims to:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide more and better local and inclusive play opportunities where they are most needed.</li><li>• Develop a mechanism, based on key principles and methodology, to prioritise development of existing and new play opportunities.</li><li>• Sustain play opportunities over the long-term.</li></ul> <p>Consultation identified a number of key findings:</p> <p>There is a need to increase play opportunities and eliminate barriers to play for socially vulnerable children and young people.</p> <p>There is a lack of equitable Play Opportunities across the Borough/Clusters.</p> <p>The need to address the disparity of play and youth facilities and identify gaps in facilities and target areas for investments.</p>																																																		
BENCHMARKING	Telford – 46% not enough	North Shropshire – 36% not enough	Shrewsbury – 35% about right																																																
	Ryedale – 39% not enough	Wychavon – 39% about right	York – 38% not enough																																																
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>In total, 62.5% of respondents feel there is nearly enough/not enough provision for children and 32.6% indicate provision is about right/more than enough. This suggests that there is a perception that children’s provision is Telford and Wrekin is insufficient. This level of dissatisfaction is one of the most conclusive of all open space typologies. Interestingly the proportion of respondents illustrating that there are more than enough play facilities is high compared to other typologies. This may be skewed by the respondent profile to the household survey, who do not frequently use these play facilities.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>More than enough</td><td>About Right</td><td>Nearly Enough</td><td>Not Enough</td><td>No Opinion</td></tr><tr><td>Overall</td><td>4.4%</td><td>28.2%</td><td>16.7%</td><td>45.8%</td><td>4.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford North West</td><td>6%</td><td>28%</td><td>16.7%</td><td>42.7%</td><td>6.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford North East</td><td>2.1%</td><td>25.5%</td><td>16.3%</td><td>50%</td><td>6.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford Central</td><td>5.1%</td><td>25.3%</td><td>18.1%</td><td>46.4%</td><td>5.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford South</td><td>4%</td><td>26.7%</td><td>10.7%</td><td>56%</td><td>2.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Newport</td><td>2.6%</td><td>30.8%</td><td>25.6%</td><td>38.4%</td><td>2.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Rural</td><td>4.3%</td><td>43.5%</td><td>15.2%</td><td>34.8%</td><td>2.2%</td></tr></table> <p>Results across the individual analysis areas are consistent with the overall perception of children’s provision being insufficient. The only exception can be found in the Rural area, where the highest level of satisfaction can be found with 43.5% of residents indicating children’s provision is about right. Even in the rural area however there remains</p>				More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	4.4%	28.2%	16.7%	45.8%	4.9%	Telford North West	6%	28%	16.7%	42.7%	6.6%	Telford North East	2.1%	25.5%	16.3%	50%	6.1%	Telford Central	5.1%	25.3%	18.1%	46.4%	5.1%	Telford South	4%	26.7%	10.7%	56%	2.6%	Newport	2.6%	30.8%	25.6%	38.4%	2.6%	Rural	4.3%	43.5%	15.2%	34.8%	2.2%
	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																														
Overall	4.4%	28.2%	16.7%	45.8%	4.9%																																														
Telford North West	6%	28%	16.7%	42.7%	6.6%																																														
Telford North East	2.1%	25.5%	16.3%	50%	6.1%																																														
Telford Central	5.1%	25.3%	18.1%	46.4%	5.1%																																														
Telford South	4%	26.7%	10.7%	56%	2.6%																																														
Newport	2.6%	30.8%	25.6%	38.4%	2.6%																																														
Rural	4.3%	43.5%	15.2%	34.8%	2.2%																																														

	<p>almost 50% of residents who suggest that there is not enough or only nearly enough facilities. This may indicate that there is an uneven distribution of provision between the rural and urban areas of Telford and Wrekin.</p> <p>General comments in the household survey support the view of children's provision being insufficient. A large amount of comments revolved around there not being enough facilities for children and particular reference was made to there being no play ground near Huntington Drive. Respondents further stated that the cost of transport to access these facilities was high. This suggests that access to local facilities is particularly important to residents. This therefore impacts on the required quantity of provision.</p>
<b>Consultation Comments (quantity)</b>	<p>The general consensus gathered from drop in sessions was the need for increased provision of children's facilities. This echoes the findings of the household survey and suggests that there is a shortfall in provision. Concern was also expressed over the £1.5 million home regeneration zone in Woodside, with residents indicating the protection of play areas for children was particularly important.</p> <p>Children responding to the IT Survey were asked to rate the amount of open spaces near to their homes. The results show that the majority of children who replied think that there is sufficient open space, although it may not be the most appropriate type of open space. When asked to rate the amount of local play areas / spaces, the most common response was that there are enough places to play where they live (59%). In contrast, very few children think there are no areas to play where they live (6%). The two most commonly mentioned types of facilities that children wanted near to their homes would be play areas with interesting play equipment and a swimming pool. Despite a high percentage of children stating that there are enough play areas, this typology ranked quite low in terms of their favourite type of open space (fifth out of six), this may be determined by the location of existing facilities.</p> <p>The value of parks and gardens was further reinforced by respondents to the IT Young People and Children's surveys, showing that parks and gardens were their favourite type of open space with 27% (Young People) and 41% (Children) respectively.</p> <p>In terms of the quantity, 36% of young people stated that there are enough, but not the right type of parks within Telford and Wrekin, as opposed to 24% of young people who stated that there are not enough parks.</p> <p>Reiterating the comments and findings from the household survey and drop in sessions, the Parish Council questionnaire suggests a desire for more children's play areas in many of the local areas, there are also qualitative issues regarding existing provision. Little Wenlock and Great Dawley are examples where quantitative deficiency does not appear to be an issue. However, Ketley identified Ketley town, Red Lees and Red Lake as having no children's play areas, despite promises of increased provision.</p>
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	<b>0.095 ha per 1000 population</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	In light of the emphasis on the need for greater levels of provision during both qualitative and quantitative consultations, it is recommended that a standard is set above the existing level of provision (currently 0.9ha per 1000

	<p>population).</p> <p>It is important that the provision of new facilities for children is balanced with the need to improve the quality of existing provision. This is particularly important given that the key complaint regarding existing provision from young people was that facilities are not sufficiently innovative or exciting.</p> <p>Setting a standard just above the existing level of provision will ensure that new provision can be delivered where it is most needed, without requiring extensive additional facilities and limiting the qualitative improvements that can take place. This standard can be achieved through the creation of additional sites (in order to achieve this standard, based on the average size of existing play provision across Telford, approximately 10 additional play areas would be required over the LDF period), through the extension of existing facilities or through new residential development creating new demand in area.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE</b>	
<b>National Standards</b>	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (i.e. 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that may not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>
<b>Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)</b>	<p>0.025 hectares per 1,000 population</p>
<b>Existing Local Standards and strategic context</b>	<p>Telford and Wrekin Play Strategy 2007 – 2017:</p> <p>Consultation identified:</p> <p>There is a lack of youth provision and youth facilities in some areas of the Borough.</p> <p>There is a need to address the disparity of play and youth facilities and identify gaps in facilities and target areas for investments.</p> <p><b>Telford and Wrekin Community Strategy 2006 – 2011:</b></p> <p>The strategy aims to implement the Town Park strategic framework to...provide youth facilities through redesigning the Northern Urban Park Zone and regeneration of the Iron Gorge World Heritage Site is to be conducted through the heritage project.</p> <p><b>The Safer and Stronger Communities Strategy 2005 – 2008:</b></p> <p>The strategy aims to: reduce crime and anti social behaviour within in the community that can affect the number of people using open spaces due to safety fears.</p> <p>Discourage children and young people becoming involved in crime, anti social behaviour and drug use by providing correct provision and enhanced quality of open spaces to keep younger people occupied and steer them away from such behaviour.</p>

BENCHMARKING	Telford – 65% not enough		North Shropshire – 65% not enough		Shrewsbury – 57% not enough	
	Ryedale – 51% not enough		Wychavon – 62% not enough		York – 59% not enough	
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Responses from the household survey indicate the majority of residents (65.3%) feel the provision of open space for teenagers is insufficient. Only 11.2% of respondents stated provision was about right/more than enough, supporting the perception of insufficient provision in Telford and Wrekin. This echoes the perceptions surrounding the provision for children and young people, and it is within these two typologies where the greatest concerns lie.					
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	2.4%	8.8%	14.8%	65.3%	8.7%
	Telford North West	4.1%	4.7%	15.5%	64.9%	10.8%
	Telford North East	1.1%	3.1%	14.4%	70.1%	11.3%
	Telford Central	1.4%	8.6%	15.7%	68.6%	5.7%
	Telford South	4.2%	16.7%	11.1%	59.7%	8.3%
	Newport	0%	15.8%	13.2%	60.5%	10.5%
	Rural	2.1%	17%	17%	59.6%	4.3%
	Analysis of perceptions across different geographical areas of the borough indicates that feelings are consistent. The highest level of satisfaction can be found in Telford South, where 20.9% of residents indicated provision was about right/more than enough. In all areas, over 70% of residents were dissatisfied, indicating that there is an overwhelming perception of insufficient provision.					
The perception of insufficient provision for teenagers is the most conclusive of all typologies. General comments support the perception of insufficient provision and particular reference was made to a lack of youth clubs in Telford and Wrekin. This suggests there is recognition that a variety of facilities should be provided to meet the needs of young people, not just equipped play facilities. This also reflects the findings of the IT young people survey, where children and young people expressed the desire for a variety of facilities.						
Consultation Comments (quantity)	Comments gathered from drop in sessions revolved around providing more teenage open space. Emphasis was further placed upon the need for safe and secure provision. Specific reference was made to a lack of facilities in Newport, Doddington and Priors Lee. Hollingswood Youth Shelter was identified as an example of bad practice, with anti-social behaviour and drug use occurring on this site. This highlights the importance of ensuring that facilities are appropriate and respected, as well as the emphasis that should be placed on accessible local facilities.					
	Young People responding to the IT Survey were asked to rate the amount of facilities for young people in their local area. The results show that 29% of young people who replied think that there are facilities but could do with more, 21% suggested that there are facilities but the quality is poor and 20% stated that there are no facilities for young people in their area.					



	<p>When asked to state one improvement young people would like to see to open space, sports and recreation facilities, the highest rated aspiration was the provision of a better range of facilities (36%). Therefore it is important to set a quantity standard that facilitates both quantitative and qualitative improvements to facilities in Telford.</p> <p>When asked which new open space facility they would like to see in their area, responses were evenly distributed between a skate park, tennis courts, swimming pool, multi use games area and a woodland area.</p> <p>All respondents to the questionnaires stated a quantitative deficiency with regards the provision of facilities for young people, this was also deemed to be a primary reason for the miss use of other open space typologies. Further comments centred on the need to tailor provision to local need in order to generate and sustain interest from the local residents.</p>
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	<b>0.04ha per 1000 population</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>Similar to the provision for children, there is an overriding emphasis on the need for more facilities for young people across Telford and Wrekin. A standard above the existing level of provision is therefore suggested (currently 0.025ha per 1000 population). The location of facilities was perceived to be particularly important to encourage young people to use facilities. The preference for facilities located in close proximity to the home places a greater demand on the quantity of facilities required.</p> <p>While quantity was the key concern emerging through consultation, the quality of facilities, and ownership of these sites was also frequently mentioned, particularly by young people themselves. In addition to setting a standard that recognises the need for increased provision across Telford and Wrekin, it is therefore important to ensure that the quality of facilities is also considered and that the need for community ownership is taken into account.</p> <p>The recommended standard will result in the need for the creation of an additional 12 sites (24 facilities) over the LDF period. This is also reflective of the findings of the Play Strategy.</p>

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES</b>	
<b>National Standards</b>	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 4 acres (i.e. 1.62 per 1,000 population) for outdoor sport - includes pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens, tennis courts training areas and croquet lawns</p> <p>'NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that may not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p>
<b>Local Standards</b>	<p><b>Telford and Wrekin Playing Pitch Strategy 2003:</b></p> <p>Football – There is currently an over supply of senior football pitches in Telford and Wrekin. However, there is a shortfall in the provision of junior pitches.</p> <p>Cricket – There is currently sufficient provision of cricket pitches to meet current and future demand, with the exception of South Telford.</p> <p>Rugby Union – Within Telford and Wrekin there are enough rugby union pitches to meet current demand, but not future demand. There is a need for the increased provision of pitches in the future.</p> <p>Hockey – There is currently only one full sized, floodlit, synthetic hockey pitch within Telford and Wrekin. This has resulted in local teams using facilities outside the council boundary to meet their needs. There is to be new provision of pitches at Madeley and Oakengates Leisure Centre.</p>
<b>Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)</b>	<b>1.8 hectares per 1,000 population</b>
<b>Existing Local Standards and strategic context</b>	<p><b>Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 1995 –2008:</b></p> <p>The plan aims to achieve the National Playing Fields Association minimum target of 2.43 hectares per 1000 population of outdoor recreational open space and developments that result in the loss of existing open space or do not provide a suitable alternative location of similar specification will be rejected.</p> <p><b>Telford Sport and Recreation Strategy 2002 – 2011:</b></p> <p>The strategic objectives of this strategy are: To promote opportunities for the whole community to participate in sport and physical recreation, and in particular encourage participation in defined target groups with special emphasis on children and young people.</p> <p>To improve the health of local people by the services and activities available through sports and physical recreation.</p>

