

Tunbridge Wells Borough
Council

PPG 17 Sport, Recreation and
Open Space Study:

An Assessment of Quantity,
Quality and Access

A

Final Report

By

Strategic Leisure Limited

December 2006

Glossary

AGMA	Association of Greater Manchester Authorities
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BAP	Bio-Diversity Action Plan
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
BSF	Building Schools for the Future
CCPR	Central Council for Physical Recreation
CCTV	Close Circuit Television
DDA	Disability Discrimination Act
DETR	Department for Environment and Transport
EN	English Nature
EW	England and Wales
ECB	England and Wales Cricket Board
FA	Football Association
GB	Governing Body
GHS	General Household Survey
EH	England Hockey
HA	Hectare
ILAM	Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
KCC	Kent County Council
LAP	Local Area for Play
LDF	Local Development Framework
LEAP	Local Equipped Area for Play
LPA	Local Planning Agreement
LTA	Lawn Tennis Association
MUGA	Multi Use Games Area
NEAP	Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play
NPFA	National Playing Field Association
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PPG 17	Planning Policy Guidance Note 17
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RPG	Regional Planning Guidance
SLL	Strategic Leisure Limited
SOA	Super Output Area
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
STP	Synthetic Turf Pitch
TGR	Team Generation Rate
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TWBC	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
TWLP	Tunbridge Wells Local Development Plan

CONTENTS

GLOSSARY

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Bound separately)	
SECTION I - INTRODUCTION	01
SECTION II - STUDY METHODOLOGY	07
SECTION III - KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH	19
Findings by Typology (quantitative, qualitative, accessibility and standards):	
• Parks	19
➤ Large Urban Parks	20
➤ Local Parks and Recreation Sites	22
➤ Formal Gardens	24
• Natural & Semi-Natural Greenspace	31
➤ Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	
➤ Green Corridors	38
• Indoor Sports Facilities	41
➤ Indoor Sports and Leisure Facilities	
➤ Community Halls/Centres	51
• Outdoor Sports Facilities	53
➤ Playing Pitches	53
➤ Bowling Greens	66
➤ Outdoor Tennis Courts	69
➤ Golf Courses	72
• Informal Open Space	81
• Provision for Children & Young People	88
• Allotments	100
• Cemeteries & Closed Churchyards	106
• Landscape of Special Character	110
• SUMMARY	

APPENDICES (Bound separately)

APPENDIX 1	-	NATIONAL, LOCAL AND REGIONAL POLICY CONTEXT
APPENDIX 2	-	STUDY CONSULTATION
APPENDIX 2a	-	Key Stakeholder Face to Face and Telephone (including Parish and Town Councils)
APPENDIX 2b	-	Focus Groups
APPENDIX 2c	-	Focus Group – Briefing Notes
APPENDIX 2d	-	Door-to-Door Survey
APPENDIX 2e	-	Sports Club Survey
APPENDIX 2f	-	Schools Survey
APPENDIX 3	-	SITE LISTINGS – ALL ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS SITES BY TYPOLOGY
		Sites by Typology and Parish
	-	3a Benenden
	-	3b Bidborough
	-	3c Brenchley
	-	3d Capel
	-	3e Cranbrook
	-	3f Frittenden
	-	3g Goudhurst
	-	3h Hawkhurst
	-	3i Horsmonden
	-	3j Lamberhurst
	-	3k Paddock Wood
	-	3l Pembury
	-	3m Sandhurst
	-	3n Southborough
	-	3o Speldhurst
	-	3p Areas of Important Open Space
	-	3q Areas of Landscape Importance
APPENDIX 4	-	FINAL PLAYING PITCH ASSESSMENT REPORT
APPENDIX 4a	-	Final Summary Table Outdoor Sport against NPFA
APPENDIX 4b	-	Playing Pitch Assessment Calculations
APPENDIX 5	-	NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITY PROVISION
APPENDIX 6	-	SUPPLY AND DEMAND OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES
APPENDIX 7	-	QUALITY RATINGS
APPENDIX 7a	-	Open Space Natural and Parks
APPENDIX 7b	-	Large Urban Parks
APPENDIX 7c	-	Cemeteries
APPENDIX 7d	-	Allotments
APPENDIX 7e	-	Provision for Children and Young People
APPENDIX 7f	-	Tennis Courts
APPENDIX 7g	-	Indoor Sports
APPENDIX 7h	-	Cricket

APPENDIX 7i	-	Rugby Pitches
APPENDIX 7j	-	Amenity Informal
APPENDIX 7k	-	Bowls
APPENDIX 7l	-	Football
APPENDIX 8	-	SITE ASSESSMENT PROFORMA
APPENDIX 8a	-	Indoor Sports Facilities
APPENDIX 8b	-	Playing Pitches
APPENDIX 8c	-	Parks and Open Spaces (Bowls Greens, Tennis Courts)
APPENDIX 8d	-	Play Provision
APPENDIX 8e	-	Allotments
APPENDIX 8f	-	Cemeteries/Churchyard
APPENDIX 9	-	SITE PHOTOGRAPHS
	-	IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE – Disk A
	-	IMPORTANT LANDSCAPE – Disk B
APPENDIX 10	-	SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE REVIEW
APPENDIX 11	-	TRAVEL TIMES AND DISTANCES TO PROVISION
APPENDIX 11a	-	TRAVEL TIMES
APPENDIX 12	-	SUPPLY AND DEMAND INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES
APPENDIX 13	-	TUNBRIDGE WELLS – INDOOR FACILITY AUDIT

MAPS (Bound separately)

Map 1 – All Sites by Typology
Map 2a – Formal Gardens
Map 2b – Large Urban Parks
Map 2c – Local Parks and Recreation Grounds
Map 3a – Formal Gardens by Quality Ratings
Map 3b – Large Urban Parks by Quality Ratings
Map 3c – Local Parks and Recreation Grounds by Quality Ratings
Map 4a – Formal Gardens with Buffers
Map 4b – Large Urban Parks with Buffers
Map 4c – Local Parks and Recreation Grounds with Buffers
Map 5 – Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space
Map 6 – Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space by Quality
Map 7 – Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space with Buffers
Map 8 – Indoor Sports Facilities
Map 9 – Indoor Sports Facilities by Quality
Map 10 – Indoor Sports Facilities with Buffers
Map 11a – Playing Pitch Sites with Senior Football Pitch Provision
Map 11b – Playing Pitch Sites with Junior Football Pitch Provision
Map 11c – Playing Pitch Sites with Mini Football Pitch Provision
Map 11d – Playing Pitch Sites with Rugby Pitch Provision
Map 11e – Playing Pitch Sites with Cricket Pitch Provision
Map 12a – Playing Pitch Sites with Senior Football Pitch Provision by quality
Map 12b – Playing Pitch Sites with Junior Football Pitch Provision by quality
Map 12c – Playing Pitch Sites with Mini Football Pitch Provision by quality
Map 12d – Playing Pitch Sites with Rugby Pitch Provision by quality
Map 12e – Playing Pitch Sites with Cricket Pitch Provision by quality
Map 13 – Playing Pitch Sites with Buffers
Map 14 – School Playing Fields with Community Use with Buffers
Map 15 – Bowling Greens
Map 16 – Bowling Greens with Quality Ratings
Map 17 – Bowling Greens with Buffers
Map 18 – Tennis Courts
Map 19 – Tennis Courts by Quality
Map 20 – Tennis Courts with Buffers
Map 21 – Informal Space
Map 22 – Informal Space by Quality
Map 23 – Informal Space with Buffers
Map 24 – Play Areas
Map 25 – Play Areas by Quality Ratings
Map 26 – Play Areas with Buffers
Map 27 – Allotments
Map 28 – Allotments by Quality
Map 29 – Allotments with Buffers
Map 30 – Churchyards and Cemeteries
Map 31 – Cemeteries and Churchyards by Quality
Map 32 – Cemeteries and Churchyards with Buffers
Map 33 – English Nature Standards
Map 33a – 20ha access buffer
Map 33b – 100ha access buffer

Map 33c – 500 ha access buffer
Map 34 – Golf Courses

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

Introduction

- 1.1 Strategic Leisure Limited (SLL) was appointed by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) in July 2005 to undertake a Policy Planning Guidance Note (PPG 17) compliant assessment of open space (including formal gardens), indoor and outdoor sport and recreational facilities. The objective of the study was to identify local needs for provision, and opportunities for enhancement, development or replacement of current facilities.
- 1.2 There are a number of main drivers behind this study; these are:
- The need to produce the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the Borough
 - The need to develop a strategic policy framework for future provision, based on identified need, to ensure future provision is planned, co-ordinated, and appropriate
 - The need to identify and provide evidence about the levels and nature of existing provision, to address issues of investment, support external funding bids, assist in planning for provision, and inform partnership working
 - The need to revise, and evidence existing policy, in the light of the Inspector's comments, to inform and guide the LDF

Structure of Study Report

- 1.3 A number of key tasks have been undertaken to complete the assessment and develop standards of provision and recommendations. These are detailed in Section II.
- 1.4 This report has been structured as follows, to assist in the presentation, and analysis of a vast amount of information. Technical details are provided in the Appendices. Maps used to illustrate specific points from the audit, and the consultation process, are included in separate Appendices to the report.

		Page Number
Section I	Introduction to, and rationale for, the study	1
Section II	Study Methodology – approach, techniques, consultation rationale, and explanations of quality ratings	7
Section III	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Assessment Findings, by typology (types of open space/facility), on a Boroughwide basis➤ Findings, by typology, on a Parish basis➤ Local Standards – their rationale, recommendations for Tunbridge Wells, and implications of their application➤ Recommendations and Conclusions	19
Appendices	Technical details, mapping, and consultee data	

Rationale: Why Develop a Strategy?

- 1.5 The desirable outcomes from undertaking a PPG17 Assessment are to provide local people with networks of accessible, high quality open spaces and sports and recreation facilities in both rural and urban areas, which will meet the need of local people and visitors. PPG 17 strives to provide a balance between enhancing existing provision and new provision. The study undertaken for TWBC has followed the PPG 17 framework provided up to, and including Stage 4, Applying Provision Standards.
- 1.6 The provision of good quality, accessible open spaces, and sport and recreation facilities can make a positive contribution to a number of key social objectives. These include:
- 1.7 **Promoting and supporting the urban renaissance agenda** - through the provision of local networks of well maintained and well managed open spaces, sports and recreational facilities helping to create urban environments that are safe, attractive and clean. Green spaces in urban areas perform vital functions for nature conservation and biodiversity and by acting as 'green lungs' can assist in meeting objectives to improve air quality.
- 1.8 **Supporting rural renewal** – the countryside can provide opportunities for recreation and visitors can play an important role in the regeneration of the economies of rural areas. Open spaces within rural settlements and accessibility to local sport and recreational facilities contribute to the quality of life and well-being of their communities.

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

- 1.9 **Promoting social inclusion and community cohesion** – well planned and maintained open spaces and good quality sports and recreational facilities can play a major part in improving people’s sense of well-being. As a focal point for community activity, they can bring people together providing opportunities for wider social interaction.
- 1.10 **Health and well-being** – open space, sports and recreational facilities have a vital role to play in promoting healthy living and preventing illness and in the social development of children of all ages through play, sporting activities and interaction with others.
- 1.11 **Promoting more sustainable development** – by ensuring that open space, sports and recreational facilities (particularly in urban areas) are easily accessible by walking or cycling and that more intensively used sports and recreational facilities are planned in locations well served by public transport.
- 1.12 **Improving** open spaces, sport and recreation facilities and encourage greater use by all members of the community. A key driver for this is to provide the residents of Tunbridge Wells Borough with safe, accessible, attractive facilities that are of the right type and meet the needs of the communities that use them.
- 1.13 **Protecting** valuable provision from development where there is a definite need, and ensuring that new landscape schemes contribute to improving the area, and that quality is maintained by securing appropriate levels of funding.
- 1.14 Identify processes for **partnership and involvement** – given the strong voluntary sector in the Borough, the Council is keen to engage local communities in the development and the management of a range of sport, recreation and open spaces. It wishes to create opportunities for people to become involved and have ownership; working together to improve provision at local level.
- 1.15 At a local level, the development of a strategy, based on an audit and assessment, can help to improve, protect and widen involvement in open space and sport and recreation provision.

Context for TWBC Study

- 1.16 In undertaking this study, it has been important to reference and reflect the thinking at national level, on the role of open space, sport and recreation provision. The key strategic influences are summarised in Table 1.1
- 1.17 The need for improved use and management of open spaces particularly public parks in urban areas has seen increased commitment demonstrated in national regional and local government policy.
- 1.18 The recent **Urban Parks Assessment** undertaken by the DETR found the shortfall in budgets for public Greenspace nationally to be in excess of £1.3 billion.
- 1.19 A prescribed methodology for the assessment of playing pitch provision is detailed in *“Towards a Level Playing Field”* (Sport England, CCPR, 2002). In addition to the assessment methodology, a number of policies to oppose the loss of playing fields are detailed in this guidance document.
- 1.20 The following key documents summarised in Table 1.1 below have provided the impetus for the development and preparation of this strategy. They include:

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

Table 1.1 - National and Local Planning Guidance Strategic Framework and Assessment

PLANNING GUIDANCE	Objective
Planning Policy Guidance Note 17.	Outlines the importance for local authorities of undertaking robust assessments of the local need for quality open spaces, in order to develop local standards which are based on local supply and demand for facilities.
"Living Places – Cleaner, Safer, Greener" (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2002)	Gives a commitment to develop a clearer national framework for urban parks and greenspaces.
Urban Greenspaces Task Force "Greenspaces, Better Places"	Recognises that parks and open spaces have the potential to make a significant contribution to urban regeneration by making places more liveable and sustainable whilst also enriching the quality of people's lives and local communities.
The Framework for Sport in England and Mission Possible (The South East Plan for Sport 2004-2008)	These documents provide the national sporting context for this study. The importance of a range of facility provision is identified, encompassing formal sporting facilities, and an environment that facilitates informal active recreation.
Kent and Medway Structure Plan (Adopted July 06)	<p>The Kent and Medway Structure Plan provides the strategic planning framework for the protection of the environment, transport priorities, and the location of new development across the County until 2025. Its priorities for Kent, in relation to countryside and open space are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting the countryside, coast, flora and fauna • Conserving and enhancing the differing landscapes of Kent, and their distinctive character
Supplementary Planning Guidance – Recreational Development and Recreation Open Space Tunbridge Wells Borough Council 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supplementary Planning Guidance supplements policies in the Local Plan Review by providing further information about how policies will be implemented, contains advice on design, and provides details of commuted payments:
Local Plan Review –Modifications September 2005 – Recreation (Adopted March 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction sets out the rationale for recreation and describes how recreation can help to promote physical and mental health, enhance social interaction and foster a sense of community. Accessible recreation facilities are an essential ingredient in improving the quality of life and achieving a sustainable living pattern for local residents. • The Local Plan deals with those aspects of recreation which have land use implications for new development and proposals affecting facilities, namely open space for youth and adult use, children's play space, informal open space (including commons and parks), allotments, indoor sports facilities and recreation in the countryside. • The Local Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Specifies the requirements for provision of youth/adult outdoor play space and children's play space. ➤ Allocates land for sports pitches and other outdoor recreation facilities whilst policy r5 allocates sites for children's play space • The aims are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To retain, and provide, an appropriate level and distribution of recreational open space ➤ To accommodate future demands for indoor and outdoor recreation facilities where this would not have an adverse effect on the amenities of adjoining occupiers or the attractiveness of the built up areas or the countryside

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

PLANNING GUIDANCE	Objective
Tunbridge Wells Community Plan 2003 - 2011	<p>The plan is very much about partnership working. The key themes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing participation • Ensuring provision of appropriate, quality facilities, service and activities • Focussing on Children and Young People • Focussing on Older People • Providing in Partnership • Encouraging healthy lifestyles • Contributing to local Community Priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Children and teenagers need affordable and accessible opportunities to lead active healthy lifestyles, to contribute to the community and develop their full potential. ➤ The needs of people with disabilities, of those with learning disabilities or mental health problems, of the homeless and of ethnic minorities need consideration. ➤ Older people play a huge role in the social support of others but also may have special housing needs and problems of access to basic health and other services and facilities.
Tunbridge Wells Corporate Plan 2005 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Vision where the borough is valued for its high quality of life, the outstanding beauty of its countryside and its historic towns and villages <p>'Where we, our partners and the wider community work together to maintain a borough':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That is a prosperous, clean, safe and attractive place to live, work and visit ➤ Where vibrant business and employment opportunities abound ➤ Where people lead healthy lives and enjoy high standards of health and leisure facilities ➤ Where the natural and built environments are safeguarded well into the future ➤ Where we provide high quality and cost efficient services focussed on the real needs of residents and visitors alike

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

- 1.21 Of equal importance is the need for the study to reflect the local context, to ensure that whilst the principles of the audit and assessment correspond with national policies and legislation, the outcomes of the study clearly link with the local issues, inform planning policy, and support achievement of the corporate priorities in Tunbridge Wells. This approach has been adopted to ensure that the study sets out a clear way forward for the Council, and its partners, for the future development, provision protection and delivery of open space, sport and recreation as part of the overall regeneration and development of the Borough, for the benefit of local people.
- 1.22 Tunbridge Wells Borough is comprised of a mix of urban and rural settlements and covers 326 square km from Speldhurst parish in the west to Sandhurst in the south east. The Borough is located in the south western corner of Kent and borders East Sussex. Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough form the urban nucleus at the western end of the Borough. These towns are served by the A26 and A21, the latter providing the main link with the M25 and London. Paddock Wood and Cranbrook are the main rural settlements within the central and eastern parts of the Borough respectively.
- 1.23 Given the natural topography of the Borough, the overall landscape is of a generally high, and in some places very high, quality. Around 70% of the Borough is designated as part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The quality of the natural environments is identified by local residents as one of the area's main assets. The landscape qualities of AONB areas and National Parks are equal, and therefore share the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
- 1.24 The area supports a wide range of flora, fauna and habitats given its historical and natural characteristics such as soil, topography, climate and natural vegetation. To reflect the uniqueness of specific areas within the area, The Borough has been divided into 19 Character Areas. These cover the rural landscape of the Borough which includes both small towns and villages.

Scope of the Study

- 1.25 The study adheres to the guidance detailed in *"Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A Companion Guide to PPG17"* which details guidance on undertaking local assessments of open space, sport and recreation provision. The study has included an audit of all existing indoor and outdoor open space, sport and recreational facilities in terms of:

- Quantity
- Quality
- Accessibility

- 1.26 The study has also considered the following factors:

- a) Different uses of facilities
- b) Different users of facilities
- c) Classification of types of provision
- d) The scale and availability of resources for maintenance / management
- e) English Nature's *"Natural Accessible Open space Standards"*

- 1.27 The study undertaken has included:

- a) Consideration of the likely needs up to 2016
- b) A review of existing open space, leisure and recreation policies contained within the Local Plan
- c) A range of consultation exercises to ascertain the views of the local community, key interest groups and wider stakeholders
- d) Consideration of existing facilities within the borough, including provision by the local authority (including education), private and voluntary sectors
- e) Consideration of provision in neighbouring authorities
- f) An assessment of playing pitch provision using the methodology detailed in *"Towards a Level Playing Field: A Guide to the Production of Playing Pitch Strategies"* (Sport England, 2002)
- g) Recommendations for local standards of provision with regard to quantity, quality and accessibility for consideration within the developing Local Development Framework

Objectives of the TWBC PPG 17 Assessment

- 1.28 The objectives of this assessment are to:
- Assess the quantity, quality and accessibility of open space and recreational facilities in the Borough
 - Set local standards for the quantity, quality and accessibility of open space and recreational facilities taking into account local needs and priorities in accordance with PPG 17
 - Identify deficiencies and/ or surpluses in the quantity of open space

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

- Assess the quality and level of accessibility of open space
- Provide information to inform decisions and help determine future development proposals in the area and feed into the Local Development Framework (LDF), (in line with central Government guidance contained within PPS 12)
- Support corporate and departmental strategies including the Community Plan and Leisure Strategy

Key Principles of the TWBC Assessment and Strategy

1.29 There are several key principles in the development of this Strategy, which are:

- To concentrate on providing quality facilities, accessible to all
- To identify opportunities for developing wider use of facilities with restricted access, for example, school facilities
- To secure high levels of access at a local level to a range of facilities (variety of greenspaces and sport/recreation facilities)
- To respond to local needs when there is a clearly articulated consensus of opinion
- To concentrate on providing formal facilities provision at strategic locations fit for purpose
- To develop local standards of provision to meet local community needs (current and future)

Review of Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 1.30 The existing Supplementary Planning Guidance, produced in 1996, was written to supplement Policies R2, R4 and R5 of the Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan, adopted in the same year. Policy R2 stipulated that contributions for recreation open space provision should be sought for developments resulting in 15 or more bedspaces.
- 1.31 The Local Plan has since been reviewed and at the time of writing this report, it has reached the Proposed Modifications Stage. It is expected that the new Local Plan will be adopted in Spring 2006. The Policies directing recreation open space provision in the Local Plan Review are, in some respects, inconsistent with those in the adopted plan. In particular, the threshold of 15 bedspaces at which developer contributions were sought has been reduced to 10 bed spaces and there is some flexibility to consider developments below this threshold if they generate a specific need.
- 1.32 Supplementary planning guidance is being written in light of these changes but it should be noted that the existing SPG does not accurately reflect the provisions of the new Local Plan Policies.
- 1.33 A review of the existing TWBC Supplementary Planning Guidance is attached at Appendix 10.

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

The Tunbridge Wells Approach

2.1 The Companion Guide to PPG17 identifies five key stages to undertaking an assessment of playing pitches, indoor facilities and open space. These are broadly:

Stage 1 – Identifying Local Needs

Stage 2 – Auditing Local Provision

Stage 3 – Setting Provision Standards

Stage 4 – Applying Provision Standards

Stage 5 – Policy Options

2.2 A number of key research exercises were undertaken during the period July 2005 – March 2006, to identify the extent and condition of existing sport, leisure and open space provision in the Borough, and the local views on this provision. It is important to note that the 2001 Census data has been used as the baseline for this study, and all calculations are based on these figures. However, the fact that the population is increasing very slightly at present is acknowledged, and where possible, the figures to support this have been shown.

2.3 The assessments of quantity and quality have been undertaken on a Boroughwide basis, but also demonstrate the difference between the town and parish areas.

Tunbridge Wells Population by Ward

2.4 It is important to consider the demographic make up of the Borough as key demographic and socio-economic characteristics are known to influence demand characteristics. For example, certain age-groups are known to register higher participation rates in a number of sport and leisure activities; deprived communities often experience issues relating to access to services and opportunities; cultural backgrounds may result in some passive and active recreation pursuits being favoured over others; car ownership levels can impact on the range of facilities that can be accessed. A brief review of the key demographics for the area shows that:

- **Overall population:** Tunbridge Wells Borough Council has a population of 104,016 (2001 Census) of which 48.10% were male and 51.90% were female. However, the Kent County Council (KCC) 2003 midterm estimate is 105,000 for 2006 which shows an increase in population.

2.5 The Office of National Statistics (ONS) estimated profile of the Tunbridge Wells Borough population (2003) shows that the distribution of population across key age groups is mainly in line with the average in England & Wales. It is important to consider key statistics within the profile as some age groups have a higher propensity to participate in sport and active recreation than others (particularly young people), which therefore has an impact on the sport, recreation and open space provision. Table 2.1 Population Comparisons identifies the population and compares Tunbridge Wells with Kent, the South East and England.

Table 2.1 Population Comparisons. (2003 mid year estimates)

	Tunbridge Wells Borough	KCC Area	South East (GO)	England
Total Population	104,030	1,329,718	8,000,645	49,138,831
Males	50,032 48.1%	643,886 48.4%	3,905,155 48.8%	23,922,144 48.7%
Females	53,998 51.9%	685,832 51.6%	4,095,490 51.2%	25,216,687 51.3%
Aged 0 to 15 years	21,499 20.7%	271,643 20.4%	1,594,219 19.9%	9,901,581 20.2%
Aged 16 to 74 years	74,240 71.4%	947,830 71.3%	5,766,307 72.1%	35,532,091 72.3%
Aged 75+ years	8,291 8.0%	110,245 8.3%	640,119 8.0%	3,705,159 7.5%
Density of population per area	3.14	3.75	4.20	3.77

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

2.6 Key differences within Tunbridge Wells Borough are:

- A slightly higher percentage of young people aged 0-15 years old than the average in England.
- A slightly higher percentage of older people aged 75+ than the average in England
- A lower density of population compared to Kent, the South East and England.

2.7 **Future Population.** Future KCC population projections (to 2021) show an overall decline in the population of the Borough. However, in the short term i.e. to 2016, the Borough's population will increase from 104,030 to 104,500.

2.8 **Ethnicity.** Tunbridge Wells Borough has a relatively low minority ethnic population. 97.52% of the population is white, in comparison to the average for England (90.9%).

2.9 **Deprivation Indices.** Levels of deprivation are measured on a localised basis using data from "super output areas" (SOAs). These provide a clearer picture to ward data (on which previous indices of deprivation were based) of deprivation at a local level. A report for the West Kent Partnership 'Priority Communities in West Kent' Jan 2005 has identified that the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2004 highlighted a number of key facts with regard to West Kent and Tunbridge Wells Borough, namely:

- According to the IMD 2004, the affluent nature of West Kent is borne out with almost two thirds (61%) of SOAs within the top 30% least deprived in the country. Additionally 28% of West Kent SOAs were ranked within the top 10% least deprived.
- In contrast only 5 SOAs within West Kent are considered to be amongst the 30% most deprived nationally.
- Sherwood in Tunbridge Wells is one of the 5 SOAs considered to be amongst the 30% most deprived SOAs nationally and Broadwater is just outside the national 30% most deprived SOAs nationally.
- The town centre wards in the Borough also have some very specific areas of deprivation
- SOAs with low educational attainment and skills levels comprise Sherwood, Southborough and High Brooms wards.
- SOAs with low income and income deprivation affecting children comprise Sherwood and Broadwater wards.

The Tunbridge Wells Methodology

2.10 The individual tasks undertaken to complete the assessment and develop standards of provision and recommendations are summarised below:

2.11 **Stage 1: Identification of local needs:** The following key tasks have been undertaken:

- A review of the implications and priorities of existing strategies
- A review of existing policies and provision standards relating to open space, sport and recreation facilities
- Consultation with communities and stakeholders via Sports Club Surveys, School Surveys, Face-to-face meetings (See Appendix 2a), Freephone and email services, and a series of Focus Groups (see Appendix 2b)
- A Door to Door survey was undertaken to identify the views of facility users and non-users; the addresses were identified and sampled by TWBC, to ensure representative feedback from around the Borough

2.12 **Stage 2: Audit of local provision:** The following key tasks have been undertaken:

- Review of quantitative information held by the Council
- Site visits to all known open space, sport and recreation facilities with community use (across all sectors)
- Qualitative assessments of all sites visited
- Consultation with facility providers
- Mapping facilities in respect of location and user catchment area

2.13 **Stage 3: Setting Provision Standards:** The following key tasks have been undertaken:

- Quantity Standards set using the findings of facility audits, local consultation and demand modelling
- Quality Standards set using the findings of facility audits and local consultation
- Accessibility Standards set using the findings of facility audits, local consultation and mapping catchment areas

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

2.14 **Stage 4: Application of Provision Standards:** Application of the proposed standards in relation to defined catchment areas, and the impact of poor quality, allows the:

- Identification of deficiencies in accessibility
- Identification of deficiencies in quality
- Identification of surpluses or deficiencies in quantity

2.15 **Stage 5: Recommendations:** The findings of the process undertaken have allowed a number of key recommendations to be made and the identification of a number of key strategic priorities for the future.

2.16 The assessment and strategy development have been undertaken to consider the **quantity, quality and accessibility** of facilities. The **value** of facilities has also been considered.

2.17 The assessment has considered a number of key questions in relation to:

Quantity

- Is there enough provision to adequately serve the needs of local residents and the local community?
- Are current facilities in the right place?
- Is there enough provision to adequately serve the borough in the future, taking into account changes to demography and the national and local strategic context?
- What is the current mix of provision across all types of open space?

Quality

- Is the provision available of sufficient quality to be “fit for purpose”?
- Does the quality of provision affect usage and potential usage?
- How is quality perceived by users and non-users?

Accessibility

- Is provision physically accessible to the local community?
- Is pricing (where prices apply), a barrier to usage?
- Is provision in the right place to serve local communities?
- How does the management of facilities impact on access?

Value

- Is provision viewed as “valuable” by the local community?
- Does the provision (directly and through enabling) contribute positively to the delivery of key Council corporate objectives?
- What is the perception of key stakeholders?

2.18 The assessment has looked at facilities on both a borough-wide basis and in relation to specific town/parish provision.

Summary of Key Tasks

2.19 In summary the following key tasks have been undertaken to inform the study:

- Audit of 613 areas, including 34 Parks (3 Large Urban Parks, 31 Local Park and Recreation Grounds), 93 playing pitches on 42 sites, 15 bowls greens, 19 tennis sites, 32 Allotment sites, over 50 Play Areas, (including over 10 multi-use games areas (MUGAS)), 21 formal gardens, 245 Natural Greenspaces and Open Spaces and 4 indoor sports facilities, 44 school facilities, and neighbouring authority facilities
- Postal surveys to 44 Schools (initial survey undertaken by TWBC) (100% response rate after telephone follow up) over 145 Sports Clubs (100% response rate after telephone follow up) (see Appendix 2e), and 1 Allotment Association to ask for views about quantity, quality and access
- Stakeholder interviews with more than 30 identified stakeholders (100%) (see Appendix 2a)

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

- Consultation with all 13 of the Parish Councils (100% response), and 2 Town Councils (100% response) (see Appendix 2a)
- A Community Hall Survey (initial survey undertaken by TWBC)
- A review of provision in neighbouring authorities (Appendix 5)
- A review of existing consultation and market research undertaken
- 6 Focus Groups (See Appendix 2b)
- 500 door to door surveys (See Appendix 2d)
- A number of mapping exercises to assess levels of provision and accessibility
- Demand modelling for indoor facilities using the parameters of the Sport England Facilities Planning Model
- The use of demographic data sets to determine the propensity to participate in key leisure activities
- Geographically mapped the sites audited by typology and quality

Types of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

- 2.20 In order to assess in some detail the adequacy of open space, sport and recreation provision, it is necessary to consider the different types of provision and their primary role and function. Knowing why, and what, an open space or sports facility is there “to do” is critical to making judgements about its adequacy in respect of quantity, quality and accessibility.
- 2.21 The PPG17 Companion Guide provides guidance on a number of key categories (Typology) of open space, sport and recreation provision. Through consultation and slight changes to the PPG 17 typology an adaptation of this typology has been made to reflect local provision across Tunbridge Wells Borough. This typology is summarised in Table 2.3.