	<p>To encourage the provision and development of Sport and Recreation facilities and services in line with locally determined need.</p> <p>To promote the effective, efficient and sustainable use of Sport and Recreation facilities and resources through mutually beneficial partnerships and the values of excellence and innovation.</p> <p>To enhance and promote opportunities available to assist people achieve their desired level of potential physical and learning development through sport and recreation.</p> <p>To increase awareness and understanding of the local opportunities available and the benefits of participating in sport and recreation.</p> <p>The recent Active People survey highlights that participation in sports in Telford and Wrekin is slightly below the national average, with around 19.1% of residents regularly participating.</p>		
<b>BENCHMARKING</b>	<b>Telford -</b>	North Shropshire -	Shrewsbury -
	Ryedale -	Wychavon -	York -
<b>Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)</b>	<b>Grass Pitches:</b> 5.6% more than enough 38.9% about right 13.2% Nearly enough 25.7% not enough 16.6% no opinion	<b>Synthetic Turf Pitches:</b> 1.9% more than enough 16% about right 9.8% Nearly enough 37.8% not enough 34.6% no opinion	<b>Tennis Courts:</b> 1.4% more than enough 21.9% about right 9.9% Nearly enough 37.8% not enough 34.6% no opinion
	<b>Bowling Greens:</b> 2.2% more than enough 27.8% about right 8.9% Nearly enough 29.5% not enough 31.5% no opinion	<b>Golf Courses:</b> 13.1% more than enough 35.5% about right 8.2% Nearly enough 16.2% not enough 26.9% no opinion	<b>Athletics:</b> 2.3% more than enough 23.1% about right 8.8% Nearly enough 33.4% not enough 32.4% no opinion

<p><b>Consultation Comments (quantity)</b></p>	<p>Outdoor sports facilities are very much demand-led and the outdoor sports facility typology encompasses a wide variety of different facilities including athletics tracks, pitches, golf courses and bowling greens. However, the concurrent theme is the high proportion of residents having no opinion, highlighting the low level of interest regarding this type of open space. This disinterest is mirrored in responses to the level of use, which shows that 46% of residents in Telford and Wrekin do not use outdoor sports facilities</p> <p>Of the facility types surveyed, dissatisfaction was shown with the provision of all facility types, with the exception of golf courses. The highest levels of dissatisfaction shown were with regard to grass pitches, synthetic turf pitches and bowling.</p> <p>When considering the level of satisfaction across the analysis areas, the Rural area showed the highest level of satisfaction in three of the six facilities, stating provision was about right for grass pitches (51%), tennis courts (34%) and athletics (29%). Telford North East displayed the lowest level of dissatisfaction in three of the six facilities, with residents indicating the provision of tennis courts (49%), bowling greens (35%) and golf courses (28%) was insufficient.</p> <p>At drop in sessions the importance of outdoor sports facilities was emphasised by residents, with many viewing the protection of this type of open space as essential. Residents viewed the protection of pitches as particularly important and noted that Iron Bridge playing field had been sold for development. Conclusions established in the playing pitch strategy support this view with rugby, cricket and senior football pitches all having adequate provision to meet current demand. However, the playing pitch strategy also identifies a shortfall in provision of junior football pitches and hockey pitches. A general assumption identified in the playing pitch strategy was the need for more pitches to meet future demand.</p> <p>The IT Young People further emphasising the importance of outdoor sports facilities, when asked about their most popular activities, and places to meet and spend time with friends, responses involving this typology scored very highly. However, when asked about the quantity of outdoor sports facilities, 50% of respondents stated that there aren't enough facilities in their local area, as opposed to only 5% who think that there are more than enough outdoor sports facilities.</p> <p>In response to the Parish Council questionnaire, Great Dawley discussed the important role the Phoenix School plays within the local community regarding the provision of outdoor sports facilities. Further responses centred on the current provision of football pitches and in some instances bowling greens and tennis courts. However, Newport Town Council stated the majority of their outdoor sports facilities are privately owned or rented by clubs, which has repercussions on the amount of publicly accessible provision in the area. A lack of accessibility to school sites was also highlighted as a key issue during drop in sessions.</p>
----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p><b>Grass Pitches:</b> Individual analysis areas indicate the provision of grass pitches is about right. The greatest dissatisfaction can be found in Telford North West, where 30% of residents feel there is not enough provision.</p>	<p><b>Synthetic Turf Pitches:</b> Results from the individual analysis areas highlight the perception that there is not enough provision. The highest satisfaction can be found in Telford South, where 27% of residents feel provision is about right.</p>	<p><b>Tennis Courts:</b> The majority of residents across each individual analysis area indicate there is not enough provision of tennis courts. Over 20% of respondents in each analysis area have no opinion, suggesting a lack of interest in this type of facility.</p>
	<p><b>Bowling Greens:</b> Within the analysis areas there is split opinion regarding the provision of open space, with three of the analysis areas stating provision is about right and the other three areas indicating there is not enough provision. However, in each analysis area there is a significant proportion of respondents in each of the two categories.</p>	<p><b>Golf Courses:</b> Across the individual analysis areas, residents feel the provision of golf courses is about right, with the exception of Telford North East, where 28% of respondents state there is not enough provision. The highest level of satisfaction can be found in Newport, with 44% of residents indicating provision is about right.</p>	<p><b>Athletics:</b> The majority of respondents across each analysis area feel there is not enough provision of athletics. The lowest level of satisfaction can be found in Newport, where 59% of residents indicated provision was insufficient.</p>
<p><b>PMP Recommendation (per 1000 population)</b></p>	<p><b>1.8ha per 1000 population</b></p>		

<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>Outdoor sports facilities are very much demand-led and the outdoor sports facility typology encompasses a wide variety of different facilities including athletics tracks, pitches, golf courses and bowling greens. However, the concurrent theme is the high response rate of residents having no opinion, highlighting the low level of interest regarding this type of open space. In order to understand the demand for outdoor sports facilities in a greater level of detail it is therefore essential to consider each type of sports facility separately.</p>
	<p>The variation in responses indicates that there may be a disparity in the distribution of facilities across the borough although overall, there is dissatisfaction in the quantity of all types of facility with the exception of golf courses (which have been removed from all figures due to their size and subsequent tendency to skew figures). While this indicates that a quantity standard greater than the existing level of provision should be set, many of the comments from other consultations focus on the quality of provision, and enhancing access to existing provision.</p>
	<p>Detailed investigations into the requirements for pitches indicate that there are surpluses in adult pitch provision which contrast with shortfalls in junior provision. Given that junior pitches are smaller in size than adult pitches, it can be considered that while the layout of pitches may change, the actual quantity of provision should remain at similar levels to the existing quantity. In light of the opportunities to improve access to new / existing facilities, it is recommended that a quantity standard reflecting the existing level of provision is set. While this may identify locational deficiencies, it will ensure that resources are maximised and that a focus on quality is maintained.</p>

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR ALLOTMENTS</b>			
<b>National Standards</b>	National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners - 20 allotment plots per 1,000 households (i.e. 20 allotments plots per 2,200 people (2.2 people per house) or 1 allotment plot per 200 people. With an average allotment plot of 250 sq/m this equates to 0.125 ha per 1,000 population		
	1970 Thorpe Report suggested 0.2 ha per 1,000 population		
<b>Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)</b>	<b>0.06 hectares per 1,000 population</b>		
<b>BENCHMARKING</b>	<b>Telford – 35% not enough</b>	North Shropshire – 31% not enough	Shrewsbury – 28% about right
	Ryedale – 28% about right	Wychavon – 31% about right	York – 36% about right

Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Results from the household survey show 47.3% of respondents feel the provision of allotments in Telford and Wrekin is insufficient. This suggests a shortfall in provision. This dissatisfaction is even more apparent considering the proportion of residents who have no opinion and this level is also significantly in excess of that demonstrated in other authorities.																																																
	<table><tr><td></td><td>More than enough</td><td>About Right</td><td>Nearly Enough</td><td>Not Enough</td><td>No Opinion</td></tr><tr><td>Overall</td><td>2.1%</td><td>22.2%</td><td>12.8%</td><td>34.5%</td><td>28.4</td></tr><tr><td>Telford North West</td><td>0.7%</td><td>19.3%</td><td>12.4%</td><td>32.4%</td><td>35.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford North East</td><td>1.1%</td><td>11.6%</td><td>8.4%</td><td>42.1%</td><td>36.8%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford Central</td><td>3.6%</td><td>23.2%</td><td>13.8%</td><td>34.8%</td><td>24.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Telford South</td><td>2.8%</td><td>45.1%</td><td>9.9%</td><td>26.7%</td><td>15.5%</td></tr><tr><td>Newport</td><td>2.8%</td><td>19.4%</td><td>13.9%</td><td>38.9%</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>Rural</td><td>2.2%</td><td>17.4%</td><td>23.9%</td><td>32.6%</td><td>23.9%</td></tr></table>		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	2.1%	22.2%	12.8%	34.5%	28.4	Telford North West	0.7%	19.3%	12.4%	32.4%	35.2%	Telford North East	1.1%	11.6%	8.4%	42.1%	36.8%	Telford Central	3.6%	23.2%	13.8%	34.8%	24.6%	Telford South	2.8%	45.1%	9.9%	26.7%	15.5%	Newport	2.8%	19.4%	13.9%	38.9%	25%	Rural	2.2%	17.4%	23.9%	32.6%	23.9%
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																											
	Overall	2.1%	22.2%	12.8%	34.5%	28.4																																											
	Telford North West	0.7%	19.3%	12.4%	32.4%	35.2%																																											
	Telford North East	1.1%	11.6%	8.4%	42.1%	36.8%																																											
	Telford Central	3.6%	23.2%	13.8%	34.8%	24.6%																																											
	Telford South	2.8%	45.1%	9.9%	26.7%	15.5%																																											
	Newport	2.8%	19.4%	13.9%	38.9%	25%																																											
	Rural	2.2%	17.4%	23.9%	32.6%	23.9%																																											
The highest level of dissatisfaction was located in Newport, where 52.8% of residents felt that the level of provision was nearly enough/not enough. This is further evident in the amount of vacancies available at allotments, with only 13% of allotments having no vacancies or a waiting list.																																																	
The greatest satisfaction with this typology is found in Telford South, where 45.1% of respondents indicated provision was about right.																																																	
A high level of respondents with no opinion was portrayed in each analysis area. This may be due to allotments experiencing the lowest level of use out of all typologies, with 89% of respondents claiming they do not use this type of open space. Given the specialist nature of allotments, in comparison to other authorities, this suggests that the level of interest in allotments is high in Telford and Wrekin.																																																	
The shortfall in provision identified by findings from the household survey were supported by general comments made by respondents, with a number of people stating allotments were too far away and more provision was needed. This also suggests a poor distribution of allotments in Telford and Wrekin as well as quantitative issues.																																																	
Responses from the drop in sessions indicated a latent demand in Wellington and Admaston where there are currently waiting lists for allotment plots, the public felt that more should be done by the council to meet the demand in these areas.																																																	
Findings from the Parish Council questionnaire suggest a deficiency in the amount of provision within certain areas of Telford and Wrekin, for example Rodington, The Gorge and Ketley which have no provision. There is however a latent demand for this typology with Wrockwardine Wood and Trench, and Madeley both having waiting lists for allotment																																																	

	sites. Great Dawley also suggested the area is in great need of an allotment site due to public demand.
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	<b>0.07ha per 1000 population</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>The clear message from consultation findings is that there is an overall perception that the quantity of allotments is insufficient (currently 0.06ha per 1000 population). This is also supported by the presence of waiting lists at the majority of sites across the borough. It is therefore suggested that a standard above the existing level of provision is set.</p> <p>This standard would ensure that deficiencies in the quantity of allotments and access to allotments can be addressed across the borough. Setting a standard at this level would equate to the requirement for an additional 76 allotment plots across the LDF period. This would go some way to offsetting the existing and future unmet demand.</p>

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR CIVIC SPACES						
National Standards	N/A					
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	N/A					
BENCHMARKING	N/A					
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	In total, 32.2% of respondents feel provision of civic spaces is about right and 31% feel there is not enough. This highlights a divide in the opinion of the provision of civic spaces.					
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	2.3%	32.2%	17.5%	31 %	17%
	Telford North West	1.4%	33.1%	19%	25.4%	21.1%
	Telford North East	0%	27.4%	19%	32.6%	21%
	Telford Central	4.4%	32.1%	16.8%	31.4%	15.3%
	Telford South	1.5%	34.8%	15.9%	37.7%	10.1%
	Newport	2.7%	29.7%	18.9%	40.6%	8.1%
	Rural	4.4%	37.8%	13.3%	26.7%	17.8%



	Findings from the individual analysis also portray a divide in opinion, with the majority of respondents in three of the analysis areas stating there is not enough provision and the other three areas indicating provision is about right. Surprisingly, the highest level of satisfaction can be found in the Rural area, where 42.2% of residents indicate provision is about right/more than enough. General comments highlighted a need for more civic spaces, however this was not a significant amount.
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	PPG17 recommends that due to the specific location of civic spaces, there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard.  It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set.
<b>PMP Justification</b>	N/A

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR GREEN CORRIDORS						
National Standards	N/A					
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	N/A					
BENCHMARKING	N/A					
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Results from the household survey show 42.2% of respondents feel the provision of green corridors is about right. However, a significant proportion of respondents (31.3%) feel there are not enough green corridors.					
		More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	3%	42.2%	18.1%	31.3%	5.4%
	Telford North West	2%	46.6%	17.8%	28.8%	4.8%
	Telford North East	1%	41.2%	15.5%	35.1%	7.2%
	Telford Central	3.7%	41.6%	18.3%	32.8%	3.6%
	Telford South	7.3%	34.8%	26.1%	24.6%	7.2%
	Newport	2.8%	47.2%	16.7%	30.5%	2.8%
	Rural	2.2%	39.1%	13%	37%	8.7%
	The individual analysis areas portray similar results and the highest level of satisfaction can be found in Newport					

	<p>where 50% of residents state the provision of green corridors is about right/more than enough. The lowest level of satisfaction is highlighted in the Rural area, where 50% of residents indicate there is nearly enough/not enough provision of this typology. The main barrier to using green corridors was safety concerns, with many residents stating in general comments that they would not use green corridors alone.</p>
<b>Consultation Comments (quantity)</b>	<p>Findings from the Parish Council questionnaires suggest that in terms of quantity, Telford and Wrekin is reasonably well served, with the importance and usage of this typology extremely high. Not only do green corridors serve the needs of several groups including walkers, cyclists and horse riders, but also acts as a link between the different open space sites, helping to create a green network and promoting the 'green feel' within the borough.</p>
<b>'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</b>	<p>PPG17 states that the need for Green Corridors arises from the need to promote environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling within urban areas. This means that there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard, just as there is no way of having a standard for the proportion of land in an area which it will be desirable to allocate for roads.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set.</p>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>N/A</p>

**APPENDIX G**

**TELFORD QUALITY STANDARDS**

## Setting Quality Standards / Vision – Telford and Wrekin

Field	Comment
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. Green Flag criteria for parks produced by Civic Trust
Existing Local Quality Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards
Benchmarking against other authorities for satisfaction of quality	These are figures detailing satisfaction levels of other authorities to the quality of their open space
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations)	Results from the household survey with regards to users of each typology in relation to their aspirations and needs and existing quality experiences
Consultation (other)	Results from all the consultations undertaken with regards the quality issues for each typology
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local quality standard for discussion and approval by the client

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These classifications are set out below:

<b>Cleanliness and maintenance</b>	<b>Vegetation</b>	<b>Ancillary accommodation</b>	<b>Security and safety</b>
Well kept grass	Flowers/Trees	Changing facilities	Welcoming staff

Clean and litter free	Level surface	Parking facilities	Good access
Play equipment	Nature features	Footpaths	On site security
Well laid out		Toilets	
Range of facilities		Seating	
Equipment maintenance		Dog bins	
		Litter bins	
		Information boards	

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

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

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

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

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

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

The percentage response rates above (informed by other consultations) can then be used to determine the relative importance of each component of quality.

Using the example above, it can be seen that for this typology, security and safety are most important, cleanliness and maintenance is second and ancillary accommodation and vegetation are less important.

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

The score for the most valued element will be multiplied by 4

The score for the second most valued aspect will be multiplied by three

The score for the third most valued aspect will be multiplied by two

The score for the fourth element will be multiplied by one.

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

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

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION</b>	
<b>PARKS AND GARDENS</b>	
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.



Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<b>Telford Town Parks Strategic Framework 2006</b>			
	Telford Town Park is a key strategic site within Telford and Wrekin Borough. The aims of the strategy are to:			
	Develop Telford Town Park to provide a public green space and recreational resource of regional significance			
	Achieve sufficient quality of provision to promote the park as a national example of best practice in park design and management			
	Develop a sustainable approach to the evolution of the park to secure its long term role at the heart of Telford Town Centre for future generation			
	Fully integrate the park with any future redevelopment of Telford town centre to improve the spatial and visual relationship between the two and maximise benefit for the park from this relationship.			
	Provide a flexible management tool for Telford Town Park which the Borough of Telford and Wrekin can use to guide future changes within and adjacent the park			
	<b>Parks Strategy 2003 – 2008</b>			
	An objective of the strategy is to establish a qualitative assessment and bench marking systems which will improve the overall <u>quality</u> of parks and recreation grounds.			
	The Green Flag average score for all parks was 36. Scores ranged from 11 – 60, but all failed to meet the pass mark of 65.			
	The strategy aims to make Green Flag Awards for all its park and recreation grounds by 2008 and Telford Town Park should be developed as a flagship for Parks Management and be a key element to the Town Centre Development.			
	Audit of Service Delivery indicates that service satisfaction with parks and open spaces has increased by 2% since 1999 to 64% in 2001.			
	<b>Benchmarking other local authorities satisfaction</b>	<b>Telford – 36% good</b>	North Shropshire – 53 % average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 86% good
		Ryedale – 58% good	Wychavon - 67% good	York – 62% good (parks)
	<b>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated parks and</b>	The household survey reveals that the highest rated aspirations with regards parks and gardens in Telford are: flowers and trees (75%), footpaths (69%), good access (65%), clean and litter free (58%) and litter bins (58%).		

<b>gardens as their most frequently used open space – 20%)</b>	Regarding the quality of parks and gardens, dog fouling (27%) and miss use of site (23%) were considered significant problems. Vandalism and graffiti (41%) and litter problems (40%) were viewed as minor problems. Poor maintenance was stated as no problem by 45% of respondents.
<b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b>	<p>Results from the household survey show a split in opinion regarding the quality of parks and gardens. 36% of respondents feel the quality of this typology is good and 34% feel the quality is average. However, more respondents indicate the quality of parks is very good (14%) than poor (12%). This suggests that overall, there is a positive perception of the quality of parks and gardens in Telford.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas results are consistent with the citywide findings, however in four of the six analysis areas the majority of respondents feel the quality of parks and gardens is average. The highest level of satisfaction is portrayed in the Rural area, where 68% of residents feel the quality of parks and gardens is good/very good.</p> <p>General comments regarding the quality of parks and gardens revolved around a lack of interesting facilities and issues with dog fouling and litter. This emphasises the importance of cleanliness and maintenance to residents, as well as the value placed on the inclusion of a range of different facilities within the site. This supports the perceptions expressed in the household survey.</p> <p>Of those responding to the survey for young people, 27% indicated that parks are their favourite type of open space (the most popular of all the typologies). 41% of respondents to the survey for children stated that parks are their favourite type of open space, again, the highest of all the typologies.</p> <p>Of those respondents to the young peoples survey who stated parks are their favourite type of open space, boring facilities (37%) and litter/untidiness (34%) are the two biggest issues. Overall responses indicate that the quality of parks are average, but are in need of improvements (51%).</p>
<b>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</b>	<p>At drop in sessions residents referred to litter problems experienced by parks and gardens. Vandalism and dog fouling was also seen as problem in Telford Town park and Granville Park. This further reinforces the emphasis placed by local residents on the cleanliness of facilities.</p> <p>A number of residents expressed concern over the knock on effect of the ongoing housing developments, both in terms of there being not enough parks to meet the needs of the increase in population and also the wear and tear effect caused by a greater level of use.</p> <p>Parks were the most popular type of open space from respondents to the IT Young People and Children's surveys, however 51% of respondents stated that the quality of parks are average and are in need of improvements. This links in with the main request from children and young people, namely a greater provision of facilities within this typology. Linking in with other consultation, new provision should be tailored to the needs of the age groups in order to meet demand and aid the reduction in miss use of other typologies.</p> <p>As some of the Parish's responding to the questionnaire do not provide parks they are unable to give any comments</p>

	regarding the quality of this typology. Those Parishes that have parks suggest the current quality is average, with further investment required to update and maintain these open spaces. As the parks are well used and serve a number of purposes it is felt that this typology should be one of the priorities for development.																
PMP Recommendation	<b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b>																
	<b>Essential</b>		<b>Desirable</b>														
	Flowers/Trees		Well Kept Grass														
	Footpaths		Clean/Litter Free														
	Good Access		Litter Bins														
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to parks, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>																
	<table><tr><td><b>Component of quality</b></td><td><b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b></td><td><b>Weighting</b></td></tr><tr><td>Security and Safety</td><td><b>32%</b></td><td><b>1</b></td></tr><tr><td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td><td><b>43%</b></td><td><b>3</b></td></tr><tr><td>Vegetation</td><td><b>52%</b></td><td><b>4</b></td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary accommodation</td><td><b>39%</b></td><td><b>2</b></td></tr></table>			<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	Security and Safety	<b>32%</b>	<b>1</b>	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>43%</b>	<b>3</b>	Vegetation	<b>52%</b>	<b>4</b>	Ancillary accommodation	<b>39%</b>
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>															
Security and Safety	<b>32%</b>	<b>1</b>															
Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>43%</b>	<b>3</b>															
Vegetation	<b>52%</b>	<b>4</b>															
Ancillary accommodation	<b>39%</b>	<b>2</b>															

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>Countryside Agency (now part of the Natural England Partnership) - land should be managed to conserve or enhance its rich landscape, biodiversity, heritage and local customs. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Natural England highlights the need to conserve and protect the natural environment and promotes local community involvement and consultation. They also have a commitment to work with Local Authorities in developing Local Area Agreements (LAA) for improved community infrastructure to enhance access to high quality natural environments</p>		
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	Telford – 38% good	North Shropshire - 48% good	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 60% good
		Wychavon – 51% good	York – 44% average
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p><b>Growing Towards the 2021 Vision – A Tree &amp; Woodland Strategy for The Borough (Consultation Draft) January 2005:</b></p> <p>The strategy acknowledges the value of trees and woodland and their contribution to the character and environment of the Borough and commits to maintain and enhance these areas.</p> <p>The vision of the strategy is: “A landscape rich in trees and woodland, diverse in age range and species, managed sustainably to provide an accessible, safe, attractive and <u>high quality</u> environment for the people and wildlife of the Borough”.</p> <p>A key theme of the strategy is maintenance and the enhancement of natural and semi-natural open space.</p>		
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated natural and semi-natural sites as their most frequently used open space – 31%)	<p>Highest rated aspirations: Nature features (81%), footpaths (67%) and flowers and trees (58%).</p> <p>When asked about the quality of natural and semi-natural sites, 26% of residents indicated that they experience significant litter problems and 26% also felt that dog fouling was very problematic. Few residents highlighted frequent issues with safety and age of equipment and poor maintenance.</p>		
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Natural and semi-natural open space is the most popular typology within Telford and Wrekin, with 58% of residents visiting more than once a month.</p>		

	Findings from the household survey show a split in the perception of the quality of natural and semi-natural areas, with 53% of respondents indicating that the quality is good/very good and 46% stating the quality is average/poor. Across the individual geographical areas similar results are evident and the lowest level of satisfaction is found in Newport, where 50% of residents feel the quality of natural and semi-natural open space is average/poor. A commonly cited problem experienced by users of this typology was litter.
<b>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</b>	<p>Drop in session responses relating to this typology focused more on quantitative issues, however, residents showed an overall satisfaction with the quality of the natural and semi natural areas within Telford and Wrekin. Moreover, due to there aesthetic and recreational value, residents stated a desire to see the maintenance this typology continue, with the provision of footpaths both within and leading to the natural areas key.</p> <p>Respondents to the Parish Council questionnaire regard the quality of natural and semi-natural space to be good. Particular reference was made to the range and variety of these sites and Little Wenlock identified the Wrekin Forest project as improving the local area.</p>

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:																
	Essential		Desirable														
	Nature Features		Good Access														
	Footpaths		Clean/Litter Free														
	Flowers/Trees		Dog Bins														
	<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to natural and semi natural areas, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>																
	<table><tr><td>Component of quality</td><td>Proportion of possible total responses received</td><td>Weighting</td></tr><tr><td>Security and Safety</td><td>22%</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td><td>22%</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Vegetation</td><td>54%</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary accommodation</td><td>29%</td><td>3</td></tr></table>			Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	22%	1	Cleanliness and maintenance	22%	2	Vegetation	54%	4	Ancillary accommodation	29%
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting															
Security and Safety	22%	1															
Cleanliness and maintenance	22%	2															
Vegetation	54%	4															
Ancillary accommodation	29%	3															
<i>Analysis suggests the improvement in quality of natural and semi-natural open space is considered to be more important than increasing its provision.</i>																	
PMP Justification																	

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION AMENITY GREEN SPACE			
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management		
<b>Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction</b>	<b>Telford – 48% average</b>	North Shropshire - 57% average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 56% average
	Ryedale – 49% average	Wychavon – 57% average	York – 50% average
<b>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</b>	No existing local quality standards.		
<b>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated amenity green space sites as their most frequently used open space – 3%)</b>	<p>Amenity green space is one of the least frequently used typologies in Telford and Wrekin and 18% of respondents to the household survey indicated that they never use this type of open space. The highest rated aspirations of those who use amenity spaces were parking facilities (67%), range of facilities (67%) and seating (67%).</p> <p>While litter and poor maintenance were not perceived to be a problem, concerns were expressed regarding miss use of the site and vandalism and graffiti.</p>		
<b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b>	<p>Consultation indicated that the quality of amenity areas is perceived to be average by 42% of household respondents. A higher percentage of people stated that they were good (24%) as opposed to poor (22%).</p> <p>The majority of respondents in four of the six analysis areas indicated the quality of amenity green space as being average. Within the two remaining areas residents felt the quality of this typology was good, with the highest level of satisfaction being located in the Rural area, where 51% of respondents rated the quality of amenity green spaces as good. The lowest level of satisfaction is located in Telford South, where 35% of residents feel the quality of this type of open space is poor.</p> <p>Poor maintenance was highlighted as a barrier to use for this typology within the general comments of the consultation. This contrasts slightly with the views expressed by frequent users of amenity space within the household survey.</p>		
<b>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</b>	<p>The main issue identified by residents at drop in sessions was the need for a balance between quality and quantity. General comments seemed to suggest an overall satisfaction with the current amount of amenity green spaces, however, the issue of poor quality maintenance was raised again as residents indicated a desire to see a focus on a qualitative improvement of this type of open space. Specific requests centred around the provision of benches and general look and feel of the sites including grass cutting, pathways and flower beds.</p> <p>35% of respondents to the IT Young People survey stated that there are enough informal grass areas, whilst 60% of children suggested that there are lots of grass areas. 50% of young people rate the quality of grass areas as average</p>		