Assessing Quantity

- 2.22 The assessment of quantity has been undertaken on the basis of:
- A review of the number of sites and size of provision, in relation to local population; it is also important to assess what needs to be protected, what can be lost, what functions of open space, indoor and outdoor sport and recreational facilities can be changed,
 - Comparison of specific types of facilities e.g. playing pitches and allotments against known demand (from consultation)

NB. The assessment does not consider privately owned gardens, grass verges alongside transport routes or school grounds with no community access

Assessing Quality

- 2.23 The assessment of quality has been undertaken on the basis of:
- Site visits to community accessible facilities to rate a number of key criteria affecting quality.
 - Quality ratings from key users, residents and specific user groups
- 2.24 The overall quality scores place a site within certain key categories along the “quality value line”. Each aspect of a site is rated for its quality out of a given score (these are shown in detail in Appendix 7, which includes the individual ratings for each site, by typology). If a site does not have a specific aspect, its quality score is calculated on the basis of what it does have, but if it is missing critical elements such as e.g. signage, its overall quality rating will be lower. The various quality lines are illustrated below; these reflect the different quality values assessed for each specific typology:

Quality Line – Open Space (Parks, Natural and Semi Natural Green Space, Green Corridors, Amenity)

0% - 15.49%	15.50% - 30.49%	30.50% - 45.49%	45.50% - 60.49%	60.50% - 75.49%	75.50% +
Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

Quality Line – Allotments

0% - 19%	20% - 39%	40% - 59%	60% - 79%	80% +
Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent

Quality Line – Playing Pitches

0% - 30%	31% - 39%	40% - 59%	60% - 89%	90% +
Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent

Quality Line – Bowling Greens, Tennis Courts,

0% - 19%	20% - 39%	40% - 59%	60% - 79%	80% +
Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent

2.25 The quality 'value' is assessed via a scored proforma which rates the quality of the provision against specific criteria (See Table 2.2) such as:

- Presence and quality of signage and available information
- Quality and presence of seats, bins and toilets
- Maintenance of boundary hedges, etc
- Quality of additional provision on site

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

2.26 Table 2.2 below details the criteria used for each typology;

Table 2.2 – Quality Assessment Criteria

	Parks/Gardens or Recreation Ground	Informal Open Space	Natural and Semi Natural Space	Green Corridors	Allotments	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Provision for Children and Young People
Assessment Criteria							
Entrance areas	✓		✓	✓	✓		
Presence and quality of signage and information	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Boundary fencing and hedges	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Tree management	✓	✓	✓				
The quality of key furniture including seats, bins, toilets	✓	✓	✓				✓
The quality of maintenance, grass cutting, pathways	✓	✓	✓				
Cleanliness	✓	✓	✓				✓
The quality of specific facilities including play provision, bowls greens and multi-use games areas (shown as separate assessment)	✓						✓
The presence of water supply					✓		
Whether the site is served by toilets					✓		
Secure fencing around the site					✓		
Signage to identify management, usage arrangements, special events and the availability of plots					✓		

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

	Parks/Gardens or Recreation Ground	Informal Open Space	Natural and Semi Natural Space	Green Corridors	Allotments	Cemeteries and Churchyards	Provision for Children and Young People
The presence of facilities such as composting bins, a shop and car parking.					✓		
Cemetery Specific							
Main entrance safety, cleanliness, and natural presence						✓	
Signage						✓	
Upkeep and safety of the graves						✓	
Quality of roads and pathways						✓	
Provision of bins and seats						✓	
Boundary fencing and hedges						✓	

Assessing Access

2.27 The assessment of accessibility has been undertaken on the basis of:

- Auditing factors known to affect the access to certain types of facility
- Consultation with local residents
- Mapping exercises to identify catchment areas for different types of provision

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

- 2.28 GIS mapping, by typology, has been used in undertaking the audit and assessment to illustrate the location, quantity, and where possible, the accessibility, and distribution of existing provision. Map 1 (in the attached document) shows the location of all sites, colour coded to reflect the primary typology of the site i.e. all sites by typology.
- 2.29 Table 2.3 overleaf identifies the green space typology used in this study.

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

Table 2.3 – Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Greenspace Typology

Typology		Primary Purpose
Parks	Large Urban Park	These include Formal Urban Parks that meet the AGMA/ ILAM definition of a formal park. These are high quality parks that offer a wide range of facilities for formal and informal recreation and events.
	Local Park and Recreation Ground	These include small parks and recreation grounds that offer a limited range of facilities for informal and formal sport, play and recreation. These sites may offer areas for children's play, and/or formal outdoor sports areas, as well as informal recreation areas.
	Formal Garden (private access)	Normally high quality laid out gardens including memorial gardens that include formal grass areas, floral and permanent landscaping and seating, to which the public has some access. (Not usually in Council ownership)
Natural and Semi Natural greenspaces	Natural and Semi Natural Open Space	Including Nature Reserves, woodlands, and commons. Wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education awareness, to which the public have access.
Green Corridors - Wildlife - Walking - Cycling - Bridleways		Walking cycling or horse riding whether for leisure purposes travel or wildlife migration.
Outdoor Sports		Participation in outdoor sports such as pitch sports, tennis, bowls, athletics, or countryside and water sports
Informal Open Space	Informal Recreational Green Space	Includes village greens. Opportunities for informal activities close to residential areas and to improve the visual appearance of residential or other areas.
	Visual Amenity Green Space	
Provision for Children and Young People		Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, multi use games areas, wheeled play areas and teenage play zones
Allotments and Community Gardens		Include opportunities for those people who wish to grow their own produce as part of the long term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion, allotments provided by the Council and those managed by allotment societies
Cemeteries, churchyards in use, disused churchyards and other burial grounds		Areas where the primary function is a Cemetery, Churchyard or other burial grounds which provide facilities for quiet contemplation and often provide areas for walking and wildlife conservation
Area of Important Open Space Areas of Landscape Importance		These two typologies are identified separately where they are stand alone provision, but also within the above typologies, where this designation also applies to an area of open space already identified by its primary typology, for example, a Local Park/Recreation Ground is the primary use, but the area includes a hedgerow of landscape importance.

N.B Indoor Facilities (sports and community) have also been audited and assessed as part of the PPG 17 ASSESSMENT, but are not included as areas of open space in the above table).

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

2.30 The typologies used in this report are summarised in Table 2.3; Appendix 3 provides a detailed listing of all sites, by typology across the Borough. This table is used as the basis for all the audit and assessment findings in section III. The typologies have been developed on the basis of the primary purpose for which the open space/facility is used.

Consultation - Background and Methodology

2.31 In order to develop a PPG17 Assessment and set provision standards, it is essential to consult with the local community to gain an insight into local needs and aspirations. It is also important to ascertain the views of local communities as part of the Corporate Performance Assessment (CPA) and Community Planning process.

2.32 A door to door survey of 500 households randomly selected across Tunbridge Wells Borough has been undertaken to establish views on the above. The questionnaire and results can be found in Appendix 2d.

2.33 The door to door survey was designed to assess views of residents, their attitude and aspirations with regard to open space, indoor and outdoor sport and recreational facilities across the borough as set out above.

Sample Selection

2.34 Participants from the random sample addresses, provided by the Council, were selected to cover all demographic aspects of the population over the age of 16 years. Table 2.4 below shows how representative the door to door survey was compared to the Census 2001 for Tunbridge Wells.

Table 2.4 – Comparison of Representative Door to Door Survey to 2001 Tunbridge Wells Census

	Census 2001	Door to Door Survey Response
Male	48.10%	45.7%
Female	51.90%	54.29%
White	97.52%	97.38%
Long Term Illness	14.5%	13.3%
Ages	Aged 16 – 73 92% Aged 74+ 8%	Aged 16 -73 90% Aged 74+ 10%

Non-Pitch Sports: Assessment Methodology

2.35 The assessment of demand for and supply of, Outdoor Bowling Greens, Tennis Courts, and Athletics Tracks (Section 3) falls outside the scope of the assessment methodology detailed in '*Towards a Level Playing Field*' (only covers playing pitches) (Sport England 2003). The provision of tennis courts (quantitative), has been based on the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) guidance on courts per population numbers, and the quantitative assessment of bowling greens relates to the General Household Survey (GHS) figures i.e. one bowling green for 6,941 people. The quantitative assessment for athletics provision is based on the guidance figure issued by UK Athletics i.e. one major track facility per 250,000 people. A number of factors make these sports difficult to assess, from both a demand and supply perspective. These include:

- **Demand** for these sports manifests itself in a variety of ways. Participation for example, can be on an individual, casual basis or as part of a team playing in a formal competitive match.
- **Access** to these facilities, can be complex in some cases. For example, membership policies of clubs can vary from full open access, through to nomination based policy. Casual use of facilities can vary from the need to purchase a season ticket through to traditional pay and play access of staffed facilities.
- **Supply** of facilities can also vary greatly. The actual size of a bowling green for example, whether it has floodlighting, and the presence of ancillary facilities can greatly affect the capacity of facilities to meet demand.

Techniques Used

2.36 The following techniques have been employed in undertaking the audit and assessments:

- Site visits and visual inspections of all identified facilities

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

- Attribution of a score to each site, and its constituent element
- Completion of on site proformas to record visual inspection
- Transfer of individual site data to overall spreadsheet (by typology)
- Translation of scores into individual and overall quality percentages
- Comparison of these percentages with the identified quality line for each typology
- Identification of position on quality line
- Comparison of individual sites by typology, on a Boroughwide and Parish basis

All technical information for each typology and the individual sites are contained in Appendices 7a – 7f.

Applying the Standards

- 2.37 The standards of provision for each type of facility, surpluses and deficiencies in provision have been considered on the basis of the assessment undertaken. GIS mapping has been used to illustrate a number of key findings, particularly in relation to access. These maps are contained in the appendices to this report.
- 2.38 The findings of the door to door and other consultation exercises have been used to inform appropriate distance thresholds (findings are reported in more detail within the appendices to this report). The survey findings also reveal local perceptions about the quantity and quality of local provision.
- 2.39 Residents were asked a number of questions about current provision in relation to quantity, quality and accessibility. The responses have been used to set provision standards, which have then been applied using GIS mapping.
- 2.40 **Future Needs:** In the future, population across the Borough is projected to increase very slightly from 104,030 to 104,500 by 2016; however, overall, based on KCC figures the population of the Borough will decline by 2021. It is therefore not considered that there will be a substantial increase in demand for provision. However, it is important that existing levels of provision are maintained, where appropriate, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, to continue to provide for the population level; only where there is a significant surplus of a specific type of provision should this be considered for alternative use. It is also particularly important to recognise that the Borough has a larger number of younger people now, who will, as they grow up, increase demand for provision. Equally, as these existing young people grow older, there will be a need to continue, as at present, to provide for a larger than average elderly population.
- 2.41 It is also critical to recognise that there is currently a national focus on increasing activity levels amongst the general population; Sport England aim to achieve 70% participation, on a regular basis, amongst the population by 2020. If these figures are achieved, there will be an impact on the local levels of participation and the demand for provision. Equally, there may well be changes in the type of activity in which people wish to participate. There is therefore a need to retain flexibility in what is provided, and the levels of provision, to be able to respond to these participation issues.

Standards of Provision

- 2.42 The local standards developed for the open space typologies (as classified in Section I and applied throughout the study) are based on the components of Quality, Quantity and Accessibility. This means that an assessment has been made of both how much provision there is, and whether there is enough for the Borough, and whether the existing provision is of a high enough quality to be used for the purpose for which it is intended. Assessment has also been made as to whether the existing provision is actually accessible for local people. The door-to-door survey of local residents and other consultation findings have been used to inform the appropriate distance thresholds (access) which have been applied using GIS to demonstrate potential surplus/ deficiencies in provision.
- 2.43 In order to set provision standards it is important to consider the standards previously applied by the Council and through the planning framework. The current standard for open space as applied by the Council reflects the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) standard of 2.4 hectares per 1,000 population; this level of provision equates to 1.6 ha of formal provision for playing pitches, and 0.8 ha of provision for children and young people). The location, accessibility and quality of open space is also important in ensuring that the areas are well used and appropriate to the needs of the community.
- 2.44 In relation to wildlife links and corridors the guiding principles for provisional standards include:

SECTION II – STUDY METHODOLOGY

- Standards for quality should enhance the natural aspects of the corridor/wildlife link
- Quality standards should provide opportunities to link various bits of green space, so that the whole corridor has a greater value than the sum of the individual links
- Standards for the quantitative provision of wildlife links and corridors should be about overall level of access to this typology, rather than a standard per 100 population, to ensure existing provision is safeguarded and enhanced rather than destroyed
- The provision of wildlife links and corridors should protect existing natural habitats for species

2.45 It is important to emphasise how important open space is in the Borough of Tunbridge Wells; the Borough is defined by its natural and semi-natural open spaces, for example, the High Weald, and it is the quality of such spaces, which make the Borough such an attractive place in which to live, work and participate in recreational activities. Open Space is a key feature of the Borough, and has been recognised as such by local residents through other consultation exercises; local residents rate quality of life highly in the Borough, and also stress the value and importance of the quality open space available to them.

2.46 In developing and applying standards of provision, it is important to be clear that:

- **National standards of recommended provision have been used for comparative purposes only**
- **Existing standards of provision relate to the current level of provision of a specific typology**
- **Recommended standards of provision are based on local assessment and analysis, but may be the same as a national recommended standard if appropriate, and specifically where current levels of provision do not meet a nationally recommended standard as a minimum. Equally, the future recommended standard may be the existing level of provision, if it is above the minimum recommended level, and to lose it would significantly change the natural character of the area**

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Introduction

- 3.1 The results and findings of the various consultation, research and audit tasks undertaken across the identified typologies are reported in this section of the report. A number of key research exercises were undertaken during the period July – November 2005.

Parks

- 3.2 Parks * provide accessible, high quality opportunities for a range of informal recreation, and community events, and in some cases, for formal sport (not in formal gardens). Many Parks have historic features and are of heritage value.

- 3.3 Parks provision has been sub-categorised (see Table 2.3) into:

- **Large Urban Parks,**
- **Local Parks and Recreation Grounds**
- **Formal Gardens** (in the Borough, these sites are owned by the National Trust, or are in other private ownership, and are therefore outside the responsibility of TWBC, or Town or Parish Councils; this was established on the basis of discussions with Leisure and Strategy and Development Services Officers about the primary role and function of the Parks and Gardens facilities across the Borough. This overall typology is therefore analysed by these individual sub-typologies of Large Urban Parks, Local Parks and Recreation Grounds, and Formal Gardens (in relation to quantity, quality and accessibility), in addition to being assessed on both a Boroughwide and Parish basis. Assessments have only been undertaken on those to which there is public access; this typology is neither the responsibility of TWBC nor the Parishes. This typology relates primarily to Historic parks and gardens, for which there is usually an entrance fee; the Formal Gardens are those in the ownership of the National Trust, or other private landowners. Many Formal Gardens have historic features and are of heritage value.

*N.B Parks refer to the overall typology; specific comments in relation to the three sub-typologies are identified as such.

Overall Quantity: Parks

- 3.4 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are **3 Large Urban Parks, 34 Local Park and Recreation Grounds and 21 Formal Gardens (total 56 sites)** within Tunbridge Wells Borough.

Table 3.1 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Parks and Gardens Provision

Town & Parish Area	Population (2001 Census)	Number of Sites				
		Large Urban Park	Local Park and Recreation Ground	Total Number	Total Hectares	Formal Gardens
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	3	9	12	66.90	0
Benenden	2,226	0	2	2	2.37	2
Bidborough	966	0	1	1	1.63	1
Brenchley	2,717	0	1	1	3.09	1
Capel	2,283	0	1	1	2.68	2
Cranbrook	6603	0	2	2	9.34	4
Frittenden	863	0	1	1	1.04	0

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town & Parish Area	Population (2001 Census)	Number of Sites				
		Large Urban Park	Local Park and Recreation Ground	Total Number	Total Hectares	Formal Gardens
Goudhurst	3,136	0	1	1	0.52	2
Hawkhurst	4,307	0	3	3	5.78	1
Horsmonden	2,150	0	1	1	4.38	2
Lamberhurst	1,496	0	1	1	4.54	2
Paddock Wood	8,329	0	4	4	10.17	0
Pembury	6,014	0	2	2	5.26	0
Sandhurst	1,290	0	1	1	2.96	0
Southborough	11,139	0	2	2	11.37	1
Speldhurst	4,765	0	2	2	5.69	3
TOTALS	104,016	3	34	37	137.72	21

3.5 The identified Parks (including the two typologies of Large Urban Park, and Local Parks and Recreation Grounds, but excluding formal gardens (National Trust and privately owned 1124.56ha), cover 137.72 ha across the Borough; the location of these facilities is shown on Maps 2a Formal Gardens, 2b Large Urban Parks, and 2c Local Parks and Recreation Grounds.

- Overall, there is Boroughwide provision of 1.32ha of Parks per 1000 head of population (excluding Formal Gardens i.e. National Trust and privately owned)

Boroughwide Assessment

Quantity: Large Urban Parks

3.6 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are 3 Large Parks within Royal Tunbridge Wells.

Table 3.2 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Large Urban Parks Provision

Town & Parish Area	Population (2001 Census)	Large Urban Park	Total Hectares
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	3	50.49
Total		3	50.49

3.7 The identified Large Urban Parks cover 50.49 ha across the Borough; the location of these facilities is shown on Map, 2b Large Urban Parks. From the site assessments, mapping exercises and the above data, a number of observations can be made:

- The characteristics of Dunorlan Park and Calverley Grounds in Royal Tunbridge Wells mean they could be defined as formal gardens but this study has defined their primary purpose as Large Urban Parks and they have been assessed accordingly
- All three of the Large Urban Parks are in Royal Tunbridge Wells.
- Overall, there is Boroughwide provision of 0.49ha of Large Urban Parks per 1000 head of population

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality: Large Urban Parks

3.8 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits to the 3 sites within this typology and completion of a scored proforma, against specific criteria as shown in Table 2.2. The quality scores are shown in Table 3.3. The quality assessment proforma for Parks is based on a number of key criteria encompassing the quality aspects of the Green Flag Programme, ILAM Parks Management Guidance and the Tidy Britain Scheme. The assessment considered the physical, social and aesthetic qualities of each individual park. In summary the scoring included the criteria of:

- Entrance areas
- Presence and quality of signage and information
- Boundary fencing and hedges
- Roads, paths and cycle ways
- Quality of planted areas (flower and shrub beds)
- Tree management
- Quality of key provision including seats, bins, toilets
- Quality of specific facilities including play provision, bowls greens and multi-use games areas

3.9 The quality audit provides an indicative rating of quality out of 100%. It is important to note that the quality score represents a “snapshot in time” and records the quality of the site at the time of the audit visit.

Table 3.3 –Tunbridge Wells Borough: Large Urban Parks Quality Ratings

Town and Parish	Provision Details	Number of Sites Audited	Total	Quality Range	
				Range:	Score:
Royal Tunbridge Wells	3 Large Urban Parks	3	3	Very Good - Excellent	71.19% - 88.67%

3.10 Key quality findings include:

- The level of quality in Royal Tunbridge Wells is very high
- An average of 81.77% ('Excellent') based on the audits undertaken on sites within this typology.
- Primarily the quality standards of these parks are excellent. The lowest quality score for Tunbridge Wells is Grosvenor and Hilbert Recreation Ground (71.19%). The challenge is to improve at Grosvenor and Hilbert Recreation Ground and ensure sustainability of this standard at other Large Urban Parks.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Local Parks and Recreation Grounds

- 3.11 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds provide accessible, high quality opportunities for a range of informal recreation, formal sport and community events.

Quantity: Local Parks and Recreation Grounds

- 3.12 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are **34 Local parks and Recreation Grounds** within Tunbridge Wells Borough.

Table 3.4– Tunbridge Wells Borough: Local Parks and Recreation Grounds Current Provision

Town & Parish Area	Population (2001 Census)	Local Park and Recreation Grounds	Total Hectares
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	9	16.41
Benenden	2,226	2	2.37
Bidborough	966	1	1.63
Brenchley	2,717	1	3.09
Capel	2,283	1	2.68
Cranbrook	6603	2	9.34
Frittenden	863	1	1.04
Goudhurst	3,136	1	0.52
Hawkhurst	4,307	3	5.78
Horsmonden	2,150	1	4.38
Lamberhurst	1,496	1	4.54
Paddock Wood	8,329	4	10.17
Pembury	6,014	2	5.26
Sandhurst	1,290	1	2.96
Southborough	11,139	2	11.37
Speldhurst	4,765	2	5.69
TOTALS	104,016	34	87.23

- 3.13 The **identified Local Parks and Recreation Grounds** cover **87.23 ha** across the Borough; the location of these facilities is shown on **Map2c Local Parks and Recreation Grounds**. From the site assessments, mapping exercises and the above data, a number of observations can be made:
- Six Parishes – Benenden, Bidborough, Capel, Frittenden, Goudhurst and Sandhurst have below 3ha of this type of provision
 - Ten Parishes – Benenden, Bidborough, Brenchley, Capel, Frittenden, Goudhurst, Horsmonden, Lamberhurst and Sandhurst have below 5ha of this type of provision

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- Overall, there is Boroughwide provision of **0.83ha** of Local Parks and Recreation Grounds per 1000 head of population

Quality: Local Parks and Recreation Grounds

3.14 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits to 33 sites within this typology and completion of a scored proforma, against specific criteria as shown in Table 2.2. The quality scores are shown in Table 3.5. The quality assessment proforma for Parks and Gardens is based on a number of key criteria encompassing the quality aspects of the Green Flag Programme, ILAM Parks Management Guidance and the Tidy Britain Scheme. The assessment considered the physical, social and aesthetic qualities of each individual park. In summary the scoring included the criteria of:

- Entrance areas
- Presence and quality of signage and information
- Boundary fencing and hedges
- Roads, paths and cycle ways
- Quality of planted areas (flower and shrub beds)
- Tree management
- Quality of key provision including seats, bins, toilets
- Quality of specific facilities including play provision, bowls greens and multi-use games areas

3.15 The quality audit provides an indicative rating of quality out of 100%. It is important to note that the quality score represents a “snapshot in time” and records the quality of the site at the time of the audit visit.

Table 3.5 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Local Parks and Recreation Grounds Quality Ratings

Town and Parish	Provision Details	Quality Range	
		Range:	Score:
Royal Tunbridge Wells	9 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds	Average - Excellent	41.67% - 80%
Benenden	2 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds	Very Good - Excellent	62.76 %– 78.71%
Bidborough	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Very Good	60.98%
Brenchley	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Excellent	79.06%
Capel	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Very Good	65.19%
Cranbrook	2 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds	Good - Excellent	60.48% - 76%
Frittenden	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Excellent	75.65
Goudhurst	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Good	Score 46.15%
Hawkhurst	3 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds – 1 Site not Audited	Range:	Score

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town and Parish	Provision Details	Quality Range	
		Very Good: Range:	64.78% - 71.90% Score:
Horsmonden	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Very Good	60.98%
Lamberhurst	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Average	43.08%
Paddock Wood	4 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds	Good - Excellent	46.10% - 88.40%
Pembury	2 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds	Very Good	65.14% – 67.46%
Sandhurst	1 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Very Good	66.78%
Southborough	2 Local Park and Recreation Ground	Good - Excellent	58.46% - 79.06%
Speldhurst	2 Local Parks and Recreation Grounds	Very Good - Excellent	70.50% - 93.22%

3.16 Key quality findings include:

- Parks and Recreation Grounds in Royal Tunbridge Wells Range from average to excellent (sites rated as average are Southview Road Open Space, and Allendale Recreation Ground)
- Across the parished areas Parks and Recreation Grounds range from good to excellent.
- The quality score does reflect the facilities in parks and recreation grounds e.g. if they have tennis and bowls provision the rating will be higher.

Formal Gardens

3.17 Formal Gardens are those in the ownership of the National Trust, or other private landowners. Many Formal Gardens have historic features and are of heritage value.

Quantity: Formal Gardens

3.18 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are **21 Formal Gardens** within Tunbridge Wells Borough.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.6 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Formal Gardens Provision

Town & Parish Area	Population (2001 Census)	Formal Gardens	Total Hectares
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	0	0
Benenden	2,226	2	144.96
Bidborough*	966	1	8.12
Brenchley	2,717	1	1.67
Capel	2,283	2	161.5
Cranbrook	6603	4	140.85
Frittenden	863	0	0
Goudhurst	3,136	2	39.58
Hawkhurst	4,307	1	43.67
Horsmonden	2,150	2	103.25
Lamberhurst	1,496	2	388.60
Paddock Wood	8,329	0	0
Pembury	6,014	0	0
Sandhurst	1,290	0	0
Southborough*	11,139	1	9.71
Speldhurst	4,765	3	82.65
TOTALS	104,016	21	1,124.56

* Mabledon is located in both Bidborough and Southborough parishes; the hectareage allocation relates to the portion of the Formal Garden in each Parish. This approach has been used for other sites with ha in two or more parishes.

3.19 The **identified Formal Gardens** cover **1,124.56 ha** across the Borough; the location of these facilities is shown on Map 2a Formal Gardens. From the mapping exercises and the above data, a number of observations can be made:

- The distribution of Formal Gardens is fairly even across the Parishes but there is no provision in Frittenden, Paddock Wood, Pembury, and Sandhurst
- There are no Formal Gardens in Royal Tunbridge Wells
- Overall, there is Boroughwide provision of **10.81ha** of parks and formal gardens per 1000 head of population

Quality: Formal Gardens

3.20 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits to the majority of the 21 sites within this typology and completion of a scored proforma, against specific criteria as shown in Table 2.2. The quality scores are shown in Table 3.7.

3.21 The quality assessment proforma for Formal Gardens is based on a number of key criteria encompassing the quality aspects of the Green Flag Programme, ILAM Parks Management Guidance and the Tidy Britain Scheme. The

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

assessment considered the physical, social and aesthetic qualities of each individual Formal Garden. In summary the scoring included the criteria of:

- Entrance areas
- Presence and quality of signage and information
- Boundary fencing and hedges
- Roads, paths and cycle ways
- Quality of planted areas (flower and shrub beds)
- Tree management
- Quality of key provision including seats, bins, toilets
- Quality of specific facilities including play provision, bowls greens and multi-use games areas

3.22 The quality audit provides an indicative rating of quality out of 100%. It is important to note that the quality score represents a “snapshot in time” and records the quality of the site at the time of the audit visit.

Table 3.7 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Formal Gardens Quality Ratings

Town and Parish	Provision Details	Number of Sites Audited	Total	Quality Range	
				Range:	Score:
Benenden	2 Formal Gardens	2	2	Very Good:	74%
Capel	2 Formal Gardens	2	2	Excellent	90%
Cranbrook	4 Formal Gardens	4	4	Excellent	94%
Goudhurst	2 Formal Gardens	2	2	Excellent	92%
Hawkhurst	1 Formal Garden	1	1	Good:	59%
Horsmonden	2 Formal Gardens	2	2	Access unavailable	Access unavailable
Lamberhurst	2 Formal Gardens	2	2	Excellent	90%
Southborough*	1 Formal Garden	1	1	Very Good:	74%
Speldhurst	3 Formal Gardens	3	3	Access unavailable	Access unavailable

*This Formal Garden is Mabledon, which is located part in Southborough and Part in Bidborough. It was assessed as one Formal Garden from Southborough access.

3.23 Key Boroughwide quality comments include:

- The Borough Council, and Parish and Town Councils have no responsibility for the quality of these sites as they are all in private ownership.
- The level of quality across the Borough is very high

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Parks: Boroughwide Quality

- 3.24 Key Boroughwide quality comments include:
- The level of quality across the Borough is very high. Maps 3a Formal Gardens by Quality Rating, 3b Large Urban Parks by Quality Rating, and 3c Local Parks and Recreation Grounds by Quality Rating illustrate the overall quality of identified sites.
 - There is a Boroughwide average of 85% ('Excellent') based on the audits undertaken on sites within this typology.
- 3.25 The average overall quality of all sites (Large Urban Parks, and Parks and Recreation Grounds) in the Parks typology is very good. In Royal Tunbridge Wells, all Large Urban Parks were rated as Very Good (71.19%) to Excellent (88.67%), and Parks and Recreation Grounds were rated as Average (41.67%) to Excellent (80%).
- 3.26 In the Parishes, the Parks and Recreation Grounds ranged in quality from Average (43.08) % to Excellent (93.22%).
- 3.27 The challenge is to ensure sustainability of this quality standard across those sites managed through TWBC, the Town and Parishes (neither Parish nor Town Councils nor TWBC have responsibility for the Formal Gardens).

Accessibility

- 3.28 Accessibility has been assessed using a variety of techniques including mapping exercises and consultation. Map 4a Formal Gardens with Buffers, 4B Large Urban Parks with Buffers, 4c Local Parks and Recreation Grounds with Buffers; illustrate accessibility buffers for identified sites. The key findings show that:
- Results from respondents to the door to door survey revealed that 33.58% use Parks at least weekly and 17.8% at least daily. However 27.78% of door to door respondents had never used a park.
 - 69.7% of people said they can walk to their nearest park (includes Large Urban Parks and Local Parks and Recreation Grounds, but not Formal Gardens) within 9.8 minutes and this equates to a distance travelled of 1.06 km
 - The consultation and audits identified that there is a need for improved toilet facilities in the Large Urban Parks, but particularly in the Local Parks and Recreation Grounds (parish areas)
 - Consultation identified a need for more events and activities, particularly in the rural areas

Summary of Consultation Findings

- 3.29 A number of consultation exercises have been undertaken as part of the development of this strategy. These have been supplemented with study-specific consultations including stakeholder interviews (with TWBC's Parks Manager, Grounds Maintenance Staff, and Community Safety representatives), consultation with Friends of Parks Groups, and a door to door household survey. The consultation provides a number of varying opinions about the current quantity, quality and accessibility of Parks (Large Urban Parks, Parks and Recreation Grounds), across the borough. Key results include:
- 52% of residents were satisfied with Parks provided near their homes
 - Only 5% of respondents identified parks being too far away as a barrier to use (includes Large Urban Parks and Local Parks and Recreation sites, but not Formal Gardens)
 - Respondents stated that they perceived the biggest barriers to use are general lack of time, no interest in using the facilities or anti social behaviour (perceived or actual).
 - Although the site audits identified that Parks are generally of a high quality (85% rated as 'Excellent') and the Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) Survey demonstrated high local satisfaction with the Parks in the Borough, some people's perception of the quality of their local park is based on a poor personal experience or negative local press coverage.
 - Issues of anti-social behaviour, dog fouling and vandalism were raised in relation to Parks, but were largely in relation to sites in the rural areas. It is often difficult to quantify comments about anti-social behaviour as this can

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

be a personal reaction, rather than an actual event. Similarly, reaction to dog fouling can be exaggerated, depending on personal experience.

- Residents who attended the focus groups identified an increase of vandalism in Local Parks and Recreation Grounds, particularly in the rural areas; some also felt that dog fouling was a big issue across all Parks sites in the Borough
- Consultation identified that Parks are well looked after in Tunbridge Wells Borough, despite the issues of dog fouling and anti-social behaviour identified above
- The highest rated Large Urban Park in Royal Tunbridge Wells was Dunorlan; Grosvenor and Hilbert Recreation Ground was rated as a very good park, but had the lowest quality score.

Key Findings:

3.30 A number of key findings and conclusions in relation to the provision of Parks can be reported. These are:

- Overall, high satisfaction with the quality of Parks provision (measured by the Door to Door residents' Survey) and from the focus groups, but there are issues, particularly in the rural areas with dog fouling and anti-social behaviour/vandalism
- High levels of overall usage (95% of respondents who said they use public Parks do so on a regular basis)
- In Royal Tunbridge Wells, Large Urban Parks, and Local Parks and Recreation Grounds are of a high quality, with all sites apart from South View Road Open Space (Rated Average) rated 'Good' or above.
- Residents also rated the quality of parks highly although a number have concerns over vandalism, dog fouling and general maintenance.
- A number of residents (from the Town and the Parishes) who responded to the consultation process are concerned about long term sustainability, i.e. appropriate revenue, to ensure the future of the recent investment in parks e.g. Dunorlan
- Sites need to be accessible and provide for people with disabilities. Further partnership work with the Tunbridge Wells Access Group will ensure that appropriate access needs are identified, and addressed.

Town Related Issues

- There is a perceived lack of dog bins in parks and green spaces; however, the provision of dog bag dispensers in all the town's parks enables dog owners to dispose of dog waste in normal bins.

Parish Related Issues

- There are concerns over the levels of vandalism and anti social behaviour to which open space is continually subjected across the Borough, in particular local parks in the rural areas
- Residents of many villages are satisfied with open spaces generally, but feel that each small village should have one decent park

Developing and Applying Standards

- 3.31 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children's play area, driving to an indoor sports facilities etc. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.
- 3.32 For the purpose of this report, the urban area comprises Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough and the small rural towns of Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst.
- 3.33 The table below sets out the modes of transport that are considered to be acceptable in terms of sustainable access (with the most sustainable stated first) for each typology. It also indicates whether it is necessary to "qualify" certain standards with regard to their use in the rural areas. This is considered to be appropriate in cases where factors such as low densities of development or small population numbers make the provision of certain types of open space respectively less important or less practical in the rural area.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

Developing and Applying Standards: Parks

Recommended Provision Standard
<p>Quantity: There is an existing level of provision of 1.32 ha per 1000 population. There is no current national recommended level of provision for parks. The recommended minimum standard of future provision for Parks is 1.32ha per 1000 population across the Borough; to reduce the current level and location of provision, given the nature, natural environment and geography of the Borough, would significantly alter the local environment.</p> <p>Respondents (88.98%) to the Door to Door Survey felt that the parks in their areas met the needs of their families for outdoor recreation.</p> <p>Quality: The average quality score for all Large Urban Parks is 80.35% (rated as 'Excellent' facilities) and local parks and recreation grounds is 65.66% which equates to "Very Good" facilities. Local residents (77.49%) made positive comments about quality, rating local provision as "Very Good - Excellent".</p> <p>Access: The consultation has revealed that the average walking distance travelled to a Park is 1.06 km. (9.88minutes; this is the time on which all travel distances to parks are based).</p> <p>Setting the Standard for Provision - Urban: The most sustainable location for new residential development is within 1.06 km of a good quality Large Urban Park, or Local Park and Recreation Ground.</p> <p>Development proposals which would be located more than 2.66km (cycle distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.</p> <p>Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 2.66km of a large urban park, local park or recreation ground.</p> <p>The need for publicly accessible parks is greater in urban areas where the density of development is generally higher. In the remoter areas of some rural parishes, population numbers may be insufficient for the provision of additional facilities to be practical. This may, however, be reviewed if circumstances change.</p> <p>There are no areas deficient in parks provision in Royal Tunbridge Wells. In the rural areas there are Local Parks and Recreation Grounds within walking distance of the settlements in most parishes. Although there is slight deficiency in provision from an accessibility perspective, in some of the rural areas, it may not be appropriate to seek</p>

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Recommended Provision Standard

to provide facilities to the urban standard, given that the population in the rural areas is more widely distributed.