	<p>and in need of some improvement. It seems that this relates to the underlying desire of young people to have a range of facilities on site rather than commenting specifically on the maintenance regimes across the borough.</p> <p>57% of children are satisfied with the quality of the grass areas in their locality, stating that they are clean, safe and nice to use. This highlights the importance of cleanliness and perceived safety to children.</p> <p>Amenity green space was considered to be good quality by Parish Councils. However, Great Dawley Parish Council highlighted amenity green space on housing estates requires attention. Respondents emphasised the need for regular maintenance at these sites.</p>																							
PMP Recommendation	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Essential</th><th>Desirable</th></tr><tr><td>Seating</td><td>Footpaths</td></tr><tr><td>Well kept grass</td><td>Flowers/trees</td></tr><tr><td>Clean/Litter Free</td><td>Litter bins</td></tr></table> <p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to amenity green spaces, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table><tr><th>Component of quality</th><th>Proportion of possible total responses received</th><th>Weighting</th></tr><tr><td>Security and Safety</td><td>39%</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td><td>46%</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>Vegetation</td><td>33%</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary accommodation</td><td>50%</td><td>4</td></tr></table> <p><i>Analysis suggests the improvement in quality of amenity green space is considered to be more important than increasing its provision.</i></p>	Essential	Desirable	Seating	Footpaths	Well kept grass	Flowers/trees	Clean/Litter Free	Litter bins	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	39%	2	Cleanliness and maintenance	46%	3	Vegetation	33%	1	Ancillary accommodation	50%	4
Essential	Desirable																							
Seating	Footpaths																							
Well kept grass	Flowers/trees																							
Clean/Litter Free	Litter bins																							
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting																						
Security and Safety	39%	2																						
Cleanliness and maintenance	46%	3																						
Vegetation	33%	1																						
Ancillary accommodation	50%	4																						
PMP Justification																								



<p align="center"><b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN</b></p>	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**National Standards and/or  
Benchmarks**

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

**Telford – 35% average**

North Shropshire - 44% average

Shrewsbury & Atcham - 43% average

Ryedale – 47% average
-----------------------

Wychavon – 44% average

York – 46% average
--------------------

<p><b>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</b></p>	<p>Local Development Framework:</p> <p>The following design criteria (not inclusive) should be taken into account when locating and designing playing spaces for children:</p> <p>Play spaces should be sited on land that is suitable for the type of play space identified. For example, equipped or kick about areas on slopes are inappropriate.</p> <p>Play spaces should not have an adverse impact upon the character or amenity of the local area. For example, they should not be built upon environmentally sensitive land.</p> <p>A wide a range of play opportunities should be provided. Playgrounds should include unobstructed appropriate open space to kick or throw a ball, as well as natural opportunities to play for creative development.</p> <p>Play spaces need to be attractive and safe to encourage children to play there, as well as meet the needs of the wider area, particularly of those people living nearby.</p> <p>Telford and Wrekin Local Play Strategy 2007 – 2011:</p> <p>The Council <i>“is committed to enhancing the quality and quantity of current and future free play provision and equipped play and youth facilities across the Borough”</i>.</p> <p>Telford &amp; Wrekin Play Vision: “All children and young people will be involved in quality play opportunities”.</p> <p>The council aims to meet the NPFA quality design criteria for location and design of new development where possible.</p> <p>Environmental Play - The Council aims to help children understand and feel secure in their surroundings, and to care for the natural and built environment.</p> <p>Maintenance and Inspection - The Council will apply the highest standards of maintenance and inspection to ensure that all formal play areas are safe and continue to meet the needs of children.</p> <p>Protection of exiting play/youth facilities - Where play spaces are proposed to be lost through development, a suitable replacement facility or feature (to the satisfaction of the Council) of <u>equal or greater quality</u> and accessibility is required to be provided, unless highlighted in the Implementation Plan as to be surplus to requirement.</p> <p>Equipment - Equipment will be selected on the basis of quality, best value, safety, durability, play value and visual attractiveness.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p><b>Parks Strategy 2003 – 2008</b></p> <p>Audit of Service Delivery indicates that service satisfaction with play areas and playgrounds has increased from 1999 –2001 to 59%.</p>
<p><b>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated play areas for children sites as their most frequently used open space – 14%)</b></p>	<p>14% of respondents to the household survey use play areas for children most frequently of all typologies. However, it is important to note that the level of use of children's play areas demonstrated through the household survey may not be representative of the actual level of use due to the age of the majority of respondents. Only a small percentage of people under the age of 16 completed the household survey, therefore it is particularly important to consider all other consultation.</p> <p>Of those people stating they do use children's play areas more frequently than any other type of open space, their highest rated aspirations are play equipment (64%), litter bins (58%) and clean and litter free (59%).</p> <p>Of those respondents who gave an opinion regarding the quality of children's open space, safety and age of equipment and poor maintenance were viewed as no problem. However, vandalism and graffiti (44%) and miss use of sites (39%) were believed to be a significant problem experienced by users of this typology.</p> <p>The majority of Parish Council respondents regard the quality of children's play areas to be poor. Only in Little Wenlock are children's play areas regarded to be well maintained. Particular reference was made to aged and damaged equipment and a lack of variety in the facilities provided.</p>
<p><b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b></p>	<p>35% of respondents to the household survey identified the quality of children's open space as average. A significant proportion of residents (26%) also felt the quality of facilities was poor. Across the individual analysis areas the majority of respondents regard the quality of children's open space as average. However, residents in Telford South and the Rural area rate the quality as poor (31%) and good (42%) respectively. This suggests that the quality of provision facilities across Telford is varying.</p> <p>General comments within the household survey produced recurring themes in terms of poor quality facilities. The findings of the household survey reveal that play areas for children in Telford and Wrekin are thought to be lacking in terms of both the number and quality of facilities. This acts as a barrier for residents who wish to access these sites. Further issues surround the miss-use of sites with residents identifying gangs of youths as a particular problem. This issue was highlighted even by residents who do not use play areas themselves. Specific reference was made to the poor quality of Coalbrookdale, Ketley and Randley play areas.</p>
<p><b>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</b></p>	<p>Many residents at drop in sessions expressed concerns that older children use facilities intended for younger children, causing damage and vandalism. It was felt that this may be a consequence of a lack of provision for teenagers. This reflects the views expressed in the household survey, where both users and non users felt that vandalism was a</p>

	<p>problem across these sites. This creates both qualitative and accessibility issues, as the damage and safety concerns act as a barrier to entry.</p> <p>Children responding to the survey indicated that the provision for children across Telford is of good quality; with 53% of respondents indicating that play provision is clean, safe and nice to use. Despite this, when asked to highlight the main problems found in play areas, ‘boring’ play facilities and the number of people using them were the two most common answers. This is reflective of issues identified in other consultations, where the need to ensure that play equipment is varied and challenging was raised. Numerous children also highlighted that there is a need for further play provision, again echoing the findings of respondents to the household survey.</p>																							
PMP Recommendation	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Essential</th><th>Desirable</th></tr><tr><td>Play Equipment</td><td>Well kept grass</td></tr><tr><td>Litter Bins</td><td>Good Access</td></tr><tr><td>Clean/Litter Free</td><td>Equipment maintenance</td></tr></table> <p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to play areas for children, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table><tr><th>Component of quality</th><th>Proportion of possible total responses received</th><th>Weighting</th></tr><tr><td>Security and Safety</td><td>26%</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td><td>42%</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Vegetation</td><td>23%</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary accommodation</td><td>31%</td><td>3</td></tr></table> <p><i>Analysis highlights the need for innovative and imaginative provision of facilities for children. Community involvement from children in the provision of play facilities was also considered to be particularly important.</i></p>	Essential	Desirable	Play Equipment	Well kept grass	Litter Bins	Good Access	Clean/Litter Free	Equipment maintenance	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	26%	2	Cleanliness and maintenance	42%	4	Vegetation	23%	1	Ancillary accommodation	31%	3
Essential	Desirable																							
Play Equipment	Well kept grass																							
Litter Bins	Good Access																							
Clean/Litter Free	Equipment maintenance																							
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting																						
Security and Safety	26%	2																						
Cleanliness and maintenance	42%	4																						
Vegetation	23%	1																						
Ancillary accommodation	31%	3																						
PMP Justification																								

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PROVISION FOR TEENAGERS AND YOUNG PEOPLE			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	NPFA guidance relating to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
	CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti-social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment. Investment: invest in place making and improving public spaces should be used to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space's study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings.' <i>CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces</i>		
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	Telford – 39% poor	North Shropshire - 72% poor	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 62% poor
	Ryedale – 57% poor	Wychavon – 65% poor	York – 64% poor
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	Parks Strategy 2003 – 2008  Best Value Consultation found that facilities for young people are the third worst feature of living in Telford and are in need of improvement. 22.6% of residents feel facilities for young people have got worse.		
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated teenage facilities as their most frequently used open space – 2%)	A small minority of respondents to the household survey use teenage facilities most frequently of all typologies. However, it is important to note that the level of use demonstrated through the household survey may not be representative of the actual level of use due to the age of the majority of respondents (68% of respondents stated that they don't use teenage facilities). Only a small percentage of people under the age of 16 completed the household survey, therefore it is important to consider all other consultations across the borough.		
Consultation Household Survey - other	Overall, the quality of teenage facilities is rated average/poor by 66% of respondents. However, the majority of respondents (39%) indicate that the quality of provision for teenagers is average.  Across the individual analysis areas, the modal response regarding the quality of teenage facilities was poor.		

	<p>Residents in Telford North West portrayed the most dissatisfaction, with 44% of respondents stating the quality of facilities as poor. General comments echoed the perception of teenage open space as being of poor quality and there was a general perception of a distinct lack of teenage facilities in Telford and Wrekin. The variety of provision was also deemed to be poor.</p>
<p><b>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</b></p>	<p>Residents at drop in sessions highlighted a lack of provision and quality of teenage facilities. Particular reference was made to Hollingswood youth shelter, with residents expressing concern over drug use and anti-social behaviour by youths. The provision of a variety of different facilities (through the consultation with local young people) when building new facilities was deemed to be essential, as there are currently either quantitative deficiencies or qualitative issues regarding the youth facilities not being fit for purpose, leading to the vandalism of these sites or the miss use of other typologies.</p> <p>Young people responding to the IT Young people survey indicated that on the whole, facilities are perceived to be of average quality and requiring improvements. The quantity of provision was perceived to be a far greater issue, with teenagers wanting local facilities. The key issues highlighted regarding the quality of provision was a lack of variety of facilities. Many young people indicated that existing provision is boring.</p> <p>Similar to Parish Council responses for children's facilities, teenage open space was considered to be of poor quality. Only in Little Wenlock was the teenage shelter identified to be of good quality.</p>

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:		
	Essential		Desirable
	Equipment		Equipment maintenance
	Good access		Clean/Litter Free
	Range of facilities		Litter bins
	Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to facilities for young people, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:		
PMP Justification	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
	Security and Safety	46%	3
	Cleanliness and maintenance	52%	4
	Vegetation	29%	1
	Ancillary accommodation	41%	2
Analysis highlights the need for innovative and imaginative provision of facilities for teenagers. Community involvement from teenagers in the provision of facilities was also considered to be particularly important.			