Development proposals which would be located more than 2.66km (cycle distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.

Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 2.66km of a large urban park, local park or recreation ground.

Applying the Standard: Map 4c shows the current provision of Local Parks and Recreation Grounds with a theoretical catchment area of 1.06 km based on the average walking travel time identified by residents as part of the door to door survey.

Recommendations: Parks

The Council should adopt a policy of providing “Good” sites as a minimum, rather than “Average” or “Poor”. A ‘Good’ site is one which provides appropriate infrastructure to facilitate usage, for example, signage, seating and bins, is clean, safe, welcoming, and attractive.

- Continue to develop and support Friends Groups for key parks, commons and open spaces to increase local involvement and ownership
- Continue to develop parks to meet the needs of people with disabilities and continue working with the Tunbridge Wells Access Group to identify what is required
- Continue to develop and improve Parks Management Plans and extend the practice of management planning to a greater range of parks and open spaces
- Test the quality and “performance” of parks through entering externally judged competitions and quality recognition schemes, for example, the Green Flag Award
- The development of new parks should be considered if there is demand, but this should be in the context of existing provision, which is already of a generally high quality.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

- 3.34 A number of sites identified within this typology are Sites of Nature Conservation Interest selected by the Kent Wildlife Trust and designated as Wildlife Sites through the Local Plan. Some were formerly "informal" recreation sites which have now been designated as Local Nature Reserves (LNR), and are managed to promote wildlife, and countryside recreation. Others are large areas of open countryside, or woodland with public access, usually provided via a public right of way network

Definition

'Sites that are nature reserves, woodlands or for wildlife conservation, biodiversity and raising environmental education awareness'

Quantity: Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

- 3.35 The audit (see Appendix 3 Natural and Semi – Natural Greenspace (by town and Parish) undertaken has revealed that there are 75 sites that have been classified as natural and semi-natural in Tunbridge Wells Borough. The location of these sites is presented on Map 5.
- 3.36 Table 3.8 provides a brief summary of natural and semi-natural green space provision within Tunbridge Wells Borough.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.8– Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace provision

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Sites	Total Hectares Accessible	Accessible Hectares per 1,000 population	Total Hectares Non Accessible
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	14	230.87	5.00	40.07
Benenden	2,226	7	153.13	74.50	138.15
Bidborough	966	2	91	94.2	0
Brenchley	2,717	4	122.84	45.21	0
Capel	2,283	1	154.28	67.58	0
Cranbrook	6,603	7	547.01	82.84	0
Frittenden	863	2	75.14	87.06	8.84
Goudhurst	3,136	8	856.08	272.98	5.91
Hawkhurst	4,307	7	521.16	121.00	0
Horsmonden	2,150	1	31.18	14.50	0
Lamberhurst	1,496	7	606.96	405.72	0
Paddock Wood	8,329	4	105.50	12.67	0
Pembury	6,014	3	181.81	30.23	1.55
Sandhurst	1,290	2	88.50	68.60	0.12
Southborough	11,139	4	40.24	3.61	16.27
Speldhurst	4,765	2	74.12	15.55	0
TOTALS	104,016	75	3890.45	37.40	210.91

3.36 A number of observations in terms of quantity can be made from the table above:

3.37 In terms of hectarage there is a **significant amount of provision of accessible natural and semi-natural greenspace across the whole borough**, accounting for accessible ha of **37.40ha per 1,000 population**. This is significantly higher than the minimum recommended English Nature standard of 2ha per 1,000 population. (The English Nature Standard relates only to accessible natural open space; the calculation for the Borough is similarly based on the amount of accessible natural open space). English Nature makes the following recommendations in relation to provision levels:

- Provision of at least 2ha of accessible natural green space per 1,000 population. No person should live more than 300m from their nearest area of natural green space
- There should be at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km from home
- There should be at least one 100ha site within 5km
- There should be at least one 500ha site within 10km
- Assessment against English Nature Standards of Provision (also encompassing Green Corridors) is considered in more detail under Standards of Provision.
- All Parishes and the town have surpluses in this type of provision.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality: Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

- 3.38 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site audits and completion of a scored proforma. The quality assessment proforma is based on a number of key criteria encompassing the quality aspects of Green Flag, Tidy Britain and ILAM Parks Management best practice. The assessment considered the physical, social and aesthetic qualities of each individual site. Given that areas of natural and semi natural open space are likely to have less formal facilities than a formal park, a number of criteria were not included in the quality assessment of this typology (See Table 2.2).
- 3.39 The focus of the quality assessment was on pathways, general access, signage, and provision of bins where appropriate etc. Quality ratings are summarised in Table 3.9 below.

Table 3.9 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace Quality Ratings

Town and Parish	Provision Details	No of sites audited	Range	Average Score
Royal Tunbridge Wells	14	14	13.04% - 66.80%	44.39% ('Average')
Benenden	7	7	25.65% - 52.86%	41% ('Average')
Bidborough	2	2	24.35% - 62.17%	43.26% ('Average')
Brenchley	4	3	37.84% - 51.43%	46.86% ('Good')
Capel	1	1	40.87%	40.87% ('Average')
Cranbrook	7	7	4.37% - 54.6%	40.52% ('Average')
Frittenden	2	2	13.91% - 37.86%	25.89% ('Poor')
Goudhurst	8	7	18.73% - 61.32%	40.69% ('Average')
Hawkhurst	7	6	19.13% - 56.09%	42.32% ('Average')
Horsmonden	1	1	37.84%	37.84% ('Average')
Lamberhurst	7	5	19.57% - 66.52%	44.71% ('Average')

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town and Parish	Provision Details	No of sites audited	Range	Average Score
Paddock Wood	4	2	24.35% - 64.32%	44.34% ('Average')
Pembury	2	3	19.57% - 57.62%	42.87%('Average')
Sandhurst	2	2	19.13% - 51.6%	35.37% ('Average')
Southborough	4	4	13.91% - 54.36%	30.11% ('Poor')
Speldhurst	2	2	47.56% - 54.47%	51.02% ('Good')
TOTALS	75	61		40.75% ('Average')

3.40 Map 6 shows the results of the quality audit for these sites. Two key comments can be made in respect of the quality of countryside and woodland sites.

- Average quality scores range from 30.11% across the Borough to 51.02%; the overall average quality score is 40.75% "average".
- Signage, benches and bins are absent from the majority of sites.

NB. It is important to note that sites have been assessed against the identified criteria for this provision, (See Table 2.2) because bins and benches have the potential to help keep a site tidy, and facilitate its use by a wider range of users than simply, for example, dog walkers. This type of 'outdoor furniture', together with appropriate signage, is recommended for sites providing for public access, whether they are formal or informal. The lack of such provision is reflected in the level of quality score awarded to a site, for this reason. However, it is recognised that areas of natural woodland are less likely to have this type of provision. In natural/semi-natural open space settings there is less need for formal provision of seating and bins, but these should be provided where their provision will enhance user experience of the site, and ensure that the site does not become littered.

Accessibility: Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

3.41 Accessibility has been assessed using a variety of techniques including mapping exercises and consultation. Map 7 illustrates the walking distance of 1.27 km that people travel to countryside and woodland sites. The key findings show that:

- 23.87 % of the door to door survey respondents access a nature area (woodland and countryside sites) weekly.
- 38.9% of respondents said they could access woodland and countryside within a five minute walk from their home.
- Generally, door to door respondents walk for an average of 11.8 minutes to reach an area of woodland or countryside; this equates to a distance travelled of 1.27 km.

Summary of Consultation Findings

3.42 A number of findings have emerged from consultation with stakeholders, users and non-users. These are summarised below:

- The primary concern of users (from Focus Group and stakeholder consultation) is the level of maintenance required to develop a sustainable and valuable habitat, whilst also providing an attractive and safely accessible site for the public, within the very limited resources available
- Woodlands are a major concern for those involved in conservation and open space maintenance (town and parish) as there are insufficient resources to address all identified maintenance requirements. The level of TWBC revenue funding to resource its woodlands is perceived to be insufficient, given the evident work required; this perception developed both from consultation feedback and site visits undertaken as part of the study.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- TWBC staff have concerns over the potential liability that is resulting from a lack of investment in the countryside sites where the infrastructures are worn, tired and in need of replacement
- There is a reliance on the Kent High Weald Project to work on sites and aid their development but more resources are required for this project to be sustainable
- Three Local Nature Reserves are perceived to be insufficiently resourced and there are low levels of protection at these sites, in relation to public access
- There is a need for more partnership working with Commons Management Groups (Source Focus Group Consultation – Representative Southborough Common)
- There is real concern that the natural and semi natural countryside sites are not under routine maintenance; effective woodland management is not taking place to the extent that will ensure the long term sustainability of the woodlands as valuable habitats and resources for local people. The infrastructure of the countryside sites are in need of investment and resources.
- The main issues raised regarding accessibility is the problem experienced by people with disabilities particularly when visiting countryside sites. Access needs to be considered holistically rather than in isolation, e.g. improvements to gates is not supported by improvements to footpaths therefore whilst people can get through the gate they then cannot travel any further due to inaccessible, and poor footpaths.
- It is important to note that if sites are not easily accessible to people with disabilities, then it is likely they will also exclude the elderly and young parents with pushchairs and buggies.
- Developing funded maintenance to enhance the value of the more sensitive ecological areas and habitats
- Improving internal communication and consultation through the establishment of an Open Spaces Steering Group

3.43 The Residents' Survey revealed:

'Residents surveyed rate the quality of Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace at an average of 2.77 out of 5. This equates to 55.4% and if applied against the quality value line achieves a score of 'Good'.

Key Findings:

3.44 Two key conclusions can be drawn from the research undertaken. These are summarised as:

- The quality audits undertaken show sites are generally average in quality, although local residents rate quality positively (sites are 'good')
- Quantity varies across the Borough, both in terms of the number of sites and hectares / size of provision.

Developing and Applying Standards

3.45 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children's play area, driving to an indoor sports facilities. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.

3.46 The recommended sustainable means of transport for each type of provision is set out below:

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

Developing and Applying Standards: Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace

Recommended Provision Standard
<p>Quantity: There is an existing level of provision of 37.40 ha per 1000 population. This equates to 35.40 ha per 1000 population more than the national recommended level of provision i.e. English Nature Standard. The recommended minimum standard of future provision for Natural/Semi-Natural Greenspace is 37.40 ha per 1000 population; to reduce the current level and location of provision, given the nature of the Borough, would significantly alter the local environment. The current extent of this provision is a major contributor to the unique characteristics of the Borough.</p> <p>Quality: The average quality score for sites classified as natural greenspace is 40.75% ('average'). Local residents (49.65%) made positive comments about quality, rating local provision as "Excellent".</p> <p>Access: The consultation has revealed that the majority of residents walk to natural/semi-natural greenspace facilities. The average walking distance is 1.27 km, based on the average travel time identified by local residents as part of the door to door survey.</p> <p>All dwellings should be within 1.27 km of a good quality natural / semi-natural greenspace</p> <p>Development proposals which would be located more than 3.15km (cycle distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.</p> <p>Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 3.15km of natural/semi-natural open space.</p> <p>Applying the Standard: Map 7 shows the current provision of sites categorised as natural / semi-natural greenspace with the recommended catchment area. This shows there are walking deficiencies within Horsmonden and some of Goudhurst and Hawkhurst.</p>

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Applying the English Nature Standards

3.47 As reported earlier, an assessment has also been undertaken against the nationally recognised English Nature standards. These standards make recommendations for the quantity and accessibility of natural greenspace. It is acknowledged that other sites, particularly a number of sites classified as Informal Greenspace have elements of natural provision, for example SSSIs, but these may not be accessible to the public. Only sites which are accessible to the public have been included in the calculations for the English Nature standard. There is significant potential to designate additional areas for Nature Conservation and/or restrict public access to SSSIs, or nature conservation areas, as there is plenty of other accessible natural/semi-natural greenspace for public access, without disturbing such sensitive environments. Application of the standard reveals the following:

- **Provision of at least 2ha of accessible natural green space per 1,000 population.** There is more than sufficient provision to meet the quantitative standards set by English Nature, of 2ha of provision per 1,000 population. This English Nature standard is exceeded in the Borough.
- **No person should live more than 300m from their nearest area of natural green space.** This recommended standard is not met uniformly across the Borough. However, it is worth noting that in addition to the accessible semi-natural open space, there are large amounts of green space eg agricultural land, which although they are not publicly accessible, do contribute to the visual amenity value of the area. A few dwellings in Brenchley, Hawkhurst, and Horsmonden do have access to green space within 300m; this is also the case in the east of the main urban area of Royal Tunbridge Wells, given that it is a built up, as opposed to, rural area..(Map 33)
- There should be at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km from home This standard is met for the majority of the Borough, given that the majority of the accessible open space sites under this typology are in excess of 20ha; exceptions are some dwellings in Paddock Wood, Horsmonden, Goudhurst, Frittenden and Sandhurst. These areas do, however, have access to a 20ha site immediately outside the Borough boundary.(Map 33a)
- **There should be at least one 100ha site within 5km.** There are 11 sites in excess of 100ha within the Borough (in Benenden, Capel, Cranbrook, Goudhurst, Lamberhurst, Hawkhurst, and Pembury); therefore the majority of dwellings within the Borough are within 5km of a 100ha site. (Map 33b)
- There should be at least one 500ha site within 10km. **There are 2 accessible 500ha sites within the Borough boundary; the largest accessible site being Bedgebury Forest 833ha in Hawkhurst, and Helmstead Forest (only some of this site is actually in the Borough boundary in Benenden 143.47 ha and Cranbrook 147.69 ha).** Local residents do have access to accessible sites in excess of 500ha just outside the Borough boundary e.g. Ashdown Forest, Bewl Water. (Map 33c)

NB. National Trust properties (where a fee is payable), and privately owned formal gardens have been excluded from this calculation.

Recommendations: Natural / Semi-natural Greenspace

3.48 A number of recommendations are made in response to the assessment findings. These are:

- The Council should adopt a policy of providing “Good” sites rather than “Average” or “Poor”, where they are accessible to the public. A ‘Good’ site is one which provides appropriate infrastructure to support the intended use of the site, for example, signage, seating and bins, is clean, safe, welcoming, and attractive. However, it must be recognised that many sites may not be suitable for infrastructure improvements on account of the rural natural character of the location.
- Review the assessment process for sites of this nature, based on the assessments undertaken for PPG 17 to take account of the above.
- Prioritise improvements to quality of sites that fall below the Borough average.
- The provision of signage, bins and seating (where appropriate to the use of a specific open space) are seen as key to improving the quality of current provision. There is a need to develop a rolling programme of renewal and improvements.
- Identify and develop circular routes for people with disabilities to enjoy
- Implement comprehensive habitat management plans for sites in Council ownership
- Consideration should be given to producing a Tunbridge Wells Biodiversity Action Plan that will translate the Kent Biodiversity Action Plan to a local level and identify locally distinctive sites and features. There is a need to recognise that wildlife and valuable sites are not just in designated areas.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Green Corridors (Natural/Semi Natural Greenspace)

- 3.49 This open space typology includes cycle ways, certain rights of way, disused railway lines and towpaths along canals and riverbanks. Green Corridors are more than just a Public Right of Way or rural footpath. They provide a green transport corridor or connected series of routes that takes account of amenity, and nature conservation, as well as connecting A to B, and may provide for informal recreation.

Definition

'Sites that provide venues for walking, cycling and horse riding, amongst other uses. Often they can provide a key "green" link and offer travel routes for both local residents and local wildlife migration'.

Quantity: Green Corridors

- 3.50 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are currently no formally adopted Green Corridors within Tunbridge Wells Borough. There are, however, opportunities in Tunbridge Wells to provide/designate Green Corridors to link both rural and urban communities together, for example Cumberland Way linking up to the Pantiles, or designation of a Green Corridor route along the River Teise.
- 3.51 Annex A of the Companion Guide to PPG 17 relates to Open Space Typology and clearly states:
- 'The need for Green Corridors arises from the need to promote environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling within urban areas.'
- 3.52 This means that there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard for this type of provision.
- PPG17 goes on to state:
- 'Planning policies should promote the use of green corridors to link housing areas to the Sustrans national cycle network, town and city centres, community facilities such as schools, community centres and sports facilities, places of employment and shops. To this end Green Corridors are demand led. It is down to the planning authorities to seize opportunities to use linear routes that are established for example canal corridors, river banks or disused railway lines, supplementing them through links from urban areas and developing circular routes and trails'.
- 3.53 With regards to Green Corridors PPG 17's emphasis appears to be on sites in urban areas. This is due to the guidance adopting the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce Report 'Urban Typology'. As a result, elements of the guidance appear to be contradictory. For example the guidance suggests that all corridors including those in remote rural settlements should be included. However, the PPG 17 companion guide insinuates that unless a Green Corridor is used as a transport route that links facilities such as home to school or town and sports centre it should not be included as part of the audit. For this reason, existing green links in the urban have the potential to be designated as part of a larger Green Corridor. In addition, potential Green Corridors in the rural areas have also been identified.
- 3.54 Linear green space in Tunbridge Wells plays an important role as wildlife corridors in addition to their wider amenity green space role and natural and semi natural open space. Although they are measured by area (typically Green Corridors are measured by length not area) they should be included within the Green Corridor Typology.
- 3.55 Green Corridors also contribute to the overall provision of natural and semi-natural green space and have consequently been included in analysis against the English Nature minimum recommended standards of provision.
- 3.56 In 2003 the Borough Council adopted a Transport Strategy and as part of this developed a Cycling Strategy and a Pedestrian Strategy. The Cycling Strategy identifies that there is a low level of cycling in Royal Tunbridge Wells because of the hilly terrain and high car ownership. In the future Green Corridors can contribute to the Cycling Strategy and Pedestrian Strategy and they should be intrinsic to the promotion of cycling and walking in the Borough, for example, the designation of links such as Longfield Road to Barnets Wood, Oak Road, Rusthall, and the development of those cycleways proposed in the Local Plan.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

3.57 Consultation identified there are very few bridleways in Tunbridge Wells Borough, although some horse riding is now permitted on Tunbridge Wells and Rusthall Common in the summer months. The lack of longer bridleways in the Borough is exacerbated by the fact that existing bridleways in the Borough are owned by a variety of landowners, and therefore it is actually very hard to develop linked routes. It is perceived by some residents that TWBC has tended to argue that the improvement or creation of Rights of Way (including bridleways) is a matter for KCC, not the Borough Council. However, S25 of the Highways Act 1980 gives local authorities powers to create bridleways by agreement, and S26 gives them powers to create them by compulsion (with compensation being paid) where it would add to the convenience or enjoyment of a substantial section of the public, or to the convenience of persons resident in the area. Thus Parliament clearly intended that local authorities, not just Highway Authorities, should be able to create bridleways where necessary, though in both cases it is subject to consultation with other local authorities in the area where the land is situated. In addition, Parish Councils have powers to create bridleways by agreement only.

3.58 Although no Green Corridors have been identified as part of this study numerous other pathways do exist that provide people with informal access to get from A to B across the Borough. It is important that these potential routes are further investigated and designated and protected as Green Corridors where necessary and practical. Potential routes include:

- Royal Tunbridge Wells to Southborough
- Links between commons and other green areas
- The 'Victorian residential parks' of Tunbridge Wells, Calverley Park (but no recognised footpath), Camden Park and Nevill Park; and Broadwater Down

Consideration should be given to designating possible networks of Green Lanes connecting residential areas with rural tourist/recreational areas. For example, the route between Tunbridge Wells and Scotney Castle could potentially build on the existing public right of way network and incorporate riverways, rural lanes and publicly accessible areas of countryside including National Trust and Forestry Commission Land.

3.59 Green Corridors do not have any national standards of provision although the Countryside Agency does give an indication of what a user should expect to find:

- A path or un-vegetated natural surface
- Ground that is not soft enough to allow a cycle or horse to sink into it
- A path provided by the reinforcement and protection of natural vegetation

3.60 As Green Corridors are often remote and isolated areas it is important they are maintained to high standards and provide a clean, safe environment. The provision of bins, seats, and signage will not be necessary in many locations but may be highly desirable in others.

Green Corridors: Accessibility

3.61 It is not realistic to set catchments for this typology. This typology is not readily influenced by planning policy or implementation and is very often opportunity led rather than led by demand. Additionally these spaces tend to aim at providing a network across the Borough that complements the Rights of Way networks.

Developing and Applying Standards: Green Corridors

3.62 **Quantity:** There is potential to formally designate a number of Green Corridors across the Borough, as discussed earlier in Section III.

3.63 **Quality:** The designation of any formal Green Corridors should be undertaken with the aim of providing good quality provision, meeting the criteria for this typology.

3.64 **Access:** No accessibility standard is recommended as Green Corridors should be accessible from a number of access points to facilitate access across, and through, a wide area. All Green Corridors should be of a high standard to encourage use.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Recommendations: Green Corridors

3.65 A number of recommendations are made in response to the assessment findings. These are:

- It has been identified that there are currently no formally adopted green corridors; identified opportunities to increase current levels of provision should be addressed through Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). The Council should adopt a policy of providing and facilitating access to additional routes catering for informal walking, cycling and riding.
- In the future green corridors can contribute to the Cycling Strategy and Pedestrian Strategy and they should be intrinsic to the promotion of cycling and walking in the Borough.
- Formal designation of Green Corridors in Tunbridge Wells Borough through the development of recreational routes. Such route-ways could tie into a Walking for Health agenda and also to developing a healthier workforce, for example, school students, TWBC staff and other local business staff could be encouraged to walk to work using these route-ways
- Planners, Transport officers and Leisure Officers need to work together with communities and community organisations, other agencies, land owners and the High Weald Project to designate appropriate green corridors within the towns and the countryside.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Indoor Sport Provision

Quantity: Indoor Sports Facilities

- 3.66 Currently, the facilities providing full community use within Tunbridge Wells Borough are managed by TWBC directly (Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre), and a commercial operator (Weald Sports Centre and Putlands Sport and Leisure Centre). There is also a dual use sports hall facility (funded by the Sport England Lottery Fund), managed by Tunbridge Wells High School.
- 3.67 Provision of indoor sports facilities across the borough falls within three categories namely:
- Public
 - Private
 - Educational Institutions/Schools
- 3.68 The only facilities to provide community use are the public facilities and one education facility (i.e. on a dual-use basis; evenings, weekends, and school holidays). Other education facilities may provide some community use but this is not guaranteed use. Schools could stop community use provision at any time if there is not a community use agreement in place. Map 8 indicates the location of community use sports facilities.
- 3.69 Table 3.10 below identifies the providers of facilities within these categories:

Table 3.10 - Providers of Indoor Sports Facilities in the Borough

Parish	Population (2001 Census)	Public Facilities	Private Facilities (i.e. requiring membership)	Educational Institutions/School Provision Providing Guaranteed Community Use	Educational Institutions/School Provision with No Current or Limited Community Use
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	Tunbridge Wells Sports & Indoor Tennis Centre	<p>LA Fitness</p> <p>The Royal Tunbridge Wells District Indoor Bowls Club</p> <p>The Royal Day Spa and members Health Club</p> <p>Sparkling Health and Beauty, Spa Hotel</p> <p>Esporta Health and Fitness</p>	<i>Tunbridge Wells High School Facilities – 4 badminton court sports hall and dance studio</i>	<p>Tunbridge Wells Girls' Grammar School (No community use) Facilities -4 Badminton court sports hall</p> <p>St Gregory's Roman Catholic Comprehensive School (Limited community use) Facilities – 1 badminton court</p> <p>Skinner's School (Limited community use) Facilities 5 station fitness room small activity and dance room</p> <p>Bennett Memorial Diocesan School (Limited community use) Facilities – 4</p>

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Parish	Population (2001 Census)	Public Facilities	Private Facilities (i.e. requiring membership)	Educational Institutions/School Provision Providing Guaranteed Community Use	Educational Institutions/School Provision with No Current or Limited Community Use
					badminton court sports hall
Benenden	2,226				Benenden School (No community use) Facilities – 30m x 15m swimming pool
Bidborough	966				
Brenchley	2,717				Brenchley School (No community use) Facilities- Outdoor Swimming Pool
Capel	2,283				
Cranbrook	6603	The Weald Sports Centre			Cranbrook School (Limited community use) Facilities – 25m swimming pool, 5 badminton court sports hall and 1 court gymnasium, 8 station fitness room, synthetic turf pitch, 2 squash courts.
Frittenden	863				
Goudhurst	3,136		Risebridge Health and Sports Club		Bethany School (Limited community use) Facilities 4 badminton court sports hall and activity room.
Hawkhurst	4,307				Marlborough House (Limited community use) Facilities – 14m x 6m swimming pool and 5 badminton court sports hall, synthetic turf pitch.
Horsmonden	2,150				
Lamberhurst	1,496				
Paddock Wood	8,329	Putlands Sports and Leisure			Mascalls School (Limited community use) Facilities – 4

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Parish	Population (2001 Census)	Public Facilities	Private Facilities (i.e. requiring membership)	Educational Institutions/School Provision Providing Guaranteed Community Use	Educational Institutions/School Provision with No Current or Limited Community Use
		Centre			badminton court sports hall and 1 court gymnasium
Pembury	6,014		Poolside Leisure Club (Ramada Jarvis)		Kent College (No community use) Facilities – 20m pool, 5 court sports hall.
Sandhurst	1,290				
Southborough	11,139				Meadows School (Special School) (Limited community use) Facilities – 1 badminton court sports hall
Speldhurst	4,765				Holmewood House (Limited community use) Facilities- Indoor pool 25m, 4 badminton court sports hall, 3 squash courts, shooting range.
TOTALS	104,016				

NB. Educational Institutions/School sites with Community Use Agreements i.e. full dual-use are shown in bold italics.

- 3.70 The distribution of the above facilities is not equitable across the Borough. Although indoor sports facilities are located across the Borough, consultation (stakeholder, Focus Groups, and Community Plan feedback from Young People) identified that there is an issue about accessing the formal sports facilities for those in the rural areas without access to private transport, and particularly for young people.

Health and Fitness

- 3.71 There are **currently 496 fitness stations** (individual piece of CV and resistance equipment) in the borough, provided across the public and commercial sectors. Details of individual stations in the public and commercial facilities are provided in Appendix 12 (TWBC provision provides a total of 192 fitness station, and 304 fitness stations are provided by the commercial sector). (The Sport England model used to support this calculation takes into account all health and fitness provision; the critical issue is whether the commercial provision is accessible to the local community i.e. is pricing reasonable? Given that the commercial sector health and fitness market now incorporates facilities, priced at a similar level to the public sector, this type of provision should be seen as complementary to the public facilities. The demographic profile of an area also needs to be reflected in comments about levels and types of fitness provision, for example, a more affluent area is likely to mean that more people are able to afford the membership fees of commercial provision).

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.72 Current demand equates to 442 stations (See Appendix 12); there is therefore currently a surplus in the current supply of health and fitness provision of 54 stations. The quality and nature of this provision, and the current level of private sector facilities (although generally at the higher end of the market, and therefore with membership fees which are prohibitive to some individuals in the Borough), means that overall, the borough is well provided for in terms of health and fitness facilities. It is, however, important to note that generally, commercial fitness facilities do not allow pay and play casual use. 43% of the health and fitness provision in the Borough is provided through TWBC; although there are specific areas of deprivation in the Borough, generally, the Borough is relatively affluent. Taking this into account, the fact that nearly half of the provision is through the public sector, and provides for casual pay and play access, overall, the borough is well provided for in terms of health and fitness facilities.

Sports Halls (Badminton Courts)

- 3.73 There are currently 20 badminton courts available for community use (on the basis of formal dual-use/community provision) across the borough. The Sport England demand model suggests a demand for 23 badminton courts. There is therefore a small deficiency (3 courts, or ¾ of a 4 court sports hall) in the current level of indoor badminton court provision across the Borough; this could be addressed through the opening up of additional school facilities, for community use (for example, the schools without community use shown in the above table, have sports halls). There is also an additional 4 badminton courts at Mascalls School, but this facility does not provide for formal community use i.e. there is no formal agreement for dual-use of the facility by the local community. The facility has been identified, and counted, but not included in the modelling calculations, as it does not meet the Facility Calculator Model criteria, because community use is not formal. N.B In order for a facility to be included in the Facility Calculator model for sports halls, there must be either full pay and play casual use available, or there must be a formal dual-use agreement in place, which allows this type of usage when the facility is not being used by the school.

Swimming Pool (Water Space)

- 3.74 There is currently 827m² of community swimming pool water space available for community use across the borough. The Sport England demand parameters suggest a demand for 727m² of swimming pool water space. There is therefore a small surplus of 100m² in current provision of swimming pool water space, based purely on a quantitative assessment. This calculation does not, however, reflect the geographical nature of the borough, and the fact that, for example, young people state they find it hard to access facilities because of distance, and the lack of good public transport.

Indoor Sports Facility Provision Neighbouring Authorities

- 3.75 Table 3.12 identifies existing indoor sports facilities which are provided by neighbouring authorities within a 10 mile radius of publicly accessible facilities in Tunbridge Wells Borough:

Figure 3.12 - Neighbouring Authority Indoor Sports Facilities within a 10 mile radius of Tunbridge Wells Borough Indoor Facilities

Facility in Tunbridge Wells	Distance from Centre	Name of Facility in Neighbouring authority	Neighbouring Authority
Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre	5.04 km	Angel Leisure Centre, Tonbridge	Tonbridge & Malling
	5.36km	Tonbridge Swimming Pool	Tonbridge & Malling
	11.43km	Freedom Leisure	Wealden
	14.23km	Sevenoaks Leisure Centre	Sevenoaks
	14.88km	Edenbridge Leisure Centre	Sevenoaks
Putlands Sports & Leisure Centre	8.1km	Angel Leisure Centre, Tonbridge	Tonbridge & Malling
	8.5km	Tonbridge Swimming Pool	Tonbridge & Malling
	13.28km	Westborough Sports Centre	Maidstone
	14.68	Maidstone Leisure Centre	Maidstone
	15.73km	Larkfield Leisure Centre	Tonbridge and Malling
The Weald Sports Centre	12.08km	Tenterden Leisure Centre	Ashford
Tunbridge Wells High School	5.92km	Angel Leisure Centre, Tonbridge	Tonbridge and Malling

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Facility in Tunbridge Wells	Distance from Centre	Name of Facility in Neighbouring authority	Neighbouring Authority
	6.4km	Tonbridge Swimming Pool	Tonbridge and Malling
	12.3km	Freedom Leisure	Wealden
	16km	Sevenoaks Leisure Centre	Sevenoaks

- 3.76 Given that there is currently sufficient quantity of indoor facility provision in the Borough, the key issue to be addressed is quality. It is also critical to stress that current sufficiency of provision does not mean that existing facilities can be 'lost'. The assessment of need supports the case for retention of the existing level of provision, but does not rule out rationalisation and replacement on alternative sites to retain the quantity of the local provision.
- 3.77 Although in the longer term the Borough's population is set to decline, in the short term, there will be a small increase in the number of people living in the Borough. This situation does not require the provision of additional facilities, but may result in additional demand for specific activities or facilities. Equally, the national focus on increasing participation in physical activity is likely to impact on the level of demand for sport and leisure facilities at local level.
- 3.78 The facilities most likely to have an impact on the usage of TWBC indoor sports facilities are the Angel Leisure Centre and Tonbridge Swimming Pool. There is some anecdotal evidence at local level that Borough residents travel to use these facilities. It has also been reported that some residents in the east of the Borough travel to use facilities at Tenterden.
- 3.79 It is also important to stress that although current provision is sufficient in terms of quantity, there is a need to maintain current high levels of quality to ensure that TWBC provision is able to compete effectively with the local commercial sector facilities.

Assessment of Indoor Facilities - Quality

- 3.52 The quality of the existing leisure facilities is a key factor in planning for the future, given the level of investment required. The following table identifies the assessment criteria for indoor sports facilities:

Table 3.13 - Assessment Criteria for Indoor Facilities (full community use)

Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access • Road/pathways • Parking • Main entrance • Internal signage • Information boards • Bins • Toilets • General cleanliness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing rooms • Reception • Indoor Tennis • Sports Hall • Learner Pool • Swimming Pool • Fitness suite • Squash • Bar / restaurant

- 3.80 The qualitative assessment is only a 'snapshot in time' i.e. an assessment of the facility at the time it is visited. PPG17 is about the 'fitness for purpose' i.e. 'is the facility the appropriate mix of provision and quality to meet local needs?' The qualitative assessment of the facilities (see Table 3.14) with full community use within Tunbridge Wells Borough has identified the following scores (maximum score 5) for each centre. Map 9 indicates the quality assessment by facility.