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES			
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction	Telford – 39% average	North Shropshire - 48% average	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 45% good
	Ryedale – 41% average	Wychavon – 52% average	York – 50% average
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	No existing local quality standards.		
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated outdoor sports facility sites as their most frequently used open space – 10%)	<p>Of those people indicating that they use this open space most frequently the highest rated aspirations were: Well kept grass (62%), parking facilities (62%), toilets (62%) and good access (51%). This highlights the importance of the ancillary accommodation as well as the quality of the actual facility.</p> <p>A significant proportion of residents have experienced minor problems in relation to vandalism and graffiti (40%), litter problems (29%) and miss use of sites (29%). In contrast, safety and age of the equipment, poor maintenance and dog fouling were not considered problematic.</p>		
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Responses from the household survey show mixed opinions concerning the quality of outdoor sports facilities. 39% of respondents rate their quality as average, 24% poor and 23% good. This may be reflective of varying quality around the borough.</p> <p>The individual geographical areas provide similar results and the majority of respondents in five of the six analysis areas consider the quality of outdoor sports facilities to be average. Only in Telford North East do the majority of residents (33%) feel the quality of outdoor sports facilities is good.</p>		
Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)	<p>Not only did respondents to the IT Young People survey suggest a need for more outdoor sports facilities, but also a need to improve the quality of existing sites (41%). This again links back to the question asked regarding one improvement respondents would like to see to open space, sport and recreation facilities, with 36% stating a desire to have a better range of facilities.</p> <p>25% of respondents to the Children's survey stated on occasions, outdoor sports facilities suffer from litter and untidiness, with the suggestion that improvements could be made. However, 54% of children felt that outdoor sports facilities in Telford are clean, safe and nice to use.</p> <p>Parish Council respondents identified school outdoor sports facilities as excellent quality. Those sites located outside schools were considered to be of good quality. Great Dawley highlighted The Phoenix as a vital facility in Telford and</p>		



	Wrekin, providing the opportunity for local people to access good quality sports facilities.																
PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:																
	<table><tr><td>Essential</td><td>Desirable</td></tr><tr><td>Well kept grass</td><td>Clean/Litter free</td></tr><tr><td>Toilets</td><td>Parking facilities</td></tr><tr><td>Good access</td><td>Changing facilities</td></tr></table>			Essential	Desirable	Well kept grass	Clean/Litter free	Toilets	Parking facilities	Good access	Changing facilities						
	Essential	Desirable															
	Well kept grass	Clean/Litter free															
	Toilets	Parking facilities															
	Good access	Changing facilities															
Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to outdoor sports facilities, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:																	
<table><tr><td>Component of quality</td><td>Proportion of possible total responses received</td><td>Weighting</td></tr><tr><td>Security and Safety</td><td>39%</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td><td>41%</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Vegetation</td><td>24%</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary accommodation</td><td>40%</td><td>3</td></tr></table>			Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting	Security and Safety	39%	2	Cleanliness and maintenance	41%	4	Vegetation	24%	1	Ancillary accommodation	40%	3
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting															
Security and Safety	39%	2															
Cleanliness and maintenance	41%	4															
Vegetation	24%	1															
Ancillary accommodation	40%	3															
PMP Justification																	

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION ALLOTMENTS			
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.		
<b>Benchmarking other Local Authorities satisfaction</b>	<b>Telford – 42% average</b>	North Shropshire - 47% poor	Shrewsbury & Atcham - 48% average
	Ryedale -	Wychavon – 54% average	York – 55% average
<b>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</b>	No existing local quality standards.		
<b>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated allotment sites as their most frequently used open space – 1%)</b>	<p>Only 1% of respondents to the household survey stated they use allotments most frequently of all open space in Telford and Wrekin. 89% of respondents also indicated they do not use an allotment.</p> <p>Of those residents who do use an allotment, many people commented on how they enjoy the tranquillity of the site and the social element of working on an allotment.</p> <p>Residents who currently use an allotment indicated that toilets, security, access and good quality paths were of particular importance to them.</p>		
<b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b>	<p>The majority of respondents (42%) consider the quality of allotments to be average. 23% regard their quality as good and 21% poor.</p> <p>The individual analysis areas mirror the citywide results and the greatest dissatisfaction is located in Telford South, where 47% of residents state the quality of allotments is poor/very poor.</p>		
<b>Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)</b>	<p>During the drop in sessions, Stirchley allotments was pointed out as an example of good practice, providing excellent access for the disabled with raised plots and wider walkways to aid wheel chair access. Although the general quality of allotments was deemed to be good, residents stated many of the qualitative improvements have been down to plot holders themselves, taking ownership of the sites and pride in the appearance of the surrounding areas. Residents stated a desire to have greater security to avoid trespassing on the sites, which has lead to miss use and vandalism. The need for further investment in ancillary accommodation was also mentioned specifically during the drop in sessions. Further comments centred around quantitative deficiencies rather than any qualitative issues.</p> <p>A lack of comments regarding the quality of allotments was provided by Parish Council questionnaires. Specifically, Madeley and Wrockwardine Wood and Trench considered the quality of allotments to be good and Great Dawley stated allotments were a priority for development in Telford and Wrekin.</p>		

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:		
	Essential		Desirable
	Toilets		Footpaths
	Security		Clean/Litter free
	Good access		Maintenance
	Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to allotments, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:		
	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
	Security and Safety	40%	4
	Cleanliness and maintenance	20%	2
Vegetation	7%	1	
Ancillary accommodation	33%	3	
PMP Justification			

<b>TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION GREEN CORRIDORS</b>	
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Countryside Agency (now a key partner in Natural England)- what the user should expect to find is i) a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation; ii) ground not soft enough to allow a horse or cycle to sink into it; iii) a path on unvegetated natural surfaces.</p> <p>Natural England, the Countryside Agency and the British Heart Foundation advocate providing a network of local health walks to promote the 'Walking the Way to Health Initiative', something that can easily be enhanced through the provision of quality green corridors and natural linkages with other open spaces.</p>
<b>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</b>	No existing local quality standards.
<b>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated green corridors as their most frequently used open space – 3%)</b>	<p>Of those respondents who stated they use green corridors most frequently, their highest rated aspirations are: Footpaths (88%), nature features (75%), flowers and trees (56%) and clean and litter free (50%).</p> <p>The most significant problems experienced by users of these sites were dog fouling (31%) and miss use of site (25%). Litter was also viewed as a minor problem (31%) while safety and age of equipment (44%) and poor maintenance (31%) were considered no problem.</p>
<b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b>	<p>Overall, 38% of respondents to the household survey stated that the quality of green corridors in Telford and Wrekin is average, with 36% regarding their quality as good.</p> <p>Similar results are shown in the individual analysis areas, with the exception of Newport and the Rural area, where the majority of residents indicated the quality of green corridors is good.</p> <p>Within the general comments, residents expressed safety concerns as the main barrier to using this type of open space.</p>
<b>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</b>	<p>The general consensus gathered from Parish Council questionnaires was that green corridors are good quality, with the exception of Madeley, where green corridors were considered to be of poor quality. This typology was deemed to be of great importance, providing links between different open spaces and settlements, therefore, the maintenance of this typology is essential.</p> <p>The findings at the drop in sessions reiterated the comments received from the parish council questionnaire and the</p>

	household survey, although the general consensus was that the quality of this typology was good. The importance it has for the community means that maintenance regimes should be ongoing and improved where possible.															
PMP Recommendation	<p><b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b></p>															
	<table><tr><td><b>Essential</b></td><td><b>Desirable</b></td></tr><tr><td>Footpaths</td><td>Clean/Litter free</td></tr><tr><td>Nature features</td><td>Good access</td></tr><tr><td>Flowers and trees</td><td></td></tr></table>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>	Footpaths	Clean/Litter free	Nature features	Good access	Flowers and trees								
	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Desirable</b>														
	Footpaths	Clean/Litter free														
	Nature features	Good access														
	Flowers and trees															
	<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to green corridors, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>															
	<table><tr><td><b>Component of quality</b></td><td><b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b></td><td><b>Weighting</b></td></tr><tr><td>Security and Safety</td><td>25%</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td><td>26%</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Vegetation</td><td>56%</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary accommodation</td><td>27%</td><td>3</td></tr></table>	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	Security and Safety	25%	1	Cleanliness and maintenance	26%	2	Vegetation	56%	4	Ancillary accommodation	27%	3
<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>														
Security and Safety	25%	1														
Cleanliness and maintenance	26%	2														
Vegetation	56%	4														
Ancillary accommodation	27%	3														
PMP Justification																

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION CIVIC SPACES	
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	NONE
<b>Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context</b>	No existing local quality standards.
<b>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated civic spaces as their most frequently used open space – 2%)</b>	<p>Of those respondents who stated they use green corridors most frequently, their highest rated aspirations are: Parking facilities, good access, seating and information boards.</p> <p>Minor problems experienced by users were litter problems and vandalism and graffiti.</p>
<b>Consultation Household Survey - other</b>	<p>Consultation from the household survey indicates the majority of respondents (45%) view civic spaces to be of average quality. However, 23% rate this typology as good quality and 20% poor quality.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas results are consistent and the area with the highest level of satisfaction is the Rural area, where 38% of respondents feel the quality of civic spaces is good/very good. General comments made by residents support the majority perception of civic spaces being of average quality and a number of comments made referred to the lack of good quality civic spaces. This suggests that residents place an emphasis on the quality of civic spaces as opposed to the quantity.</p>
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>When asked to give comments relating to the quality of civic spaces, residents attending the drop in sessions discussed the aesthetic importance of this typology, particularly as both residents and tourists use civic spaces. Bearing this in mind, specific comments centred around the need for these areas to be clean and litter free, and the provision of information boards for residents and visitors alike.</p>

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:		
	Essential		Desirable
	Information boards		Clean/Litter free
	Good access		Seating
	Parking facilities		Flowers/trees
	Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to civic spaces, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:		
	Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
	Security and Safety	33%	2
	Cleanliness and maintenance	38%	3
Vegetation	19%	1	
Ancillary accommodation	46%	4	
PMP Justification			

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	NONE
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p><b>Telford Indoor Sports and Physical Activity Facilities Draft Strategy 2007:</b></p> <p>The vision of the strategy is: <i>“To create a network of inclusive <u>high quality</u> community and specialist sport and physical activity facilities within Telford and Wrekin that will encourage an increase in its communities physical activity levels, and enhance the quality of life of existing and future communities”</i></p> <p>All nine council leisure facilities are Quest accredited, four of which are highly commended. In terms of the CPA accessibility target, 52.7% of the population within Telford and Wrekin reside within 20 minutes travel time of a range of three different sports facility types of which one has achieved a quality assured standard.</p>
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated indoor sports facilities as their most frequently used open space – 13%)	<p>Although 56% of respondents to the household survey stated they rarely use/do not use indoor sports facilities, a significant proportion of residents (13%) indicated they use this type of open space most frequently. This highlights the nature of indoor sports facilities as being very much demand led typologies.</p> <p>The highest rated aspirations for users of indoor sports facilities are: Welcoming staff (65%), parking facilities (65%), toilets (57%), changing facilities (49%) and good access (48%). Minor problems experienced by users were vandalism and graffiti, poor maintenance and miss use of site. Factors not considered problematic were safety and age of equipment and litter problems.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>37% of respondents rate the quality of indoor sports facilities as average, with 28% considering them to be of good quality. Only 6% of residents regard indoor sports facilities to be poor quality.</p> <p>The borough wide results are reflected within the individual analysis areas, where the majority of residents in all analysis areas view the quality of indoor sports facilities to be average. Residents in the rural area portrayed the highest dissatisfaction, with 39% of respondents stating indoor sports facilities to be poor quality.</p> <p>Barriers to using indoor sports facilities were identified as price, a lack of access (with swimming pools only available for use by schools during the day) and poor public transport links. A lack of a direct transport link to Wellington swimming and leisure facilities was highlighted as a particular issue.</p> <p>Respondents from the young people survey suggest that the quality of indoor facilities is average, but are in need of some improvements (28%), 38% stated that they did not know, the highest of all the answers. This may indicate that few children and young people use indoor sports facilities.</p>



	At drop in sessions, residents' comments were directed towards quantitative deficiencies rather than qualitative issues. Those who did discuss the quality of indoor facilities stated a need to improve the ancillary facilities such as toilets and changing rooms. Several residents claimed not to be able to give an opinion, again reinforcing indoor sports facilities position as a demand led typology.		
Consultation			
PMP Recommendation	<b>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</b>		
	<b>Essential</b>		<b>Desirable</b>
	Parking facilities		Good access
	Toilets		Equipment maintenance
	Changing facilities		Range of facilities
PMP Justification	<b><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to indoor sports facilities, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></b>		
	<b>Component of quality</b>	<b>Proportion of possible total responses received</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
	Security and Safety	<b>45%</b>	<b>4</b>
	Cleanliness and maintenance	<b>34%</b>	<b>2</b>
	Vegetation	<b>11%</b>	<b>1</b>
	Ancillary accommodation	<b>37%</b>	<b>3</b>

TELFORD AND WREKIN – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION CHURCHYARDS AND CEMETERIES	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	NONE
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated indoor sports facilities as their most frequently used open space – 1%)	<p>The highest rated aspirations of those people who use churchyards and cemeteries most frequently are: Well kept grass, clean and litter free, flowers and trees and good access.</p> <p>Factors considered problematic by users of this typology are vandalism and graffiti and poor maintenance. Miss use of site was not considered to be a problem.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>45% of respondents rate the quality of cemeteries and churchyards to be of average quality. However, a significant amount of respondents also rate their quality to be good (23%).</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas similar results are portrayed, with the majority of residents in each analysis area stating the quality of cemeteries and churchyards is average.</p> <p>Specific reference was made to St George's cemetery being in a poor condition and that there is no public transport near Telford cemetery.</p> <p>Residents at drop in sessions made a number of comments regarding quality issues with cemeteries and churchyards. In particular there was a general consensus that good maintenance and appearance of this typology was important accompanied with a range of ancillary features, such as seating and footpaths.</p>
Consultation	

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:		
	Essential		Desirable
	Seating		Well kept grass
	Footpaths		Flowers/trees
	Clean/Litter free		Litter bins
	Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to cemeteries and churchyards, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:		
	Component of quality		Proportion of possible total responses received
Security and Safety		33%	1
Cleanliness and maintenance		50%	4
Vegetation		44%	3
Ancillary accommodation		33%	2
PMP Justification			