NB. It is important to note that each facility is assessed only in relation to the facilities actually provided, but each type of facility is assessed against the criteria identified for quality; in relation to indoor sports facilities quality relates to range of provision, as well as cleanliness, accessibility etc. The facilities are rated on the following scale: 5 – Excellent; 4 – Very Good; 3 Good; 2- Below Average; 1- Poor).

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.14 Quality Assessment of Indoor Sports Facilities (full community use and dual use)

Facility	Total Score (Max 5)
Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre	3.42
Weald Sports Centre	2.21
Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre	1.87
Tunbridge Wells High School	1.96
AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE	2.36

- 3.81 This information clearly identifies that the Leisure Centres, with the exception of Putlands and Tunbridge Wells High School (responsibility of the school to improve), are in good condition, but need ongoing investment to remain attractive to local people, and compete effectively with the commercial sector. The Weald Sports Centre is the newest facility, having opened in 2000, at a cost of £4.5m.
- 3.82 There is some commercial sector provision in the Borough, predominantly health and fitness facilities. The main overall competitor for TWBC facilities in Royal Tunbridge Wells is LA Fitness.
- 3.83 The door to door survey identified that users of existing facilities were satisfied with the quality of the facilities:
- 72.50% of Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre users thought the quality of the facility was “very good” to “excellent”
 - 68.42% of Weald Sports Centre users thought the quality of the facility was “very good” to “excellent”
 - 50% of Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre’s users thought the quality of the facility was “very good” – “excellent”.

Accessibility

- 3.84 The key issues currently affecting access to existing sport and leisure facilities in the Borough are:
- The need to ensure additional investment in disability access, to build on what has already been achieved, for example, hearing loop systems at receptions at The Weald Sports Centre and Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre.
 - The need to increase opportunities for access at the school sites
 - 58.67% of users travel to sports and leisure centres by car, 32.67% walk, 6.67% cycle and 2% use public transport. The average walking time for people using indoor sports facilities is 12 minutes which equates to 1.05 km. This equates to travelling 6.4km (4 miles) by car, and 3.2km (2 miles) by bicycle.
- 3.85 Map 10 illustrates the 1.05 kilometre buffers for sport and leisure centres. Appendix 11 illustrates the overall average travel times (walking, cycling, private transport), consultees in the Borough stated that they travelled to access provision.
- Barriers to participation for non users are:
 - Lack of interest 24.33%
 - Lack of time 23.84%
 - Too far away 10.46%
 - Cost of facility/equipment hire 7.54%
 - Lack of transport 5.11%
 - Barriers that stop users participating more often:
 - Lack of time 46.44%
 - Cost of facility/equipment hire 14.81%
 - Too far away 8.02%
 - Lack of interest 7.41%
 - Lack of facilities 4.94%

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Key Issues for Indoor Facility Provision

3.86 There are a number of key issues to be considered in respect of the existing indoor facilities in the Borough, in relation to the PPG 17 assessment. These are summarised overleaf:

Strategic Importance

- The provision of sport, leisure and physical activity has been identified as a high priority in various community consultation exercises in the Borough; it is also linked to the need to provide more for young people
- TWBC funding for sport and leisure is reducing
- It is important to make the case for sport and leisure provision, and their critical contribution to delivery of the wider agenda, including community safety, social inclusion, health, skill development etc
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Council leisure facilities are currently undergoing market testing.

Facility Role

- Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre plays a regional role with the provision of the indoor tennis facility, and the Centre of Excellence for Diving. Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre and the Weald Sports Centre provide public swimming facilities in the Borough.
- Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre serves the town of Paddock Wood and surrounding villages
- There are education facilities in the Borough which provide only limited, or no, access for community use; these resources need to be maximised for the benefit of local people.

Management and Operation

- The existing leisure facility management contract has been re-let in 2006.

New Provision – Planned

- Paddock Wood Primary School is considering building a swimming pool facility on its land

Potential for New Provision

- The future level of indoor wet and dry facility provision in the Borough must take into account any new facilities provided by education. (At the time of writing, KCC does not have any new education facilities planned).

Quality – Indoor Sports Facilities

- 80.75% of respondents stated that the current facilities met their needs
- 72.50% of respondents rated the quality of Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre as 'Very Good to Excellent', 68.42% the quality of the Weald Sports Centre as 'Very Good to Excellent', and 50% Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre as 'Very Good to Excellent'.

Quantity – Indoor Sports

- 31.39% of respondents stated they use indoor sports facilities within the borough of Tunbridge Wells.
- The most used facility is Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre, followed by the Weald Sports Centre and Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre

Accessibility – Indoor Sports

- Only 2% access indoor sports facilities by public transport, 32.67% walk, 6.67% cycle and 58.67% use a car.
- The main reason given by non users for not using indoor sports centres was lack of interest (24.33%), followed by lack of time (23.84% of respondents), and then too far away (10.46%)
- The main reason given for not using indoor sports centres was lack of time (44.4% of the 31.39% who use sports facilities), followed by cost of hire (14.81%) and then too far away (8.02%)

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- There is a perception that school sports facilities could be utilised more in the future
- Non-council / private indoor sports facilities are still perceived as better than public sports and leisure facilities
However, the reasons why users of private facilities do not use the Council's facilities are mainly because:
 - Private facilities are nearer to their house or work (or on their way between house and work), and / or
 - Private facilities are better advertised

Parish Related Issues

- There are significant public transport issues for the young and old, particularly from the rural areas when wishing to access sports facilities. Public transport is irregular and does not run at the times required to access facilities.
- There is a need to address the lack of facilities for young people. In rural areas there are problems of young people congregating in large numbers mainly because they feel safer in groups as opposed to being on their own. Such behaviour may also reflect the fact that they feel there is nowhere for them to go.
- Lack of recreation opportunities for teenagers is a major concern.

Developing and Applying Standards

3.88 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children's play area, driving to an indoor sports facilities. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.

3.89 The recommended sustainable means of transport for each type of provision is set out below:

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Developing and Applying Standards: Indoor Sports Facilities

Recommended Provision Standard

Quantity: There is currently sufficient indoor sports facility provision in the Borough, with the exception of badminton courts. **There is a need to provide a further 3 badminton courts** which are accessible for community use. There is currently an over-supply of health and fitness stations across the Borough, and there is sufficient water space for the current and future population. The **future recommended minimum standards for provision are:**

- 442 Fitness stations
- 23 badminton courts
- 727 sqm of water space

The issue for future provision of indoor sports facilities is more about location and access than quantity. It will be critical to ensure that identified access issues are addressed at local level, to facilitate use of facilities, and increase participation, particularly amongst younger people.

Quality: The quality of the existing TWBC facilities will need to be maintained, and in the case of Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre, and Tunbridge Wells High School (responsibility of the school), existing facilities should be improved.

Access: The consultation has revealed that the majority of residents (58.67%) drive to indoor sports facilities. An average walking distance of 1.05 km has been calculated, based on the average travel time identified by local residents (12 minutes).

Setting the Standard for Provision – Urban/Rural: The most sustainable location for new residential development is within 3.6km kilometres of a **good quality** Indoor Sports Facility, (based on the fact that cycling is more sustainable than driving).

All dwellings should be **within 8km** (drive distance) of a **good quality indoor sports facility**. (It will be important to work towards this, in partnership with other local providers, given the new Sport England Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) requirements that all residents have access to three good quality (accredited/assessed by recognised scheme) indoor or outdoor sport facilities within 20 minutes (walking time in an urban area, and driving time in a rural area).

Development proposals which would be located more than 8km (drive distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.

Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 8km (drive distance) of an Indoor Sports Facility.

Given the nature of this type of provision i.e. large scale facilities, providing for wide a catchment area, which may include both rural and urban areas, it is not considered necessary to set separate standards of provision for the urban and rural areas.

Applying the Standard: Maps 9 and 10 show the current provision of sites categorised as accessible ie pay and play indoor sports facilities with the recommended catchment areas. This shows that there are currently areas of deficiency in the Borough based on the recommended accessibility standard for provision. These areas are the parishes of Horsmonden, Frittendon, Lamberhurst, and parts of Bidborough, Speldhurst, Capel, Brenchley, Goudhurst, Beneden, Hawkhurst and Sandhurst. Residents in these areas will have access to some facilities in neighbouring authorities, but this may not be within the recommended accessibility standards.

Recommendations: Indoor Sports Facilities

3.90 A number of recommendations are made in response to the assessment findings. These are:

- There is a need to provide an additional 3 badminton courts for community use in the Borough.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- Given the fact that there are a number of school facilities in the borough which are not currently available for community use, there is an opportunity for the Council to develop partnerships with education providers to provide increased access to such facilities for the benefit of the local community.
- There is a need to ensure that young people can access the provision that is available, especially in the rural areas.
- There is a need to improve the quality of provision at Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre
- There is also a need to encourage the school to improve the sports facilities provided at Tunbridge Wells High School.
- There is a need to work in partnership to improve transport links to the indoor facilities in the borough.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Community Centres/Halls

- 3.91 Community Centres need to be considered within the context of the findings of the Indoor Sports Facility assessment – Community Centres, and other venues such as Church Halls, Scout Huts and Civic Halls can all provide valuable indoor space for a range of sport and recreation activities, particularly of an informal nature.
- 3.92 Table 3.15 shows those community centres which provide facilities that cater for sport and physical activity in the Borough:

Figure 3.15 - Community Centres with Facilities for sport and physical activity

Centre	Area
Benenden Village Hall	Benenden
Bidborough Village Hall	Bidborough
Camden Centre	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Capel Village Hall	Five Oak Green
Christ Church Centre	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Community Hall	Southborough
Copt Hall	Hawkhurst
Cranbrook School	Cranbrook
Friends Meeting House	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Goldsmid Hall	Tudeley
Horsmonden Methodist Church	Horsmonden
Horsmonden Village Hall	Horsmonden
Iden Green Pavilion	Benenden
King Charles Martyr Hall	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Matfield Village Hall	Matfield
Memorial Hall	Brenchley
Memorial Hall	Benenden
Paddock Wood Freemasons Hall	Paddock Wood
Pembury Village Hall	Pembury
Royal Victoria Hall	Southborough
Sherwood Community Centre	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Showfields Hall	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Speldhurst Village Hall	Speldhurst
St Andrews Church	Paddock Wood
St Barnabas Church Hall	Royal Tunbridge wells
St Georges Institute	Sissinghurst
St James Church Hall	Royal Tunbridge Wells
St Marks Hall	Royal Tunbridge Wells
St Philips Church	Royal Tunbridge wells
Toc H Hall	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Vale Royal Methodist Church	Royal Tunbridge Wells
Vestry Hall	Cranbrook
Watson Hall	Langton Green

- 3.93 The audit focuses on the extent and location of existing provision, rather than the quality. The current level of provision (quantitative and qualitative findings), has been informed by both consultation, and a survey undertaken in August 2005 by TWBC. Given the wide range of halls, their provision, and focus, it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons in relation to quality, as there are few similarities between the different buildings, how they are operated, and the purposes for which they are used. However, it is important to know the distribution of community halls provision, as it has potential to contribute to outreach sport development work, in terms of accessing hard to reach groups to encourage them to participate in sport and physical activity, and being able to accommodate activities at local level.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quantity Findings: Community Provision

3.94 From the above audit information, the following can be identified:

- Existing community centre/hall provision is reasonably well distributed across the Borough

Accessibility

3.95 There are a number of accessibility issues in relation to Community Recreation facilities these include:

- Limited opening times. Opening times and access arrangements vary greatly, from facilities with fixed, managed opening times to those where opening is on demand
- Transport to these facilities is also an issue; there are few public transport routes which provide direct access to these facilities
- Some facilities operate close to capacity, while others have fewer bookings/activities.
- Some facilities provide only limited space, which restricts the type of activity for which it can be used.

Key Findings

3.96 Realistically, there are currently few community halls in the Borough which are suitable for formal sport, given their scale and size. They do, however, have some potential to host less formal activities e.g. fitness and exercise classes, yoga, pilates, shortmat bowls and table tennis.

3.97 Facilities can be seen as key in providing informal venues for encouraging more people to be physically active. Community centre facilities can often prove to be more 'accessible' for certain sections of the community.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Outdoor Sports Facilities

Definition:-

“Participation in outdoor sports such as pitch sports, tennis, bowls, athletics, or countryside and water sports”

- 3.98 Outdoor sports facilities, for the purposes of the assessment have been sub-divided into the following facilities:
- **Playing Pitches** – provision for Football, Cricket, Rugby and Hockey have been assessed using the prescribed methodology detailed within *“Towards a Level Playing Field”*. The assessment methodology is provided in more detail within the appendices to this report.
 - **Bowls Greens** have been assessed separately as discrete sports facilities. Where they are present in parks, bowling greens have formed part of the overall quality score for the facility
 - **Tennis Courts**, as with Bowls Greens have been assessed as discrete sports facilities and where they are present in parks, have contributed to the overall score for the park/open space
 - **Golf Courses** have been assessed on the basis of access and opportunities to play
 - **Athletics facilities have been** quantitatively assessed as part of this study; qualitative assessment was not possible, given that facilities were not in place at the time of site auditing. One site, used for athletics has been identified at Paddock Wood.
 - **Croquet Facilities** have been assessed through consultation with the Tunbridge Wells Croquet Club.
- 3.99 Other more informal facilities have been included within the other listed typologies. For example, a number of Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs) were identified. Given their intended use, these have been included as part of the assessment of play areas and provision for young people. The various types of outdoor sports facilities are considered in brief below.

Playing Pitches

- 3.100 Playing pitches in Tunbridge Wells Borough are provided through a number of different providers, specifically:
- **TWBC Leisure Services and Parish and Town Councils.** The Parish and Town Councils are identified as the main provider in number of pitches provided, followed by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.
 - **Kent County Council Local Education Authority.** Very few school pitches are available for community use across the Borough. There is no “blanket” policy on the community use of school playing pitches. Three schools have been identified as providing pitches for community use but this is not secure use as schools could withdraw the informal arrangements of this use at any time if community use agreements are not in place.
 - **Private/ Voluntary Sector.** Facilities are also provided via the private and voluntary sector. These encompass private sports clubs and facilities which are leased on a long term basis for self-management by local clubs.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quantity: Playing Pitches

3.101 The audit of facilities has revealed that there are currently 100 football, rugby and cricket playing pitches in the Borough available for community use including 3 grass hockey pitches and an STP. Map 11a -11e illustrates the location of playing pitches across the borough. These are summarised in the table below.

Table 3.16 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Community Accessible Playing Pitch Provision

Town and Parish	Number of pitches						
	Mini Soccer	Junior Football	Senior Football	Cricket	Rugby	STP & Grass Hockey	Total
Royal Tunbridge Wells	7	2	17	8	4	4	42
Benenden	0	0	0	1	0		1
Bidborough	1	0	0	1	0		2
Brenchley	0	1	1	2	0		4
Capel	0	1	1	0	0		2
Cranbrook	1	1	1	1	2		6
Frittenden	0	0	1	1	0		2
Goudhurst	0	0	1	1	0		2
Hawkhurst	0	0	1	0	0		1
Horsmonden	0	0	1	1	0		2
Lamberhurst	0	1	2	0	0		3
Paddock Wood	2	0	6	1	1		10
Pembury	0	0	2	1	0		3
Sandhurst	0	0	1	1	0		2
Southborough	4	1	5	1	0		11
Speldhurst	2	1	3	1	0		7
TOTALS	17	8	43	21	7	4	100

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality: Playing Pitches

3.103 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits and completion of a non-technical visual inspection. The pitch visit proforma provided as part of the Sport England Electronic Toolkit has been used. This will allow comparison with pitch quality findings in future years with other local authorities who have completed local assessments. The key qualitative aspects of provision include:

- Pitch Slope
- Pitch Evenness
- Grass Cover
- Condition of equipment
- Presence of ancillary facilities
- Presence of common problems
- Proximity to transport network
- Presence of training facilities

3.104 The results of the quality assessments undertaken are illustrated in Map 12a – 12e by typology and summarised in the table below. 4 football pitches were not assessed.

Table 3.17 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Type of pitch	Provision Details	Quality Range	Rating
Football Pitch	57 pitches	Good/Excellent	48% – 94% +
	5 Pitches	Average	40% - 59%
Cricket Pitch	21 Pitches	Very Poor Excellent	8% - 94% +
	1 Pitch	Poor	0% - 19%
Rugby Pitch	7 Pitches	Good	79% - 89% +
Grass Hockey Pitch	3 Pitches	Excellent	90%+

*STPs not rated using pitch proforma

3.105 The audit of pitches has revealed that:

- Quality of pitches is good to excellent across the borough with few pitches below average or poor.
- Rugby Pitches had the least variance in quality with all pitches rated as 'Good' or 'Excellent'

3.106 These ratings provide a comprehensive guide to the varying quality across the borough, but need to be treated with caution for the following reasons:

- The inspections were non-technical, based on a visual assessment only
- The inspections are a "snapshot" view of provision – scores are recorded based on what is seen on site at one particular visit (this is particularly relevant when pitches are audited at the start of the season)

Accessibility: Playing Pitches

3.107 Access to pitch provision is influenced by a number of factors and needs to be viewed differently to access factors for more general open space provision. The following factors need to be considered:

- The need for ancillary facilities, such as changing rooms and car parking to ensure that some league standards are met
- The level of fees and charges for use of the facility – playing pitches have been assessed from the perspective of being formal sports facilities
- The demand "unit" is different to that of other types of open space. A team may not necessarily comprise of residents from the same locality.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

3.108 The door to door survey revealed that respondents taking part in the survey can walk to playing pitches within 11.38 minutes (based on a speed of 4 miles per hour). This equates to 1.22 km. This distance is important, as it relates to distances mentioned by door to door respondents in relation to young people accessing pitch facilities to play informally. In practice, the majority of people using pitches for a match, or training, would be likely to drive to the site; drive times have therefore been used to illustrate catchment areas in Map 13. Map 13 illustrates the distance buffer travelled by users to playing pitches. Appendix 11 illustrates the overall average travel times (for eg walking, cycling, private transport), which consultees in the Borough stated it took them to travel to provision.

3.109

Contribution of School Facilities

3.110 The contribution of school facilities, specifically playing pitches has been considered within the assessment. School pitches, where there is secured (i.e. agreed level and times of community access), community use, have been included within the assessment calculations. The audit undertaken reveals that only three schools Meadows School, Angley School and St Gregory's School have community use of their playing pitch facilities and this is unsecured community use. In most cases this is organised with the schools by the teams themselves.

3.111 Currently there is no "blanket" policy relating to the community use of school sites, with schools making their own decision about community use. Effectively this means that the supply available each season could be subject to fluctuation if schools decide not to let their pitches. As a result pitch hire levels can vary significantly.

3.112 In comparison to other nationwide playing pitch assessments undertaken by Strategic Leisure Limited, the percentage of schools with community use would appear to be low. There are also other issues in relation to the community use of school pitches. Quality is a key concern, given the use of school pitches for PE and school sport. In most cases, use during the week for PE and school sport can affect the quality and capacity of pitches for community use. Most schools which do not provide community use would like to do so, but are concerned that the pitches would deteriorate; others believe they need assistance in improving pitches.

3.113 In terms of their contribution to other types of open space, schools in reality make little contribution. In most cases schools are prioritising the increased security of their sites, and a reduction in the amount of 'informal' access.

Audit of Current Demand

3.114 It is important to consider the "spread" and distribution of facilities to ensure that access for local teams is in theory equitable. It is also important to consider the nature and ownership of provision that is available as this can influence access.

3.115 The following numbers of clubs and teams have been identified as playing regular fixtures throughout the relevant season:

Table 3.18 – Numbers of Clubs and Teams

Sport	Number of clubs	Number of teams
Football	64	182
Cricket	19	73
Rugby Union	3	26
Hockey	1	19
Total	87	300

Summary of Consultation Findings

3.116 A number of consultation exercises have been undertaken to inform the study. This has largely comprised a number of stakeholder interviews, consultation with a number of sports specific forums and governing bodies and a postal questionnaire to all known sports clubs. Additionally local residents, via the door to door surveys were asked for opinions on quantity and quality. The key findings include:

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Consultation with Sports Clubs – Ratings of facilities used

3.117 A consultation exercise was undertaken with all identified sports clubs (relating to outdoor sport) within Tunbridge Wells Borough boundary. The initial response rate to the survey was poor and was subsequently boosted through telephone surveys undertaken by Strategic Leisure Limited. In total 100% of the 60 clubs responded.

3.118 Overall views on quality are shown below:

- 12% of respondents rated pitches as “excellent”
- 28% rated pitches “good”
- 44% rated pitches as “average”
- 16% rated pitches as “poor” or “very poor”

3.119 The results show that 84% of clubs rate facilities as “average” or above.

- Football clubs varied in their opinions on pitch quality. The most common rating was “good”.
- Cricket clubs and rugby clubs generally rated pitches used positively – most clubs felt that their pitches were good.
- Clubs thought that maintenance could be improved
- One club is still waiting for its own pitch after its previous one was developed for housing.
- Ridgeway FC is concerned over loss of pitches in Southborough due to a planning allocation for a supermarket.
- 31% of football clubs expected their membership to rise in the coming years. Estimates based on numbers provided by the clubs would suggest that this increase may equate to in excess of 11 mini and junior teams. This would mean maintaining the existing number of mini and junior pitches in the future.
- 65% of clubs expected their membership to remain static.
- 4% of clubs expected a decline in their membership numbers.
- The hockey club identified the need for another STP in Royal Tunbridge Wells

Door to Door Consultation

3.120 Consultation with residents revealed that:

- Residents perceived there to be sufficient facilities (all outdoor sports facilities).
- Most people with a view felt that they were satisfied with the overall quality of provision in Tunbridge Wells.

Consultation with Schools - Self-ratings of School Facilities

3.121 A questionnaire survey was sent to every school within Tunbridge Wells Borough and a 100% response rate was achieved with follow up telephone conversations. Map 14 illustrates the distance buffer that people travel to use school playing fields (this map only shows the schools in the Borough with community use of their playing pitches).

3.122 3 schools were identified as having community use, St Gregory's Catholic School, The Angley School and Meadows School. The Meadows school is managed by Barnados charitable trust. The assessment of the schools' pitches was “average”.

Sport by Sport Assessment – Key Findings

3.123 The findings of the assessment of playing pitch provision undertaken are considered on a sport-by-sport basis, in relation to Football, Cricket, Rugby Union and Hockey. No Gaelic Football or Lacrosse league teams were identified although Lacrosse is developing at the Tomlin Ground Cranbrook.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Football Assessment

- 3.124 **Numbers of teams.** The study research has identified 64 football clubs generating 182 teams. The number of teams generated by each club varies significantly, from single team clubs to those with in excess of seventeen teams. These teams are detailed by the number within each identified “type” of team in Table 3.19.

Table 3.19 – Football Teams in Tunbridge Wells Borough

Team Type	Number of teams
Mini Soccer (Under 7 – Under 10)	42
Junior Football - Boys (Under 11 – Under 16)	47
Junior Football – Girls (Under 11 – Under 16)	3
Senior Football – Men’s (Over 16)	89
Senior Football – Women’s (Over 16)	1
TOTAL NUMBER OF TEAMS	182

- 3.125 **Number of pitches.** The study research has identified **68** football pitches with secured public use, which are included in the assessment calculation. The study has identified a further **67** football pitches (**19 senior, 37 junior and 11 mini pitches**) across the Borough which do not currently accommodate community use.

Table 3.20 – Pitches with secured public use in Tunbridge Wells Borough

Pitch Type	Number of pitches
Mini Soccer Pitch	17
Junior Football Pitch	8
Senior Football Pitch	43
TOTAL NUMBER OF PITCHES IN SECURED PUBLIC USE	68

Key Findings: Playing Pitch Assessment

- 3.126 Details of the assessment calculations for playing pitches are provided in the appendices. The assessment calculation provides an indication of whether there is a surplus or deficiency of pitches to meet peak demand. A summary is provided below, by type of pitch:

- **Senior Football:** The assessment has indicated that there is a theoretical **surplus of 7 pitches**.
- **Junior Football:** The quantitative assessment has revealed that there is insufficient supply of junior football pitch provision to meet peak demand on a Sunday of **–12** pitches.
- **Mini Soccer Facilities:** The quantitative assessment has revealed that there is an insufficient supply of mini soccer pitches to meet peak demand on a Saturday of **–4** pitches.

- 3.127 **Impact of Quality on capacity.** It is important to assess the impact of quality of pitches on capacity. If pitches are particularly poor then they may not be able to accommodate the number of games required to meet demand. This could increase any deficiency recorded or reduce surpluses. The results of the quality inspections can be used to show how quality might affect capacity. Figure 3.21 identifies assumptions that could be made on capacity.

Figure 3.21 – Theoretical Carrying Capacity

Rating of Pitch	Carrying Capacity	Multiplication Factor
Excellent / Good	Three matches per week	1.5
Average	Two matches per week	1.0
Below average	One match per week	0.5
Poor	One match per fortnight	0.25

- 3.128 Using the results of the non-technical visual assessments, the following analysis can be used to determine the impact of quality on pitch supply.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Figure 3.22 – Football Pitches – Quality and carrying capacity

Rating of Pitch	No. of pitches	Quality Factor	Score / No. of pitches
Excellent / Good	30	1.5	45
Average	4	1.0	4
Below average	2	0.5	1
Poor	0	0.25	0
TOTAL PITCHES	36		50

3.129 **Impact of quality** – The analysis in the above figures identifies that when quality of pitches is taken into account the following findings are apparent:

- The quality rating for football pitches in theory impacts positively on the theoretical capacity of provision. When quality is factored into the supply, the current pitch supply is increased slightly, on the basis that a number of pitches can in theory accommodate three games a week. (The assessment calculation works on an assumption of two games per week).
- The audit also revealed that the majority of pitches used by local clubs are served by changing rooms. The perception of clubs is that the best changing rooms are at Brenchley Sports and Social Club with other changing rooms being described by clubs as poor in need of refurbishment.

Boroughwide Findings

3.130 **Summary of key findings for football** - Based on the boroughwide assessment undertaken, the following key issues relate to football supply and demand in Tunbridge Wells Borough:

- There are significant quantitative deficiencies in junior and mini football pitch provision, which can be rectified in some areas by changing some of the surplus senior pitches into junior pitches. This is not the case in Royal Tunbridge Wells, Pembury and Speldhurst as any theoretical surplus cannot meet the overall deficiency.
- In addition, developing community use agreements with schools which have playing pitches but do not currently make them available to the community and could be another way of reducing quantitative deficiencies.
- Sissinghurst Junior Football Club currently plays their fixtures outside the Borough boundary. The club is currently seeking funding to purchase land next to King George Cricket Ground between Frittenden and Sissinghurst and drain and provide football pitches for the clubs use in the future.
- There are a number of clubs from other Boroughs who use Parish football pitches. These pitches are in Paddock Wood and Horsmonden.
- Clubs anticipate an increase in the number of players over the next few years by up to 11 teams. This needs to be considered alongside current TGR's and future population projections, which suggest that the senior, junior boys and mini teams will decline.
- Pitch quality is generally perceived to be "Average" – "Good" (on the basis of the technical survey undertaken, and the club consultation). This is reflected in both the scores from the quality assessments and the ratings given to facilities by clubs.
- Ancillary facilities on the whole are of an "average" standard with football rated as "Poor" across the borough and this highlights significant scope for improvement. However, some Parish owned pitches are not served by changing facilities.
- There are a number of "spare" pitches (those currently not used by the community) that can potentially be brought into play. However, it needs to be acknowledged that these pitches often have an alternative primary purpose, for instance, in the case of school pitches, physical education and school sport.
- Common key issues raised by clubs relate to poor grounds maintenance, and poor quality changing facilities.

3.131 **Town and Parish Related Issues** -The perception is that there is a need for more junior football playing pitch space in Royal Tunbridge Wells, Southborough and Paddock Wood. The artificial turf pitch (ATP) at Hawkenbury, could be used twice over on Saturdays between 12 noon and 4.00pm for league hockey. Tunbridge Wells Hockey Club says that it requires use of a second ATP in Royal Tunbridge Wells for league games and for the development of the club and hockey.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.132 Residents and football clubs have issues regarding an allocation in the Local Plan for a new supermarket in Southborough and the open space, allotment and playing pitch issues this will cause. Some residents perceive that planning permission has already been agreed.

Recommendations: Football

F1

Review the Grounds Maintenance contract to identify areas for improvements in pitch quality.

F2

There are significant quantitative deficiencies in junior and mini football pitch provision see table above, which can be rectified by, the possible provision of community playing pitch facilities at school facilities, and community use agreements with other-non community playing pitches currently unavailable at school sites.

Cricket Assessment

- 3.133 **Numbers of teams.** The study research has identified 19 clubs playing cricket on a regular basis and a number of clubs playing ad hoc fixtures. These clubs generate 73 teams. These teams are detailed by the number within each identified “type” of team in Table 3.23 below.

Table 3.23 – Cricket Teams in Tunbridge Borough

Team Type	Number of teams
Junior Boys Cricket (11-17 year olds)	21
Junior Girls Cricket (11-17 year olds)	0
Senior Men's Cricket (18 - 55 year olds)	52
Senior Women's Cricket (18- 55year olds)	0
TOTAL NUMBER OF CRICKET TEAMS	73

N.B The age groups relate to the population groupings in the Sport England model, set out in Towards a Level Playing Field.

- 3.134 **Number of pitches.** The study research has identified 21 pitches with secured community use, which are included in the assessment calculation. A further 20 pitches have been identified with no community use; these are all on school sites.

Table 3.24 – Cricket Pitches with secured public use in Tunbridge Wells area

Pitch Type	Number of Pitches
Cricket Pitch*	21
TOTAL NUMBER OF CRICKET PITCHES	21

*No differentiation has been made between Junior and Senior pitches. Unlike football, pitches are not separate designated pitch areas. Junior fixtures make use of the same pitch (often a smaller area on the pitch) as senior teams. Also no differentiation made between size of wickets – each pitch can only accommodate one game at a time.

Key Assessment Findings: Boroughwide

- 3.135 The assessment of cricket Boroughwide has revealed a number of key findings, which are reported below.
- 3.136 **Pitch Ownership.** The majority of pitches used by local clubs are managed through Tunbridge Wells Borough Council or the Parishes and Town Councils. Other pitches are provided on private club sites.
- 3.137 **Temporal Demand for Games.** The assessment reveals that there are approximately **36.5** games a week during the season. Junior games take place mid week and Sunday mornings. Senior games demand is **58%** on Saturday and **34%** on Sunday.
- 3.138 **Surplus / Deficiencies.** There is a theoretical **surplus** of senior cricket pitch provision to meet peak demand during the weekend of + **7** pitches on a Saturday and of +**13** pitches on Sunday. However, the number of colt's games played means that these pitches are constantly used.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.139 **Latent Demand.** Clubs were asked to identify issues associated with the ability of facilities to accommodate teams demanding pitches. Clubs through the consultation undertaken raised no issues. The audit did not reveal any teams playing cricket on an ad-hoc basis, generating a demand for a pitch periodically throughout the playing season. It is prudent however to have a surplus of provision to ensure that this type of demand is not stifled for the future.
- 3.140 **Future demand.** Future demand for playing pitches is difficult to ascertain as there are many factors, which can contribute to a change in the demand for playing pitches, including the success of local teams, sports development initiatives and the quality/accessibility of local facilities and nature/scope of local leagues. For the purposes of the assessment, future demand has been assessed through the use of Team Generation Rates and population projections and through Club Consultation.
- 3.141 **Consultation** undertaken with cricket clubs needs to be considered, specifically in relation to their estimations about membership growth. Consultation findings were limited but of the clubs providing an indication about future growth/decline, all predicted an increase in membership. Bidborough Cricket Club indicated an expected increase in membership of 22%.
- 3.142 **Impact of Quality on capacity.** It is important to assess the impact of quality of pitches on capacity. If pitches are particularly poor then they may not be able to accommodate the number of games required to meet demand. If pitches are of a high standard then they may be able to accommodate more matches. By factoring quality into the assessment, a truer picture of the adequacy of pitch provision can be gained. The results of the quality inspections can be used to show how quality might affect capacity on the basis of the capacity assumptions detailed in Table 3.25.

Table 3.25 – Cricket Pitches' Carrying Capacity

Rating of Pitch	Carrying Capacity	Multiplication Factor
Excellent / Good	Three matches per week	1.5
Average	Two matches per week	1.0
Below average	One match per week	0.5
Poor	One match per fortnight	0.25

- 3.143 **Planned Pitch Developments** – There are no known pitch developments planned for cricket, which will increase the current capacity.
- 3.144 **Pitches with no community use.** A total of 20 pitches within the borough have been identified which do not currently have secured community use. All of these are located on school sites. As with football pitches, there are quality issues relating to the pitches and availability of changing provision.

Cricket Assessment – Summary of Findings

Boroughwide

- 3.145 **Summary of key findings for cricket** – The key issues relating to supply and demand of cricket can be summarised as:
- The Parish and Town Councils manage most of the cricket pitches identified for community use (45%)
 - TWBC manages 32% of community use pitches and there are 23% owned by private or voluntary groups.
 - Current demand is met by the available pitch supply. Demand is split throughout the week.
 - Pembury has a deficit of –1 pitch
 - Royal Tunbridge Wells has a surplus of one cricket pitch but this can be removed from this surplus as it includes the Nevill Ground cricket square.
 - Quality is generally good with most pitches rated above average. However, the majority of pitches are on public open space sites and could be susceptible to vandalism and unofficial use, which can impact negatively on quality
 - Future growth is not estimated to be significant based on the use of TGR's.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

3.146 The key issues relating to supply and demand of cricket can be summarised as:

- Current demand is met by the available pitch supply. Demand is split throughout the week.
- Quality is generally good with most pitches rated as “Good”. No problems were noted at the times of the pitch audits (off season for cricket).
- Cricket development is very much at a club level using private grounds.

Recommendations: Cricket

C1

Maintain the current level of cricket pitch provision across Tunbridge Wells Borough.

Rugby Union Assessment

3.147 **Numbers of clubs and teams.** The study research has identified **2 clubs** based in the borough generating **25 teams**. There is a third club, East Peckham and Capel Rugby club from outside the borough who use a pitch at Putlands Sports and Leisure Centre, Paddock Wood. The teams are detailed by the number within each identified “type” of team in Table 3.26 below.

Table 3.26 – Rugby Union Teams in Tunbridge Wells Borough

Team Type	Number of Teams
Mini Rugby Mixed (8-12 year olds)	6
Junior Ruby - Boys (13-17 year olds)	9
Junior Rugby - Girls (16-17 year olds)	0
Senior Rugby - Men (18-45 year olds)	10
Senior Rugby - Women (18-45 year olds)	0
TOTAL NUMBER OF RUGBY UNION TEAMS	25

N.B The age groups relate to the population groupings in the Sport England model, set out in Towards a Level Playing Field.

3.148 **Number of pitches.** The study research has identified 7 pitches available for community use, which are included in the assessment calculation. A further 8 pitches are not currently available for use by the community

Table 3.27 – Rugby Pitches with secured public use in Tunbridge Wells Borough

Pitch Type	Number of pitches
Rugby Union (Full-size)	7
TOTAL NUMBER OF PITCHES IN SECURED PUBLIC USE	7

Key Assessment Findings: Boroughwide

3.149 The assessment and analysis of supply and demand has revealed the following key findings.

3.150 **Pitch Ownership:** 4 Rugby pitches are provided or maintained by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 1 by Paddock Wood Town Council, and 2 by Cranbrook Parish Council.

3.151 **Identified Surplus / Deficiencies:** The results show that there is theoretically sufficient pitch provision to meet current senior demand at its peak. However there is a deficit of **-1 pitch** on Sunday in Royal Tunbridge Wells to meet junior demand.

3.152 **Temporal Demand for Games:** The assessment reveals that peak demand for pitch use is on a Saturday with all senior fixtures on this day.

3.153 **Latent Demand:** Consultation with local clubs reveals that no teams are denied the opportunity to play matches due to a lack of pitches. This means that some pitches are used for more than one game per day to make up for the theoretical deficiency of 1 pitch on Sunday in Royal Tunbridge Wells to meet junior demand.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.154 **Future Demand:** Future demand for playing pitches is difficult to ascertain as there are many factors, which can contribute to a change in the demand for playing pitches, including the success of local teams, sports development initiatives and the quality/accessibility of local facilities and nature/scope of local leagues. For the purposes of the assessment, future demand has been assessed through the use of Team Generation Rates and population projections and through consultation with clubs.
- 3.155 **Impact of Quality on capacity:** It is important to assess the impact of quality of pitches on capacity. If pitches are particularly poor then they may not be able to accommodate the number of games required to meet demand. This could increase any deficiency recorded or reduce surpluses. The results of the quality inspections can be used to show how quality might affect capacity. Table 3.28 identifies assumptions that could be made on capacity.

Table 3.28 – Rugby Pitch Carrying Capacity

Rating of Pitch	Carrying Capacity	Multiplication Factor
Excellent / Good	Three matches per week	1.5
Average	Two matches per week	1.0
Below average	One match per week	0.5
Poor	One match per fortnight	0.25

- 3.156 In the case of rugby, all 7 pitches in use were rated as 'Excellent' or "Good". By using the results of the quality audit and above multiplication factors, the following assessment on carrying capacity for rugby is shown below:

Table 3.29 - Rugby Pitches – Quality and carrying capacity

Rating of Pitch	No. of pitches	Quality Factor	Score / No. of pitches
Excellent / Good	7	1.5	10.5
Average	0	1.0	0
Below average	0	0.5	0
Poor	0	0.25	0
TOTAL PITCHES	7		10.5

- 3.157 On this basis, if it is assumed that all pitches can be used for three matches per week, the carrying capacity of rugby pitches is likely to be the equivalent of 10.5 pitches. This, in theory, increases the capacity of available supply.
- 3.158 **Planned Pitch developments.** The assessment has not revealed any known rugby union pitch developments.
- 3.159 **Pitches with no community use.** The assessment has revealed that there are 25 additional rugby union pitches, which are not currently available to the community. These are all located on school sites. If these pitches were to be brought into play, then there would be an increase in the theoretical surplus of pitch provision.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Rugby Assessment – Summary of Findings

Boroughwide Assessment

3.160 **Key findings for Rugby Union** – The assessment has identified a number of issues relating to the demand for and supply of rugby union pitches. These are:

- There is a deficit of **-1 pitch** to accommodate current junior teams in The Royal Tunbridge Wells Area.
- The quality of pitches is “Good/Excellent”.
- The quality of ancillary facilities is “Good”.
- The sport is reliant upon two clubs to drive its future development

Recommendations: Rugby

R1

Maintain the current level of rugby pitch provision within the Borough

Hockey Assessment

3.161 **Numbers of clubs and teams.** The study research has identified **1 Hockey club** generating **19 teams**. These teams are detailed by the number within each identified “type” of team in Table 3.30:

Table 3.30 – Hockey Teams in the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council area

Team Type	Number of Teams
Junior Hockey – Boys (11-16 year olds)	3
Junior Hockey – Girls (11-16 year olds)	3
Senior Hockey – Men (16-45 year olds)	7
Senior Hockey – women (16-45 year olds)	6
TOTAL NUMBER OF HOCKEY TEAMS	19

N.B The age groups relate to the population groupings in the Sport England model, set out in Towards a Level Playing Field.

3.162 **Number of pitches.** The study research has identified **1 full-size Synthetic Turf (STP) Pitch** used for fixtures at Hawkenbury Recreation Ground, which is included in the assessment calculation. There are also 3 grass pitches at the Nevill Cricket Ground which are excellent pitches and are used by the Vets Teams. It is not known how much longer it will be acceptable to play competitive hockey (at some levels) on grass pitches, as the majority of competition level hockey is now played on a synthetic surface.

Table 3.31 – Pitches with secured public use in Tunbridge Wells Borough

Pitch Type	Number of pitches
Synthetic Turf Pitches (Full Size)	1
TOTAL NUMBER OF PITCHES IN SECURED PUBLIC USE	1

3.163 **Pitch Ownership.** Hawkenbury Recreation Ground is in the ownership of TWBC.

Key Assessment Findings: Boroughwide

3.164 The assessment of hockey boroughwide has identified a number of key findings, which are reported below.

3.165 **Temporal demand for games.** The assessment reveals that there are approximately 9.5 games per week during the season. Of these games, the peak demand for hockey is on a Saturday with 85% of the games played at this time.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.166 **Surplus/deficiencies.** There is a theoretical shortfall of STP provision to meet peak demand for hockey (equivalent to -2 match slots). This deficit is based on the assumption that the STP is accessible for hockey at the required times. The deficit relates to a Boroughwide availability on the basis of there being 3 match slots at peak time (1 pitches x 3 slots = 3 games capacity). Consideration needs to be given to the other potential usage of STPs during the week, particularly for football or hockey training.
- 3.167 **Latent Demand.** Clubs were asked to identify issues associated with the ability of facilities to accommodate teams demanding pitches. Tunbridge Wells Hockey Club regards the existing provision of only one synthetic pitch impeding the development of the hockey club.
- 3.168 **Future Demand.** Future demand for playing pitches is difficult to ascertain, as there are many factors, which can contribute to a change in demand, such as the success of sports development programmes and team generation rates.
- 3.169 **Pitch Quality & Ancillary Facilities.** Visual Inspections and key ratings have not been applied to synthetic pitches in the same way as natural turf pitches for other sports.
- 3.170 **Impact of Quality on capacity.** It is important to assess the impact of quality of pitches on capacity. If pitches are particularly poor then they may not be able to accommodate the number of games required to meet demand. However the following needs to be considered:
- The quality of pitches impacts upon the standard of league hockey that can be accommodated
 - Additionally lighting levels can have an impact. As well as implications for match play, there are also limiting factors on the use of these facilities for training.
- 3.171 **Planned Pitch developments** – The assessment has revealed that there is a planned development of a synthetic turf pitch at Mascalls School, Paddock Wood. It is understood that although planning permission has been agreed, the school has no funding for the development. An Independent school, Holmewood House is also considering a synthetic turf pitch but this would not be available for Tunbridge Wells Hockey Club to hire or use as it would be used by the school on Saturdays when the club would wish to use it. However, this facility could be used for training and if league requirements permitted could be used for league games on Sundays.
- 3.172 **Pitches with no community use.** The assessment has identified 2 other STPs (full size) in the Borough at Marlborough School and Cranbrook School. If community use agreements were to be agreed with these schools the deficit of - 1 STP within the area will have been met. However, Tunbridge Wells Hockey Club would wish to use these facilities on a Saturday, when these private schools use them.

Key Findings: Local Area Analysis

- 3.173 No detailed analysis has been undertaken on a local area basis, given the existence of only one club, which is based within the Royal Tunbridge Wells area, where the STP is located.

Hockey Summary

- 3.174 **Key Findings for Hockey** – The assessment has identified one key issue relating to the identified deficit of -1 STP to meet local demand against current use.
- 3.175 Tunbridge Wells Hockey Club would like an additional synthetic turf pitch to be considered as part of the Hawkenbury Master Plan for outdoor pitches or to be able to work in partnership with one of the Secondary Schools in the St Johns Road area of Royal Tunbridge Wells to build a synthetic turf pitch.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Recommendations: Hockey

H1

Investigate a second Synthetic Turf Pitch as part of the Master Plan for Hawkenbury and/or seek partnership arrangements for a new synthetic turf pitch to be provided on a school site in the St Johns Road area of Tunbridge Wells in partnership with TWBC, Tunbridge Wells Hockey Club and schools.

Bowling Greens

- 3.176 Bowling Greens as sports facilities accommodate a range of formal and casual use. Demand manifests itself through differing uses, such as formal bowling teams using facilities for league games, or for individuals to bowl on a more casual or informal basis. Bowling greens across the Borough are provided through a network of public facilities (often in parks and recreation grounds) and private facilities (through private clubs).

Quantity: Bowling Greens

- 3.177 The audit has identified a total of **15 bowling greens** currently provided by TWBC and Private Clubs (across 15 sites). The distribution across the borough of these facilities is illustrated in the table below and Map 15.

Table 3.32 – Tunbridge Wells Borough Council: Quantity of Bowling Greens

Club	
Benenden Bowls Club	Membership: No Reply Membership: Facilities: Quality Score: 74%
Bidborough Bowls Club	Membership: 54 Membership: Stays the same Facilities: Good – Average Quality Score: 74%
Brenchley and Matfield Bowls Club	Membership: 63 Membership: Stays the same Facilities: Good – Average Quality Score: 86%
Cranbrook Bowls Club	Membership: No Reply Membership: Facilities: Quality Score: 80%
Hawkhurst Bowls Club	Membership: 36 Membership: Decreasing Facilities: Poor Quality Score: 72%
Bayham and Lamberhurst Bowls Club	Membership: 29 Membership: Same Facilities: Good Quality Score: 80%
Paddock Wood Bowls Club	Membership: No Reply Membership: Facilities: Quality Score: 90%
Pembury Bowls Club	Membership: 64 Membership: Same Facilities: Poor Quality Score: 68%

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Club	
Southborough Bowls Club	Membership: No Reply Membership: Facilities: Quality Score: 72%
Speldhurst Bowls Club	Membership: No Reply Membership: Facilities: Quality Score: 78%
Hawkenbury Bowling Club – Hawkenbury Recreation Ground	Membership: 30 Membership: Facilities: Average - Good Quality Score: 70%
Tunbridge Wells Bowls Club – St Johns Road	Membership: 58 Membership: Facilities: Good Quality Score: 84%
Grosvenor Bowls Club – Grosvenor Recreation Ground	Membership: 21 Membership: Facilities: Good Quality Score: 78%
Grove Bowling Club – The Grove Bowls Club	Membership: 54 Membership: Increasing Facilities: Good Quality Score: 90%
TW Culverdon Bowls Club – St Johns Recreation Ground	Membership: 44 Membership: Facilities: Average - Good Quality Score: 84%

3.178 From the Table 3.32 above, and the mapping (Map 15), it is clear that:

- Provision levels vary across the Borough with 1 green provided per 9146 of the population in Royal Tunbridge Wells and 1 green per 11,139 in Southborough and 1 green per 966 in Bidborough.
- There is a variance in quality across the current supply with scores ranging from 68% (Good) through to 90% (Excellent)
- The average quality score for all facilities is 73% (Good)
- Only one site is served by an artificial pitch and floodlighting (Paddock Wood)

3.179 Clubs using local facilities were also consulted about their ratings of the quality of the facilities they use. The majority of the ratings were good. Two clubs stated their facilities were poor (Hawkhurst and Pembury).

3.180 **Ownership.** The assessment has revealed that the Parishes are where the majority of bowls greens are located. TWBC will only provide greens at Grosvenor Recreation Ground and St Johns Recreation Ground in the future. The Hawkenbury Green will be leased to the Hawkenbury Bowls Club. 2 clubs are privately owned - Tunbridge Wells Bowling Club and The Grove Bowling Club Tunbridge Wells Ltd. Paddock Wood Bowls Club have an artificial green with floodlights. Bidborough Bowls Club is working with the Parish Council to fund a low maintenance artificial bowls green.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality: Bowling Greens

3.181 The quality of bowling greens has been assessed via site visits and the completion of a non-technical visual assessment, using a standard proforma. A number of criteria have been examined, specifically:

- Presence of floodlighting
- Surface / turf
- Benches
- Condition of gullies / backboards
- Whether the facility is served by a pavilion

3.182 The results of the audit are illustrated in Map 16 and summarised in Table 3.33 below:

Table 3.33 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Town and Parish	Number of Sites Audited	Quality Range
Royal Tunbridge Wells	5	70% - 90% Good - Excellent
Benenden	1	74% Good
Bidborough	1	74% Good
Brenchley	1	86% Good
Cranbrook	1	80% Excellent
Hawkhurst	1	72% Good
Lamberhurst	1	80% Excellent
Paddock Wood	1	90% Excellent
Pembury	1	68% Good
Southborough	1	72% Good
Speldhurst	1	78% Good
TOTALS	15	Average 73% Good

Accessibility: Bowling Greens

3.182 A number of factors affect the accessibility of Bowling Greens. These include the geographical location of facilities, fees and charges applicable, and in the case of club facilities the membership policy. Other factors such as the presence of floodlighting will also have an impact. Map 17 illustrates the distance buffers people are prepared to travel to use bowls facilities. The key findings in relation to access are:

- Membership policies vary across clubs within the Borough
- Access arrangements also vary. Some clubs provide casual use. Others require membership.
- The cost of playing bowls on a casual basis is not an issue as casual play is almost non-existent.
- The two private clubs in Royal Tunbridge Wells have social facilities.

Summary of Consultation Findings

3.183 Consultation included stakeholder interviews, a postal survey of all known bowls clubs, and informal consultation with providers. The key findings are reported overleaf:

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- Some clubs working in partnership with Parish Council's have embraced grounds maintenance successfully when they have taken over responsibility for the bowls facilities they use, for example Paddock Wood and Brenchley.
- Membership of bowls clubs has remained generally static over the past 10 years.
- Current supply needs to be monitored and if required further Outdoor Bowls facilities may require closure.
- Clubs should be encouraged to operate independently of TWBC and the Parish and Town Councils and offered leases to maintain the facilities and greens.
- In some instances it may not be financially viable for a club to take on a lease. In this instance the Borough Council, Parish and Town Councils will need to consider if they wish to subsidise bowls greens in the future or move the club to another facility
- Clubs based in the Parishes identified the main issues they face relate to vandalism and security. Vandalism was also an issue raised by stakeholders as a key issue.
- Only one club expected an increase in membership.
- The majority of clubs expected membership to remain the same in the future
- One club was currently experiencing a reduction in membership (Hawkhurst)
- The majority of clubs rated their own facilities as "Average" to "Good" with two clubs rating their facilities as "Poor" (Hawkhurst and Pembury).
- Bidborough Bowls Club is working with the Parish to fund a low maintenance artificial bowls green for the future.

Key Findings: Bowling Greens

3.184 The key findings for bowls are:

- There has been a conscious effort by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council to rationalise its own bowls provision and put greens under self management agreements.
- The key facility issues raised by clubs and stakeholders in the Parishes relate to vandalism and security, rather than lack of facilities.
- The only facility with an artificial green and floodlights is Paddock Wood which was part funded with Sport England Lottery money.
- Bowling greens are perceived as very good but under utilised.

Recommendations: Bowls

B1

Clubs should be encouraged to operate independently of TWBC or Parish or Town Councils and offered leases to maintain the facilities and greens.

B2

In some instances it may not be financially viable for a club to take on a lease. In this instance the relevant Council will need to consider if it wishes to continue subsidising bowling greens in the future or alternatively move the club to another facility either seeking development for housing and using the proceeds to increase quality in other bowling facilities elsewhere or keeping the redundant bowling facilities and green as amenity space.

Outdoor Tennis Courts

3.185 Tennis courts are provided in a variety of settings, including schools, public parks and through private sports clubs. They provide for casual opportunities and formal competitive play. As with bowls, the demand for tennis is varied, ranging from facilities to accommodate formal league matches to casual games between friends and family.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quantity: Tennis Courts

- 3.186 Tennis courts have been audited through site visits, questionnaires to known tennis clubs and via school consultation. The audit has identified a total of **19** sites with **72** tennis courts (either casual access or via club membership / formal hire) across the borough. The distribution of these is shown in Table 3.34 below.

Table 3.34 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Outdoor Tennis Courts with Community use

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Sites	Number of Courts
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	5	34
Benenden	2,226	1	2
Bidborough	966	1	1
Brenchley	2,717	1	4
Capel	2,283	0	0
Cranbrook	6603	2	6
Frittenden	863	1	1
Goudhurst	3,136	1	2
Hawkhurst	4,307	2	4
Horsmonden	2,150	1	4
Lamberhurst	1,496	0	0
Paddock Wood	8,329	1	3
Pembury	6,014	1	3
Sandhurst	1,290	0	0
Southborough	11,139	1	4
Speldhurst	4,765	1	4
TOTALS	104,016	19	72

- 3.187 The LTA provision standards can be used as a framework for assessing quantity of provision. The standards are based on the assumption that 2% of the population regularly play tennis and demand court usage. On the basis of assumptions about frequency of use, the LTA advocates the provision of 1 court per 45 players. Assessment against this standard reveals that there is a need for **46** courts. **72** courts with community access have been identified. A standard is also proposed for the number of floodlit courts based on 1 floodlit court per 65 players. On the basis of this there is a requirement for **32** floodlit courts. This study has identified **26** courts which currently have flood lighting.

Quality: Tennis Courts

- 3.188 Tennis court quality has been assessed on the basis of a non-technical visual assessment of all identified courts with community use. The assessment has considered the following factors:

- Presence of floodlighting
- Quality and condition of the playing surface and fencing

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- Access to ancillary facilities

3.189 Based on a simple scoring system, each facility has the potential to score a maximum of 100%. The range of scores for identified facilities across the Borough are summarised in the Table 3.35 below. The quality assessment is shown on Map 19.

Table 3.35 – Tunbridge Wells Borough Tennis Courts: Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Town and Parish	Number of Sites Audited	Quality Range
Royal Tunbridge Wells	5	56% - 98% Average - Excellent
Benenden	1	83.6% Excellent
Brenchley	1	83.6% Excellent
Bidborough	1	83.6% Excellent
Capel	0	0
Cranbrook	2	92.73% - 98% Excellent
Frittenden	1	78.17% Good
Goudhurst	1	85% Excellent
Hawkhurst	2	70.91% - 94.5% Good - Excellent
Horsmonden	1	90.91% Excellent
Lamberhurst	0	0
Paddock Wood	1	65.45% Good
Pembury	1	52.73% Average
Sandhurst	0	0
Southborough	1	83.64% Excellent
Speldhurst	1	70.91% Excellent
TOTALS	19	75% Good

3.190 Key findings relating to the assessment of quality include:

- A substantial amount of quality tennis facilities throughout the Borough especially at Club facilities such as Tunbridge Wells Lawn Tennis Club
- Key reasons for low quality scores are lack of floodlighting, fencing and weeds and mould on hard courts
- Tennis courts also scored low on quality due to uneven and irregular surfaces

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Accessibility: Tennis Courts

3.191 As with bowling greens, a number of key factors affect access. These include location of facilities (see Maps 18 and 20), marketing and promotion of facilities, hire fees and charges and the membership policies of private clubs. Key findings are:

- A variance in fees and charges for membership of clubs. Examples include annual Adult Membership fees ranging from £223 at Tunbridge Wells Lawn Tennis Club to £100 for annual senior membership at St Johns Lawn Tennis Club.
- The mapping shows that the majority of tennis courts are where the denser populations are.
- There is evidence that clubs are trying to encourage young people to participate especially at Tunbridge Wells Lawn Tennis Club.

Recommendation: Tennis

T1

Investigate the costs and restrictions of installing floodlighting at sites serving areas where there is a lack of floodlit courts. This could include working with local schools where provision is available to the local community and there are likely to be less planning restrictions. (Planning permission has already been successful at St Gregory's School for floodlit tennis courts but the courts are not yet built). For surpluses and deficiencies see Figure 3.3 Appendix 4 Playing Pitch Assessment.

Golf

3.192 There are 5 golf courses located across the borough providing a range of opportunities for local residents to play golf. The focus of the audit has been on "access" given that in the case of private facilities, supply is often developed to meet a known demand and all sites are of a high quality.

Quantity: Golf Courses

3.193 There are 5 golf courses within the Borough (See Map 34) and the Nevill Golf Course, just outside the Borough Boundary.

Table 3.36 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Golf Courses

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Courses	Total Number of Holes
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	1 (plus the Nevill Course, which is just over the Borough boundary, but well-used by residents)	27
Benenden	2,226	0	0
Bidborough	966	0	0
Brenchley	2,717	1	18
Capel	2,283	0	0
Cranbrook	6603	1	18
Frittenden	863	0	0
Goudhurst	3,136	0	0

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Courses	Total Number of Holes
Hawkhurst	4,307	1	9
Horsmonden	2,150	0	0
Lamberhurst	1,496	1	18
Paddock Wood	8,329	0	0
Pembury	6,014	0	0
Sandhurst	1,290	0	0
Southborough	11,139	0	0
Speldhurst	4,765	0	0
TOTALS	104,016	5 Plus the Nevill Golf Course	90

Quality: Golf

- 3.194 Site visits have been undertaken to the golf courses across the Borough. Quality has not been formally rated using a scored proforma. All facilities visited are of a high standard.

Access: Golf

- 3.195 Access to opportunities to play golf has been the focus of the assessment undertaken. Telephone consultation with Golf Clubs has revealed the following in relation to membership / usage arrangements:

- 3.196 Telephone consultation was undertaken with identified Golf Clubs in order to ascertain information regarding membership. Questions asked included:

- Whether the clubs were private or public
- The cost of the joining fee and membership fee
- Whether the clubs were taking on new members
- The method of application to become a member
- How much a casual round for a non-member would cost

- 3.197 The findings included:

Golf Clubs:

Table 3.37 - Golf Clubs and number of other golf clubs within a 10mile radius

Golf Club	Area	Other Golf Clubs within a 10 mile radius
Tunbridge Wells Golf Club	Royal Tunbridge Wells	19
Lamberhurst Golf Club	Lamberhurst	12
Hawkhurst Golf Club	Hawkhurst	12
Hemsted Golf Club (Cranbrook Golf Club)	Cranbrook	12
Moatlands Golf Club	Brenchley	17

- 3.198 The findings were as follows:

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- All the Golf Clubs telephoned were private
- Moatlands Golf Club has joining fees of £500.00 and Lamberhurst £350.00
- Annual membership fees for Adults start at £590.00 at Tunbridge Wells Golf Club and rise to £1250.00 charged by Moatlands Golf Club.
- All of the clubs are taking on new members and all clubs requested that an application form had to be filled in when applying for membership.

Key Findings:

- 3.199 Despite there being 5 Golf Courses within the Borough (and the Nevill just outside the Borough boundary, none of these are public. Consultation reveals that the cost of participation, although varying significantly, is generally high and would present a barrier to participation for some Tunbridge Wells Borough residents.
- 3.200 The ratio of golf courses (5) to the population of Tunbridge Wells (104,016) is equal to one course per 20,803 people. The ratio of golf courses (84) to the population of Kent (1,329,718) is equal to one course per 15, 830 people.
- 3.201 However, given the current level at which members are being taken on at all the golf clubs in the Borough, it would appear that there is, at the moment, sufficient capacity for golf, and those who wish to play as members of clubs, in the Tunbridge Wells Borough.

Recommendation: Golf

- 3.202 The following recommendation is made:

G01

Ensure that casual pay and play opportunities are maintained and further developed, through regular liaison and communication with the local clubs.

Developing and Applying Standards

- 3.203 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children's play area, driving to an indoor sports facilities. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.
- 3.204 The recommended sustainable means of transport for each type of provision is set out below:

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

Developing and Applying Standards: Outdoor Sports Facilities

- 3.205 **Playing Pitches - Quantity:** The recommended standards are based on the results of the assessment, consideration of likely future demand and the number of pitches required to meet such needs. A significant amount of provision is located on amenity greenspace which serves wider needs than just sport, for example dog walking. A surplus of pitches does not therefore indicate that land can be sold for development, but rather that there may be potential for it to be used for alternative formal sport e.g. other pitch type/size, or alternative open space provision e.g. informal open space. The space itself is then not 'lost', and can be readily re-designated for formal use as and when appropriate.
- 3.206 PPG17 advocates that Councils move away from the NPFA standard and establish standards based on local need. It advocates the use of Sport England's 'Towards a Level Playing Field' methodology when assessing provision for playing pitches.
- 3.207 The recommended standards for playing pitches are based on the results of the playing pitch assessment and consideration of likely future demand, given that there is currently an overall deficit in provision across the Borough, and only 6 parishes have surplus existing pitch provision.

Table 3.38 - Quantity Standards

Recommended Provision standard (based on Sport England methodology, Towards a Level Playing Field)
Senior Football Pitches: Recommended requirement for 36 pitches, based on the current population of senior football playing age (2005).
Junior Football Pitches: Recommended requirement for 20 pitches, based on the current population of junior football playing age (2005)
Mini Soccer Pitches: Recommended requirement for 21 pitches, based on the current population of mini soccer playing age (2005)
Cricket Pitches: Recommended requirement for 20 pitches, based on the current population of cricket playing age (2005)
Rugby Pitches: Recommended requirement for 8 pitches, based on the current population of rugby playing age (2005)
It is important to note that provision standards do not reflect the needs of teams to play locally and this needs careful consideration when planning future provision.
Quality All pitch and ancillary provision should be of a "good" standard All multi-pitch sites should be served by changing facilities

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.208 On the basis of the above table, there is a need for an additional 12 junior football pitches, and 4 mini football pitches: given that there is a surplus of 7 senior pitches across the Borough, there is potential to re-designate these as junior or mini pitches to reduce the identified deficit in provision. If this option is adopted, the priority areas where this should occur should be those areas which currently have an overall surplus of pitch provision. The areas of deficiency for football pitches are Royal Tunbridge Wells 5 junior and 3 mini pitches, Brenchley 1 mini pitch, Paddock Wood 2 junior pitches, Pembury 3 mini pitches and 2 junior pitches, Southborough 2 junior pitches and Speldhurst 4 junior pitches.
- 3.209 There is also a need for 1 additional rugby pitch in Royal Tunbridge Wells, and 1 fullsize, floodlit synthetic pitch, with community use in the Borough.
- 3.210 The above amount of provision is based on current population data (2005). Given that population projections (KCC) show an overall decline in population to 2021, there is unlikely to be additional demand for formal playing pitch provision. This is based on the detailed Team Generation Rates (TGRs) developed as part of the Playing Pitch Strategy.
- 3.211 **Playing Pitches – Quality:** Quality varied across the Borough, but on the whole was rated good to excellent. The results of the quality audits undertaken should be treated with caution; a pitch scores highly if it is served by changing room provision, regardless of the quality of the pitch. The average pitch score across the Borough was 71.81% which is within the “Good” rating.
- 3.212 **Access:** The assessment has not revealed significant issues relating to access. Hire fees and charges do not appear high especially in the Parishes and should not present a barrier to teams and clubs.
- 3.213 **Application of the Provision Standard:** Quantitative provision standards have been set based on the “playing population”. This allows provision levels to fluctuate in accordance with the changes in the age group populations that could in theory play the sport, rather than the general population.
- 3.214 **Qualitative deficiencies:** Based on a standard that all provision should be rated as “good” or above, there are a number of deficiencies (as scored using the playing pitch non-technical visual assessment form). On the basis of the results collated there are qualitative deficiencies at the following football pitch sites The Moor Recreation Ground, Hawkhurst, ‘average’, Colebrook Playing Field, Royal Tunbridge Wells ‘average’ and Frittenden Recreation Ground, “average. Those football pitches that were identified as below average included Five Oak Green Senior and Junior pitches and the pitch at Cinder Hill Matfield.
- 3.215 **Bowling Greens:** Quantity appears to be sufficient to meet formal bowling needs and cater for casual play. There is a mix of public and private provision. The recommended standard is to work towards retention of the current supply of greens unless demand for bowls continues to drop. This needs to be monitored on an annual basis. All greens should be of a “good” quality. On the basis of the audit undertaken, there are qualitative deficiencies at some sites with regard to ancillary facilities and pavilions.
- 3.216 **Tennis Courts:** Tennis Courts are provided through schools, private clubs and within parks. The Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) works on the basis of 2% of the population participating in tennis on a regular basis. This figure is used as a basis for their facility planning prioritisation on a national and regional level. An assessment of court provision in Tunbridge Wells Borough has been undertaken using this participation level as a framework, which sets broad standards for outdoor court provision with, and without floodlighting. These standards are:
- A requirement for 1 outdoor court per 45 players
 - A requirement for 1 outdoor floodlit court per 65 players
- 3.217 It is recommended that the current provision of **72 courts provision be rationalised, to provide fewer, but better quality sites**. The Council should aim for all provision to be rated as “good”. The audit identified a substantial amount of quality tennis facilities throughout the Borough, but some facilities need to be improved. Key reasons for some lower quality scores are lack of floodlighting, fencing and weeds and mould on hard courts. The recommended option is to reduce the number of courts, but improve the quality of the provision. **Specifically, it is recommended that an additional 6 of the 72 courts are provided with floodlighting**. Those tennis courts which are surplus to requirement should be considered for alternative uses, for example MUGAs.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.218 **Golf:** No quantitative standards are proposed on the basis that all of the provision is privately provided, and supplied in reaction to market forces. Quality is also high at most facilities across the borough. The critical issue for golf provision in the Borough is accessibility, and the need to ensure that casual pay and play opportunities continue to be offered at the private clubs.

Overall Recommendations: Outdoor Sports Facilities

- 3.219 The following recommendations have been identified from the assessment of key outdoor sports in the Borough. There are a number of solutions that need to be considered in relation to findings and issues identified. These can broadly be described as:
- Increase the number of formal dual-use facilities i.e. with community use agreements, and facilitate increased use of school pitches, including synthetic pitches at private schools, if possible
 - Enhancing pitch carrying capacity through improving the quality of facilities
 - Review current management options, including consideration of club self-management through leasing arrangements
 - Where practical, address identified site specific Grounds Maintenance Issues
 - Prioritise improvements to ancillary facilities
- 3.220 The following recommendations are made with consideration to the above policy options and provide a framework for prioritisation of resources.