**APPENDIX H**

**TELFORD ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS**

## Setting Accessibility Standards – Telford and Wrekin Council

Field	Comment
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. Natural England make recommendations of access for 'Natural Greenspace'
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (set by PMP)</b>	These are figures detailing other local standards set by PMP within other green space and open space projects and provide another comparison benchmark when setting local standards for other Local Authorities.
<b>Consultation (Household Survey - establish 75% threshold catchments)</b>	Some statistical information that will come from the household questionnaire - need to take the 75% level as recommended by PPG 17 Companion Guide (ie from a list of responses - what is the time 75% are willing to travel)
<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	PMP recommendation of a local standard for discussion and approval by the client - standard should be in time and/or distance
<b>PMP Justification</b>	PMP reasoning and justification for the local standard that has been recommended
<b>CLIENT APPROVAL</b>	Client to approve local standard before analysis undertaken - any changes in standards at a later date during the project will impact on re-doing calculations, analysis and report - the standards drive the analysis
<b>LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD</b>	Final Local Standard agreed and approved that will be stated in the report and used for analysis purposes - standard should be in time and/or distance

## Accessibility standards – assumptions

<b>Walking</b>	<b>All areas</b>	<b>average of 3mph</b>
----------------	------------------	------------------------

## Conversion (walking)

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

## Assumption

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

**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS  
PARKS AND GARDENS**

<b>Definition</b>	Includes urban parks, formal gardens and country parks. Parks usually contain a variety of facilities, and may have one of more of the other types of open space within them. Their primary purpose is informal recreation.		
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	No national standards		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	<p><b>Telford and Wrekin Community Strategy 2006 –2011:</b></p> <p>A key action of the strategy is to implement the Town Park strategic framework and improve <u>access</u> to town parks. No specific standards or targets are set,</p> <p><b>Heart and Soul – Telford and Wrekin Cultural Strategy 2001 – 2006:</b></p> <p>The strategy aims to, ‘<i>Establish a wider range of <u>accessible</u> cultural, recreational and leisure activities in the community</i>’.</p>		
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b>	<b>Telford – 15 minute walk time (Urban), 20 minute drive time (Rural)</b>	North Shropshire – 15 minute walk time	Shrewsbury – 15 minute walk time
	Ryedale – 30 minute drive time (Town), 15 minute walk time (Local)	Wychavon – 15 minute walk time	York – 20 minute walk time (City), 15 minute walk time (Local)

## Consultation

### **HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS**

20% of respondents to the household survey use parks and gardens more frequently than any other typology in Telford and Wrekin. Of these respondents, a significant majority (69%) walk to this type of open space, with 26% indicating they travel by car.

When asked how far they currently travel to use parks and gardens, travel times were split between three responses, between 5 and 10 minutes (35%), less than 5 minutes (25%) and between 11 and 15 minutes (21%).

### **HOUSEHOLD SURVEY - PREFERRED METHOD OF TRAVEL**

Results from the household survey indicate 63% of respondents expect to walk to parks and gardens and 26% favour driving. Across the individual analysis areas similar results are portrayed, with the majority of respondents in all areas stating walking as the preferred method of travel. However, in the rural analysis area a significantly higher proportion of residents (44%) indicate a preference to travel by car to access this type of open space. This indicates that there is an acceptance by residents in the rural area that parks may not be located in close proximity to their homes.

For those respondents who prefer to walk to parks and gardens a journey time of 5 – 10 minutes is expected (62%). When travelling by car, the majority of respondents (51%) also expected the journey to take 5 –10 minutes. Results across the analysis areas are consistent with the borough wide results, with the exception of the rural area, where the majority of car users (42%) expect a journey time between 16 and 20 minutes, suggesting poorer accessibility to parks and gardens within the rural areas of Telford and Wrekin.

Borough wide results show that 75% of respondents are willing to travel for 15 minutes by foot to access this typology, with the modal response being 10 minutes. This is consistent across all of the analysis areas, with the exception of Telford North East and Telford Central, where respondents were willing to travel for 10 minutes and 16 minutes respectively.

For those who prefer to travel by car, 75% of respondents would be willing to travel for 20 minutes to access a park or garden in Telford and Wrekin, with the modal response rate being 10 minutes. Within the individual analysis areas differing results are evident. In Telford Central and Telford South residents indicate a willingness to travel for up to 15 minutes, in Telford North East 18 minutes and in Telford North West and the Rural area 20 minutes. This highlights that of those residents who prefer to drive, those residing in the urban area expect to drive a shorter distance than those living in the rural area.

### **OTHER CONSULTATIONS**

The findings from the IT Young People survey and the Children's survey reveals that parks are the most popular type of open space, sport and recreation facilities. Moreover, 80% of young people and 52% of children would expect to walk to their favourite open space. When asked specifically what they like the most about their favourite type of open space, 53% of young people stated the fact that it is close to their home, thus reinforcing the importance of local access for people of this age group.



<b>Consultation Comments</b>	<p>Residents at drop in sessions felt that there is a requirement for not only large, centrally located parks and gardens but also smaller facilities, accessible on foot to local communities. Most residents indicated they would be willing to travel further to reach larger strategic parks e.g. Telford Town Park than to small local parks.</p> <p>Responses from the Parish Council questionnaires highlighted that there are perceived to be areas deficient in parks and gardens. General comments from the questionnaires suggested that the accessibility of parks and gardens is average or poor, with reasons being locality and the need for better public transport.</p>
------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<p><b>15 MINUTE WALK TIME (720 METRES) – URBAN</b></p> <p><b>20 MINUTE DRIVE TIME - RURAL</b></p>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>There is an emphasis in favour of walking to local parks and gardens both in terms of current travel patterns and expectations. The standard for urban areas is therefore set at 15 minutes (720 metres) walking to local parks and gardens, based on the 75% threshold level borough wide (as advocated in the PPG17 companion guide). This encompasses all areas and is representative of the viewpoint of residents of all areas (due to the number of responses this information can be said to be statistically robust). While the mode is 10 minutes, setting the standard at 15 minutes provides a more realistic target and is in line with the 75% threshold,</p> <p>Given that parks tend to be larger more strategic facilities offering a range of activities it would not be realistic to expect this type of facility within a shorter walking time and also within each village, therefore, a drive time of 20 minutes has been set for the rural areas, in light of the findings from the household survey. This is supported by the consultation undertaken in the rural area, where it can be seen that residents expect to travel by car, with the 75% level being 20 minutes.</p> <p>Setting separate accessibility standards is reflective of the fact that further provision should be made within the urban areas that are currently outside of the proposed accessibility catchment due to the density of population in these areas. This is not to suggest that the Council should not be pursuing improvements to the accessibility of these areas for rural residents (such as public transport networks etc), but rather offers an approach that facilitates the usage of these areas and increases their value locally.</p> <p>Setting a standard at this level will enable the Council to strike a balance between quantitative improvements in accessibility deficient areas and also on improving the quality of existing sites.</p>

<b>Client Approval</b>	<b>Local Accessibility Standard</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------------

**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL– SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS  
NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL OPEN SPACE**

<b>Definition</b>	Includes publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (e.g. downlands, commons, meadows), wetlands and wastelands.		
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	<p>English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends at least 2 ha of accessible natural greenspace per 1,000 people based on no-one living more than: 300m from nearest natural greenspace / 2km from a site of 20ha / 5km from a site of 100ha / 10km from a site of 500ha. Woodland Trust Access Standards recommend that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size and that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people's homes</p> <p>Natural England have a commitment to champion preventative health solutions in the natural environment and have adopted an objective of providing accessible natural space within 300 metres (or 5 minutes walk) of every home in England for exercise, relaxation and wellbeing. <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/pdf/campaigns/Health_card.pdf">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/pdf/campaigns/Health_card.pdf</a></p>		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	No existing local accessibility standards.		
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b>	<b>Telford – 10 minute walk time</b>	North Shropshire – 15 minute walk time	Shrewsbury – 15 minute walk time
	Ryedale – 30 minutes drive time (Sites over 5ha), 15 minute walk time (Local)	Wychavon –15 minute walk time	York – 15 minute walk time

## Consultation

### **CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS**

Natural and semi-natural open space is the most popular typology in Telford and Wrekin, with 31% of residents stating they use it more frequently than any other open space. Within this group of regular natural and semi natural open space users, walking is the most common mode of travel used to access sites (74%). Using the car is second with 22%. Travel times of current users were evenly distributed over two timeframes; 0-5 minutes (38%) and 5-10 minutes (36%).

### **PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL**

Similar to the patterns exhibited by regular users, 64% of respondents expect to walk and 24% expect to travel by car to natural and semi-natural open space.

Of those who would expect to walk to a natural and semi natural open space, 60% would be willing to travel between 5-10 minutes. Of those respondents who would prefer to drive, 51% expect a journey to take between 5 and 10 minutes. All of these figures are consistent across all of the analysis areas.

It can be calculated that 75% of the total population would be willing to travel 15 minutes on foot to this type of open space (The modal response is a 10 minute walk time). Analysis of the five individual analysis areas shows identical results in terms of the 75% threshold and the modal response, with the exception of Newport and the Rural area, where residents are willing to travel for 16 minutes to access this type of open space.

### **OTHER CONSULTATIONS**

Responses from the Parish Council questionnaires indicate a general satisfaction with the level of accessible natural and semi natural open space, aided by the current quantitative provision. Any negative comments centred on the amount of busy roads required to cross in order to access this typology, Ketley Parish Council also indicated a need to improve the signage as some areas are unknown to residents.

Reiterating the findings of the Parish Council questionnaires, general comments from the drop in sessions indicated an overall satisfaction with the level of accessible natural and semi natural open spaces. Residents stated an expectation to walk to this type of open space, and highlighted concerns regarding current housing developments and the impact this may have on the distance needed to travel in the future.

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>10 MINUTE (480 METRES) WALK TIME</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>Local consultation serves to highlight the split in opinion regarding whether natural and semi natural sites should be accessed by walking or driving (24% of respondents would travel by car, whilst 64% of people stated that they would travel by foot). To a certain extent, this will relate to the varying size and function of spaces within each locality.</p> <p>An assessment of the 75% threshold level borough wide suggests that residents are willing to walk up to 15 minutes to a natural and semi natural open space, however, the modal response time was 10 minutes and current usage patterns show 74% of residents currently travel between 0-10 minutes to access natural and semi natural sites, Furthermore, expectations show that of those who would walk to a natural and semi natural open space, 60% would be willing to travel between 5-10 minutes. Given the high level of agreement from respondents to the household survey (namely the current usage patterns and the expectations of residents) regarding the appropriateness of a 10 minute (480 metre) walk time, it is recommended that the standard should be set at this level.</p> <p>A drive time standard would produce a significantly larger distance threshold than a walk time standard. PPG17 states that higher thresholds may be appropriate if there is no realistic possibility of sufficient new provision to allow lower thresholds to be achievable, but can result in levels of provision that are too low and may not meet some local needs. In the context of the local consultation findings regarding the quantity of provision (33% think that there is not enough as opposed to only 5% who think there is more than enough) and given the importance of facilitating everyday contact with nature, a standard based on a walk time is recommended as this will help to deliver a greater number of localised natural and semi natural spaces.</p>
<b>Client Approval</b>	<b>Local Accessibility Standard</b>

**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS  
AMENITY GREEN SPACE**

<b>Definition</b>	Most commonly but not exclusively found in housing areas. Includes informal recreation green spaces and village greens.		
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	No national standards		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	No existing local accessibility standards.		
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b>	<b>Telford – 10 minute walk time</b>	North Shropshire – 10 minute walk time	Shrewsbury – 10 minute walk time
	Ryedale – 10 minute walk	Wychavon – 10 minute walk time	York – 5 minute walk time
<b>Consultation</b>	<p><b><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u></b> A small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (3%), it is therefore difficult to produce sound analysis on current usage patterns based on the sample size provided, a more detailed analysis is given below in terms of expected mode of transport and travel time in relation to all respondents. Analysis of the regularity of use of amenity spaces indicates that amenity spaces are less frequently used than other typologies, with many having a wider landscape value rather than recreational use.</p> <p><b><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u></b> When accessing amenity areas the majority of people would prefer to walk (57%), with 72% of respondents stating a journey should take between 5-10 minutes. The figures relating to preferred travel patterns and length of journey are similar in all areas, with the exception of the Rural area (however significant conclusions cannot be drawn from this due to the relatively low number of responses).</p> <p>Using the borough wide results, it can be calculated that 75% of the total population would travel 15 minutes on foot to amenity areas, however the most common travel time stated is 10 minutes walk-time. Analysis of the individual areas highlights the common travel time by foot as 10 minutes in Telford North West, Telford Central and Telford South. However, in Telford North East and Newport residents are willing to travel on foot for up to 18 minutes and 15 minutes to access an amenity green space. For those residents who prefer to travel by car, borough wide results show 75% are prepared to travel for 15 minutes. However, across the individual analysis areas residents located in Telford North West and Telford Central are willing to travel for 10 minutes and Telford Central and Telford South 20 minutes. This highlights a variation in local expectations. This variation is potentially reflective of the existing distribution of provision.</p> <p><b><u>OTHER CONSULTATIONS</u></b> Due to the split in opinion over the quantity of amenity green space, there was also a split in opinion regarding the accessibility of amenity green space. Those parishes that stated the level of provision was good also suggested there was no problem with accessibility. The opposite can be said for those parishes that stated the level of provision was poor, for example Church Aston and Rodington, who suggested residents face accessibility issues including longer travel times and have busy roads to negotiate.</p>		

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>10 MINUTE (480 METRES) WALK TIME</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>Given the large emphasis on walking rather than driving in terms of the expectations of respondents it is suggested that a walking standard is set. The expressed desire for local amenity space throughout consultations supports the perception that a standard based on travelling on foot is most appropriate.</p> <p>At a borough wide level, the 75% threshold from the household survey of 15 minutes walk is higher than the modal response (10 minutes). Whilst setting a standard based on the 75% threshold level of a 15 minute walk time has been considered, this has to be rationalised against the local nature of amenity green spaces and the aspiration of residents for these local open spaces through consultation. In the absence of other forms of open space, sport and recreation provision within close proximity of residents, the value of localised amenity green spaces is particularly important. This was particularly apparent during consultation with children and young people as great emphasis was placed on the importance of the provision of local open spaces.</p> <p>Applying a shorter walk time will highlight real priority areas of deficiency. Furthermore, whilst having a smaller distance threshold will reveal a larger number of accessibility deficiencies, within these areas the provision of alternative forms of open space can often substitute for provision of informal amenity green spaces. A smaller accessibility catchment will ensure all residents have local access to some type of open space, facilitating delivery of increased participation in sport and physical activity. The importance of local provision to break up the urban landscape should also not be underestimated.</p>

<b>Client Approval</b>	<b>Local Accessibility Standard</b>

**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS**  
**PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN**

<b>Definition</b>	Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children below aged 12. While it is recognised that a wide variety of opportunities for children exist (including play schemes and open spaces not specifically designed for this purpose), as per PPG17, this typology considers only those spaces specifically designed as equipped play facilities. Within this study, play provision for children includes only equipped play areas (i.e. LEAPS and NEAPS) which are designed for children.
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	<p><b><u>NPFA</u></b>  LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p> <p>NEAPs aged min 8; min area size 1000msq; should be located 1,000 metres or 15 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (600 metres in a straight line)</p>

<p><b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b></p>	<p>Local Development Framework:</p> <p>The following design criteria (not inclusive) should be taken into account when locating and designing playing spaces for children:</p> <p>All play spaces should be accessible by safe, practical routes.</p> <p>All play spaces should be sited in welcoming, open areas, not on backland or land that is un-developable for other purposes.</p> <p>Play spaces should be accessible from pedestrian routes and away from major vehicle movement.</p> <p>Play spaces should be sited on land that is suitable for the type of play space identified. For example, equipped or kick about areas on slopes are inappropriate.</p> <p>Play spaces should, where possible, be over-looked by houses or well-used pedestrian routes, but also be far enough away from houses to reduce the likelihood of general disturbance. A buffer of a minimum of 20 metres from the edge of LEAP fence to residential property and in the case of a NEAP 30 metres away from the equipment to the nearest residential property.</p> <p>Telford and Wrekin Play Strategy 2007 –2017:</p> <p>All Play Opportunities will be freely accessible, free of charge and children and young people will have the freedom to come and go.</p> <p>The strategy aims to:</p> <p>Provide more and better local and inclusive play opportunities where they are most needed.</p> <p>Improve children's access to safe places to play and socialise.</p>		
<p><b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b></p>	<p><b>Telford – 10 minute walk time</b></p>	<p>North Shropshire – 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>Shrewsbury – 10 minute walk time</p>
	<p>Ryedale – 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>Wychavon – 10 minute walk time</p>	<p>York – 10 minute walk time</p>



## Consultation

### **CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS**

A relatively small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (14%), this may be due to the fact that it is very specific to its function. When accessing this type of open space 77% of these respondents stated walking was their current method of travel.

In terms of length of journey, results showed an even split over three time frames; 0-5 minutes (41%), 5-10 minutes (30%) and 11-15 minutes (20%), thus displaying a flexibility in terms of how far people currently travel to this type of open site. This may be influenced by the location of existing facilities.

### **PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL**

Similar to the patterns exhibited by regular users, responses from the household survey regarding preferred methods of travel to this type of open space highlighted that 84% of residents expected to walk. Expectations in terms of travel time show a clearer pattern than for those of regular users, with 82% of people expecting the journey to take 5-10 minutes.

Consideration of travel expectations across the analysis areas shows almost identical figures to those collated at the borough-wide level – a typical example being Telford North West, where 84% of respondents stated walking was their preferred method of travel with 82% of these people suggesting a typical journey should take between 5-10 minutes. There are very few differences between the urban and rural areas indicating that all residents expect to find play areas local to their home.

Using the borough wide results, it can be calculated that 75% of the total population would travel 10 minutes on foot to children's play areas and this is supported through the most common travel time of 10 minutes walk time. This is also consistent when analysed on an area-by-area basis, with the exception of Newport, which had a slightly higher travel time of 11 minutes.

### **OTHER CONSULTATION**

The IT for young people and children surveys highlighted the importance of local facilities, with many local children indicating that a key determinant of which facilities they use was the location (23%). Distance from home was perceived to be a greater barrier to usage than cost or poor quality facility provision.

Residents attending drop in sessions highlighted accessibility deficiencies for this typology, parents in particular commented on the barriers presented by main roads and distances to travel. These issues may arise on some occasions as a direct result of a lack of facilities. Concerns over the perceived safety of equipment and miss use of sites may also act as a further deterrent to usage.

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>10 MINUTE (480 METRES) WALK TIME</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>The majority of respondents to the household questionnaire indicate that they would expect to walk to a children's play facility (84%). Furthermore, the distances parents are willing to let their children travel unaccompanied from their homes to play facilities has reduced as concerns over safety have grown, facilities should therefore be in close proximity to the home. However, PPG17 suggests that distance thresholds should be reflective of the maximum distance that typical users can reasonably be expected to travel. The 75% threshold level for children using the responses from the household survey was a 10 minute (480 metre) walk time across the Borough. This figure was consistent across all analysis areas with the exception of Newport (11 minutes), indicating an overall consensus of opinion. Furthermore the modal response was also a 10 minute walk time (consistent across all of the geographical areas).</p> <p>Setting the standard in accordance with the 75% threshold level is advocated in PPG17. Moreover, a larger accessibility catchment provides greater flexibility in terms of striking a balance between qualitative and quantitative improvements in provision. Where a 5 minute catchment would place a greater requirement on new provision, local consultation also revealed the importance of high quality sites and not just new facilities. The Council should continually seek to promote measures designed to improve accessibility, such as better public transport or cycling routes.</p> <p>A standard of 10 minutes (480 metre) walk time therefore meets user expectations and provides a realistic target for implementation. Furthermore, this local standard encompasses all types of provision for children, including the larger, more strategic sites that people could be expected to travel further to visit. The provision of local facilities meets with the aspirations of children and ensures that the use of these play facilities is maximized. It will be important to consider the provision of play facilities in the context of amenity open spaces and other typologies providing more informal play opportunities for children.</p>

<b>Client Approval</b>	<b>Local Accessibility Standard</b>

**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS  
PROVISION FOR TEENAGERS**

<b>Definition</b>	<p>Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving young people aged 12 and above. While it is recognised that a wide variety of opportunities for young people exist (including youth clubs and open spaces not specifically designed for this purpose, as per PPG17, this typology considers only those spaces specifically designed for use by young people eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teenage shelters</li> <li>• skateboard Parks</li> <li>• BMX tracks</li> <li>• Multi Use Games Areas.</li> </ul>		
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	<p><b>NPFA</b> LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p> <p>NEAPs aged min 8; min area size 1000msq; should be located 1,000 metres or 15 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (600 metres in a straight line)</p>		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	No existing local accessibility standards.		
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b>	<b>Telford – 15 minute walk time</b>	North Shropshire – 10 minute walk time	Shrewsbury – 15 minute walk time
	Ryedale – 15 minute walk time (Urban), 20 minute drive time (Rural)	Wychavon – 15 minute walk time	York – 15 minute walk time

<p><b>Consultation</b></p>	<p><b><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u></b></p> <p>The use of this type of open space is very specific to its function and the availability of the data collected on current usage through the household survey makes it difficult to assess given the small number of responses (2%). The statistically robust evidence base generated by the household survey enables detailed analysis and interpretation of the expectations and aspirations of local residents.</p> <p><b><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u></b></p> <p>60% of respondents stated that walking would be the preferred option when travelling to this type of open space. Of those respondents who would expect to walk to teenager facilities, the most commonly held expectation is that this journey should take 5-10 minutes (68%). When looking across the analysis areas, the figures relating to preferred travel patterns and length of journey are similar in all areas (both urban and rural). A typical example of this being Telford North East, where 63% of respondents would prefer to walk, with 74% stating this journey should take 5-10 minutes.</p> <p>The findings of the household survey suggest that across Telford and Wrekin 75% of the total population would travel 15 minutes on foot to access teenage facilities, however the modal response was slightly lower, calculated as a 10-minute walk time. The breakdown of individual areas shows comparable results in Telford Central, however the 75% threshold was lower in Telford North West (10 minutes), Telford North East (13 minutes) and Telford South (10 minutes). Residents in Newport indicated a willingness to travel by foot for 19 minutes to access a teenage facility. This may be reflective of the limited existing provision in this area.</p> <p><b><u>OTHER CONSULTATION</u></b></p> <p>The IT young people survey highlighted the importance of the location of the facility, with most young people indicating that they are likely to use facilities near their home. Drop in session comments also highlighted the need for localised provision for young people to reduce the levels of misuse of other sites and ensure that there are positive opportunities for young people to play and socialise.</p> <p>Residents attending drop in sessions highlighted accessibility deficiencies for this typology, particular comments centred on the barriers presented by main roads and distances to travel. These issues may arise as a direct result of a lack of facilities. Further barriers to entry centred around the degree to which the facilities are fit for purpose.</p>
<p><b>PMP Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>10 MINUTE (480 METRES) WALK TIME</b></p>

<p><b>PMP Justification</b></p>	<p>60% of people stated that walking is the preferred method of travel to a young person's facility; therefore it is recommended that a walk time standard be adopted. A walk time is considered most appropriate as these facilities are for young people who do not always have access to a motorised vehicle and consequently a walk time enables access for all ages and users. Provision of localised facilities meets the needs of young people as identified within the IT young people survey. Location was a particularly important determinant of the level of use of a site.</p> <p>While the 75% threshold level is 15 minutes, the modal response rate is 10 minutes. Given that the overriding issue emerging from consultations was a shortfall of provision for children and young people and the need for local facilities, it is recommended that the standard is set at 10 minutes in line with the modal response.</p> <p>A ten-minute walk time is further supported as within Telford North West, Telford North East and Telford South, the 75% level is a 10 minute walk time, indicating that residents expect more local facilities.</p> <p>In applying the local standards, consideration should be made for other open spaces that are used by young people, such as amenity green spaces, parks and outdoor sport facilities. The Telford Borough Council Play Strategy sets out the key features that will be provided as part of the provision of facilities for young people and it should be ensured that new facilities developed are of sufficient quality and appropriate for the young people they are designed for.</p>
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Client Approval	Local Accessibility Standard

**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS**  
**OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES**

<b>Definition</b>	<p>Natural or artificial surfaces either publicly or privately owned used for sport and recreation. Includes school playing fields. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outdoor sports pitches</li> <li>• tennis and bowls</li> <li>• golf courses</li> <li>• athletics</li> <li>• playing fields (including school playing fields)</li> <li>• water sports.</li> </ul>		
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	<p>No national standards, although the Comprehensive Performance Assessment highlights “% of the population within 20 minutes of a range of 3 different sports facility types, one of which much be quality assured” as one of their key performance indicators. Sport England’s December 2006 Choice and Opportunity Scores reveal the current figure as 21.81%.</p>		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	<p>No existing local accessibility standards.</p>		
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b>	<p><b>Telford – 15 minute walk time (grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens), 20 minute drive time (synthetic turf pitches, golf course and athletics track)</b></p>	<p><b>North Shropshire – 15 minute walk time (grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens), 20 minute drive time (synthetic turf pitches, golf course and athletics track)</b></p>	<p><b>Shrewsbury – 15 minute walk time (grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens), 20 minute drive time (synthetic turf pitches, golf course and athletics track)</b></p>
	<p>Ryedale –15 minute drive time (Urban), 20 minute drive time (Rural)</p>	<p>Wychavon –15 minute walk time (grass pitches and tennis courts), 15 minute drive time (synthetic turf pitches, golf courses and bowling greens)</p>	<p><b>York – 15 minute walk time (grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens), 20 minute drive time (synthetic turf pitches, golf course and athletics track)</b></p>

## Consultation

### **CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS**

A relatively small percentage of respondents to the household survey stated that they use this type of open space most frequently (10%). Of these frequent users 62% travel by car and 33% walk to access these facilities. With regards to travel times, 51% of respondents stated a journey took 5 – 10 minutes and 24% 11 – 15 minutes.

### **PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL**

Responses from the household survey regarding the preferred travel method for the different types of open space highlighted the variation between types of facilities. Results for all areas included:

Grass Pitches – **Walk (57%)**, Car (32%)

Synthetic Turf – Walk (36%), **Car (51%)**

Tennis Courts – **Walk (47%)**, Car (37%)

Bowling Greens – **Walk (44%)**, Car (44%)

Golf Courses – Walk (19%), **Car (72%)**

**Athletics – Walk (29%), Car (57%)**

This highlights how there are differing preferences in Telford and Wrekin regarding the six types of outdoor sport facilities. More people expect to drive to access synthetic turf pitches, golf courses and athletics, whereas more people prefer to walk to grass pitches and tennis courts. However, in terms of journey times the majority of respondents expected a journey to take 5 – 10 minutes by foot or car to access each of the six facilities.

Looking across the analysis areas, the travel expectations followed a similar pattern to the results given at a borough level, with only a few exceptions. In Telford North East, the majority of respondents (49%) stated they would walk to synthetic turf pitches and in Telford South people would predominantly use the car when travelling to bowling greens (65%).