Planning Standards

- 3.221 Given the generally close balance between the supply and demand of pitches and outdoor sports facilities in Tunbridge Wells Borough, local minimum recommended standards of provision have been calculated on the basis of dividing the number of existing facilities by the resident population of the borough. We recommend that Tunbridge Wells Borough does not drop below its existing provision. The table below shows how the recommended standards have been reached.:

Playing Pitches

Table 3.39 – Existing Provision and Minimum Recommended Standards for Playing Pitches

Pitch Type	Towards a Level Playing Field (hectares)	Existing Number of Pitches	Area of Pitches (hectares)	Minimum Recommended Standard - Area per 1,000 people
Senior Football	1.40	43	60.2	0.58ha
Junior Football	1.05	8	8.4	0.08ha
Mini Soccer	0.30	17	5.1	0.05ha
Cricket	1.60	21	33.6	0.32ha
Rugby	1.20	7	8.4	0.08ha
Grass Hockey	1.40	3	4.2	0.04ha
Synthetic Turf Pitch	0.9	1	0.9	0.008ha
TOTAL PROVISION AVAILABLE		100	120.80	1.16ha

Other Outdoor Sports

Table 3.40 – Existing Provision and Minimum Recommended Standards for Other Outdoor Sports

Facility	Existing No. Facilities	Minimum Recommended Standards -No. people per facility
Bowling Greens	15	1:6,941

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Facility	Existing No. Facilities	Minimum Recommended Standards -No. people per facility
Tennis Courts	72	Utilise the LTA standard of 2% of the population participate in tennis = 2082 of the population. LTA recommends 1 court per 45 people = 46 courts across Tunbridge Wells Borough and one the LTA recommends one floodlit court per 65 people this equates to 32 courts of the 46 courts being floodlit.
Athletics Tracks	0	250,000 per major track i.e. 8 lane, synthetic surface, plus field facilities, training areas
Croquet Lawns	3	1:38039

3.222 It is therefore recommended that:

- a) **Playing Pitches:** A minimum standard of provision of **1.16 hectares of playing pitches per 1,000 people** should formally be adopted by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.
- b) **Bowling Greens:** The minimum standard of **1 bowling green for 6,941 people** should be adopted for bowling green provision. However this needs to be revised on an annual basis depending on the future demand for outdoor bowls.
- c) **Tennis Courts:** the minimum LTA standard (2% of the population participate in tennis = 2,082 in Tunbridge Wells Borough) should be adopted; therefore need to provide **1 court per 45 people = 46 courts and one floodlit court per 65 people = 32 courts on basis of current population.**
- d) These standards should be maintained on a borough wide basis.
- e) The standards should be applied to increases in population, including those relating to housing developments, as a preliminary measure of the need for additional outdoor facility provision

Policy Options

- 3.223 **Patterns of pitch provision:** It is recommended that consideration should be given to establishing a hierarchy of pitch provision facilities in Tunbridge Wells Borough, involving development centres for each sport where appropriate, in line with the current and future needs of the sports development programmes for each sport. Consultation has identified the following possibilities: provision of a sports village or hub at Hawkenbury Recreation Ground as part of the Master Plan for the site, possible development of the Nevill Ground as a Centre of Excellence for cricket and St Marks Playing Fields as a Centre of Excellence for rugby.
- 3.224 **Surplus and deficit provision:** There is a strong case for regarding the facility surpluses identified through the peak demand method with caution; it is not simply indicating that the facilities concerned could be disposed of, without detriment to sports provision in the area. Furthermore, even if informal sports usage were to be discontinued, it can be argued strongly that the outdoor sports facilities should be maintained for their open space functions, including informal sports, play recreation and general visual amenity value.
- 3.225 **A number of deficiencies** in outdoor facility provision in Tunbridge Wells Borough, the Parishes and Town Council areas have been identified for some types of facility. Some of the deficiencies can be overcome by utilising senior football pitches as junior or mini soccer pitches. The main surplus and deficiencies are as follows:

Table 3.41 - Surpluses and Deficiencies in Playing Pitch Provision by Town and Parish

Settlement Area	Population	Mini Football	Junior Football	Senior Football	Cricket	Rugby	Total Ha
-----------------	------------	---------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------	-------	----------

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Settlement Area	Population	Mini Football	Junior Football	Senior Football	Cricket	Rugby	Total Ha
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	-3	-5	2	1	-1	-2.95
Benenden	2,226	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Bidborough	966	1	0	0	0	0	0.30
Brenchley	2717	-1	1	0	1	0	2.35
Capel	2,283	0	1	0	0	0	1.05
Cranbrook	6603	1	0	0	0	0	0.30
Frittenden	863	0	0	1	0	0	1.40
Goudhurst	3,136	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Hawkhurst	4,307	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Horsmonden	2,150	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Lamberhurst	1,496	0	1	0	0	0	1.05
Paddock Wood	8,329	0	-2	0	0	0	-2.10
Pembury	6,114	-3	-2	0	-1	0	-4.60
Sandhurst	1,290	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Southborough	11,139	1	-2	2	0	0	1.00
Speldhurst	4,765	0	-4	2	0	0	-1.40
TOTALS	104,116	-4	-12	7	1	-1	-3.60

- 3.226 Based on population projections and the assumption that TGRs will remain static, there is not likely to be any increased demand for pitches over the next 16 years.
- 3.227 It is recommended that Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and other local facility providers should seek to eliminate the identified deficiencies in the provision of playing pitches and outdoor sports facilities at Borough, Parish and Town Council level, through a combination of:
- **Extensions:** Adding pitches to an existing pitch site for example Rusthall where there are plans for 3 additional pitches and Hawkenbury where a Master Planning exercise is being undertaken to revise the layout of the existing site and to add additional facilities. Surpluses and deficiencies by area can be seen in the Table above.
 - **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG):** Ensuring that SPG policy is sufficiently robust to secure developer contributions where possible towards the development, or improvement of playing pitches, where there is demonstrable deficiency in the Borough.
 - **Planning Agreements:** Obtaining a financial contribution from a developer, to provide new facilities to compensate for the loss of an existing facility for example Ridgeway and Yew Tree Road, Southborough or to cater for an influx of population creating additional demand. The Team Generation Rates produced for this study can be used to demonstrate the numbers of additional people required to generate an additional team.
 - **Conversion:** Where there is clear evidence that use of an existing facility has been discontinued, conversion to a facility type for which deficiencies have been identified could be a cost effective solution for example, tennis courts into multi use games areas and senior football into junior and mini soccer pitches.
 - **Improved Capacity:** Improvements to the playing surface and drainage of a facility will enable it to accommodate more play and may be as effective as and cheaper than providing an entirely new facility. STRI Ltd has undertaken Feasibility Study and Reports on the Works Required to Improve the Drainage and Condition of the Winter Games Pitches on all Tunbridge Wells Borough owned football pitches.
 - **Staggered start times:** Where facilities are capable of accommodating more than one fixture in a day, the relaxation of specified match start times would help to reduce or spread peak demand.
 - **Community Use of Education Facilities:** Three schools currently provide use of pitches for football clubs. These are the Meadows School, St Gregory's, School and the Angley School. These facilities need to be regulated by a formal community use agreement. In areas of deficiency, negotiating community access to

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

existing education facilities offers an attractive means of securing additional facility capacity, especially if such use is regulated by a formal community use agreement.

- 3.228 **Qualitative deficiencies:** It is recommended that all providers should adopt a rolling programme of improvements to their playing pitches and outdoor sports facilities, so that all eventually conform to at least a “good” standard set out in the quality assessment criteria in the Strategy.
- 3.229 **Changing Facilities:** It is recommended that all facility providers should adopt a rolling programme of improvements to changing rooms so that all eventually conform to at least a ‘good’ standard as set out in the quality assessment criteria in the Strategy.

General Recommendations

G1

Maintain and update a club directory that is available on the internet.

G2

Update the supply and demand information collated on an annual basis. A full playing pitch assessment should be repeated every 3-5 years.

G3

Review the Grounds Maintenance Contract covering all outdoor facilities in order to improve quality and facility life expectancy.

G4

Develop regular consultation with pitch users to establish trend data in relation to satisfaction, ratings of quality, common pitch issues, number of members and teams.

G5

Ensure that partnerships developed to manage facilities, particularly for bowls and tennis, are effective through regular monitoring and reporting of usage. Mystery visits could also be programmed.

G6

Develop a set of criteria for use in decision-making on sites which are suitable for long-term leasing. These could include the following as a basis:

- Typically sites considered for leasing will currently be used by a single club
- Sites will only be leased where they do not make a significant contribution to other typologies

Athletics

A1

The Council should enable and support the development of an athletics facility at Paddock Wood.

Croquet

CR1

The Council should continue to work in partnership with Tunbridge Wells Croquet Club.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Informal Open Space

Definition

Open space which provides opportunities for informal activities close to residential areas and improves the visual appearance of residential or other areas. This typology includes Village Greens. The two sub typologies for the overall typology of Informal Open Space are:

Informal Recreational Open Space
Visual Amenity Greenspace

Quantity: Informal Recreational Open Space and Visual Amenity Greenspace

- 3.230 The audit undertaken illustrates that there are **60 informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** within Tunbridge Wells Borough. Map 21 illustrates the location of these facilities across the Borough. The key statistics relating to the number of Informal Greenspaces are detailed in Table 3.42 below. Areas of Landscape Importance and Areas of Important Open Space are listed later in Section III.

Table 3.42 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Quantity of Informal Open Space and Visual Amenity Greenspace

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Sites (all audited)	Total Hectareage
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	11	7.35
Benenden	2,226	1	1.23
Bidborough	966	0	0
Brenchley	2,717	9	3.12
Capel	2,283	4	0.21
Cranbrook	6603	3	0.94
Frittenden	863	1	0.19
Goudhurst	3,136	2	0.23
Hawkhurst	4,307	7	2.45
Horsmonden	2,150	1	0.12
Lamberhurst	1,496	1	0.03
Paddock Wood	8,329	4	1.63
Pembury	6,014	3	0.77
Sandhurst	1,290	4	0.53
Southborough	11,139	5	1.25
Speldhurst	4,765	4	1.68
TOTALS	104,016	60	21.75

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.231 The provision of informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites as identified by TWBC officers indicates that there are 21.75 hectares in total across the Borough. This equates to 0.21ha per 1000 population.
- 3.232 It is important to note that PPG 17 is very much about setting local standards of provision that in this case are specific to Tunbridge Wells. The only national standard for the level of informal open space provided is 0.5 hectares per 1000 population. This is based on the current U.K average of all applicable local authorities' provision standards as highlighted in the Government's 'Rethinking Open Space Report' (2001).
- 3.233 It is also important to note that open spaces such as football pitches have been classified under the outdoor sports typology as their primary purpose. However, in a number of instances pitches will fulfil the role of informal open space in areas where there are a limited number of sites. (Where a pitch is the only open space available, and because it is not used as a pitch 100% of the time, it is likely that the area will also be used as informal open space, for example, dog walking and kick-about's etc)
- 3.234 A number of key findings can be made in relation to the quantity of **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace site** provision across the Borough. These include:
- A variance in the quantity of provision across the Borough in relation to both the number of sites and number of hectares.
 - 35.1% of the existing provision is located within Royal Tunbridge Wells
 - 1 Parish (Bidborough) has no identified **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace site** provision
 - The current level of provision across the Borough for **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** is 0.211 hectares per 1000 population

Quality: Informal Recreational Open Space and Visual Amenity Greenspace Sites

- 3.235 There is no national quality standard or local quality standard for informal green space. Therefore, site audits have been based on a combination of a number of national greenspace quality standards.
- 3.236 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits and completion of a scored proforma for **60** sites identified as informal green space. The quality assessment proforma is based on a number of key criteria encompassing the quality aspects of Green Flag, Tidy Britain and ILAM Parks Management good practice. The assessment considered the physical, social and aesthetic qualities of each individual area, but focussed on key criteria relating to access, and basic provision such as bins, signage, seats and maintenance such as grass cutting and cleanliness. As a base level of provision, it has been assumed that all sites should have a sign, bin, clear pathway and appropriate seating provision. Key findings are illustrated in Table 3.43 below, and in Map 22.

Table 3.43 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Town and Parish	No of Sites Audited	Quality Range	Average Quality Score
Royal Tunbridge Wells	11	17.7% - 45.71%	25.86% ('Poor')
Benenden	1	44.76%	44.76% ('Average')
Bidborough	0	0	0
Brenchley	9	16.33% -47.69%	30.13% (Poor)
Capel	4	15.05% - 29.78%	23.76% ('Poor')
Cranbrook	3	34.76% - 39.52%	37.14% ('Average')
Frittenden	1	20.43%-	20.43% ('Poor')
Goudhurst N.B Only one site audited	2	39.11%	39.11% ('Average')
Hawkhurst	7	8.1% – 35.77%	21.94% ('Poor')

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town and Parish	No of Sites Audited	Quality Range	Average Quality Score
Horsmonden	1	30.36%	30.36% (Poor)
Lamberhurst	1	64.89%	64.89% ('Very Good')
Paddock Wood	4	18.1% - 32.31%	26.16% (Poor)
Pembury	3	19.62% - 47.62%	30.98% (Average)
Sandhurst	4	22.07% - 34.76%	29.95% (Poor)
Southborough	5	18.08% - 33.85%	27.81% (Poor)
Speldhurst	4	17.43% - 44.41%	31.49% ('Average')
TOTALS	60		30.30% (Poor)

3.237 One key comment can be made in relation to the quality audit results, specifically:

- A Borough average quality score of 30.30% which equates to 'Poor' (just below average). 32 sites were found to be below the Borough average.
- Many sites lacked bins and benches, and this is reflected in the low quality scores.

NB. It is important to note that sites have been assessed against the identified criteria for this provision because bins and benches have the potential to help keep a site tidy, and facilitate its use by a wider range of users. This type of 'outdoor furniture', together with appropriate signage, is recommended for sites providing for public access, whether they are formal or informal. The lack of such provision is reflected in the level of quality score awarded to a site, for this reason.

Accessibility: Informal Recreational Open Space and Visual Amenity Greenspace Sites

3.238 Accessibility has been assessed using a variety of techniques including mapping exercises and consultation. The key findings show that:

- 18.3% of the respondents to the door to door survey stated that they used the **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** near to their home on a daily basis, and that walking is their most common form of travel to access such space.
- As with other typologies, site audits revealed a general lack of suitable provision for those with a disability.
- 27.78% of the respondents never make use of the **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** near their home
- 79.28% of the respondents walk for up to 10 minutes to access the **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** near their home. N.B Although visual amenity space is not necessarily used, it contributes to the characteristic of the Borough.
- The average travel time to **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** near to people's home is 7.59 minutes; this equates to a travel distance (walking) of 0.80 km (Map 8)
- **Informal Recreational Open Space** is generally "Poor" in quality across the Borough (based on the site audits and assessments undertaken to support this study). Residents generally make little conscious use of provision. There was a noted lack of signage, benches or bins on many of the sites within this typology

3.239 Given that there is a significant amount of open space provision in the Borough across the different typologies, the 'poor' quality of **informal recreational open space** may not be as significant as in more urban Boroughs where it may be the only green space available for local residents. However, **informal recreational open space** is located close to residential areas, and therefore is used, particularly by older people, who may not be able to travel to other types of provision. It is therefore important that amenity space is of as good a quality as is possible.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality – Informal Open Space

- 84.77% of door to door respondents considered that the quality of **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** near to their homes was good with 77.49% stating the quality of **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** near to their homes was very good to excellent.
- 88.98% of respondents considered that the **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** in their areas met the needs of their families for outdoor recreation

Boroughwide Issues

- There is recognition amongst key TWBC staff that the long term sustainability of improvements is an issue and that revenue funding is a problem when dealing with developers and therefore the Section 106 process needs to be improved to ensure delivery of developer contributions
- There is a need for greater understanding, marketing and development of circular routes for people to use.

Town Related Issues

- It is also recognised that **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** in urban areas are valuable, and need to remain, but also need to link to the commons and other parks by using green corridors, cycle routes and walking routes.
- There is recognition amongst key TWBC staff that the long term sustainability of improvements is an issue and that revenue funding is a problem when dealing with developers

Quantity – Informal Open Space

- 90.76% of respondents believe there is enough **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** in their local area.
- A high proportion of respondents generally wished to see more facilities for teenagers and young people, and improvements to toilets and car parking.
- There is general agreement that there is a lot of informal open space within Tunbridge Well borough and much is already publicly accessible.
- The general feeling is that there is enough informal open space within the borough and what the Borough needs to achieve is a balance between the quality of both urban and countryside sites.

Accessibility – Informal Open Space

- 60% of respondents stated that they can access informal open space within 5 minutes walking time
- The main reason given for not using open spaces is that respondents do not have the time (29.81% of respondents), followed by no interest (13.29%) and anti social behaviour (10.39%).

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Developing and Applying Standards

- 3.240 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children’s play are, driving to an indoor sports facilities. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.
- 3.241 The recommended sustainable means of transport for each type of provision is set out below:

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Developing and Applying Standards: Informal Open Space

Recommended Provision standard

Quantity: Current provision of informal open space consists of 60 sites totalling 21.75ha. This equates to a current provision level of 0.21 ha per 1000 population, which is less than the national recommended standard (0.5ha per 1000 population) by 0.29 ha per 1000 population. The future recommended standard is a minimum of 0.21ha per 1000 population. This is made on the basis that a large number of the existing sites are of poor quality, and the fact that there is a significant over provision of both Parks, and Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace in the Borough, which is publicly accessible.

Local residents (64% of respondents to the door to door survey) believe there is enough informal open space in their local area.

Quality: The average quality score for all informal sites is 30.30% which equates to 'poor' facilities. All Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Parish managed / maintained sites should maintain quality scores of "good". (The audits identify slight variances in signage benches and bins, these should be addressed)

Access: The consultation has revealed that the majority of residents walk to **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites**, which, given their purpose is to be expected. Based on the average (mean) travel time stated, an average distance travelled to access **informal recreational open space and visual amenity greenspace sites** of 0.80 km has been calculated, on the basis of the consultation undertaken. (The travel time used is 7.52 minutes, for all travel calculations, based on the consultation).

Setting the Standard for Provision - Urban: The most sustainable location for new residential development is within 0.80km of **good quality** informal open space.

Development proposals which would be located more than 2km (cycle distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.

Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 2km of informal open space.

Setting the Standard for Provision - Rural: The most sustainable location for new residential development is within 0.80km of **good quality** informal open space.

Development proposals which would be located more than 2km (cycle distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.

Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 2km of informal open space.

Rural Qualification for Provision: Given that open space is generally more abundant in the rural areas, it may not be necessary to provide informal open space to the same extent as in the urban areas. For this reason, the standards set above are purely aspirational for the rural areas and provision should be made where necessary

Application of the provision standard: Map 23 shows the current provision of informal greenspace with a theoretical catchment area of 0.80 km. This shows that generally settlements are accessible, Goudhurst and Lamberhurst are however, partially deficient. It is important to recognise the importance of visual amenity open space; this should occur even in those areas where there is no publicly accessible informal open space, or where there is limited informal open space; informal open space/visual amenity open space may be a hedgerow, or verge, rather than a large piece of land.

Recommendations: Informal Open Space

3.242 The following recommendations are made in relation to informal open space:

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- The Council should adopt a policy of providing “Good” sites rather than “Average” or “Poor”. The sites scoring “average” or below in the quality assessments are contained in Appendix 7a, Open Space Quality Ratings.
- Prioritise improvements to quality in the areas where quality is below the Borough average
- Consider the opportunity, where there is substantial provision, for change of use from **informal recreational open space**, to other types of open space. For example Village greens to provide play areas.
- The provision of signage, bins and seating (where appropriate) is seen as key to improving the quality of current provision. There is a need to develop a rolling programme of renewal and improvements.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Provision for Children and Young People

3.243 The definition of provision for Children and Young People is:

Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, multi-use games areas, wheeled play areas and teenage play-zones.

3.244 Under the Children's Act, Local Authorities have a responsibility to provide appropriate provision for children and young people, to support their development, and deliver on the identified key outcomes of the Act. This includes addressing community safety needs, by providing safe and secure facilities for children and young people.

3.245 Provision for Children and Young People consists of equipped play areas and specialist provision for young people, including wheeled play areas, Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and Teen Shelters. The provision of facilities for children and young people is important in facilitating opportunities for physical activity and the development of movement and social skills. Local authorities also have a duty to provide for the well-being of their communities; provision of play provision addresses community safety issues, and provides opportunities for diversionary activities. Provision for children's play is sub-divided into categories in line with the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) play area categories. These include Local Equipped Areas of Play (LEAP) and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play (NEAP); definitions of these types of play area are shown below, as set out in the NPFA guidance. There are no LAPs in the Borough, as there was a TWBC policy decision taken that LEAPs would be the minimum standard of provision, in both the town and parishes. A number of play areas do not fall into either the category of a LEAP or a NEAP; these are identified as 'unclassified' in this study. Three main types of youth provision have been identified, specifically for wheeled play facilities such as skateboarding and BMX biking, ball courts, multi-use games areas (MUGA) and teen shelters.

Table 3.44 - Definition of LEAPS and NEAPS (NPFA)

Age Group	LEAP	NEAP
	4-8 years	Older Children
Walking time from home	5 min	10 min
Location	Adjacent to a well used pathway and on a flat site that is well drained	Adjacent to a well used pathway and on a flat site that is well drained
Minimum activity zone	400m ²	1,000m ² divided into 2 parts; at least 465m ² of hard surface area and equipped play space area
No. and type of play equipment	At least 5 types of play equipment where at least 2 are individual items rather than part of a combination. Impact absorbing surface beneath/around play equipment	At least 8 types of play equipment to allow developmental play amongst younger children and moderate/adventurous play for older children
Buffer zone	10m depth including planting feature	30m depth including planting and other physical features

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

	LEAP	NEAP
Age Group	4-8 years	Older Children
Fencing	1m high fencing with two pedestrian gates and barriers to limit speed of child entering/leaving the facility	1m high fencing with two pedestrian gates and barriers to limit speed of child entering or leaving the facility
Furniture	Seating and a litter bin	Seating and litter bins at each access point. Secure Bicycle parking facilities.
Signs and notices	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children, and name and tel. no. of facility manager	Area solely used for children and that adults are not allowed unless accompanied by children, and name and tel. no. of facility manager.

3.246 TWBC use an interpretation of the above in relation to developing play provision in the Borough:

Table 3.45 - TWBC Specification for LEAP

NPFA Specification for; LOCAL EQUIPPED AREA for PLAY (LEAP)		
Content;	Qty	Unit
Site/ground works - activity zone a minimum of 400m ²	400.00	m ²
Play equipment;		
Swings (2 seat) - supply	1.00	unit
Install		item
Multi-play unit (climbing and sliding) - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Rotary item (small roundabout) - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Springy - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Impact-absorbing surfacing under;		
Swings (2 seat)	22.00	m ²
Multi-play unit (climbing and sliding)	35.00	m ²
Rotary item (small roundabout)	15.00	m ²
Springy	10.00	m ²
Kerbs/edgings	85.00	lin.m
Timber seat - supply	2.00	no
install		item
Litter bin - supply	2.00	no
install		item
Bowtop 1.0m high galvanised	80.00	lin.m
self-closing pedestrian gate	2.00	no
maintenance gate	1.00	no
Traffic/safety barrier	1.00	no
Powder coating		item

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

NPFA Specification for; LOCAL EQUIPPED AREA for PLAY (LEAP)		
Tarmac footpath and areas	110.00	m ²
Pcc edgings	80.00	lin.m
The buffer zone planting and landscaping - 10m		item
Play area sign	1.00	no
bicycle parking		item
Re-instatement works		item
Site fencing/protection/secure storage		item
Contract preliminaries, CODAM, H&S Regs		item
Contingency	5.00	%
Professional fees; - allow	10.00	%

Table 3.46 - TWBC Specification for NEAP

NPFA Specification for; NEIGHBOURHOOD EQUIPPED AREA for PLAY (NEAP) ALL THE ABOVE, I.E. SPECIFICATION FOR LEAP, PLUS THE FOLLOWING		
Content;	Qty	Unit
Site/ground works - activity zone a min of 1000m ²	1,000.00	m ²
Play equipment;		
Swings (4 seat) - supply	1.00	unit
Install		item
Multi-play unit (climbing and sliding) - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Rotary item (roundabout) - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
See-Saw - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Aerial Runway - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Single Point Swing - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Youth Shelter - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Impact-absorbing surfacing under;		
Swings (4 seat)	45.00	m ²
Multi-play unit (climbing and sliding)	65.00	m ²
Rotary item (small roundabout)	30.00	m ²
See-Saw	25.00	m ²
Aerial Runway	50.00	m ²
Single Point Swing	50.00	m ²
Kerbs/edgings	200.00	lin.m
Steel seat - supply	6.00	no
install		item
Litter bin - supply	4.00	no
install		item
Bowtop 1.0m high galvanised	160.00	lin.m
self-closing pedestrian gate	4.00	no

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

NPFA Specification for; NEIGHBOURHOOD EQUIPPED AREA for PLAY (NEAP) ALL THE ABOVE, I.E. SPECIFICATION FOR LEAP, PLUS THE FOLLOWING		
Content;	Qty	Unit
maintenance gate	2.00	no
Traffic/safety barrier	2.00	no
Powder coating		item
Tarmac footpath and areas	150.00	m ²
Pcc edgings	100.00	lin.m
Tarmac Games Area (typically soccer & basketball)	465.00	m ²
Pcc edgings	175.00	lin.m
Soccer goals -supply	1.00	pair
install		item
Basketball goal -supply	1.00	pair
install		item
Re-bound fencing (3.0m+ high) - supply	64.00	lin.m
install	64.00	lin.m
Re-bound fencing (1.2m high) - supply	48.00	lin.m
install	48.00	lin.m
Wheeled Sports Area;		
Hard surface (tarmac)	330.00	m ²
Pcc edgings	100.00	lin.m
Quarterpipe - supply	2.00	unit
install		item
Flat Bank - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Fun Box - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Jump Ramp - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
Grind Rail - supply	1.00	unit
install		item
The buffer zone planting and landscaping - 30m		item
Play area sign	3.00	no
bicycle parking		item
Re-instatement works		item
Site fencing/protection/secure storage		item
Contract preliminaries, CODAM, H&S Regs		item
Contingency	5.00	%
Professional fees; - allow	9.00	%

Quantity: Provision for Children & Young People

- 3.247 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are 51 Play areas in the Borough, of which 50 are fixed play areas (total of all LEAPs, NEAPs, non-classified areas). There is a total of 6 sites comprising of ball courts and wheeled play areas. The distribution of play areas, and quantity per Town and Parish is summarised in Table 3.47 overleaf:

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.47 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Provision for Children & Young People

Town and Parish	Population	Unclassified Play Areas	LEAPS	NEAPS (including Youth Provision)	Games Areas	TOTAL
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	7	5	6	1	19
Benenden	2,226	2	0	0		2
Bidborough	966	0	1	0		1
Brenchley	2,717	0	2	0		2
Capel	2,283	1	0	0		1
Cranbrook	6603	4	0	2		6
Frittenden	863	0	1	0		1
Goudhurst	3,136	0	2	0		2
Hawkhurst	4,307	1	0	1		2
Horsmonden	2,150	1	0	0		1
Lamberhurst	1,496	0	1	0		1
Paddock Wood	8,329	3	0	2		5
Pembury	6,014	0	1	0		1
Sandhurst	1,290	1	1	0		2
Southborough	11,139	0	1	2		3*
Speldhurst	4,765	0	1	1		2
TOTALS	104,106	20	16	14	1	51

N.B Southborough Town Council plan to build a fourth Play Area at Wheelers Field

3.248 From Appendix 3, and the above table, the following points in relation to existing play areas can be made:

- Unclassified play areas can be found in Royal Tunbridge Wells, Benenden, Capel, Cranbrook, Hawkhurst, Horsmonden, Paddock Wood, and Sandhurst..
- Youth provision is only located in Royal Tunbridge Wells; there are 9 sites at: Grosvenor Recreation Ground (basketball hoops and kick about area), Hilbert Recreation Ground (wheeled play provision), The Hunters, Showfields (some wheeled play equipment), Mary Caley Recreation Ground (small ball area), Oak Road Play Area (aerial ropeway and climbing wall, plus informal bike course, and kick around area), St Mark's School (basketball court available out of school hours), St John's School (kick about area available out of school hours), Allandale has a MUGA, and there are informal goals at Colebrook (not hard surface)
- There is a new MUGA is under construction at Angley School, Cranbrook; this facility will have some community use.
- There is a new informal cycleway adjacent to Oak Road - NEAP

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality: Provision for Children & Young People

3.249 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits and completion of a scored proforma. Visits have been undertaken to sites with equipment and play features. The quality assessment proforma for play areas has been based on the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (ROSPA) "Play Value Assessment" and looks at a variety of criteria (as set out below) including the overall appearance of the site, the ambience and the type of equipment by age range.

- Balancing
- Climbing
- Crawling
- Gliding
- Group Swinging
- Single Swinging
- Ball Play
- Jumping
- Rotating
- Sliding
- Rocking
- Agility Bridges
- Viewing Platform
- Wheeled Play

3.250 A copy of the proforma is contained within Appendix 8d to this report. In summary the following criteria have been used to rate quality and value of local play facilities. It is important to note that play provision is not simply providing equipment. It is also about the environment that equipment is situated in. The proforma considers elements that best practice play areas have been found to promote. These include diversity in textures, and use of landscaping. In supporting the generation of a sense of place it considers whether the play area is designed to reflect some local significance.

3.251 Site scores not only consider the condition of the equipment but also consider the play value of the entire designated play area. This includes consideration of the different types of activity that the play area allows including:

- **Overall site features** including access gates, whether the area is pollution and noise free, presence of shade, access for the disabled, appropriate signage, locally related features and seating
- **Ambience** including layout, visual appeal, the level of litter or graffiti
- **Equipment for Toddlers, Juniors and Teenagers** has been assessed as discrete elements within the overall play value assessment

3.252 The assessment proforma allows compilation of a total numerical score to reflect the "value" and importance of a local play area. The score can be rated against a value line that reflects the overall quality of the site and also the age range the equipment is designed for. The value lines are outlined below:

Site Overall Value

Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
<20	20-28	29-35	36-47	>47

Overall Ambience

Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
<4	4-5	6-7	8-10	>10

Toddler Play

Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
<10	10-13	14-17	18-22	>22

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Junior Play

Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
<13	13-25	26-31	32-40	>40

Teenage Play

Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
<10	10-14	15-19	20-26	>27

3.253 A summary of the main findings in relation to quality is provided in the Table 3.48 below, and in Map 25:

Table 3.48 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Town and Parish	Overall Site Quality				
	No of Sites Audited	Score Range (out of 69)	Score Range	Ambience Score Range (out of 14)	Ambience Score Range
Royal Tunbridge Wells	19	17 - 56	Poor – Excellent	0 - 12	Poor - Excellent
Benenden	2	38 - 44	Good	9 - 11	Good - Excellent
Bidborough	1	36	Good	8	Good
Brenchley	2	28 - 37	Below Average - Good	6 - 9	Average - Good
Capel	1	41	Good	10	Good
Cranbrook	6	12 - 33	Poor – Average	2 -10	Poor - Good
Frittenden	1	28	Below Average	6	Average
Goudhurst	2	31 - 48	Average – Excellent	8	Good
Hawkhurst	2	44 - 52	Good – Excellent	8 - 9	Good
Horsmonden	1	30	Average	6	Average
Lamberhurst	1	18	Poor	6	Average
Paddock Wood	5	3 - 42	Poor - Good	1 - 11	Poor - Excellent
Pembury	1	44	Good	11	Excellent
Sandhurst	2	41 - 44	Good	11	Excellent
Southborough	3*	34 - 37	Average - Good	8 - 10	Good
Speldhurst	2	28 - 31	Below Average – Average	8 - 9	Good

* Southborough Town Council plan to build a fourth play area at Wheelers Field

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.49 - Play Area by Age Type Rating

Town and Parish	Rating Range					
	Toddlers Play (out of 34)		Junior Play (out of 59)		Teenage Play (out of 40)	
	Score Range	Range	Score Range	Range	Score Range	Range
Royal Tunbridge Wells	0 - 31	Poor - Excellent	0 - 44	Poor - Excellent	0 - 21	Poor - Excellent
Benenden	0 - 4	Poor	9 - 19	Poor - Below Average	0	Poor
Bidborough	12	Below Average	20	Below Average	0	Poor
Brenchley	1 - 10	Poor - Below Average	10 - 17	Poor - Below Average	0	Poor
Capel	4	Poor	11	Poor	0	Poor
Cranbrook	0 - 10	Poor - Below Average	0 - 22	Poor - Below Average	0 - 3	Poor
Frittenden	4	Poor	8	Poor	0	Poor
Goudhurst	7 - 12	Poor - Below Average	0 - 12	Poor	0	Poor
Hawkhurst	9 - 12	Poor - Below Average	0 - 17	Poor - Below Average	0	Poor
Horsmonden	5	Poor	7	Poor	0	Poor
Lamberhurst	6	Poor	12	Poor	0	Poor
Paddock Wood	1 - 8	Poor	0 - 21	Poor - Below Average	0	Poor
Pembury	11	Below Average	16	Below Average	0	Poor
Sandhurst	0 - 6	Poor	13 - 19	Below Average	0	Poor
Southborough	8 - 23	Poor - Excellent	2 - 21	Poor - Below Average	0	Poor
Speldhurst	4 - 9	Poor	9 - 15	Poor - Below Average	0	Poor

3.254 Table 3.49 above shows the broad range in the quality of play provision across the Borough in terms of general appearance and also by age range of equipment. Quality of play provision is affected by a number of factors such as graffiti, vandalism, inadequate signage, dog proof fences and general repair. It is also affected by range of equipment, textures and whether the equipment stimulates creativity.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

3.255 Against the quality value line the Borough's overall average quality of play provision is 'Good'. In percentage terms, the average quality of all play areas for the Royal Tunbridge Wells area is 34.38%. The Parish and Town Councils' average quality of all play areas in percentage terms is 28.26%. It is important to note from Table 3.39 that the majority of provision for children and young people in the parishes is of a 'poor' or 'below average' quality. This reflects the fact that, in general, provision for children and young people is of a better overall quality in Royal Tunbridge Wells.