For the three types of provision for which there was an overall preference for driving (synthetic turf pitches, golf courses and athletics) the 75% threshold level was a 20-minute drive time for synthetic turf pitches and athletics and a 10-minute drive time for golf courses.

For grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens 75% of residents are prepared to walk for 15 minutes to access these facilities, with a modal response of 10 minutes. Residents in Telford North West indicated the least travel times for accessing synthetic turf pitches and athletics facilities and in analysis area 3 respondents were willing to travel the furthest to access synthetic turf pitches and tennis courts.

### **OTHER CONSULTATIONS**

Responses from the Parish Council questionnaire portrayed a split in opinion regarding access to outdoor sports facilities. In Sutton Park and France access was perceived to be very good, however in Habberley and Blakebrook access was considered to be average.

PMP Recommendation	<b>15 MINUTE WALK TIME (720 METRES) = GRASS PITCHES, TENNIS COURTS, BOWLING GREENS</b> <b>20 MINUTE DRIVE TIME = SYNTHETIC TURF PITCHES, GOLF COURSES, ATHLETICS TRACKS</b>
PMP Justification	<p>There are several factors to consider in setting a standard for outdoor sports facilities. In particular, the range of facilities that lie within this typology makes it difficult to set a meaningful standard that can be applied across the board as per PPG17 requirements. For example, residents have significantly different expectations for synthetic turf pitches (to which they are willing to travel further) than they do for grass pitches (where there is a presumption of more localised provision).</p> <p>Given the findings from the local consultation, it is suggested that two standards are set, one for grass pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens, and a separate standard for synthetic turf pitches, athletics tracks and golf courses to reflect local expectations regarding driving and walking to outdoor sport facilities. The 75% threshold level for those who expect to walk to grass pitches, tennis and bowling greens is 15 minutes (720 metres). As a consequence a 15 minute (720 metre) walk time to these "local" outdoor sports facilities is considered an appropriate standard that will ensure quantitative improvements whilst also focusing on improving the quality of existing provision, furthermore, this 15 minute level is supported across all individual analysis areas. This is in line with incorporating sustainable transport choices, to account for the wide mix of facilities types within the standard to meet all expectations.</p> <p>The 75% threshold level for those who expect to drive to synthetic turf pitches and athletics tracks are both 20 minutes, with a 10 minute drive time for golf courses. Given the more specialist nature of these facilities (and the vast area that golf courses cover), alongside the fact they are usually built in strategic locations to incorporate local demand, a 20 minute drive time standard is recommended. Again this is reflective of the 75% level.</p> <p>The formal use of school facilities by the community after school hours will be particularly important if the recommended standards are to be delivered.</p>
Client Approval	Local Accessibility Standard



**TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS  
INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES**

<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	<p>CPA targets measure the number of residents that are within a range of three different sports facility types.</p> <p>Sport England accessibility targets reinforce those measured within the CPA.</p>		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	<p>Telford and Wrekin Indoor Sports and Physical Activity Facilities Draft Strategy 2007</p> <p>CPA accessibility target - 52.7% of the population within Telford and Wrekin reside within 20 minutes travel time (urban areas – by walk; rural areas – by car) of a range of three different sports facility types of which one has achieved a quality assured standard, specifically;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quest</li> <li>• Green Flag</li> <li>• ISO 9001:2000</li> <li>• Investors in Excellence</li> <li>• Chartermark</li> </ul>		
Other Authorities - Benchmarking	Wychavon – 20 minute drive time	Wolverhampton – 20 minute walk time (urban areas)	Northampton – 15 minute drive time

## Consultation

### PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL

Responses from the household survey regarding the preferred travel method for the different types of open space highlighted the variation between types of facilities. Results for all areas included:

Swimming pools – Walk (33%), Car (55%)

Sports halls – Walk (32%), Car (56%)

Indoor Bowls – (32%), Car (56%)

Indoor Tennis – (34%), Car (55%)

Findings from the household survey show that over half the residents expected to travel by car to use indoor sports facilities. This suggests that the existing distribution of facilities in Telford and Wrekin may be poor. However, over 30% of residents also expect to walk to indoor sports facilities. The overall findings are consistent when looking at the individual analysis areas. The poor distribution of indoor facilities was highlighted as a key issue within the indoor facility strategy.

Borough wide results reveal that 75% of residents are willing to travel for up to 15 minutes on foot to access indoor sports facilities in Telford and Wrekin. However, the modal response across all facility types was slightly lower at 10 minutes. For those residents who expect to travel by car 75% are prepared to travel 20 minutes to access indoor bowls and indoor tennis, to access swimming pools and sports halls residents are willing to travel for 15 and 19 minutes respectively.

Below are the 75% threshold levels for the urban and rural areas for each facility type (split as recommended by the Sport England CPA Accessibility Indicator). As can be seen, 75% of residents living in the urban areas would expect to walk 15 minutes (720 metres) to access an indoor sports facility. Within the rural areas, residents would be willing to drive up to 20 minutes to access a facility. The 75% levels are consistent across all of the facility types.

Swimming pools – Urban – 15 minute walk, Rural – 20 minute drive

Sports halls – Urban – 15 minute walk, Rural – 20 minute drive

Indoor Bowls – Urban – 15 minute walk, Rural – 20 minute drive

Indoor Tennis – Urban – 15 minute walk, Rural – 20 minute drive

Across the individual analysis areas results support the borough wide responses. The number of residents who expect to travel by car in the rural area is particularly high, with over 80% of residents expecting to travel by car to access swimming pools, sports halls and indoor tennis facilities. This indicates access to indoor sports facilities is more limited in the rural areas compared to the urban areas of Telford and Wrekin.

Residents in Telford Central are prepared to travel the longest on foot to access all four facility types, indicating facilities in this location are in close proximity. In the rural area residents are willing to travel the longest by car to access sports halls and indoor bowls. Combined with the high expectation levels of car usage by residents in the rural area, this suggests a reliance on car ownership to access indoor sports facilities in Telford and Wrekin.

	<p>General comments from respondents to the household survey emphasised poor accessibility to indoor sports facilities in the rural area, with residents stating the majority of facilities were located 20 minutes away and that car ownership was essential to access this typology.</p> <p><b><u>OTHER CONSULTATIONS</u></b></p> <p>42% of respondents to the IT Young People survey do not think there are enough indoor facilities in their local area. Of those who stated indoor facilities were their favourite type of open space 52% currently walk and 32% travel by car, again reinforcing the importance of locality as a determinant of participation. Cost and distance travelled to access the facilities are two of the biggest barriers to entry for young people.</p>
<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<p><b>15 MINUTE WALK TIME – URBAN AREAS (for sports halls and pools)</b></p> <p><b>20 MINUTE DRIVE TIME – RURAL AREAS (for sports halls and pools)</b></p>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>In line with the CPA indicator, Telford and Wrekin has been split into a rural and urban area, as such, different modes of transport to access indoor facilities have been established. Within the rural areas, in line with the 75% threshold, of those respondents who suggested that they would drive to indoor sports facilities (82%), it is recommended that the local accessibility standard should be set at a 20 minute drive time for both sports halls and swimming pools.</p> <p>Within the urban areas, in line with the 75% threshold, of those respondents who suggested that they would walk to indoor sports facilities (34%), it is recommended that the local accessibility standard should be set at a 15 minute walk time. While this is more challenging than the national indicator, it is representative of the expectations and aspirations of local residents within Telford and Wrekin.</p> <p>Sport England guidance on the implementation of the national CPA standards suggests that the range of facilities is essential in giving people a choice. Greater choice in the different types of facilities which people have access to and the proximity of these facilities to where they live will increase the likelihood that people will visit and become more active. This has been the rationale behind setting a challenging standard for the urban areas.</p> <p>The use of school facilities for community use will be particularly important if the recommended standards are to be delivered.</p>

## TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS ALLOTMENTS

<b>Definitions</b>	Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. May also include urban farms. This typology does not include private gardens.		
<b>National Standards and/or Benchmarks</b>	No national standards		
<b>Existing Local Accessibility Standards</b>	No existing local accessibility standards.		
<b>Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)</b>	<b>Telford – 15 minute walk time</b>	<b>North Shropshire – 15 minute walk time</b>	Shrewsbury – 15 minute walk time
	Ryedale – 15 minute walk (Urban), 15 minute drive (Rural)	Wychavon – 15 minute walk time	York – 15 minute walk time
<b>Consultation</b>	<p><b><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u></b></p> <p>Respondents to the household survey stated that walking (53%) would be the most popular travel method when visiting allotments, with 36% preferring to travel by car. Across both travel methods, the expected travel times are similar, with 61% of walkers and 63% of those who would travel by car suggesting a typical journey should take 5 – 10 minutes. Results from the individual analysis areas support the overall results, with the exception of Telford North East, where the majority of residents (53%) stated travelling by car was their preferred mode of travel.</p> <p>Using the borough wide results, it can be calculated that 75% of the total population would travel 15 minutes on foot to allotments in Telford and Wrekin. Individual travel times for each area remained constant with the exception of Telford North East (16 minutes) and the Rural area (10 minutes). This suggests that residents in the rural area expect more local allotments than those in other areas of the borough.</p> <p><b><u>OTHER CONSULTATION</u></b></p> <p>Responses from the Parish Council questionnaires both highlighted accessibility deficiencies, this however was primarily due to quantitative shortfalls.</p>		

<b>PMP Recommendation</b>	<b>15 MINUTE (720 METRE) WALK TIME</b>
<b>PMP Justification</b>	<p>The provision of allotments is very much a demand led typology and this should be reflected in the application of the accessibility and quantity standards. As such any deficiencies that are highlighted through the application of the study should be assessed further to indicate if there is any demand in that area.</p> <p>However, as a guide a standard has been set at 15 minutes (720 metre) walk time, although challenging, reflects the findings of the household survey as 35% of respondents stated there are not enough allotments. Residents responding to the household survey also indicated that they would expect to walk to allotments and a walk time has therefore been used in line with living a healthy lifestyle and targets to reduce the reliance on private transport. Given the 75% threshold level is for a 15 minute (720 metre) walk, setting a standard at this level is in accordance with the PPG17 Companion Guide. This expected level of provision was also consistent across the analysis areas, with the exception of the rural areas, where expectations were higher. By setting the standard at a 15 minute walk time, this will encompass the expectations of most users and potential users of this type of open space.</p>
<b>Client Approval</b>	<b>Local Accessibility Standard</b>

TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL – SETTING ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS CIVIC SPACES			
Definitions	Hard surfaced areas located usually located within Town or city centres.		
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	No national standards		
Existing Local Accessibility Standards	No existing local accessibility standards.		
Other Local Authorities Standards (by PMP)			
Consultation	<p><b><u>CURRENT USAGE PATTERNS</u></b> Findings from the household surveys show that a minimal amount of respondents (2%) use civic spaces more than any other typology. It is therefore difficult to produce sound analysis on current usage patterns based on the sample size provided; a more detailed analysis is given below in terms of expected mode of transport and travel time.</p>		
	<p><b><u>PREFERRED MODE OF TRAVEL</u></b> 50% of respondents stated that walking would be the preferred option when travelling to this type of open space. Travelling by car was second with 36%. Of those respondents who would expect to walk, 61% expect the journey to take between 5 - 10 minutes. To drive to this typology respondents expect a journey to also take 5 - 10 minutes (57%).</p>		
	<p>Across the individual analysis areas similar results are provided, with the exception of the Rural analysis area, where 75% of residents indicated travelling by car as the preferred mode of travel suggesting residents have to travel significantly further to access a civic space in Telford and Wrekin. In Newport respondents indicated a considerably higher expectation to walk to civic spaces (86%) suggesting either adequate current provision of civic spaces or generally high demand and high expectations in the area.</p>		
	<p>The findings of the household survey suggest that across Telford and Wrekin 75% of the total population would travel 15 minutes by foot to access civic spaces (with a modal response of 10 minutes). Telford North East and Telford Central mirror the borough wide response, however in Telford North West and Telford South residents expect the journey to be shorter (10 minutes). The highest expected journey time was highlighted in Newport, where 75% of residents were willing to travel up to 18 minutes to access a civic space.</p>		
PMP Recommendation	<p>When travelling by car, 75% of residents in Telford and Wrekin are prepared to travel for 15 minutes to access this type of open space. Identical results are found in Telford North East, Telford North West and Telford Central, however in Telford South and the Rural area residents are willing to travel for longer, 20 minutes and 23 minutes respectively.</p>		
	<p><b>15 MINUTE WALK TIME (URBAN)</b> <b>15 MINUTE DRIVE TIME (RURAL)</b></p>		

<p><b>PMP Justification</b></p>	<p>It is important to note that PPG17 states that there is no realistic requirement to set catchments for such a typology as it cannot be easily influenced through planning policy and implementation. Therefore strict adherence to an accessibility standard (in terms of highlighting area inside and outside the catchment of existing provision) would be counterproductive. However, it is recommended that the council consider the accessibility of civic spaces within a 15 minute walk time for the urban area and a 15 minute drive time or the rural area.</p> <p>Considering the location of civic spaces in the context of a 15 minute walk time in the urban area and 15 minute drive time in the rural area is consistent with the 75% threshold level as advocated in PPG17.</p> <p>Whilst the accessibility standard can be used for broad planning need, it should not be adopted as policy to influence future civic space provision</p>
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Client Approval	Local Accessibility Standard