Accessibility: Provision for Children and Young People

3.256 Access to play provision is influenced by a number of key factors. These include:

- Geographical location and proximity to key residential areas
- The appropriateness of facilities provided and target user group
- External factors such as a perception of personal, or children's safety (this can be influenced by location)

3.257 Currently the Council makes use of the catchment areas defined by the National Playing Fields Association for each category of play area (i.e. LEAP or NEAP). These catchments have long been established and tested and provide usable areas for planning purposes. PPG 17 allows the Council to set local standards for catchments.

3.91 Only 3.8% of the respondents to the door to door survey identified visiting a children's play area in the previous four weeks and of those respondents 2.8% use them on a weekly basis. (It should be noted that these responses did not include children visiting/using play areas on their own, so the actual level of use is much higher than the response rate recorded by the door to door survey).

3.258 77.50% of respondents to the door to door survey stated that they could walk to an equipped play area (LEAP) in less than 5 minutes from home. A further 20% stated they could walk to an equipped play area in 10 minutes (LEAP or NEAP, depending on location).

3.259 The average travel time for all respondents to access provision for young people is 10.72 minutes which equates to a walking distance from home of 1.14 km. (This distance reflects teenagers walking or parents walking with children or pushing children in pushchairs to play provision).

3.260 A mapping exercise has been undertaken to illustrate geographical proximity to play areas. This is illustrated in Map 26

Key Consultation Findings

3.261 The consultation has revealed a number of varying opinions about the current quantity and quality, and whether play facilities in place at present are adequate. Key findings from public consultation and stakeholder interviews include:

- TWBC has invested substantial funding in its playgrounds including some areas for wheeled play. Play area equipment is improving in quality across Royal Tunbridge Wells through a programme of replacement. TWBC has also provided grant funded improvements in play provision in the parishes.
- Good partnership working with Friends of Parks which includes playgrounds.
- St Johns Recreation Ground - TWBC is working with the local community to provide new play facilities at this site.
- TWBC is consulting with young people; issues have been raised regarding open space and parks provision, for example access, safety, appropriate provision
- The Parishes are consulting with young people and listening to what they require such as wheeled play areas and teenage shelters.
- The door to door survey revealed that of those expressing a view, the majority perceived there to be too few play facilities across the borough (parish issue).

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- Stakeholders from the focus groups also perceived that more facilities were needed for young people, across the borough, in both rural and urban areas.
- A number of play areas in the Parishes do not cater for children with disabilities
- Parish Councils identified concerns about the number of play areas they have and the resources available to them to maintain this provision
- Children need to be able to access quality local play facilities in a safe environment; given that play in the rural areas is predominantly provided by the Town and Parish Councils, appropriate support is needed through TWBC, to ensure a consistent approach to play value, safety and quality is delivered.
- Residents of many villages are satisfied with open spaces generally, but feel that each small village should have one good children's play area. A few of the older respondents mentioned that there was more play area provision for them when they were young than there is for the children today.
- The audit and consultation revealed that there is potential to provide more facilities for teenagers and young people in Royal Tunbridge Wells, but particularly in the Parishes
- Use of school play area provision in those parish areas where formal play areas are prone to vandalism, or especially in areas where there are no areas of formal play equipment or available space
- Proactively engaging young people in the provision of teenage shelters in appropriate areas with young people taking ownership

Developing and Applying Standards

- 3.262 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children's play area, driving to an indoor sports facilities. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.
- 3.263 The recommended sustainable means of transport for each type of provision is set out below:

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Developing and Applying Standards: Provision for Children and Young people

Recommended Provision standard

Quantity: Currently there are 51 fixed play areas across the borough, providing equipped play, ball play, wheeled play (6) and teenage shelters. In terms of the national recommended standard of provision, the Borough has 0.05 ha of fixed play provision per 1000 population (based on 5.024 ha of overall provision); given that the NPFA recommended level of provision per 1000 population of 8 ha is based on both fixed and unequipped play areas, it is not appropriate to use this standard as a comparison in Tunbridge Wells Borough.

Given that it is the 0-15 year old age group who use play areas, it may, however, be more appropriate to set a standard for provision for this sector of the Borough's population; the recommended standard for provision for the 0-15 year old population would need to reflect that although they are the main users of the provision, they only represent around a fifth (20.7%) of the local population.

If the current standard of provision were to be based only on the 0-15 year old population, the current standard of fixed play provision would be 0.24 ha per 1000 population.

On this basis, the minimum standard for provision of play space for children and young people should be 0.24ha, although it is recognised that this is an aspirational standard for the rural areas, given the lower population densities, and because there is greater access to open space generally out of the urban area.

Quality: The average quality of play areas across the Borough is 29% which equates to a 'Average' rating. However, the play areas in the Parishes are generally of a poorer quality than those in Royal Tunbridge Wells.

Access: The consultation undertaken suggests that most users walk to access local provision. Given the role and purpose of play areas, there is a need for facility provision close to home. The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) set a number of standards of provision for catchment areas to different categories of play area, and these were originally used in Tunbridge Wells Borough to inform planning policies. However, a policy decision was subsequently taken not to provide Local Areas for Play (LAPs), and that the smallest play area provided would be a Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP). Standards of provision have been based on local consultation, with a comparison shown against the NPFA standards. Based on the consultation results, the average walking distance equates to 1.14 km, and the average cycling distance equates to 2.87km. Both walking and cycling travel times are based on 10.72 minutes (LEAP), and 15 minutes (NEAP). (See Appendix 11 for conversion times and speeds)

Setting the Standard for Provision - Urban: The most sustainable location for new residential development is within 1.14 kilometres of a good quality LEAP, and within 1.6km of a NEAP (based on walking distance at a speed of 4 miles per hour).

Development proposals which would be located more than 2.87km (cycle distance) from a NEAP would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.

Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 2.87km of a NEAP.

It is considered that the above standard must remain, an aspirational target for the rural areas where lower population densities (and therefore demand) may render the provision of additional facilities impractical.

The above standards will start to address the existing deficiency in levels of play provision across the Borough.

Application of the provision standard: Map 26 shows the current provision of facilities for children and young people with a theoretical catchment area of 1.14 km (based on walking distance). This shows that although there is some provision in all Parish and Town council areas, some residents in Capel and in the outskirts of most Parishes are outside the walking catchment distance for this type of provision. This situation is, however, unlikely to affect major settlements. Map 26 demonstrates that the urban areas and the main residential settlements in the rural area have generally good access to play area provision. However, there are significant

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Recommended Provision standard

access deficiencies in the wider rural areas eg Capel, Horsmonden, Beneden, and also in parts of Bidborough, Speldhurst, Pembury, Brenchley, Lamberhurst, Goudhurst, Frittenden, Cranbrook, Hawkhurst, and Sandhurst; It is important to note that applying the cycling catchment area demonstrates that all areas of the Borough are within reasonable cycling distance of a play area.

Recommendations: Provision for Children and Young People

3.264 The following recommendations are made in relation to provision for children and young people:

- Aim to provide Good quality sites as a minimum. A 'Good' site is one which provides appropriate infrastructure to facilitate usage e.g. signage, seating and bins, is clean, safe, welcoming, and attractive, and, in relation to this typology, provides the appropriate play facilities, play value and environment for the age group at which it is targeted..
- Undertake minor maintenance improvements to sites such as the treating of benches & bins, increased provision of bins, tidying of entrances etc
- Remove evidence of vandalism quickly (within 48 hours)
- Introduce signage on all sites with site details and contact numbers
- Improve provision for Young People especially Teenagers and Toddlers through a more diverse range of design
- Develop equipment that caters for children and young people with disabilities
- Involve young people in the design and choice of provision
- Continue to work with Friends Groups and Residents' Groups to ensure that refurbishment of play areas or provision of new play areas is in keeping with the communities' needs and desires.
- Given that play in the rural areas is predominantly provided by the Town and Parish Councils, appropriate support is needed through TWBC, to ensure a consistent approach to play value, safety and quality.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Allotments

- 3.265 Allotments are a key type of provision within the overall portfolio of open space, sport and recreation facilities. From the consultation undertaken, the value of allotments is significant, providing facilities for physical activity in addition to the promotion of healthy eating and educational value. The provision of allotments is a statutory function for local authorities under legislation, including the 1950 Allotment Act.
- 3.266 The need for allotments is likely to increase as a result of a number of factors, including:
- The recent Health White Paper which emphasised the benefits of physical activity and healthy eating.
 - Growth in the interest in organic produce and farming as a result of product placement in supermarkets and media coverage about food production.
 - Rising housing densities nationally and locally and the consequential reduction in the size of many gardens.
- 3.267 Allotments like other open space can provide a number of wider community benefits and hit a number of sustainability targets as well as the primary use of growing produce. These include
- Recycling - Allotment holders can be encouraged to recycle and offer the potential for community composting sites.
 - Transport - Home grown food means there is less transport (less road and air miles) and less packaging.
 - Employment and training - New skills and opportunities whether promotional, managerial or related to cultivation.
 - Education - Links with schools, special needs and adult learning. Close contact with wildlife can lead to a lifelong interest.
 - Leisure - Promoting local tourism - arts, crafts and volunteering.
 - Sustainable neighbourhoods - revitalising allotments and neighbourhoods.
 - Community Development - co-operation across ethnic, age and other groups. Allotment societies often play a wider role in community schemes, becoming involved with local schools as well as programmes for the disabled.
 - Health - Increased consumption of fresh foods and more exercise and relief from stress, and therapy for those with mental health problems.
 - Providing opportunity for social inclusion and cohesion.
 - Creating opportunities for people to participate in recreation.
 - Heritage - Allotments can be an important genetic resource for the conservation of rare species.
 - Greenspace and Biodiversity – Allotments provide areas of green space in built up areas and are used by wildlife.

Quantity: Allotments

- 3.268 The audit undertaken has revealed that there are 31 allotment sites in current use.
- 3.269 When considering all plots let and currently available, it has not been possible to undertake a thorough analysis owing to the lack of detail provided by the Parish Councils. The number of allotments required is a reflection of the levels of demand for this type of provision.

Table 3.50 – Tunbridge Wells Borough: Current Allotment Provision

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Sites	Area Hectares
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	14	18.37
Benenden	2,226	0	0
Bidborough	966	1	0.47
Brenchley	2717	1	0.57
Capel	2,283	1	1.39

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Sites	Area Hectares
Cranbrook	6603	1	1.05
Frittenden	863	0	0
Goudhurst	3,136	1	0.24
Hawkhurst	4,307	2	1.84
Horsmonden	2,150	0	0
Lamberhurst	1,496	2	0.60
Paddock Wood	8,329	3	3.4
Pembury	6,014	1	2.03
Sandhurst	1,290	0	0
Southborough	11,139	3	3.28
Speldhurst	4,765	1	0.40
TOTALS	104,016	31	33.64

- 3.270 Research has revealed that there are approximately 33.64 hectares of allotments across the Borough. 18.37 ha are in Royal Tunbridge Wells (See Map 27).
- 3.271 In 1969 the Thorpe report recommended a standard of provision of 0.2 hectares per 1000 population.
- 3.272 Across the borough there is provision of 0.32 hectares per 1,000 population.

Quality: Allotments

- 3.273 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits and completion of a scored proforma. The quality assessment has been based on a non-technical visual assessment completed to rate the quality of a number of key criteria. The proforma built on a previous audit undertaken, the findings of the Government Select Committee report into best practice in allotment provision, and the Local Government Association's "*A New Future for Allotments*" publication (2000). A copy of the site visit proforma is included in Appendix 8e. Information collected using the proforma was supplemented by information gathered through consultation with allotment holders and TWBC Officers.
- 3.274 Allotments were assessed and the scores measured against the quality value line for allotments. The results are illustrated in Map 28.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality Line – Allotments

0% - 19%	20% - 39%	40% - 59%	60% - 79%	80% +
Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent

3.275 Key criteria affecting “quality” include;

- The presence of water supply
- Whether the site is served by toilets
- Secure fencing around the site
- Signage to identify management, usage arrangements, special events and the availability of plots
- The presence of facilities such as composting bins, a shop and car parking.

3.276 A detailed summary of the allotment audit results is contained within the appendices. Table 3.51 below provides a summary of the key findings from the quality assessments:

Table 3.51 - Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Town and Parish	Number of Sites Audited	Lowest Quality	Highest Quality	Average Quality	Average Quality Range
Royal Tunbridge Wells	14	30%	63%	44.35%	Average
Benenden	0	-	-	-	-
Bidborough	1	-	-	48%	Average
Brenchley	1	-	-	45%	Average
Capel	1	-	-	40%	Average
Cranbrook	1	-	-	53%	Average
Frittenden	0	-	-	-	-
Goudhurst	1	-	-	13%	Very Poor
Hawkhurst	2	38%	40%	39%	Poor
Horsmonden	0	-	-	-	-
Lamberhurst	2	8%	18%	13%	Very Poor
Paddock Wood	3	40%	60%	47.6%	Average
Pembury	1	-	-	35%	Poor
Sandhurst	0	-	-	-	-
Southborough	3	18%	45%	34.33%	Poor
Speldhurst	1	-	-	40%	Average
Totals	31	-	-	37.69%	Poor

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

3.277 The audit of the quality of current allotment sites has revealed:

- Quality varies across the borough with site ratings ranging from 13% (Goudhurst and Lamberhurst) and 63% (Southwood Road, Rusthall)
- Royal Tunbridge Wells has two good rated sites Reynolds Lane and Southwood Road, Rusthall, 8 sites are rated as average and 4 sites are rated as poor.
- Allotments within the Parish and Town Council areas are rated 9 average, 1 below average, 4 very poor and 1 good.
- The main areas in need of improvement are the provision of meeting facilities, and continued infrastructure improvements
- The highest scoring TWBC allotment was Rusthall Newtown.
- The average quality score for all allotments across the Borough is 37.69%, which equates to 'poor'.

Accessibility: Allotments

3.278 A number of key considerations have been made in assessing access to allotments. These have included; the cost of renting an allotment; physical access, particularly for those with a disability; marketing and promotion of sites; location of facilities; range of services provided; availability of plots. The audit undertaken has revealed the following:

- **Fees and charges.** The cost of hire varies significantly between the Borough Council and the Parish and Town Councils. This variation means that local residents are charged more in one area than another. However, fees could be reduced to encourage use at allotment sites such as Goudhurst and Lamberhurst.
- **Physical Access** to sites and services. Although a detailed access audit was not undertaken, each site visited was rated for current and potential disability access. Key considerations included the quality of roads and pathways into and within sites, and the presence of specialist disabled facilities (such as raised bed allotments and disabled toilets). The audit revealed that access to allotment sites across the borough is poor for disabled gardeners; there is one allotment for gardeners with a disability at Marl Pits, which is run by Hawkenbury Allotment Holders Association.
- **Marketing and promotion** of sites and services is also a key consideration in relation to access. It is important that local residents are aware of facilities and services available, and demand could be stifled if awareness of allotments is low.
- **Range of services provided** is a particularly important consideration in widening access to allotments from a broader cross section of the local population to those traditionally likely to comprise the majority of allotment gardeners. Facilities such as car parking, toilets and other amenities need to be considered if allotments are to generate usage from families, local schools and other organisations. The audit revealed that toilet provision is rare and that parking facilities are also lacking at most of the sites.
- **Availability of plots.** Within Royal Tunbridge Wells there are currently 59 plots available out of 498 plots managed by the Borough Council. Usage in Royal Tunbridge Wells is very high when compared to the Parish and Town Council plots. The Town Council plots in Paddock wood and Southborough have a higher percentage of plots used than those in the other Parishes.
- **Accessibility.** Many people walk to allotments, given their location, and the lack of parking available for allotment holders. Allotment holders are able to walk if they do not have to carry tools and equipment for use; the issues of vandalism and security are therefore important to address, given that tools and equipment are stored on site.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Summary of Consultation and Key Findings

- 3.279 Consultation has revealed a number of varying opinions (allotment users, and TWBC officers) about the current quantity, and quality of allotments, and whether current facilities in place at present are adequate. A summary of these opinions are reported overleaf:
- 3.280 The Allotment consultation revealed that:
- Vandalism is a common issue particularly highlighted at Southborough Yew Tree Road.
 - Secure fencing was regarded as a key priority at a number of allotments especially those in the Parish but also at Charity Farm and Yew Tree in Southborough.
 - Allotments are also perceived to be under utilised in the rural areas. Users of allotments complained about lack of water and untidy allotments, for example, weeds taking over in particular Yew Tree Road, Southborough and some rural allotments.
 - Southborough Town Council is to invest in, and improve, allotments at Yew Tree Road
 - Concerns over planning issues for development of the Yew Tree Road allotments sites at Southborough
 - Some allotment holders outside Royal Tunbridge Wells and the allotment holders at sites owned by the Borough Council perceived that marketing of allotments was not being undertaken.
 - The 'value' of allotments, particularly for education and health purposes is not being achieved
 - Many allotment holders regard improvement of on site facilities as the key priority for the future
 - Residents and allotment holders have issues regarding an allocation in the Local Plan for a new supermarket in Southborough and the open space, allotment and playing pitch issues this will cause. Some residents perceive that planning permission has already been agreed.

Developing and Applying Standards

- 3.281 It is not appropriate to set local standards in the same way for each typology; this is because the majority of people access different types of provision in different ways, for example, walking to a park or children's play area, driving to an indoor sports facilities. In addition, the way in which people choose to access different types of provision may be influenced by locational factors, for example, a high quality park may be within cycling, but not walking, distance in a rural area.
- 3.282 The recommended sustainable means of transport for each type of provision is set out below:

TYOLOGY	SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRANSPORT	RURAL QUALIFICATION?
Parks (Large Urban/Local Park/Recreation Ground)	Walk Cycle	Yes
Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space	Walk Cycle	No
Indoor Sports Facilities	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Outdoor Sports	Walk Cycle Drive	No
Informal Green Space	Walk Cycle	Yes
Provision for Children and Young People	Walk	Yes
NEAP	Walk/Cycle	
LEAP	Walk	
Allotments	Walk Cycle	Yes

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Developing and Applying Standards: Allotments

Recommended Provision Standard
<p>Quantity: There are 33.64 ha of allotments across the Borough which equates to a current level of provision of 0.32 ha per 1000 head of population. This exceeds the nationally recommended standard by 0.12ha per 1000 population. The future standard for provision of allotments is recommended as 0.2 ha per 1000 population; only the sites in Royal Tunbridge Wells are at capacity, and this standard is sufficient to provide for the Borough's population.</p> <p>Quality: The average quality score for allotments is 37.69% which equates to "poor" facilities.</p> <p>Access: Based on the consultation results, the average walking distance equates to 1.48 km.</p> <p>Setting the Standard for Provision - Urban: The most sustainable location for new residential development is within 1.48 km of a good quality allotment.</p> <p>Development proposals which would be located more than 3.67km (cycle distance) would not be considered sustainable in terms of this type of open space provision.</p> <p>Existing dwellings are considered to have satisfactory provision where they are within 3.67km of an allotment.</p> <p>Given that the need for allotments is greatest in the urban areas where the density of development is higher, the standard above is considered to be aspirational for the rural areas. It should also be noted that, there is currently an over-provision (against national standards) of allotments in the Borough and that there is only full occupancy of plots in Royal Tunbridge Wells.</p>

Recommendations: Allotments

3.283 The following recommendations are made in relation to allotment provision:

- A programme of facility development including toilet provision needs to be established and prioritised. Facilities for users/potential users with a disability need to be further developed
- There is potential for the development of a number of partnerships to increase the value and accessibility of allotments that should be progressed. These include partnerships with schools (where sites are close enough) and the further development of health-related projects currently in place
- Develop proactive marketing of the parish-based allotments with allotment holders and societies to help raise the profile of the sites and the benefits allotments can bring

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Cemeteries & Churchyards

3.284 The definition of cemeteries and churchyards:

Areas where the primary function is a Cemetery, Churchyard; this typology may also include other burial grounds which can also provide opportunity for quiet contemplation and often for walking and wildlife conservation

3.285 Cemeteries, churchyards in use for burials, disused church yards and other burial grounds can provide a valuable contribution to the portfolio of open space provision within an area. For many, churchyards can provide a place for quiet contemplation in addition to their primary purpose as a “final” resting place, particularly in busy urban areas. Often churchyards have wildlife conservation and biodiversity value. In the context of this study, it is important to acknowledge that churchyards are not created with the intention of providing informal or passive recreation opportunities. Churchyards only exist where there is a church and as such, standards of provision need to focus on quality, rather than quantity. There is a huge range of churchyards and cemeteries across the Borough. The vast majority, (all but 3), of these fall outside the responsibility of the Council.

Quantity: Cemeteries and Churchyards

3.286 The audit undertaken has identified 30 cemeteries. These are shown in Appendix 3. The distribution of these across the borough is illustrated in Table 3.52 below:

Table 3.52 - Cemeteries

Town and Parish	Population	Number of Sites
Royal Tunbridge Wells	45,732	7
Benenden	2,226	1
Bidborough	966	1
Brenchley	2,717	1
Capel	2,283	2
Cranbrook	6603	2
Frittenden	863	2
Goudhurst	3,136	2
Hawkhurst	4,307	2
Horsmonden	2,150	1
Lamberhurst	1,496	1
Paddock Wood	8,329	1
Pembury	6,014	3
Sandhurst	1,290	1
Southborough	11,139	1
Speldhurst	4,765	2
TOTALS	104,016	30

3.287 No quantity standards are to be set for cemeteries. The PPG 17 Annex states:

“Every individual cemetery has a finite capacity and therefore there is a steady need for more of them. Indeed many areas may face a shortage of burial grounds.”

3.288 The need for graves for all religious faiths can be calculated from the estimated population coupled to the average number of deaths, which provides a calculation that can be converted into a quantitative population based provision standard if required.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Quality: Cemeteries and Churchyards

3.289 The annex to PPG 17 Annex clearly states:

“Many historic churchyards and cemeteries provide important places for quiet contemplation, especially in busy urban areas and often support biodiversity and interesting geological features. As such many can be viewed as amenity green spaces. Unfortunately many are also in a poor and run down condition and therefore it may be desirable to enhance their quality.”

3.290 Quality inspections have been undertaken via site visits and completion of a scored proforma for the 3 TWBC managed cemeteries, and 22 other sites. The proforma used to assess quality of a sample of the provision was broadly based on the scoring system for other accessible types of open space. The key criteria used, given the intended value of this type of provision included:

- Main entrance safety, cleanliness, and natural presence
- Signage
- Quality of roads and pathways
- Provision of bins and seats

3.291 The key findings of the quality assessments undertaken are provided in Table 3.53 below:

Table 3.53 - Tunbridge Wells Borough Council: Summary of Quality Assessment Findings

Town and Parish	Provision Details	Quality Range	Average Quality Score
Royal Tunbridge Wells	4 sites visited	31.91% - 95.91% ('Average' to 'Excellent')	73.81% ('Very Good')
Benenden	1 site visited	74.74% ('Very Good')	74.74% ('Very Good')
Bidborough	1 site visited	75.38% ('Very Good')	75.38% ('Very Good')
Brenchley	1 site visited	67.35% ('Very Good')	67.35% ('Very Good')
Capel	2 sites visited	71.92% - 74.39% ('Very Good - Very Good')	73.15% ('Very Good')
Cranbrook	2 sites visited	46.99% - 50.84% ('Good')	48.91% ('Good')
Frittenden	2 sites visited	43.40% - 69.38% ('Average' to 'Very Good')	56.39% ('Good')
Goudhurst	2 sites visited	38.31% - 53.20% ('Good')	45.75% ('Good')
Hawkhurst	2 sites visited	67.35% - 75.38% ('Very Good')	71.35% ('Very Good')
Horsmonden	1 site visited	62.27% ('Very Good')	62.27% ('Very Good')
Lamberhurst	1 site visited	72.73% ('Very Good')	72.73% ('Very Good')
Paddock Wood	1 site visited	74.04% ('Very Good')	74.04% ('Very Good')
Pembury	2 sites visited	50.36% - 69.82% ('Good - Very Good')	60.09% ('Good')
Sandhurst	1 site visited	77.54% ('Excellent')	77.54% ('Excellent')
Southborough	1 site visited	81.36% ('Excellent')	81.36% ('Excellent')
Speldhurst	2 sites visited	67.35% - 75.09% ('Very Good')	71.22% ('Very Good')

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Town and Parish	Provision Details	Quality Range	Average Quality Score
TOTALS	26 sites visited (of the total 30)		67.88% ('Very Good')

3.292 The results of the quality assessments can be summarised as:

- An average quality score across the borough of **67.88%** ('Very Good')
- The general maintenance was found to be good with sites being kept clean and tidy
- Woodbury Park and Borough Cemetery Royal Tunbridge Wells are rated as excellent cemeteries and Southborough Cemetery was rated the highest of cemeteries within the Parish and Town Council areas.

Accessibility: Cemeteries and Churchyards

3.293 Accessibility to cemeteries and churchyards is difficult to assess. In regard to their overall contribution to open space, given their primary purpose and factors affecting location and provision levels, the assessment has not included a focus on distribution, location or distance thresholds. People make use of this type of provision for a variety of reasons. In terms of physical access, a number of sites had poor access for those with mobility difficulties or visiting in a wheel chair.

3.294 The definitive standards in relation to the quality of cemeteries is increasingly being recognised as that set by the Green Flag Award.

3.295 The door to door household survey undertaken in relation to cemeteries within the Borough identified:

- In relation to cemeteries within the Borough, only 4.7% (18 people) of the people surveyed had used cemeteries in the previous four weeks.
- The respondents' average travel time when walking was 17.62 minutes which equates to a travelling distance of 1.88 km.

Summary of Key Findings

3.296 The following comments are made in relation to cemeteries and disused churchyards on the basis of the sites audited and consultation undertaken:

- Churchyards and cemeteries are potentially under-utilised areas of open space; there is potential for them to be enjoyed as informal open space by more local people, if, for example, there was improved provision of car parking, and lighting, to make them easier to access, and be perceived as being safer areas, particularly in the evenings.
- Quality varies across the sites inspected, with the main deficiencies relating to lack of accessibility to toilets, lighting and car parking.
- There is currently no space for woodland burials, the nearest being in Sevenoaks. There are also concerns that residential buildings are encroaching and beginning to change the environment of the Tunbridge Wells Cemetery

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Developing and Applying Standards: Cemeteries / Churchyards

Recommended Provision Standard
<p>Quantity: There are numerous churchyards, cemeteries and burial grounds across Tunbridge Wells Borough. This provision is sometimes dependent upon the presence and location of a church. As a result, no quantitative provision standards have been set. Additionally, the residents' consultation suggests that this type of provision is not well used.</p> <p>Quality: The average quality score for all assessed sites (Tunbridge Borough Council & Parish managed/maintained) is 67.88% which equates to "Very Good" facilities.</p>

Recommendations: Churchyards/Cemeteries

- 3.297 It is recommended that a quality standard be adopted based on the quality assessment results as an initial basis. The Council should in the near future develop management plans for the cemeteries and proactively promote them and consider submitting them for the Green Flag Award.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Landscape of Special Designation

3.298 The definition of Landscape of Special Designation is:

Landscape which is predominantly important, due to its vegetation e.g. trees and hedgerows. This type of open space may not always be accessible for informal use, as the landscape may be e.g. a hedgerow.

3.299 Landscape of Special Designation may be an integral part of a wider area e.g. trees in a park, or be a stand-alone landscape feature e.g. a hedgerow. For this reason it is not appropriate to set standards for the specific typology. It is, however, critical to acknowledge the importance of this type of open space and to ensure that its visual, bio-diversity and historical value is reflected in the wider assessment, and continued protection, of open space in the Borough. This value judgement is vital, irrespective of whether the specific open space area is in public or private ownership.

3.300 Within Tunbridge Wells Borough, Landscape of Special Character Designation refers specifically to designated Areas of Importance Open Space and Areas of Landscape Importance. These sites have been classified either within the open space typology of Informal Open Space or Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space, as detailed in the relevant tables (3.54 and 3.55), and they have therefore been audited as such.,

3.301 The designation of these areas results from the special value of their contribution to open space in the Borough; this is often visual i.e. a tree line (covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)), incidental open space or a hedgerow. Table 3.54 identifies the location of these areas within the Borough, and details which ones are part of a wider area of open space.

Areas of Important Open Space 2001

3.302 Areas of Important Open Space are covered by Policy EN21 in the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan which states:

'Proposals for development affecting Areas of Important Open Space, as defined on the Proposals Map, will only be permitted where no significant harm would be caused to the appearance or open character of the designated area and the development would not materially detract from the contribution which that area makes to the locality.'

3.303 There are 87 Areas of Important Open Space identified in the Schedule of Sites of 2001. Having visited, assessed and photographed these sites where access permitted. It is recommended that the Schedule be reviewed on the following basis:

- It is noted that other similar sites, which are not presently included in the Schedule, could potentially be designated as Areas of Important Open Space.
- Conversely, Officers of TWBC should consider whether some of the sites which are designated should be on the Area of Open Space Importance Schedule at all.

3.304 The majority of these sites have been included in this assessment as informal open space. Some sites fall under the cemeteries and local parks and recreation sites typologies. Table 3.54 should be looked at in conjunction with the photograph schedule for the Important Open Space Schedule of Sites 2001 Appendix 9).

3.305 Table 3.54 shows the existing TWBC Schedule of Areas of Open Space.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

3.306 In reviewing the existing Schedule, this study has identified that there are a number of designated Important Open Spaces which perform a function as Amenity Space. The quality assessment of Amenity Space across the Borough has identified that much of it is of a poor or average quality. Whilst open space areas which are designated as Important Areas of Open Space, as well as performing another typology function, for example, Playing Field, should be retained with both designations, because they perform a dual function, stand alone Amenity Space should be reviewed for its designation as Important Open Space. Many of these sites are small, and along a road side; from the audit and some are private gardens. Their designation as Important Open Space therefore needs to be justified. The specific sites (TWBC ID) which should be reviewed are:

6,18,20,26,25,86,69,68,79,80,75,40,41,62,31,30,29,27,45,44,42,43,66,83,82,57,34,61,64,22,3,5. These are all listed by name and location in Table 3.54.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.54 – Areas of Important Open Space

Area of Important Open Space	Site No TWBC	Name	Locality	Ward/Parish	Historical Importance	LvaValue	StratImp	Photograph No.	PPG17 Typology
Area of Important Open Space	14	Playing Field Next to Nevill Ground	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	N	Y	Y	Disc B 71, 72, 73	Playing Field
Area of Important Open Space	12	Private Road Entrance Camden Park	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park	Y	Y	N	No Photo	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	11	Culverden Park	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park	Y	Y	N	See Parks	Urban Park
Area of Important Open Space	16	Allotment Charity Farm	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St James	N	Y	Y	See Allotment Typology	Allotments
Area of Important Open Space	15	Hilbert Recreation Ground	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St James	N	Y	Y	Disc B 41, 42, 43, 44	Recreation Ground
Area of Important Open Space	6	Fronting Eridge Road - Opposite Showfields Estate	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	Y	Disc B 91	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	9	Showfields Road Estate	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	N	Disc B 88	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	7	Showfields Road Estate	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	Y	Disc B 90	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	19	Playing Field back of Library Southborough - Locked	Southborough	Southborough East	N	Y	Y	Disc B 15,16	Playing Fields School - 4 Rugby, 1Foot, 1 C
Area of Important Open Space	18	South View Road	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Johns	N	Y	Y	Disc 37B	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	20	Yew Tree Road Southborough	Southborough	Southborough East	N	Y	N	Disc B 17	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	21	Yew Tree Recreation Ground	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	See Playing Fields	Playing Fields
Area of Important Open Space	26	Ladysgift Road	Southborough	Southborough West	N	Y	N	Disc B 12	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	25	Wooley Road, Southborough	Southborough	Southborough West	N	Y	Y	Disc B 11	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	23	Southborough	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	Disc B 9	Amenity Space with Play Area
Area of Important Open Space	39	Bidborough Churchyard	Bidborough	Bidborough	Y	Y	N	Disc B 1	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	87	Speldhurst Churchyard	Speldhurst	Speldhurst	Y	Y	N	Disc B 5	Churchyard

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Important Open Space	Site No TWBC	Name	Locality	Ward/Parish	Historical Importance	LvaValue	StratImp	Photograph No.	PPG17 Typology
Space									
Area of Important Open Space	86	Speldhurst	Speldhurst	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Disc B 6	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	1	Ashley Park Road Rusthall	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Rusthall	N	Y	N	Disc B 34, 35	Small Amenity Space with Play Area
Area of Important Open Space	69	Langton Green - Hare Inn Junction	Langton Green	Speldhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 29	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	68	Langton Green - Hare Inn Junction	Langton Green	Speldhurst	Y	Y	N	Disc B 28	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	77	Historic Village Green	Pembury	Pembury	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 20	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	78	St Peters Churchyard	Pembury	Pembury	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 21, 22	Churchyard and Green
Area of Important Open Space	79	Belfield Road	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	Y	Disc A 24	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	80	Off Beagles Wood Road	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	N	Disc A 23	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	71	Forms part of Matfield Village Green	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 28	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	70	Forms part of Matfield Village Green	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 28	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	75	Opposite entrance to village hall	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 27	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	40	Jack Verral Garden to the left but appears the rest is a Private Garden	Brenchley	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 35, 36, 37	The Garden is Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	41	Church Close	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	Y	N	Disc A 34	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	62	Fernandez Drive	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 38	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	33	Putlands Leisure Centre	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	Y	Disc A 10, 11, 12	Sports Ground and Bowls Club
Area of Important Open Space	32	Memorial Ground	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	Y	Disc A 7, 8, 9	Sports Ground with tennis and play ground
Area of Important Open Space	31	Ringden Avenue	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	N	Disc A 14,	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	30	Off Goldings	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	N	Disc A 13	Amenity Space

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Important Open Space	Site No TWBC	Name	Locality	Ward/Parish	Historical Importance	LvaValue	StratImp	Photograph No.	PPG17 Typology
Space									
Area of Important Open Space	28	St Andrews Recreation Ground	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	N	Disc A 3, 4, 5	Local Park
Area of Important Open Space	29	Granary off Warrington Road	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	N	Disc A 6	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	27	Allington Rd/Maidstone Rd	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	Y	Disc A 1, 2	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	45	Fronting Houses Five Oak Green Rd	Five Oak Green	Capel	N	Y	Y	Disc A 18 & 19	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	44	Triangle Middle of road	Five Oak Green	Capel	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 15	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	42	Fronting Houses Right Hand side of Longfield Rd	Five Oak Green	Capel	N	Y	Y	Disc A 17	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	43	Fronting Houses Left Hand side of Longfield Road	Five Oak Green	Capel	N	Y	Y	Disc A 16	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	48	The Pond Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 44	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	49	St Marys Churchyard	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	See Churchyard Typology	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	66	Lamberhurst Main High Street Small Island - Being Block Paved	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 40, 41	Amenity Space Being Block Paved
Area of Important Open Space	35	Cranbrook Churchyard	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	N	N	Disc B 105	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	36	Cranbrook School (Public Right of Way)	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	N	N	Disc B 106	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	85	Sissinghurst	Sissinghurst	Cranbrook	N	Y	N	Disc A 53	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	46	St Marys Churchyard	Frittenden	Frittenden	Y	Y	Y	See Church Yards	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	47	Land Adjacent to Frittenden School	Frittenden	Frittenden	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 47	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	84	Ringle Green	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	N	Y	Y	Disc A 69	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	83	Back Lane	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 70	Amenity Space

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Important Open Space	Site No TWBC	Name	Locality	Ward/Parish	Historical Importance	LvaValue	StratImp	Photograph No.	PPG17 Typology
Area of Important Open Space	82	Triangle of Grass Land	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 71	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	81	Village Green	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 72	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	51	St Lawrence Churchyard	Hawkhurst, The Moor	Hawkhurst	Y	Y	Y	See Churchyard Typology	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	52	The Moor Opposite Recreation Ground	Hawkhurst, The Moor	Hawkhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 82	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	57	Crane House Garden - Small Frontage onto houses and parking	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Disc A 83	Amenity Space - Untidy
Area of Important Open Space	58	Next to Victoria Gardens	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	Y	N	Disc A 84	Private Garden
Area of Important Open Space	60	All Saints Church Grave Yard	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	Y	N	Disc A 87	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	61	Junction Queens Road & Bus Station	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	N	Y	Disc A 88	Small Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	59	Front Gardens to Alms Houses - Queens Inn	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 85, 86	Front Gardens
Area of Important Open Space	56		Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	Y	No Photo	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	55		Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	Y	No Photo	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	54		Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	Y	No Photo	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	53		Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	No Photo	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	37	Benenden Village Green	Benenden	Benenden	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 58	Amenity Space with Cricket Square
Area of Important Open Space	50	Pond on outskirts of village	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 45	Semi Natural
Area of Important Open Space	64	Kilndown next to church (Now a car Park and front gardens to houses)	Kilndown	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 42, 43	Amenity Space now car park
Area of Important Open Space	65	Back of Church yard	Kilndown	Goudhurst	Y	Y	N	See Landscape Import.	Churchyard

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Important Open Space	Site No TWBC	Name	Locality	Ward/Parish	Historical Importance	LvaValue	StratImp	Photograph No.	PPG17 Typology
Area of Important Open Space	22	Front to main Tonbridge Road	Southborough	Southborough North	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 8	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	38	Benenden Churchyard	Benenden	Benenden	Y	N	Y	Disc A 59	Churchyard
Area of Important Open Space	24	Sir Davids Gardens, Southborough	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	Disc B 10	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	2	Alan Close, Rusthall	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Rusthall	N	Y	N	Disc B 36	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	3	Summervale Road Ramslye	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	N	Disc B 93	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	4	Eastlands Road, No Photo due to playground area being utilised	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	N	Y	No Photo	Amenity Space with Play Area
Area of Important Open Space	8	Showfields Road Estate	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	N	Disc B 89	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	5	Eridge Road Ramslye Fronting main road	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	N	Y	Disc B 92	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	10	Nr Hawkenbury	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park	N	Y	N	Disc B 65	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	17	Sherwood Road	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	N	Y	N	Disc B57	Sherwood Road Play Area
Area of Important Open Space	13	Francombe Road Open Space	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	N	N	Y	Disc B 67, 68, 69	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	63	Horsmonden Sports Ground	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 39	Recreation Ground
Area of Important Open Space	67	Langton Green Associated with church and pub	Langton Green	Speldhurst	Y	Y	N	Disc B 28	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	76	Matfield Village Green outside pub sign on	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 25	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	74	Opposite pub Matfield Village Green	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 26	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	73	Pond Area of Village green	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 30	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	72	Main Part of Village Green	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	Disc A 29	Amenity Space
Area of Important Open Space	34	Museum Cranbrook and Private Garden	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	Y	N	Disc B 104	Not applicable

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Areas of Landscape Importance Schedule of Sites 2001

3.307 Areas of Landscape Importance are covered in the Local Plan in the Environment Chapter under Landscape within the Built Environment. They are protected by policy EN 22 which states:

Policy EN 22

3.308 'Proposals for development affecting Areas of Landscape Importance, as defined on the Proposals Map, will only be permitted where no significant harm would be caused to the appearance or landscape character of the designated area and the development would not materially detract from the contribution which that area makes to the locality.'

3.309 There are 158 Areas of Landscape Importance identified in the Schedule of Sites of 2001. Having visited, and photographed these sites where access permitted:

- It is noted that other similar sites, which are not presently included in the Schedule could potentially be designated as Areas of Landscape Importance
- Conversely, decisions need to be made by Officers of TWBC about whether some of the sites which are designated, should be on the Area of Landscape Importance Schedule at all.

3.310 Some of the existing Areas of Landscape Importance represent small numbers of trees in private gardens. One or two areas have housing development taking place. Some sites fall under the following typologies of cemeteries and natural /semi natural green space. Table 3.55 should be looked at in conjunction with the photograph schedule for the Areas of Landscape Importance Schedule of Sites 2001.

3.311 Table 3.55 shows the existing Areas of Landscape Importance, as designated by TWBC.

3.312 It is important to review the designations of Area of Landscape of Importance; from the audit, some existing sites are being built on, and many appear to relate to trees in private gardens. It is difficult to justify such designations in sites where there is no public access, and therefore no opportunity for the local community to benefit from such areas, other than visually. Many of the existing site designations relate to trees along roads; these are important to retain as they contribute to the visual amenity value of the local area. The specific sites that should be reviewed in relation to their existing designation as Areas of Landscape (TWBC ID) are as follows: 76, 79, 80, 154, 153, 42, 56, 58, 59, 97, 121, 91, 116, 104, 70, 71, 75, 68, 64, 131, 139, 22, 21A, 54, 61, 55. These are all named in Table 3.45 overleaf. Where an Area of Landscape Importance is part of a larger open space typology, for example, a Churchyard, the designation should be retained, as the site contributes to the specific character of the typology.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Table 3.55 – Areas of Landscape Importance

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	77	Frittenden	Frittenden	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 52	Row of Hedge & Grass Verge
Area of Landscape Importance	76	Frittenden	Frittenden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc A 51	Front Garden
Area of Landscape Importance	79	Frittenden	Frittenden	Y	N	N	Y	No Photo people working in front gardens	Front Gardens to cottages opposite Frittenden Church
Area of Landscape Importance	78	Frittenden	Frittenden	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc A 49	Tree and Hedge Row Fronting Private Garden
Area of Landscape Importance	80	Frittenden	Frittenden	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 48	Grass Verge fronting Hedge to Front Gardens
Area of Landscape Importance	154	Sissinghurst	Cranbrook	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 57	Front Gardens and grass verge with conifer tree
Area of Landscape Importance	153	Sissinghurst	Cranbrook	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 56	Small Green with hedge and trees in private garden
Area of Landscape Importance	152	Sissinghurst	Cranbrook	Y	N	N	Y	Disc A 55	Tree and Hedge Row Fronting Road
Area of Landscape Importance	151	Sissinghurst	Cranbrook	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc A 54	Tree line fronting road
Area of Landscape Importance	50	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 107, 108,109	Trees around Churchyard, Cranbrook School
Area of Landscape Importance	49	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	Y	N	N	Disc B 116	Trees been pollarded
Area of Landscape Importance	48	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 117, 118	Tree line following both sides of lane in between house
Area of Landscape Importance	47	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 119	Trees and Hedges fronting road
Area of Landscape Importance	46	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	N	N	Y	N	Disc B 114, 115	Tree line fronting small grass verge and parking area
Area of Landscape Importance	45	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	N	N	Y	N	Disc B 113	Narrow strip of trees between houses
Area of Landscape Importance	44	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 111	Tree line at far end of photo

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	51	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 111	Front right of Photo 4 trees in a row
Area of Landscape Importance	42	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	Y	Y	N	No access Private Garden	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	43	Cranbrook	Cranbrook	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 110	Hedge and trees facing road
Area of Landscape Importance	56	Benenden	Benenden	Y	Y	N	Y	No access Private Garden	Trees and Hedgerow
Area of Landscape Importance	57	Benenden	Benenden	Y	N	N	Y	No access Private Garden	Front Garden with trees and hedgerow
Area of Landscape Importance	58	Benenden	Benenden	Y	N	N	Y	No access Private Garden	Rear of property
Area of Landscape Importance	53	Benenden	Benenden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc A 67, 68	Front garden and tree line frontage to road
Area of Landscape Importance	59	Benenden	Benenden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc A 62	Photo shows front hedge and trees in private garden
Area of Landscape Importance	60	Benenden	Benenden	N	Y	N	Y	Disc A 63	Small woodland
Area of Landscape Importance	108	Iden Green	Benenden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 102, 103	Tree and hedge line behind monument
Area of Landscape Importance	110	Iden Green	Benenden	N	Y	Y	N	Private Land	Tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	150	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	N	Y	N	N	Disc B 81	Not Known
Area of Landscape Importance	147	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 77	Hedges fronting garden
Area of Landscape Importance	148	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 78	Trees in private road between houses off Back Lane
Area of Landscape Importance	143	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc A 73 Private Garden	Hedge in front of house
Area of Landscape Importance	94	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	N	Y	N	No Photo	Church land with trees
Area of Landscape Importance	145	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 75	Hedge and trees facing road

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	146	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	N	N	N	Y	Disc A 76	Hedge and trees facing road
Area of Landscape Importance	93	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	No photo	Tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	98	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc A 90	Tree line small grass area with telephone box
Area of Landscape Importance	97	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc A Private Garden	Hedge Row and trees in private garden
Area of Landscape Importance	100	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	N	Y	N	No photo	Private garden at rear of church
Area of Landscape Importance	101	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc A 92	Small wooded area backing on to houses
Area of Landscape Importance	102	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc A 93, 94	Tree and hedge row fronting houses
Area of Landscape Importance	96	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	N	N	Y	Disc A 95	Tree line behind fence new housing
Area of Landscape Importance	92	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc A 96	Tree and hedge line fronting road
Area of Landscape Importance	95	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	No photo	No access
Area of Landscape Importance	91	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	N	Y	N	No photo	New houses difficult to photograph
Area of Landscape Importance	90	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	N	Y	N	Y	No photo	Trees - wooded amongst new housing
Area of Landscape Importance	114	Kilndown	Goudhurst	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 133	More hedge row very few trees
Area of Landscape Importance	111	Kilndown	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 129	Kilndown Pond and surrounds
Area of Landscape Importance	122	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	N	Disc B 141, 142, 143	Heavier tree line around houses
Area of Landscape Importance	121	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 138, 139	Tree lines within house grounds
Area of Landscape Importance	120	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 137	Tree and hedge line alongside road

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	119	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 136	Tree line by car park 3 trees in car park the rest private
Area of Landscape Importance	116	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	N	No photo	No apparent access
Area of Landscape Importance	118	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 135	River bank and tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	117	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 134	Tree Line both side of the river
Area of Landscape Importance	81	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 128	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	82	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 127	Tree Line
Area of Landscape Importance	83	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 126	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	84	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 125	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	85	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 123	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	86	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 124	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	87	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	N	N	N	Y	Disc B 122	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	88	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	N	Y	N	N	Disc B 121	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	89	Goudhurst	Goudhurst	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 120	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	107	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 92	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	106	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 147	Tree and hedge row by old station garage
Area of Landscape Importance	105	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 146	one tree in front of house and tree line down side of house
Area of Landscape Importance	104	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 145	Tree line in Private Garden

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	73	Brenchley	Brenchley	Y	Y	N	Y	No Photo	Brenchley Churchyard
Area of Landscape Importance	70	Brenchley	Brenchley	Y	Y	N	N	Disc B 151	Private Garden tree lined
Area of Landscape Importance	72	Brenchley	Brenchley	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 152, 153	Tree and hedge lined gardens
Area of Landscape Importance	71	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	N	N	Y	Disc B 150	Trees in gardens
Area of Landscape Importance	69	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 154	Very narrow strip of trees between houses on the right
Area of Landscape Importance	74	Brenchley	Brenchley	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 155	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	75	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	N	N	Y	Disc B 156	Tree and Hedgerow in Front Garden
Area of Landscape Importance	68	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 149	Trees in Back gardens
Area of Landscape Importance	67	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	N	N	Y	Disc B 148	Small green with trees
Area of Landscape Importance	65	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 159	Tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	64	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 160	Trees and Hedge row in front garden
Area of Landscape Importance	134	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 162	Tree and hedge row
Area of Landscape Importance	131	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 166	One tree and hedges in private gardens
Area of Landscape Importance	130	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	N	N	Disc B 167, 168	Edge of public house car park mainly trees
Area of Landscape Importance	41	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	Y	N	Y	No Photo	Could not access
Area of Landscape Importance	40	Paddock Wood	Paddock Wood	N	N	N	Y	Disc B 169	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	137	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 171, 172	Trees dotted within housing

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	136	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 170	Old cemetery Pembury wooded surrounds
Area of Landscape Importance	140	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 176	Trees at far end of picture forming a surround
Area of Landscape Importance	139	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 174, 175	Trees and hedges in private gardens
Area of Landscape Importance	138	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 173	Tree lines
Area of Landscape Importance	142	Pembury	Pembury	N	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 180	Tree line surrounding Tesco Supermarket
Area of Landscape Importance	12	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	Y	Y	N	Y	No Photo	Greggs Wood
Area of Landscape Importance	13	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	N	N	Y	N	Disc B 58, 59	58 tree line to the right and 59 is the frontage on main road
Area of Landscape Importance	14	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	N	N	Y	N	Disc B 60, 61	60 shows edge of tree line and 61 shows frontage of houses on main road
Area of Landscape Importance	16	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St James	Y	Y	Y	N		Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	31	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St James	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 48	Trees - Woodland
Area of Landscape Importance	10	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood/St Johns	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 56	Example of trees and hedge row
Area of Landscape Importance	9	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 53, 54, 55	Robin Hood Pub Gardens and surrounds
Area of Landscape Importance	8	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 52	Lane leading into area
Area of Landscape Importance	34	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 22, 23, 24	Tree line between housing and playing fields Yew Tree Rd
Area of Landscape Importance	35	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 18	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	36	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 19	Trees

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	37	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 21	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	38	Southborough	Southborough North	N	Y	Y	N	Disc B 20	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	39	Southborough	Southborough East	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 26, 27	Trees - Woodland
Area of Landscape Importance	6	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Johns	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 40	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	5	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Johns	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 39	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	32	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Culverden	Y	N	N	Y	No Photo	Cemetery
Area of Landscape Importance	11	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	Y	N	Y	Y	Disc B 50, 51	Tree and hedge lines
Area of Landscape Importance	7	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St James	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 41	Wooded Area
Area of Landscape Importance	33	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Culverden	Y	Y	N	Y	No photo	Culverden Parkland
Area of Landscape Importance	4	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Rusthall	Y	Y	N	Y	No Photo	Trees - Woodland
Area of Landscape Importance	22	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Culverden	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 100, 101	Gardens associated with house
Area of Landscape Importance	29	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 78	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	3	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Culverden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 97,98	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	30	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 79, 80	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	27	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks/Park	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 77	The Grove
Area of Landscape Importance	19	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 67	Side of Sussex Show could not gain entrance
Area of Landscape Importance	28	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	N	N	N	Y		Trees

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	23	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park	N	N	N	Y	Disc B 81	Tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	21a	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 82	Being Built on
Area of Landscape Importance	21	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park/St Marks	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 85	Tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	2	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Rusthall	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 95 , 96	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	1	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 94	Photo shows example of what the area is like
Area of Landscape Importance	124	Langton Green	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Y	No Access	
Area of Landscape Importance	125	Langton Green	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Y	No Access	
Area of Landscape Importance	127	Langton Green	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 32	Tree and hedge lines
Area of Landscape Importance	128	Langton Green	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 33	Grass Verge and trees
Area of Landscape Importance	129	Langton Green	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 34	Grass Verge and trees
Area of Landscape Importance	126	Langton Green	Speldhurst	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 31	Tree line by roadside
Area of Landscape Importance	156	Speldhurst	Speldhurst	N	Y	Y	N	No Access	
Area of Landscape Importance	155	Speldhurst	Speldhurst	N	Y	Y	N	No Access	
Area of Landscape Importance	63	Bidborough	Bidborough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 2, 3	Hedge Rows
Area of Landscape Importance	133	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 161	Tree area opposite village green
Area of Landscape Importance	112	Kilndown	Goudhurst	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 130, 131	Trees in Church Yard Kilndown
Area of Landscape Importance	115	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	Y		Trees

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	99	Hawkhurst	Hawkhurst	Y	N	N	Y	Disc A 91	Tree and hedge line fronting road
Area of Landscape Importance	144	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc A 74	Tree line fronting road
Area of Landscape Importance	149	Sandhurst	Sandhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc A 79	Wooded area corner Back Lane and Bodium Road
Area of Landscape Importance	109	Iden Green	Benenden	N	Y	N	N	No Photo	Tree line
Area of Landscape Importance	54	Benenden	Benenden	N	Y	Y	N	No Photo	Looks as though been built on could not gain access
Area of Landscape Importance	55	Benenden	Benenden	N	Y	Y	N	No Photo	Private Drive no access
Area of Landscape Importance	141	Pembury	Pembury	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 177, 178, 179	Tree lines surrounding housing and village green
Area of Landscape Importance	52	Benenden	Benenden	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc A 64, 65, 66	Semi natural area with pond trees and hedges
Area of Landscape Importance	62	Benenden	Benenden	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc A 60	Historic Garden Photo of front entrance
Area of Landscape Importance	61	Benenden	Benenden	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc A 61	Private Vicarage Garden
Area of Landscape Importance	132	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 163	Trees in distance to left of house
Area of Landscape Importance	135	Matfield	Brenchley	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 165	Grass area edge of village green with trees in front of wall
Area of Landscape Importance	103	Horsmonden	Horsmonden	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 143	Trees surrounding Village Green Horsmonden
Area of Landscape Importance	123	Lamberhurst	Lamberhurst	Y	Y	N	Y	Disc B 140	Tree lines
Area of Landscape Importance	15	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Sherwood	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 62, 63	Tree Lines
Area of Landscape Importance	17	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St James/Park	Y	Y	Y	N	No Photo	Tree lined
Area of Landscape Importance	18	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Park/St Marks	Y	Y	Y	N	Disc B 64, 66	Tree wooded areas within housing

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Area of Landscape Importance	Site No (TWBC)	Locality	Parish	Historical Importance	N Edges	L Skyline	Strategic Importance	Photographs No.	PPG 17 Typology
Area of Landscape Importance	21c	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	N	N	Disc B 87	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	21b	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Pantiles	N	Y	N	N	Disc B 86	See Photo
Area of Landscape Importance	26	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	Y	N	N	Y	Disc B 76	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	24	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 75	Prominent tree cover within housing
Area of Landscape Importance	20	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	N	N	Y	N	Disc B 83, 84	Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	25	Royal Tunbridge Wells	St Marks	N	Y	Y	Y	Disc B 71	Should show elongated area of tree and grass cover
Area of Landscape Importance	66	Brenchley	Brenchley	N	Y	N	Y	Disc B 157, 158	Planted Hedgerow
Area of Landscape Importance	113	Kilndown	Goudhurst	Y	N	Y	N	Disc B 132	Trees at side of church yard Kilndown
Area of Landscape Importance	157	Royal Tunbridge Wells	Southborough	N	Y	Y	Y		Trees
Area of Landscape Importance	158	Royal Tunbridge Wells							Parkland and Hedgerow

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Private Gardens

- 3.313 Although not designated as areas of Landscape Importance, it is appropriate to make comment on an issue of increasing concern in Royal Tunbridge Wells. This is the issue of backfill development, i.e. the development of residential property on existing back gardens.
- 3.314 Such development is driven by private householders, in the main, selling off large gardens. However, it becomes an issue within an urban environment, when this happens several times in the same street, or streets. The impact of this backfill development is a loss of visual amenity value, and potentially a change in the character of an area. This is now of particular concern in Forest Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells.

Recommendations: Areas of Important Open Space Schedule 2001

- 3.315 Following the audit of Areas of Important Open Space 2001, it is recommended that this Schedule is revised by Officers of TWBC, in line with this study. The existing document needs to reflect what is important currently and needs to be updated every 3 years.

Recommendations: Areas of Landscape Importance Schedule 2001

- 3.316 Following the audit of the Areas of Landscape Importance 2001, it is recommended that the Schedule is revised by Officers of TWBC in line with this study. The existing document needs to reflect what is important currently and needs to be updated every 3 years.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

Overall Generic Recommendations

- 3.317 A number of recommendations are made in relation to all sites, the audit and the assessment undertaken. These are concerned with the use of information gathered and the further development of the study in future years:
- Audit greenspaces on a regular basis (every three - five years) and publish findings. This will allow trend data to be collated and improvements to be tracked. It is important that findings are published to enable stakeholders to track progress.
 - Develop a central record of all open space to include the findings of the assessment undertaken. Currently many different sections of the Council hold information regarding open space. Often this information is not consistent (sites listed by different names etc). The central record should include access to GIS mapping.
 - Continue to develop the marketing information produced about the availability of parks and open space facilities available, key activities accommodated and access arrangements. The Council should seek to work with key partners such as the local PCT in future marketing to ensure that greenspace fulfils a valuable role in meeting wider social objectives (e.g. health improvement).
 - Develop an access standard regarding physical access for existing and potential users with a disability
 - Review maintenance standards for greenspace, and agree with local people e.g. Friends Groups any changes. Report on performance annually.
 - For both formal and informal (Semi natural sites) ensure that all sites are safe, attractive and welcoming to visitors.
 - Develop and fund a programme of signage installation, for example, appropriate way markers, information boards and interpretative panels, as well as additional entrance signage to those sites not yet improved.
 - Continue to work towards the reduction of the effects of crime and anti-social behaviour in parks and open spaces.
 - Accessibility – the issue of accessibility, particularly for young people needs to be addressed in partnership with, for example, transport providers to try and alleviate the current problems of poor public transport, which is also time consuming and costly, and which is affecting ability to use e.g. indoor and outdoor sports facilities.
 - Accessibility for older people - wherever possible issues of time and cost need to be addressed to facilitate access to activities and provision across the Borough. In addition, it is important that all facilities across the Borough comply with the requirements of the DDA; even informal open spaces should provide some means of access to at least part of the site, to enable use by those with a disability.

Quality

- 3.318 It is envisaged that the site audits undertaken can be built upon and used as a benchmark against which to measure the condition of the sites now and the progressive improvements in quality in coming years. The assessment can be broken down into a detailed matrix covering all elements of the infrastructure.
- 3.319 Providers of greenspace and indoor and outdoor sports facilities should aspire to provide 'good quality facilities'. TWBC therefore needs to allocate adequate resources to improve those open spaces and indoor facilities that fall below that standard to ensure equality of access for residents within the borough boundaries. As a bare minimum every site that the public use and that is owned by the Borough Council should have signage; if the public use it for recreation it should have a bench and a bin, be clean and be well maintained as a minimum standard of provision.

Accessibility

- 3.320 Sustainable methods of transport such as walking and cycling are actively encouraged within PPG17, especially for any new open space provision or where existing spaces are being improved. Improvements to open space access made by providers should ensure that accessibility by environmentally friendly transport modes is encouraged.
- 3.321 The consultation undertaken with local residents through the door to door survey confirms that they are generally happy with the type of provision and amount of open spaces in their local area and that the time taken to travel to them is acceptable. Residents do however have concerns about personal safety e.g. fear of walking out alone in unlit spaces, which is more of a social issue than a physical access issue.
- 3.322 The community friends groups involved in the more informal countryside areas were concerned over the nuisance caused by motorbikes, which are able to access some sites, and in so doing damage, or affect, the access provided for others. There

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

needs to be consideration given to prohibiting access to wheeled vehicles where this could damage open space provided for public use; and particularly where parts of this space are designated sites of special interest/conservation value.

- 3.323 Facilities need to be compliant with the recommended Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) accessibility guidance; whilst this may not be completely achievable for an outdoor site, there should at minimum be the means provided for individuals to access the site, or parts of the site, and be able to park a vehicle.
- 3.324 People with disabilities find it difficult to access the semi natural greenspaces (they do not particularly want access to the whole site however, but would be happy with a means of accessing part of the site, for example a circular route on site).
- 3.325 The door to door consultation has provided specific accessibility information that has enabled accessibility standards and distance thresholds to be established for each open space typology as defined by the PPG17 Guidance. Respondents to the Door to Door Survey were asked about the time it took them to walk to facilities; this has been used as a guide in establishing accessibility standards; given that levels of car ownership are not 100%, it is important to establish how far local residents would have to walk to provision, if that were their only means of transport. In practice, people tend to access indoor and outdoor sports facilities by car. Appendix 13 illustrates the walking distance thresholds for the open space typologies in Tunbridge Wells Borough.
- 3.326 The travel times in Appendix 13 are based on walking, as this was identified as a main means of transport for many people. Obviously, cycling, public and private transports are also used to access local provision. Tables 3.47 and 3.48 (Appendix 13) demonstrate the impact on the above travel times of using other means of transport. Table 3.48 demonstrates the mode of transport used for each typology as the basis of setting accessibility standards. These have been developed based on the usual means of access provision.
- 3.327 Setting distance thresholds for each type of open space for all areas is not easy to achieve as many factors will influence travel times. The figures are based on generic average travel times. However the standards provided in the main report, as PPG17 recommends, provide guidance that help to identify gaps in provision and meet the local needs as identified through the sample door to door survey of local residents in Tunbridge Wells Borough.
- 3.328 The recommended standards of provision are based on the above mode of travel to provision; it is important to note that it is the access to sports facilities, indoor and outdoor, which are based on drive times, as opposed to walking times; this is the means of travel most generally used to access this type of formal provision, given that participants have equipment and kit to carry. It is important to note that drive times are calculated on the basis of time; in an urban environment, the facilities may be closer, but it is likely to take longer to access them by car, given the traffic levels in the town. In a rural area, facilities may be further away, but it is likely to take less time to travel further. Walking times have been calculated as the same in rural and urban areas; the types of provision to which people walk are more local facilities e.g. parks, play areas, and they should be provided within the same walking distances of residential areas, irrespective of whether the setting is rural or urban.

Review of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- 3.329 Given the limitations of the current Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to securing developer contributions for all types of open space provision, and indoor facilities, from every development in the Borough, it is recommended that the current policies are revised to seek contributions from any development with a bed space (not just 10 bed spaces) towards meeting the prospective recreational needs of new residents.
- 3.330 It is recommended that the Supplementary Planning Guidance should consider developing a hierarchy of play provision, to build on the TWBC policy decision to provide LEAPs as the minimum standard of play provision. Standard play areas should not be below 0.2ha.
- 3.331 It is recommended that the Commuted Costs for Children Play Space Youth and Adult Recreation Open Space are updated with estimated costs reflecting today's prices and these will need to be updated annually.
- 3.332 It is recommended that indoor leisure provision should also be subject to developer contributions, given that there is an ongoing need for investment and development of provision to meet the needs of the local community, and encourage participation in physical activity, to improve community health. Contribution levels should be calculated in relation to the same units as used for other developer contributions e.g. number of bedrooms.

SECTION III – KEY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: BOROUGHWIDE AND PARISH

- 3.333 It is recommended that the suggested local standards as part of this study determine the most appropriate level of provision and therefore guidance for the Borough when setting standards for developer contributions.
- 3.334 It is also recommended that thought be given to development of specific comments in SPP regarding infill development; this should help to address current issues of development on back garden sites, which has the potential to change the character of an area.

Key Challenges for future Provision and Management

- 3.335 From the research, consultation and auditing undertaken, it is clear that there are a number of common issues and challenges that need to be addressed in developing a future strategy for the provision and management of open space, sport and recreation facilities. These are summarised below:

Time Limited Data

- 3.336 As with many assessments, the results of audit work and consultation needs to be considered within the context in which it has been collected and collated. Quality assessments based on site visits and the completion of a non-technical visual assessment provide a good guide to the quality of a site. However, they are also a “snap-shot” in time. Assessments must be repeated on a regular basis in order to develop a clear picture of site quality.

Parish Variances in Provision

- 3.337 The assessment results, when considered on a Parish by Parish basis show a number of variances in the quantity and quality of different types of open space. This presents an issue from an equity point of view, with some communities in the parishes served by better quality, or higher levels, of provision than others, for example provision for children and young people, outdoor sports.

Setting Standards

- 3.338 Setting Standards- some of the recommended future standards for provision are the same as those currently provided; this is because where there is a specific type of provision e.g. Semi-natural/Natural open space which is a significant contributor to the overall topography and nature of the area, it is not a practical recommendation to suggest that the current amount should be reduced, because it is in excess of national recommendations. Rather, the excess of one type of provision, which is inherent to the nature of the Borough, can be seen as compensating for other specific typology deficiencies, if they exist.

Potential Opportunities for Increasing Participation

- 3.339 It was identified through the consultation that open spaces within the borough are sometimes not fully utilised; this is mainly due to the limited funding available, for example, it is perceived that increased funding is required to maintain woodlands and nature reserves. Parish Councils find it difficult to maintain play areas and other outdoor resources.